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# **Introduction**

The following WI scope w.r.t HARQ enhancement is endorsed in RAN#86 meeting:

* *HARQ*
	+ *Number of HARQ process [RAN1]*
	+ *Enabling / disabling of HARQ feedback as described in the TR 38.821 [RAN1&2]*

In this meeting, companies’ views are summarized with corresponding observations/proposals on following aspects with detailed proposals from each company listed in appendix.

* Enhancement on HARQ process number
* Disabling/enabling HARQ feedback
* Other

# **Enhancement on HARQ process number**

In existing NR, up to 16 HARQ processes are supported for UE via the configuration as cited below.

TS 38.214 section 5.1:

For downlink, a maximum of 16 HARQ processes per cell is supported by the UE. The number of processes the UE may assume will at most be used for the downlink is configured to the UE for each cell separately by higher layer parameter *nrofHARQ-ProcessesForPDSCH*, and when no configuration is provided the UE may assume a default number of 8 processes.

TS 38.331:

**– *PDSCH-ServingCellConfig***

The IE *PDSCH-ServingCellConfig* is used to configure UE specific PDSCH parameters that are common across the UE's BWPs of one serving cell.

*PDSCH-ServingCellConfig* information element

-- ASN1START

-- TAG-PDSCH-SERVINGCELLCONFIG-START

PDSCH-ServingCellConfig ::= SEQUENCE {

 ……

 nrofHARQ-ProcessesForPDSCH ENUMERATED {n2, n4, n6, n10, n12, n16} OPTIONAL, -- Need S

 ……

For NTN, due to the large RTT (e.g., 25.77 ms for LEO-600) and potential scheduling with larger SCS (e.g., SCS = 30 KHz), the existing maximal supported HARQ process number is not sufficient for corresponding the DL/UL. Meanwhile, this value is also not feasible to enable the ATG operation in TDD mode.

For dealing with the aforementioned issue, as mentioned in [Huawei, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Samsung, CMCC, Panasonic, LG, ZTE, Apple, QC, CATT, Sony, Thales, Nomor Research GmbH, OPPO], extension of maximum supported HARQ process number can be supported with following solutions:

* Slot/SFN-based solution:

In this way, the determination of HARQ process ID will be coupled with the index of slot(s)/SFN(s) carrying the corresponding transmission/scheduling [QC, Lenovo, Samsung, Panasonic, Sony, Huawei, OPPO, Intel]. For example, as highlighted in [Samsung], a slot number based HARQ process ID constructor can be considered as the LSB value for HARQ ID calculation. And in [Huawei], group ID of slots are considered as the MSB for HARQ ID determination and for enhancing scheduling flexibility, additional information, e.g., DM-RS sequence, is also proposed to be considered.

* Reuse HARQ process ID time window/segments:

In this way, the determination of HARQ process ID will be coupled with division of time domain resource [CMCC, Xiaomi, Panasonic]. For example, the calculation on HARQ process ID is based on the window index and supported HARQ process number within each window [CMCC].

* Re-interpretation of existing DCI fields:

In this way, the determination of HARQ process ID relies on the re-interpretation of existing DCI bit [CATT, Apple, ZTE]. For example, as mentioned in [Apple], the bit within the existing RV field can be considered as the MSB for HARQ calculation.

* CCE index:

In this way, the determination of HARQ process ID will be coupled with the index of CCE, which carrying the scheduling information for transmission [LG].

* Additional scrambling for scheduling grant:

In this way, the determination of HARQ process ID will be up to additional scrambling on the scheduling grant [Xiaomi].

Prior to the solution selection, [CAICT] highlight that the determination of target number of HARQ process (e.g., 32 [ZTE, CMCC], 64 for S-band (FR1) and 256 for Ka-band (FR2) [Panasonic]) should be determined and it should be up to the peak data rate expected for NTN.

Meanwhile, consideration on the UE capability is also highlighted by [OPPO, Intel, CATT, QC, Apple, Sony, Thales, Nomor Research GmbH, Nokia]. For example, as mentioned in [CATT, Apple], supporting of extended value should be up to UE capability without increase on the UE buffer/cost [OPPO]. For achieving it, existing value should be considered as fallback case [CATT, Nomor Research GmbH, Thales] and supports on the extension value should be configurable to UE [QC]. Additional consideration on the introduction of constraints w.r.t maximum TBS for a HARQ process or maximum total TBS across all parallel HARQ processes is also mentioned in [Intel].

However, as another alternative, [MTK, Ericsson] prefer to keep the existing HARQ process number. In this way, with assumption on the disable of HARQ feedback, the transmission will conduct via relaying on the RLC-ARQ mechanism. For example, similar performance of enhanced HARQ process number and RLC-ARQ mechanism is shown in the simulation results from [Ericsson] in certain case. And configuration of shoter t-PollRetransmit and t-Reassembly in ul-AM-RLC and dl-AM-RLC is proposed by [MTK] to match the satellite RTD without change to specifications. But, according to the results shown in [ZTE, Panasonic], benefits on both throughput and latency can be achieved with extended HARQ process number. And as mentioned by [QC, ZTE], the impact on UE’s power consumption due to lower BLER target and RLC reports by using RLC-ARQ should also be evaluated.

According to the above summary, the following proposals are listed as majority views:

***[Initial Proposal 1]:*** *Extension of maximal HARQ process number is supported.*

* *FFS: candidate value for maximal HARQ process number, e.g., [32] or [64]*
* *FFS: addition restriction due to the UE capability if any.*
* *FFS: solution for HARQ process ID indication*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| MediaTek | Proposal 1 should further discuss need for extension of maximal HARQ process number. There was no consensus on need for > 16 HARQ processes in Rel-16 NR NTN SI. SLS evaluation of HARQ R1-2005321 by Nomor Research GmbH, Thales showed marginal gain at system level for >16 HARQ processes. The network can configure shorter RLC window with the RLC status report transmitted by the UE at least once or several times per satellite RTD for LEO and GEO. The discussion should be on UL feedback efficiency at MAC layer or RLC layer, and whether the signalling overhead difference justify > 16 HARQ processes. |
| Lenovo&MotoM | Support proposal 1. The extended maximal HARQ process number is configured by higher layer signalling based on UE capability report, RTT and SCS etc.The size of HARQ process field in DCI should be the same as legacy, and the extended HARQ process number is implicitly indicated. |
| Panasonic | We support proposal 1.We evaluated with SLS using the agreed assumptions in R1-2006327. User throughput performance is significantly improved by increasing the number of HARQ processes even without soft combining. The results also show HARQ-feedback disabled is inferior to HARQ-feedback enabled because of robust MCS choice to achieve lower (1%) BLER target. With 10% BLER operation with HARQ feedback, 90% of the transmission only requires the time/frequency resource corresponds to MCS of 10% BLER, and only 10% of the transmission requires additional resource for retransmission. With 1% BLER operation without HARQ feedback, 99% of the transmission requires the time/frequency resource corresponds to MCS of 1% BLER. Such resource usage difference makes larger HARQ process efficient. Even without soft combining (in spite of the name to increase HARQ process), resource efficiency gain of different BLER target can be obtained according to our simulation results. SLS in R1-2005321(Nomor, Thales) shows only marginal gain from 16 processes to 32 processes. The SLS is based on full buffer traffic, which is not aligned with agreed assumption. Our understanding is full buffer evaluation is not appropriate to evaluation the number of HARQ process because the waiting time from the buffer to resource assignment caused by the shortage of HARQ process is not modelled. Non-full buffer traffic based evaluation is essential.LLS in R1-2006465(Ericsson) shows no gain from HARQ-feedback disabled, but this might not reflect resource inefficiency to achieve lower BLER in a practical situation including interference fluctuation. We wonder why the difference on RTT is not influencing throughput when we compared figure 3 to 6. In addition, channel model used for the evaluation (NTN-TDL-D suburban with elevation angle 30$°$) seems less fluctuated channel due to weak NLOS component (i.e. high K-factor) according to the model in TR38.811. Higher elevation angle (e.g. 70$°$) that has stronger NLOS component could make the result difference. Regarding the 2nd FFS point in Proposal 1, additional restriction due to UE capability would not be needed because it is basically up to UE implementation whether to perform soft combining. Sufficiently good user throughput can be obtained even with a limited UE soft buffer according to our SLS results. |
| Sony | We are neutral on HARQ process number extension. |
| CMCC | Support proposal 1.Extending maximal HARQ process number to 32 is preferred. The extended maximal HARQ process number can be configured by higher layer signalling based on UE capability. |
| Spreadtrum | We support proposal 1. |
|  CATT | Support proposal 1. One simple reason is that in NTN it is no need to support two transport blocks transmission due to poor channel condition. Even if without memory extension, 32 HARQ processes can be supported. |
| Huawei | We support proposal 1.We prefer an extension of maximal HARQ process number to at least 32.Implicit HARQ process ID indication are preferred e.g. slot/SFN-based, combined design of DMRS-based and slot-based solution.  |
| Ericsson | Disagree. We provided simulation results showing no gain is achieved by increasing number of HARQ processes. Simulations from other companies showing gains of increased number of HARQ processes also show inconsistent/unexpected behaviour that requires more thorough analysis before conclusions can be drawn. We propose that companies provide simulation results with same set of simulation assumptions.Also, it should be noted that the fundamental NR HARQ design is asynchronous and thus flexible, relaxed from early LTE HARQ design (which is synchronous to some extent). Time window-based method (and its variations) is not aligned with this principle and re-introduces unnecessary restriction from LTE. In addition, Rel-16 already introduces DCI format x\_2, where the size of HARQ field is 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 bits determined by higher layer configured number of HARQ processes. This design direction is much cleaner. |
| ETRI | Not support.In our view, we are not sure about the necessity of proposal 1. The throughput reduction owing to HARQ stalling might be compensated by disabling HARQ feedback, and subsequently, the reliability degradation with HARQ feedback disabled might be mitigated by using multiple transmissions in a bundle (e.g. slot aggregation)  |
| ZTE | We support proposal 1.In our contribution, both link and system level simulation results are provide to justify the gain with enlarged HARQ process number. Clear benefits can be observed from both throughput and latency perspective. Moreover, feedback overhead is much smaller comparing to the RLC-ARQ.W.r.t the HARQ process number, 32 can be starting point for extension. For the UE capability issue, configuration of corresponding value can be done in UE specific according to current mechanism based on the reported UE capability.  |
| LG | Support this proposal 1, it can be configured based on the UE capability.  |
| Nokia | Prior to looking into extension of the number of HARQ processes, it is important to also look into alternatives such as (a) performing automatic HARQ retransmissions to improve the link efficiency, and (b) disabling HARQ operation for selected processes. It should be noted that introducing more HARQ processes will not come for free as already mentioned during the GTW. Especially the HARQ-ACK feedback may create problems, and in case of HARQ-ACK bundling, one single failed reception will potentially trigger retransmission for a full set of HARQ processes (within the same bundling operation). As a starting point, Nokia is of the opinion that the current 16 HARQ processes combined with automatic retransmission would be sufficient for most use cases. |
| Thales | Proposal 1 should be further discussed. It seems that the simulation results submitted by [Ericsson, Nomor Research GmbH, ZTE and Panasonic] may suggest different conclusion on whether increasing the number of HARQ processes is beneficial or not for NTN.At the end, we are neutral on whether the maximal number of HARQ processes shall be extended or not. However, considering the significant specification impact associated to the support the extension of maximum number of HARQ processes, RAN1 shall further clarify whether the benefits of such extension is really beneficial for NTN. |
| Nomor Research GmbH | Proposal 1 should be further discussed. From our perspective, the extension of maximum number of HARQ processes should be considered as optional UE capability for high capability devices. The baseline should be 16 HARQ processes. Simulation results in R1-2005965 (ZTE) show only comparison between alternative of HARQ and 32 HARQ processes but we lack results for 16 HARQ processes. Regarding R1-2006327 (Panasonic) we wonder how it could be that the UE throughput is similar for 10 and 20UEs per beam, if target RU is 20% in both cases. Considering 20UEs per beam, there are only half of the resources available per UE in comparison to the case with 10UEs per beam. The SINR should be similar as we have 20%RU in both cases. Regarding Panasonic’s comment on R1-2005321, we need to consider that in NTN, there are very large cells. If non-full buffer traffic should be used, the number of UEs needs to be increased significantly above 20UEs per beam, which means large simulation complexity. |
| QC | Support |
| Eutelsat | Agree with MediaTek. Any increase above 16 HARQ processes requires significant benefits to be demonstrated taking into account potential optimizations with 16 processes. |
| Asia pacific telecom | We are neutral on increasing HARQ process number. * **PRO**: >16 HARQ is good to have especially when earth fixed cells are deployed, UE may suffer from low elevation angles to have poor CSI condition. >16 HARQ processes may help.
* **CON**: However, the goal for NTN is to support massive NR UEs designed for TN. Since most of NR Rel-15/16 UEs only support 16 HARQ per cell, the feature of >16 HARQ per cell may have some conflicts on NTN’s interests.

Another thing is that although companies precludes MIMO and carrier aggregation (CA) features during NTN SI. However, CA is possible, e.g., * [R1-2006464, Ericsson] Note that if an NTN network has more bandwidths than the maximum channel bandwidths supported in FR1 / FR2, carrier aggregation can be applied.

If CA can be supported in Rel-17 NTN, then UE may have >16 HARQ in multiple serving cells. This increases throughput and guarantees robustness without change of specs. |
| OPPO | Support |
| Intel | Our preference is to support proposal 1. Based on the contributions submitted to this meeting support for increased number of HARQ processes may lead to better performance. |
| SS | Support |
| Apple | Support the Proposal. This feature may be depending on UE capability.  |

# **Disabling/enabling HARQ feedback**

# **Mechanism for disabling/enabling HARQ feedback**

In SI, the discussion on the mechanism for disabling/enabling HARQ feedback is concluded in RAN2 as below:

* HARQ
	+ Enabling / disabling of uplink HARQ feedback for downlink transmission at the UE receiver should be configurable per UE and per HARQ process.
	+ Enabling / disabling of HARQ uplink retransmission should be configurable per UE or per HARQ process. The LCP impact caused by disabling the HARQ uplink retransmission configuration and its impact on UE’s uplink transmission should be discussed in the work item phase.
	+ Multiple transmission of the same TB to lower residual BLER should also be configured.

In this meeting, group based mechanism for HARQ enabling/disabling is proposed by [MTK, Lenovo, CATT, CAICT]. For example, two set of HARQ process can be constructed with enabling and disabling the HARQ feedback, respectively [MTK]. And as highlighted by [CATT, Xiaomi], dynamic HARQ enabling/disabling via DCI should not be supported. But from [OPPO, Apple]’s view, either RRC configured or L1 signaling based enabling/disabling for each HARQ process can be considered. Moreover, for the DL SPS/UL CG case, enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback per configuration is proposed by [CAICT]. And reporting HARQ feedback information for the SPS PDSCH activation by UE is preferred in case of HARQ feedback is disabled for HARQ process of SPS PDSCH [Sony].

In addition, discussion on the different parameters configurations per HARQ with/without feedback is proposed by [QC, Ericsson]. For example, parameters as power control, MCS table and UCI multiplexing parameters are mentioned in [QC].

In addition, for ensuring the efficiency and reliability of transmission carrying the signaling, e.g., RRC configuration/MAC CE command, as highlighted in [Ericsson, ZTE, MTK, Sony, LG, CAICT, Samsung], at least one HARQ process with feedback should be kept. Moreover, the specification impacts (e.g., up to gNB implementation without specification changes) on such restriction should be further discussed [MTK, ZTE].

Based on the above analysis, following proposals are provided according to majority view:

***[Initial Proposal 2]:*** *Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be at least configurable per HARQ process via RRC signaling.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| MediaTek | Support proposal 2[Updated according to the offline comments from MTK]Proposal 2 should be clarified and state “dedicated” RRC signaling to avoid contradicting RAN2 agreement for enabling/disabling HARQ feedback per HARQ process per UE. With this clarification, we can support Proposal 2. |
| Lenovo&MotoM | Support proposal 2 |
| Panasonic | Support proposal 2 |
| Sony | Support proposal 2 |
| CMCC | Support proposal 2 |
| Spreadtrum | Support proposal 2 |
| CATT | Support proposal 2 |
| Huawei | Support proposal 2. |
| Ericsson  | We think RAN2 already agreed this and thus perhaps there is no need to make agreement again in RAN1. In RAN1, we could take this as a common understanding and a basis for further discussion. |
| ETRI | Support proposal 2.In addition, if RAN2 decide to include enabling/disabling via MAC-CE, then enabling/disabling HARQ feedback via MAC-CE might be also considered for dynamic operation. |
| ZTE | Support proposal 2 since the confirmation in WI phase from RAN2 is not conducted yet.  |
| LG | Support proposal 2 |
| Nokia | Support proposal 2 |
| Thales | Support proposal 2 |
| Nomor Research GmbH | Support Proposal 2 |
| QC | Support Proposal 2 |
| Eutelsat | Support Proposal 2. |
| Asia pacific telecom | Support proposal 2 |
| OPPO | Support proposal 2 in principle, but in our view HARQ disabling and HARQ-ACK feedback can be decoupled. In our contribution R1-2006031, we presented our view that the HARQ disabling and HARQ-ACK information feedback can be decoupled. It is beneficial for UE to still fed back HARQ-ACK information for the disabled DL HARQ process, considering that Rel-15 Type-1 and Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebooks are generated independent of HARQ process number. |
| Intel | Support proposal 2.  |
| SS | Support |
| Apple | Besides HARQ feedback enabled/disabled by configuration, we also consider dynamic enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback as well. Basically, the system has the flexibility of dynamically disabling some HARQ processes with configuration of enabling HARQ feedback.  |

***[Initial Proposal 3]:*** *At least one HARQ process with feedback for downlink transmission should be kept.*

* *FFS: whether and how to capture it in specification*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| MediaTek  | Support proposal 3 |
| Lenovo&MotoM | Support proposal 3 |
| Panasonic | Support proposal 3 in principle, but it would be up to network implementation.  |
| Sony | Support proposal 3On the FFS part, descriptions such as UE is not expected to receive a PDSCH carrying MAC CE via a HARQ process with feedback disabling can be added. If MAC CE is allowed to be scheduled with both HARQ feedback enabled and disabled processes, then two MAC CE action timings may need to be specified for the with and without HARQ feedback cases.In case HARQ feedback is disabled for SPS PDSCH, the DCI for SPS PDSCH activation may need HARQ feedback similar with SPS PDSCH release in Rel.15/16. |
| CMCC | Support proposal 3 |
| Spreadtrum | Support proposal 3 |
| CATT | Support proposal 2 |
| Huawei | Support proposal 3. |
| Ericsson | Support proposal 3. |
| ETRI | Not support.In our view, the necessity of proposal 3 is not clear. According to TR38.821, it has been already agreed that enabling/disabling HARQ feedback is a network decision. Furthermore, if needed, the situation in proposal 3 could be configurable by using disabling per HARQ processes. Thus, it might be up to network implementation. |
| ZTE | Support proposal 3. Prefer to take it as conclusion without any specification impact. |
| LG | Support proposal 3 |
| Nokia | Not sure that proposal 3 is needed, since ensuring this would be up to gNB implementation/configuration, especially if HARQ operation is enabled by default. |
| Thales | Support proposal 3 |
| Nomor Research GmbH | Support proposal 3 |
| QC | Recommend to send an LS to RAN2 if RAN1 believes that HARQ feedback for certain DL transmissions is always needed, such as a PDSCH including a MAC-CE whose action time depends on the reception of HARQ ACK. In such case, UE is expected that the PDSCH is transmitted using a HARQ process with HARQ-ACK feedback enabled. |
| Eutelsat | Support proposal 3.  |
| Asia pacific telecom | Support proposal 3; this also implies that HARQ-ACK disabling for DL transmission should NOT be per UE. LS to RAN2 may be considered. |
| OPPO | Our view is that HARQ disabling and HARQ-ACK information feedback can be decoupled. In this case, proposal 3 might not be necessary.  |
| Intel | Support proposal 3 |
| SS | It should be clarified what is the spec impact for the proposal. |
| Apple | Support proposal 3 |

***[Initial Proposal 4]：****Different parameters configuration for each HARQ process with/without feedback can be further discussed.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| MediaTek  | Support proposal 4 |
| Lenovo&MotoM | Not support. Hope unified parameter configuration for case with/without HARQ feedback, and the detail MCS is flexibly indicated per HARQ process (with/without feedback) |
| Panasonic | Support proposal 4 |
| Sony | Support proposal 4 |
| CMCC | Support proposal 4 |
| CATT | Not support. No clear reason to configure different parameters for with and without feedback. |
| Huawei | It is not clear to us whether different parameters are actually needed for HARQ processes with and without feedback. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal. In addition, we think that it would be beneficial to identify the set of parameters that needs to be discussed at this stage. In our view following parameters could be a starting point.- Aggregation factor- MCS table- Time domain resource allocation table- Frequency resource allocation type 0 and type 1- Block error rate target- Physical resource block (PRB) bundling configuration- PDSCH mapping type A and type B |
| ETRI | Support proposal 4However, the contents of the parameters should be discussed further. As described in R1-2006360, slot aggregation factor is unique for either PDSCH or PUSCH and it has critical impacts on the performance. Thus, multiple (different) slot aggregation factors might be needed for optimal performance. Consequently, slot aggregation factor might be also considered as a candidate, and it should be included in the scope of the parameter together with the above examples (power control, MCS table and UCI multiplexing parameters). |
| ZTE | Prefer to support this proposal. And further discussion on the detailed parameters, e.g., aggregation factor can be considered.  |
| LG | Support proposal 4 |
| Nokia | No support for proposal 4. Link parameters such as UL power control, MCS table, etc should be representative of the link. The HARQ is a support for the link adaptation operation, and changing MCS table per HARQ process would not bring additional gain/resolution on top of what is already available. |
| Thales | Support proposal 4 |
| Nomor Research GmbH | Support proposal 4 |
| QC | Support Proposal. Recommend to list the related parameters: power control, MCS table. |
| Eutelsat | Support for proposal 4. Agree with Ericsson in principle the full set parameters should be identified early in the discussion. |
| Asia pacific telecom | Support proposal 4. Btw, this shall be included in 3.3. Enhancement on the transmission. |
| Intel | Support proposal 4 |
| SS | We do not see the need to configure different parameters for each HARQ  |
| Apple | Support proposal 4 |

# **Enhancement on the HARQ-ACK codebook**

In case of HARQ feedback enabling/disabling on a per HARQ process basis, necessity on enhancement for HARQ-ACK codebook is identified in [Huawei, Ericsson, Sony, LG, Asia Pacific Telecom]. For example, as mentioned in by [Ericsson], enhancement on Type-1 can be done by inserting the NACK directly. For Type-2, ignoring the counter DAI from PDCCH associated with a feedback disabled HARQ process can be considered. And w.r.t the Type-3, determination of codebook size can be up to the HARQ process with enabled feedback. Meanwhile, optimization on the HARQ process scheduling to reduce the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook redundancy is also mentioned in [Huawei].

Based on the above analysis, following proposal is provided according to majority view:

***[Initial Proposal 5]****: Optimization on the HARQ-ACK codebook is needed.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Lenovo&MotoM | Support proposal 5 |
| Panasonic | We prefer a straightforward solution (e.g. insert NACK for type1 and ignore DAI for type2 as proposed by Ericsson). Optimization might not be needed.  |
| Sony | Support proposal 5Type-1 and Type-2 HARQ codebook should be supported in NTN with minor spec. change. For Type-1, consider how to reduce the codebook redundancy. For Type-2, ignore to feedback on disabled HARQ processes when counting DAI. The feedback for SPS PDSCH activation is counted in DAI when HARQ feedback is disabled for HARQ process of SPS PDSCH. |
| CATT | Similar view with Panasonic. We prefer very simple solution. For example, for type 1 codebook, just insert a fixed value ‘0’ or ‘1’, no need special optimization. |
| Huawei | Support proposal 5 |
| Ericsson | We support this proposal. This is not an optimization. It is an essential design piece for enabling / disabling HARQ feedback. UE behaviours for HARQ codebooks should be discussed and specified to support enabling / disabling HARQ. |
| ETRI | Support proposal 5 |
| ZTE | Support proposal 5. all HARQ-ACK codebook (Type-1/2/3) should be considered.  |
| LG | Support proposal 5. How to enhance/optimize HARQ-ACK codebooks (e.g., Type-1//2/3) can be further discussion.  |
| Nokia | Not needed, as in our opinion the number of HARQ processes does not need to be increased. Hence, there is no need for optimizing the HARQ-ACK codebook. |
| Thales | Support proposal 5 |
| Nomor Research GmbH | Support proposal 5 |
| QC | Support Proposal 5. |
| Eutelsat | Support further discussion of proposal 5, no strong opinion on need for optimization at this stage but it is noted very different views still need to be reconciled (i.e. ranging from essential to not needed). |
| Asia pacific telecom | Support proposal 5 with minor wording change; support at least type-1 and type-2 HARQ codebooks. Proposal 5-a: Enhancements on the Rel-15/16 NR HARQ-ACK codebooks , at least Type-1 and Type-2 shall be considered.  |
| OPPO | We don’t support this proposal, as we think the spec impact is not needed for the codebook design.  |
| Intel | Support proposal 5 |
| SS | Do not support. |
| Apple | Support proposal 5 |

# **Enhancement on the transmission**

For enhancing the performance of transmission, especially for the scheduling with disabled feedback for corresponding HARQ process, following aspects are highlighted:

1. Blind retransmission

As highlighted by [Nomor Research GmbH, Thales], supports on blind PDSCH (re)transmission of the same packet by MAC scheduling without waiting for the transmission of the HARQ feedback can be considered.

1. Larger aggregation/repetition factor

Supports on the larger aggregation number is proposed by [CATT, ETRI] with the time-interleaved transmission [CMCC, CATT, Lenovo]. Indication of repetition-related parameters via DCI is also highlighted in [Huawei, Lenovo]. In addition, reduced DM-RS density in both time and frequency domain is also proposed for such case in [ZTE]. Meanwhile, as highlighted in [Nokia], RAN1 to discuss and decide on whether automatic repetitions can solve HARQ stalling in NTN.

1. CQI table with new BLER target

As mentioned in [Nomor Research GmbH, Thales, Qualcomm], introduction on the new CQI table with different BLER target seems to be beneficial. For example, the new table can be developed by assuming BLER equaling to 1% [Nomor Research GmbH, Thales].

1. UCI

As highlighted in [Xiaomi, Qualcomm, ETRI], in case of scheduling with disabled HARQ feedback, additional new UCI feedback, e.g., to report the decoding statistic or reporting DL transmission disruption and/or requesting DL scheduling changes, can be considered to improve the scheduling configuration from gNB side. Meanwhile, reporting of such information via MAC CE is also acceptable by [ETRI].

1. UE assistance information

As mentioned in [Samsung], with additional information from UE side, e.g., the buffer situation in the DL HARQ procedure, the decision for HARQ scheduling with enabled/disabled feedback can be optimized.

Moreover, as highlighted in [CAICT], for performance improvements with disabled HARQ-ACK, solutions with less speciation impacts should be considered firstly. For the solutions with much standardization work, the benefits should be justified.

Based on the above analysis, following proposal is provided according to majority view:

***[Initial Proposal 6]****: Enhancements on PDSCH/PUSCH transmission can be considered.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| MediaTek | Support proposal 6 |
| Lenovo &MotoM | Support proposal 6 |
| Panasonic | Support proposal 6. In addition to above list, we propose to discuss an indication to recommend soft buffer usage (store or not) in DCI, as proposed in R1-2006327.  |
| Sony  | Support proposal 6, we prefer aspects 1&3. |
| CMCC | Support proposal 6.Nevertheless, solutions with less spec impacts (e.g., aspects 1&2) may be considered firstly. |
| Spreadtrum | We shared the same view with CMCC |
| CATT | Support proposal 6. More specifically, larger aggregation factor can be supported. |
| Huawei | We propose to add a new bullet:1. Enhancement for HARQ feedback

For handling the larger RTT for ACK/NACK feedback, enhancement as pre-active feedback [Huawei] is proposed. And in this way, the ACK/NACK will be feedback to gNB prior to the reception of re-transmission.With this addition Huawei would support Proposal 6. |
| Ericsson | The necessity of proposed enhancements should come with at least simulation results. Then companies could check the results and discuss whether a specific enhancement is needed. |
| ETRI | Support proposal 6.  |
| ZTE | Support proposal 6. Solution such as Larger aggregation/repetition factor can be discussed firstly.  |
| LG | Support proposal 6, we prefer aspect 1&4 |
| Nokia | Potential support for proposal 6. Only for cases where there is a substantial gain/benefit for a given enhancement, it should be considered. Such considerations would need defining assumptions and conditions for evaluations. |
| Thales | Support proposal 6 |
| Nomor Research GmbH | Support proposal 6 |
| QC | The need of the proposal is questionable. Suggest to discuss the exact solutions. |
| Ligado | On (1) Blind repetition: We support Blind Transmission with HARQ turned off.  Unlike the present proposal, which seems to propose blind MAC layer scheduling, we support making the scheduling of the blind repetitions (repetition instance and number of repeats) adaptive.  Specifically, we propose linking the scheduling to CSI feedback from the receiver. |
| Eutelsat | Support proposal 6. |
| Asia pacific telecom | Support proposal 6 |
| OPPO | Support |
| Intel | Support |
| SS | Support |
| Apple | Support proposal 6 |

# **Others**

# **Extension of K1 value**

For enabling the scheduling with larger HARQ process number and potential ATG usage with TDD configuration, the extension of K1 value for scheduling is proposed in [ZTE, MTK]. Similar discussion is also conducted in AI 8.4.1.

***[Initial Proposal 7]****: Extension of K1 value can be discussed in AI 8.4.1.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| MediaTek | Support proposal 7 |
| Lenovo &MotoM | Support proposal 7 |
| CMCC | Support proposal 7.In our understanding, extending K1 value range is not a specific requirement of ATG, actually it is beneficial for both LEO and ATG scenario.For example in LEO scenario, enlarge K1/K2 value range is beneficial to enable flexibly changing of timing relationship via DCI, which may reduce RRC signaling overhead for frequently updating $K\_{offset}$ to fit rapidly changed RTT.In ATG scenario, enlarge K1 value range is beneficial to reduce GP overhead.  |
| Huawei | We support Proposal 7 to consider the extension under AI 8.4.1 and not in the HARQ topic in order to avoid overlap. |
| Ericsson | Support proposal 7 |
| ZTE | Support proposal 7 |
| Nokia | OK to discuss this in AI 8.4.1, but as a general viewpoint, the extension of K1 value would be changing scope of WID, and would require that discussions are pushed for RAN plenary. |
| Eutelsat | Support proposal 7. |
| Asia pacific telecom | Support proposal 7 |
| Intel | Support |
| SS | Support |
| Apple | Support proposal 7 |

# **Enhancement on the HARQ feedback**

For handling the larger RTT for ACK/NACK feedback, enhancement as pre-active feedback [Huawei] is proposed. And in this way, the ACK/NACK will be feedback to gNB prior to the reception of re-transmission.

***[Initial Proposal 8]****: Further discussion and evaluation on the enhancement for HARQ feedback can be considered.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Lenovo &MotoM | Not support. We don’t see the benefit of pre-active feedback. |
| CMCC | Support proposal 8 with lower priority.If repetition with large transmission interval (e.g., in granularity of RTD) is supported, pre-active feedback may be beneficial to reduce re-transmission overhead. |
| CATT | Not support. If any, the application scenarios and benefits should be justified. |
| Huawei | This issue on ACK/NACK feedback relates more generally to section 3.3 on enhancing the performance of transmission. We propose to move Proposal 8 and merge it with Proposal 6. |
| Ericsson | There are many problems with the “pre-active” feedback. Feedback in current NR is under network control. Such UE initiated “pre-active” feedback is against the basic design principle.  |
| ETRI | Not support. In our view, the accuracy of pre-active ACK/NACK is not clear. Furthermore, critical specification impacts on RAN1, as well as RAN2, might be expected for correcting false pre-active ACK. |
| ZTE | More discussion/justification on the benefits are needed with also consideration on the spec efforts. |
| LG | Not support, but open for further discussion if there is clear benefit.  |
| Nokia | The proposal does not contain much information other than further discussion can be considered. Hence it is difficult to either agree or disagree. Prior to accepting such enhancements, it is crucial that the associated overhead and reliability is further investigated. |
| Nomor Research GmbH | From our view, this enhancement has not highest priority. |
| QC | Additional enhancements aimed directly at HARQ-ACK feedback can be complicated without clear benefits. Instead, enhancements on additional feedbacks based on decoding status should be considered. |
| Eutelsat | No strong opinion – further detail of proposal desirable. |
| Asia pacific telecom | Not support. Based on our understanding, two ACK/NACK per HARQ ID may be feasible by current NR HARQ-ACK codebooks, but no good reason to support this feature. |
| OPPO | As presented previously, we don't think spec change for HARQ-ACK feedback is needed.  |
| SS | Do not support |
| Apple  | The benefit of this approach is not clear.  |

# **Misc.**

Additionally, following enhancements are also proposed by corresponding proponent, further discussion on these issues is expected:

* Introduce the larger CSI-Report periodicity [Nomor Research GmbH, Thales]
* Define a minimum time gap for both two PDSCHs of a HARQ process without feedbacks and two PUSCHs of a HARQ process [QC]
* Signalling of the HARQ enabling by the source satellite gNB before the completion of the handover should be studied [Samsung]

***[Initial Proposal 9]****: Further discussion on the enhancements below can be considered:*

* *Larger CSI-Report periodicity*
* *Define a minimum time gap for both two PDSCHs of a HARQ process without feedbacks and two PUSCHs of a HARQ process*
* *Signalling of the HARQ enabling information by the source satellite gNB*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Lenovo &MotoM | Not support. These issues are not essential and can be discussed in later release. |
| CMCC | Support proposal 9 with lower priority. |
| CATT | Not support. No clear reason to justify these enhancements. |
| Huawei | Further enhancements can be considered if the benefits are obvious. |
| Ericsson | On larger CSI-report periodicity: The necessity would need to be further justified.On minimum gap of 2 feedback disabled PDSCHs/PUSCHs: This is a valid issue related to UE processing time discussion. It is worth further discussionOn HARQ info for handover: This belongs to RAN2 discussion. |
| ZTE | Further enhancements can be considered if the benefits are clear. |
| LG | Agree with ZTE, it could be further discussed when there is clear benefit. |
| Nokia | The proposal does not contain much information other than further discussion can be considered. Hence it is difficult to either agree or disagree. Prior to accepting such enhancements, it is crucial that the associated overhead and reliability is further investigated. |
| Thales | Support first bullet of Proposal 9. |
| Nomor Research GmbH | Support first bullet of Proposal 9.  |
| QC | Support bullets 1 and 2. |
| Eutelsat | No strong opinion – further detail of proposal desirable. |
| Asia pacific telecom | Not support. Some existing alternatives in NR may handle these issues, e.g., * Lager CSI-Report periodicity = using few AP CSI reports in NR
* Minimum time gap = PDSCH processing time in NR
* Signaling by the source gNB = no need. The HO command RRCReconfiguration is from the target gNB, rather than the source gNB.
 |
| OPPO | Agree with ZTE |
| Intel | Same view with Ericsson |
| SS | Support |
| Apple | We are neutral on these enhancements. If benefit is shown, we are open to discuss them.  |

# **Summary for the 1st round discussion**

# **# Issue 1: HARQ process number**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-1 in section 2.1, in the 1st round discussion, 22 companies are provided views:

* Up to 13 companies (Lenovo, Panasonic, CMCC, Spreadtrum, CATT, Huawei, ZTE, LG, QC, OPPO, Intel, Samsung, Apple) are fine with the proposal
* Up to 6 companies (MTK , Ericsson,ETRI, Nokia, Normor Eutelsat) has concerns on it.
* Up to 3 companies (Sony, Thales, APT) are neutral.

With consideration on the majority views and also to address the concerns, following updated proposal is provided for 2nd round discussion:

***Updated Proposal 1:*** *Further discussion on extension of maximal HARQ process number is needed with following considerations:*

* + *Candidate value for maximal HARQ process number, e.g., [32] or [64]*
	+ *Solution and corresponding impacts on specification and scheduling*
	+ *Addition restriction due to the UE capability if any.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | Maximal HARQ process number can be UE capability. Potential impact on the HARQ process number indication. Solutions can be further discussed.  |
| Apple | Maximal HARQ process number can be based on UE capability, and can be upper bounded by 32.  |
| CMCC | **Support Proposal 1.**Extending maximal HARQ process number to 32 is preferred. The extended maximal HARQ process number can be configured by higher layer signalling based on UE capability. |
| QC | **Agree with OPPO.** |
| CATT | We support this proposal. As commented earlier, one transmission block can be assumed for NTN case, so 32 HARQ processes don’t require new memory extension. |
| Panasonic | Support updated proposal 1. On the user throughput performance for larger number of HARQ processes and HARQ disabled, we suggest to evaluate via system level simulations with the agreed assumptions in the TR. Regarding the maximal HARQ processes, 32 or 64 would be reasonable for S-band. On the other hand, up to 256 should be considered for Ka-band where slot length is smaller due to larger SCS.  |
| SS | Support |
| MediaTek | Not support. It should first be discussed whether there is a need to increase maximum HARQ process number and consider other solutions to avoid issue – i.e. faster RLC ARQ with UL feedback.  |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal, the maximal number of HARQ process is configured per UE depending on the UE capability. |
| Huawei | Maximal number of HARQ processes can be flexibly supported based on UE capability and scenarios, e.g., GEO, LEO can be different.Solutions with least specification impact are preferred, e.g., HARQ process ID should be implicitly indicated without new bits in DCI. |
| LG | Agree with many companies, Max. # of HARQ process number can be based on UE capability, regarding the upper bound, we can further discuss between possible candidate values {32, 64}. |
| ZTE | Support. Extension of HARQ process has clear benefits on the performance/latency for transmission. Moreover, comparing to the RLC-ARC with UL feedback, less overhead for UL is needed. It should be noticed that according to the SI, link budget for UL is challenge for the normal mobile UE even in clear sky condition and it will lead to the more risky transmission for RLC status via PUSCH.  |
| Nomor Research | Maximal HARQ process number is configured per UE depending on the UE capability. Baseline should be 16HARQ processes. |
| ETRI | Agree with Nomor.  |
| Intel | Support proposal 1.  |
| Sony | We are neutral on HARQ process number extension but we support updated proposal 1.  |
| Ericsson | We do not support increasing number of HARQ processes.And obviously, there is not any consensus on increasing number of the HARQs. Therefore, we should first focus on whether this enhancement is needed or not so we agree with the main bullet that further discussion is needed but details in the sub-bullets should be discussed after this. We want to reiterate that our simulation results (alongside with some other companies) show little gain in increasing number of HARQ process. Perhaps one way forward is to agree on set of common simulation assumptions so that companies can provided comparable results.We think the second sub-bullet about spec and scheduling impact is also an important consideration. Repeating our previous comment: it should be noted that the fundamental NR HARQ design is asynchronous and thus flexible, relaxed from early LTE HARQ design (which is synchronous to some extent). Time window-based method (and its variations) is not aligned with this principle and re-introduces unnecessary restriction from LTE. In addition, Rel-16 already introduces DCI format x\_2, where the size of HARQ field is 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 bits determined by higher layer configured number of HARQ processes. This design direction is much cleaner. |
| APT | Support proposal 1. Maximal number of HARQ processes can be flexibly supported based on UE capability and UE types, e.g., handheld, vehicle mounted, and VSAT can be different. Agree Ericsson, time window-based method (and its variations), e.g., SFN, is not aligned with NR. This can be done simply extend DCI format x\_2 to more than 4 bits, e.g., 5 bits for 32 HARQ processes, indicated by higher layers. Or modify DCI format x\_1 with similar features. |

# **# Issue 2: Mechanism for disabling/enabling HARQ feedback**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-2 in section 3.1, in the 1st round discussion, 22 companies are provided views:

* All the companies support / are fine with the proposal.

Regarding the suggestion from MTK to highlight that the signalling should be dedicated to enable the per UE action, it’s reasonable from moderator perspective.

In summary, it is reasonable to suggest the following updated proposal as offline consensus and to be agreed at this RAN1 meeting.

[Offline consensus based on 1st round of email discussion]

***Proposal 2:*** *Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be at least configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling.*

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-3 in section 3.1, in the 1st round discussion, 22 companies are provided views:

* Up to 17 companies (MediaTek, Lenovo&MotoM,Panasonic,Sony,CMCC,Spreadtrum,Huawei,CATT,Ericsson, ZTE,LG, Thales, Nomor Research GmbH,Eutelsat,APT,Intel,Apple) are fine with the proposal
* Up to 3 companies (Nokia,ETRI,SS) prefer to clarify the spec impact and want to take it as UE implementation.
* QC mentioned to send the LS to RAN2 to check the necessity and OPPO highlight such proposal may not be necessary.

Regarding the suggestion for clarification on the spec impact, which is already covered by the FFS part and resolved in further discussion.

In summary, considering the majority views, it is reasonable to suggest the following proposal as offline consensus and to be agreed at this RAN1 meeting.

[Offline consensus based on 1st round of email discussion]

*Proposal 3: At least one HARQ process with feedback for downlink transmission should be kept.*

* *FFS: whether and how to capture it in specification*

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-3 in section 3.1, in the 1st round discussion, 20 companies are provided views:

* Up to 15 companies (MediaTek,Panasonic,Sony,CMCC,Ericsson,ETRI,ZTE,LG,Thales,Nomor Research GmbH, QC,Eutelsat,APT,Intel,Apple) are fine with the proposal with more detailes:
* Up to 5 companies (Lenovo&MotoM,CATT,Huawei,Nokia,SS) has concerns on it.

To addressing the concerns on the necessity for different parameter configuration, in summary, the following updated proposal is provided for 2nd round discussion:

***Updated Proposal 4：****Further discussion on necessity to enable the different configuration on following parameter(s) for each HARQ process with/without feedback can be further discussed*

* *Aggregation factor*
* *MCS table*
* *Time domain resource allocation table*
* *Frequency resource allocation type 0 and type 1*
* *Block error rate target*
* *Physical resource block (PRB) bundling configuration*
* *PDSCH mapping type A and type B*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | We wonder why we need block error rate target as a configuration parameter. In our understanding, it is implicitly reflected by MCS table configuration.  |
| Apple | We do not see the necessity to introduce a new MCS table or adjust the target BLER associated with each MCS table.  |
| CMCC | Support Proposal 4. |
| QC | Support. |
| CATT | A unified solution is preferred for with and without HARQ. So we disagree different configuration for with and without HARQ feedback. For NTN, sometimes it will experience very low SINR, e.g rain attenuation, and then reliability can be enhanced even if with HARQ feedback. We can’t restrict the enhanced techniques only used in HARQ disabling case. |
| Panasonic | Support proposal 4, but we should strive to use common configuration as much as possible.  |
| SS | OK to discuss but we need to focus on issues with high priority  |
| MediaTek | Support proposal 2 with further clarification that the proposal is for the Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission **via configuration**. Further discussion on configuration via common signaling as potential implementation in the specifications of proposal 3 could be considered if beneficial.Support proposal 3, 4 |
| Xiaomi | Support proposal 4 |
| Huawei | Firstly, the main bullet can be changed to “*~~Further discussion on~~ The necessity to enable the different configuration on following parameter(s) for each HARQ process with/without feedback can be further discussed*”Secondly, even though the main bullet says “Further discussion on the necessity to …. can be further discussed”, we would like to understand the motivation on some items in the list- MCS table: Considering the SINR operating range, we don't think NTN will target high SE hence one MCS table (same as URLLC) may be sufficient.- Time domain resource allocation table: This leads to some complications to HARQ-ACK codebook construction without clear benefit.- Frequency resource allocation type 0 and type 1: Some explanation on the benefit of configuring different RA types will be appreciated.- Block error rate target: The BLER target can be controlled by choosing MCS dynamically, not sure any configuration is needed. - Physical resource block (PRB) bundling configuration: Some explanation on the benefit of configuring different RA types will be appreciated.- PDSCH mapping type A and type B: Some explanation on the benefit of configuring different RA types will be appreciated. |
| LG | Ok to disuss. |
| ZTE | Support for this proposal. And needs for each item should be justified by proponent. |
| Nomor Research | Support proposal 4, with following modification “*~~Further discussion on~~ The necessity to enable the different configuration on following parameter(s) for each HARQ process with/without feedback can be further discussed*” |
| ETRI | Support updated proposal 4Especially, for aggregation factor, the optimal value might be different, depending on the target performance. Additionally, target performances might be defined differently depending on whether HARQ feedback is disabled or not. Thus, it would be helpful for achieving optimal performance if different aggregation factor is introduced per target performance and/or per transmission parameter.  |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal. Different configuration for cases with/without HARQ may be beneficial, however it is not clear if enhancements are necessary since some parameters may be different in existing Rel. 16 specification. So, the need to change the specification should be motivated by proponents. |
| Sony | Support proposal 4, the DCI format should be unified for all HARQ process with/without feedback even though two sets of parameter configuration for HARQ processes with/without feedback are considered. |
| Ericsson | We support to further discuss this, as the necessity of this has already been identified in Rel-16 SI, see Section 7.2.1.4, TR 38.821:*If the feedback is disabled for a selective number (i.e. not all) of HARQ processes, the configuration parameters for different HARQ processes may need to be different.* The necessity of having different sets of transmission parameters (one set for feedback enabled HARQs, and one set for feedback disabled HARQs) is that, according to current specification, the same transmission parameters apply to all HARQ processes for the UE. However, if feedback of some of the HARQ processes is disabled, some of the parameters among the ones listed above might need to be changed for reasons e.g. to use higher aggregation factor for feedback disabled HARQ processes to compensate for lack of feedback. |
| APT | Support Proposal 4.NW shall pre-configure different configurations for robustness enhancement. |

# **# Issue 3: Enhancement on HARA-ARQ codebook:**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-5 in section 3.2, in the 1st round discussion, 18 companies are provided views:

* Up to 13 companies (Huawei,Ericsson,Lenovo&MotoM,Sony,ETRI,ZTE,LG,Thales,Nomor Research GmbH, QC,APT,Intel,Apple) are fine with the proposal
* Up to 3 companies (Nokia,OPPO,Samsung) has concern to support potential optimization on codebook.
* Two companies (Panasonic, CATT) prefer the simple solution without additional optimization.

As clarification from moderator perspective, enhancement on HARQ ARQ-codebook is just target to reduce the overhead for HARQ-ARQ codebook once the HARQ process is disabled. To addressing the concerns, in summary, the following updated proposal is provided for 2nd round discussion:

***Updated Proposal 5****: Enhancement on the HARQ-ACK codebook is supported with consideration on the DL transmission scheduled by HARQ process with disabled feedback.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | We think the HARQ-ACK codebook design does not need to be changed compared with Rel.15. If the HARQ-ACK codebook design reuses Rel.15 (i.e. no spec change), the function works fine and, moreover, we see additional benefits of reusing Rel. 15 codebook. 1. No spec impact.
2. For NTN terminal, it can reuse Rel.15 module for HARQ-ACK codebook generation.
3. gNB can obtain valid HARQ-ACK information for each of the transmitted PDSCH.
4. The previously identified issues with HARQ disabling can be naturally resolved, e.g. a) MAC CE and RRC signalling are not received by UE; b) DL packets not correctly received by UE for a long period of time without being known by gNB.

Based on the above analysis, we think that reusing Rel.15 HARQ-ACK codebook design without spec impact should be the baseline. Additional enhancement on HARQ-ACK codebook should be motivated by justified technical benefits.  |
| Apple | We think the benefit of updating the existing HARQ-ACK codebook needs to be first identified. In case of no clear benefit is observed, we prefer to reuse existing HARQ-ACK codebook design.  |
| CMCC | Support Proposal 5. |
| QC | Suggest change: “to support” to “to be studied” given that we haven’t identify any enhancement yet. |
| CATT | At least for type 1 codebook, it seems no reason to introduce new design. With same overhead, no need to restrict ACK/NACK feedback. |
| Panasonic | It would be necessary to specify handling of HARQ-feedback disabled process for HARQ-ACK codebook, but a straightforward rule (e.g. insert NACK (or ACK) for type1 and ignore DAI for type2) would be the baseline.  |
| SS | Agree with OPPO |
| MediaTek | Suggest to study first need and potential enhancements.. |
| Xiaomi | It’s too early to say the enhancement on HARQ codebook is needed unless we identify the benefit. |
| Huawei | Support proposal 5 |
| LG | Support |
| ZTE | Support to this proposal. Companies are encourage to provide more detailed analysis for each solution including corresponding spec impacts. |
| Nomor Research | More detailed discussion on the benefit of potential enhancements for each codebook type is needed. |
| ETRI | Support updated proposal 5 |
| Intel | We are OK with updated proposal 5.  |
| Sony | Support proposal 5. In our opinion, essential adjustments for HARQ-ACK codebooks with consideration on the DL transmission scheduled by HARQ process with disabled feedback are needed. At least adjustment for HARQ codebook Type-1 and Type-2 should be considered. For Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, the redundancy in the codebook is obvious. For example, when 2 CCs are configured to UE and all the HARQ processes in the secondary CC are disabled, it is not necessary for UE to reserve the ACK/NACK bits for secondary CC. As there are many aspects that impact the Type-1 codebook size, it would be better to decide on the adjustment of Type-1 codebook after the issues such as whether all HARQ process can be disabled, and different parameter configuration of each HARQ process with/without HARQ feedback are decided. For Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, we prefer the straightforward way that UE does not feedback on disabled HARQ processes, and DAI is not incremented for a PDCCH which is scheduling a feedback disabled HARQ process. |
| Ericsson | We support this proposal. This is needed to complete the functionality of the agreed enabling / disabling HARQ feedback per HARQ process. UE behaviours for HARQ codebooks should be discussed and specified to support enabling / disabling HARQ feedback per HARQ process.For example, in GEO NTN, the network may only configure 1-2 HARQ processes with feedback (e.g., for initial access and MAC CE transmission) and disable feedback for the rest 14-15 HARQ processes for normal data transmission. It is highly inefficient to require the UE to still provide feedback for these HARQ processes with feedback disabled. In addition, existing scheduling restriction for feedback enabled HARQ processes should be relaxed for feedback disabled HARQ processes, such as the following spec clause in TS 38.214:*The UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH for a given HARQ process until after the end of the expected transmission of HARQ-ACK for that HARQ process, where the timing is given by Subclause 9.2.3 of [6].* |
| APT | Support proposal 5.Specs impact cannot be avoided when part of HARQ-ACK is disabling. However, as mentioned by companies, only some minor changes are needed. |

# **# Issue 4: Enhancement on the transmission:**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-6 in section 3.3, in the 1st round discussion, 18 companies are provided views:

* Up to 19 companies (MediaTek, Lenovo &MotoM, Panasonic,Sony,CMCC,Spreadtrum,CATT, ETRI,ZTE,LG,Thales,Nomor Research GmbH, Ligado,Eutelsat,ATC,OPPO,Intel,SS,Apple) are fine with the proposal.
* Up to 2 companies (Ericsson, Nokia) prefer to justify the benefits of potential enhancement.
* QC propose to discussion the solution directly.
* Huawei propose another solution as candidate for discussion.

With consideration on the majority views, following updated proposal is provided for 2nd round discussion:

***Updated Proposal 6****: Companies are encourage to justify the benefits on the following solutions to enhance the PDSCH/PUSCH transmission.*

* *Blind retransmission*
* *Larger aggregation/repetition factor*
* *CQI table with new BLER target*
* *UCI*
* *UE assistance information*
* *Pre-active feedback*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | Firstly, we see the benefit of having larger aggregation/repetition factor, CQI table with new BLER target (discuss the possibility to reuse CQI table for URLLC), Secondly, the benefits for blind retransmission and pre-active feedback are not clear. Finally, we understand the intention with UCI enhancement but we believe R15 codebook design can achieve the same goal without spec impact. Otherwise, we call for a more detailed explanation UE assistance information. What are the concrete solutions? |
| Apple | We are in general fine to discuss the potential benefits of these enhancements.  |
| CMCC | Support Proposal 6.Solutions with less spec impacts, such as larger aggregation factor, can be discussed firstly. |
| CATT | For aggregation factor extension, it owns clear benefits since it can resist low SINR impact in NTN hostile scenarios.For other enhancement, we don’t see the rational if breaking the R15 framework. |
| Panasonic | As we commented in the 1st round discussion, we propose to add DCI indication of soft buffer usage (to store or not). This allows gNB to recommend UE to perform soft combining for high priority data, e.g. RRC signalling, even in case of shortage of the soft buffer for larger number of HARQ processes. We support proposal 6 with adding the following bullet, - Soft buffer usage indication  |
| SS | Support |
| MediaTek | We have preference to downslope the list of potential enhancements. Larger aggregation factor / repetition factor for PDSCH/PUSCH seem reasonable enhancements for GEO with limited link budget on DL and UL. |
| Xiaomi | We support to have UE’s reporting to adjust the transmission. |
| Huawei | Support Proposal 6 to consider the benefits of listed enhancements. For pre-active feedback, at least two benefits are clear: 1) Pre-emptive scheme can significantly reduce stop-and-wait time which accounts for main latency in NTN-HARQ; 2) Feedback in pre-emptive scheme can be enhanced to trigger multiple retransmissions in advance for reliability. Thus, the transmission efficiency can be improved. In addition, pre-emptive feedback can utilise the existing channel measurement protocols and the feedback information can be repeated to improve the reliability based on the channel condition. |
| LG | Support. Regarding UCI, we suggest to revise as “UCI including DL decoding info. / MCS request”.  |
| ZTE | Support. If down-selection is possible in this meeting, the first three can be starting point. |
| Nomor Research | Support Proposal 6. Maybe prioritization is necessary. |
| ETRI | Suggest the word change from “UCI” into the more general term (like “UL feedback”) to include other potential solutions (e.g. MAC-CE/RRC signalling). Firstly, the same operation might be possible by using other feedback methods (such as MAC-CE/RRC) instead of UCI. Secondly, the UL feedback via MAC-CE/RRC might be more reliable than UCI because it could use the reliability enhancement schemes (such as slot aggregation/HARQ) on PUSCH. Thirdly, the UL feedback via MAC-CE/RRC seems to have less RAN1 impact than UCI. Thus, those potential solutions should be not excluded because we haven’t identified anything yet.and Support the rest of the updated proposal 6 except the above suggestion |
| Intel | OK with the updated proposal 6.  |
| Sony | Support proposal 6. We prefer blind retransmission and CQI table with new BLER. As the blind retransmission has less spec, impact and a new CQI table to ensure robust operation with low code rates and lower order modulation such as BPSK (low MCS). |
| Ericsson | We are fine to further discuss these. However, our view remains the same: The necessity of proposed enhancements should come with at least simulation results. Then companies could check the results and discuss whether a specific enhancement is needed. Additionally, compatibility with existing NR design should be taken into account and analysis of the specification impact should be provided. |
| APT | Support Proposal 6.Further prioritize Blind retransmission, Larger aggregation/repetition factor, and CQI table with new BLER target. |

# **# Issue 5: Extension of k1 value:**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-7 in section 3.3, in the 1st round discussion, 12 companies are provided views:

* Up to 11 companies (MediaTek, Lenovo &MotoM, CMCC, Huawei,Ericsson,ZTE,Eutelsat, APT,Intel,SS,Apple) are fine with the proposal. And one company is neutral.

In summary, from moderator perspective, the offline consensus can be treated as informative guidance for contribution submission. No need to take it for official approve.

[Offline consensus based on 1st round of email discussion]

***Proposal 7****: Extension of K1 value can be discussed in AI 8.4.1.*

# **# Issue 6: Enhancement on the HARQ feedback:**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-8 in section 3.3, in the 1st round discussion, 18 companies are provided views:

* Up to 3 companies (Huawei,QC,CMCC) are fine with the proposal.
* Up to 10 companies (Ericsson,ETRI,CATT,Lenovo &MotoM, LG,APT,OPPO,SS, Apple, ZTE) has concerns on it and prefer to justify the benefits of potential enhancement.
* One company (Nomor Research GmbH) highlight priority for this topic is lower.
* One company (Nokia) prefer to investigate the overhead and reliability

From moderator perspective, such solution is merged within updated proposal 6 and further discussion is needed. Then, no dedicated proposal is provided.

# **# Issue 7: Misc:**

W.r.t the Initial Proposal-9 in section 3.3, in the 1st round discussion, 12 companies are provided views:

* Up to 7 companies (*Ericsson,Intel,QC, Thales,Nomor Research GmbH,SS,CMCC*) are fine with the proposal with following more detailed preference
	+ *Larger CSI-Report periodicity [supported by Thales,Nomor Research GmbH, QC,]*
	+ *Define a minimum time gap for both two PDSCHs of a HARQ process without feedbacks and two PUSCHs of a HARQ process [supported by Ericsson,Intel,QC,]*
* Up to 3 companies (*CATT, Lenovo &MotoM,APT*) has concerns on it.
* Up to 6 companies (*Huawei,ZTE,LG,Nokia,OPPO,Apple*) prefer to check the benefits of each enhancements

With consideration on the majority views, following updated proposal is provided for 2nd round discussion:

 ***Updated proposal 9****: Further discussion on necessity on the enhancements below can be considered:*

* + *Larger CSI-Report periodicity*
	+ *Define a minimum time gap for both two PDSCHs of a HARQ process without feedbacks and two PUSCHs of a HARQ process*
	+ *Signalling of the HARQ enabling information by the source satellite gNB*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| OPPO | Define a minimum time gap seems necessary, at least the gap should ensure a PDSCH processing time.  |
| Apple | We see the necessity of defining a minimum time gap for two PDSCH or two PUSCH. |
| QC | Agree with the second bullet. The first needs further discussion. |
| CATT | For the second bullet, we can agree.For the other two bullets, they are not needed. * For larger CSI report periodicity, current configuration is enough.
* For the signalling of HARQ enabling information, it belongs to a part of RRC reconfiguration for HARQ, no need indication from the source satellite gNB. In the initial access stage, HARQ feedback should be enabled by default.
 |
| Panasonic | Support to discuss about the necessity on the 1st and 2nd bullets. 3rd bullet might be RAN2 topic.  |
| SS | Agree with the first bullet |
| MediaTek | Support proposal 9. The last bullet on signalling of the HARQ enabling information seems to be RAN2 discussion. |
| Huawei | Fine to agree the first two sub-bullet as a conclusion to provide guidance for further discussion. The details of the third bullet is not clear. |
| LG | We are ok with further discussion to verify the potential benenfit. |
| ZTE | Support proposal 9 and the first two can be further evaluated. |
| Nomor Research | Agree to discuss on the first and second bullet. Third bullet should be discussed in RAN2. |
| Intel | Ok with updated proposal 9. |
| Ericsson | We are fine to further discuss these. But our view does not change compared to the first round of email discussion:* On larger CSI-report periodicity: The necessity would need to be further justified.
* On minimum gap of 2 feedback disabled PDSCHs/PUSCHs: This is a valid issue related to UE processing time discussion. It is worth further discussion
* On HARQ info for handover: This belongs to RAN2 discussion.
 |

# **Appendix**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contribution | Observation/Proposals |
| R1-2005267Huawei, HiSilicon | Observation 1: HARQ ID can be implicitly indicated via slot index at the cost of scheduling flexibility.Observation 2: HARQ ID can be implicitly indicated via DMRS at the cost of detection complexity.Observation 3: The pre-active HARQ feedback scheme can improve overall HARQ latency in NTN with multiple retransmission.Proposal 1: More than 16 HARQ process can be considered for higher throughput.Proposal 2: HARQ process number field in DCI shall not be extended to ensure the compatibility with existing NR protocols.Proposal 3: Part of HARQ process ID can be implicitly obtained by slot index and/or DMRS sequence while the rest are indicated from DCI. Proposal 4: Optimization on HAR Q processes scheduling can be considered for reducing HARQ-ACK codebook redundancy.Proposal 5: The pre-active HARQ feedback scheme can be considered as enhancement when enabling HARQ in NTN.Proposal 6: Reinterpreting bits in DCI for indicating repetition-related parameters shall be considered for disabled HARQ process. |
| R1-2005312 Nomor Research GmbH, Thales | Observation 1: For 15UEs per cell, the DL UE throughput is similar for 16 and 32 HARQ processes except when scheduling up to 4 UEs per TTI.Observation 2: For 15UEs per cell and a restriction to schedule up to 4UEs per TTI, the 50%-tile DL UE throughput is 7% higher, if up to 32 instead of 16 HARQ processes can be configured per UE.Observation 3: For 15UEs per cell and a restriction to schedule up to 2UEs or only 1UE per TTI, the 50%-tile DL UE throughput is the same independent if up to 32 or 16 HARQ processes can be configured per UE.Observation 4: For 20UEs per cell, the DL UE throughput is similar for 16 and 32 HARQ processes. Observation 5: The largest difference between the usage of 16 and 32 HARQ processes per UE can be observed for the 5%-tile DL UE throughput.Observation 6: Increasing the number of UEs per cell from 15 to 20, the difference of the DL UE throughput between systems where up to 16 or 32 HARQ processes per UE can be configured disappears.Observation 7: If the propagation delay decreases, e.g. for a system using a lower orbit, the round trip time decreases and 16 HARQ processes per UE will be sufficient. Observation 8: The main purpose of NTN is to provide coverage everywhere and to support high mobility. In real NTN scenarios, there is no need to schedule a UE in each TTI.Observation 9: UL resources utilization decreases with 3 or less UEs scheduled in one TTI.Observation 10: For 16 HARQ processes per cell, the UL UE throughput is maximized for a maximum of 3 UEs per TTI.Observation 11: For 15UEs per cell and a scheduling of 3UEs per TTI, the 50%-tile UL UE throughput is 11% higher, if up to 32 instead of 16 HARQ processes per UE are used.Observation 12: For 15UEs per cell, the difference of the UL UE throughput for the cases with 16 and 32 HARQ processes per UE decreases if the number of UEs scheduled per TTI decreases down to 3. Observation 13: Considering a LEO-1200 S-Band scenario with 20UEs per cell with a restriction to schedule up to 3UEs per TTI, the 50%-tile UL UE throughput is 9% higher, if up to 32 instead of 16 HARQ processes can be configured per UE.Observation 14: Considering a LEO-1200 S-Band scenario with 30UEs per cell the with a restriction to schedule up to 3UEs, the CDF of the UL UE throughput is similar if up to 32 or 16 HARQ processes can be configured per UE.Observation 15: Considering a LEO-1200 S-Band scenario with 30UEs per cell with a restriction to schedule up to 3UEs per TTI, the 50%-tile UL UE throughput is 2% higher, if up to 32 instead of 16 HARQ processes can be configured per UE.Observation 16: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 LOS UEs per cell, the minimum TP per UE is 4.2Mbit/s.Observation 17: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 NLOS UEs per cell, 88% of the UEs have a TP of 0bit/s.Observation 18: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 UEs per cell and LOS probability according to TR 38.811, 6% of the UEs have no TP.Observation 19: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 UEs per cell and LOS probability according to TR 38.811, 94.8% of the UEs have an RLC packet error rate smaller or equal than 2%.Observation 20: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 LOS UEs per cell 99.2% of the UEs have an RLC packet error rate smaller or equal than 2%.Observation 21: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 NLOS UEs per cell, 56.7% of the UEs have an RLC packet error rate smaller or equal than 2%.Observation 22: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3, the coupling loss for NLOS UEs is in most of the cases significantly larger than the coupling loss for LOS UEs (99% of LOS UEs have coupling loss smaller or equal 120dB, while only 13% of NLOS UEs have coupling loss smaller or equal 120dB). Observation 23: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3, the geometry SINR for NLOS UEs is in 50% lower than -6.5dB which was the minimum threshold to schedule a UE with lowest MCS in the performed SLS. LOS UEs show all geometry SINR larger than 1.5dB.Observation 24: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 LOS UEs per cell, the TP per UE is in average 30% lower (8.8Mbit/s vs. 12.6Mbit/s) if link adaptation is performed based on the instantaneous channel state.Observation 25: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 LOS UEs per cell, the probability of an RLC error rates per UE larger than 3% is 4% if link adaptation is performed based on the instantaneous channel state and BLER offset, while it is 0.6% if link adaptation is performed based on initial channel state measurement and BLER offset.Observation 26: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 LOS UEs per cell, it is useful to do an averaging in terms of BLER rather than taking into account the instantaneous channel state due to the expiration of the channel state information upon receiving the CQI at the gNB because of the large transmission delay.Observation 27: Applying a CQI feedback with 1% PHY BLER target performs better in terms of TP than applying a CQI feedback with 10% PHY BLER target and an additional offset.Observation 28: The probability of an RLC error rate per UE larger than 2% is 0.8% if a PHY BLER target of 1% is applied and 0.5% if an averaged SINR in dB and an offset of -4.5dB is used for link adaptation. In the other considered cases of averaged SINR the RLC error rate is significantly larger.Observation 29: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 LOS UEs per cell, the mean TP per UE increases from 13.2Mbit/s to 14.0Mbit/s if a PHY BLER target of 2% instead of 1% is applied.Observation 30: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 LOS UEs per cell, the 5%-tile of the TP per UE increases from 8.4Mbit/s to 9.2Mbit/s if a PHY BLER target of 2% instead of 1% is applied.Observation 31: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 LOS UEs per cell, the mean RLC error rate per UE increases from 1.1% to 2.2% if a PHY BLER target of 2% instead of 1% is applied.Observation 32: Considering a GEO Ka-Band scenario with FR3 and 10 LOS UEs per cell, the 5%-tile of the RLC error rate per UE increases from 0.8% to 1.8% if a PHY BLER target of 2% instead of 1% is applied.Observation 33: The specified 5QI match either packet error rate or delay of a GEO scenario but not both. Proposal 1: UEs supporting NTN should not be mandated to support a higher number of HARQ processes than terrestrial UEs. 16 HARQ processes should be the baseline. Proposal 2: RAN1 may consider 32 HARQ processes as optional UE capability for high capability devices supporting NR peak data rates in low load scenarios. .Proposal 3: The enhancement to the number of HARQ processes per UE shall be captured in following specification sections: Section 5.1 and 6.1 in TS 38.214, Section 6.3.2 in TS 38.331 and Section 4.2.7.10 in TS 38.306.Proposal 4: Allow to send blind PDSCH (re)transmission of the same packet by MAC scheduling without waiting for the transmission of the HARQ feedback. Proposal 5: For GEO scenarios change the channel model to a LOS only channel model meaning Table 6.6.1-1 of TR 38.811[5] does not apply.Proposal 6: Introduce larger CSI-Report periodicity values in TS 38.331 [2] to avoid unnecessary overhead in scenarios with large transmission delay.Proposal 7: Introduce a target BLER for CQI-Reporting to support NTN scenarios with HARQ disabled. Proposal 8: RAN1 to discuss reasonable assumptions for operator defined 5QI requirements to support GEO satellite communication in NR. |
| R1-2005497 MTK | Observation 1: Increasing the number of HARQ processes to match satellite round trip delay to avoid stop-and-wait in HARQ procedure results in a very high number of HARQ processes in device and gNB for LEO and GEO.Observation 2: The network can choose to configure shorter RLC window size parameters t-PollRetransmit = {5, 10, 15, 20, 25, …, 400, 450, 500, 800, 1000, 2000, 4000 ms} for UL and t-Reassembly = {5, 10, 15, 20, 25, …, 400, 450, 500, 800, 1000, 2000, 4000 ms} for DL in ul-AM-RLC and dl-AM-RLC configurations to match the satellite RTD without change to specifications. Observation 3: The network can configure shorter RLC window with the RLC status report transmitted by the UE at least once or several times per satellite RTD for LEO and GEO.Observation 4: Disabling UL HARQ feedback per UE per HARQ process and relying on shorter RLC window with RLC ARQ re-transmission for LEO and GEO will have the following benefits* No stop-and-wait due to UL HARQ feedback: this has the advantage of not decreasing the peak throughput even if the number of HARQ processes is kept to 16
* Re-use legacy DCI
* No impact on HARQ soft buffer

Observation 5: Reliability of Message 3 in RACH procedure cannot be achieved via RLC ARQ as RLC AM is not possible before contention resolution has completed.Proposal 1: UL HARQ retransmissions is not disabled for Message 3 transmission in RACH procedure.maximum data rates can be scheduled with HARQ feedback enabled. . Proposal 2: Whether UE should expect that at least one HARQ process is configured with UL HARQ feedback for MAC CE activation / de-activation is specified or up to network configuration can be further discussed.Observation 7: The HARQ parameters for each pool can be configured differently to ensure adequate reliability – i.e. Block error rate target, MCS table, aggregation factor, Time Domain and Frequency Domain resource allocation, PRB bundling, etc.Proposal 3: The network can configure one HARQ process pool with UL HARQ feedback enabled and one HARQ process pool with UL HARQ feedback disabled. Whether HARQ process IDs with UL HARQ feedback disabled via RRC can do HARQ soft combining is a UE capability.Observation 8: 16 HARQ processes are sufficient for ATG NR TDD with 20 ms UL-DL switching periodicity.Observation 9: The value range of K1 for the scheduling gap between the DL packet on PDSCH and the corresponding UL HARQ feedback on PUSCH/PUCCH may need to be increased. |
| R1-2005575Sony | Observation 1: The beam switching is a time-sensitive behavior due to the movement of satellite. Waiting for the HARQ feedback for PDSCH carrying MAC CE for beam switching may miss the favorable time.Observation 2: The redundant feedback of Type-1 / semi-static HARQ codebook would be large based on current HARQ codebook design.Proposal 1: Support at least one HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled.Proposal 2: When the MAC CE for beam switching is carried by PDSCH without HARQ feedback. UE applies the corresponding action with the reference to slots of the end of PDSCH transmission.Proposal 3: When the HARQ process of SPS PDSCH is HARQ feedback disabled, UE reports HARQ feedback information for the SPS PDSCH activation.  |
| R1-2005708CATT | Proposal 1: Keep at least one HARQ process with feedback if UE specific disabling is configured. Proposal 2: Using HARQ process ID subset to differentiate HARQ feedback should be supported, no need DCI change for HARQ disabling.Proposal 3: Support more than 16 process IDs depending on UE capability. Proposal 4: Keep 16 HARQ process number at most in fallback case. Proposal 5: Re-interpreting DCI field to indicate the HARQ index in case of more than 16 HARQ processes configured.Proposal 6: Support time interleaved slot aggregation to improve transmission reliability. Proposal 7: Support more than 8 repetitions in slot-aggreation transmission. |
| R1-2005835Lenovo | Proposal 1: Support more than 16 HARQ process number in NTN to match long RTT delay.Proposal 2: The HARQ process number is tied to SFN/slot index of PDCCH/PUSCH/PDSCH.Proposal 3: Different numbers of HARQ processes is configured based on UE capability.Proposal 4: UE assume the HARQ feedback disabling where HARQ ID belongs to the RRC configured HARQ process disabling subset.Proposal 5: The multiple transmissions of same TBs in consecutive or interlaced slots can be considered when HARQ is disabled.Proposal 6: Repetition transmission number and interlace transmission interval can be indicated in corresponding DCI when HARQ process is disabled. |
| R1-2005875Intel | Proposal 1:* Enabling / disabling of HARQ feedback for DL transmission should be configurable per HARQ process
	+ UE may expect reception of retransmission for HARQ process with enabled or disabled HARQ feedback

Proposal 2: * If more than 16 parallel HARQ processes are supported for NTN,
	+ HARQ process ID is determined based on DCI indication and slot index of the corresponding transmission
		- 4 bits are used for HARQ process ID indication in DCI
	+ Additional constraints on maximum TBS for a HARQ process or maximum total TBS across all parallel HARQ processes are discussed
 |
| R1-2005965ZTE | Observation 1: Existing HARQ process number is not sufficient to support NTN case.Observation 2: Performance gain can be achieved for the results based on enlarged HARQ process number comparing to the scheduling with disabled HARQ feedback and conservative scheduling, e.g., MCS offset and MCS table with LSE.Observation 3: Performance gain can be achieved for the results based on enlarged HARQ process number comparing to the scheduling with disabled HARQ feedback and lower target BLER.Observation 4: Performance gain can be achieved for the results based on enlarged HARQ process number comparing to the scheduling with disabled HARQ feedback and RLC-ARQ.Observation 5: Performance gain can be achieved for the results based on enlarged HARQ process number comparing to the TDM-ed scheduling with less HARQ process number.Observation 6: It’s necessary to support the HARQ procedure with larger process number in NTN case.Observation 7: The impacts on the UE/BS capability with support on extended HARQ process number is affordable.Proposal 1: Extension of the maximum supported HARQ process number, e.g., up to 32, should be supported for NTN.Proposal 2: Re-interpretation of bits in DCI should be considered as the baseline to support the HARQ process indication with extended maximum HARQ process number.Proposal 3: Enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback in per UE, per HARQ process and per LCH should be supported.Proposal 4: As one baseline assumption, at least one HARQ process with HARQ feedback should be kept. * FFS on whether and how to capture it in specification

Proposal 5: Extension of K1 value should be supported.Proposal 6: Additional enhancement to minimize the DM-RS overhead can be considered. |
| R1-2006031OPPO | Proposal 1: RRC configuring or DCI indicating the disabling of HARQ processes for both DL and UL scheduling should be considered.Proposal 2: HARQ-ACK information should be reported for disabled DL HARQ processes.Proposal 3: HARQ process number can be increased for capable UE if it does not increase UE buffer/cost. Proposal 4: Low DCI overhead methods should be considered if the number of HARQ processes is increased. Proposal 5: Enhancements to PDSCH/PUSCH transmission to achieve higher reliability should be considered.  |
| R1-2006146Samsung | Proposal 1: The number of HARQ processes should be increased.Proposal 2: Mechanism to simplify the DCI format should be supported in NTN.Proposal 3: To support more than 16 HARQ process IDs a slot number based HARQ process ID constructor should be supported in NTN.Proposal 4: Further discuss whether to support to disable HARQ feedback for all the HARQ processes.Proposal 5: UE assistance informaiton for HARQ should be studied for NTN.Proposal 6: Signalling of the HARQ enabling by the source satellite gNB before the completion of the handover should be studied. |
| R1-2006212CMCC | Proposal 1: Support greater than 16 HARQ process number in NTN and keep 4-bit HARQ process number field in DCI.Proposal 2: The time domain window based HARQ scheme can be used for greater than 16 HARQ process ID indication.Proposal 3: The multiple transmissions of same TB in in-consecutive slots can be considered when HARQ is disabled. And at least the following parameters should be included for the configuration: * Repetition number
* The slot interval of repetition slots

Proposal 4: The following HARQ re-transmission parameters configuration methods can be considered:* Via RRC signaling semi-static configuration
* Reuse and redefine HARQ related DCI fields
* Remove HARQ related DCI fields and introduced some new DCI fields
 |
| R1-2006327Panasonic | Proposal 1: The maximum number of HARQ processes should be increased for NTN. Candidate would be up to 64 for S-band (FR1) and 256 for Ka-band (FR2).Proposal 2: The following implicit indication of HARQ process ID should be discussed to minimize the DCI size.  Option 1: HARQ process is tied to SFN/slot number  Option 2: Reuse HARQ process ID within RTT by time segmentationProposal 3: A flag in DCI to recommend UE to store HARQ buffer should be supported. |
| R1-2006360ETRI | Observation 1 : When HARQ feedback is disabled on a per UE, the ACK/NACK information for gNB to determine whether DL transmission has become reliable or not does not exist.Observation 2 : Without HARQ feedback, it is impossible for gNB to know whether the transmission parameter is appropriate for the current situation or not.Observation 3 : With slot aggregation, the transmission parameter should be determined properly. * Too reliable parameter : throughput loss
* Too un-reliable parameter : reliability loss

Observation 4 : For minimizing RAN1 impact, UL feedback via MAC-CE/RRC is preferred rather than UL feedback via UCI.Observation 5 : slot aggregation factor is unique for either PDSCH or PUSCH.Observation 6 : slot aggregation factor change could lead to both throughput change and reliability change.Observation 7 : Each transmission parameter has its own SAF value for optimal performance.Observation 8 : Transmission parameter changes might lead to SAF change for achieving optimal performance.Observation 9 : Target performance change might result in requiring SAF value change for optimal performance.Observation 10 : Target performance might be defined individually per RNTI and/or per search space and/or per whether HARQ feedback is disabled or not.Observation 11 : Optimal performance can be achieved by introducing separate SAF per each transmission parameter and/or per each required target performance.Observation 12 : In case of NR, because SAF is unique, the change of SAF is required whenever parameter and/or target performance changes for optimal performance.Proposal 1 : Support a new UL feedback via UCI/MAC-CE/RRC for reporting DL status or requesting DL scheduling changes when HARQ feedback is disabled. * UL feedback can include information such as
	+ DL decoding statistics
	+ request for reducing/increasing MCS
	+ request for reducing/increasing pdsch-AggregationFactor
	+ combinations of the above

Proposal 2 : Introduce multiple aggregation factors per PDSCH/PUSCH for achieving optimal adaptation* the following components could be considered as the axis of multiple aggregation factors span
	+ MCS index, modulation order, code rate, spectral efficiency, etc
	+ RNTI type, search space type, etc
		- PDSCH related RNTI : {P,SI,RA,MSGB,TC,C,MCS-C,CS}-RNTI
		- PUSCH related RNTI : {TC,C,MCS-C,CS}-RNTI
		- search space type : {Type0,Type0A,Type1,Type2,Type3}-CSS, USS
	+ whether HARQ feedback is disabled or not, etc
	+ combinations of the above
	+ subsets of the above
 |
| R1-2006380LG | Proposal 1: Based on the UE capability, more than 16 HARQ processes are supported in NTN.Proposal 2: Consider CCE index based HARQ process id identification for NTN.Proposal 3: At least one HARQ process is enabled for HARQ feedback.Proposal 4: Discuss on HARQ-ACK codebook enhancement when HARQ feedback is disabled. |
| R1-2006423Nokia | Observation 1: Continuously scheduling a UE under NTN operation may lead to lower link efficiency due to HARQ stalling.Observation 2: Spreading the UE scheduling over time, lowers the likelihood of lower link efficiency due to stalling.Observation 3: Even for a continuously scheduled UE it is important to avoid stalling due to HARQ in order to save UE power and maximize the network usage.Observation 4: Disabling HARQ and relying on higher layer retransmissions reduces the flexibility of the scheduler and may result in lower spectral efficiency. Observation 5: Disabling HARQ and relying on higher layer retransmissions leads to higher latency per retransmitted packet, which may harm certain applications, in special considering the physical latency constraints in NTN environment.Observation 6: Increasing the number of HARQ processes leads to higher UE complexity.Proposal 1: RAN1 to discuss and decide on whether automatic repetitions can solve HARQ stalling in NTN. |
| R1-2006465 Ericsson | Observation 1 The motivation of increasing number of HARQ processes is not clear, as there exist several other ways to address the issue originated from the stop-and-wait HARQ protocol, particularly by enabling / disabling HARQ feedback. In addition, depending on carrier frequency, subcarrier spacing, satellite altitude and elevation, the needed number of HARQ processes will differ. Hence, any increase is likely to be insufficient for many configurations.Observation 2 Evaluation results show that compared to increasing the number of HARQ processes, HARQ without feedback achieves similar throughput performance.Observation 3 The main purpose of NTN is to provide ubiquitous coverage rather than to provide maximum throughput. Considering the negligible performance difference for realistic scenarios and the added UE complexity and specification impact, it is not desirable to increase the number of HARQ processes.Proposal 1 UE expects that at least one HARQ process is configured with UL HARQ feedback.Proposal 2 RAN1 to discuss what parameters need to be configured differently for HARQ processes with feedback and HARQ processes without feedback.Proposal 3 When HARQ processes are enabled/disabled on a per HARQ process basis, in the case of the NR Type-1 HARQ codebook, the UE inserts NACKs in positions corresponding to PDSCHs associated with feedback disabled HARQ processes.Proposal 4 When HARQ processes are enabled/disabled on a per HARQ process basis, in the case of the NR Type-2 HARQ codebook, the UE ignores counter DAI from a PDCCH that is associated with a feedback disabled HARQ process and counter DAI is not incremented for such a PDCCH.Proposal 5 When HARQ processes are enabled/disabled on a per HARQ process basis, in the case of the NR Type-2 HARQ codebook, the total DAI (if present) indicates the sum of all the scheduled PDCCHs associated with feedback enabled HARQ process.Proposal 6 When HARQ processes are enabled/disabled on a per HARQ process basis, in the case of the NR Type-3 HARQ codebook, the codebook size is dimensioned to include ACK/NACK information only for HARQ processes that are enabled.Proposal 7 RAN1 to conclude that there is no need to increase the number of HARQ processes for NTN. |
| R1-2006521Apple | Proposal 1: NTN supports dynamic enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback. The HARQ feedback is disabled if HARQ process number is configured with disabled HARQ feedback or if dynamically indicated by layer-1 signaling.Proposal 2: The maximum number of HARQ processes for NTN is larger than 16, based on UE capability.Proposal 3: The HARQ process number field in DCI is remained to be 4 bits, and DCI fields are re-interpreted to indicate more than 16 HARQ process numbers.  |
| R1-2006604Xiaomi | Proposal 1: The number of supported HARQ processes can be extended in NTN scenarioProposal 2: The number of the HARQ process indicator in the scheduling grant should be kept unchanged. Proposal 3: Dynamic HARQ enabling/disabling is not supported.Proposal 4: Enhancement on the UCI reporting such as the data decoding statistics should be introduced. |
| R1-2006642Asia Pacific Telecom | Observation 1 For Earth fixed cells, UE may experience poor channel quality for a longer time than Earth moving cells due to having low elevation angles during service.Observation 2 Based on TR 38.821, it is unclear whether the legacy HARQ-ACK codebooks are supportedBased on these observations, we have the following proposalsProposal 1 For Earth fixed cells, HARQ enhancement, especially for low elevation angles, may need FFS.Proposal 2 Type-1 and Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebooks shall be supported in Rel-17 NTN.Proposal 3 To support Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, minor changes on the scheduling offset shall be FFS.Proposal 4 To support Type-2 HARQ-ACK codebook, minor changes on the scheduling offset shall be FFS. |
| R1-2006806Qualcomm | Proposal 1: For NTN, UE reports the capability on the number of HARQ processes.Proposal 2: For NTN, more than 16 HARQ processes can be configured.Proposal 3: For NTN, support slot number based HARQ process identification when more than 16 HARQ processes are configured to a UE. Proposal 4: Define a minimum time gap between two PDSCHs of a HARQ process without feedbacks * Different numerologies may have different time gaps.
* FFS to introduce virtual k1

Proposal 5: Consider new CQI BLER targets for HARQ processes without feedbacks.Proposal 6: Support a new UCI feedback for reporting DL transmission disruption and/or requesting DL scheduling changes when HARQ feedback is disabled. * To study the new UCI format and associated resource allocation.

Proposal 7: Support different transmit parameters and/or configurations per HARQ process or per HARQ process type (retransmissions is enabled/disabled), including* Power control
* MCS table
* UCI multiplexing parameters
* FFS other parameters

Proposal 9: For NTN, UE may receive a DCI scheduling a PUSCH of a given HARQ process before the end of the transmission of another PUSCH of that HARQ process. Proposal 10: Define a minimum time gap between two PUSCHs of a HARQ process. |
| R1-2006857CAICT | Proposal 1: Decide the maximum supported number of HARQ process number before discussing the indication method. The supported number of HARQ process number is determined by the requirement of peak data rates in NTN.Proposal 2: Basic assumption for supporting HARQ-ACK disable/enable is to configure two subsets of HARQ processes for enabled HARQ processes and disabled HARQ processes respectively via RRC signaling. To decide the HARQ-ACK disable/enable state with HARQ process ID indication in the scheduling DCI.Proposal 3: Enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for DL SPS/UL CG is configured per configuration.Proposal 4: For performance improvements for disabled HARQ-ACK, solutions with less speciation impacts should be considered firstly. For the solutions with much standardization work, the benefits should be justified. |