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# Introduction

At the RAN#92 meeting, a new Work Item was approved for IoT Non Terrestrial Network (NTN) [1]. In this meeting, company views on UL synchronization for IoT NTN are summarized and observations/proposals on identified issues are made. Observations and proposals in Company’s TDoc contributions are listed in the Appendix.

# Issue 1: GNSS Measurements

## Backround

In RAN1#106-e, the following agreement was made:

Agreement:

For sporadic short transmission, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED should go back to idle mode and re-acquire a GNSS position fix if GNSS becomes outdated.

There was no further agreement during RAN1#106bis-e on this issue. Moderator made recommendation as follows

## Company views

### In RRC\_IDLE:

Paging timers:

CMCC discussed for sporadic DL traffic, UE may perform GNSS measurements after a paging occasion and only if it has been paged to reduce battery consumption. GNSS measurement duration can be up to 10 seconds, which implies that after MME requests the lower layer to start paging, it may receive paging response after a long time (e.g., 10 seconds). In current specification (TS 24.301), to initiate high level paging procedure initiated by the MME, the EMM (EPS Mobility Managed) entity in the network requests the lower layer to start paging and shall start the timer:

* T3415 for this paging procedure, if the network accepted to use eDRX for the UE and the UE does not have a PDN connection for emergency bearer services.
* Otherwise, T3413 for this paging procedure.

T3413/T3415 is a supervision timer for the paging procedure. The MME can re-attempt the paging procedure if T3413/T3415 expires before a response is received.

Note that the expiry time of T3413/T3415 is implementation dependent and is not specified in 3GPP, network operator may configure expiry time of T3413/T3415 considering GNSS measurement duration (e.g., 10 seconds) impact in NTN scenario. Thus, for sporadic DL traffic, the existing timers (e.g., T3413/T3415) can be configured large enough to ensure a sufficient gap to accommodate GNSS acquisition after decoding the paging message and before initiating UL transmission.

CMCC proposed conclusion: Acquisition of GNSS position fix during paging procedure is up to UE implementation and network configuration of paging timers considering GNSS measurement duration (e.g. GNSS Time To First Fix with cold start of typically 10 seconds) impact in NTN scenario. These paging timers are not specified in 3GPP in legacy paging procedure (i.e. T3413 / T3415).



**Figure 1: Paging procedure using S-TMSI. (CMCC 2111633)**

CATT proposed the UE triggers the GNSS measurement when it is waken up due to T3412 timer expiration, and then enter IoT active state after GNSS measurement.



Figure 2 GNSS signal reception and IoT UE wakeup (CATT R1-2111236)

GNSS measurement report:

Nokia proposed UE shall report GNSS measurement gap at prior occasion such that network can allocate sufficient time between sending a paging message and when to expect random access procedure initialization from UE. Network shall not repeat the paging message for a UE during the UE’s GNSS measurement gap.



Figure 1 Illustration of GNSS start delay in a paging scenario. (Nokia R1-2111276)

Time gap for GNSS measurements:

ZTE proposed that the UE’s behavior for GNSS information acquisition should be explicitly specified at least before initiating UL transmission after the eDRX/PSM.



Figure 7 Illustration on Time gap for GNSS measurement. (ZTE R1-2111662)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assumption for GNSS TTFF** | | **GNSS TTFF** |
| Cold start | No valid ephemeris, almanac | < 30 seconds (first TTFF of GNSS module) |
| Warm start | Valid almanac if used at least once within 180 days of last TTFF | < 5 seconds (at least a few TTFF within 180 days for optimised prediction algorithms)  Up to 30 seconds (un-optimized algorithms) |
| Hot start | Valid ephemeris if used within 4 hours of last TTFF | < 1 second |

***Moderator view:*** *This issue was discussed extensively in RAN1#106bis-e.*

*Commenting companies have indicated timer-based mechanisms for UE to acquire GNSS measurements during paging procedure. GNSS measurement duration can be up to 10 seconds. After MME requests the lower layer to start paging, it may receive paging response after a long time (e.g., 10 seconds). The MME can re-attempt the paging procedure if T3413/T3415 expires before a response is received. Several approachs were proposed with UE performs GNSS Measurement each time UE wakes up from IDLE mode, time gap for GNSS measurements, or UE shall report GNSS measurement gap at prior occasion. To the moderator understand, a warm start with a valid almanac if used at least once within 180 days of last TTFF would be 5 seconds (longer could be assumed like 10 seconds to be safe). Hot start 1s may only be valid for 4 hours, and may not be possible when next satellite comes by after 4 hours. A tyoical 10 seconds can be assumption for the network for UE and can be configuration optimization when the feature is tested in the network. Since there was no consensus on specifying enhancements, it seems reasonable to use legacy solution with paging timers as proposed by CMCC and CATT..*

***Initial proposal – Section 2.2.1: Companies are encouraged to further on the proposed conclusion, and whether enhancements are needed in Rel-17.***

***Conclusion***

* ***Acquisition of GNSS position fix during paging procedure is up to UE implementation and network configuration of paging timers considering GNSS measurement duration (e.g. GNSS Time To First Fix with cold start of typically 10 seconds) impact in NTN scenario. These paging timers are not specified in 3GPP in legacy paging procedure (i.e. T3413 / T3415).***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| ZTE | Regarding this issue, there are two apsects should be considered:   1. Whether the valid GNSS information should be required before initiating a UL tranasmission:   For this aspect, it’s clear that companies share same understanding (e.g., CATT) that before entering IoT active state for UL transmission, the GNSS positioning fixing is needed. Otherwise, the valid GNSS can not be ensured for UL transmission.  Then, a specified behavior for this operation is needed instead of UE’s implementation.   1. How to specify the required time for GNSS fixing:   Regarding how to define the required time for GNSS fixing, although we prefer to introduce the explicit gap for this purpose, we are also open to take this gap as part of paging timer in Rel-17. It means that the exended timer is always required for NTN UE.  Then, following updated proposal is preferred:  ***UE is expected to acquire the of GNSS position fix before entering IoT active state for UL transmission and network configuration of paging timers considering GNSS measurement duration (e.g. GNSS Time To First Fix with cold start of typically 10 seconds) impact in NTN scenario.*** |
| Qualcomm | This—if it is—will be captured by higher layer specs. RAN1 specs won’t capture these things. |
| Nokia, NSB | Reuse legacy solution with no modification on spec will be one way if the result can be accepted. But if modification on timer is needed, then a exact value for timer based on UE capability of GNSS measurement should be used, to 1) avoid long unnecessary latency because of a) paging missed by UE, b) paging not transmitted in the cell where UE is in, e.g. UE moved, etc, also 2) avoid the unnecessary reduction of coverage time from one moving satellite cell, where UE may not complete the traffic because of a large latency for paging. |
| CMCC | We support the proposed conclusion. |
| GateHouse | We propose rephrasing:  ***Acquisition of a valid GNSS position fix before atempting synchronization is required but left up to UE implementation. (before synch := (a) before T3412 timeout or (b) before any scheduled paging occasions as configured by the network, or (c) upon waking up to transmit mobile-originating traffic)*** |
| Intel | In principle we are fine with the conclusion. However, it seems for us that it is not RAN1 issue. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not sure there is a need to agree on something that has no specification impact. |
| SONY | We agree that the UE should be able to perform a GNSS measurement between being paged and transmitting in the UL (i.e. the UE doesn’t have to speculatively perform a GNSS measurement before paging).  This gap between paging and UL transmission can be created by network configuration of paging timers, as per the moderator conclusion. However, it seems that the UE needs to either know that this is the network configuration (otherwise it would have to perform a GNSS measurement before paging just in case the network had a “short” paging timer configuration) or the eNB needs to know that any UE could perform a GNSS measurement between paging and UL transmission.  We would prefer some stronger statement about what the UE implementation can do, such as:   * ***A UE implementation may acquire a GNSS position fix during the paging procedure and the network can hence configure paging timers to take into account the GNSS measurement duration (e.g. GNSS Time To First Fix with cold start of typically 10 seconds) impact in NTN scenario. These paging timers are not specified in 3GPP in legacy paging procedure (i.e. T3413 / T3415).***   We have a couple of concerns with the text from ZTE:   * What is “IoT Active” state?   What does “before entering IoT active state” mean? This can be read to either mean before the paging, or between paging and UL transmission |
| Ericsson | This conclusion is not needed since it is not RAN1 responsibility. |
| MediaTek | It is fine if we do not make any conclusion. It is not RAN 1responsibility. It can be up to UE implementation and network configuration. We do not any need to optimize things further. As it is typically the case in cellular, the UE vendor, infra vendor and operator will test everything is configured properly and that the system works. |
| Apple | We do not need a conclusion which is not in RAN1 domain. |
|  |  |

### In RRC\_CONNECTED:

GNSS position fix error:

MediaTek provide some analysis suggesting GNSS position fix can be valid for up to 30 seconds assuming high-velocity UEs and UE implementation mechanisms to mitigate position errors in most challenging high velocity scenarios. This is more than sufficient for “short transmission”. A typical in-coverage LEO satellite time is in the order of two minutes (Eutelsat R1-2106776). Within that time the UE could go to idle a maximum of 3 times to re-acquire GNSS position fix with a typical hot fix of 1 second. Assuming Suspend and resume procedure to move UE in RRC\_IDLE and back to RRC\_CONNECTED would add some latency of a few 100 ms seconds (in suspend/resume procedure, the UE context is stored in UE memory and eNB memory, so the RRC messages are minimum size).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Validity of UE location** | 10 s | | 30 s | | 60 s | |
| **UE Velocity** | **UEpos,error** | **TAerror** | **UEpos,error** | **TAerror** | **UEpos,error** | **TAerror** |
| 3 km/h | 4.2 m | 0.02 us | 25 m | 0.14 us | 50 m | 0.29 us |
| 30 km/h | 83.3 m | 0.48 us | 250 m | 1.4 us | 500 m | 2.9 us |
| 60 km/s | 166.7 m | 0.95 us | 500 m | 2.9 us | 1000 m | 5.8 us |
| 120 km/h | 333.3 m | 1.92 us | 1000 m | 5.8 us | 2000 m | 11.6 us |

***Table 1****: TA tracking error due to UE mobility for elevation angle 30 degrees (MediaTek R1-2111373)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Validity of UE location** | 30 s | | | 60 s | | |
| **UE Velocity** | **UEpos,error** | **θ** | **Fderror** | **UEpos,error** | **θ** | **Fderror** |
| 3 km/h | 25 m | 89.999 deg | 0.01 Hz | 50 m | 89.999 Hz | 0.61 Hz |
| 30 km/h | 250 m | 89.998 deg | 1.45 Hz | 500 m | 89.993 deg | 6.1 Hz |
| 60 km/s | 500 m | 89.993 deg | 6.1 Hz | 1000 m | 89.9 deg | 24.9 Hz |
| 120 km/h | 1000 m | 89.9 deg | 24.9 Hz | 2000 m | 89.87 deg | 97 Hz |

***Table 2****: Doppler shift tracking error due to UE mobility at Nadir (MediaTek R1-211133)*

GNSS position fix validity report:

Ericsson observed that the short connection can be defined by considering the validity durations of GNSS position fix, common TA (if indicated) and satellite ephemeris.

Ericson proposed to send an LS to RAN4 on time and frequency error requirements for IoT NTN before discussing the details of validity duration for GNSS position.

Huawei, Nokia proposed UE report its GNSS position fix validity duration to the network.

NEC proposed an internal timer in the device is used by UE to set the GNSS validity duration autonomously.The UE could signal the network the length of time that GNSS position fix is valid, and the GNSS position fix validity duration is determined by the UE at the time it is reported by the UE. MAC CE can be used by the UE to report the remaining valid duration of GNSS position fix.

CATT suggest UE reports its valid duration of GNSS position fix to gNB.

Huawei, Nokia proposed based on the UE reported GNSS position fix validity duration, the network can configure a measurement gap for a new GNSS position fix if the UE does not support simultaneous GNSS and NTN NB-IoT/eMTC operation.

Qualcomm proposed a UE initiates a GNSS validity period when it acquires a fresh GNSS position fix to obtain its geolocation.

* The duration of this validity period is autonomously determined by the UE.
* The start of validity period and validity duration is reported to the network by the UE.

Xiaomi proposed the duration of the GNSS position fix validation is autonomously determined by the UE. The GNSS position fix duration and the time of last GNSS position fix is reported to the network. If UE can maintain its RRC connection when performing the GNSS measurement, UE can trigger RLF or re-acquire GNSS position fix without releasing connection. Otherwise, the UE should directly release the RRC connection

Apple proposed UE autonomously determines the validity of GNSS position fix, based on UE’s mobility patterns (e.g., UE speed). UE reports GNSS position fix validity duration to network via high layer signaling (e.g., MAC CE). UE reporting GNSS position fix validity duration is event-triggered, e.g., when the GNSS position fix validity timer is less than a threshold. UE expects to receive a scheduling gap window from network after reporting GNSS position fix validity duration. UE suspends uplink transmissions and re-acquires GNSS position fix during this scheduling gap window.

It was discussed in discussed in Rel-17 IoT NTN Study Item that UE to re-acquire GNSS is via connected DRX in RRC\_CONNECTED or in eDRX in RRC\_IDLE. This seems straightforward way as in connected DRX or idle eDRX, all IoT operations are stopped which would be consistent with the assumption in the Rel-17 Study Item and Rel-17 Work Item of no simulataneous GNSS and IoT operations. In idle mode, a maximum eDRX of 43.69 min for eMTC and 2.91 hours for NB-IoT can be configured, where eDRX cycle consist of an integral multiple of length of a single H-SFN. The minimum eDRX cycle is 5.12 s for eMTC and 20.48 s for NB-IoT [Table 10.5.5.32, 5]. In connected mode, a maximum DRX of 2.56 s and a maximum eDRX of 10.24s can be configured in *MAC-MainConfig* information element. Rel-12 Power Saving Mode (PSM) with a maximum of 12.1 days can be configured with T3412 configuration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Connected UE** | **Max DRX=2.56 s / eDRX = 10.24 s** |
| **Idle UE** | **Min eDRX = 5.12 s (eMTC) Min eDRX = 20.48 s (NB-IoT)** |
| **Max eDRX = 43.69 min (eMTC) Max eDRX = 2.91 hours (NB-IoT) Max PSM = 12.1 days (NB-IoT)** |

***Table 2****: Connected DRX, Idle DRX, PSM durations (MediaTek R1-2104568)*

It was discussed in discussed in Rel-17 IoT NTN Study Item that during long connections, GNSS fixes by connected UE for UE pre-compensation can be avoided by using closed-loop time and frequency corrections issued by the base-station. Potentially periodic, or prior to each uplink transmission, dedicated/contention-free NPRACH transmission from the UE, followed by a timing and/or frequency correction command are issued by the network in a response message. NPRACH resources with alternate starting subcarriers for NPRACH transmissions *robust* to time and frequency synchronization errors are used for the dedicated/contention-free NPRACH transmission. Reduction in power consumption penalty from GNSS fixing during a long connection can be achieved by replacing a GNSS fix with an NPRACH followed by a closed loop correction as illustrated in Figures below.



Figure 1: Relaxed GNSS fixing using (N)PRACH-based closed loop corrections (Qualcomm R1-2104823)
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Figure 2: Example of "restrictions" on starting NPRACH subcarriers for CBRA. Alternate starting subcarriers may be selected for NPRACH transmission by a UE. (Qualcomm R1-2104823)

Mechanisms to move UE to RRC\_IDLE if GNSS position fix outdated:

ZTE proposed if GNSS becomes outdated, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED declares RLF and move to RRC\_IDLE. There is no need to specify link recovery mechanism specifically for GNSS expiration. Report of GNSS validity duration should be supported to ensure common understanding between BS and UE. The rest validity duration after reporting time is reported.

MediaTek proposed RAN1 send LS to RAN2 to specify mechanism where

* if GNSS position fix becomes outdated, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED declares RLF and move to RRC\_IDLE
* Before GNSS position fix becomes outdated, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED sends Rel-16 MAC CE Release Assistance Indication to request network to move into RRC\_IDLE.

OPPO proposed RAN2 can further discuss and decide the procedure for the UE to go back to idle for GNSS acquisition.

* As GNSS measurements in idle/connected state is an important case which requires detailed discussions to make meaningful progress, we have no objection if any remaining discussions are deferred until the start of Release 18.

Intel proposed to rely on UE implementation for GNSS validity

* Before commencing an UL transmission, the UE shall ensure it has a GNSS position fix that is valid for the duration of that UL transmission
* If UE GNSS measurements are not valid UE declares RLF

Qualcomm proposed to introduce a mechanism that declares RLF when the UE’s GNSS-based geolocation validity expires.

* Details to be specified by RAN2.

CMCC proposed if GNSS becomes outdated, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED declares RLF and move to RRC\_IDLE. UE reports GNSS position fix validity duration to be used by network to move UE to RRC\_IDLE can be considered as an enhancement functionality.

* The rest GNSS position fix validity duration after the reporting may be reported.
* The report may be triggered by the network before UL transmission is scheduled.

Lenovo popose the network can optionally configure the following options for UE to acquire GNSS position fix for sporadic short transmission:

* UE performs GNSS Measurement each time it wakes up from IDLE mode even if the GNSS position fix keeps valid
* When UE wakes up from IDLE mode, if the GNSS position fix is outdated, or if the GNSS validity duration is valid but the remaining GNSS validity duration is less than a threshold, it performs GNSS Measurements

If GNSS becomes outdated, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED declares RLF and move to RRC\_IDLE.

***Moderator view:*** *Commenting companies have indicated a preference if GNSS becomes invalid to move to idle, stay in connect, or trigger RLF. It was proposed that Before commencing an UL transmission, the UE shall ensure it has a GNSS position fix that is valid for the duration of that UL transmission. The short connection could be defined by considering the validity durations of GNSS position fix, common TA (if indicated) and satellite ephemeris. This can be in the order of up to 30 seconds (and would likely have to be at least shorter than 2 minutes because anyway the satellite is in coverage for typically up to 2 minues in LEO). For transmitting a typical IoT packet with a few hundred bits, a short transmission duration or 10 seconds or less should be fine in most cases.*

*Companies also discussed reporting the GNSS position fix validity duration to allow network and UE to have common understanding for either*

1. *Moving UE to RRC\_IDLE;*
2. *Scheduling a gap to allow UE to refresh its GNSS position fix.*

*There were also other ways discussed in the Study Item phase and in offline discussions during Work Item:*

1. *UE re-acquire GNSS in connected DRX*
2. *UE closed-loop time and frequency corrections issued by the base-station*

*Interpretation (i) for the GNSS report usage is consistent with RAN1#106-e agreement “For sporadic short transmission, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED should go back to idle mode and re-acquire a GNSS position fix if GNSS becomes outdated.”.*

*Interpretation (ii) for an UL scheduling gap using GNSS position validity report to network was discussed without consensus in RAN1#106bis-e due to expected large impact on RAN1 specifications and no time in RAN1 to discuss and make agreements within Rel-17 timeframe as many design aspects for an UL scheduling gap will need to be discussed - i.e. when to start/end/duration of gap), how to configure / indicate the gap, UE behaviour before the gap starts (drop / suspend UL transmissions, Ack of DL packets), maintain DL synchronization during/after gap if no simultaneous GNSS and IoT operation, preference for not making new GNSS measurements and instead use combination of Closed-loop timing adjustments and CFRA with Closed-Loop frequency correction to save power consumption and so on. RAN2 cannot specify a scheduling gap which is RAN1 expertise and scope. Scheduling gap enhancements to re-acquire GNSS in RRC\_CONNECTED can be deferred to Rel-18 as part of broader discussions on improved GNSS operations for long connection and high-velocity UEs.*

*Interpretation (iii) UE re-acquire GNSS in connected DRX would be straightforward where eNB can configure connected DRX and restrict scheduling according to the GNSS position fix validity. A Max DRX=2.56 s / eDRX = 10.24 would be more than suffieint time to allow UE to make a GNSS position measurement with a typical hot fix of 1 second. It has minimum impact on specifications since it is a legacy mechanism with only minimum adjustments needs based on GNSS position fix validity.*

*Interpretation (iv) has the advantage that UE may not use its GNSS module to re-acquire GNSS position fix after moving to RRC\_CONNECTED for the time the UE is in coverage of LEO satellite (about 2 minutes in typical LEO constellation). This is optimum for power consumption. The impact on specifications may be relatively higher than interpretation iii, but may be simpler and more flexible than interpretation ii since it is not needed to have a scheduling gap and simply send CFRA on configured resources and receive closed-loop frequency compensation for Doppler and MAC CE TAC for timing corrections in RRC\_CONNECTED..*

***Initial proposal – Section 2.2.1:*** *Companies are encouraged to comment RAN1 send LS to RAN2 to specify solution to move UE to RRC\_IDLE when GNSS becomes outdated*

* *RAN1 has discussed the following aspects and leaves it up to RAN2 to specify UE behaviour related to GNSS position fix validity and determine which of the following aspects are to be specified:*
  + *A new clause of RLF for GNSS becomes outdated to move UE to RRC\_IDLE and re-acquire GNSS*
  + *UE signalling to indicate the GNSS position validity duration is about to expire*
* *It is up to UE implementation to determine if GNSS position fix becomes outdated*
* *Long connection and high-velocity UEs were not prioritized in RAN1 discussions in Rel-17 IoT NTN. These more challenging scenarios of IoT NTN can be deferred to Rel-18 IoT NTN.*

***Initial proposal – Section 2.2.2:***

*Companies are also encouraged to comment on usage and role of GNSS position fix duration report, on the use case (e.g. long connection and high velocity UEs, duration of sporadic short transmission), pros and cons of each way, on scope of potential enhancements and impact on RAN1 / RAN2 specification effort for interpretations i, ii, iii, and iv to use the report, and deferring these potential enhancements to Rel-18 as part of broader discussions on improved GNSS operations for long connection and high-velocity UEs.*

1. *Moving UE to RRC\_IDLE*
2. *Scheduling a gap to allow UE to refresh its GNSS position fix*
3. *UE re-acquire GNSS in connected DRX*
4. ***UE closed-loop time and frequency corrections issued by the base-station***

***Companies can also comment on sending an LS to RAN4 on time and frequency error requirements for IoT NTN before discussing the details of validity duration for GNSS position.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| ZTE | 1. For the first ***Initial proposal – Section 2.2.2:***   As highlighted in our contribution, the best choice to avoid the the case that GNSS will be invalid during the sparodic transmission is to ennable the reporting of GNSS validility duration, then, common understanding will be shared on this aspects for following scheduling.  ***Proposal 12:*** *Report of GNSS validity duration should be supported to ensure common understanding between BS and UE. The rest validity duration after reporting time is reported.*  If no consensus on this direction, we are fine to the moderator’s proposal, and the simpliest way is to take same principle as the agreement in last meeting in case of expiry of UL synchronization validity time. Directly RFL behavior will be specified in RAN2   1. For the 2nd ***Initial proposal – Section 2.2.2:***   We prefer to clarify the intention of this proposal, if it’s for Rel-18, maybe we can postpone it later.  In general, for long connection and high-velocity UEs, regarding each interpretation listed, we think i (moving UE to RRC\_IDLE) is not feasible since frequent RACH procedure will significantly increase the cost.  Moreover, iv (closed-loop correction) may be applicable for stationary UEs or UEs with low speed. But for high-velocity UEs, the closed loop correction may not able to track the variation.  The methods ii and iii can work for long duration and high-velocity UEs, where ii can be considered if still assuming GNSS and IoT modules do not work simultaneously, while iii can be considered if GNSS and IoT modules can work simultaneously. However, for all these two solution, reporting of GNSS validity duration and required time for GNSS positioning fixing are neededto enable the better scheduling/configuration at network side. |
| Qualcomm | For the ***first*** proposal: The part about “up to UE implementation to determine if GNSS position fix becomes outdated” may need to be clarified a bit further. As in, *the UE may autonomously determine how long GNSS fix is valid*. Besides that, 2.2.2 looks OK.  For the ***second*** proposal:   * + 1. Not clear: does it mean the network moving the UE to IDLE? What if such a mechanism fails—i.e., the UE doesn’t receive such a message, but GNSS expires? We anyway RLF (as we have described for ephemeris many times over). We don’t see additional need for this.     2. This CANNOT be done under Release 17 assumptions. When you go from cellular🡪GNSS, it is impossible for a UE to retain the entire cellular (RAN and otherwise) context, while the UE is in (non-simultaneous) GNSS mode. *[The other way round (retaining last GNSS fix when moving to cellular) is trivial, and just involves mostly saving coordinates.]*     3. When the UE acquires GNSS should be left to UE implementation, without any specifications.   We discussed this extensively before, including the many merits it can bring, and how these are *essential* in supporting longer connections. Now we have one company that wants to support long connetions in the last meeting of the release—I wish they voiced their interests earlier, when we raised this issue. Sadly, there is no time to do this in this meeting. This has to be Release 18. |
| Nokia, NSB | Actually, there are several points that need to be clarified:  1, There is one confliction between validity timer and scheduling. No one can provide a clear definition on how long it takes to transmit a complete packet. It is totally up to network scheduling. Please note there are plenty of UEs served in one NTN cell. It is possible network scheduling the one UE long time very late considering e.g. traffic congestion in the cell, number of UEs with data in the buffer etc. Also the packet may be divided into several PHY packets consider the limited PHY packet payload considered in scheduling (e.g. link adaptation). It is network scheduling along with status of cell, status of UE, which can not be known in advance for the system performance.  2, Then, it can not be guaranteed that the UE’s packet can be completed in the validity timer of GNSS or ephemeris, and no one can guarantee that (e.g. the UE may be scheduled to transmit data in any time within the validity timer). So, a common understanding will be needed when validity timer for GNSS or ephemeris will expire and then what UE do for following packets not transmitted. We think that RAN1 should confirm that a common understanding between UE and network is needed. Furthermore, If UE go to IDLE mode after its validity timer expired, then all the repetitions for the ongoing transmission will be wasted and all the PHY packets that has been transmitted may be wasted, as UE need to go for an new initial access and RRC CONNECTION, which will be a big waste. As discussion in RAN2, most companies do not want this procedure.  3, For this common understanding, UE  needs to report the status whether the GNSS/ephemeris is valid and whether new GNSS/ephemeris has been read before its validity timer expire should be necessary as only UE know whether successful/valid.  All these should be considered to make the system work for GNSS and ephemeris validity. |
| CMCC | We support ***Initial proposal – Section 2.2.2***. |
| Intel | We support the first proposal.  For the second proposal, considering limited time for Rel-17 IoT NTN, we prefer the first solution, i.e. “Moving UE to RRC\_IDLE”. Or, RLF can be considered at the UE side. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For the first proposal, we are fine in principle. The second and third bullets are not strictly needed given that there is no specification impact.  For the second proposal, we see the benefit of the first two use cases (i) and (ii). In general, a UE can report its GNSS position validity durationduring initial acess and whether gNB will schedule a gap or give some closed-loop information depends on gNB implemention. Considering the different implementation choices at the UE side, (iii) may not have any specification impact. |
| SONY | The IoT-NTN work item is about sporadic short transmisions. These should be completed before the GNSS position fix becomes invalid. If the UE is engaged in a connection that is so long that the GNSS position fix becomes invalid then an error has occurred. While the specifications need to deal with this error case, elaborate mechanisms are not required.  To allow the eNB to decide whether it can complete a short transmission within the validity of the GNSS position fix (i.e. complete the short transmission before an error case occurs), the UE should indicate the remaining validity of its GNSS position fix at the start of the short transmission.  We would like the **first proposal** to say:  *Companies are encouraged to comment RAN1 send LS to RAN2 to specify solution to avoid commencement of a short transmission if there is insufficient remaining GNSS position fix validity and, as an error case, move UE to RRC\_IDLE when GNSS becomes outdated*   * *RAN1 has discussed the following aspects related to the error case scenario and leaves it up to RAN2 to specify UE behaviour related to GNSS position fix validity and determine which of the following aspects are to be specified:*   + *A new clause of RLF for GNSS becomes outdated to move UE to RRC\_IDLE and re-acquire GNSS*   + *UE signalling to indicate the GNSS position validity duration is about to expire* * *It is up to UE implementation to determine if GNSS position fix becomes outdated* * *Long connection and high-velocity UEs were not prioritized in RAN1 discussions in Rel-17 IoT NTN. These more challenging scenarios of IoT NTN can be deferred to Rel-18 IoT NTN.*   The **second proposal** doesn’t need to be discussed in Rel-17. Rel-17 is about sporadic short transmissions that can be completed within the validity of GNSS position fix and satellite ephemeris information. Support for long connections should be addressed in Rel-18. |
| Ericsson | First proposal: The text looks ok.  Second proposal: We acknowledge that there could be scenarios where GNSS position report may be beneficial. However, we view it as a useful optimization rather than an essential feature for the Rel-17 WI. Therefore, we suggest postponing the discussions until Rel-18.  Reporting GNSS validity duration may not be necessary to move the UE to idle mode. We prefer waiting for RAN2 input on the proposed LS and revisiting this topic in Rel-18 if needed.  We agree with the FL’s interpretation and think that this is a broad topic that can be discussed in Rel-18.  The FL’s interpretation has merit but we think that further discussions are needed. This can be revisited in Rel-18.  Closed-loop frequency correction has not been discussed in detail. This can be discussed in Rel-18.  Regarding sending an LS to RAN4, we don’t think there is time to do this considering that we need to finish our work as much as possible at RAN1#107-e. (A proposal to send an LS to RAN4 was accidentally included in the first version of our contribution but we removed it in a revision.) |
| MediaTek | On first proposal 2.2-1 (typo), Qualcom suggestion is helpful “the UE may autonomously determine how long GNSS fix is valid”    On second proposal 2.2-2  General comment echoing SONY is that the ambition level in Rel-17 should ot very high. It is sufficient to have a working system supporting typical IoT services with short sporadic transmissions. Everyone knows what this means and that it could in the order of a few seconds to 10s typically. UE should be able to keep its UL synchronization for up to 30 seconds even in the case of more challenging of velocity UEs. There is some margin.It is not strictly needed to specify further enhancements for GNSS in RAN1. This discussion can move to RAN2.  A general comment on RLF is that it can be an obvious way for UE to declare RFL and move directly to RRC\_IDLE if it needs to refresh its GNSS position. RAN2 can discuss this.  On (i), reporting GNSS is not necessary. The simplest way for UEs that do not support simultaneous GNSS and IoT operations is to move to idle. The hot fix takes ~ 1second. Adding a few ms to move to RRC\_IDLE and back to CONNECTED via Suspend/Resume procedure with UE context kept in UE and eNB would not add much service interruption. It may not be needed to do that for most UEs, and even for high velocity UEs it may only be needed to do every 30 seconds or a few times within a typical in satellite coverage duration of 2 minutes  On (ii), this solution has huge impact on the specifications as discussed in moderator’s summary. This is a broad topic that can be discussed in Rel-18.  On (iii) this could be considered in RAN2. There may not be any need to do anything except configuring the UE with connected DRX. Discussion on this solution direction and any potential enhancements can be postponed to Rel-18.  On (iv) the ambition level in Rel-18 could be higher. We think it should be an attainable objective not to re-acquire GNSS after moving to RRC\_CONNECTED for a typical in-coverage satellite duration of 2 minures (reference Eutelsat R1-2106776) |
| Ligado | We agree with MediaTek above. The first proposal with Qualcomm’s suggestion is agreeable.  For the second proposal we agree that the ambition level in Rel 17 should be borne in mind. |
| Apple | For the first proposal, Qualcomm’s suggestion seems better.  For the second proposal, we are fine to discuss it in a later release. This is targeted for long connection, which is not the focus of Rel-17. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 1st Round FL proposals for Issue 1

There is no consensus on usage and mechanisms for report of GNSS validity duration to the network, though it is seen by several companies as a potential enhancements allowing the UE and eNB to have common understanding.

Several companies commented that for scheduling gap to re-acquire GNSS cannot be done under Rel-17 assumption and also commented on complexity of mechanisms and need to defer this discussion to Rel-18.

Companies also commented it should be part of a broader discussion considering other potential enhancements such as CFRA and closed-loop frequency correction for improve GNSS operations, connected DRX, and so on.

SONY proposed that RAN2 looks into a solution based on RLF to re-acquire GNSS and avoid issue commencement of a short transmission if there is insufficient remaining GNSS position fix validity.

Based on the above, we make the following proposal:

***1st Round Proposal – Section 2.3:***

* *RAN1 has discussed the following aspects related to the error case scenario of commencement of a short transmission if there is insufficient remaining GNSS position fix validity and leaves it up to RAN2 to specify UE behaviour related to GNSS position fix validity and determine which of the following aspects are to be specified:*
  + *A new clause of RLF for GNSS becomes outdated to move UE to RRC\_IDLE and re-acquire GNSS*
  + *UE signalling to indicate the GNSS position validity duration is about to expire*
* *It is up to UE implementation to determine if GNSS position fix becomes outdated*
* *Long connection and high-velocity UEs were not prioritized in RAN1 discussions in Rel-17 IoT NTN. These more challenging scenarios of IoT NTN can be deferred to Rel-18 IoT NTN.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Intel | The proposal seems reasonable considering the Rel-17 WI priorities. It is up to UE to make sure that GNSS info is up to date. If it is not – UE can declare RLF. |
| MediaTek | Support proposal. The UE can autonomously determine if it has time to commence and finish a new UL transmission before its GNSS position becomes outdated based on some internal timer, algorithm to predict when the GNSS position becomes outdated, and so on. The GNSS position should not become outdated for at least 10 – 30 seconds even assuming high velocity UEs. This should give time for the UE to finish transmission. RAN2 can discuss error case scenario with either RLF to move UE to RRC\_IDLE or UE signaling to indicate GNSS position duration is about to expire re-using existing signaling (i.e. Rel-16 Release Assistance Signalling with a new interpretation). This will keep impact on RAN2 specification minimum. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | For the first bullet, it is suggested to delete ”move UE to RRC \_IDLE”, it could be up to RAN2 to decide the RRC states during the RLF.  For the second bullet, we don’t really need this as an agreement.  For the third bullet, we agree with it in principle , but it is not clear to us what is the definition of the “•Long connection and high-velocity UEs” |
| CMCC | Fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | The LS text looks fine.  We propose to add an initial sentence to the proposal: “Send an LS to RAN2 with the following content:” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the first bullet and suggest to remove “*the error case scenario of*”. The second bullet and the third bullet are not strictly needed. |
| Nokia, NSB | We think the “*UE signaling to indicate the GNSS position validity duration is about to expire*” is for common understanding between UE and network on validity of GNSS duration so that network can clearly know when GNSS will expire and then later UE behavior can be discussed further. However, the issue is which resource UE will use to report. UE may not be scheduled for UL transmission when GNSS is about to expire. We can agree with HW on UE to report GNSS validity duration at least in RACH procedure, which can be used in either initial access or when recovery UL sync in RRC CONNECTED mode. So we propose to keep both signaling for RAN2 to further discuss:   * + *UE signaling to indicate the GNSS position validity duration during RACH procedure or UE signalling to indicate the GNSS position validity duration is about to expire*   While for RLF like scheme, we can agree with Qualcomm that it is not for UE to go to IDLE mode as there is still chance for UE to recover the UL sync. But it is not new RLF but a new TAT timer like procedure as it is not loss of DL synchronization but all UE’s processing is for UL synchronization recovery. We agree with ZTE and Qualcomm that UE should be kept in RRC CONNECTED mode so that the traffic can continue when UL sync recovered. We can reuse from *timeAlignmentTimer* recovery like procedure, where UE can be kept in RRC connected mode and a new GNSS can be acquired and then perform legacy procedure as CBRA/CFRA. This TAT recovery like procesure is discussed in RAN2 as most straightforward solution with minimum impact on specification. So we propose to add the subbullet as   * + *A new TAT timer recovery, where UE is kept in RRC\_CONNECTED and re-acquires the GNSS and triggers RACH procedure to recover from UL out of synchronization.*   Updated proposal as below:  ***1st Round Proposal – Section 2.3:***   * *RAN1 has discussed the following aspects related to the error case scenario of commencement of a short transmission if there is insufficient remaining GNSS position fix validity and leaves it up to RAN2 to specify UE behaviour related to GNSS position fix validity and determine which of the following aspects are to be specified:*   + *A new TAT timer recovery, where UE is kept in RRC\_CONNECTED and re-acquires the GNSS and triggers RACH procedure to recover from UL out of synchronization.*   + *A new clause of RLF for GNSS becomes outdated to move UE to RRC\_IDLE and re-acquire GNSS*   + *UE signaling to indicate the GNSS position validity duration during RACH procedure or UE signalling to indicate the GNSS position validity duration is about to expire* * *It is up to UE implementation to determine if GNSS position fix becomes outdated* * *Long connection and high-velocity UEs were not prioritized in RAN1 discussions in Rel-17 IoT NTN. These more challenging scenarios of IoT NTN can be deferred to Rel-18 IoT NTN.*   Considering limited time in Rel17, we can compromise that just above proposal are discussed in Rel17, although still maybe some issues for Rel17. |
| OPPO | Support |
|  |  |

## 2nd Round Proposal for Issue 1

***2nd Round Proposal –2.4-rev1:***

* *Send LS to RAN2 to specify solution to avoid commencement of a short transmission if there is insufficient remaining GNSS position fix validity and, as an error case, move UE to RRC\_IDLE when GNSS becomes outdated:*
  + *A new clause of RLF for GNSS becomes outdated to move UE to RRC\_IDLE and re-acquire GNSS*
  + *UE signalling to indicate the GNSS position validity duration is about to expire*
* *It is up to UE implementation to determine if GNSS position fix becomes outdated*
* *Long connection and high-velocity UEs were not prioritized in RAN1 discussions in Rel-17 IoT NTN. These more challenging scenarios of IoT NTN can be deferred to Rel-18 IoT NTN.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Issue 2: Validity timer for UL synchronization

## Background

The following agreements were made in RAN1#106e.

Agreement:

* Satellite ephemeris read on SIB are valid for the duration of sporadic short transmission in RRC\_CONNECTED.
* Common TA parameters if indicated and read on SIB are valid for the duration of sporadic short transmission in RRC\_CONNECTED.
* Note: The duration of the short transmission is not longer than the “validity timer for UL synchronization” referred to in the WID objective (but which still needs further discussion for specifying further details)

Agreement:

The validity timer of UL synchronization is configured by the network

* FFS: Whether a single validity timer or separate validity timers are used for satellite ephemeris and common TA parameters

Agreement:

UE in RRC\_IDLE reads the satellite ephemeris on SIB and the common TA parameters if indicated on SIB and (re-)start the validity timer(s) for UL synchronization before moving to RRC\_CONNECTED.

* FFS: Details of the precise (re-)start time for the validity timer for UL synchronization to ensure a common understanding between gNB and UE.
* Other signaling details for validity timer are up to RAN2

RAN1#106bis-e made the following agreements

Agreement:

The validity timer for UL synchronization is started/restarted with configured timer validity duration at the epoch time of the assistance information (i.e. serving satellite ephemeris data).

* FFS: Precise definition of epoch time taking into account SIB repetitions

Agreement:

A single validity duration for both serving satellite ephemeris and common TA related parameters is defined at least if serving satellite ephemeris and common TA parameters are signalled in the same SIB message.

Agreement:

RAN1 has discussed the following aspects and leaves it up to RAN2 to specify UE behaviour related to expiry of UL synchronization validity timer and determine which of the following aspects are to be specified:

* Mechanisms for UE to declare loss of UL synchronization including mechanisms for UL synchronization recovery procedure when UL synchronization is lost if UL synchronization validity timer expires in RRC\_CONNECTED
  + It is up to RAN2 to specify this new behaviour for connected UE within RLF set of procedures or a new procedure for re-acquiring satellite ephemeris
  + Mechanism for UL synchronization includes re-acquiring the satellite ephemeris and common TA parameters if indicated on SIB
  + A new clause of RLF for loss of UL synchronization if validity timer for UL synchronization expires assuming a new re-interpretation of RLF set of procedures is specified for recovery of UL synchronization with re-acquisition of satellite ephemeris and common TA parameters if indicated
  + Potential additional RACH after re-acquisition of satellite ephemeris and common TA parameters if indicated for the UL synchronization recovery procedure in case of potential residual TA error.
* If validity timer for UL synchronization expires and no UL synchronization recovery mechanisms specified as above, UE behaviour shall declare RLF and go into idle mode autonomously to re-acquire ephemeris SIB. UE will then need to re-access the cell via Random Access procedure.

UE signalling to indicate the validity timer for UL synchronization is about to expire

## Company views

Epoch time:

Huwaei proposed the reference point for Epoch time is set at the serving satellite transmitter. The Epoch time for common TA and satellite ephemeris is defined as the ending time of the SI window carrying the common TA and satellite ephemeris.

Marvenir proposed the Epoch time of serving satellite ephemeris data is the time instance at which the corresponding ephemeris data has been captured. The epoch time of serving satellite ephemeris data is transmitted in the same SIB which contains the ephemeris data.

CATT proposed if SIBs are transmitted repeatedly, epoch time should be based on the transmitting time of the first SIB.

SONY proposed the epoch time of the current ephemeris information is defined as the time that the first physical layer repetition of the first RRC level repetition of the current ephemeris information is transmitted. The epoch time of the current ephemeris information is transmitted on SIB.

ZTE proposed the Epoch time of assistance information is set to be boundary of last DL subframe carrying the first transmission of SIB.

Samsung proposed Epoch time of assistance information (i.e., satellite ephemeris and common TA) can be defined as the starting time of the first repetition of the SIB received by UE to acquire the assistance information.

Ericsson proposed to adopt the same definition of epoch time for IoT NTN as for NR NTN.

Validity timer duration:

Ericsson proposed that separate validity timers are preferred if ephemeris and common TA are transmitted in different SIBs.

Qualcomm proposed that the duration of valid ephemeris (and common TA, if applicable) is counted starting from the first repetition of the SIB carrying satellite ephemeris (and, if applicable, common TA-related) information.

ZTE proposed validity timer for uplink synchronization (i.e., satellite ephemeris or common TA parameters) (re)starts at the starting time of system information window of system information carrying uplink synchronization parameters.

CMCC proposed RAN2 determine adoption of one of the following two approaches for updating the assistance information (i.e. serving satellite ephemeris data or Common TA parameters).

* If Approach 1 is adopted: the update period (e.g. 160 ms) as well as the validity duration (e.g. 10~30s) for the assistance information are much smaller than SI modification period (e.g. 1~3 hours), one of the following options can be supported. Changes of the assistance information should neither result in system information change notifications nor in a modification of systemInfoValueTag in SIB1.
  + Option 1: Provide the epoch time as part of the assistance information by indicating the SFN and the sub-frame number that the information is valid for.
  + Option 2: The epoch time is set to be boundary of last DL slot carrying the SIB.
* If Approach 2 is adopted: Set the SI modification period = The update period for the assistance information = the validity duration for the assistance information (about 10~30s), no spec impact is expected. In this case, UE expects the assistance information keep valid within the current SI modification period.

Nordic Semiconductor proposed if serving satellite ephemeris and common TA are signaled in separate SIB messages, a separate validity timer for serving satellite ephemeris and timer for common TA is configured by eNB with initial timer values X and Y. Validity timer for SIB ephemeris is reset at least upon UE reading SIB with ephemeris and validity timer for common TA is reset at least upon UE receiving SIB with common TA.

Marvenir observed there are important use cases in which a UE needs to communicate with eNB in longer time scales, e.g., multimedia transmission (pictures, videos) in the UL, or firmware update in the DL, which could span from a few 10s of minutes to many hours. They would like to ensure these use cases are seamlessly covered in IoT-NTN without service interruptions. They believe that we also need to let UE to regularly read SIB to get the up to date info on the TA parameters, and would want to avoid UE going back and forth between idle and connected mode.

Validity timer duration report:

Nokia proposed there should be common understanding on start time and expire time of validity timer for GNSS and validity timer for ephemeris between UE and network, which should be specified in IoT NTN. TAT like validity timer could be used as a baseline, where UE should report to network so that both UE and network reset the validity timer and keep common understanding. To reduce overhead, UE reporting should be reduced, where e.g. only first report valid information and failure report. Network configured UL resource for report for validity of ephemeris should be specified. Validity report within the repetitions should be specified.

UL transmission duration:

CATT proposed to support validity duration along with satellite ephemeris and Common TA is broadcasted in SIB to simplify the signaling design. After UE has lost uplink synchronization caused by unavailable new or additional assistance information, IoT NTN UE will go back to IDLE state and resynchronize.

Ericsson observed that the short connection can be defined by considering the validity durations of GNSS position fix, common TA (if indicated) and satellite ephemeris. The need and purpose of a new UL compensation gap for long UL transmission is not well-justified. For example, it is not clear if it is needed for avoiding phase discontinuity, re-acquiring satellite ephemeris, getting a GNSS position fix, calculating pre-compensation values, or for reducing implementation complexity for transmit timing and frequency adjustment.

SONY proposed the UE estimates the time it will take to complete a short transmission based on the amount of data to transmit, measurements and scaling / correction information transmitted in SIB. SIB configures a scaling factor and time offset to allow the UE to calculate the time to complete its short transmission. The UE only commences a short transmission if its estimate of the duration of the short transmission is less than the remaining validity time of UL synchronisation. If an ongoing short transmission cannot be completed within the validity time of UL synchronization, the UE informs the network of imminent loss of UL synchronisation.

* Issue 1: How to ensure the UE only starts a short transmission if there is a reasonable prospect of it completing the transmission before the validity timer expires.
* Issue 2: There is a limited time in CONNECTED mode for the UE to complete its short transmission.
* Issue 3: The UE needs to calculate when the validity timer will expire.
* Issue 4: Definition and configuration of epoch time, where the epoch time is the start time of the validity of the ephemeris information.
* Issue 5: Any RLF procedure that may be specified by RAN2 is for exceptional situations. The UE should complete its short transmission before an RLF procedure is triggered.

The UE has to undertake the following procedure when data arrives in its UE buffers and it starts a short mobile-originated transmission (more details in R1-2111410):

* UE reads SIB containing ephemeris information
* UE determines value of validity timer from SIB
* UE determines the current age of the ephemeris information on SIB [issue 4]
* UE calculates the remaining time for which ephemeris information on SIB is valid [issue 3]
* UE decides whether it can complete a short transmission during the remaining validity time [issue 1]
* If the UE estimates that there is sufficient time to complete the short transmission:
  + UE performs initial access
  + UE moves to CONNECTED mode
  + UE takes part in signalling exchange in order to communicate its short transmission
  + RRC connection is released gracefully
* If the UE short transmission time exceeds the validity time of the ephemeris information, the UE undertakes a modified RLF procedure or moves to IDLE [issue 5]
  + Note: this should be an exceptional situation that should be avoided



Issues to short transmissions while UL synchronisation is valid SONY R1-2111410

***Moderator view****: It was discussed that UL transmission duration is determined autonomously by the UE based on its validity timer duration and scheduled UL grant. Report of validity timer duration was also discussed. On Epoch time, several companies proposed it is based on the first transmission of SIB. NB-IoT has SIB scheduling based on SIB1. Adopting same definition of epoch time for IoT NTN as for NR NTN from NR is a good guiding principle. It seems reasonable to base the Epcoh time on the boundary of last DL subframe carrying the first transmission of SIB as it simplifies timing aspects of when the SIB is read within the window and latency due to processing. It gives some margin fo the validity of the ephemeris and common TA parameters. Then, it seems also logival that the validity timer for uplink synchronization (i.e., satellite ephemeris or common TA parameters) (re)starts at the starting time of system information window of system information carrying uplink synchronization parameters. The validity duration can be discussed in RRC parameter email discussion.*

*Companies are encouraged to comment the following two proposals below.*

***Initial proposal – Section 3.2-1:***

*Epoch time of assistance information is set to be boundary of last DL subframe carrying the first transmission of SIB*

***Initial proposal – Section 3.2-2:***

*Validity timer for uplink synchronization (i.e., satellite ephemeris or common TA parameters) (re)starts at the starting time of system information window of system information carrying uplink synchronization parameters.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| OPPO | Support initial proposal- section 3.2-1  Support initial proposal – section 3.2-2 |
| ZTE | 1. For 3.2-1,   we support the proposal. Note that different from NR-NTN, UE is able to distinguish first transmission and repetition of SIB1 based on SFN, PCID and repetition number. Even if UE decode a repetition of SIB, it is able to derive the time of first transmission according to SFN and there is no ambiguity. Hence, it is feasible to apply a pre-defined rule to indicate epoch time.   1. For 3.2-2,   Firstly, we’d like to clarify that our positioning seems to be captured incorrectly in the analysis above and prefer to remove th description as (sorry for any potential mis-understanding):  ~~ZTE proposed validity timer for uplink synchronization (i.e., satellite ephemeris or common TA parameters) (re)starts at the starting time of system information window of system information carrying uplink synchronization parameters.~~  **Regarding the time instant to (re)start the validity timer, it should be aligned with epoch time, i.e., boudnary of last DL subframe carrying the first transmission of SIB**. It means that regardless of time instant for SIB decoding, the validility duration should be counted from the first transmission of SIB. In this way, no changes on the SIB content will be expected including validity duration cross all repetition. |
| MODERATOR | We captured in-correctly ZTE position. Sorry for mistake. We’ll cross out the text for ZTE position as suggested |
| Qualcomm | 1. For the most up-to-date ephemeris values and corresponding propagation at the UE, why shouldn’t the timer be calculated from the ***first DL subframe*** carrying the SIB? If the timer starts from the last DL subframe, and the network sets the validity duration based on the moment it transmits the ephemeris, for the last **“last SF – first SF”** duration of time at the UE, the ephemeris value will be outdated. 2. We are needlessly complicating this. The validity timer **starts when the UE reads “the SIB”**. That gives the most accurate ephemeris propagation at the UE. The UE shall assume that each SIB carrying this info is “fresh”, “up to date”, and the validity duration will start from that point on. [Note that, there are SIBs like this, that do not “repeat”, etc.]. |
| Nokia, NSB | There are similar discussion on NR NTN. We need discuss whether special design for IoT NTN with NR NTN solution as starting point.  For validity timer of ephemeris and common TA, it should (re)start from the epoch time associated to the information, not just the SI window. |
| CMCC | Conditional support for ***Initial proposal – Section 3.2-1*** and ***Initial proposal – Section 3.2-2***.  As highlighted in our contribution (R1-2111633), two approaches can be considered to update the assistance information (i.e. serving satellite ephemeris data or Common TA parameters).  - Approach 1: The update period (e.g., 160ms) as well as the validity duration (e.g., 10~30s) for the assistance information are much smaller than SI modification period (e.g., 1~3 hours). Changes of the assistance information should neither result in system information change notifications nor in a modification of valueTag in SIB1, just like “timeInfoUTC” field acts in SIB9.  - Approach 2: Set the SI modification period = The update period for the assistance information = the validity duration for the assistance information (about 10~30s).  **It is up to RAN2 to determine which approach is adopted for updating the assistance information.**  If Approach 1 (i.e., the update period as well as the validity duration for the assistance information are much smaller than SI modification period) is agreed to be adopted, we support ***Initial proposal – Section 3.2-1*** and ***Initial proposal – Section 3.2-2***.  Nevertheless, if Approach 2 (i.e., Set the SI modification period = The update period for the assistance information = the validity duration for the assistance information) is adopted, no spec impact is expected, i.e., **there is no need to explicitly or implicitly indicate the validity duration, as well as to define the va*lidity timer for uplink synchronization***. In fact, UE expects the assistance information keep valid within the current SI modification period. If needed, we can say that the epoch time of assistance information is implicitly known as the start boundary of the current SI modification period. |
| GateHouse | 1. To answer Qualcomss question: We believe the ephemeris transmitted in the SIB should be propagated forward to whichever Epoch . Therefore to have the most accurate ephemeris, its epoch should start at the end of its transmission.  We agree with the proposal – alternatively, adding an offset to the Epoch to account for transmission delay from satellite to could be considered.   We agree with Qualcomm. The Ephemeris included in the SIB will be propagated forward from the Epoch at which we start it, thus the validity of propagating using this ephemeris should be assessed in relation to the Epoch time.  Not sure this is captured in the initial proposal. |
| Intel | We support the first proposal.  For the second proposal we share the same view as Qualcomm, i.e. The validity timer starts when the UE reads the SIB. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ***Initial proposal – Section 3.2-1:***  We prefer to define the epoch time as the ending time of the SI window carrying the common TA and satellite ephemeris.  ***Initial proposal – Section 3.2-2:***  In NR NTN, we have the following agreement. We don’t understand why the agreement cannot be reused for IoT-NTN.  Agreement:  NTN ephemeris validity timer should be started/restarted with configured timer validity duration at the epoch time of the assistance information (i.e. serving satellite ephemeris data) |
| Mavenir | Epoch start time should be the same as NR-NTN, and signaled in SIB.  Validity timer should start at epoch start time.  This for ensuring the eNB to have common timer as all the serving UEs in global clock, not UE specific DL timing which is difficult for eNB to individually track. |
| SONY | **First proposal**. Agree with Qualcomm on point (1). The validity duration should be based on the first SF. The validity duration has already gone a bit stale by the time the last SF is reached.  **Second proposal**. Agree with moderator proposal. The ephemeris information is valid from when it is first transmitted in the system information window until the system information window ends and new ephemeris information is transmitted.  Why would old ephemeris information be valid when there is new ephermeris information???  If the UE were UE-specifically sent updated ephemeris information, such as if the UE were to report that it would imminently lose UL sychronisation, then the UE could re-start its validity timer on the basis of this UE-specific updated ephemeris information.  We also think that there needs to be some mechanism to allow the UE to estimate the time that a short transmission will take before the ephemeric (or GNSS for that matter) information becomes invalid. The UE should not start a short transmission if it cannot complete it in time. |
| Ericsson | ***Initial proposal – Section 3.2-1, Initial proposal – Section 3.2-2:*** These are different to what is proposed for NR NTN by the moderator of AI 8.4.2. We think the definitions should be aligned and prefer the definitions proposed for NR NTN and think we should await conclusion in the NR NTN WI and adopt those solutions. |
| MediaTek | An overall comment is that the UE prediction time can be in the order of 30 seconds. There is no need to over optimize the start of validity ephemeris. Ii is good practice to have some margin to avoid issues with UL synchronization.  Support 3.2-1 Serving satellite ephemeris Epoch time is implicitly known as a reference time defined by the starting time of a DL slot and/or frame.. The difference in IoT NTN are the repetitions for the SIB carrying the ephemris and common TA parameters. NB-IoT supports SIB periodicity up to 4.096 seconds and up to 256 repetitions. There is no way of knowing how long / how many repetitions a UE needs to decode the SIB with the ephemeris / common TA parameters. It is simpler to do the UE prediction from a known reference time for the first repetition. This way provides some margin.  On 3.2-2, the simplest way is that UE start the timer when it read the ephemeris on the SIB. We agree with Huawei that it can be same as in NR NTN. This way also provides some margin.  Agreement:  NTN ephemeris validity timer should be started/restarted with configured timer validity duration at the epoch time of the assistance information (i.e. serving satellite ephemeris data) |
| Apple | We think the similar discussion is in NR NTN. We may follow a unified design as NR NTN. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 1st Round proposal for Issue 2

Several companies commented the time instant to (re)start the validity timer, it should be aligned with epoch time. This is consistent with the NTN agreement

Agreement:

NTN ephemeris validity timer should be started/restarted with configured timer validity duration at the epoch time of the assistance information (i.e. serving satellite ephemeris data)

Several companies commented further that it should be aligned with epoch time at boundary of last DL subframe carrying the first transmission of SIB. This can avoid ambiguity of when the UE re-acquire / read the ephemeris and re-start the validity timer due to SIB repetititon within the window. The difference with NR NTN in IoT NTN are the repetitions for the SIB carrying the ephemeris and common TA parameters. NB-IoT supports SIB periodicity up to 4.096 seconds and up to 256 repetitions. This way provides some margin when applying the NR NTN agreement to IoT NTN.

Several companies proposed that the validity timer starts when the UE reads “the SIB”. That gives the most accurate ephemeris propagation at the UE. The UE shall assume that each SIB carrying this info is “fresh”, “up to date”, and the validity duration will start from that point on. The moderator has much sympathy for this view that suggest it is up to the UE implementation and is simpler.

CMCC discussed one approach where the update period (e.g., 160ms) as well as the validity duration (e.g., 10~30s) for the assistance information are much smaller than SI modification period (e.g., 1~3 hours). Changes of the assistance information should neither result in system information change notifications nor in a modification of valueTag in SIB1, just like “timeInfoUTC” field acts in SIB9. Another approach is to set the SI modification period = The update period for the assistance information = the validity duration for the assistance information (about 10~30s). It is up to RAN2 to determine which approach is adopted for updating the assistance information.

SONY commented that there needs to be some mechanism to allow the UE to estimate the time that a short transmission will take before the ephemeric (or GNSS for that matter) information becomes invalid. The UE should not start a short transmission if it cannot complete it in time.

***1st Round Proposal – Section 3.3-1:***

*Epoch time of assistance information is set to be boundary of last DL subframe carrying the first transmission of SIB*

***1st Round Proposal –Section 3.3-2:*** *Companies are encouraged to comment on the following options and indicate preference*

* *Option 1: NTN ephemeris validity timer should be started/restarted with configured timer validity duration at the epoch time of the assistance information (i.e. serving satellite ephemeris data).*
* *Option 2: The validity timer starts when the UE reads the ephemeris and common TA parameters on the SIB, which provides the most accurate propagation of ephemeris and common TA at the UE.*

*It is up to RAN2 to determine which approach is adopted for updating the assistance information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Intel | For the first proposal, we are OK with the proposal provided by the moderator. In the same time, it is also acceptable for us to reuse solution from NR NTN. |
| MediaTek | Support 3.3-1. This way is consistent with NR NTN, where the main difference is repetitions of SIB in IoT NTN. It is also straightforward to predict in time going forward for the amount of UE pre-compensation for delay and Doppler shift using GNSS-acquired position and ephemeris.  Support Option 2: The justification is the high level of repetitions in IoT NTN. This is simpler and does not need any specification.. |
| Apple | We are fine with the first proposal. We are also fine to follow the same conclusion as NR NTN (which is still open).  For second proposal, we support Option 1 since it is aligned with NR NTN solution. We do not support that it is up to RAN2 to determine the approach. |
| Xiaomi | For the first proposal, the definition of the first transmission of SIB may need to be clarified as the SIB is periodical transmitted.  For the second proposal, we already agreed in the last meeting ” The validity timer for UL synchronization is started/restarted with configured timer validity duration at the epoch time of the assistance information (i.e. serving satellite ephemeris data).” It is naturally option 1. Why we are discussing this again. Anything missed here? |
| CMCC | Regarding the following two approaches:   * Approach 1: The update period (e.g., 160ms) as well as the validity duration (e.g., 10~30s) for the assistance information are much smaller than SI modification period (e.g., 1~3 hours). Changes of the assistance information should neither result in system information change notifications nor in a modification of systemInfoValueTag in SIB1, just like “timeInfoUTC” field acts in SIB16.   - Approach 2: Set the SI modification period = The update period for the assistance information = the validity duration for the assistance information (about 10~30s).  In our understanding, Approach 1 is the implicit working assumption for ***1st Round Proposal – Section 3.3-1*** and ***1st Round Proposal –Section 3.3-2***.  If Approach 2 is adopted, the assistance information is unchanged at least within the whole SI modification period. Thus, there is no need to start/restart the NTN ephemeris validity timer, since UE can simply expect the assistance information keep valid within the current SI modification period.  Nevertheless, we get aware of the inefficiency of Approach 2. Although how long to update SIBs is up to network implementation, and according to the specification, the modification period can be configured as short as 640ms, NW may seldomly update SIBs in the terrestrial network. Thus, Approach 2 may restrict network implementation flexibility.  We also prefer Approach 1. However, consider there may be some spec impact in RAN2, we suggest to make a working assumption for Approach 1, and send a LS to RAN2 for confirmation.  Working assumption:  - Changes of the assistance information ((i.e. Serving satellite ephemeris and Common TA parameters)) should neither result in system information change notifications nor in a modification of systemInfoValueTag in SIB1  For ***1st Round Proposal – Section 3.3-1***, if Approach 1 is adopted, we support it. We are also fine to follow the same conclusion as NR NTN (which is still open).  For ***1st Round Proposal – Section 3.3-2***, we slightly prefer Option 1 since it is aligned with NR NTN solution. |
| Ericsson | 1st Round Proposal – Section 3.3-1: We do not support this since we think a unified design with NR NTN should be adopted unless there is a good reason not to. For NR NTN there is majority support for indicating epoch time with SFN + subframe number signaled together with the assistance information. We should await conclusion from the NR NTN discussion before agreeing on a definition for IoT NTN.  1st Round Proposal –Section 3.3-2: We prefer Option 1 since it is unambiguous and aligned with the agreement for NR NTN. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For the definition of epoch time in ***1st Round Proposal – Section 3.3-1,*** we are fine.  For ***1st Round Proposal – Section 3.3-2,*** we prefer Option 1 to align with NR NTN. |
| Nokia, NSB | For ***1st Round Proposal – Section 3.3-1****,* this item is in discussion in both NR NTN and IoT NTN. We think it is NCC to decide which Epoch time the ephemeris/common TA are associated to, it should be up to NCC but not to define it as fixed subframe. From this PoV, we propose the Epoch time is explicitely configured in SIB and up to network to decide which DL subframe is associated to.  For ***1st Round Proposal –Section 3.3-2,*** this item is also in discussion in NR NTN and IoT NTN. We propose Option 1. |
| SONY | **3.3-1**: We would prefer that it is the first subframe. The validity time is a relflection of how long the ephemeris information is “fresh”. By the end of the last subframe of the first subframe, the ephemeris information is already “stale” by the time it takes to transmit the physical layer repetitions of the first SIB transmission.  **3.3-2**: Support option 1. The validity time is a reflection of how far into the future the ephemeris information that was transmitted starting at the epoch time is valid. The problem with option 2 is that a UE that reads ephemeris information that is about to be updated will consider it to be valid for a time beyond which it is valid.  We don’t understand the bullet “*It is up to RAN2 to determine which approach is adopted for updating the assistance information.*”. What does “which” refer to? It sounds like there is some list of possible options and RAN2 decides which of those options is going to be applied. Maybe this should be a separate proposal that states:  *It is up to RAN2 to determine the approach that is taken ~~is adopted~~ for updating the assistance information.*”  Are we saying that RAN2 will decide which SIB carries the assistance (aka ephemeris) information and the mechanisms by which the SIB is updated? |
| OPPO | We support ***1st Round Proposal – Section 3.3-1***  For ***1st Round Proposal –Section 3.3-2***, we think option 1 and option 2 are not contradicting to each other. In fact, the option 2 gives the moment for the UE to restart the timer and the option 1 is the regulate what the starting time the UE shall set. In our opinion, the correct UE behavior is the combination of these two options. When the UE reads the ephemeris and common TA, the UE restarts the timer and sets the timer with an initial value equal to the validity duration – epoch time. |
|  |  |

## 2nd Round Proposal for Issue 2

Several companies commented NR NTN agreement for validity timer should be re-used for validity timer for UL synchronization. For Epoch time of assistance information, we can wait for NR NTN discussion to conclude. Hence, we revised and added proposals for 2nd Checkpoint agreements accordingly

***2nd Checkpoint Proposals –3.4-1:*** *The serving satellite ephemeris and common TA related parameters are signalled in the same SIB message and have the same epoch time.*

***2nd Checkpoint Proposals –3.4-2:*** *A single validity duration for both serving satellite ephemeris and common TA related parameters is broadcast on the SIB.*

***2nd Checkpoint Proposals –3.4-3:*** *Validity timer for UL synchronization should be started/restarted with configured timer validity duration at the epoch time of the assistance information.*

***2nd Checkpoint Proposals –3.4-4:*** *NTN validity duration is configured per cell and indicated to the UE in X bits with :*

*·       Value range { 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35, 40, 45, 50, 55, 60, 120, 180, 240 }*

*·       Unit is second*

*·       FFS (to be resolved in current meeting): Additional values for GEO*

# Issue 3: Long UL transmission on PUSCH and PRACH

## Background

The following issues are for discussions based on agreements were made during RAN1#106e.

* Configuration of UL transmission segment via SIB or dedicated RRC signalling
* Downscoping of values for NPRACH/RACH UL transmission segment duration
* Downscoping of values NPUSCH/PUCH UL transmission segment duration
* New UL gaps for long UL transmissions
* Phase discontinuity in segmented pre-compensation

During Rel-17 IoT NTN SI, it was clarified that there is impact on specification of applying TA adjustments during long UL transmission:

In the specifications UE is not allowed to adjust timing advance in the duration of repetitions as specified in TS 36.133 V16.8.0, Clause 7.20.2.

[***3GPP TS 36.133 V16.8.0, Section 7.20.2] When a repetition period is configured on the uplink for which R>1, the UE shall not adjust the uplink transmission timing autonomously during an ongoing repetition period other than at initial transmission as defined above.***

## Company views

Configuration of UL transmission segment duration / gap:

The following agreements were made during RAN1#106e and RAN1#106bis-e on configuration of UL transmission segment.

Agreement:

The UL transmission segment duration is configured by the network

* FFS: Details of the configuration signalling.

Agreement:

* The UL transmission segment duration is provided by UE-specific RRC signalling or by signalling in SIB.
* NOTE: the values of UL transmission segment duration for NB-IoT can be different to those for eMTC

In RAN1#106-e and RAN1#106bis-e , the following agreements on NPUSCH/PUSCH UL transmission segment were made

Agreement:

Duration of UL transmission segment for UE pre-compensation for PUSCH transmission is a number of PUSCH repetition units configured by the network

* For NB-IoT, repetition unit is
* For eMTC, repetition unit is for sub-PRB allocation, where Tslot = 0.5 ms. For full-PRB allocation, repetition unit is one subframe.
* NOTE1: are defined in TS 36.211 10.1.2.3 and 10.1.3.6 for NB-IoT
* NOTE2: M\_^UL\_slot is defined in TS 36.211, 5.2.3A for eMTC
* FFS: RAN1 to further discuss valid and invalid subframes
* FFS: Configuration details

Agreement:

* For NB-IoT/eMTC NTN, the network configures one of K candidate values for the UL transmission segment duration of NPUSCH/PUSCH in a k-bit field.
  + For NB-IoT, maximum 3-bit field with a maximum number of K=8 candidate values 2 ms, 4 ms, 8 ms, 16 ms, 32 ms, 64 ms, 128 ms, 256 ms
* FFS: Down scoping of K candidate values, size of k-bit field

***NOTE: the values of UL transmission segment duration for NB-IoT can be different to those for eMTC***

Agreement:

For NB-IoT, if a mapping to Nslots slots or a repetition of the mapping in an UL transmission segment for UE pre-compensation for NPUSCH transmission contains a resource element which overlaps with any configured NPRACH resource, the NPUSCH transmission in overlapped Nslots slots is postponed until the next Nslots slots not overlapping with any configured NPRACH resource.

* NOTE: Nslots is defined in TS 36.211, 10.1.3.6

Agreement:

Configuration of UL transmission segment is indicated on SIB at least for initial access

* FFS via UE-specific RRC signalling in RRC\_CONNECTED.

Agreement:

Configuration of UL transmission segment is indicated on SIB at least for initial access

* FFS via UE-specific RRC signalling in RRC\_CONNECTED.

Agreement:

For eMTC PUSCH, a 3-bit field to indicate K=8 values for the uplink transmission segment duration:

* Full-PRB allocation (unit: subframes): 2 4 8 16 32 64 128 256
* Sub-PRB allocation (unit: resource units): 1 2 4 8 16 32 64 128

In RAN1#106-e and RAN1#106bis-e, the following agreements on NPRACH/PRACH UL transmission segment were made

Agreement:

Duration of UL transmission segment for UE pre-compensation for PRACH transmission is a number of RACH repetition units configured by the network

* For NB-IoT, repetition unit is P symbol groups.
* For eMTC, repetition unit is one preamble including guard period.
* FFS: Configuration details

Agreement:

* For NB-IoT NTN, the network configures one of K values for the UL transmission segment duration of each PRACH preamble format in a k-bit field, where the size of the k-bit field and the number of K candidate values depend on the preamble format.
* Format 0 and format 1: 3-bit field, K=6 candidate values 2.4.(TCP+TSEQ), 4.4.(TCP+TSEQ), 8.4.(TCP+TSEQ), 16.4.(TCP+TSEQ), 32.4.(TCP+TSEQ), 64.4.(TCP+TSEQ)
* Format 2:  2-bit field, K=4 candidate values 2.6.(TCP+TSEQ), 4.6.(TCP+TSEQ), 8.6.(TCP+TSEQ), 16.6.(TCP+TSEQ)
* FFS: Down scoping of K candidate values, size of k-bit field
* FFS: Whether the same segment duration can be used for all preambles within a preamble format

Agreement:

For eMTC, the network configures one of K values for the UL transmission segment duration of PRACH in a k-bit field.

* FFS: K candidate values, size of k-bit field

Agreement:

For eMTC, a 3-bit field is defined in the SIB to indicate the following K=8 values for the uplink transmission segment duration of PRACH:

(TCP+TSEQ+TGP), 2\*(TCP+TSEQ+TGP), 4\*(TCP+TSEQ+TGP), 8\*(TCP+TSEQ+TGP), 16\*(TCP+TSEQ+TGP), 32\*(TCP+TSEQ+TGP), 64\*(TCP+TSEQ+TGP), 128\*(TCP+TSEQ+TGP)

Agreement:

For eMTC, the same value is used for segment durations for all PRACH preambles

Agreement:

For NB-IOT, the same value is used for segment durations for all NPRACH preambles for a particular NPRACH format

The main issue for the configuration of UL transmission segments is that the delay drift increases as elevation angle decreases. If indicated on SIB, this would ean that only the smaller UL transmission segments can be used for initial access. In RRC\_CONNECTED the UL transmission segments can be re-configured with larger UL transmission segment for higher elevation angles.

The maximum total TA drift over service link and feeder link in 256 ms can be in the order of 24 µs for LEO-600 km as can be derived from TR 36.763 Section 6.1 Table 6.1-1: IoT NTN reference scenario parameters. At higher elevation angles it can be lower and even 0 µs.



Figure 3. TA changes during a 256 ms transmission period at different elevation angles from 10 degree to 90 degrees (Nokia R1-2109265)

Huawei, Vivo, Spreadtrum, Apple, Qualcomm, Nokia proposed NPUSCH segmentation duration can be configured via UE-specific signalling. Some down-scoping proposed:

* Huwaei: {16 ms, 32 ms, 64 ms, 128 ms, 256 ms}.
* Vivo: *{4ms, 8ms, 16ms, 32ms, 64ms, 128ms, 256ms}.*

Huawei, Vivo, Ericsson proposed add one value for NPRACH format 2 of *1\*6\*(TCP+TSEQ).*

Nokia proposed UE selects the segment duration that is applicable to the elevation angle and has the smallest number of gaps / TA adjustments. A set of applicable UL transmission segments is indicated in SIB. After UE selects a segment duration, the index of the selected segment duration should be sent to the network. When UE location is available to the network, eNB can indicate the transmission segment duration to UE via RRC signaling.

Qualcomm proposed the for PUSCH, the segment duration for uplink pre-compensation may be indicated/negotiated between the network and the UE via dedicated unicast (RRC) signalling. This may involve the UE sending assistance information to the network, e.g., indicating its mobility pattern and speed.

CMCC, ZTE, Nordic Semiconductor, MediaTek propose configuration of UL transmission segment is indicated (only) on SIB in RRC\_CONNECTED.

UL gap for NPUSCH (NB-IoT) / PUSCH / PUCCH (eMTC):

Huawei, ZTE, MediaTek proposed support 1ms of UL gap for NB-IoT over NTN.

Spreadtrum, Lenovo, Samsung proposed a gap of N time units (i.e. PUSCH repetitions is a number of Tslots or ms)

Vivo proposed to support gaps X ms or Y symbols configured or pre-determined

Nokia, CATT support gap of last symbol of slot

Ericsson, Qualcomm: skip / drop samples

Ericsson proposed that if segmented pre-compensation is implemented by sample dropping or puncturing, the details should be specified. RAN4 can check the impact of sample dropping/puncturing on performance.

Ericsson proposed if new Gap needed, to consider creating UL gaps by blanking UL subframes at regular intervals (configured by the network) without increasing the total transmission time.

CATT proposed that for small TAvariation, TA adjustment is implemented by dropping tail samples of a segment or delaying a few samples for UL transmission

CATT proposed for small TA variation, TA adjustment is implemented by dropping tail samples of a segment or delaying a few samples for UL transmission. For large TA variation, the gap can be configured with original GP is reused for (N)PRACH’s gap.

UL gap for NPRACH / PRACH for NB-IoT / eMTC:

CATT proposed skip/drop samples within Guard Period of RACH preamble (i.e. no new gap)

Moderator view: in NB-IoT there is no GP inserted at the end of the NPRACH preamble. The NPRACH preamble repetition is transmitted continuously based on the specification as illustrated in below figure. This is difference with eMTC that has GP inserted at the end of tehe preamble with preamble aligned with the subframe boundary. In TS 36.211

The preamble consisting of symbol groups shall be transmitted cid:image003.png@01D7D61A.CBD8B630 times.



Preamble format of NB-IoT in frame structure type1(FDD)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Preamble format** | **P** |  |  | **Duration of one repetition** |
| 0 | 4 | 2048.Ts | 5.8192.Ts | 5.6ms |
| 1 | 4 | 8192.Ts | 5.8192.Ts | 6.4ms |
| 2 | 6 | 24576.Ts | 3 | 19.2ms |

Preamble format of eMTC

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Preamble format** | TCP | TSEQ | **Guard Time(ms)** | **Time Duration(ms)** |
| 0 | 3168.Ts | 24576.Ts | 0.097 | 1 |
| 1 | 21024.Ts | 24576.Ts | 0.516 | 2 |
| 2 | 6240.Ts | 2.24576.Ts | 0.197 | 2 |
| 3 | 21024.Ts | 2.24576.Ts | 0.716 | 3 |
| 4 (see Note) | 448.Ts | 4096.Ts |  |  |
| NOTE: Frame structure type 2 and special subframe configurations with UpPTS lengths and only assuming that the number of additional SC-FDMA symbols in UpPTS X in Table 4.2-1 of TS36.211 is 0. | | | | |

UL Transmission segment duration for eMTC PUCCH:

Ericsson observed for eMTC PUCCH with CE mode A, it is sufficient to use a 1-bit field to indicate the configured value of transmission segment duration for long uplink transmission. For eMTC PUCCH with CE mode B, it is sufficient to use a 3-bit field to indicate the configured value of transmission segment duration for long uplink transmission.

Ericsson proposed for eMTC PUCCH, the network configures one of the K values for the uplink transmission segment duration using a k-bit field, where the values are different depending on the CE mode:

Table 1 Transmission segment duration for eMTC PUCCH (Ericsson R1-2112531) .

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CE mode | Basic rep. unit duration | No. of repetitions | Transmission segment duration  (unit: no. of repetitions) |
| A | 1 ms | 1, 2, 4, 8 | 2, 4 |
| B | 1 ms | 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128 | 4, 8, 16, 32, 64 |

eMTC Frequency hopping:

Ericsson observed to facilitate frequency hopping, eMTC allows a frequency retuning gap of up to 2 SC-FDMA uplink symbols between adjacent narrowbands. If the UE can leverage frequency hopping occasion to perform uplink pre-compensation, there is no need to introduce a pre-compensation gap between transmission segments in this case.

Ericsson proosed for eMTC PUCCH/PUSCH with frequency hopping enabled, the UE can adjust the uplink transmit timing when hopping to a new narrowband if the frequency hopping interval is less than or equal to the configured transmission segment duration.

Qualcomm proposed for eMTC when frequency hopping is configured:

* When the hopping interval is less than the configured segment duration for uplink synchronization, the UE shall use the hopping interval as the segment duration for uplink synchronization
* When the hopping interval is greater than or equal to the configured segment duration for uplink synchronization, the UE shall use as the segment duration for uplink synchronization, where denotes the hopping interval, and is the configured segment duration.

Postponment of NPUSCH with overlapped NRACH:

ZTE propose postponement of NPUSCH due to overlap with NPRACH is counted in segment duration. The portion of postponement which coincides with a UL gap is counted as part of the gap.

Phase noise:

NEC support gaps to avoid phase discontinuity

Nokia proposed RAN1 to study the impact of timing drift induced phase error for NB-IoT transmission in NTN. Timing-drift-induced phase error may exceed the phase error tolerance for demodulation at the receiver. The phase error increases as the elevation angle decreases since the TA drift rate is higher at a lower elevation angle. Accumulating phase error of SC-FDMA symbols occurs due to the TA drift in the IoT NTN scenarios. There can be two solution approaches:

* At the UE transmitter, UE scales up the phase difference across symbols based on TA drift rate:
* At eNB transmitter, the network estimate the UE-specific TA drift and pre-compensate the phase difference across symbols based on UE location:

***Moderator view:*** *To the moderator understanding, it is is needed to discuss UL segment duration and gap in initial access and in RRC\_CONNECTED. A UE capability to apply UE pre-compensation may be needed for UEs that need a gap to avoid high impact on UE complexity. Such UE capability cannot be assumed in intial access before UE accesses the cell. UL segment duration can be configured on SIB for initial cell access. In RRC\_CONNECTED, UL transmission segment duration may be updated via RRC signalling if the network knows the UE location and determines the elevation angle experienced by a given UE. RAN1 / RAN2 are waiting for SA3 to conclude on secutiry aspects on based on UE location report.* Agreement on UE applying precompensation between segments is needed as this has not been agreed due to being tied to discussion on gap.

*On UL gap, companies have different views. Huawei, ZTE, MediaTek, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, Samsung support for 1 ms gap; Ericsson, Qualcomm, Nokia, CATT do not support gap (skip samles / puncture 1 OFDM).*

*Postponent of NPUSCH with overlapped NRACH agreed in RAN1#106bis-e. Further enhancement is proposed on ho to count the postponement as part of the gap.*

*Phase noise issue at the subframe boundary was discussed extensively in RAN1#106-e, RAN1#106bis-e. There can be work around solution in UE and eNB, or a gap can be used.*

*On eMTC PUCCH/PUSCH with frequency enabled, the frequency hopping interval can be less than or equal to the configured transmission segment duration.After checking offline, proponents can further discuss if HI>Nconfigured then HI×⌊N\_configured/HI⌋ is always 0. The need for any special rule if HI>Nconfigured needs further clarification. The hopping interval (for FDD) can be in the range {1 ms, 2 ms, 4 ms, 8 ms, 16 ms}. The segment duration is also a power of 2 [ms] so it should be straightforward to apply the configured segment duration as is.*

***Initial Proposal 4.2-1-Rev1*** *Companies are encouraged to comment on the following for UL Segmented transmission in Initial Cell Access:*

1. *Segmented UL transmission NPUSCH / NPRACH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH / PRACH for eMTC is not configured for GEO*
2. *UL transmission segment duration [16 ms, (32 ms)] for NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is indicated on SIB*
3. *UL transmission segment duration for NPRACH/RACH for NB-IoT / eMTC is indicated on SIB*
4. *UE precompensation is applied to UL transmission segments of NPRACH/PRACH*
5. *A gap duration of 1 ms between UL transmission segments of duration [16 ms, (32 ms)] for NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is configured on SIB. UL transmission duration <=16 ms (without UL segmented transmission) can be scheduled without need to apply UE pre-compensation of TA at any elevation*

* *NOTE 1: UEs in different locations without large beams up to 1700 km may experience different elevation angles in [30 degrees – 90 degrees]. Segment duration indicated on SIB must work for all UEs, which limits segment duration to 16 ms or 32 ms to avoid breaking CP.*
* *NOTE2: In initial access, eNB cannot be assumed to know UE capability to support UE pre-compensation between segments with a gap of 1 ms for LEO/MEO before UE moves to RRC\_CONNECTED*

***Initial Proposal 4.2-2-Rev1*** *Companies are encouraged to comment on the following for UL Segmented transmission* during RRC\_CONNECTED:

1. *Segmented UL transmission NPUSCH / NPRACH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH / PRACH for eMTC is not configured for GEO*
2. *UL transmission segment duration for NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC may be configurable by dedicated RRC Signalling if eNB has knowledge of elevation angle / UE location (depending on SA3)*
3. *UE precompensation is applied to UL transmission segments of NPDCCH/PDCCH ordered NPRACH/PRACH*
4. *UE capability to support UE pre-compensation between segments* 
   * *Option 1:*
     + *UE capability to support UE-Pre-compensation between UL transmission segments by skip/drop samples/puncture last OFDM symbol of UL transmission segment duration [1 ms, 2 ms, 4 ms, 8 ms, 16 ms, 32 ms, 64 ms, 128 ms] for NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC*
     + *A gap duration of 1 ms between UL transmission segments of duration [16 ms, (32 ms), (64 ms), (128 ms)] for NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is specified*
   * *Option 2:*
     + *UE applies UE-Pre-compensation between UL transmission segments by skip/drop samples/puncture last OFDM symbol of UL transmission segment duration [1 ms, 2 ms, 4 ms, 8 ms, 16 ms, 32 ms, 64 ms, 128 ms] for NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC*
     + *UE capability to support UE-Pre-compensation between UL transmission segments with a gap duration of 1 ms between UL transmission segments of duration [16 ms, (32 ms), (64 ms), (128 ms)] for NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC*
   * *Option 3:*
     + *UE does not support UL segmented transmission / only support up to 16 ms or (32 ms) UL transmission duration without UL segmented transmission / for longer UL transmission eNB will schedule several normal UL transmissions*

***Initial Proposal 4.2-3:*** *For NB-IoT, postponement of NPUSCH due to overlap with NPRACH is counted in segment duration. The portion of postponement which coincides with a UL gap is counted as part of the gap*

***Initial Proposal 4.2-4:*** *For eMTC PUCCH, the network configures one of the K values for the uplink transmission segment duration using a k-bit field, where the values are different depending on the CE mode:*

Table 1 Transmission segment duration for eMTC PUCCH (Ericsson R1-2112531) .

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CE mode | Basic rep. unit duration | No. of repetitions | Transmission segment duration  (unit: no. of repetitions) |
| A | 1 ms | 1, 2, 4, 8 | 2, 4 |
| B | 1 ms | 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128 | 4, 8, 16, 32, 64 |

***Initial Proposal 4.2-5:*** *For eMTC PUCCH/PUSCH with frequency hopping enabled, the UE can adjust the uplink transmit timing when hopping to a new narrowband if the frequency hopping interval is less than or equal to the configured transmission segment duration.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| OPPO | 1) yes it is our understanding that GEO does not need segments  2) agree  3) agree  4) option 1 seems more reasonable, and we can also support option 3. |
| ZTE | For both 4.2-1 and 4.2-2 for the segement transmission, firstly, we need to make the agreement to specify that  Proposal-0: If a segment duration is configured for one channel, the UE is expected to adjust the value for pre-compensation per segment during the transmission of corresponding channel.  Otherwise, the remaining discussion seems to be useless and corresponding UE behavior is not clear.  Moreover, additional detailed views for each bullet are listed below:  ***For 4.2-1:***   1. We are open to have this restriction. And regarding the potential specific impact, maybe corresponding limitation should be added in the RRC descrption field in 38.331.. 2. We agree to this principle that only one value should be indicated in the SBI for these channel. For the candidate value, we can take the proposal from moderator as starting point. 3. We are supportive of this proposal, but maybe can directly reuse the same duration as listed in the 2nd bullet. Then, these two parts can be merged together. 4. It’s not clear about the intention of the 4th bullet, and if the intention to specify the behavior for pre-compensation with consideration of segement, the Proposal-0 as highlited above is applicable for all channels. 5. We are fine with this proposal. However, it seems that no need to highlight that the second part since it is common understanding that if the whole transmission is shorter than 16 ms, no additional behavior is expected. 6. *A gap duration of 1 ms between UL transmission segments of duration [16 ms, (32 ms)] for NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is configured on SIB. ~~UL transmission duration <=16 ms (without UL segmented transmission) can be scheduled without need to apply UE pre-compensation of TA at any elevation~~*   ***For 4.2-2:***   1. Same as the replies above, we are open to have this restriction. And regarding the potential specific impact, maybe corresponding limitation should be added in the RRC descrption field in 38.331. 2. The adjustment of segment duration within RRC\_CONNECTED mode is not essential since only the short sporadic transmission is considered in Rel-17. If majority still prefer to optimize the configuration, we are open to the dedicated signalling but how to configure it is up to gNB’s implementation and prefer to remove th description as below:   *UL transmission segment duration for NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC may be configurable by dedicated RRC Signalling ~~if eNB has knowledge of elevation angle / UE location (depending on SA3)~~*   1. Agree to take the PDCCH ordered PRACH and in general, It’s not clear about the intention of the 4th bullet, and if the intention to specify the behavior for pre-compensation with consideration of segement, the Proposal-0 as highlited above is applicable for all channels. 2. For the UE capability part, based on the Proposal-0 listed above, we are open to define the UE capability to achieve such updates for segment transmission. Option-1 can be considered.   For 4.2-3: support.  For 4.2-4: we are fine to it.  For 4.2-5: no need to have this agreement and we can simple configure/define the segment length as the integer times of hopping length. |
| Qualcomm | **4.2.1 [IDLE]:**  1. Agree  2. Agree in principle [may try to double check values during the week]  3. Agree (Although this is agreed, I think)  4. Agree (Although I think this is automatic)  5. Agree in principle. However, I think, for the 3.75 kHz subcarrier spacing, because the slot length is longer than 1 ms, we may need a [2 ms/slot aligned] gap for this case, no?  **4.2.2 [CONNECTED]:**  1. Agree  2. Agree. With “whatever” info the network has, enabling this feature is wise. Even if later down the line, some other information is agreed, this can significantly help UL Tx quality.  3. Agree  4. OK to compromise on this in principle. This **has to be Option 2**, since “default” should be gap-less. “Need for gaps” should be the “capability”, **much like the 40ms gap after 256 ms capability for eMTC.**  Also, for the 3.75 kHz numerology, I think you need a slot-aligned gap [2ms], no?  **4.2.3:**  Agree.  **4.2.4:**  Agree with the principle. Would like to double check the values.  **4.2.5:**  Yes, this is an issue that has to be addressed somehow, to prevent boundaries are respected both for “segments”, as well as for “hopping intervals”. May need some re-wording eventually. |
| vivo | For Proposal 4.2-1:   1. We think the segment duration is 256ms for GEO, same as existing transmission mechanism. 2. & 3) & 4) & 5) Agree   For Proposal 4.2-2:   1. Same with proposal 4.2-1 2. & 3) Agree   4) We prefer option 1 |
| Nokia, NSB | ***Initial Proposal 4.2-1***  As there are different timing requirement for NB-IoT an eMTC, the maximum size of segment for them will also be different, even with same location.  Additionally, as mentioned in the notes, for different location or elevation angle, the supported segment size will also be different considering the TA changing.  For the definition of the segment, 30 degree should not be the minimum value, but 10 degree. By which, the 16ms may not work for eMTC. We suggest to add 8ms for the minimum elevation angle case.  Additionally, if there are more than 1 value in the SIB, then UE should select one based on it’s elevation angle or location, to make sure currect TA can be used in the segment.  ***Initial Proposal 4.2-2***  As the segment size to be used by UE is related to the elevation angle or location, it is good to define this mapping between them, fixed or broadcasted in SIB. Then later all the UE reporting or RRC configuration can be based on this mapping, where UE to report the index of the relationship between elevation angle/location, with reduced overhead, where network just confirm with HARQ-ACK or reconfigure a new one for segment. Considering the load for NB-IoT impact much more than for normal UE, overhead reduction should be considered and we propose to define fixed table or broadcasted table.  ***Initial Proposal 4.2-3***  Agree. It should be like the gap between the segments of PUSCH.  ***Initial Proposal 4.2-4:***  FFS.  ***Initial Proposal 4.2-5:***  It is not clear before any detail evaluation done. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | ***Initial Proposal 4.2-1-Rev1***  1) We are fine with the statement but would like to understand the specification impact further. There is no need to have a restriction if 256 ms can already be indicated. In addition, this proposal also seems to imply that the deployment scenarios would need to be informed to UE.  2) we don’t understand why only one value can be indicated given that several values have already been defined. Is the intention to revert the previous agreement?  3) Isn’t this already agreed?  4) Fine.  5) Not sure why a configuration in SIB is needed given UE capability are to be defined. These two aspects are a bit contradicting to each other since the UE would need to follow the SIB configuration anyway which means the UE has to support both capabilities.  ***Initial Proposal 4.2-2-Rev1***  1) Similar to the response to ***4.2-1***, we are fine with the statement but would like to understand the specification impact further.  2) Agree  3) We are not sure why PDCCH ordered PRACH is mentioned in particular.  4) We are open to define UE capabilities but would like to consider it further together with the need of configuration in SIB.  ***Initial Proposal 4.2-3***  Fine. |
| SONY | **4.2-1: IDLE**  1: this sounds like a restriction on network behavious and are not sure it is necessary  4: We need to be clear that the pre-compensation is maintained during the UL transmission segments and is changed between transmission segments  **4.2-2: CONNECTED**  Point 2: dedicated RRC signalling is not required. We do not need to optimise the segment duration for each UE based on elevation angle / UE location. Such an optimisaiton is not compatible with “essential minimum functionality”. There should be a cell-wide UL segment configuration.  Point 4: Our preference is option 2. The baseline should be that a 1ms segment gaop is required. The optional capability should be that no gap is required (and the UE does a “bulk” pre-compensation between UL transmission segments).  **4.2-4: eMTC PUCCH**  This level of optimisation is not required (and maybe not beneficial). The transmission segment duration should depend on the rate of change of TA and not on the CE Mode A/B status. We would also prefer that one UL transmission segment duration were configured for the whole cell rather than on a UE by UE basis.  Is it necessary to segment UL transmissions that are 8 repetitions or less? Our understanding is that the use of UL segments is only required when there are 16 or more repetitions. Hence, there only needs to be one list of potential UL segment durations that is applicable to both CE mode A and CE mode B.  **4.2-5: eMTC FH**  OK. |
| Ericsson | ***Initial Proposal 4.2-1-Rev1:***   * 1. It should up to the network to decide whether to configure segmented transmission or not. We do acknowledge that segmented pre-compensation may not be needed for GEO for NB-IoT but it may still be needed in some cases for eMTC. For example, with a delay drift of (4\*0.93 us/s), the TA error is ~0.476 us for a segment duration of 128 ms which exceeds the RAN4 timing error requirement of 0.39 us ((Table 7.26.2-1 in TS 36.133). Therefore, we propose that the use of segmented transmission is determined by the presence of segment duration parameters in SIB, and not by that the satellite orbit is non-GEO. If the network does not signal the segment duration parameters, then this means that segmented precompensation is not configured and UE not supporting segmented transmissions can access the network.   2. We are fine with indication in SIB but do not want to downscope the segment lengths to 16/32 ms considering wide range satellite orbit support, e.g. LEO at altitudes down to e.g. 300 km and MEO up to e.g. 25000 km.   3. Ok (already agreed)   4. The purpose of this point is not clear. Our understanding is that segmented pre-compensation is applicable to NPRACH/PRACH, NPUSCH/PUSCH, and PUCCH.   5. The use of short segment durations could be left to network configuration without need for downscoping.   ***Initial Proposal 4.2-2-Rev1:***   1. Same comment as for initial proposal 4.2-1-Rev1. 2. Agree. Even if eNB does not know the exact position/elevation angle, it may still want to configure a different segment duration for UE for PUSCH/PUCCH than what it broadcasted in SIB. One reason could be that the network estimates that the elevation angle has changed by the time PUSCH will start for a certain UE (e.g., a UE uses many repetitions for MSG1 and reaches PUSCH stage after a while). 3. Agree. 4. We are not sure what the difference is between Option 1 and 2. We do not support Option 3. In general, before jumping on to introducing a gap, we need to justify why one of the following methods may not work:    * Skip/drop samples    * Puncturing ofdm symbol    * Blanking subframes/slots: if a UE absolutely needs a gap, it may choose to skip transmitting a slot or a subframe to create a gap. This does not require introducing capability signalling as the network does not explicitly need to insert a gap for such UEs.   ***Initial Proposal 4.2-4, Initial Proposal 4.2-5:***  We support the proposals. |
| MediaTek | We think ZTE suggestion “per segment” and a unified view for UE pre-compensation in Proposal:0 is helpful. This way is also agnostic to UE-specifc implementation, which is simpler.  Proposal-0: If a segment duration is configured for one channel, the UE is expected to adjust the value for pre-compensation per segment during the transmission of corresponding channel.  For 4.2-1  On 1), support  Support 2) and 3), and as suggested by ZTE combine 2) and 3) with one value for simplicity. This has no extra complexity for UE. On 2) a single value must be broadcast because UEs can experience different elevation angles and it cannot be assumed he UE knows its elevation angle and that the eNB knw the UE elevatin angle. If the UE is just under the satellite at nadir, its elevation angle is 90 degrees. If the UE is on the beam edge, its elevation angle can be 30 degrees (e.g. in Set-4). The eNB on receiving RACH will give UE a RAR-based UL grant with a given total duration and all the UEs will use the same UL segment value broadcast on the SIB. We cannot any other way this can be done.  On 4) This can be skipped. And, only needed to have proposal 0 as suggested by ZTE  On 5) the proposal can be simplified as suggested by ZTE (2nd sentence can be omitted). For Msg3, the eNB has no wy of knowing the UE capability before contention resolution is complete. The UL segment duration on SIB must be used until the eNB knows the UE capability.  The NOTE1 and NOTE 2 are only informative and do not need to be captured  For 4.2-2  On 1) support  On 2), this seems not essential and unlikely if SA3 cannot agree on UE location report. It can be optional for network to support it.  On 3) This can be skipped. And, only needed to have proposal 0 as suggested by ZTE  On 4) Support. Option 1 or Option 2 are fine. We do not think Option 3 is good way as it is un-necessarily restrictive. As suggested by Ericsson in their contribution, if a new Gap needed it can be created by blanking UL subframes at regular intervals (configured by the network) without increasing the total transmission time.  4.2-3: Support  4.2-4: Support  4.2-5: Support |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 1st Round proposal for Issue 3

The following agreement was agreed in 1st GTW:

**Agreement**

*For UL Segmented transmission during RRC\_CONNECTED:*

* *If a segment duration is configured, the UE is expected to adjust the value for pre-compensation for a segment.*
* *FFS: UL transmission segment duration for NPDCCH ordered NPRACH/NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PDCCH ordered PRACH/PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is configurable by dedicated RRC Signalling*
* *For UE pre-compensation per segment, further discuss how the following options apply from one segment to the next segment, and potential down-selection among the options:*
  + *Option 1: Skip / drop / insert samples*
  + *Option 2: puncture OFDM symbols*
  + *Option 3: Blanking subframes/slots where UE skip a slot or a subframe*
  + *FFS whether this can be left to UE implementation or if specification impact is needed*

1st Checkpoint Proposals based on first round comments in Summary and email reflector:

The below proposals had support from commenting companies in moderator summary for initial round and were indicated as stable on the RAN1 reflector for 1st checkpoint for agreements:

***~~1~~~~st~~ ~~Checkpoint Proposal 4.3-3:~~*** *~~For NB-IoT, postponement of NPUSCH due to overlap with NPRACH is counted in segment duration. The portion of postponement which coincides with a UL gap is counted as part of the gap~~*

Revised proposal

***1st Checkpoint Proposal 4.3-3-ver2:*** *For NB-IoT, postponement of NPUSCH due to overlap with NPRACH is counted in segment duration.*

***1st Checkpoint Proposal 4.3-4:*** *For eMTC PUCCH, the network configures one of the K values for the uplink transmission segment duration using a k-bit field, where the values are different depending on the CE mode:*

Transmission segment duration for eMTC PUCCH

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CE mode | Basic rep. unit duration | No. of repetitions | Transmission segment duration  (unit: no. of repetitions) |
| A | 1 ms | 1, 2, 4, 8 | 2, 4 |
| B | 1 ms | 4, 8, 16, 32, 64, 128 | 4, 8, 16, 32, 64 |

***1st Checkpoint Proposal 4.3-5:*** *For eMTC PUCCH/PUSCH with frequency hopping enabled, the UE can adjust the uplink transmit timing when hopping to a new narrowband if the frequency hopping interval is less than or equal to the configured transmission segment duration.*

1st Round proposals following 1st GTW discussions

The UL Segmented transmission in RRC\_CONNECTED were discussed. It is generally understood that a single value for UL transmission segment that works for all UEs need to be configured on the SIB. UEs may experience different elevation angles due to their location within the beam foot print on the ground, which the eNB cannot know before the UE moves to RRC\_CONNECTED.

Re-configuration of UE-specific UL transmission segments via RRC signalling was discussed as a potential optimization – e.g. based on UE location report or new UE-assistance information for UE-specific elevation, mobility pattern and speed, UE-determined delay drift. One company commented that such enhancement is not compatible with essential minimum functionality

The solutions to apply UE pre-compensation per segment from one segment to the next segment were discussed. It was agreed that UE may apply the UE pre-compensation by skip/drop/insert samples, puncture OFDM symbol, blank subframes. It is FFS whether this can be left to UE implementation or if specification impact is needed.

Companies commented that UL segment of 8 ms for eMTC should be included as one potential value necessary configured on the MIB; not downscope the segment to 16/32 ms considering wide range satellite orbit support, e.g. LEO at altitudes down to e.g. 300 km and MEO up to e.g. 25000 km.

The table below shows the maximum 2-way delay drift over the service link and feeder link assuming low elevation angle and up to +/-100 us/s. In all the options 1, 2 and 3, the total transmission time is not changed. There is no scheduling gap or fixed gaps between the segments.

* For UE implementation that can support Option 1 and Option 2, the UE may decide autonomously it is better to puncture an OFDM symbol if the number of samples skipped/inserted as a proportion of Cyclic Prefix CP [%] exceeds a level that would compromise significantly the orthogonality of OFDM wavefore – i.e. CP[%] > 20%. This corresponds to segment duration greater than 8 ms for LEO, 32 ms for MEO, and well exceeding 256 ms for GEO.
* For UE implementation that can only support Option 3 “Blanking subframes/slots” where UE skip a slot or a subframe can be used if the porportion of 1 ms blanked Subframe/ total subframes is sufficiently small while also keeping CP[%] > 20% – i.e. 6.25% or lower. This corresponds to segment duration greater than 8 ms for LEO, 32 ms for MEO, and well exceeding 256 ms for GEO.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **UL segment length** | **2 ms** | **4 ms** | **8 ms** | **16 ms** | **32 ms** | **64 ms** | **128 ms** | **256 ms** |
| Max Delay drift LEO/MEO/GEO | 0.2 us / 0.06 us / 0.00744 us | 0.4 us / 0.12 us / 0.015 us | 0.8 us / 0.24 us / 0.03 us | **1.6 us** / 0.48 us / 0.06 us | **3.2 us** / 0.96 us / 0.12 us | **6.4** us / 1.92 us / 0.24 us | 12.8 us / 3.84 us / 0.48 us | **(N/A)\*** |
| CP[%] - LEO | **4.27%** | **8.55 %** | **17.1 %** | **34.2 %** | **68.3%** | **136.7%** | **273.5%** | **(N/A)\*** |
| CP[%] - MEO | **1.28%** | **2.56 %** | **5.13 %** | **10.2 %** | **20.5%** | **41.0%** | **82.0%** | **(N/A)\*** |
| CP[%] - GEO | **0.16%** | **0.31 %** | **0.63 %** | **1.27 %** | **2.54%** | **5.08%** | **10.2%** | **(N/A)\*** |
| 1 OFDM symbol puncture/total subframes | **3.57%** | **1.78%** | **0.89%** | **0.44%** | **0.22%** | **0.11%** | **0.05%** | **(N/A)\*** |
| 1 ms blanked Subframe/ total subframes | **50%** | **25%** | **12.5%** | **6.25%** | **3.125%** | **1.56%** | **0.78%** | **(N/A)\*** |

UE pre-compensation per segment of NPUSH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC can be applied from one segment to the next segment by using Option 1, Option 2, or Option 3 as can be supported by UE implementation without any down-selection of options. It is up to the UE implemention which option to use.

UE pre-compensation per segment of NPRACH for NB-IoT and PUSCH for eMTC can be applied from one segment to the next segment by using Option 1. As discussed in Section 4.2, for eMTC there is a Guard Period at the end of PRACH preamble to align the RACH preamble with the subframe boundary; for NB-IoT, there is no such Guard Period and PRACH preamble repetitions are continuously transmitted. For NPRACH segment 64.4.(TCP+TSEQ) for NPRACH format 0 and 16.6.(TCP+TSEQ)  for NPRACH format 2, the legacy UL compensation gap to re-acquire DL synchronization can be used to apply UE pre-compensation

To the moderator understanding, companies did not support a new gap for the NPRACH for NB-IoT and were supportive of Option 1 for NPRACH.

For NB-IoT/eMTC, it is desirable that the method used for the UE pre-compensation per segment of NPUSCH to be applied from one segment to the next segment by UE implementation is known to the eNB. This could be done in two ways:

• Option A: UE capability

• Option 2: RRC signalling

Note that if a UE capability is defined it still needs to be indicated to the eNB via RRC signalling.

In initial access,

* eNB cannot be assumed to know UE implementation method / UE capability to support UE pre-compensation per segment from one segment to the next segment before UE moves to RRC\_CONNECTED. UEs in different locations without large beams up to 1700 km may experience different elevation angles in [30 degrees – 90 degrees].
* UE can determine the total 2-way delay drift over the service link and feeder link from it GNSS-acquired location, the ephemris and common TA parameters broadcast on SIB.

RAN4 have not concluded on initial transmit timing error requirement for NTN UE (RAN4 LS R4-2120311), but to the moderator understanding RAN4 assumption is that the values for RACH will also be used for PUSCH/PUCCH in RRC\_CONNECTED. Segment duration indicated on SIB must work for all UEs at least for initial access, with segment duration to 8 ms or 16 ms used to avoid breaking CP of NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC. The same values for segment duration of 8 ms or 16 ms can be used for the RACH. It is preferable to use smaller values for the segments for RACH to avoid potential loss of RACH detection performance at the eNB.

After moving to RRC\_CONNECTED, it is for further study whether the UL transmission segment is configurable by dedicated RRC Signalling. To the moderator understanding several ways could be discussed – i.e. UE location report via MAC CE if allowed by SA3, UE-determined delay drift / mobility pattern and speed via RRC signalling.

The maximum 2–way delay drift over service link and feeder link assuming low elevation angle and up to +/-100 us/s is 0.96 us, which is much smaller than in LEO or MEO. It is preferable the UL segment transmission is not configured for GEO to save significant impact on UE implementation and testing for UE. The moderator proposal would be first to make agreement accordingly. Whether the configuration can indicate explicitly that the satellite is GEO or that the UE may derive from ephemeris broadcast on SIB that the satellite is GEO can be further discussed.

Hence, based on the above the moderator makes the following first round proposals following outcomd of 1st GTW Session discussions and agreement:

For NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC:

***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-1:*** *UE pre-compensation per segment of NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is applied from one segment to the next segment by using one or more of the following methods if supported by UE implementation*

* *Skip / drop / insert samples for all segments*
* *Puncture OFDM symbols for segments greater than 8 ms for LEO, 32 ms for MEO.*
* *Blanking subframes/slots where UE skip a slot or a subframe for segments greater than 8 ms, 32 ms for MEO.*

*The total transmission time is not changed*

*No skip / drop / insert samples, puncturing or blanking of subframes/slots is needed for GEO as maximum segment duration can be used with legacy gap*

For NPRACH for NB-IoT and PRACH for eMTC:

***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-2:*** *For NB-IoT, UE pre-compensation per segment of NPRACH is applied from one segment to the next segment by Skip / drop / insert samples.*

* *The total transmission time is not changed*

*No skip / drop / insert samples is needed for GEO as maximum segment duration can be used with legacy gap*

***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-3:*** *For eMTC, UE pre-compensation per segment of PRACH is applied from one segment to the next segment by Skip / drop / insert samples in Guard Period of PRACH preamble.*

* *The total transmission time is not changed*

UL segmented transmission configuration:

***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-4:***  *UL transmission segment duration with one value X for NPRACH/NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PRACH/PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is indicated on SIB.*

* *Value X in [(8 ms), (16 ms)] for LEO*
* *Value X in [(16 ms), (32 ms)] for MEO*
* *Note the values of X in (.) between bracket are indicative*
* *Note maximum UL transmission segment can be used for GEO with no need for UL Segmented transmission*

***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-5:***  *UL Segmented transmission NPRACH/NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PRACH/PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is not configured for GEO.*

* *FFS Whether the configuration can indicate explicitly that the satellite is GEO or that the UE may derive from ephemeris broadcast on SIB that the satellite is GEO.*

***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-6:***  *FFS How the method used for the UE pre-compensation per segment by UE implementation is known to the eNB*

* *Option A: UE capability*
* *Option B: RRC signalling*
* *Note that if a UE capability is defined it needs to be indicated to the eNB via RRC signalling.*

***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-7:***

*Conclusion:*

*On FFS on whether after moving to RRC\_CONNECTED, RAN1 discussed options for the re-configuration of the UL transmission segment by dedicated RRC Signalling*

* *Using UE location report via MAC CE if allowed by SA3*
* *Using UE-determined delay drift / mobility pattern and speed via RRC signalling*

*This potential enhancement is an optimization that can deferred to Release-18*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Intel | For proposal 4.3-6 more detailed discussion is needed since it is not clear if UE applies a single method in all the cases or it is specific to a scenario (e.g. for LEO UE do OFDM symbol puncturing). Furthermore, for LEO method can be dynamically changed depending on the particular timing drift.  For proposal 4.3-7 in our view this is not needed since we just can agree that segment duration can be updated in dedicated RRC. There is no need to agree on how eNB would determine the segment duration. |
| Moderator2 | Proposal ***1st Checkpoint Proposal 4.3-3*** was withdrawn. There will be no new gaps (scheduling gap or fixed gaps) based on 1st GTW agreement. We have options for UE pre-compensation with skip/drop/insert samples, of puncture OFDM symbol, or blank subframes. The total transmission time does not change. This agreement in 1st GTW covers 4.3-3 as the portion of postponement which coincides with a “blanked subframe” is counted as part of the “blanked subframe”.  The proposal was revised as  ***1st Checkpoint Proposal 4.3-3-ver2:*** *For NB-IoT, postponement of NPUSCH due to overlap with NPRACH is counted in segment duration. ~~The portion of postponement which coincides with a UL gap is counted as part of the gap~~* |
| MediaTek | On proposal 4.3-1   * The methods are implementation basedand one or several implementation methods may be supported by a given UE implementation. The UE may apply UE pre-compensation based on determined delay drift over the service link and feeder link and apply UE pre-compensation accordingly. It is of course prefereable to first skip/drop/insert samples for small TA adjustment; then puncture one OFDM if percentage of CP punctures becones high or even CP is completely punctured. Then the orthogonality for the OFDM symbol is lost. * The blanking of subframe is only needed if a UE implementation cannot support applying of UE pre-compensation with a fraction of OFDM symbol or even within an OFDM symbol without high UE complexity. Assuming this is only done for UL sgments > 8 ms, the combining loss is in the order of 10\*log10( (1-0.0625)/1)=0.28 dB for segment 16 ms, 0.13 dB for segment 32 ms, 0.06 dB for segment 64 ms, and so on.   There is no scheduling gap or fixed gaps based on 1st GTW agreement. We have options for UE pre-compensation with skip/drop/insert samples, of puncture OFDM symbol, or blank subframes. The total transmission time does not change.  On proposal 4.3-2   * We can suppport first skip/drop/insert samples for small TA adjustment for NPRACH. It is preferable not to puncture OFDM or blank subframes but other UE implementations may do that if cannot support this skip/drop/insert sample method.   Support 4.3-3, 4.3-4, 4.3.5  On proposal 4.3-6:  It can be discussed. It would be preferable to avoid UE capabilities if methods can be agreed for the different channels (i.e. NPRACH/RACH, NPUSCH, PUSCH/PUCCH). It may be sufficient if the UE indicates to eNB the method(s) it can support via RRC signalling if beneficial. Another way is that this is transparent to the eNB and left to the UE implementation to minimize the SNR loss with skip/drop/insert, puncture OFDM symbol, blank subframes while ensuring that timing requirements and frequency requirements for UE pre-compensation are met.  On proposal 4.3-7  On the options, these are potential enhancement is an optimization that can deferred to Release-18. But we would be fine that after moving to RRC\_CONNECTED, re-configuration of the UL transmission segment by dedicated RRC Signalling can be done. It would be up to the eNB implementation. For example the eNB may configure a conservative smaller value for segment on the MIB, and relax it with a larger value via RRC signalling |
| Apple | For proposal 4.3-1, if the methods are based on UE implementation, we do not see the need of this proposal at all.  For proposal 4.3-6, the motivation is unclear to us. What is the point that the whole bullet is FFS?  For proposal 4.3-7, we only need to agree on “supporting the indication of UL transmission segment via dedicated RRC signaling”. We do not need to mention the two sub-bullets here. Actually, we may mention that “UE reports assistance information to enable eNB’s determination of UL transmission segment” as a sub-bullet. |
| Ericsson | 1st Round Proposal – 4.3-1:  We don’t think methods in bullet 2 and 3 should be limited to segments greater than 8 ms for LEO, 32 ms for MEO. The current accuracy requirement for Rel-16 eMTC is Te=12Ts. RAN4 has not yet defined accuracy requirements for IoT NTN but a reasonable assumption is that the requirements for eMTC will be similar to NR NTN with 15 kHz SCS, i.e., Te\_NTN=29Ts. With 8 ms segment duration and 100 ppm drift, 85% of the error budget will be spent on the drift. Adding UE GNSS position error and satellite ephemeris inaccuracy to this, the error budget may be exceeded.  Similarly, we think it is not always possible to avoid segmented transmission for GEO for eMTC. Within a 128 ms segment, the drift is up to 0.48 µs (see table above), which is 50% of 29Ts.  We propose that segmented UL transmission may be a UE capability but it should be possible to use segmented transmission also for GEO if the UE supports segmented transmission. The use of segmented transmission is determined by the presence of segment duration parameters in SIB, and not by that the satellite orbit is non-GEO. If the network does not signal the segment duration parameters, then this means that segmented precompensation is not configured and UE not supporting segmented transmissions can access the network.  1st Round Proposal – 4.3-2: We have concerns with the restriction for GEO for similar reasons as for 4.3-1.  1st Round Proposal – 4.3-3: Ok.  1st Round Proposal – 4.3-4:  We don’t see the need to down-select the allowed segment lengths. This can be up to network configuration to decide.  We have concerns with the restriction for GEO for similar reasons as for 4.3-1.  1st Round Proposal – 4.3-5: We have concerns with the restriction for GEO for similar reasons as for 4.3-1.  1st Round Proposal – 4.3-6: Ok  1st Round Proposal – 4.3-7: We think reconfiguration can be useful for the network and don’t think this needs to be deferred to Rel-18. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal – 4.3-1: The following bullets seems to enforce how the UE should do under a given scenario. If this is the intention, it is not clear how this is related to the agreement from the last meeting that a 3-bit fied in SIB to indicate the segmentation duration for UL transmission.   * *Puncture OFDM symbols for segments greater than 8 ms for LEO, 32 ms for MEO.* * *Blanking subframes/slots where UE skip a slot or a subframe for segments greater than 8 ms, 32 ms for MEO.*   Agreement:  For eMTC PUSCH, a 3-bit field to indicate K=8 values for the uplink transmission segment duration:   * Full-PRB allocation (unit: subframes): 2 4 8 16 32 64 128 256 * Sub-PRB allocation (unit: resource units): 1 2 4 8 16 32 64 128   Proposal – 4.3-2: Not sure why GEO is mentioned particularly if segmentation duration is signaled for NPRACH in SIB.  Proposal – 4.3-4 and 4.3-5, we don’t see the need to downscopt the values for each scenarios. It is up to network configuration.  Proposal – 4.3-6: We have a preference NOT to define different UE capabilities.  Proposal – 4.3-7: We support the re-configuration of the UL transmission segment by dedicated RRC Signalling but don't see the need of the subbullets. |
| Nokia, NSB | ***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-1***  Support.  ***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-2***  We prefer to consider similar unit e.g. changed to “*Skip / drop / insert samples/subframe*”, as similar as PUSCH case.  ***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-3***  We prefer to consider similar unit e.g. changed to “*Skip / drop / insert samples/subframe*”, as similar as PUSCH case.  ***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-4***  Support  ***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-5***  Support  ***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-6***  We agree that UE capability should be supported. If based on RRC signaling, then all UE should support all candidate implementation.  ***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-7***  We think that multiple segment size for different elevation angle to be broadcasted in SIB will save overhead for signaling between UE and network.  The other way is RRC signaling should be configured for UE to change segment size with UE location report, as we should not always use the minimum segment where the resource wasting because of gap will be largest. We should support network to configure the suitable segment for UE based on UE’s location or elevation angle, for highest spectrum efficiency.  We should make agreement in Rel17 and we can compromise on RRC signaling on UE segment changing in CONNECTED mode. |
| SONY | We made comments on the reflector and repeat them here:  ***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-1:*** *UE pre-compensation per segment of NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is applied from one segment to the next segment by using one or more of the following methods if supported by UE implementation*   * *Skip / drop / insert samples for all segments* * *Puncture OFDM symbols for segments greater than 8 ms for LEO, 32 ms for MEO.* * *Blanking subframes/slots where UE skip a slot or a subframe for segments greater than 8 ms, 32 ms for MEO.*   *The total transmission time is not changed*  *No skip / drop / insert samples, puncturing or blanking of subframes/slots is needed for GEO as maximum segment duration can be used with legacy gap*  >> Our understanding is that “UE pre-compensation per segment” means that there one bulk pre-compensation is applied to the entire segment and there is not a drip feed of mini pre-compensations throughout the segment. This isn’t very clear from the proposal.  For timing advance that is decreasing, what samples are inserted? Does the UE repeat a previous sample? Does it insert a zero sample?  Is the intention that there will be a down-scoping between the bullets? The eNB presumably needs to know what the UE is doing when the UE applies pre-compensation.  It isn’t clear why the puncturing / blanking functionality is dependent on segment length. It also isn’t clear why there is differentiation between LEO and MEO.  ***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-2:*** *For NB-IoT, UE pre-compensation per segment of NPRACH is applied from one segment to the next segment by Skip / drop / insert samples.*   * *The total transmission time is not changed*   *No skip / drop / insert samples is needed for GEO as maximum segment duration can be used with legacy gap*  >> As for the above proposal (4-3.1), it isn’t clear that there is a bulk pre-compensation applied, rather than a drip-feed of mini pre-compensations.  ***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-3:*** *For eMTC, UE pre-compensation per segment of PRACH is applied from one segment to the next segment by Skip / drop / insert samples in Guard Period of PRACH preamble.*   * *The total transmission time is not changed*   >> Same comment as 4-3.2.  ***1st Round Proposal – 4.3-6:*** *FFS How the method used for the UE pre-compensation per segment by UE implementation is known to the eNB*   * *Option A: UE capability* * *Option B: RRC signalling* * *Note that if a UE capability is defined it needs to be indicated to the eNB via RRC signalling.*   >> Our assumption is that there would be a down scoping between the bullets in proposal 4.3-1 and the specification would say what the UE does about pre-compensation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 2nd Round Proposal for Issue 3

The following agreement was made by qst checkpoint

**Agreement**

For eMTC PUCCH/PUSCH with frequency hopping enabled, the UE can adjust the uplink transmit timing when hopping to a new narrowband if the frequency hopping interval is less than or equal to the configured transmission segment duration.

As discussed in offline, the agreement we made needs to also include “frequency”. We make a 2nd Round proposal 4.4-8

Several companies commented on UL transmission segment duration for PUCCH in MTC and proposed to revise the proposal. The value 256 is not needed since the maximum number of repetitions for eMTC PUCCH is 128 and full PRB allocation is the only option.

***2nd Checkpoint Proposals –4.4-1:*** *For eMTC PUCCH, a 3-bit field to indicate K=8 values for the uplink transmission segment duration:*

* *2 4 8 16 32 64 128 subframes*

***2nd Checkpoint Proposals –4.4-2*** *For eMTC PUCCH/PUSCH with frequency hopping enabled, the UE can adjust the uplink transmit timing and transmit frequency when hopping to a new narrowband if the frequency hopping interval is less than or equal to the configured transmission segment duration.*

For NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC:

***2nd Round Proposal – 4.4-1-rev2:*** *UE pre-compensation per segment of NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is applied from one segment to the next segment by using one or more of the following methods if supported by UE implementation*

1. *UE may Drop / Insert samples / Puncture OFDM symbols*
2. *UE may Blank subframes / slots where UE skip a slot or a subframe*

*The total transmission time is not changed*

*UE autonomously Drop / insert samples / Puncture OFDM symbols or Blank subframes / slots where UE drops a subframe / slot*

*The method used for the UE pre-compensation is known to the eNB by a single UE capability*

* *UE Blank subframes / slots where UE skip a slot or a subframe (slot is based on Sub Carrier Spacing)*

*FFS Details of method(s) to drop / insert samples, blanking subframes / slots (slot is based on Sub Carrier Spacing)*

For NPRACH for NB-IoT and PRACH for eMTC:

***2nd Round Proposal – 4.4-2:*** *For NB-IoT, UE pre-compensation per segment of NPRACH is applied from one segment to the next segment by using one or more of the following methods if supported by UE implementation*

* *UE may Drop / Insert samples*
* *UE may Blank subframes / slots where UE drops a slot / subframe*
* *The total transmission time is not changed*
* *FFS Details of method(s) to drop / insert samples / blanking subframes / slots*
* *FFS Specification impact*

***2nd Round Proposal – 4.4-3:*** *For eMTC, UE pre-compensation per segment of PRACH is applied from one segment to the next segment by drop / insert samples in Guard Period of PRACH preamble.*

* *The total transmission time is not changed*
* *FFS Details of method(s) to drop / insert samples*

UL segmented transmission configuration:

***2nd Round Proposal – 4.4-4-rev1:***  *UL transmission segment duration with one value X per NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC is indicated on SIB.*

* For NB-IoT/eMTC, X is one one of K candidate values for the UL transmission segment duration of NPUSCH/PUSCH/PUCCH

***2nd Round Proposal – 4.4-5-rev1:***  *At least UL transmission segment duration with one value X for NPRACH for NB-IoT and PRACH for eMTC is indicated on SIB*

* *For NB-IoT/eMTC, X is one of K candidate values for the UL transmission segment duration of NPRACH/PRACH*
* *FFS One value X, one or more values Xi*

***2nd Round Proposal – 4.4-6:***  *UL Segmented transmission NPRACH/NPUSCH for NB-IoT is not supported in GEO based on UE feature*

*.*

***2nd Round Proposal – 4.4-7:***  *Support network re-configuration of UL transmission segment by dedicated RRC Signalling*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Issue 4: DL Synchronization

## Background

In RAN#92e, the following objective was agreed in the Rel-17 IoT NTN WID [1]

*Specify the following time and frequency synchronization enhancements that are not covered by NR\_NTN\_Solutions WI agreements, according to Section 8 in TR 36.763:*

* *DL synchronization enhancements: A single solution will be selected between: new channel raster, (part of) ARFCN-indication-in-MIB.*

The differential Doppler frequency can be up to +/-39.9 kHz with set-4 LEO-600. The max Doppler shift cann be +/-48 kHz. Wth 20 ppm oscillator error at UE, there can be additional frequency error term of +/-40 KHz. The total uncertainty on DL raster exceeds half of 100 kHz channel raster of terrestrial NB-IoT/eMTC. Synchronizing on the wrong raster could cause error in (N)Cell frequency selection.

## Company views

New channel raster:

MediaTek discussed this solution is specification is a RAN4 discussion and only considered for LEO. It is not needed for GEO or MEO since Doppler is only +/-0.93 ppm and +/-7.5 ppm respectively and Cell Search algorithms should synchronize on correct raster. Grid with new channel raster 200 kHz should align with NB-IoT carrier / Ncell deployment on satellite band. With channel raster 200 kHz, UE always synchronize to correct raster. The UE does not know the value and direction of change of feeder link delay drift (before reading common TA parameters on SIB). UE corrects / tracks feeder link delay spread contribution to Sampling Frequency Offset (SFO). Some analysis to show impact of feeder link delay drift on SFO was shown in R1-2119169. When UE first access cell, it does not know if cell is cellular or NTN GEO or LEO. Earliest this can be known is NTN SIB with NTN SIB or NTN fields in legacy SIBs.



***Figure 3: Illustration of channel raster with 100 kHz and 200 kHz grid and 3\*200 kHz allocation (MediaTek R1-2111373)***

Huawei, NEC, CATT, Nokia, OPPO, Xiaomi, ZTE, Apple, Lenovo proposed introducing the new channel raster with step size greater than 100 kHz for DL synchronization in IoT NTN (i.e. 200 kHz).

MediaTek, proposed RAN1#107-e further discuss pros and cons and select one solution for DL synchronization enhancements for LEO.

Ericsson discussed new channel ratser provides a clean approach to address the ambiguity in downlink synchronization. Since this is the last RAN1 meeting, RAN1 may agree on increasing the channel raster size as RAN4 work will not begin until 03/2022.

Intel proposed channel raster with a step size increased to be greater than 100 kHz for NB-IoT NTN should be supported if no issues identified with the number of NB-IoT carriers.

Qualcomm observed increasing the channel raster step size limits possible Ncell deployments for operators. For example, if the raster step size is doubled, entire chunks of spectrum up to 200 kHz that do not contain a raster point cannot be used to deploy an Ncell.

Moderator adds some further analysis for new channel raster below:

Legacy Sync raster

* Channel BW = 200 Hz
* NPSS / NSSS = 180 kHz
* Channel raster = sync raster = 100 kHz

New sync raster = 200 kHz to accommodate the satellite Doppler shift +/-48 kHz and crystal error for oscillator in device of +/-20 ppm (on anchor carrier)

* Channel BW = channel raster = sync raster = 200 kHz
* NPSS / NSSS = 180 kHz

When UE sync, centre of NPSS/NSSS is known and offset between centre NPSS/NSSS and channel raster (ARFCN) is known.



Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB:

MediaTek discussed this solution is only considered for LEO. It is not needed for GEO or MEO since Doppler is only +/-0.93 ppm and +/-7.5 ppm respectively and Cell Search algorithms should synchronize on correct raster. With 100 channel raster, 9 bits will be needed to indicate all the possible ARFCNs – i.e. 30 MHz/100 kHz=300 = 9 bits. The ARFCN index with 2 spare LSBs allows to save 7 bits for S band.

* ARFCN 2 GHz + 0 kHz 000000000
* ARFCN 2 GHz + 100 kHz 000000001
* ARFCN 2 GHz + 200 kHz 000000010
* ARFCN 2 GHz + 300 kHz 000000011

Between synchronization on NPSSS/NSSS and PBCH/MIB CRC check, if UE synchronized to the wrong raster it will assume a wrong DL carrier to derive the Sampling Frequency Offset (SFO) for its sampling rate. The SFO is +/-100 kHz/2 GHz = +/-50 ppm at carrier frequency Fc= 2GHz. To avoid loss in performance in LEO, UE makes 3 hypothesis for channel raster per synchronization attempt , without trying SFO steps of 2 ppm sweep to detect MIB on wrong raster if it fails first time (this may depend on the averaging window size and experienced SNR conditions – i.e. at high SNR and small window, the MIB detection may succeed even if on wrong raster then 2 LSBs can be read to correct the impact of SFO on sampling rate).



***Figure 4: Illustration of channel raster with 100 kHz and 3\*200 kHz allocation (MediaTek R1-2111373)***

ZTE, MediaTek provided simulations to show the loss of NPBCH demodulation performance with 640 ms averaging window.They show good agreement (ZTE used the TDL-D channel profile, which is better). The SFO impact if UE is on wrong raster with SFO=+/-50 ppm is very severe resulting in complete loss of NPBCH detection. ZTE assume the UE attemps to decode the MIB even if on wrong raster and make multiple hypothesis trying SFO steps of 2 ppm sweep to detect MIB. This way has very high complexity but seems reasonable strategy as the purpose of the MIB is to indicate when UE is on the wrong raster, so it must be read. The other strategy was assumed by MediaTek, where the UE attempts to read the MIB on first try on raster without trying SFO steps of 2 ppm sweep to detect MIB.



Figure 1 Detection complexity for option 1 and option 2 (ZTE R1-2111662)



Ericsson comented that with part-of ARFCN solution, there is an implicit assumption that the UE successfully acquires the MIB. However, the UE may not be aware of the amount of frequency uncertainty prior to reading MIB. As a result, it may need to test multiple hypotheses to acquire (N)PBCH and MIB. RAN1 to compare the pros and cons of increasing the channel raster step size and introducing ARFCN-indication-in-MIB.

Qualcomm observed the MIB in NB-IoT already indicates a channel raster offset to aid the UE accurately determining the frequency of the Ncell. Proposed to indicate two LSBs of the ARFCN in the MIB for NB-IoT over NTN. The NB-MIB currently has 9 spare bits, facilitating this indication seamlessly.

Moderator addes some further analysis for te Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB below:

**This solution has not significant impact on processing latency and battery life.**

* **Assuming average 1.5 raster hypothesis** (max 3 channel raster hypothesis per synchronization attempt)
  + ~1.5 times average processing latency for cell search (PSSS/NSSS+MIB) or about 7.3% average increase in overall processing time at MCL=164 dB
  + ~3 % average battery life reduction at MCL=154 dB and 164 dB

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BATTERY LIFE** | **WITHOUT 3 raster Hypothesis** | **WITH 3 raster Hypothesis** | **Assumption** |
| WARM FIX | 23.72 years / 20.17 years | 23.17 years / 19.85 years | 50B / 200B, 154 dB |
| 15.31 years / 10.03 years | 15.12 years / 9.95 years | 50B / 200B, 164 dB |
| HOT FIX | 8.37 years / 4.80 years | 7.74 years / 4.58 years | 50B / 200B, 154 dB |
| 2.52 years / 1.23 years | 2.46 years / 1.22 years | 50B / 200B, 164 dB |

Qualcomm observed on RAN1 reflector that an important point about “100 kHz raster with NO enhancement”

This has several issues, some of which, such as latency, UE power consumption, have been mentioned before. A critical point has not been discussed, where at sufficiently good SNRs, the MIB and SIB decoding passes [in a wrong cell, without the UE knowing till then]; the UE will subsequently transmit a PRACH with the incorrect frequency assumption! Now the neighbor cell at the adjacent raster point—which can even belong to another operator—may well get jammed by “this PRACH”. This is a terrible outcome!

DL frequency pre-compensation on service link:

Huawei proposed to support DL frequency pre-compensation in IoT NTN and use 12-bit to indicate the value of DL frequency pre-compensation with range [0,…, 4095] and granularity of 0.01ppm.

Intel proposed indication of Common Doppler pre-compensation should follow design agreed for NR NTN

***Moderator view:*** *The two solutions with channel raster and Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB are serious contenders with pros and cons. These solutions were extensively discussed during the Rel-17 IoT NTN Study Item and Rel-17 IoT NTN Work Item. RAN1 can discuss further and select one solution in this RAN1#107-e. Satellite companies input is needed to ensure the right solution is selected for RAN4 specification. Based on offline discussions with companies*

* *Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB allows UE to know early if on wrong raster in better SNR conditions and re-use legacy 100 kHz channel raster for easier cell deployment, small spectrum chunk deployment.*
* *Channel raster allows simpler device implementation, but has cell deployment limitation, small spectrum chunk allocation concern, require specify one raster > 100 kHz specified for GEO/MEO/LEO only per satellite band.*

*Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB has advantage over no DL synchronization enhancements at good / medium SNR. For example with smaller NPBCH window, UE on wrong raster may still decode the MIB / pass CRC check if timing drift to SFO is relatively small compare to larger NPBCH window of 640 ms. UE can use 2 LSBs to know correct raster / ARFCN, and determine sampling rate without SFO issue. Without 2 LSBs, the UE cannot know it is on wrong raster and the timing drift due to SFO will increase in time until UE loses DL synchronization. At low SNR, the Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB cannot help compare to no indication as UE will need to update raster anyway if it cannot read the MIB.*

*It is needed to discuss whether the new channel raster or (Part-of) ARFCN indication on MIB are useful optimizations but not specified in Rel-17 if there cannot be consensus on selecting a single solution. If there is no enhancements, if the UE is on the wrong raster the DL link will break when UE loses its DL timing sunchronization because of SFO. The UE will need to update raster and attempt to synchronize and pass the MIB CRC check, then receive the NTN SIB with ephemeris. It can then calculate the satellite Doppler shift and determine whether it is on the correct raster and absolute ARFCN to use for its sampling rate. The SFO issue due to wrong raster is then resolved, and the UE can proceed with initial cell access.*

*Without a decision on select a single solution for specification in RAN4 in RAN1#107-e, the default is to re-use the legacy channel ratser 100 kHz for LEO/MEO/GEO constellations.*

*The issue raised by Qualcomm on RAN1 reflector about “100 kHz raster with NO enhancement” for potential RACH transmission on wrong ratser can be discussed. This should be avoided. To the moderator understanding it would require the UE to check what the satellite Doppler shift is and correct the ARFCN assumption if on wrong raster. RAN1 has made no agreement on UE behaviour in this case. The indication of part-of ARFCN will solve this potential issue with RACH.*

***Initial Proposal – Section 5.2:*** *Companies are encouraged to comment on the pros and cons and take into account the respective views. It will be helpful if companies can show flexibility on implementation Versus cell deployment tradeoff. It is essential that a solution is selected in this RAN1#107-e.*

* *Discuss and summarize pros and cons for each DL synchronization solution for LEO – e.g.*
  + *Cell deployment in small spectrum chunks*
  + *Potential issue of transmittin RACH on wrong ratser in keep 100 kHz and donothing*
  + *What is to be specified in RAN1 specifications*
  + *Expected RAN4 specification effort*
  + *Firmware change / HW change / complexity in device*
* *RAN1 select a single solution for specification in RAN4 in RAN1#107-e*
  + *If no conclusion on select single solution, RAN1 can conclude on the pros and cons, and feasibility of each solution without selection of a single solution. From RAN1 viewpoint, there will be no optimization with DL synchronization enhancements in Rel-17 IoT NTN. It is up to UE implementation.*

*Companies can also indicate their preference and reasons for their prefere the solution. It will be very helpful if companies that do not implement the solution in the UE or are directly involdved in satellite cell configuration (i.e. gNB / satellite systems and operators) could be open to either solution. Companies that implement solution in UE are encouraged to comment on UE complexity low / medium / highand. Satellite companies / satellite providing eNB can comment on satellite cell deployment / spectrum allocation. Since this has been discussed for the whole of Rel-17 in SI and WI phases, moderator guiline to companies is to avoid just commenting that they prefer the solution. The default solution is no DL enhencements. If an option is not acceptable, it can be indicated and also indicated if company is willing to compromise.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option A  New channel raster = 200 kHz | Option B  Part-of ARFCN Indication on MIB | Option C  No DL enhancements | Reason for preference (i.e. UE complexity low / medium / high), satellite cell deployment / spectrum allocation |
| Preference of company | (1) | (2) | (3) | Low UE complexity inA, medium complexity of B, C is not acceptable, can accept B as compromise |
| Preference of company | (2) | (1) | (3) | Flexible cell deployment essential in small spectrum chunks with keep 100 kHz raster in B, |
| Preference of company | (1-2) | (1-2) | (3) | Can be fine with A and B, Would rather not have C as not clear why at least B without 3 hypothesis cannot be used with no impact on UE complexity. |
| GateHouse | 3 | 1 | 2 | A is inflexible and requires more time for standardisation. B is an optimized version of C.  C and B only add slightl complexity on the UE side. |
| MediaTek | (1-2) | (1-2) | (3) | Lean towards B because of satellite companies concern. Option B complexity can be acceptable. Option C should be avoided. |
| Ligado | (1-2) | (1-2) | (3) | We prefer B for spectrum flexibility reasons, but would be willing to compromise. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| OPPO | The pros for adopting larger grid channel rasters are: 1) easy for RAN1 specification; 2) completely remove the DL sync issue; 3) less search complexity for UE. The cons are 1) relying RAN4 workload to define the raster; 2) less flexible for operators to deploy anchor carrier.  The pros for adopting ARFCN indication in MIB are 1) solution is decided within RAN1; 2) remove the DL sync issue; 3) more flexibility for operators deployment. The cons are 1) relatively higher search complexity; 2) more test cases.  We supporting the solution of wider grid of channel rasters. But we can compromise to accept solution with ARFCN indicaiotn in MIB. |
| ZTE | In general, increasing channel raster is preferred since it is a straightforward solution with less complexity.  However, if there is strong demand from operator for cell deployment over the limited bandwidth, e.g., narrow than 200 KHz and shared between GEO and LEO, compared to the solution with ARFCN indicaiotn in MIB, we are fine to keep the current spec with 100 kHz unchanged as the similar conclusion in NR-NTN SI (cited from 38821).  *However, for the LEO without pre-compensation of the frequency offset, additional complexity is needed at UE receiver to achieve robust DL initial synchronization performance based on Rel-15 SSB. No further enhancement on the SSB is needed.*  In this case, all the behavior will up to the UE’s implementation without any impacts from RAN1-4 to satisfy the demand for quick commercialization. |
| Qualcomm | To us, the tradeoffs are simple between the two solutions:   * 1. A larger raster is simple for the UE, but operators have explicitly said that spectrum is very scarce and they can have **spectrum chunks of 200 kHz or less**, wherein there may be the possibility that there are **no raster points for them to deploy an Ncell anchor carrier**. This is a potential disaster.   2. The ARFCN in MIB allows us to keep the 100 kHz raster (providing operators full deployment flexibility), at the cost of (in the worst case) doing 3 hypothesis tests t decode the MIB.   As is customary in 3GPP, as UE vendors, we try our best to accommodate solutions that provide them the maximum flexibility [since it is common understanding that operators drive business in the industry].  To this end, we—as a UE vendor—**are OK with the minimal change required for PBCH decoding to facilitate the “2 bits in MIB” solution**.  **Important point about “100 KHz raster with NO enhancement”**  This is a very problematic idea for several reasons—some of which, such as latency, UE power consumption, have been mentioned by the moderator. However, a critical point has not been discussed.  Imagine that at sufficiently good SNRs, the MIB and SIB decoding passes [in a wrong cell, without the UE knowing till then]; the UE will subsequently **transmit a PRACH with the incorrect frequency assumption**!  Now the **neighbour cell at the adjacent raster point—which can even belong to another operator—may well get jammed by “this PRACH”**. This is simply a terrible outcome! |
| Sateliot | We think that pros and cons of different options are well captured in moderator exposition and previous responses, noting the new point also raised by QC with regard to the issue of a 100 kHz raster with no enhancement.  As satellite operator, we cannot do other than reiterating the fact that satellite MSS spectrum is scarce, and spectrum for satellite IoT is even scarcer, meaning that there wont be that much spectrum to be used by IoT. Hence, increasing the raster size to 200kHz will be detrimental in front of keeping the 100 kHz raster, will allows for more efficient use of the spectrum which is ITU priority number 1.  So, Sateliot supports any solution (preferably the MIB solution) that keeps the raster unchanged and leave it to operators to make the most out of available spectrum for satellite IoT. |
| Nokia, NSB | Increasing the size of channel raster may waste the spectrum in the real deployment, while the add ing ARFCN in MIB will impact performance of PBCH and also complexity of UE as PSS/SSS still need to be estimated for different choice.  From this point of view, we think both of them will have disadvantage. But considering the limited time in Rel17, no more solutions discussed.  One possible way is to study more in Rel18 and do not select in Rel17.  If we want to ask RAN4 to select, we propose to add one more option as reuse the legacy solution and it is up to UE implementation. |
| GateHouse | Our main priority is to have a single solution that can move forward without unnecessary delay to the standardization, but **we have a large preference for maintaining flexibility for operators and spectrum providers**. Among the arguments for spectral flexibility we have heard that (a) there is a scarcity of spectrum, (b) legacy systems in non-optimal spectrum slices and (c) the alignment of spectrum slices owned by a single spectrum provider. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share a similar view with OPPO on the pros and cons of the two solutions and we have a preference to increase the channel raster considering both the specification impact and the UE implementation.  In addition, we would like to bring up one additional point to address the potential resource waste by increasing the channel raster to 200 kHz and requirement of deployment flexibility from the satellite operator. On possible approach is to adopt a similar solution as NR, i.e. to keep the 100kHz channel raster and only increase the sync raster to 200kHz. We think this can address sync raster ambiguity at the UE side and at the same time the operator can still make full use of the spectrum. We acknowledge that this scheme may pose some restriction to the anchor carrier selection but the operator can still make full use of the spectrum. What is not clear to us is whether there is any satellite operator who only have 200kHz spectrum in hand and decide to use it for IoT NTN. In term of specification effort, we think this solution requires similar effort as increasing the channel raster to 200kHz in RAN4 but did address the concern on spectrum ultilization flexibility to some extend. |
| Novamint | We believe it is very important to consider the impact for the sat operators in regards of increasing the raster size with a scarce spectrum available in particular for IoT. We also believe we should consider strongly the point raised by Qualcomm on keeping 100 KHz raster with NO enhancement. In both cases, this will be damaging for the satellite operators and therefore we should focus on the MIB solution only. |
| SONY | Our preference is for a new channel raster.  In Rel-13, we were very careful not to use “spare” MIB bits and even when a few of these “spare” MIB bits were used, there were associated problems. We should avoid that.  In initial deployments, we would not expect carriers to be fully loaded with Rel-17 UEs. It is not clear that there is a spectrum issue in Rel-13. We would welcome input from satellite operators here.  Our order of preference is:  New channel raster, (3) no DL enhancements, (3) ARFCN |
| Ericsson | Input from satellite companies is crucial to understand the impact on deployment in small spectrum chunks. If this is viewed as a severe problem, our preference is to signal part of the ARFCN in MIB. This also has the advantage that RAN1 can agree on a solution without RAN4 involvement.  We agree that it is essential that RAN1 selects 1 solution in this meeting. |
| MediaTek | The default option is do nothing and keep 100 kHz sync raster.  We are open to satellite companies concern for small spectrum allocation and preference to use legacy sync raster of 100 kHz. The “NR-like” sync raster design for IoT NTN cannot solve issue of misalignment of small contiguous spectrum chunk and raster grid with 200 kHz sync raster, does not work for anchor carrier, and cannot.  We agree that new channel raster has lower impact on UE complexity, but this should only one consideration for UE vendors. On use 2 spare bits in the 5 spare bits / 4 spare bits for NB-IoT/eMTC to support LEO, it is reasonable. Rel-17 will be likely the final Cellular NB-IoT/eMTC/LTE release(none in Rel-18). |
| Ligado | Satellite spectrum is scarce and can be allocated in small bandwidths as low as 200 kHz. Extending the raster could leave entire 200kHz bands unavailable for use as discussed above. @Sony this is not an issue about number of UEs, it is about ensuring carriers can be put up within spectrum allocated to an operator in small chunks. For this reason, in common with all the operators we prefer to go with the ARFCN MIB solution. |
| Apple | The channel raster step size could be increased from 100 kHz to a larger number (e.g., 200 kHz). This approach could address the downlink synchronization error. However, this has RAN4 impact.  The other potential solution is to include part of ARFCN information in MIB. This approach requires multiple hypotheses testing before decoding the PBCH, which includes the correct channel frequency information.  Comparing the two approaches, we think the new channel raster has less specification/UE implementation impact and is preferred. But we can accept the solution with ARFCN indicaiotn in MIB. |

## 1st Round Issue 4

The proposal below was discussed in 1st GTW. The default position if no agreement to select a single solution in RAN1#107-e is that the legacy 100 kHz channel raster will be used without any enhancement. This outcome is seen as un-acceptable by commenting companies.

* Several satelitte companies commented that channel raster 200 kHz restrict small spectrum chunks allocation for LEO and is not their preferrence.
* Several companies that preferred the channel raster 200 kHz solution are now more open to compromise on the part-of ARFCN indication on MIB if serious concern from satellite operators for satellite spectrum allocation, especially small spectrum chunks.
* Device vendors have overall preference for channel raster 200 kHz solution which has low complexity. No device vendor has commented that the UE complexity of the part-of ARFCN indication on MIB is un-acceptable.
* Companies commented on availability of spare bits in MIB. Its is 5 spare bits for MIB-NB in NB-IoT and 4 spare bits for MIN in eMTC (TS 36.331).
* Companies commented on potential RACH issue if UE decodes MIB on the wrong raster assuming 100 kHz raster is used without the part-of ARFCN indication on MIB. To the moderator understanding in that case the UE can determine the ARFCN from System Information SIB2-NB for UL ARFCN and on SIB5-NB for DL ARFCN for inter-frequency cell re-selection (i.e. the ARFCN applicable for the NB-IoT carrier frequency as defined in TS 36.101 [42, Table 5.7.3-1] in CarrierFreq-NB IE for NB-IoT in TS 36.331 Section 6.7.3.2). UE may have wrong assumption on DL ARFCN if on wrong raster. Since the ambiguity happened in initial access due to satellite Doppler shift +/-48 kHz and +/-20 ppm crystal error. Then, the UE may transmit RACH on wrong UL ARFCN. Even after UE determines the satellite Doppler shift from ephemeris, the ambiguity may not be resoved since the crystal error impact on synchronization and sampling rate has been corrected.

Moderator view is that this can be avoided wuith better understanding of the pros and cons and compromise to select one single solution.

***1st Round Proposal 5.3-1:*** *For each solution, discuss and summarize pros and cons for each DL synchronization solution– (i) New channel raster of 200 kHz; (ii) Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB:*

* + *Cell deployment in small (contiguous) spectrum chunks*
  + *What is to be specified in RAN1 specifications*
  + *Firmware change / HW change / complexity in device*
* *RAN1 conclude on the pros and cons, and feasibility of each solution and select a single solution for specification in RAN4 in RAN1#107-e*

***1st Round Proposal 5.3-2:*** *Capture Pros and Cons of solutions for DL synchronization enhancements based on Moderator summary as provided in Issue 4 DL synchronization enhancements in Moderator summary:*

* *Channel raster = 200 kHz*
* *Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB*

Channel raster = 200 kHz:

RAN4 will be expected to specify core requirements for one channel raster for LEO/MEO/GEO only per band.

Pros:

* With channel raster 200 kHz align with NB-IoT Anchor carrier / Pcell deployment on satellite band, UE always synchronize to correct raster on anchor carrier and can accommodate the satellite Doppler shift +/-48 kHz and crystal error for oscillator in device of +/-20 ppm. One option discussed is that to the moderator understanding the legacy channel raster 100 kHz could align with NB-IoT Non-Anchor carrier / Scell.
* Low complexity for UE device implementation

Cons:

* Deployment of (anchor) NB-IoT carriers in small contiguous spectrum chunk may lead to spectrum waste as illustrated in Figure below.
* Channel raster = 200 kHz anchor carrier / PCell and legacy channel raster 100 kHz Non-anchor carrier / SCell may be restricted to
  1. Non-contiguous Spectrum chunk allocation with anchor carriers and non-anchor carriers
  2. Some spectrum allocation aligned with anchor carriers to allow UE synchronization / SIB acquisition
  3. Potential RACH issue if UE decodes MIB on the wrong raster assuming 100 kHz raster is used without the part-of ARFCN indication on MIB



Figure: Channel raster = 200 kHz for anchor carriers, and channel raster of 100 kHz for non-anchor carriers

Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB:

RAN4 will be expected to specify performance requirements and a test for Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB for LEO. As satellite Doppler shift is 0.93 ppm and 7.5 ppm for GEO and MEO respectively, the UE is expected to synchronize to correct raster without enhancement as in cellular. However, it was discussed that

Pros:

* UE knows early if on wrong channel raster by detecting the MIB with up to 3 channel raster hypothesis and can accommodate the satellite Doppler shift +/-48 kHz and crystal error for oscillator in device of +/-20 ppm for LEO. The UE subsequently use correct ARFCN for its sampling rate determination to avoid Sampling Frequency Offset issue.

Cons:

* Increased UE complexity with up to 3 channel raster hypothesis (1.5 raster hypothesis on average) per synchronization attempt. If after trying the 3 channel raster hypothesis, the UE cannot detect the MIB then it gives up and try another channel raster. Some receiver algorithm optimization for synchronization may reduce the complexity impact.
* UE does not know the Sampling Frequency Offset (SFO) assumption if synchronized to wrong raster before reading MIB.
  + ~5 dB loss with SFO=+/-10 ppm with 80 ms NPBCH averaging window (good SNR)
  + Total PBCH failure if SFO=+/-50 ppm with 640 ms NPBCH averaging window (low SNR)

Moderator Analysis for processing latency and battery life using power consumption methodology in study item phase as captured in TR 36.763:

* The Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB may have reasonable impact on processing latency and battery life
  + ~1.5 times average processing latency for cell search (PSSS/NSSS+MIB) or about 7.3% average increase in overall processing time at MCL=164 dB
  + ~3 % average battery life reduction at MCL=154 dB and 164 dB

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **BATTERY LIFE** | **WITHOUT 3 raster Hypothesis** | **WITH 3 raster Hypothesis** | **Assumption** |
| WARM FIX | 23.72 years / 20.17 years | 23.17 years / 19.85 years | 50B / 200B, 154 dB |
| 15.31 years / 10.03 years | 15.12 years / 9.95 years | 50B / 200B, 164 dB |
| HOT FIX | 8.37 years / 4.80 years | 7.74 years / 4.58 years | 50B / 200B, 154 dB |
| 2.52 years / 1.23 years | 2.46 years / 1.22 years | 50B / 200B, 164 dB |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Processing time** | **WITHOUT 3 raster Hypothesis** | **WITH 3 raster Hypothesis** | **Assumption** |
| WARM FIX | 502 ms / 3987 ms | 877 ms / 4362 ms | 50B / 200B, 154 dB |
| 1173 ms / 7102 ms | 1548 ms / 7477 ms | 50B / 200B, 164 dB |

*Moderator view: Table below canbe used to collect companies views on 1st Round Proposal 5.3.1. It would be very helpful if companies can show in Table below their views. Please, avoid re-stating preference for either solution.*

* *For UE vendors, in particular please comment on concern / cannot support UE implementation solution with MIB (please give reasons if cannot support – i.e. HW change, 3 raster hypothesis cannot be done by UE implementation, cannot give up and try another raster without using 3 raster hypothesis).*
* *For satellite operators and infra vendors, in particular please comment on potential concern on restrictions on spectrum deployment in contiguous / non-contiguous small spectrum chunks, spectrum waste with new channel raster and other potential issues.*
* *For all companies, it is also very fine to indicate no strong view on solutions and can compromise and also comment on potential issues (e.g. RACH with Solution 1a).*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company views | **Solution 1**: Chanel raster 200 kHz | **Solution 1a**: Chanel raster 200 kHz for Anchor carrier / channel raster 100 kHz for non-anchor carrier | **Solution 2**: Part-AFCN indication on MIB | Flexibility on solution |
| MediaTek | * Simplest for UE implementation * Concern for restrictions on spectrum deployment in contiguous / non-contiguous small spectrum chunks | * Adds complexity to UE implementation * Concern for restrictions on spectrum deployment in contiguous small spectrum chunks, has more flexibility for non-contiguous small spectrum chunks * RACH issue if UE sync and decode MIB on wrong raster using raster 100 kHz may break system | * Can support solution with increase UE complexity with up to 3 raster hypothesis, solve issue with spectrum deployment * Avoid error case early if UE sync and decode MIB on wrong raster for increased robustness | * Can support Solution 1 or solution 2 as a compromise |
| Hughes/EchoStar | Strong concern on restrictions on spectrum deployment in contiguous / non-contiguous small spectrum chunks, | Strong concern on restrictions on spectrum deployment in contiguous / non-contiguous small spectrum chunks, | Can support solution with increase UE complexity with up to 3 raster hypothesis, solve issue with spectrum deployment | Can compromise on ARFCN MIB solution |

*Moderator guidance: Table below can be used to comment on moderator summary of pros and cons in 1st Round Proposal 5.3-2 (above):*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| Moderator | First draft of summary of pros and cons for DL synchronization solutions:   * *Channel raster = 200 kHz* * *Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB* |
| Hughes/EchoStar | Strong concern on Solution 1 and 2- restrictions on spectrum deployment in contiguous / non-contiguous small spectrum chunks. OK to consider ARFCN MIB solution. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The comments from on UE complexity increase and RACH issue for option 1a does not seem to be valid since the sync raster has been increased to 200kHz. Our understanding is that there is no additional UE complexity compared to Option 1, niether is a sync issue. The only cons we can thinks of the reduced flexibility to choose the anchor carrier. |
| Nokia, NSB | The evaluation of the two solutions are not discussed before.  Firstly, there should be clear evaluation how many UE will be impacted and impact to system if there is error. If the impact can be accepted in Rel17, it should be up to UE implementation and no modification on specification.  Considering the pros and cons we have discussed in server meetings and limited time in Rel17, we think the solution for new raster with less impact on UE complexity and modification on specification could be first choice and we have preference order as  New channel raster with 200kHz step 2) no enhancement 3) add ARFCN in MIB |
| SONY | Our preference is for a new channel raster. This is the simplest from a UE perspective and results in minimum changes to the specification and potentially to UE implementations.  **Small spectrum chunks**  The issues seems to be that at the ends of a band, there will be frequency locations where it is not possible to locate an IoT-NTN carrier. Is that “chunk” related to the amount of spectrum that an operator has or the amount of spectrum in the band? Based on the latter understanding (chunk = band), it would seem that the percentage of spectrum that would be unallocatable for an anchor carrier would be small (and that spectrum could in any case be used by a non anchor carrier).  **RACH**  An issue has been raised about sending RACH on the wrong frequency. Our understanding is that the UE needs to read SIB before sending RACH and will know the frequency raster as a consequence of reading SIB. We do not expect the UE to send PRACH based on reading MIB alone. |

## 2nd Round Proposal for Issue 4

Agreement was made in 2nd GTW as follows

**Agreement**

For DL synchronization enhancements:

* Signal Part-of ARFCN indication on MIB for bands where RAN4 cannot introduce a 200 kHz channel raster and the legacy 100 kHz raster is used, otherwise for bands where RAN4 can introduce a 200 kHz channel raster there is no signalling of the part-of ARFCN indication on MIB.

LS to RAN4

R1-2112689 - DRAFT LS on DL synchronization enhancements for IoT NTN

Following agreement, it is further needed to specify the indication of ARFCN in the MIB. This can be done with 2 spare LSBs on the MIB for NB-IoT.

***2nd Round Proposal 5.4-1:*** *For IoT NTN, indicate two LSBs of the ARFCN in the MIB.*

# Issue 5: Synchronization aspects common to IoT NTN and NR NTN

## Background

In RAN#92e, the following objective was agreed in the Rel-17 IoT NTN WID [1]

*Specify the following time and frequency synchronization enhancements, using NR\_NTN\_solutions WI agreements as baseline, according to Section 8 in TR 36.763:*

*- UE pre-compensation including ephemeris format (orbital / Position -Velocity)*

*- UE pre-compensation for UL synchronization in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_CONNECTED states based at least on its GNSS-acquired position and the serving satellite ephemeris*

*- Timing advance formula (granularity of the timing advance may be different)*

*- Combination of Open (i.e. UE autonomous TA estimation, and common TA estimation) and Closed TA (i.e., received TA commands) control loops in RRC\_CONNECTED state*

*Agreements on the above are up to the decision in NR\_NTN\_Solutions WI and will be used for IoT NTN with minimum changes, if any.*

In RAN1#106-e and RAN1#106bis-e, the following agreements were made

Agreement:

The following agreements from NR NTN are re-used for IoT NTN as working assumption.

1. The Doppler shift over the feeder link and any transponder frequency error for both Downlink and Uplink is compensated by the GW and satellite-payload without any specification impacts in Release 17.
2. The orbital propagator model to be used at UE side can be left to implementation
3. Timing Advance formula can be transposed to IoT-NTN with Ts used instead of Tc

The Timing Advance applied by an NR NTN UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED is given by:

Where:

* is defined as 0 for PRACH and updated based on TA Command field in msg2/msgB and MAC CE TA command.
  + FFS: details of NTA update/accumulation.
* is UE self-estimated TA to pre-compensate for the service link delay.
* is network-controlled common TA, and may include any timing offset considered necessary by the network.
* with value of 0 is supported.
  + FFS:  details of signaling including granularity.
* is a fixed offset used to calculate the timing advance.

Note-1: Definition of  is different from that in RAN1#103-e agreement in NR NTN WI.

Note-2: UE might not assume that the RTT between UE and gNB is equal to the calculated TA for Msg1/Msg A.

Note-3:  is the common timing offset X as agreed in RAN1 #103-e in NR NTN WI.

1. Support the delivery of ephemeris information using both ephemeris formats, i.e., state vectors and orbital elements

* Set 1: Satellite position and velocity state vectors (position/velocity)
  + Position X,Y,Z in ECEF (m)
  + Velocity VX,VY,VZ in ECEF (m/s)
* Set 2: Parameters in orbital parameter ephemeris format
  + Semi-major axis α [m]
  + Eccentricity e
  + Argument of periapsis ω [rad]
  + Longitude of ascending node Ω [rad]
  + Inclination i [rad]
  + Mean anomaly M [rad] at epoch time to
  + FFS: Whether pre-provisioned ephemeris based on orbital elements can be used as reference. Thereby, only delta corrections can be broadcast in order to reduce the overhead

1. For TA update in RRC\_CONNECTED state, combination of both open (i.e. UE autonomous TA estimation, and common TA estimation) and closed (i.e., received TA commands) control loops shall be supported for IoT-NTN

Agreement:

The following agreement from NR NTN are re-used for IoT NTN as working assumption

1. In Rel-17 IoT-NTN, at least support UE which can compute timing advance and frequency adjustment for serving link based on its GNSS position and serving satellite ephemeris signalled by the network and apply corresponding timing advance and frequency adjustment in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_CONNECTED modes
2. Serving satellite ephemeris Epoch time is implicitly known as a reference time defined by the starting time of a DL slot and/or frame.

FFS: Whether this starting time is given by predefined rule or it is indicated by the Network

Agreement:

In eMTC/NB-IoT, NTA update based on TA Command field in msg2 and MAC CE TA command is used for UL timing alignment correction as follows:

* No extension on TAC 11-bit field in Random Access Response
* When TAC (TA) in Msg2 is received, UE first adjustment and NTA is adjusted as follows: NTA,new = TA ×16, where TA is the timing advance command in msg2.
* When TACs ( provided within the MAC CE is received, is updated as follows:
  + ,
* Where TA is the TAC field received in MAC CE command.

## Company views

MediaTek proposed for the following Rel-17 NR NTN WI agreements are used for Rel-17 IoT NTN. These are included directly as moderator initial proposal

***Initial Proposal – Section 6.2-1:*** *The following agreements from NR NTN are re-used for IoT NTN*

*Common TA may include parameter(s) indicating timing drift.*

* *The UE will apply common TA according to the parameters provided by the network (if any). No offset between the common TA according to the parameters provided by the network and the actual feeder link RTT is considered when defining UE UL timing error requirements.*

*Common TA Epoch time is implicitly known as a reference time defined by the starting time of a DL slot and/or frame.*

* *FFS: Whether this starting time is given by predefined rule or it is indicated by the Network*
  + *Note: “implicitly known” means that UTC is not provided to define the Common TA epoch time.*

*In NTN, the Network may optionally indicate one or more of the following parameters:*

* *Common TA , Common TA drift rate and Common TA drift rate variation.*
* *FFS: Common TA third order derivative.*
* *FFS: Details of combination of Common TA parameters*

***Initial Proposal – Section 6.2-2:*** *The following agreements from NR NTN are re-used for IoT NTN*

* *The granularity of Common TA is set to be 1.Ts*

***Initial Proposal – Section 6.2-3:*** *The following agreements from NR NTN are re-used for IoT NTN*

* *Conclusion: Do not define a TA margin.*

***Initial Proposal – Section 6.2-4:*** *The following agreements from NR NTN are re-used for IoT NTN*

*Support serving satellite ephemeris format bit allocations for LEO/MEO/GEO based non-terrestrial access network.:*

* *Position and velocity state vector ephemeris format [17 bytes payload].* 
  + *The field size for position [m]  is [78 bits]*
    - *Position range is driven by GEO : +/- 42 200 km*
    - *The quantization step is [1.3m] for position*
  + *The field size for velocity [m/s] is [54 bits]*
    - *Velocity range is driven by LEO@600 km: +/- 8000 m/s*
    - *The quantization step is [0.06 m/s] for Velocity*
* *Orbital parameter ephemeris format [18 byte payload]*
  + *Semi-major axis α [m] is [33 bits]*
    - *Range: [6500, 43000]km*
  + *Eccentricity e is [19 bits]*
    - *Range: ≤ 0.015*
  + *Argument of periapsis ω [rad] is [24 bits]* 
    - *Range: [0, 2π]*
  + *Longitude of ascending node Ω [rad] is [21 bits]*
    - *Range: [-180o , +180o]*
  + *Inclination i [rad] is [20 bits]*
    - *Range: [-90o  , +90o ]*
  + *Mean anomaly M [rad] at epoch time to is [24 bits]*
    - *Range: [0, 2π]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Companies | Comments |
| ZTE | Agree to reuse the agreements for NR-NTN. And prefer to postpone the in the later phase of this meeting and capturing the latest version since updates may occurs for some of them. |
| Nokia, NSB | For ***Initial Proposal – Section 6.2-1,*** overhead of SIB for NB-IoT and eMTC should be considered.  We are OK for the other 3 ones. |
| MediaTek | Support 6.2-1, 6.2-2, 6.2-3, 6.2-4 |
| Ligado | Agree to re-use the NTN-NR agreements. |
| Apple | ***Initial Proposal – Section 6.2-4:***  is a working assumption in NR NTN. We may wait for the confirmation in NR NTN first.  We are fine with the other proposals. |

## 1st Round for Issue 5

1st Checkpoint Proposals based on first round comments in Summary and email reflector:

The below proposals had support from commenting companies in moderator summary for initial round and were indicated as stable on the RAN1 reflector for 1st checkpoint for agreements:

***1st Checkpoint Proposal 6.2-2:*** *The following agreements from NR NTN are re-used for IoT NTN*

* *The granularity of Common TA is set to be 1.Ts*

***1st Checkpoint Proposal 6.2-3:*** *The following agreements from NR NTN are re-used for IoT NTN*

* *Conclusion: Do not define a TA margin.*

***1st Checkpoint Proposal 6.2-4:*** *The following agreements from NR NTN are re-used for IoT NTN*

*Support serving satellite ephemeris format bit allocations for LEO/MEO/GEO based non-terrestrial access network.:*

* *Position and velocity state vector ephemeris format [17 bytes payload].* 
  + *The field size for position [m]  is [78 bits]*
    - *Position range is driven by GEO : +/- 42 200 km*
    - *The quantization step is [1.3m] for position*
  + *The field size for velocity [m/s] is [54 bits]*
    - *Velocity range is driven by LEO@600 km: +/- 8000 m/s*
    - *The quantization step is [0.06 m/s] for Velocity*
* *Orbital parameter ephemeris format [18 byte payload]*
  + *Semi-major axis α [m] is [33 bits]*
    - *Range: [6500, 43000]km*
  + *Eccentricity e is [19 bits]*
    - *Range: ≤ 0.015*
  + *Argument of periapsis ω [rad] is [24 bits]* 
    - *Range: [0, 2π]*
  + *Longitude of ascending node Ω [rad] is [21 bits]*
    - *Range: [-180o , +180o]*
  + *Inclination i [rad] is [20 bits]*
    - *Range: [-90o  , +90o ]*
  + *Mean anomaly M [rad] at epoch time to is [24 bits]*
    - *Range: [0, 2π]*

## 2nd Round Proposal for Issue 5

The following agreements and conclusion were made by 1st Chekpoint

**Agreement**

The following agreements from NR NTN are re-used for IoT NTN

The granularity of Common TA is set to be 1.Ts

**Conclusion**

The following conclusion from NR NTN is re-used for IoT NTN

Conclusion: Do not define a TA margin.

The following proposals were for 2nd Chekpoint agreemeents

**2nd Checkpoint Proposal – 6.4-1-rev1:**

Working assumption:

**Higher-layer parameters TACommon, TACommonDrift, TACommonDriftVariation and [TACommonThirdOrder] are indicated with the following range, granularity and bits allocation:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter name** | **Value range** | **Granularity** | **Bits allocation** |
| **TACommon** | **0 ...8316826**  **(i.e: 0… 270.73 ms)** | **32.55208 ×10-3μs** | **23 bits** |
| **TACommonDrift** | **- 261935… + 261935**  **(i.e: --53.33   μss… +-53.33 μss)** | **0.2×10-3μss** | **19 bits** |
| **TACommonDriftVariation** | **0…29470**  **(0…0.60 μss2)** | **0.2×10-4μss2** | **15 bits** |
| **[TACommonThirdOrder]** | **-4912…+4912**  **(-0.015 μss*3*…+0.015 μss*3*)** | **0.3×10-5μss*3*** | **14 bits** |
| -        **Value ranges are given in unit of corresponding granularity** |  |  |  |

**2nd Checkpoint Proposal – 6.4-2:**

*Confirm the working assumption made at RAN1#106-bis-e on serving satellite ephemeris bit allocations for LEO/MEO/GEO based non-terrestrial access network :*

* *Support serving satellite ephemeris format bit allocations for LEO/MEO/GEO based non-terrestrial access network.:*
* *Position and velocity state vector ephemeris format is 17 bytes payload.* 
  + *The field size for position (m) is 78 bits* 
    - *Position range is driven by GEO : +/- 42 200 km*
    - *The quantization step is 1.3m for position*
  + *The field size for velocity (m/s) is 54 bits* 
    - *Velocity range is driven by LEO@600 km: +/- 8000 m/s*
    - *The quantization step is 0.06 m/s for Velocity*
* *Orbital parameter ephemeris format 18 byte payload* 
  + *Semi-major axis α (m) is 33 bits* 
    - *Range: [6500, 43000]km*
  + *Eccentricity e is 19 bits* 
    - *Range: ≤ 0.015*
  + *Argument of periapsis ω (rad) is 24 bits* 
    - *Range: [0, 2π]*
  + *Longitude of ascending node (Ω rad) is 21 bits* 
    - *Range: [0, 2π]*
  + *Inclination i (rad) is 20 bits* 
    - *Range: [- π/2 , + π/2]*
  + *Mean anomaly M (rad) at epoch time to is 24 bits* 
    - *Range: [0, 2π]*

# Conclusions

We list the RAN1#106-e agreements here.TBA

# References

1. RP-211601, “NB-IoT/eTMC support for NTN WI”, MediaTek, RAN#92-e, May 2021
2. R1-2110808, Huawei, Discussion on time and frequency synchronization enhancement for IoT in NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
3. R1-2111048, VIVO, Discussion on time and frequency synchronization enhancements for NB-IoT/eMTC over NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
4. R1-2111117, Spreadtrum, Discussions on enhancements to time and frequency synchronization, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
5. R1-2111172, Mavenir, Enhancements to time and frequency synchronization, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
6. R1-2111182, NEC, Enhancements to time and frequency synchronization, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
7. R1-2111236, CATT, Time and frequency synchronization enhancement for IoT over NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
8. R1-2111276, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell, Enhancement to time and frequency synchronization for NB-IoT/eMTC over NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, August 2021
9. R1-2111319, OPPO, Discussion on enhancements to time and frequency synchronization, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
10. R1-2111373, MediaTek, Enhancements to time and frequency synchronization for IoT NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
11. R1-2111410, SONY, Remaining issues on enhancement to time synchronisation for IoT-NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
12. R1-2111420, Ericsson, On time and frequency synchronization enhancements for IoT NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
13. R1-2111451, Qualcomm, Enhancements to time and frequency synchronization, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
14. R1-2111523, Intel, On synchronization for NB-IoT and eMTC NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
15. R1-2111557, Xiaomi, Discussion on time and frequency synchronization for IoT NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
16. R1-2111633, CMCC, Enhancements on time and frequency synchronization for IoT NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
17. R1-2111662, ZTE, Discussion on synchronization for IoT-NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
18. R1-2111767, Samsung, On enhancements to time and frequency synchronization, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
19. R1-2111904, Apple, Time and Frequency Synchronization in IoT NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
20. R1-2112002, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Time and frequency synchronization for IoT NTN, RAN1#106bis-e, October 2021
21. R1-2112329, Nordic Semiconductor ASA, Enhancements to time and frequency synchronization, RAN1#106-e, August 2021

# Appendix

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contribution | Observation/Proposals |
| Huawei (R1-2110808) | In this contribution, we discuss the time/frequency adjustment, RACH enhancement and power consumption introduced by GNSS and NTN related SIB reading in IoT NTN. The following observations and proposals are presented.  ***Observation:*** *Without DL frequency pre-compensation, UE initial cell search complexity and latency will introduce large power consumption.*  ***Proposal******1****:* *UE in RRC\_CONNECTED can report its GNSS position fix validity duration to the network.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Based on the UE reported GNSS position fix validity duration, the network can configure a measurement gap for a new GNSS position fix if the UE does not support simultaneous GNSS and NTN NB-IoT/eMTC operation.*  ***Proposal 3***: *For all satellite orbits, network configures one of 5 candidate values for the UL transmission segmentation duration of NPUSCH in a 3-bit field, where the 5 candidate values are*   * *{16 ms, 32 ms, 64 ms, 128 ms, 256 ms}*   ***Proposal 4****: The NPUSCH segmentation duration can be configured via UE-specific signaling.*  ***Proposal 5****: Network configures one of K values for the UL transmission segment duration of each PRACH preamble format in a k-bit field in the system information where the size of k and K values are:*   * *Format 0 and format 1: 3-bit field, K=6 candidate values 2\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ), 4\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ), 8\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ), 16\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ), 32\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ), 64\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ)* * *Format 2: 3-bit field, K=5 candidate values 1\*6\*(TCP+TSEQ), 2\*6\*(TCP+TSEQ), 4\*6\*(TCP+TSEQ), 8\*6\*(TCP+TSEQ), 16\*6\*(TCP+TSEQ)*   ***Proposal 6****:**The reference point for epoch time is set at the serving satellite transmitter.*  ***Propose 7:*** *The epoch time for common TA and satellite ephemeris is defined as the ending time of the SI window carrying the common TA and satellite ephemeris.*  ***Proposal 8****: Support 1ms of UL gap for NB-IoT over NTN.*  ***Proposal 9***: *Support introducing the new channel raster with step size greater than 100 kHz for DL synchronization in IoT NTN.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *Support DL frequency pre-compensation in IoT NTN and use 12-bit to indicate the value of DL frequency pre-compensation with range [0,…, 4095] and granularity of 0.01ppm.*  ***Proposal 11****: Update the RRC parameters according to the Table provided in the Appendix.* |
| VIVO (R1-2111048) | ***Observation 1:*** *Time gaps are needed to operate timing and frequency pre- compensation between two adjacent segments.*  ***Proposal 1:*** *For PUSCH transmission segment duration of NB-IoT, use 3-bit field with 7 candidate values {4ms, 8ms, 16ms, 32ms, 64ms, 128ms, 256ms} for various satellite orbits.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For PRACH transmission segment duration of NB-IoT, use*  *3-bit field with 5 candidate values {2\*4\*(TCP + TSEQ), 4\*4\*(TCP + TSEQ), 8\*4\*(TCP + TSEQ), 16\*4\*(TCP + TSEQ), 32\*4\*(TCP + TSEQ)} for format 0 and 1,*  *2-bit field with 4 candidate values {1\*6\*(TCP + TSEQ), 2\*6\*(TCP + TSEQ), 4\*6\*(TCP + TSEQ), 8\*6\*(TCP + TSEQ)} for format 2.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Support to indicate configuration of UL transmission segment via UE-specific RRC signalling****.***  ***Proposal 4:*** *Support to configure time gaps for timing and frequency pre-compensation during UL transmission.* |
| Spreadtrum (R1-2111117) | ***Proposal 1:*** *The segment duration can be configured by UE-specific RRC signaling in RRC\_CONNECTED state.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *Inserting a gap between adjacent segments (N time units) to avoid the overlap of segments for long PUSCH should be supported.* |
| Mavenir (R1-2111172) | ***Proposal 1:*** *UE shall read SIB in RRC\_CONNECTED state for non-“short sporadic transmission”.*  ***Observation 1:*** *SIB repetition does not impact the start time of the validity timer for UL synchronization.*  ***Proposal 2:***  *The epoch time of serving satellite ephemeris data is the time instance at which the corresponding ephemeris data has been captured.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *The epoch time of serving satellite ephemeris data is transmitted in the same SIB which contains the ephemeris data.* |
| NEC (R1-2111182) | ***Proposal 1****. An internal timer in the device is used by UE to set the GNSS validity duration autonomously.*  ***Proposal 2****. The UE could signal the network the length of time that GNSS position fix is valid, and the GNSS position fix validity duration is determined by the UE at the time it is reported by the UE.*  ***Proposal 3****. MAC CE can be used by the UE to report the remaining valid duration of GNSS position fix.*  ***Proposal 4****. Support UL gaps during long transmission to avoid phase discontinuity between segments.*  ***Proposal 5****. Support increased channel raster size in IoT NTN.* |
| CATT (R1-2111236) | ***Observation 1****: The new UL gap for long UL transmission will cause slot misalignment for (N)PUSCH, if the length of new UL gap is not the integer of a slot.*  ***Observation 2****: UE may have the maximum initial frequency error more than 50KHz contributed by oscillator, Doppler shift and anchor carrier offset in S band.*  ***Proposal 1****: UL transmission segment duration can be provided to UE by dedicated RRC signaling in handover command.*  ***Proposal 2****: For small TA variation, TA adjustment is implemented by dropping tail samples of a segment or delaying a few samples for UL transmission.*  ***Proposal 3****: For large TA variation, the gap can be configured with*   * *Last symbol of a slot can be reserved for (N)PUSCH’s gap* * *Original GP is reused for (N)PRACH’s gap.*   ***Proposal 4****: If SIBs are transmitted repeatedly, epoch time should be based on the transmitting time of the first SIB.*  ***Proposal 5****: Support validity duration along with satellite ephemeris and Common TA is broadcasted in SIB to simplify the signaling design.*  ***Proposal 6****: After UE has lost uplink synchronization caused by unavailable new or additional assistance information, IoT NTN UE will go back to IDLE state and resynchronize.*  ***Proposal 7****: Suggest UE reports its valid duration of GNSS position fix to gNB.*  ***Proposal 8****: Increasing channel raster in IoT NTN is supported.*  ***Proposal 9****: The UE triggers the GNSS measurement when it is waken up due to T3412 timer expiration, and then enter IoT active state after GNSS measurement.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *Network activates UE to perform the GNSS position fix through the configuration of T3413/T3415.* |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell (R1-2111276) | ***Observation 1****: The acquired GNSS/ephemeris will be out-of-date after some time because of e.g. UE movement or satellite perturbation. UE need to keep valid GNSS/ephemeris before any UL transmission.*  ***Observation 2****: there would be unexpected/uncontrolled operation of UE for eNB scheduling if there is no common understanding on validity timer of GNSS and ephemeris, causing that network can not schedule as no information on when UE can/will transmit or receive.*  ***Observation 3****: If the network is not aware that a UE requires time to obtain valid GNSS information the network may trigger additional paging before the UE has a chance to initiate the pre-compensated random access procedure.*  ***Observation 4****: Basing paging repetition/escalation on GNSS cold start time value significantly delays the paging procedure.*  ***Observation 5****: If UE validates GNSS before every paging occasion it will waste energy due to low paging probability.*  ***Observation 6****: Common understanding on GNSS measurement window between UE and network is needed.*  ***Observation 7****: Multiple IoT UE with different capability and channel status may request different GNSS measurement window.*  ***Observation 8****: The TA error in a transmission segment duaration is related to the elevation angle.*  ***Observation 9****: Long segment duration can be used by the UE at a high elevation angle to keep the TA change within the timing error tolerance.*  ***Observation 10****: NB-IoT UE can use equivalent or longer segments than eMTC UE for a given elevation angle, due to the high timing error tolerance of NB-IoT.*  ***Observation 11****: When multiple segment durations satisfy the timing error tolerance, UE can use the longest segment for efficient utilization of uplink resources.*  ***Observation 12****: An indexed table can be used to indicate the relationship between elevation angle range and segment duration.*  ***Observation 13****: When the applicable segment durations are known, UE can decide the most suitable segment length depending on the UE’s elevation angle.*  ***Observation 14****: The network should be aware of the UE’s selection in order to know when an UL transmission period ends and how many repetitions are scheduled.*  ***Observation 15****: If UE is in RRC CONNECTED mode, the network can select a new segment duration based on the UE’s elevation angle, which can be derived from the UE’s location and satellite ephemeris.*  ***Observation 16****: Operation of closed loop and open loop TA control in RRC connected state needs careful design to avoid instability due to erroneous calculation of the UE-specific TA value by the UE.*  ***Observation 17****: If TAC is generated to fix a temporary deviation in the UE transmission timing, when UE updates their autonomous components on the timing advance formula, there may be an overcompensation of the timing advance, generating a similar deviation on the opposite direction (Figure 5).*  ***Observation 18****: If TAC is generated to introduce an offset in UE timing due to eNB internal optimizations, the TAC should be applied regardless of UE accuracy for timing estimation.*  ***Observation 19****: In order to guarantee TA update loop stability, two operation modes for TAC update are needed.*  ***Observation 20****: Timing-drift-induced phase error may exceed the phase error tolerance for demodulation at the receiver.*  ***Observation 21****: The phase error increases as the elevation angle decreases since the TA drift rate is higher at a lower elevation angle.*  ***Observation 22****: Accumulating phase error of SC-FDMA symbols occurs due to the TA drift in the IoT NTN scenarios.*  ***Proposal 1****: there should be common understanding on start time and expire time of validity timer for GNSS and validity timer for ephemeris between UE and network, which should be specified in IoT NTN.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *TAT like validity timer could be used as a baseline, where UE should report to network so that both UE and network reset the validity timer and keep common understanding.*  ***Proposal 3****: To reduce overhead, UE reporting should be reduced, where e.g. only first report valid information and failure report.*  ***Proposal 4****: To save power consumption and latency, one possible way is only to perform a new UL synchronization by CFRA instead of CBRA or going back to IDLE mode.*  ***Proposal 5****: Network configured UL resource for report for validity of ephemeris should be specified.*  ***Proposal 6****: Validity report within the repetitions should be specified.*  ***Proposal 7****: UE shall report GNSS measurement capability such that network can allocate sufficient time between sending a paging message and when to expect random access procedure initialization from UE.*  ***Proposal 8****: Network shall not repeat the paging message for a UE during the UE’s GNSS measurement gap.*  ***Proposal 9****: A GNSS measurement gap, corresponding to the time the UE requires to validate GNSS, shall be configured in the paging procedure. The position and duration of the gap can be decided and supported in Rel 17.*  ***Proposal 10****: GNSS measurement window in CONNECTED mode should be specified for a new GNSS measurement when GNSS is about to outdated.*  ***Proposal 11****: Overhead reduction should be considered for selection of GNSS measurement window and coordination between UE and eNB.*  ***Proposal 12****: UE report the GNSS measurement gap should be the specified, to keep a low overhead.*  ***Proposal 13****: Within the segment duration, the accumulated timing error due to TA drift should not exceed the tolerance provided by the cyclic prefix.*  ***Proposal 14****: For TA value changing during the repetitions of PUSCH, a simple configuration of a bundle of TA and corresponding time to utilize from Node B to UE, should be considered as one option.*  ***Proposal 15****: A TA adjustment gap between adjacent segments should be no longer than one SC-FDMA symbol length.*  ***Proposal 16****: UE selects the segment duration that is applicable to the elevation angle and has the smallest number of gaps / TA adjustments.*  ***Proposal 17****: A set of applicable UL transmission segments is indicated in SIB.*  ***Proposal 18****: After UE selects a segment duration, the index of the selected segment duration should be sent to the network.*  ***Proposal 19****: When UE location is available to the network, eNB can indicate the transmission segment duration to UE via RRC signaling.*  ***Proposal 20****: The update rate that the UE applies for both the UE-specific TA and Common TA should be such that the applied TA fulfilles the RAN4 time synchronization requirements.*  ***Proposal 21****: The Common TA should be calculated in a deterministic way and applied at the same time for all UEs.*  ***Proposal 22****: For UE in RRC connected mode, in case closed loop TA control is used, open loop TA control should be applied only in a way that does not impact the stability and accuracy as provided by closed loop TA control.*  ***Proposal 23****: The eNB should be able to use the closed-loop solution (Timing Advance Commands over DL MAC-CE) at any time.*  ***Proposal 24****: The TAC should operate in two different states to allow both differential and absolute indication of the TAC updates.*  ***Proposal 25****: RAN1 to study the impact of timing drift induced phase error for NB-IoT transmission in NTN.* |
| OPPO (R1-2111319) | ***Proposal 1****: RAN2 can further discuss and decide the procedure for the UE to go back to idle for GNSS acquisition.*  ***Proposal 2****: for DL synchronization, RAN1 to adopt the solution with channel raster grid increase to 200kHz.* |
| MediaTek (R1-2111373) | GNSS measurements for sporadic short transmissions:  ***Proposal 1:*** *RAN1 send LS to RAN2 to specify mechanism where*   * *if GNSS position fix becomes outdated, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED declares RLF and move to RRC\_IDLE* * *Before GNSS position fix becomes outdated, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED sends Rel-16 MAC CE Release Assistance Indication to request network to move into RRC\_IDLE.*   Long UL Transmission on PUSCH:  ***Observation 2:*** *The new gap avoids issue of overlapping of UL transmission segments and allows less complex UE implementation to apply UE pre-compensation for UL synchronization. eNB schedule gaps between UL transmission segments for UL transmission based on UE capability. Before the UE capability is reported by UE, eNB schedules gaps between UL transmission segments for the UE.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *UE capability for LEO, to support updating time and frequency pre-compensation between segments during UL repetition of NPUSCH for NB-IoT and PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC*   * *with a gap of one 1 ms duration between segments with duration less than 256 ms* * *without a gap between segments*   ***Proposal 3:*** *For LEO, eNB may schedule a gap of 1 ms between UL transmission segments based on UE capability to support UE-pre-compensation between UL transmission segments with a gap*  ***Observation 3:*** *The delay drift and Doppler shift are much smaller in GEO and MEO. UE does not need to update time and frequency pre-compensation between segments during UL repetition of PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC and NPUSCH for NB-IoT*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For GEO and MEO, UL transmission segments of PUSCH/PUCCH for eMTC and NPUSCH for NB-IoT are not configured by the network.*  Long UL Transmission on PRACH:  ***Observation 4:*** *The delay drift within maximum UL transmission segment of NPRACH l is smaller than NPRACH Cyclic Prefix. The Doppler shift is within the transmit frequency error of +/-0.1 ppm. New gaps are not needed for NPRACH. For GSO and NGSO, UE may not update time and frequency pre-compensation between segments during UL repetition of PRACH/NPRACH for eMTC/NB-IoT. The legacy UL compensation gap of 40 ms to re-sync on DL can be used to apply UE pre-compensation for UL synchronization.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *For GEO and MEO, UL transmission segments of NPRACH/PRACH for eMTC and NB-IoT are not configured by the network.*  DL Synchronization:  ***Observation 5:*** *DL synchronization enhancements are not needed for GEO or MEO since Doppler is only +/-0.93 ppm and +/-7.5 ppm respectively and Cell Search receiver algorithms should synchronize on correct raster****.***  ***Observation 6:*** *New channel raster of 200 kHz has minimum impact on complexity in device to support DL synchronization in LEO. Spectrum waste can be avoided by alignment of 3GPP raster grid and spectrum allocation by regulator. Perfect alignment may not be possible in case of allocation of small spectrum chunks.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *DL synchronization enhancements with new channel raster or (Part-of) ARFCN indication on MIB are not specified for GEO and MEO.*  ***Proposal 7: In*** *RAN1#107-e, further discuss and select one solution for DL synchronization enhancements for LEO.*   * *New channel raster 200 kHz with less flexibility for spectrum deployment* * *(Part-of) ARFCH indication on MIB impact on complexity with re-use of 100 kHz channel raster and up to 3 channel raster hypothesis for NPBCH detection*   Synchronization aspects common to IoT NTN and NR NTN:  ***Proposal 8:*** *Common TA may include parameter(s) indicating timing drift.*   * *The UE will apply common TA according to the parameters provided by the network (if any). No offset between the common TA according to the parameters provided by the network and the actual feeder link RTT is considered when defining UE UL timing error requirements.*   ***Proposal 9:*** *Common TA Epoch time is implicitly known as a reference time defined by the starting time of a DL slot and/or frame.*   * *FFS: Whether this starting time is given by predefined rule or it is indicated by the Network*   + *Note: “implicitly known” means that UTC is not provided to define the Common TA epoch time.*   ***Proposal 10:*** *In NTN, the Network may optionally indicate one or more of the following parameters:*   * *Common TA, Common TA drift rate and Common TA drift rate variation.* * *FFS: Common TA third order derivative.* * *FFS: Details of combination of Common TA parameters*   ***Proposal 11:***   * *The granularity of Common TA is set to be 1.Ts*   ***Proposal 12:***   * *Conclusion: Do not define a TA margin.*   ***Proposal 13:*** *Support serving satellite ephemeris format bit allocations for LEO/MEO/GEO based non-terrestrial access network:*   * *Position and velocity state vector ephemeris format [17 bytes payload].*    + *The field size for position [m]  is [78 bits]*     - *Position range is driven by GEO : +/- 42 200 km*     - *The quantization step is [1.3m] for position*   + *The field size for velocity [m/s] is [54 bits]*     - *Velocity range is driven by LEO@600 km: +/- 8000 m/s*     - *The quantization step is [0.06 m/s] for Velocity* * *Orbital parameter ephemeris format [18 byte payload]*   + *Semi-major axis α [m] is [33 bits]*     - *Range: [6500, 43000]km*   + *Eccentricity e is [19 bits]*     - *Range: ≤ 0.015*   + *Argument of periapsis ω [rad] is [24 bits]*      - *Range: [0, 2π]*   + *Longitude of ascending node Ω [rad] is [21 bits]*     - *Range: [-180o , +180o]*   + *Inclination i [rad] is [20 bits]*     - *Range: [-90o  , +90o ]*   + *Mean anomaly M [rad] at epoch time to is [24 bits]*     - *Range: [0, 2π]* |
| SONY (R1-2111410) | ***Proposal 1****: The epoch time of the current ephemeris information is defined as the time that the first physical layer repetition of the first RRC level repetition of the current ephemeris information is transmitted.*  ***Proposal 2****: The epoch time of the current ephemeris information is transmitted on SIB.*  ***Proposal 3****: The UE estimates the time it will take to complete a short transmission based on the amount of data to transmit, measurements and scaling / correction information transmitted in SIB.*  ***Proposal 4****: SIB configures a scaling factor and time offset to allow the UE to calculate the time to complete its short transmission.*  ***Proposal 5****: The UE only commences a short transmission if its estimate of the duration of the short transmission is less than the remaining validity time of UL synchronisation.*  ***Proposal 6****: If an ongoing short transmission cannot be completed within the validity time of UL synchronization, the UE informs the network of imminent loss of UL synchronisation.* |
| Ericsson (R1-2111420) | ***Observation 1*** *For NB-IoT NPRACH format 2, the TA error after 1 preamble repetition unit spanning 19.2 ms is 1.92 μs assuming a 100 μs/s TA drift. This TA error is 3.84 μs for 2 preamble repetition units.*  ***Observation 2*** *For NB-IoT NPRACH format 2, the network should be able to configure a transmission segment duration spanning 1 preamble repetition unit. For NPRACH format 0/1, it is not necessary to configure a transmission segment duration spanning 1 preamble repetition unit.*  ***Observation 3*** *The agreed sets of values for transmission segment duration of PUSCH/NPUSCH are flexible enough to enable operation in both LEO and GEO scenarios.*  ***Observation 4*** *For GEO scenario, the network may choose not to configure the transmission segment duration parameter for eMTC/NB-IoT.*  ***Observation 5*** *A new UL compensation gap is not needed to address the phase discontinuity’s impact on the uplink demodulation performance.*  ***Observation 6*** *The need and purpose of a new UL compensation gap for long UL transmission is not well-justified. For example, it is not clear if it is needed for avoiding phase discontinuity, re-acquiring satellite ephemeris, getting a GNSS position fix, calculating pre-compensation values, or for reducing implementation complexity for transmit timing and frequency adjustment.*  ***Observation 7*** *Introducing a new UL compensation gap will complicate scheduling.*  ***Observation 8*** *The short connection can be defined by considering the validity durations of GNSS position fix, common TA (if indicated) and satellite ephemeris.*  *Based on the discussion in the previous sections we propose the following:*  ***Proposal 1*** *As a baseline, the time and frequency synchronization for eMTC and NB-IoT should follow the same principles as outlined in the NR NTN WI.*  ***Proposal 2*** *The network should be able to configure UL transmission segment duration for PUSCH/NPUSCH via UE-specific RRC signalling.*  ***Proposal 3*** *For NB-IoT PRACH format 2, the network configures one of the K values for the uplink transmission segment duration of each PRACH preamble format using a k-bit field. We propose using a 3-bit field to indicate the following set of values for the uplink transmission segment duration:*  *- Format 2: 3-bit field, K=5 candidate values 1.6.(TCP+TSEQ), 2.6.(TCP+TSEQ), 4.6.(TCP+TSEQ), 8.6.(TCP+TSEQ), 16.6.(TCP+TSEQ)*  ***Proposal 4*** *Further down-scoping of the agreed values for the transmission segment duration is not needed.*  ***Proposal 5*** *A new UL compensation gap for long UL transmission need not be introduced unless it is essential.*  ***Proposal 6*** *If segmented pre-compensation is implemented by sample dropping or puncturing, the details should be specified.*  ***Proposal 7*** *Separate validity timers are preferred if ephemeris and common TA are transmitted in different SIBs.*  ***Proposal 8*** *Adopt the same definition of epoch time for IoT NTN as for NR NTN.*  ***Proposal 9*** *RAN1 to compare the pros and cons of increasing the channel raster step size and introducing ARFCN-indication-in-MIB.*  ***Proposal 10*** *Send an LS to RAN4 on time and frequency error requirements for IoT NTN before discussing the details of validity duration for GNSS position.* |
| Qualcomm (R1-2111451) | ***Proposal 1*: The duration of valid ephemeris (and common TA, if applicable) is counted starting from the first repetition of the SIB carrying satellite ephemeris (and, if applicable, common TA-related) information.**  ***Proposal 2*: A UE initiates a GNSS validity period when it acquires a fresh GNSS position fix to obtain its geolocation.**   * **The duration of this validity period is autonomously determined by the UE.** * **The start of validity period and validity duration is reported to the network by the UE.**   ***Proposal 3*: Introduce a mechanism that declares RLF when the UE’s GNSS-based geolocation validity expires.**   * **Details to be specified by RAN2.**   ***Proposal 4*: No gaps are specified between successive segments with different (constant within a segment) uplink pre-compensation values.**  ***Proposal 5*: The segment duration value(s) for uplink pre-compensation of time and frequency depend on the satellite orbit type, with GEO satellites supporting longer durations of time than LEO satellites.**   * **For GEO, the smaller values of segment durations may not be required, leading to a smaller (or non-existent) bit-field size in the SIB/RRC configuration for GEO.**   ***Proposal 6*: For eMTC when frequency hopping is configured:**   * **When the hopping interval is less than the configured segment duration for uplink synchronization, the UE shall use the hopping interval as the segment duration for uplink synchronization** * **When the hopping interval is greater than or equal to the configured segment duration for uplink synchronization, the UE shall use as the segment duration for uplink synchronization, where denotes the hopping interval, and is the configured segment duration.**   ***Proposal 7*: For PUSCH, the segment duration for uplink pre-compensation may be indicated/negotiated between the network and the UE via dedicated unicast (RRC) signalling.**   * **This may involve the UE sending assistance information to the network, e.g., indicating its mobility pattern and speed.**   ***Observation 1*: Increasing the channel raster step size limits possible Ncell deployments for operators. For example, if the raster step size is doubled, entire chunks of spectrum up to 200 kHz that do not contain a raster point cannot be used to deploy an Ncell.**  ***Observation 2*: The MIB in NB-IoT already indicates a channel raster offset to aid the UE accurately determining the frequency of the Ncell.**  ***Proposal 8*: Indicate two LSBs of the ARFCN in the MIB for NB-IoT over NTN.**   * **The NB-MIB currently has 9 spare bits, facilitating this indication seamlessly.** |
| Intel (R1-2111523) | ***Proposal 1****:*   * *For eMTC and NB-IoT NTN, the Network may optionally indicate one or more of the following parameters*   + *Common TA, Common TA drift rate and Common TA drift rate variation*   ***Proposal 2:***   * *Solution based on channel raster with a step size increased to be greater than 100 kHz for NB-IoT NTN should be supported if no issues identified with the number of NB-IoT carriers*   ***Proposal 3****:*   * *Support Common Doppler pre-compensation for DL*   + *Indication of Common Doppler pre-compensation should follow design agreed for NR NTN*   ***Proposal 4****:*   * *Rely on UE implementation for GNSS validity*   + *Before commencing an UL transmission, the UE shall ensure it has a GNSS position fix that is valid for the duration of that UL transmission*   + *If UE GNSS measurements are not valid UE declares RLF* |
| Xiaomi (R1-2111517) | ***Observation 1****: 100 kHz channel raster may not be large enough to avoid ambiguity in DL synchronization of IoT over NTN when multiple cells from different satellites could cover same UE.*  ***Proposal 1****: New Channel raster with a step size increased to 200 kHz should be supported.*  ***Proposal 2****: The duration of the GNSS position fix validation is autonomously determined by the UE.*  ***Proposal 3****: The GNSS position fix duration and the time of last GNSS position fix is reported to the network.*  ***Proposal 4****: If UE can maintain its RRC connection when performing the GNSS measurement, UE can trigger RLF or re-acquire GNSS position fix without releasing connection. Otherwise, the UE should directly release the RRC connection* |
| CMCC (R1-2111633) | ***Observation 1:*** For sporadic DL traffic, UE may perform GNSS measurements after a paging occasion and only if it has been paged to reduce battery consumption. The existing timers (e.g., T3413/T3415) can be configured large enough to ensure a sufficient gap to accommodate GNSS acquisition after decoding the paging message and before initiating UL transmission.  ***Observation 2:*** Two approaches can be considered to update the assistance information (i.e. serving satellite ephemeris data or Common TA parameters).   * Approach 1: The update period (e.g., 160ms) as well as the validity duration (e.g., 10~30s) for the assistance information are much smaller than SI modification period (e.g., 1~3 hours). Changes of the assistance information should neither result in system information change notifications nor in a modification of systemInfoValueTag in SIB1, just like “timeInfoUTC” field acts in SIB16. * Approach 2: Set the SI modification period = The update period for the assistance information = the validity duration for the assistance information (about 10~30s).   ***Proposal 1:*** Support the following conclusion.   * Acquisition of GNSS position fix during paging procedure is up to UE implementation and network configuration of paging timers considering GNSS measurement duration (e.g. GNSS Time To First Fix with cold start of typically 10 seconds) impact in NTN scenario. These paging timers are not specified in 3GPP in legacy paging procedure (i.e. T3413 / T3415).   ***Proposal 2:*** If GNSS becomes outdated, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED declares RLF and move to RRC\_IDLE.  ***Proposal 3:*** UE reports GNSS position fix validity duration to be used by network to move UE to RRC\_IDLE can be considered as an enhancement functionality.   * The rest GNSS position fix validity duration after the reporting may be reported. * The report may be triggered by the network before UL transmission is scheduled.   ***Proposal 4:*** If Approach 1 (i.e., the update period as well as the validity duration for the assistance information are much smaller than SI modification period) is adopted, one of the following options can be supported.   * Option 1: Provide the epoch time as part of the assistance information by indicating the SFN and the sub-frame number that the information is valid for. * Option 3: The epoch time is set to be boundary of last DL slot carrying the SIB.   ***Proposal 5:*** If Approach 2 (i.e., Set the SI modification period = The update period for the assistance information = the validity duration for the assistance information) is adopted, no spec impact is expected. In this case, UE expects the assistance information keep valid within the current SI modification period.  ***Proposal 6:*** It is up to RAN2 to determine which approach is adopted for updating the assistance information.   * Approach 1: The update period (e.g., 160ms) as well as the validity duration (e.g., 10~30s) for the assistance information are much smaller than SI modification period (e.g., 1~3 hours). Changes of the assistance information should neither result in system information change notifications nor in a modification of systemInfoValueTag in SIB1. * Approach 2: Set the SI modification period = The update period for the assistance information = the validity duration for the assistance information (about 10~30s).   ***Proposal 7:*** Configuration of UL transmission segment is indicated on SIB in RRC\_CONNECTED. |
| ZTE (R1-2111662) | ***Observation 1:*** *The PAPR increment due to phase discontinuity in segmented pre-compensation is acceptable even if no further enhancement is introduced.*  ***Observation 2:*** *Further improvement on the PAPR with proper configuration of segment length can be achieved.*  ***Proposal 1:*** *Increasing the channel raster is preferred for detection complexity and NPBCH demodulation performance.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *For NB-IoT, a 3-bit field is defined to indicate the following K=8 candidate values for UL transmission segment duration of NPUSCH:*   * *2ms, 4ms, 8ms, 16ms, 32ms, 64ms, 128ms, 256ms*   ***Proposal 3:*** *For NB-IoT, a 3-bit field is defined to indicate the following K candidate values for UL transmission segment duration of NPRACH:*   * *Format 0 and format 1, K=7: 4\*(TCP+TSEQ), 2\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ), 4\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ), 8\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ), 16\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ), 32\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ), 64\*4\*(TCP+TSEQ)* * *Format 2, K=5: 6\*(TCP+TSEQ), 2\*6\*(TCP+TSEQ), 4\*6\*(TCP+TSEQ), 8\*6\*(TCP+TSEQ), 16\*6\*(TCP+TSEQ)*   ***Proposal 4:*** *The updating of TA and frequency used for pre-compensated UL transmission should be supported at UE side per segment if corresponding segment length is configured.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Configuration of UL transmission segment is indicated only via SIB for both (N)PRACH in initial access and (N)PUSCH in RRC\_CONNECTED*  ***Proposal 6:*** *For enabling the updates of TA and frequency used for pre-compensated UL transmission, new UL gaps (i.e., 1ms) should be supported between segments to avoid segment overlap and phase discontinuity caused by segmented pre-compensation.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *The postponement of NPUSCH due to overlap with NPRACH is counted in segment duration. The portion of postponement which coincides with a UL gap is counted as part of the gap.*  ***Proposal 8:*** *The epoch time of assistance information is set to be boundary of last DL subframe carrying the first transmission of SIB.*  ***Proposal 9:*** *The UE’s behavior for GNSS information acquisition should be explicitly specified at least before initiating UL transmission after the eDRX/PSM.*  ***Proposal 10:*** *If GNSS becomes outdated, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED declares RLF and move to RRC\_IDLE.*  ***Proposal 11:*** *There is no need to specify link recovery mechanism specifically for GNSS expiration.*  ***Proposal 12:*** *Report of GNSS validity duration should be supported to ensure common understanding between BS and UE. The rest validity duration after reporting time is reported.* |
| Samsung (R1-2111767) | ***Proposal 1****: Frequent new gap is supported during long UL transmission, and the details of the new gap can be further discussed.*  ***Proposal 2****: For sporadic short transmission, UE specific TA is reported only once, e.g., reporting UE specific TA in Msg3 or Msg5 via MAC CE.*  ***Proposal 3****: Epoch time of assistance information (i.e., satellite ephemeris and common TA) can be defined as the starting time of the first repetition of the SIB received by UE to acquire the assistance information.*  ***Proposal 4****: For segmented UE pre-compensation per N time units, the value of N can be separately configured for UL timing pre-compensation and UL frequency pre-compensation.*  ***Proposal 5****: For segmented UE timing pre-compensation, if transmission signal is overlapped between two adjacent segments, overlapped samples of the last segment can be dropped.* |
| Apple (R1-2111904) | ***Proposal 1:*** *UE autonomously determines the validity of GNSS position fix, based on UE’s mobility patterns (e.g., UE speed).*  ***Proposal 2:*** *UE reports GNSS position fix validity duration to network via high layer signaling (e.g., MAC CE).*  ***Proposal 3:*** *UE reporting GNSS position fix validity duration is event-triggered, e.g., when the GNSS position fix validity timer is less than a threshold.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *UE expects to receive a scheduling gap window from network after reporting GNSS position fix validity duration. UE suspends uplink transmissions and re-acquires GNSS position fix during this scheduling gap window.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Validity timer for uplink synchronization (i.e., satellite ephemeris or common TA parameters) (re)starts at the starting time of system information window of system information carrying uplink synchronization parameters.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Support the configuration of uplink transmission segment via UE-specific RRC signaling.*  ***Proposal 7:*** *Consider increasing the channel raster step size in IoT NTN.* |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility (R1-2122002) | ***Proposal 1：****The network can optionally configure the option A and B for UE to acquire GNSS position fix for sporadic short transmission.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *If GNSS becomes outdated, UE in RRC\_CONNECTED declares RLF and move to RRC\_IDLE.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *UE pre-compensation done per N time units with inserting transmission gap or puncturing uplink transmission should be considered in UL transmission in IoT on NTN.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *For DL synchronization enhancement, new channel raster with a step size greater than 100 kHz (e.g., 300kHz) is introduced.* |
| Nordic Semiconductor ASA (R1-2112329) | ***Proposal-1:*** *No new gaps are introduced for long UL transmissions.*  ***Proposal-2:*** *The configuration of UE pre-compensation segment should be signaled in SIB during initial access and after initial access.*  ***Proposal-3:*** *If serving satellite ephemeris and common TA are signaled in separate SIB messages, a separate validity timer for serving satellite ephemeris and timer for common TA is configured by eNB with initial timer values X and Y. Validity timer for SIB ephemeris is reset at least upon UE reading SIB with ephemeris and validity timer for common TA is reset at least upon UE receiving SIB with common TA.* |