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# 1 Introduction

In RAN#86, a SI was approved to determine and evaluate the minimum necessary specification updates to introduce NB-IoT/eMTC support for non-terrestrial networks (NTN), The description for the SI was updated in RAN#90 [1] and it was agreed to use the existing work on NR NTN captured in TR 38.821 [2] as a baseline. In RAN#92-e, a follow up WI was approved to specify NB-IoT/eMTC support for Non-Terrestrial Networks.

In R2-2109003, we summarized the contributions, submitted to the AI 9.2.4.1, on tracking area update and mobility mechanisms for NB-IoT and LTE-M devices in NTN. That document has been treated during the online session and a set of agreements have been made.

This document is to continue the discussion based on what has been agreed during the online session and rapporteur’s suggestions per topic on which proposals to continue the discussion with as given below:

**Idle mode mobility**

**Proposal 3**         Discuss whether satellite assistance information, e.g., ephemeris, for neighbour cell(s) is provided to UE.

**Proposal 7**          Discuss whether cell selection procedure is used instead of cell reselection procedure when a UE is configured with an eDRX cycle.

**Tracking area update**

**Proposal 16**       Discuss whether system information modification notification procedure is used to inform TAC updates and, if not, discuss the alternative mechanisms.

**Connected mode mobility**

**Proposal 23**       Discuss whether value range for parameter t304 needs to be extended. The values to be specified, if necessary, are FFS.

**Proposal 19**       Discuss whether RAN2 should check with RAN4 on the RRM impacts for supporting CHO and related measurements for LTE-M.

**Proposal 27**       Discuss whether UE specific timers and constants for RLF and RRC connection re-establishment procedure require any changes.

# 2 Discussion

### 2.1 Idle mode mobility

In RAN2#113-e, the following agreement was made: “The NTN ephemeris is divided into serving cell’s ephemeris and neighbour’s ephemeris. FFS how would they differ regarding e.g., the required accuracy or signalling impact.” Proposal 3, above, was briefly discussed, via emails, during Ph1, but some companies commented that it is not clear what such information, i.e., satellite assistance information, would be beneficial for at this point. Rapporteur thinks the intention is to have a similar agreement as in NR NTN and satellite assistance information for neighbour cells, in-line with what is to be provided for the serving cell, can be used for example to decide when to perform measurement on neighbour cells. Satellite assistance information for a neighbour cell can be subject of a discussion on whether it would be beneficial for estimating discontinuous coverage, but rapporteur thinks this is not within the context of this offline discussion. With the question below rapporteur would like to check if a reformulated version of **Proposal 3** above reflecting the intention better is acceptable to companies.

**Question 1: Do you think RAN2 should assume that satellite assistance information for neighbour cell(s) is provided to UE for cell selection/reselection?**

**Please note the following agreement for the serving cell “RAN2 assumes that satellite assistance information, e.g., for cell selection reselection, for serving cell is provided to UE” and that discontinuous coverage is not within the context of this discussion.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | No | Given the limited TU budget for this WI in R-17, we don’t think such optimizations are essential in the first release. We can consider it in Rel-18. |
| Lenovo | No | For continuous coverage we see no urgent necessity to introduce new mechanism for idle mode mobility. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 2: Do you think cell selection procedure should be used instead of cell reselection procedure when a UE is configured with an eDRX cycle?**

**If yes, please indicate whether the statement above should apply to any eDRX cycle or eDRX cycles with lengths above certain values.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes | The eDRX cycle length does not matter, as the UE will know from the serving cell ephemeris whether it is going to be served by the same cell, when it wakes up. Based on this information the UE can decide whether to perform cell selection or not. |
| Lenovo | Yes with comments | If ephemeris is provided, UE can predict which cell will be serving when it wakes up. Cell selection can be used to replace reselection or not depending on the result.  So it could be “cell selection procedure **can** be used instead of cell reselection procedure…”. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### 2.2 Tracking area update

In RAN2#114-e, the following agreement was made for NR-NTN: “Change in TAC in SIB1 triggers SI update notification procedure as legacy behaviour. It is FFS whether broadcasting TAC update time can also be considered” In Ph1, rapporteur stated that one company [13] proposed using the legacy system information update notification mechanism to inform about the TAC update whereas three companies, [7] [8] [17], proposed not to use that procedure due to its impact on UE power consumption.

**Question 3: Do you think system information modification notification procedure should be used to inform TAC updates?**

**Please state the rationale for your reply regardless of whether you replied yes/no considering the arguments provided in the references given above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | No | This is not essential and should be avoided as there is a chance of higher power consumption. If the UE changes its tracking area, it will anyway issue a TAU on cell reselection. |
| Lenovo | No | TAU mechanism is sufficient for now. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In [8] and [17] alternative mechanisms have been proposed to inform TAC updates.

**Question 4: If RAN2 agrees that system information modification notification procedure should NOT be used to inform TAC updates; do you think time information about TAC updates should be broadcast?**

**Please consider the mechanism proposed in [8] on a high level when you reply. Note that the details may be discussed separately, if needed, depending on the support.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | No | We think such optimizations can be done in later releases, after a working solution is made. If the UE changes its tracking area, it will anyway issue a TAU on cell reselection. |
| Lenovo | No | TAU mechanism is sufficient for now. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 5: If RAN2 agrees that system information modification notification procedure should NOT be used to inform TAC updates; do you think that UE should ignore the notification if it is for TAC update and the UE is “stationary”?**

**Please consider the mechanism proposed in [17] on a high level when you reply. Note that the details may be discussed separately, if needed, depending on the support.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes | Stationary UEs can ignore the notifications and if the UE changes its tracking area, it will anyway issue a TAU on cell reselection. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### 2.3 Connected mode mobility

In [18], it was discussed whether value range for parameter *t304* needs to be extended. In Rel-13 an extended value, i.e., *ms10000-v1310* was introduced for UEs that support CE with the intention to cover cases where the UE is in enhanced coverage. Now that adaptation for NTN is specified, new values for this timer can be considered to compensate for propagation delay due to satellites

**Question 6: Do you think that value range for parameter *t304* needs to be extended to compensate for propagation delay due to satellites?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes | The value range can be increased to accommodate the NTN RTT for eMTC. |
| Lenovo | No | We think the current value range is sufficient to cover UE-eNB RTT. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In [10], it is proposed that RAN2 should check with RAN4 on the RRM impacts for supporting CHO and related measurements for LTE-M.

**Question 7: Do you think RAN2 should check with RAN4 on the RRM impacts for supporting CHO and related measurements for LTE-M?**

**Please state the rationale for your reply regardless of whether you replied yes/no considering the arguments provided in the reference given above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Yes | We think RAN4 should be involved for considering RRM impacts of supporting CHO. |
| Lenovo | Yes | RAN4 can be informed if necessary. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

During the online session, some companies indicated that more time is needed to check whether procedural update is required to support RLF and RRC connection re-establishment procedures in IoT NTN. Since there was no time to bring it up online, the rapporteur would like to check whether UE specific timers and constants for RLF and RRC connection re-establishment procedure require any changes, i.e., value range or behaviour, in IoT NTN.

**Question 8: Do you think that UE specific timers and constants for RLF and RRC connection re-establishment procedures require extended value range and/or new behaviour in IoT NTN?**

**Please state the rationale for your reply regardless of whether you replied yes/no and, if yes, provide the names of the timers and constants that you think which may require change.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | - | We think such UE specific timers need to be identified first, before considering their extension. |
| Lenovo | Yes | The triggering and recovery of RLF may bring additional delay and power consumption in NTN due to LEO movement or link switch. For NB-IoT mobility a more straightforward way is to use the conditional concept as CHO for NR NTN, i.e. conditional RRC re-establishment.  This can be implemented by introducing a timer or indicating a time so that UE can initiate RRC reestablishment to target cell at a given time, instead of triggering RLF and attempting recovery. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Summary

TBD

# 3 Conclusion

This document is to continue the discussion based on what has been agreed during the online session and rapporteur’s suggestions per topic on which proposals to continue the discussion with. Based on the discussion in the section above the following proposals are made:

[Proposal 1 ???.](#_Toc80614972)
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