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# Introduction

This lead summary document captures issues related to NR NTN RF core requirements and demodulation aspects. The document also provides information with respect to use cases, deployment scenarios and regulatory information to be considered, including exemplary band discussions. It contains a summary of the contributions under sections 12.8.1, 12.8.2, 12.8.3 at TSG-RAN WG4 #97e, together with identified key open issues and recommends topics/questions to be handled via email discussions. The goal of this document is also to provide recommendation on prioritization of discussion and whether any issues should be postponed.

Please also note the TSG-RAN WG4 #97e meeting agenda provided in R4-2014000 with respect to NTN topic:

*12.8 Solutions for NR to support non-terrestrial networks (NTN) [NR\_NTN\_solutions]*

*12.8.1 General and work plan [NR\_NTN\_solutions]*

*12.8.2 Use cases, deployment scenarios, and regulatory information [NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core]*

*\* Include exemplary bands discussion*

*12.8.3 Coexistence aspects [NR\_NTN\_solutions -Core]*

*12.8.3.1 Simulation assumptions [NR\_NTN\_solutions -Core]*

*12.8.3.2 UE requirements aspects [NR\_NTN\_solutions -Core]*

*12.8.3.3 BS requirements aspects [NR\_NTN\_solutions -Core]*

*12.8.4 RRM requirements [NR\_NTN\_solutions-Core]*

According to RAN4#97-e E-meeting Arrangements and Guidelines, the following schedule has been proposed in R4-2016599:

* + *Stage 1: Moderators kick off email discussion (Monday Nov. 2)*
  + *Stage 2: Companies provide comments for the 1st round (Nov. 2 – Wednesday 6pm UTC Nov. 4)*
  + *Stage 3: Moderators summarize the status and possible proposals, recommending what decisions can be made for 1st round. A formal t-doc will be used (Thursday 6pm UTC, Nov. 5)*
  + *Stage 4: After receiving the summary from moderators, session chair may approve documents, make agreements or assign new CRs, WFs, LSs, etc. (no later than Monday 8am UTC, Nov. 9)*
  + *Stage 5: Companies provide comments for 2nd round.*
    - *Draft WF/LS and revised CRs/TPs shall be shared by Wednesday 1am UTC, Nov. 11.*
    - *Commenting shall stop by Wednesday 11pm UTC, Nov. 11.*
    - *Formal tdocs of WF/LS/CRs/TPs shall be uploaded to the Inbox (except Cat A CRs) by Thursday 1am UTC, Nov. 12.*
    - *Draft moderator summary shall be shared by Thursday 9am UTC, Nov. 12, but moderators are strongly encouraged to share it earlier if possible and delegates to comment as early as possible.*
  + *Stage 6: Moderators provide 2nd round summary with a formal tdoc by Thursday 6pm UTC, Nov. 12.*
  + *Stage 7: Session chairs announce close of sessions (no later than 6pm UTC, Nov. 13). Final decisions will be captured in Chairman meeting report (to be shared after the meeting is closed)*

A total of 16 TDOCs have been provided for this agenda, while 1 TDOC has been reserved and not submitted:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***TDoc Number*** | ***TDoc Type*** | ***Title*** | ***Company*** | ***Status*** | ***General Purpose*** | ***Agenda Item*** |
| [*R4-2015905*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015905.zip) | *Other* | *Specification structure for NTN nodes* | *Ericsson* | *available* | *Approval* | *12.8.1* |
| [*R4-2014785*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014785.zip) | *Discussion* | *Views on NTN bands and coexistence study* | *Samsung* | *available* | *Approval* | *12.8.1* |
| *R4-2014880* | *Discussion* | *Discussion on the applicability of DFT-S-OFDM for NTN* | *CAICT* | *Reserved,*  *Not available* | *-* | *12.8.1* |
| [*R4-2014381*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014381.zip) | *Work Plan* | *NR\_NTN\_solutions work plan* | *THALES* | *available* | *Endorsement* | *12.8.1* |
| [*R4-2014066*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014066.zip) | *Discussion* | *On the status of NTN in 3GPP* | *Fraunhofer HHI, Fraunhofer IIS* | *available* | *-* | *12.8.1* |
| [*R4-2014467*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014467.zip) | *Discussion* | *Possible FR2 exemplary band for NR based satellite networks* | *HUGHES Network Systems Ltd, Thales* | *available* | *Discussion* | *12.8.2* |
| [*R4-2015906*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015906.zip) | *Other* | *NTN Scenarios and Regulatory overview* | *Ericsson* | *available* | *Approval* | *12.8.2* |
| [*R4-2015915*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015915.zip) | *Discussion* | *Possible FR1 exemplary band for NR satellite networks* | *THALES* | *available* | *Discussion* | *12.8.2* |
| [*R4-2015913*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015913.zip) | *Discussion* | *NTN use case scenarios and architectures* | *THALES* | *available* | *Discussion* | *12.8.2* |
| [*R4-2015263*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015263.zip) | *Other* | *Initial discussion for NR to support non-terrestrial networks* | *Xiaomi* | *available* | *Approval* | *12.8.2* |
| [*R4-2015252*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015252.zip) | *Discussion* | *NTN - On use cases and deployment scenarios* | *Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell* | *available* | *Approval* | *12.8.2* |
| [*R4-2015547*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015547.zip) | *Other* | *General discussion about NTN topic* | *Huawei, HiSilicon* | *available* | *Approval* | *12.8.2* |
| [*R4-2015945*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015945.zip) | *Discussion* | *NTN Proposed RF Core Requirements* | *THALES* | *available* | *Discussion* | *12.8.3* |
| [*R4-2015907*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015907.zip) | *Other* | *NTN Simulations discussion* | *Ericsson* | *available* | *Approval* | *12.8.3.1* |
| [*R4-2016112*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016112.zip) | *Other* | *Discussion on simulation assumptions for NTN coexistence study* | *ZTE Corporation* | *available* | *Approval* | *12.8.3.1* |
| [*R4-2015548*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015548.zip) | *Discussion* | *General discussion on NTN simulation assumptions* | *Huawei, HiSilicon* | *available* | *Discussion* | *12.8.3.1* |
| [*R4-2015908*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015908.zip) | *Discussion* | *NTN coexistence - BS requirements aspects* | *Ericsson* | *available* | *Discussion* | *12.8.3.3* |

*List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round*

* 1st round: TBA
* 2nd round: TBA

# Topic #1: General RAN4 use cases related aspects

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

General RAN4 RF NTN related aspects discussions are required to decide on the way forward and to provide an initial RF core list of parameters/requirements to be considered by RAN4 RF and demodulation work.

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [*R4-2014785*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014785.zip) | Samsung | **View 1:** At least the Radio Regulations should be taken as basic reference for NTN band selection.  **View 2:** It is necessary to prioritize the candidate NTN frequency bands to identify 1 or 2 example bands, which should be within the range of FR1 or FR2, while the confirmed and practical needs from operators should be well taken into account.  **View 3:** ITU-R Recommendations/Reports on characteristics of satellite systems can be used as references for developing or cross-check the assumptions of coexistence studies in RAN4.  **View 4:** As usual, 3GPP RAN4 should conduct relative independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements (such as ACLR, ACS) for NTN. |
| [*R4-2014381*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014381.zip) | THALES | **General and work plan** [NR\_NTN\_solutions], updated with RAN4 activity |
| [*R4-2014066*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014066.zip) | Fraunhofer HHI, Fraunhofer IIS | During the early study items, several architectures and deployment scenarios were investigated.  **Observation 1:** In general, two different satellite architectures can be considered: Transparent and Regenerative satellites.  **Observation 3:** The propagation delay for a transparent payload is twice as long as for a regenerative payload.  **Observation 2:** Deployment scenarios in FR1 and FR2 are considered in geostationary (GEO) and low earth orbit (LEO).  A study on the propagation characteristics of non-terrestrial scenarios was conducted and an initial channel model was defined, featuring dynamic attenuation, Doppler effects and fading.  **Observation 5:** Only outdoor conditions are considered for satellite operations.  **Observation 6:** The propagation channel for NTN is a combination of satellite and terrestrial channels.  **Observation 7:** The propagation channel for satellites in medium and low earth orbit features strong variation in delay and Doppler shift due to the fast movement of the satellite.  **Observation 9:** The propagation losses can be as high as 217 dB in GEO and 188 dB in LEO scenarios.  **Observation 4:** The one-way propagation delay can be up to 272 ms in GEO and 14 ms in LEO scenarios.  Based on the investigations, several key issues were identified.  **Observation 12:** Long propagation delays, large Doppler effects and moving cells were identified as key issues.  **Observation 8:** In both architectures (transparent and regenerative), timers have to be extended to cope with the longer delays.  **Observation 11:** Release 15 and 16 NR functionalities are found to form a good basis for supporting LEO and GEO NTN scenarios.  **Observation 10:** While Release 15/16 beam management and BWP procedures are considered as baseline for NTN, they should be further discussed.  In the ongoing Release 17 work item NR\_NTN\_solutions, RAN4 has several objectives.  **Observation 13:** For the current WI, LEO and GEO based satellites with both Earth fixed and moving cells are considered. FDD and UEs with GNSS capabilities are assumed.  **Observation 14:** RAN4 is to specify UE RRM and RF core requirements, study bands related to NTN and investigate and specify UE timing and frequency pre-compensation requirements.  **Observation 15:** All requirements shall be specified for both FR1 and FR2.  **Observation 16:** Although RAN4 will select exemplary band(s) in the current NR-NTN-solutions WI, the definition of additional NR bands for NTN will be part of dedicated RAN4 led Release 17 work items. |
| [*R4-2014467*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014467.zip) | HUGHES Network Systems Ltd, Thales | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 work should consider an exemplary FR2 band for NTN. |
| [*R4-2015906*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015906.zip) | Ericsson | In this contribution, based on Radio Regulations, we made following proposal and observations:  **Observation 1**: A NTN BS might be considered as a “Relay node” or “Remote Radio Head” unit.  **Observation 2:** A NTN UE operating in FR1 might be considered as NR FR1 UE.  **Observation 3:** A NTN UE operating in FR2 might be considered as a relay UE, but most likely not a NR FR2 UE.  **Observation 4:** According to the RR definitions, HAPS vehicles fly between 20-50 km.  **Proposal 1:** Only HIBS are in the scope of NTN. The NTN WI shall be updated to clarify this, replacing “HAPS” (*High Altitude Platforms*) with “HIBS” *(HAPS operating as an IMT base station).*  **Proposal 2:** The frequency ranges considered for NTN should be spectrum allocated by ITU to the Mobile satellite as a primary service. |
| [*R4-2015915*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015915.zip) | THALES | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 work should consider an exemplary FR1 band for NTN.  **Proposal 3:** RAN4 work should consider previous 3GPP relevant references (such as TR 36.861, TR 36.862, TR 38.891), ETSI relevant standardization sources (e.g. ETSI EN 302 574-2), ITU-R regulations (e.g. Resolution 212), regional/national regulations (e.g. ECC/DEC(06)09, EC Decision 2007/98/EC), and coexistence studies approved by regulatory bodies (e.g. ECC Report 298). |
| [*R4-2015913*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015913.zip) | THALES | **Proposal 4:** RAN4 needs to identify coexistence scenarios in adjacent bands.  **Proposal 2:** Consider frequency reuse schemes with frequency reuse > 1 for RAN4 work.  **Proposal 5:** For exemplary band S, RAN4 should consider scenarios C1.1, C2.1 (LEO Earth Fixed Beams and Earth Moving Beams) and A1 (GEO).  **C1.1:** LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams  **C2.1:** LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth moving beams  **A1:** GEO @ 35,786 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams  **Proposal 6:** RAN4 should consider the following UE key reference scenario parameters:  **Handheld:** Omnidirectional antenna, 500 km/h (e.g. on board a high speed train), Linear: +/-45°X-pol, up to 200 mW (UE power class 3)  **VSAT:** Directive antenna (up to 60 cm equivalent aperture diameter), Up to 1200 km/h (e.g. aircraft mounted), Circular, up to 20 W  **Proposal 7:** UE with GNSS capabilities are assumed for RAN4 work.  **Proposal 9:** RAN4 should follow RAN1 outcomes for the synchronization solutions to be considered.  **Proposal 10:** RAN4 should use TR 38.821 assumptions for satellite parameters. |
| [*R4-2015263*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015263.zip) | Xiaomi | **Proposal 1:** it is proposed at least the type of handheld UE with PC3 should be considered first for FR1.  **Proposal 2:** it is proposed the UE reference architecture with 1Tx/2Rx could be as baseline to define UE requirements |
| [*R4-2015252*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015252.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Proposal 1:** The discussion related to this WI within RAN4 should focus only on LEO, GEO and HAPS deployment until decision for ATG have been made by RAN.  **Observation 1:** ITU separates spectrum for satellite and HAPS deployments in separate groups.  **Observation 2:** RAN4 should within this WI only consider example NR bands/frequencies.  **Proposal 2:** Choose example NR bands/frequencies in both the FR1 and FR2 range.  **Observation 3:** New NR bands should be defined at least for LEO and GEO deployments. Reusing existing bands can be discussed for HAPS deployments.  **Observation 4:** A HAPS as seen from the UE is a serving gNB and therefore the UE should expect same RF characteristics as a terrestrial gNB.  **Observation 5:** The RF requirements for the service link provided by LEO and GEO deployments should be at least same level as those for a terrestrial gNB.  **Proposal 3:** RF requirements for a terrestrial gNB should be used as baseline for HAPS, LEO and GEO deployments.  **Proposal 4:** Satellites both in transparent and regenerative deployments should provide same performance in terms of RF characteristics. |
| [*R4-2015547*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015547.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Observation 4:** The RF requirements of satellite are different from the base station considering the large propagation distance between UE and satellite.  **Observation 5:** RF requirements of VSAT is totally different from the traditional 3GPP UE. For handheld UE, the general UE RF requirements can be considered as baseline. |
| [*R4-2015945*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015945.zip) | THALES | **Proposal 1:** 3GPP does not define RF Tx requirements for a given transparent payload to allow flexibility in the space segment design;  **Proposal 2:** 3GPP does not define RF Tx requirements for a BS in NTN;  **Proposal 3:** 3GPP defines equivalent BS Tx requirements at UE reception level, by taking into account e.g. a frequency spectrum mask corresponding to the cumulated self-interferences generated by the satellite network infrastructure at UE level.  **Proposal 4:** 3GPP should re-use for NTN UE RAN4 core requirements definition the existent TN framework.  **Proposal 5:** Consider parameters from ETSI EN 302 574-2 V2.1.1 for defining specific RAN4 NTN UE core requirements for exemplary FR1 NTN band.  **Proposal 6:** NTN shall consider equivalent ETSI ACS and ACLR parameters.  **Proposal 7:** Consider 3GPP KPIs from TS 38.101-1 for defining RAN4 core requirements for exemplary FR1 NTN band.  **Proposal 8:** Down-select 3GPP core requirements from 3GPP KPI list, for exemplary FR1 NTN proposed RAN4 band.  **Proposal 9:** Define in RAN4 at least specific NTN core requirements for UE Tx Power, UE Output Power Dynamics, UE Tx Frequency Error, UE Tx EVM, UE Tx ACLR, UE Rx ACS, Spectrum Mask, Blocking Characteristics.  **Proposal 10:** A similar exemplary band definition approach should be applied for FR2. |
| [*R4-2015907*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015907.zip) | Ericsson | **Proposal 1:** Co-channel coexistence and coexistence with adjacent services are out of NTN WI’s scope.  **Proposal 2:** A down-selection of coexistence NTN/NR scenarios is needed, further consideration would be needed to select the most relevant and stringent ones.  **Observation 2:** Networks layout and NTN UEs distribution would need further alignement.  **Proposal 3:** For NR and NB-IoT, ACLR and ACS specified in TS 38.104 and 38.101 shall be assumed for NR BS and NR UE when running coexistence simulations. |
| [*R4-2016112*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016112.zip) | ZTE Corporation | **Proposal 1:** to adopt the coexistence scenarios in Table 2.1-1 for NTN coexistence study.  1 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; TN, 30MHz; DL to DL; 2 GHz Rural  2 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; TN, 30MHz; UL to UL; 2 GHz Rural  3 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; NTN, 30MHz; DL to DL; 2 GHz Rural  4 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; NTN, 30MHz; UL to UL; 2 GHz Rural  5 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; TN, 200MHz; DL to DL; 20 GHz Rural [Note1]  6 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; TN, 200MHz; UL to UL ; 20 GHz Rural [Note1]  7 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; NTN, 200MHz; DL to DL; 20 GHz Rural  8 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; NTN, 200MHz; UL to UL; 20 GHz Rural  **Proposal 2:** only one satellite is assumed for coexistence study at the beginning.  **Proposal 3:** consider the frequency reuse factor 1 as worst case for coexistence study.  Note 1: there are no rural cases above 3GHz according to ITU-R M.2292, coexistence between FR2 NTN and TN should be deprioritized  Note 2: the baseline scenario for NTN coverage should be rural area, FFS for other scenarios.  Note 3: TN should be NR based and it’s not necessary to evaluate LTE based or UTRA based as requirements should be close. |
| [*R4-2015548*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015548.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Observation 1:** It isn’t expected that the co-existence simulation of NTN will have an impact on RF requirements of terrestrial IMT UE/BS.  **Observation 2:** Some scenarios, such as LEO, GEO, HAPS and ATG are considered for NTN system. The outer scenario, such as rural macro, urban macro and dense urban, are considered for terrestrial network. The simulation scenarios are based on the permutation and combination between NTN scenario and TN scenario.  **Observation 3:** RAN4 need to consider how to match two heterogeneous network (NTN and IMT network).  **Observation 4:** For the co-existence scenario between two NTN systems, RAN4 need to consider whether to assume the same orbits and partial overlapping about foot print.  **Simulation Parameter/Potential Choice:**  Satellite orbits/GEO, LEO-1200, LEO-600  Center frequency /It depends on the decision about the example band.  Satellite antenna model/Passive reflector antenna or AAS. Antenna Gain and 3dB beam width  Channel bandwidth/It depends on operators’ spectrum allocations, no more than 100MHz.  Transmitter power/Different satellite orbits need different transmitter power  Noise figure/FFS  UE’s type/VSAT or handheld UE  Power control/FFS |
| [*R4-2015908*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015908.zip) | Ericsson | The proposed approach i.e. handling NTN gateway+ satellite as either a repeater or alternatively a relay.  The repeater RF requirements overview and structure from TS 36.106 is as following:  - Output power  - Frequency stability  - Out-of-band gain  - Unwanted emissions  - Error Vector Magnitude  - Input intermodulation  - Output intermodulation  - Adjacent channel rejection ration  The Relay requirements overview and structure from specification TS 36.116 is as following. More comprehensive requirements are specified due to the additional signal processing covering both access and backhaul link.  - Output power  - Output power dynamics including ON/OFF masks and transient handling for unpaired spectrum  - Transmit signal quality  - Unwanted emissions covering spurious emission, ACLR and operating band unwanted emission  - Transmit intermodulation  - Receiver sensitivity  - Receiver dynamic range  - In-channel selectivity  - Receiver blocking  - Receiver spurious emission  - Receiver intermodulation  - Access performance Requirements for PUSCH, PUCCH and PRACH  - Backhaul performance requirement covering PDSCH and PDCCH (for NR context)  Considering the relay requirements are more comprehensive, if there is any additional signal processing occurs performed within either the gateway or the satellite, the relay approach should be preferred. It looks then essential to conclude on this choice to progress further. |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

From provided documents, some general open issues have been identified and should be considered for decision/agreed working assumptions/possible WF:

* Sources of information;
* Frequency ranges to be considered
* Coexistence studies to be performed;
* HAPS/HIBS discussions
* UE types;
* Satellite types to be considered (transparent, regenerative);
* Satellite constellation to be considered (LEO, GEO);
* Satellite specific parameters to be considered;
* RAN4 should start considering a list of potential RF core and demodulation KPIs with respect to considered NTN use cases
* Earth fixed beam vs. Earth moving beam
* Simulation Scenarios

### Sub-topic 1-1 : Sources of Information

*Sub-topic description: Sources of information to be considered by RAN4 work*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-1:** Sources of Information

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
    - At least the Radio Regulations should be taken as basic reference for NTN band selection.
    - ITU-R Recommendations/Reports on characteristics of satellite systems can be used as references for developing or cross-check the assumptions of coexistence studies in RAN4.
    - As usual, 3GPP RAN4 should conduct relative independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements (such as ACLR, ACS) for NTN.
  + Option 2:
    - RAN4 work should consider previous 3GPP relevant references (such as TR 36.861, TR 36.862, TR 38.891), ETSI relevant standardization sources (e.g. ETSI EN 302 574-2), ITU-R regulations (e.g. Resolution 212), regional/national regulations (e.g. ECC/DEC(06)09, EC Decision 2007/98/EC), and coexistence studies approved by regulatory bodies (e.g. ECC Report 298).
* Recommended WF
  + RAN4 should use ITU-R sources & relevant radio regulations, ETSI relevant standardization sources, regional/national regulations, and coexistence studies approved by regulatory bodies.
  + 3GPP RAN4 should provide/conduct relative independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements for NTN.

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: If possible, companies are encouraged to provide justification for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: The Radio Regulations are for sure the reference document to select a NTN band that might be common for all Regions. Other ITU-R and CEPT Reports would help to better understand the impact on the adjacent services when needed. Nevertheless, RAN4 shall still make adjacent channel coexistence studies: this not covered by the other studies and is a pre-requisite to specify NTN RF requirements.  Option 2: |
| Huawei | As usual, RAN4 will perform the adjacent channel coexistence studies as it is shown as one of objectives in NTN WID. And every agreement is based on the consensus. We can’t determine or exclude the source of information at this early stage or in high level discussion. |
| Samsung | Option 1: Yes. And prefer to emphasize that RAN4 should not exclude any source of information for reference. |
| DISH | Option 1: Emphasize that RAN4 should not exclude any source of information |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-1: fine with recommended general WF. |
| Thales | For the relevant sources we suggest to re-use agreed text in RAN plenary: Relevant sources (including but not limited to ITU-R Radio Regulations, relevant national regulations, pre-existing Harmonized Standards developed for example in ETSI, coexistence studies approved by regulatory bodies and/or 3GPP specifications)  The purpose is of using these source documents is to select appropriate exemplary bands for NTN and to carry the needed adjacent channel coexistence studies in order to specify NTN RF requirements. |
| Panasonic | Option 1: Yes  Option 2: Yes |
| MTK | For UEs it is extremely important to align as much as possible with existing 3GPP UE RF specifications for terrestrial devices such as 38.101. Large deviations risk compromising a healthy availability of handheld NTN or dual mode NTN/TN UEs with similar cost and overall performance as terrestrial UEs.  Existing 3GPP RF specifications should be taken as a starting point by default for UE. All required additional changes to UE requirements should be justified by RAN4 coexistence studies. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1: RAN4 should conduct independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements for NTN. |
| Apple | We need to follow and account for available radio regulations, both common as well as regional/national rules. |
| Nokia | Sources of information is included in both options and should be considered. It is not understood why a selection is proposed. |
| Intelsat | Yes for Option 1 and Option 2. |
| HNS/Ech | Agree with Option 1&2 |
| Eutelsat | Option 1 is acceptable. |
| Loon/Google | Option 1: RAN4 should conduct independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements for NTN. |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Partially | See comments above |
| Huawei | Partially | See comments above |
| Samsung | Partially | See comments above.  Support the recommended WF with modification to the 1st bullet as below,  “RAN4 should consider all the relevant sources, and not limited to ITU-R sources & relevant radio regulations, ETSI relevant standardization sources, regional/national regulations, and coexistence studies approved by regulatory bodies.”  Support the 2nd bullet of recommended WF, “3GPP RAN4 should provide/conduct relative independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements for NTN.” |
| DISH | Partially | See comments above |
| Panasonic | Agree |  |
| MTK | Partially | See comments above |
| Qualcomm | Partially | See comments above. |
| Nokia | Partially | See comments above. |
| Intelsat | Agree |  |
| HNS/Ech | Agree |  |
| Eutelsat | Partially | WF should be restricted to FR1 FDD only (e.g. S-Band or L-band). |
| Thales | Partially | Support the recommended WF with modifications as below in line with comments above:   * RAN4 should consider all the relevant sources (including but not limited to ITU-R Radio Regulations, relevant national regulations, pre-existing Harmonized Standards developed for example in ETSI, coexistence studies approved by regulatory bodies and/or 3GPP specifications) in order to specify NTN RF requirements * RAN4 should select appropriate exemplary bands for NTN and to carry the needed adjacent channel coexistence studies in order to specify NTN RF requirements |

Proposed WF with respect to sources:

* 9 companies partially agree
* 3 companies agree

However, all companies seem to agree that coexistence studies are necessary in RAN4. RAN4 should therefore conduct independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements for NTN.

Moderator suggests the following modifications for WF:

**Proposal 1:** RAN4 should consider all the relevant sources (including but not limited to ITU-R Radio Regulations, relevant national regulations, pre-existing Harmonized Standards developed for example in ETSI, coexistence studies approved by regulatory bodies and/or 3GPP specifications) in order to specify NTN RF requirements.

**Proposal 2:** RAN4 should select appropriate exemplary bands for NTN and to carry the needed adjacent channel coexistence studies in order to specify NTN RF requirements.

**Proposal 3:** 3GPP RAN4 should provide/conduct relative independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements for NTN.

### Sub-topic 1-2 : Frequency Ranges to be considered

*Sub-topic description:* Frequency Ranges to be considered by RAN4 work

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-2:** Frequency Ranges

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
    - It is necessary to prioritize the candidate NTN frequency bands to identify 1 or 2 example bands, which should be within the range of FR1 or FR2, while the confirmed and practical needs from operators should be well taken into account.
  + Option 2:
    - The frequency ranges considered for NTN should be spectrum allocated by ITU to the Mobile satellite as a primary service.
  + Option 3:
    - RAN4 work should consider an exemplary FR1 band for NTN.
  + Option 4:
    - RAN4 work should consider an exemplary FR2 band for NTN.
  + Option 5:
    - New NR bands should be defined at least for LEO and GEO deployments. Reusing existing bands can be discussed for HAPS deployments.
  + Option 6:
    - Although RAN4 will select exemplary band(s) in the current NR-NTN-solutions WI, the definition of additional NR bands for NTN will be part of dedicated RAN4 led Release 17 work items.
* Recommended WF
  + At least one FR1 and FR2 exemplary frequency bands should be considered
  + Although RAN4 will select exemplary band(s) in the current NR-NTN-solutions WI, the definition of additional NR bands for NTN will be part of dedicated RAN4 led Release 17 work items.

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: If possible, companies are encouraged to provide justification for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1:  Option 2: yes  Option 3: yes, if possible.  Option 4: Unfortunately, no potential FR2 band has been identified so far fo NTN. Most of the proposed frequency ranges are only partly included in FR2. Also, they are all FDD while NR FR2 bands are all TDD, which would be source of major coexistence issues.  Option 5: We guess the intention is to specify a new NTN band, not new NR band here. If so, yes.  Option 6:It could be Rel-17 or later Release. |
| Huawei | RAN4 never touch the satellite topic. Thus, it’s better to choose a traditional satellite band considering the commercial and technical advantage. 1.6GHz L band is preferred.  As for FR2, most of frequency range for FR2 is for FSS. RAN4 can’t consider to specify 7-24GHz before RAN decide to address this frequency range between FR1&FR2. Furthermore, NR FR2 bands are all TDD. |
| Samsung | Option 1: Yes  Option 3: Yes  Option 4: The proposed candidate Ka-band for NTN is out of the range of FR2. Considering the work load of RAN4 and complex situation on coexistence, suggest to deprioritize FR2 exemplary band at this stage. |
| DISH | Option 1: Yes, as long as only one exemplary band per FR is defined.  Option 2: Yes  Option 3: Yes  Option 4: Yes with some modifications to proposal. We need to be very specific; “FR2 band” in 3GPP terminology means both UL and DL are ≥24.25GHz. If UL or DL or both are below 24.25GHz, then the decision should be made by RAN as there is significant amount of work needed to do RAN1/RAN2/etc work for 7-24GHz range. If RAN agrees to allocate time to make the required specification work for frequency/frequencies within 7-24GHz outside RAN4, then we are fine with defining e.g. Ka band, whose DL is within 7-24GHz and UL is >24GHz. |
| LGE | Option 3: Yes  Option 4: No. For FR2, FDD is assumed in NTN, but, for TN, TDD is assumed. It implies that the system operation may be complicated such as coexistence, UE measurement and so on. For this reason, we propose that RAN4 focuses on NTN for FR1 at this stage. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-2: fine to start with one FR1 band and one FR2 band |
| Panasonic | Option 1: Yes  Option 2: Yes, if option 6 is adopted.  Option 3: Yes  Option 4: Yes  Option 5: Yes  Option 6: Yes |
| Xiaomi | **Issue 1-2:** Frequency Ranges  Ok with the recommended WF |
| MTK | The recommended WF by the moderator seems a good compromise. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1: Yes. We should include both FR1 and FR2 at this stage.  Option 6: Yes.  Clarifications: Can HAPS/HIBS reuse the exciting LTE/NR bands? Is it allowed from radio regulatory point of view? |
| Skyworks | The proposed way forward seems reasonable and straight forward for FR1. For ranges >FR1, in our understanding Satellite bands often use FDD which is not covered for FR2 or may falls between FR1 and FR2. Is the intention to pick an existing FR2 band as a vehicle for simulations or to actually pick a representative satellite band (potentially FDD) and use FR2 parameters? |
| Apple | It is worth noting that RAN4 specifications do not address 7-24GHz frequency range (there was only SI), and all RAN4 specifications assume the TDD mode for FR2. |
| Nokia | It is our preference to investigate both a FR1 and FR2 band. However, as commented by others no clear candidate for a satellite FR2 band is available and given the workload in RAN4 we are okay to focus on FR1 only. Additional bands are to be part of a separate WI. |
| Intelsat | Option 1: Yes  Option 2: Yes  Option 3: Yes  Option 4: Yes  Option 5: Yes  Option 6: Yes |
| HNS/Ech | Option 1, 3, 4, YES  Option 2: No, the frequency ranges considered for NTN should be spectrum allocated by ITU to satellite (MS and FSS) as a primary service  Option 5: NR bands for NTN use should be defined at least for LEO and GEO deployments but HAPS has its own allocation.  Option 6: Yes, should be in Rel-17 otherwise NTN deployment will be too far away, and will miss the market demand |
| Eutelsat | Option 2: Support  Option 3: Support  Option 4: Do not support. |
| Thales | Option 1: Yes, as long as at least one exemplary band per FR is defined for NTN.  Option 2: No need to restrict  Option 3: Yes (an MSS band can be considered for FR1)  Option 4: Yes (any satellite service allocated band can be considered for FR2, it should be possible to select Ka or Ku band which UL or DL or both can be below 24.25GHz but due to the targeted type of UEs will behave the same)  Option 5: the exemplary bands selected could apply to NGSO and/or GEO  Option 6: Yes |
| Loon/Google. | Agree with Nokia. We also support Option 5: “Reusing existing bands can be discussed for HAPS deployments.” |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Partially | See previous comments |
| Huawei | Partially | See previous comments |
| Samsung | partially | See previous comments |
| DISH | Partially | See previous comments |
| LGE | Partially | See previous comments |
| Panasonic | Yes | The recommended WF is reasonable. |
| MTK | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Skyworks | Agree | May need some further clarification, see comment |
| Nokia | Partially | See previous comments |
| Intelsat | Agree |  |
| HNS/Ech | Agree |  |
| Eutelsat | Partially | WF not applicable to higher bands (e.g. FR2). |
| Thales | Partially | Support the recommended WF with modifications as below in line with comments above:   * At least one exemplary frequency band per FR should be defined for NTN. It may be possible to consider a FR2 like band (similar usage conditions as FR2 band) which UL or DL or both can be below 24.25GHz. The bands could apply to NGSO and/or GEO * Although RAN4 will select exemplary band(s) in the current NR-NTN-solutions WI, the definition of additional NR bands for NTN will be part of dedicated RAN4 led Release 17 work items. |

Proposed WF with respect to frequency ranges:

* 8 companies partially agree
* 6 companies agree

For FR1 there seems to be a consensus. For FR2 not clear so far. Companies raised concerns with respect to proposed frequency out of 3GPP FR2 and coexistence between TN TDD with NTN FDD in FR2.

Moderator suggests the following modifications for WF:

**Proposal 1:** At least one exemplary frequency band per FR1 should be defined for satellite.

**Proposal 2:** At least one exemplary frequency band per FR2 should be defined for satellite.

**Proposal 3:** It may be possible to consider an exemplary band (with similar usage conditions as FR2 band) for which UL or DL or both can be below 24.25GHz.

**Proposal 4:** Although RAN4 will select exemplary band(s) in the current NR-NTN-solutions WI, the definition of additional NR bands for satellite will be part of dedicated RAN4 led Release-17 work items.

**Proposal 5:** The frequency ranges considered for satellite should be spectrum allocated by ITU to satellite (MSS) as a primary service. FFS whether FSS spectrum can be considered.

### Sub-topic 1-3 : Coexistence studies to be performed

*Sub-topic description:* Coexistence studies to be performed by RAN4

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-3:** Coexistence studies

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
    - to adopt the coexistence scenarios in Table 2.1-1 for NTN coexistence study.
    - only one satellite is assumed for coexistence study at the beginning.
    - consider the frequency reuse factor 1 as worst case for coexistence study.
    - there are no rural cases above 3GHz according to ITU-R M.2292, coexistence between FR2 NTN and TN should be deprioritized
  + Option 2:
    - RAN4 needs to identify coexistence scenarios in adjacent bands.
    - Consider frequency reuse schemes with frequency reuse > 1 for RAN4 work.
  + Option 3: NTN to TN in adjacent bands for both FR1 and FR2
  + Option 4: NTN to TN in adjacent bands for FR1 only
  + Option 5: NTN to NTN in adjacent bands for both FR1 & FR2
  + Option 6: Both NTN to TN and NTN to NTN in adjacent bands for both FR1 & FR2
  + Option 7: Both NTN to TN (for FR1 only) and NTN to NTN (for both FR1 & FR2) in adjacent bands
  + Option 8:
    - Co-channel coexistence and coexistence with adjacent services are out of NTN WI’s scope.
    - A down-selection of coexistence NTN/NR scenarios is needed, further consideration would be needed to select the most relevant and stringent ones.
  + Option 9:
    - It isn’t expected that the co-existence simulation of NTN will have an impact on RF requirements of terrestrial IMT UE/BS.
    - RAN4 need to consider how to match two heterogeneous network (NTN and IMT network).
    - For the co-existence scenario between two NTN systems, RAN4 need to consider whether to assume the same orbits and partial overlapping about foot print.
  + Option 10:
    - One key assumption when introducing NTN is to minimize as much as possible the impacts on legacy NR networks.
    - Based on this assumption, the ACLR and ACS values for legacy NR BS and UE shall be as specified in TS 36.104 (BS NB-IoT), TS 36.101 (UE NB-IoT), TS 38.104 (NR BS), TS 38.101-1 (NR UE FR1) and TS 38.101-2 (NR UE FR2).
* Recommended WF1
  + Consider frequency reuse schemes with frequency reuse > 1 for RAN4 work.

OR

* + Consider the frequency reuse factor 1 as worst case for coexistence study.
* Recommended WF2
  + Option 5, if at least 2 satellites are assumed;

OR

* + Option 4, if at least 1 satellite is assumed.
* Recommended WF3
  + It isn’t expected that the co-existence simulation of NTN will have an impact on RF requirements of terrestrial IMT UE/BS.
  + One key assumption when introducing NTN is to minimize as much as possible the impacts on legacy NR networks. Based on this assumption, the ACLR and ACS values for legacy NR BS and UE shall be as specified in the table below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | **2GHz** | **20 GHz and 30 GHz** |
| **BS** | **ACLR** | 45 dB | 28 dB |
| **ACS** | 45 dB |  |
| **UE** | **ACLR** | 30dB (ACLR1)  43dB (ACLR2) | 17 dB |
| **ACS** | 33 | 23 dB |

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: If possible, companies are encouraged to provide justification for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: It’s still unclear to us how the NTN/TN layout would look like, how satellite(s) would overlap IMT network(s), the choice of 1 vs 2 satellites would depend on the probability to have 2 satellites overlapping IMT network(s). Frequency reuse should be chosen for the worst case but still realistic scenario. We don’t agree with the last part: there are for example FR2 urban macro deployement, impact of NTN shall also study for such case. I guess Table 2.1 is from ZTE contribution? But then, this should be further detailed as TN covers rural, macro urban, suburban, .. deployments!  Option 2: See comments on option 1.  Option 3: Yes  Option 4: Only if FR2 is out of scope of NTN.  Option 5: Yes, to specify NTN RF requirements.  Option 6: Yes  Option 7: No, see before.  Option 8: Co-channel should be clearly stated out of scope, not allowed then. Coexistence with adjacent services is usually not in RAN4’ scope, except when doing some analytic analysis. Doesn-selection would be needed considering the number of possible permutations to be considered.  Option 9: No impact on IMT network is not only an expectation but a pre-requisite. Option 10: Yes |
| Huawei | Both NTN to TN and NTN to NTN in adjacent bands for FR1 should be considered firstly.  As we discussed in our contribution, it’s unclear how to match two heterogeneous network (IMT and NTN ). Anyway, before we jump into the details of simulation assumption, RAN4 need to outline the example band and simulation scenatios. |
| Samsung | Option 3: Yes  Option 5: Yes  Option 10: Yes |
| LGE | General comments: Down scope is needed.  Option 9: Yes |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-3: the structure for coexistence is a bit confusing, it’s better to follow the skeleton proposed in [*R4-2016112*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016112.zip)*,maybe some other parematers could be further discussed.* |
| Panasonic | Option 2: No (The frequency reuse factor 1 should be considered as worst case.) |
| Qualcomm | Option 2: Yes. The reuse factor should be larger than 1 which is the real deployment scenario. For example, 2 or 3 can be a starting point. Both NTN to NTN and NTN to TN should be considered. |
| Nokia | Option 8: Yes  Option 10: Yes |
| Intelsat | Option 4: Yes  Option 5: Yes  Option 6: Yes  Assume, or prefer, that FR2 is in scope for NTN. |
| Thales | Yes, at least Options 2, 3, 4 and/or 5. Down-scope is required. |
| Loon/Google | Option 5: Yes  Option 6: Yes |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward(s) stated above? Which way forward do you prefer? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward(s) stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson |  | WF1 and WF2: to be further discussed with netowrk layouts and overlapping.  WF3, but the non-impact is not an expectation, it’s a pre-requisite. |
| Huawei |  | WF1 and WF2: to be further discussed.  WF3, No impact on the IMT system since we can’t change the legacy system’s requirements. |
| Samsung |  | WF1 and WF2: to be further discussed  WF3: agree that no impact is a pre-requisite |
| DISH |  | WF3: No impact to terrestrial is a prequisite |
| LGE |  | WF1 and WF2: to be further discussed  WF3 : Agree. It is not expected that the coexistence simulation of NTN will have an impact on TN. |
| Panasonic | Agree to WF1 | On WF1, we prefer the latter “Consider the frequency reuse factor 1 as worst case for coexistence study” rather than the former “Consider frequency reuse schemes with frequency reuse > 1 for RAN4 work”. |
| MTK |  | We agree with WF3, subject to the modifications in the UE-related values in the table as explained below. These values should use 3GPP TS38.101 as a reference.  Regarding UE requirements, we agree with re-using existing NR requirement, including ACLR1 (30dB). However, we do not see the need to also include a tighter value for the ACLR2 (43dB) as this is not in line with existing 3GPP requirements in TS38.101.  For UE ACS, 33dB is only valid for 5 and 10MHz bandwidths, for larger bandwidths the ACS needs to be relaxed, we should refer instead to the values in table 7.5-1 in TS38.101-1.  Table 7.5-1: ACS for NR bands with FDL\_high < 2700 MHz and FUL\_high < 2700 MHz   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | RX parameter | Units | Channel bandwidth | | | | | | 5 MHz | 10 MHz | 15 MHz | 20 MHz | 25 MHz | | ACS | dB | 33 | 33 | 30 | 27 | 26 | | RX parameter | Units | Channel bandwidth | | | | | | 30 MHz | 40 MHz | 50 MHz | 60 MHz | 80 MHz | | ACS | dB | 25.5 | 24 | 23 | 22.5 | 21 | | RX parameter | Units | Channel bandwidth | | | | | | 90 MHz | 100 MHz |  |  |  | | ACS | dB | 20.5 | 20 |  |  |  | |
| Qualcomm | partially | WF1: Consider frequency reuse schemes with frequency reuse > 1 for RAN4 work  WF2: FFS  WF3: Agree with no impact on IMT system. |
| Skyworks | Conditionally support WF3 | Regarding way FW3 on UE ACLR: general requirement for FR1 does not have ACLR2 requirements in some NS cases we have ACLR2 of 40dB which in general are met with the 30dB ACLR requirement but ACLR2 become critical at low power. We suggest that ACLR2 assumptions for UE are studied further and for now we think that 43dB should be kept in bracket or possibly revised to 40dB and we can later provide indications about feasibility of better numbers. This also depends on the output power dynamic range over which ACLR1/2 need to be maintained. |
| Nokia |  | WF-1 and WF2 – Needs more discussion and on some sense dependent on other issues.  WF-3 – It not enough to assume there is no impact to already deployed networks this should be ensured. |
| Intelsat | Agree to WF1 |  |
| HNS/Ech | Conditional | Details of WF1 and WF2 and WF3 need to be further discussed, cannot be agree here |
| Thales | Partially | No impact on IMT. TN RF parameters to be considered (e.g. TN ACLR, TS ACS for UE and BS in FR1 and FR2) need to be clearly specified.  Impact is expected only on NTN UE & BS (satellite segment) specification, potentially by relaxing RF parameters. |
|  |  |  |

Main feedbacks:

* No agreements are possible so far on the suggested WFs.
* Companies agree that co-existence simulation of NTN is required and should be further simulated and discussed.
* Concerns are raised with respect to ACS & ACLR values to be considered by the TN.
* Moreover, it seems that for the time being is not clear how NTN/TN layout would look like, how satellite(s) would overlap IMT network(s),

Moderator suggests further discussing about ACS & ACLR requirements to be respected for TN when coexistence with NTN, depending on FR and BW configuration, and also further discussing about the NTN/TN layout in the simulation section.

Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:

**Proposal 1:** RAN4 should further discuss and decide ACS & ACLR requirements to be considered for TN in the coexistence study with NTN, depending on FR and BW configuration.

**Proposal 2:** Further discuss the frequency reuse factor to be considered for the coexistence studies (which could be FR specific).

**Proposal 3:** No impact on IMT network is a pre-requisite.

**Proposal 4:** For coexistence studied, both NTN/NTN and NTN/TN in adjacent channels should be considered.

**Proposal 5:** NTN RF requirements shall be specified assuming no impact on TN RF requirements.

**Proposal 6:** RAN4 need to consider how to take into account the heterogeneous cell patterns of NTN and TN networks assuming that they serve the same areas.

**Proposal 7:** Down-select from a list with approx. 70 coexistence cases (x 2 Frequency Ranges) x 2 scenarios (Earth Fixed Beam, Earth Fixed Beam) x 3-4 BW configurations, from:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | **Set 1** | | | | **Set 2** | | | |
| **GEO** | **LEO 600km** | **LEO 1200km** | **HIBS** | **GEO** | **LEO 600km** | **LEO 1200km** | **HIBS** |
| **NR / NB-IoT** | **Rural** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| **Urban macro** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| **Dense Urban** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| **Micro/small cell outdoor** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| **Indoor hotspot** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| **NTN** | **GEO** | **Set 1** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **LEO 1200km** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **LEO 600km** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **HIBS** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| **GEO** | **Set 2** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X |
| **LEO 1200km** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X |
| **LEO 600km** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X |
| **HIBS** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X |

**Proposal 8:** Consider only NTN complementary cases e.g. 1 worst case and 1 best case (in terms of Doppler, received power) for x2 type of configurations (Earth Fixed Beam, Earth Fixed Beam) x 3-4 BW configurations.

### Sub-topic 1-4 : HAPS/HIBS discussions

*Sub-topic description:* HAPS/HIBS discussions

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-4:** HAPS/HIBS

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
    - According to the RR definitions, HAPS vehicles fly between 20-50 km.
    - Only HIBS are in the scope of NTN.
    - The NTN WI shall be updated to clarify this, replacing “HAPS” (High Altitude Platforms) with “HIBS” (HAPS operating as an IMT base station).
  + Option 2: Do not change/update HAPS to HIBS in the NTN WI
  + Option 3: ITU separates spectrum for satellite and HAPS deployments in separate groups.
* Recommended WF
  + RAN4 should decide if HAPS/HIBS exemplary bands should be on its own. The range should be covered under FR1 or FR2 category.
  + RAN4 should decide if change/update “HAPS” to “HIBS” in the NTN WI

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: If possible, companies are encouraged to provide justification for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: Yes, only HIBS are considered. That’s already a RAN2 agreement.  Option 2:no, why?  Option 3: |
| Huawei | About HAPS/HIBS, RAN4 can’t decide to change and update the WID. It’s a crossing working group issue. We’d better send a LS to RAN plenary for guideline and the accurate definition for HAPs. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-4: regarding the HAPS and HIBS definition, it’s encouraged to have RANP level discussion, then go back to RAN4. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1: Before we decide to change/update the WID, RAN4 should clarify what’s the difference when defining bands and requirements with HAPS and HIBS. Can both HAPS and HIBS reuse existing IMT bands? It also depends on the operators’ deployment. |
| Apple | HAPS/HIBS are regarded differently in the regulatory domain, so further clarifications for the WI scope will be helpful. |
| Nokia | Option 2: We prefer not to change the HAPS to HIPS in the WI. This as HAPS may not be equivalent to HIBS, since potentially HAPS can be used for fixed service, for example, providing BS backhauling in a remote area. In that case, HAPS is different from HIBS. HIBS is referring to IMT mobile services. HIBS is using <2.7 GHz bands, but HAPS fixed services may use higher frequency bands in FR2. In any case this change can not be imposed by RAN4 but should be discussed at RAN.  Option 3: Yes |
| Intelsat | Support Option 2 (Include HAPS in the NTN WI) |
| HNS/Ech | Option 1: If need to be changed there should be a proposal for decision to change or use HAPS/HIBS alternately  Option 2: Do not change/update HAPS to HIBS, it is in the NTN WI  Option 3: In ITU HAPS is considered fixed services, NOT satellite. |
| Thales | Option 2: In line with current Rel-17 WI objective, HIBS are not addressed  Option 3: Yes, the allocated bands for Satellite and HAPS based services are distinct  Please also note that HAPS seems to use transparent payload (with ground BS) while HIBS may use regenerative payload (with on-board BS). Both are NTN subjects but they seem different. |
| Loon/Google | Agree with Nokia. (Option 2 and Option 3) |
| SoftBank | As a general comment, we prefer to leave HAPS/HIBS issues open for some time since, in our understanding, the definition of HIBS and the relation between HAPS and HIBS, including spectrum to be used, are the items to be discussed in ITU-R. In addition, the main subject of this WI is for satellite and HAPS is just assumed as a target of “implicit compatibility”.  (Note: 5906(Er) mentioned in section 2.2 that “HAPS are under fixed satellite service allocation” but it does not seem right: in our understanding, HAPS has not been under “satellite” service in ITU-R thus far.) |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson |  | It’s only open questions here, not really a concrete WF |
| Huawei |  | Before we decide HAPS/HIBS exemplary bands, we should be aligned with each other about the accurate definition for HAPs. |
| DISH | Disagree | It is not under the authority of RAN4 to make any decisions on changes to the WID content. |
| Qualcomm |  | See comments above |
| Nokia |  | Only first built is open for discussion. Second is out of scope of RAN4. |
| Intelsat | Disagree |  |
| HNS/Ech |  | Let HAPS proponents propose the exemplary band  See comment above |
| Thales | Partially | Support the recommended WF with modifications as below in line with comments above:   * RAN-WG4 may consider the definition of additional NR bands for HAPS as part of dedicated RAN4 led Release 17 work items * TSG-RAN to decide the change from “HAPS” to “HIBS” in the NTN WI |
| Loon/Google |  | Agree with Nokia |
|  |  |  |

Main feedbacks:

* HAPS may not be equivalent to HIBS, since potentially HAPS can be used for fixed service,

Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:

**Proposal 1:** RAN-WG4 may consider the definition of additional NR bands for HAPS as part of dedicated RAN4 led Release-17 work items.

**Proposal 2:** TSG-RAN to decide the change from “HAPS” to “HIBS” in the NTN WI

**Proposal 3:** LS to RAN plenary for guideline and the accurate definition for HAPS.

### Sub-topic 1-5 : UE types

*Sub-topic description:* UE types to be considered by RAN4 work

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-5:** UE types

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
    - it is proposed at least the type of handheld UE with PC3 should be considered first for FR1.
    - it is proposed the UE reference architecture with 1Tx/2Rx could be as baseline to define UE requirements
  + Option 2:
    - A NTN UE operating in FR1 might be considered as NR FR1 UE.
    - A NTN UE operating in FR2 might be considered as a relay UE, but most likely not a NR FR2 UE.
  + Option 3:
    - RF requirements of VSAT is totally different from the traditional 3GPP UE.
    - For handheld UE, the general UE RF requirements can be considered as baseline.
  + Option 4: RAN4 should consider the following UE key reference scenario parameters:
    - Handheld: Omnidirectional antenna, 500 km/h (e.g. on board a high speed train), Linear: +/-45°X-pol, up to 200 mW (UE power class 3)
    - VSAT: Directive antenna (up to 60 cm equivalent aperture diameter), Up to 1200 km/h (e.g. aircraft mounted), Circular, up to 20 W
    - UE with GNSS capabilities are assumed for RAN4 work
  + Option 5: ESIM under FR2
* Recommended WF
  + Handheld UE & VSAT UE with described characteristics:
    - Handheld: Omnidirectional antenna, 500 km/h (e.g. on board a high speed train), Linear: +/-45°X-pol, up to 200 mW (UE power class 3)
    - VSAT: Directive antenna (up to 60 cm equivalent aperture diameter), Up to 1200 km/h (e.g. aircraft mounted), Circular, up to 20 W
  + ESIM to be considered for FR2

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: If possible, companies are encouraged to provide justification for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: Ok  Option 2: Ok  Option 3: What “totally different” means? If it’s a realy, it shall comply with Relay RF requirements.  Option 4:  Option 5: A priori, no, that would need further justification, that was not proposed by anyone. |
| Huawei | The types of UE should be considered when deriving simulation assumption. Maybe different scenario or frequency bands will use different kinds of UE.  To Ericsson, Not sure whether VSAT is similar to relay or FWA or IAB. Anyway, it has a high antenna gain. |
| DISH | Option 5: Where does this proposal come from? |
| ZTE | .Sub topic 1-5: considering the workload for NTN, it is better to start with handled UE firstly, regarding the VSAT, it could be discussed once we have stable framework for coexistence study. |
| Panasonic | Option 3: Yes  Option 4: Yes |
| Xiaomi | **Issue 1-5:** UE types  Option 1: Ok |
| MTK | Agree with Option 1, Option 3, Option 4. No strong view on option 5. |
| Qualcomm | Option 4: Yes. It aligns with output of NTN SI. |
| Skyworks | Question for clarification on WF. Is handheld FR1 only? If FR2 too is the omnidirectional antenna assumption valid? Also what about Fixed UEs like CPE? |
| Nokia | Option 1: Agree  Option 2: To some extend agree  Option 3: Fine but should regardless RF vise behave alike NR deployments since the ambition is to deploy in this system – meaning same performance requirements should be meet.  Option 4: This need further discussion when a reference scenario is agreed.  Option 5: This is out of scope of RAN4. |
| Intelsat | Support Option 4 |
| HNS/Ech | Option 1: OK  Option 2: Partially OK. An NTN UE operating in FR1 and FR2 shall be considered  Option 3: VSAT and handheld UE shall be included for applicable scenarios  Option 4: OK  Option 5: ESIM (moving platform) and VSAT under FR2 |
| Thales | Yes to all options. At least VSAT and handheld UE under FR1. We also agree that RF requirements of VSAT are different from the traditional 3GPP UE. However, the most restrictive case is probably Handheld UE (up to 200 mW, UE power class 3, and much lower antenna gain compared to VSAT) |
| Loon/Google | Option 1: Agree |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Disagree | See previous comments |
| Huawei |  | Not sure characteristics is shown as requirements or simulation assumptions. |
| Panasonic | Agree |  |
| MTK | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Partially | What’s the difference between VSAT and ESIM? With the recommended WF, does it mean handheld and VSAT are for FR1? Or they can be both FR1 and FR2? |
| Skyworks |  | See questions in comment above |
| Nokia | Disagree | Too early to make this decision. |
| Intelsat | Agree |  |
| HNS/Ech | Agree |  |
| Thales | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Main feedbacks:

* Some companies suggest is too early to make such decision with respect to UE-type. However, it would be useful for simulation scenarios.

Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:

**Proposal 1:** At least for FR1, RAN4 shall consider Handheld UE & VSAT UE with described characteristics:

* Handheld: Omnidirectional antenna, 500 km/h (e.g. on board a high speed train), Linear: +/-45°X-pol, up to 200 mW (UE power class 3)
* VSAT: Directive antenna (up to 60 cm equivalent aperture diameter), Up to 1200 km/h (e.g. aircraft mounted), Circular, up to 20 W

**Proposal 2:** Further discuss other UE-types to be considered for FR1 & FR2.

### Sub-topic 1-6 : Satellite types to be considered (transparent, regenerative);

*Sub-topic description: The RP to be used concerns only Rel-17 with transparent payload.*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-6:** Satellite types

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Transparent payload in Rel-17
  + Option 2: In general, two different satellite architectures can be considered: Transparent and Regenerative satellites.
  + Option 3: Satellites both in transparent and regenerative deployments should provide same performance in terms of RF characteristics.
* Recommended WF
  + Transparent payload in Rel-17

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: If possible, companies are encouraged to provide justification for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: Ok, that’s in the WI’s scope  Option 2: Why this option? Only transparent is considered in this WI, right?  Option 3: ok |
| Huawei | Based on the NTN WID, transparent payload is assumed. RAN4 will not consider the regenerative satellite. |
| Samsung | RAN4 should focus on Transparent payload in Rel17 which is aligned with WID. |
| DISH | Option 1: OK  Option 2: Not aligned with WID  Option 3: OK |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-6: regarding the transparent satellite or regenerative satellite, we don’t want to preclude anything at the beginning, if RF requirement are the same for transparent and regenerative satellite, then both should be supported. |
| Panasonic | Option 1: Yes  Option 2: No |
| Xiaomi | Option 1: Ok |
| MTK | Agree with option 1 only. |
| Nokia | Option 1: Agree  Option 2: Out of WI scope  Option 3: Yes, they should perform accordingly but for now regenerative is out of WI scope. |
| Intelsat | Support Option 3 |
| HNS/Ech | Option 1: Already in the WI  Option 2: Transparent in Rel-17  Option 3: OK. |
| Thales | Transparent |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| DISH | Agree |  |
| Panasonic | Agree |  |
| MTK | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | Regenerative is out of WI scope |
| Intelsat | Agree |  |
| HNS/Ech | Agree |  |
| Thales | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Main feedbacks:

* In early proposals some companies suggested/recalled regenerative scenarios. However, there is a full agreement that only transparent satellite scenarios will be considered by RAN4 in Rel-17.

Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:

**Proposal 1:** Transparent payload (on board NTN vehicle) to be considered by RAN4 in Rel-17.

### Sub-topic 1-7 : Satellite constellation to be considered (LEO, GEO);

*Sub-topic description: Several scenarios have been considered with LEO, GEO, HAPS, etc. and different exemplary bands in FR1 and FR2.*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-7:** Satellite constellation

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For exemplary band S, RAN4 should consider scenarios C1.1, C2.1 (LEO Earth Fixed Beams and Earth Moving Beams) and A1 (GEO).
    - C1.1: LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams
    - C2.1: LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth moving beams
    - A1: GEO @ 35,786 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams
  + Option 2: The discussion related to this WI within RAN4 should focus only on LEO, GEO and HAPS deployment until decision for ATG have been made by RAN.
  + Option 3:
    - Some scenarios, such as LEO, GEO, HAPS and ATG are considered for NTN system.
    - Satellite orbits/GEO, LEO-1200, LEO-600
* Recommended WF1
  + Down-scope the number of scenarios to LEO @600km (Earth Fixed Beams and Earth Moving Beams) and GEO.
* Recommended WF2
  + Focus only on LEO, GEO and HAPS deployment until decision for ATG have been made by RAN.
* Recommended WF3
  + Focus only on LEO @600km (Earth Fixed Beams and Earth Moving Beams), GEO and HAPS deployment until decision for ATG have been made by RAN.

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: If possible, companies are encouraged to provide justification for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: No, S band has not yet been chosen as the examplary band.  Option 2: Yes, ATG is a separate WI, not yet agreed in RAN.  Option 3: Yes, but not HAPS, HIBS. |
| Huawei | If some scenarios have no supporting companies or operators, RAN4 can down-scope the number of scenarios considering the large scope and workload. In this release, we can focus on satellite scenario. |
| Samsung | Support further down-scope the number of scenarios considering the workload of RAN4. |
| DISH | Option 1: S band has not been agreed as exemplary band. Hence the proposal is not valid yet. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-7: fine to focus on LEO and GEO, more clarifications on moving and fixed beams and impacts on coexistence performance. |
| Panasonic | Option 1: Yes  Option 2: Yes  Option 3: No (ATG should be considered in other WI) |
| Nokia | Option 1: It is to early to determine this as the frequency band has not been chosen yet. Also, HAPS are missing as a scenario.  Option 2: Yes, ATG is to be considered for separate WI by RAN  Option 3: Fine to consider different scenarios but not for ATG as described above. |
| Intelsat | Support option 3 |
| HNS/Ech | Option 1: OK  Option 2: OK  Option 3: OK but not for HAPS and ATG |
| Thales | Option 1: Yes  Option 2: Yes |
| Loon | Agree with Nokia |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward(s) stated above? Which way forward do you prefer? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward(s) stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Partially | WF1 and WF3: disagree, only LEO @600km was not proposed in the options and shall be justified anyway.  WF2: ok |
| Huawei |  | We need to consider the demand and implementation when choosing scenario. |
| Samsung |  | Support WF2 as a generic approach, meanwhile also support further down-scope the number of scenarios considering the workload of RAN4. |
| Panasonic | Agree |  |
| MTK | Agree with WF2 | No view on WF1 and WF3 |
| Nokia |  | WF1: Disagree HAPS is not included  WF2: Agree  WF3: Do not agree as is. However, we support down-scoping of scenarios and would like operator demand to help determining which scenario is the most essential. |
| Intelsat | Support WF3 |  |
| HNS/Ech | partially | WF1, WF2 – should follow the approved WI in RAN  WF3 – partial |
| Thales | Support WF1 & WP3 |  |
| Loon |  | WFI: HAPS is not included  WF2: Agree |
|  |  |  |

Main feedbacks:

* No clear agreement.

Moderator suggests removing “S band” (replaced with FR1) from option 1, plus specifying “satellite” and proposes:

**Proposal 1:** For exemplary band in FR1, RAN4 should consider **at least** satellite scenarios C1.1, C2.1 (LEO Earth Fixed Beams and Earth Moving Beams) and A1 (GEO):

* + - C1.1: LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams
    - C2.1: LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth moving beams
    - A1: GEO @ 35,786 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams

**Proposal 2:** Furtherinclude following scenarios:

* + - C1.2: LEO @ 1200 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams
    - C2.2: LEO @ 1200 km altitude, FR1, Earth moving beams

**Proposal 3:** Further discuss “worst case” scenarios in terms of orbit, transmission power, coexistence and Doppler.

**Proposal 4:** Further discuss if and which HAPS scenarios should be considered by RAN4 as part of the WI NR-NTN-solutions.

**Proposal 5:** ATG is to be considered for separate WI by RAN.

### Sub-topic 1-8 : Satellite specific parameters to be considered

*Sub-topic description:* Satellite specific parameters to be considered by RAN4 work

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-8:** Satellite specific parameters

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 should use TR 38.821 assumptions for satellite parameters.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + Down-scope the number of scenarios for satellite specific parameters in TS 38.821

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: If possible, companies are encouraged to provide justification for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: may bem this could be a starting point but shall be further analyzed when going into details. |
| Huawei | TR 38.821 can be a baseline. Other assumptions aren’t excluded. |
| Samsung | Support to take TR 38.821 as baseline while further discussion on details and down-scope the scenarios are needed. |
| DISH | Option 1: How do we handle the different assumptions for certain frequencies (e.g Handheld 2GHz NF=7dB for non-terrestrial while for terrestrial NF=9dB was used)? Other assumptions should not be precluded. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-8: fine to follow the TR 38.821, however some parameter like power control, ACIR model should be discussed in RAN4. |
| Panasonic | Option 1: Yes |
| Nokia | Option 1: Can serve as a starting point but e.g. HAPS should also be added. |
| Intelsat | Option 1 may be a starting point |
| HNS/Ech | Option 1 OK |
| Thales | Yes for Option 1 |
| Loon/Google | Option 1: Add HAPS |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |  |
| Panasonic | Agree |  |
| Nokia | partially | Fine to down scope as long as HAPS is still included |
| HNS/Ech |  | Should align with approved WID in RAN |
| Thales | Agree |  |
| Loon/Google | Partially | Agree with Nokia |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:

**Proposal 1:** Use TR 38.821 as a baseline/starting point, as long as HAPS is still included, and NTN study aligns with WID in RAN.

**Proposal 2:** FFS the down selection of TR 38.821 scenarios for satellite specific parameters.

### Sub-topic 1-9 : RAN4 should start considering a list of potential RF core and demodulation KPIs with respect to considered NTN use cases

*Sub-topic description: An initial list with potential (core) NTN RF core and demodulation KPIs should be considered*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-9:** Potential list of NTN-related RF KPIs

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 should start to establish a list with (preliminary) RF core parameters for NTN
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + Use 3GPP TS 38.101-1 and 38.101-2 for choosing RF UE parameters to be considered with priority for NTN
  + Use ETSI essential parameters from harmonized standard when possible (e.g. ETSI EN 302 574-2 V2.1.1 (2016-06))
  + Companies are invited to select/recommend parameters to be considered with priority for NTN
  + Identify other required (NTN-specific) parameters
  + Where is possible, down-scope parameters only to some essential NTN parameters

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: If possible, companies are encouraged to provide justification for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: RAN4 has already specified a list of RF parameters, both for UE and BS |
| Huawei | It’s too early to discuss the RF core requirements. At this stage, we need to discuss the example band and scenario. Besides, it’s unclear which and what kind of device will be normalized from RF perspective. |
| DISH | Option 1: RAN4 has a list of specified parameters for both UE and BS. Having a different list for UE’s operating at same frequency ranges with different list or requirements would be very confusing. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-9: prefer to discuss 3GPP based requirement instead of ETSI based. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer to identify the example bands first before going to the detail RF core requirements. |
| MTK | Agree with option 1. Specifically, prioritise Use 3GPP TS 38.101-1 and 38.101-2 for choosing RF UE parameters to be considered with priority for NTN |
| Qualcomm | Option 1: RF UE requirements listed in TS 38.101-1 and 38.101-2 can be the starting point. |
| Nokia | Option 1: RAN4 already has specified RF parameters which all should be considered. More time and discussion are needed related to numerous prerequisite assumptions before considering modifications. In addition, multiple items are highly dependent on progress in other RAN groups. |
| Intelsat | Agree with Option 1 |
| HNS/Ech | Agree with Ericsson |
| Thales | RAN4 has already specified a list of RF parameters, both for UE and BS TN, but not for NTN. The proposal was to prioritize some of NTN requirements to be looked at first. This is not suggesting excluding other important parameters/requirements. |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Disagree | RAN4 has already specified a list of RF parameters, both for UE and BS.  RAN4 shall not comment on requirements in ETSI Harmonized Standard. |
| Huawei | Disagree | Same view with Ericsson. |
| DISH | Disagree | Same view with E// and Huawei. In addition, the WF itself is procedurally very unclear. |
| MTK | Disagree | Same view as Ericsson and other companies. Should adopt all existing RAN4 working practices and focus solely on the definition of 3GPP specifications. |
| Nokia | Disagree | RAN4 should not ‘select’ and ‘choose’ which parameters to follow from other standardization bodies but used already defined parameters by RAN4 when available. |
| Intelsat | Disagree | Same view as MTK |
| HNS/Ech | Disagree | This is not a WF – confusing alternatives |
| Thales |  | **Clarification:** is not a question of “select” and “chose” but a question of “prioritizing” already defined RAN4 parameters and potentially considering new ones.  At least ACS and ACLR parameters should be considered with priority for NTN networks (RF UE & RF BS). These parameters could be probably relaxed, at least for NTN BS.  Other parameters such as REFSENS should remain the same as in TN, particularly for NTN UE, in order to provide operational compatibility across TN and NTN with the same UE. |
|  |  |  |

**Question: Which of the following parameters/requirements should be treated with priority? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” only if parameter should be treated with priority.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Essential Parameter**  **(**ETSI EN 302 574-2 V2.1.1 (2016-06)**)** | **Parameter Name** | **Parameter Meaning** | **Company view**  [please add comment only if the parameter should be treated with priority] |
| Spectrum emissions mask | Spectrum emission mask | The spectrum emission mask of the UE applies to frequencies (ΔfOOB) starting from the +/- edge of the assigned channel bandwidth. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements.  Company B:  Company C: |
| Adjacent Channel Leakage Power Ratio (ACLR) | Adjacent Channel Leakage power Ratio (ACLR) is the ratio of the filtered mean power centred on the assigned channel frequency to the filtered mean power centred on an adjacent channel frequency. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements.  Company B:  Company C: |
| Conducted spurious emissions from the transmitter antenna connector | Transmitter spurious emissions | Spurious emissions are emissions which are caused by unwanted transmitter effects such as harmonics emission, parasitic emission, intermodulation products and frequency conversion products, but exclude out-of-band emissions.  The spurious emission limits are specified in terms of general requirements in line with Recommendation ITU-R SM.329-12.  To improve measurement accuracy, sensitivity and efficiency, the resolution bandwidth may be smaller than the measurement bandwidth. When the resolution bandwidth is smaller than the measurement bandwidth, the result should be integrated over the measurement bandwidth in order to obtain the equivalent noise bandwidth of the measurement bandwidth. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements. |
| Accuracy of maximum output power | Maximum output power | UE Power Classes define the maximum output power for any transmission bandwidth within the channel bandwidth. The period of measurement shall be at least one sub-frame (1 ms). The nominal maximum output power and its tolerance are defined according to the power class of the UE. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements. |
| Prevention of harmful interference through control of power | Minimum output power | The minimum controlled output power of the UE is defined as the broadband transmit power of the UE, i.e. the power in the channel bandwidth for all transmit bandwidth configurations (resource blocks), when the power is set to a minimum value. The minimum controlled output power of the UE is when the power is set to a minimum value. The minimum transmit power is defined as a mean power in one time slot. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements. |
| Conducted spurious emissions from the receiver antenna connector | Receiver spurious emissions | The spurious emissions power is the power of emissions generated or amplified in a receiver that appear at the UE antenna connector. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements. |
| Impact of interference on receiver performance | Blocking characteristics | The blocking characteristic is a measure of the receiver's ability to receive a wanted signal at its assigned channel frequency in the presence of an unwanted interferer on frequencies other than those of the spurious response or the adjacent channels, without this unwanted input signal causing a degradation of the performance of the receiver beyond a specified limit. The blocking performance shall apply at all frequencies except those at which a spurious response occur.  The throughput shall be ≥ 95 % of the maximum throughput of the reference measurement channels as specified (e.g. in ETSI TS 136 521-1). | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements. |
| Receiver spurious response | Spurious response is a measure of the receiver's ability to receive a wanted signal on its assigned channel frequency without exceeding a given degradation due to the presence of an unwanted Continuous Wave (CW) interfering signal at any other frequency at which a response is obtained i.e. for which the out-of-band blocking limit (as specified) is not met.  The throughput shall be ≥ 95 % of the maximum throughput of the reference measurement channels as specified in (e.g. in ETSI TS 136 521-1). | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements. |
| Receiver inter-modulation characteristics | Intermodulation response rejection is a measure of the capability of the receiver to receive a wanted signal on its assigned channel frequency in the presence of two or more interfering signals which have a specific frequency relationship to the wanted signal.  The throughput shall be ≥ 95 % of the maximum throughput of the reference measurement channels as specified (e.g. in ETSI TS 136 521-1). | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements. |
| Receiver adjacent channel selectivity | Receiver Adjacent Channel Selectivity (ACS) | Adjacent Channel Selectivity (ACS) is a measure of a receiver's ability to receive a signal at its assigned channel frequency in the presence of an adjacent channel signal at a given frequency offset from the centre frequency of the assigned channel. ACS is the ratio of the receive filter attenuation on the assigned channel frequency to the receive filter attenuation on the adjacent channel(s).  The throughput Rav shall be ≥ 95 % of the maximum throughput of the reference measurement channels as specified in ETSI (e.g. TS 136 521-1) under the specified conditions. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements. |
| (Optional) Control and monitoring functions | Control and monitoring functions | This requirement verifies that the control and monitoring functions of the UE prevent it from transmitting in the absence of a valid network. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements. |
| Out of synchronisation handling of output power | The UE shall monitor the downlink signal (associated to the transmission signal of the two ways services) in order to detect a loss of the signal. Upon quality level threshold detection, the UE shall stop transmitting. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall not comment ETSI EN requirements. |
| .. |  |  |  |

**Question: Which of the following parameters/requirements should be treated with priority? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” only if parameter should be treated with priority.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Essential Parameter**  (e.g. 3GPP TS 38.101-1) | **Parameter Name** | **Parameter Meaning** | **Company view**  [please add comment only if the parameter should be treated with priority] |
| Transmitter characteristics - Transmitter power | UE maximum output power | UE Power Classes define the maximum output power for any transmission bandwidth within the channel bandwidth of NR carrier unless otherwise stated. The period of measurement shall be at least one sub frame (1ms). | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, ....Company B:  Company C: |
| UE maximum output power reduction | UE is allowed to reduce the maximum output power due to higher order modulations and transmit bandwidth configurations. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .....Company B:  Company C: |
| UE additional maximum output power reduction | To meet the additional requirements, additional maximum power reduction (A-MPR) is allowed for the maximum output power. Each additional emission requirement is associated with a unique network signalling (NS) value indicated in RRC signalling by an NR frequency band number of the applicable operating band and an associated value in the field *additionalSpectrumEmission.* | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Configured transmitted power | The UE is allowed to set its configured maximum output power PCMAX,f,c for carrier f of serving cell c in each slot. The configured maximum output power PCMAX,f,c is set within some defined bounds. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Transmitter characteristics – Output power dynamics | Minimum output power | The minimum controlled output power of the UE is defined as the power in the channel bandwidth for all transmit bandwidth configurations (resource blocks), when the power is set to a minimum value. The minimum output power is defined as the mean power in at least one sub-frame 1 ms. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Transmit OFF power | Transmit OFF power is defined as the mean power in the channel bandwidth when the transmitter is OFF. The transmitter is considered OFF when the UE is not allowed to transmit on any of its ports. The “transmit OFF” power is defined as the mean power in a duration of at least one sub-frame (1 ms) excluding any transient periods. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Transmit ON/OFF time mask | The transmit power time mask defines the transient period(s) allowed 1) between transmit OFF power as defined and transmit ON power symbols (transmit ON/OFF) and 2) between continuous ON-power transmissions with power change or RB hopping. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Power control | The absolute power tolerance is the ability of the UE transmitter to set its initial output power to a specific value for the first sub-frame (1 ms) at the start of a contiguous transmission or non-contiguous transmission with a transmission gap larger than 20 ms.  The tolerance includes the channel estimation error.  The relative power tolerance is the ability of the UE transmitter to set its output power in a target sub-frame (1 ms) relatively to the power of the most recently transmitted reference sub-frame (1 ms) if the transmission gap between these sub-frames is less than or equal to 20 ms.  The aggregate power control tolerance is the ability of the UE transmitter to maintain its power in a sub-frame (1 ms) during non-contiguous transmissions within 21 ms in response to 0 dB commands with respect to the first UE transmission and all other power control parameters as specified in TS 38.213 kept constant. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Transmitter characteristics – Transmit signal quality | Frequency error | The UE basic measurement interval of modulated carrier frequency is 1 UL slot. The mean value of basic measurements of UE modulated carrier frequency shall be accurate to within ± 0.1 PPM observed over a period of 1 ms of cumulated measurement intervals compared to the carrier frequency received from the NR Node B. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Transmit modulation quality - Error Vector Magnitude (EVM) | The Error Vector Magnitude is a measure of the difference between the reference waveform and the measured waveform. This difference is called the error vector. Before calculating the EVM the measured waveform is corrected by the sample timing offset and RF frequency offset. Then the carrier leakage shall be removed from the measured waveform before calculating the EVM.. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Transmit modulation quality - Carrier leakage | Carrier leakage is an additive sinusoid waveform whose frequency is the same as the modulated waveform carrier frequency. The measurement interval is one slot in the time domain. The relative carrier leakage power is a power ratio of the additive sinusoid waveform and the modulated waveform. The relative carrier leakage power shall not exceed the specified values. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Transmit modulation quality - In-band emissions | The in-band emission is defined as the average emission across 12 sub-carriers and as a function of the RB offset from the edge of the allocated UL transmission bandwidth. The in-band emission is measured as the ratio of the UE output power in a non–allocated RB to the UE output power in an allocated RB.  The basic in-band emissions measurement interval is defined over one slot in the time domain; however, the minimum requirement applies when the in-band emission measurement is averaged over 10 sub-frames. The average of the basic in-band emission measurement over 10 sub-frames shall not exceed the specified values. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Transmit modulation quality - EVM equalizer spectrum flatness | The zero-forcing equalizer correction applied in the EVM measurement process (as specified by 3GPP) must meet a spectral flatness requirement for the EVM measurement to be valid. The EVM equalizer spectrum flatness is defined in terms of the maximum peak-to-peak ripple of the equalizer coefficients (dB) across the allocated uplink block. The basic measurement interval is the same as for EVM.  The peak-to-peak variation of the EVM equalizer coefficients contained within the frequency range of the uplink allocation shall not exceed the maximum ripple specified for normal conditions.  The EVM equalizer spectral flatness shall not exceed the values specified for extreme conditions. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Transmitter characteristics – Output RF spectrum emissions | Occupied bandwidth | Occupied bandwidth is defined as the bandwidth containing 99 % of the total integrated mean power of the transmitted spectrum on the assigned channel. The occupied bandwidth for all transmission bandwidth configurations (Resources Blocks) shall be less than the specified channel bandwidth. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Out of band emission - Spectrum emission mask | The spectrum emission mask of the UE applies to frequencies (ΔfOOB) starting from the edge of the assigned NR channel bandwidth.  For frequencies offset greater than ΔfOOB, the spurious requirements are applicable. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Out of band emission - Additional spectrum emission mask | Additional spectrum emission requirements are signalled by the network to indicate that the UE shall meet an additional requirement for a specific deployment scenario as part of the cell handover/broadcast message. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Out of band emission - Adjacent channel leakage ratio (ACLR) | Adjacent Channel Leakage power Ratio (ACLR) is the ratio of the filtered mean power centred on the assigned channel frequency to the filtered mean power centred on an adjacent channel frequency.  To improve measurement accuracy, sensitivity and efficiency, the resolution bandwidth may be smaller than the measurement bandwidth. When the resolution bandwidth is smaller than the measurement bandwidth, the result should be integrated over the measurement bandwidth in order to obtain the equivalent noise bandwidth of the measurement bandwidth.  NR Adjacent Channel Leakage power Ratio (NRACLR) is the ratio of the filtered mean power centred on the assigned NR channel frequency to the filtered mean power centred on an adjacent NR channel frequency at nominal channel spacing. The assigned NR channel power and adjacent NR channel power are measured with rectangular filters with specified measurement bandwidths. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Spurious emissions | Spurious emissions are emissions which are caused by unwanted transmitter effects such as harmonics emission, parasitic emissions, intermodulation products and frequency conversion products, but exclude out of band emissions unless otherwise stated. The spurious emission limits are specified in terms of general requirements in line with SM.329 and NR operating band requirement to address UE co-existence.  Unless otherwise stated, the spurious emission limits apply for the frequency ranges that are more than FOOB (MHz) from the edge of the channel bandwidth. The spurious emission limits apply for all considered transmitter band configurations (NRB) and channel bandwidths.  Additional spurious emission requirements may be signalled by the network to indicate that the UE shall meet an additional requirement for a specific deployment scenario as part of the cell handover/broadcast message. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Transmit intermodulation | The transmit intermodulation performance is a measure of the capability of the transmitter to inhibit the generation of signals in its nonlinear elements caused by presence of the wanted signal and an interfering signal reaching the transmitter via the antenna.  UE transmit intermodulation is defined by the ratio of the mean power of the wanted signal to the mean power of the intermodulation product when an interfering Continuous Wave (CW) signal is added at a level below the wanted signal at each transmitter antenna port with the other antenna port(s) if any terminated. Both the wanted signal power and the intermodulation product power are measured through NR rectangular filter | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Receiver characteristics | Diversity characteristics | The UE is required to be equipped with a minimum of two Rx antenna ports in all operating bands (except for the bands n7, n38, n41, n77, n78, n79 where the UE is required to be equipped with a minimum of four Rx antenna ports). This requirement applies when the band is used as a standalone band or as part of a band combination.  The UE shall be verified with two Rx antenna ports in all supported frequency bands.  Additional requirements for four Rx ports shall be verified in operating bands where the UE is equipped with four Rx antenna ports. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Reference sensitivity | The reference sensitivity power level REFSENS is the minimum mean power applied to each one of the UE antenna ports for all UE categories, at which the throughput shall meet or exceed the requirements for the specified reference measurement channel.  The throughput shall be ≥ 95 % of the maximum throughput of the reference measurement channels as specified. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Maximum input level | Maximum input level is defined as the maximum mean power received at the UE antenna port, at which the specified relative throughput shall meet or exceed the minimum requirements for the specified reference measurement channel.  The throughput shall be ≥ 95 % of the maximum throughput of the reference measurement channels as specified. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Adjacent channel selectivity (ACS) | Adjacent channel selectivity (ACS) is a measure of a receiver's ability to receive an NR signal at its assigned channel frequency in the presence of an adjacent channel signal at a given frequency offset from the centre frequency of the assigned channel. ACS is the ratio of the receive filter attenuation on the assigned channel frequency to the receive filter attenuation on the adjacent channel(s).  These requirements apply for all values of an adjacent channel interferer up to -25 dBm and for any SCS specified for the channel bandwidth of the wanted signal. However, it is not possible to directly measure the ACS; instead a lower and upper range of test parameters are chosen for the verification of the specified requirements.  For these test parameters, the throughput shall be ≥ 95 % of the maximum throughput of the reference measurement channels as specified. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Blocking characteristics - In-band blocking | For NR bands with FDL\_high < 2700 MHz and FUL\_high < 2700 MHz in-band blocking (IBB) is defined for an unwanted interfering signal falling into the UE receive band or into the first 15 MHz below or above the UE receive band.  The throughput of the wanted signal shall be ≥ 95 % of the maximum throughput of the specified reference measurement channels.  The relative throughput requirement shall be met for any SCS specified for the channel bandwidth of the wanted signal. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Blocking characteristics - Out-of-band blocking | For NR bands with FDL\_high < 2700 MHz and FUL\_high < 2700 MHz out-of-band band blocking is defined for an unwanted CW interfering signal falling outside a frequency range 15 MHz below or above the UE receive band.  The throughput of the wanted signal shall be ≥ 95% of the maximum throughput of the specified reference measurement channels.  The relative throughput requirement shall be met for any SCS specified for the channel bandwidth of the wanted signal. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Blocking characteristics - Narrow band blocking | This requirement is measure of a receiver's ability to receive a NR signal at its assigned channel frequency in the presence of an unwanted narrow band CW interferer at a frequency, which is less than the nominal channel spacing.  The relative throughput shall be ≥ 95 % of the maximum throughput of the specified reference measurement channels. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Spurious response | Spurious response is a measure of the ability of the receiver to receive a wanted signal on its assigned channel frequency without exceeding a given degradation due to the presence of an unwanted CW interfering signal at any other frequency for which a response is obtained, i.e. for which the out-of-band blocking limit (as specified) is not met.  The throughput shall be ≥ 95 % of the maximum throughput of the specified reference measurement channels. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Intermodulation characteristics | Intermodulation response rejection is a measure of the capability of the receiver to receive a wanted signal on its assigned channel frequency in the presence of two or more interfering signals which have a specific frequency relationship to the wanted signal.  The wide band intermodulation requirement is defined using a CW carrier and modulated NR signal as interferer 1 and interferer 2 respectively.  The throughput shall be ≥ 95 % of the maximum throughput of the specified reference measurement channels. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| Spurious emissions | The spurious emissions power is the power of emissions generated or amplified in a receiver that appear at the UE antenna connector.  The power of any narrow band CW spurious emission shall not exceed the specified maximum level. | Ericsson: RAN4 shall follow usual approach to specify RF requirements, starting with coexistence simulations, REFSENS, .... |
| .. |  |  |  |

Main feedbacks:

* It seems too early to discuss the requirements.

Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:

**Proposal 1:** Use 3GPP TS 38.101-1 and 38.101-2 for NTN RF UE requirements.

**Proposal 2:** For some selected UE RF requirements, it is expected to adopt same performance requirements (e.g. REFSENS, Tx Power) for NTN to ensure operational compatibility across NTN and TN.

**Proposal 3:** Select exemplary bands before going to the detail of RF core requirements.

**Proposal 4:** Possible adaptations based on the co-existence studies outcomes (NTN with TN or NTN with NTN) may be considered for NTN RF BS requirements.

### Sub-topic 1-10 : Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam

*Sub-topic description: RAN4 should consider both Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam; Please also note that fixed Tracking Area is considered on ground level.*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-10:** Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 should consider both Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + Consider both Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam for RAN4 scenarios

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: If possible, companies are encouraged to provide justification for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: Ok |
| Huawei | We need to identify the impact on RF requirements and simulation assumption for Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-10: as mentioned in sub-topic 1-7, impacts between moving and fixed beam on coexistence study should be clarified.  Sub topic 1-11: clear list of coexistence scenarios are needed as in [*R4-2016112*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016112.zip) |
| Panasonic | Option 1: Yes |
| Nokia | Option 1: This is okay to us, but a suggestion could be to focus on Earth moving beams as these in our opinion would cover the Earth fixed beams as a deployment scenario. |
| Intelsat | Support Option 1 |
| HNS/Ech | Opt 1 : OK |
| Eutelsat | Option 1: Yes both should be considered. |
| Thales | Yes |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |  |
| Panasonic | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Nokia |  | See comments to options above |
| Intelsat | Agree |  |
| HNS/Ech | Agree |  |
| Eutelsat | Agree |  |
| Thales | Agree |  |

Based on the above, the moderator suggests for discussion:

**Proposal 1:** RAN4 should consider both Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam.

**Proposal 2:** Impacts between moving and fixed beam on coexistence study should be clarified. Further discussions are required to identify the respective impact on RF requirements and simulation assumption for Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam.

### Sub-topic 1-11 : Simulation scenarios

*Sub-topic description:* Simulation scenarios to be taken into account by RAN4 work

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 1-11:** Simulations

* Proposals
  + Option 1: The simulation scenarios are based on the permutation and combination between NTN scenario and TN scenario.
  + Option 2: Networks layout and NTN UEs distribution would need further alignment.
  + Option 3: Incorporate parameters from previous sub-topics 1-1 to 1-10
* Recommended WF
  + Incorporate parameters from previous sub-topics/issues 1-1 to 1-10
  + The simulation scenarios are based on the permutation and combination between NTN scenario and TN scenario.
  + Networks layout and NTN UEs distribution would need further alignment.

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: If possible, companies are encouraged to provide justification for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: Yes  Option 2: Ok  Option 3: Ok |
| Huawei | It’s very important to outline the simulation scenarios. Both NTN to TN and NTN to NTN in adjacent bands for FR1 should be considered. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 1-11: clear list of coexistence scenarios are needed as in [*R4-2016112*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016112.zip) |
| Qualcomm | Option 1/2/3: Yes |
| Nokia | Clearly further discussion is needed but as the options an all general they are fine. |
| Intelsat | Support Option 1/2/3 |
| Thales | Yes for Options 1/2/3 |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Nokia |  | See comments to options above |
| HNS Ech | Partially | Need further discussion |
| Thales | Agree | Further discussion is required. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Based on the above, the moderator suggests for discussion:

**Proposal 1:** The simulation scenarios shall be defined based on the permutation and/or combination between NTN/TN or NTN/NTN scenarios.

**Proposal 2:** Networks layout (cell coverage for NTN and TN) and NTN UEs distribution would need to be further aligned.

**Proposal 3:** Further discuss simulation assumptions and the down selection of scenarios for the coexistence studies.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 1-1:  Sub topic 1-2:  Sub topic 1-3:  Sub topic 1-4:  Sub topic 1-5:  Sub topic 1-6:  Sub topic 1-7:  Sub topic 1-8:  Sub topic 1-9:  Sub topic 1-10:  Sub topic 1-11:  ….  Others: |
| ZTE |  |
| Nokia | Our comments are reflected in questions/tables included in the sub topics. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommandation** |
| [*R4-2014381*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014381.zip) | Ericsson: There should a RAN4 specific Work Plan so that RAN4 could accept it.  Why should we discuss any band specific requirement in 98->102? That should be done in separate WI.  It might be too early to start demodulations discussion already in January.  No plan for simulations? |
| Nokia: Similar concerns as Ericsson. |
|  | Thales proposes to revise the work plan by replacing   * “Further discuss on band(s) specific requirements”   By   * “Further discuss on specific requirements associated the selected exemplary bands as well as the necessary simulations” |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Issue 1-1:** Sources of Information | Proposed WF with respect to sources:   * 9 companies partially agree * 3 companies agree   However, all companies seem to agree that coexistence studies are necessary in RAN4. RAN4 should therefore conduct independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements for NTN.  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** RAN4 should consider all the relevant sources (including but not limited to ITU-R Radio Regulations, relevant national regulations, pre-existing Harmonized Standards developed for example in ETSI, coexistence studies approved by regulatory bodies and/or 3GPP specifications) in order to specify NTN RF requirements.  **Proposal 2:** RAN4 should select appropriate exemplary bands for NTN and to carry the needed adjacent channel coexistence studies in order to specify NTN RF requirements.  **Proposal 3:** 3GPP RAN4 should provide/conduct relative independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements for NTN.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 1-2:** Frequency Ranges | Proposed WF with respect to frequency ranges:   * 8 companies partially agree * 6 companies agree   For FR1 there seems to be a consensus. For FR2 not clear so far. Companies raised concerns with respect to proposed frequency out of 3GPP FR2 and coexistence between TN TDD with NTN FDD in FR2.  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** At least one exemplary frequency band per FR1 should be defined for satellite.  **Proposal 2:** At least one exemplary frequency band per FR2 should be defined for satellite.  **Proposal 3:** It may be possible to consider an exemplary band (with similar usage conditions as FR2 band) for which UL or DL or both can be below 24.25GHz.  **Proposal 4:** Although RAN4 will select exemplary band(s) in the current NR-NTN-solutions WI, the definition of additional NR bands for satellite will be part of dedicated RAN4 led Release-17 work items.  **Proposal 5:** The frequency ranges considered for satellite should be spectrum allocated by ITU to satellite (MSS) as a primary service. FFS whether FSS spectrum can be considered.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 1-3:** Coexistence studies | Main feedbacks:   * No agreements are possible so far on the suggested WFs. * Companies agree that co-existence simulation of NTN is required and should be further simulated and discussed. * Concerns are raised with respect to ACS & ACLR values to be considered by the TN. * Moreover, it seems that for the time being is not clear how NTN/TN layout would look like, how satellite(s) would overlap IMT network(s),   Moderator suggests further discussing about ACS & ACLR requirements to be respected for TN when coexistence with NTN, depending on FR and BW configuration, and also further discussing about the NTN/TN layout in the simulation section.  No clear agreement so far. Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** RAN4 should further discuss and decide ACS & ACLR requirements to be considered for TN in the coexistence study with NTN, depending on FR and BW configuration.  **Proposal 2:** Further discuss the frequency reuse factor to be considered for the coexistence studies (which could be FR specific).  **Proposal 3:** No impact on IMT network is a pre-requisite.  **Proposal 4:** For coexistence studied, both NTN/NTN and NTN/TN in adjacent channels should be considered.  **Proposal 5:** NTN RF requirements shall be specified assuming no impact on TN RF requirements.  **Proposal 6:** RAN4 need to consider how to take into account the heterogeneous cell patterns of NTN and TN networks assuming that they serve the same areas.  **Proposal 7:** Down-select from a list with approx. 70 coexistence cases (x 2 Frequency Ranges) x 2 scenarios (Earth Fixed Beam, Earth Fixed Beam) x 3-4 BW configurations, from:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | | | **Set 1** | | | | **Set 2** | | | | | **GEO** | **LEO 600km** | **LEO 1200km** | **HIBS** | **GEO** | **LEO 600km** | **LEO 1200km** | **HIBS** | | **NR / NB-IoT** | **Rural** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | **Urban macro** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | **Dense Urban** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | **Micro/small cell outdoor** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | **Indoor hotspot** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | **NTN** | **GEO** | **Set 1** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | **LEO 1200km** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | **LEO 600km** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | **HIBS** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | **GEO** | **Set 2** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X | | **LEO 1200km** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X | | **LEO 600km** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X | | **HIBS** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X |   **Proposal 8:** Consider only NTN complementary cases e.g. 1 worst case and 1 best case (in terms of Doppler, received power) for x2 type of configurations (Earth Fixed Beam, Earth Fixed Beam) x 3-4 BW configurations.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 1-4:** HAPS/HIBS | Main feedbacks:   * HAPS may not be equivalent to HIBS, since potentially HAPS can be used for fixed service,   Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** RAN-WG4 may consider the definition of additional NR bands for HAPS as part of dedicated RAN4 led Release-17 work items.  **Proposal 2:** TSG-RAN to decide the change from “HAPS” to “HIBS” in the NTN WI  **Proposal 3:** LS to RAN plenary for guideline and the accurate definition for HAPS.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 1-5:** UE types | Main feedbacks:   * Some companies suggest is too early to make such decision with respect to UE-type. However, it would be useful for simulation scenarios.   Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** At least for FR1, RAN4 shall consider Handheld UE & VSAT UE with described characteristics:   * Handheld: Omnidirectional antenna, 500 km/h (e.g. on board a high speed train), Linear: +/-45°X-pol, up to 200 mW (UE power class 3) * VSAT: Directive antenna (up to 60 cm equivalent aperture diameter), Up to 1200 km/h (e.g. aircraft mounted), Circular, up to 20 W   **Proposal 2:** Further discuss other UE-types to be considered for FR1 & FR2.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 1-6:** Satellite types | Main feedbacks:   * In early proposals some companies suggested/recalled regenerative scenarios. However, there is a full agreement that only transparent satellite scenarios will be considered by RAN4 in Rel-17.   Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** Transparent payload (on board NTN vehicle) to be considered by RAN4 in Rel-17.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 1-7:** Satellite constellation | Main feedbacks:   * No clear agreement.   Moderator suggests removing “S band” (replaced with FR1) from option 1, plus specifying “satellite” and proposes:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** For exemplary band in FR1, RAN4 should consider **at least** satellite scenarios C1.1, C2.1 (LEO Earth Fixed Beams and Earth Moving Beams) and A1 (GEO):   * + - C1.1: LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams     - C2.1: LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth moving beams     - A1: GEO @ 35,786 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams   **Proposal 2:** Furtherinclude following scenarios:   * + - C1.2: LEO @ 1200 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams     - C2.2: LEO @ 1200 km altitude, FR1, Earth moving beams   **Proposal 3:** Further discuss “worst case” scenarios in terms of orbit, transmission power, coexistence and Doppler.  **Proposal 4:** Further discuss if and which HAPS scenarios should be considered by RAN4 as part of the WI NR-NTN-solutions.  **Proposal 5:** ATG is to be considered for separate WI by RAN.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 1-8:** Satellite specific parameters | Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** Use TR 38.821 as a baseline/starting point, as long as HAPS is still included, and NTN study aligns with WID in RAN.  **Proposal 2:** FFS the down selection of TR 38.821 scenarios for satellite specific parameters.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 1-9:** Potential list of NTN-related RF KPIs | Main feedbacks:   * It seems too early to discuss the requirements.   Based on the above, the moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** Use 3GPP TS 38.101-1 and 38.101-2 for NTN RF UE requirements.  **Proposal 2:** For some selected UE RF requirements, it is expected to adopt same performance requirements (e.g. REFSENS, Tx Power) for NTN to ensure operational compatibility across NTN and TN.  **Proposal 3:** Select exemplary bands before going to the detail of RF core requirements.  **Proposal 4:** Possible adaptations based on the co-existence studies outcomes (NTN with TN or NTN with NTN) may be considered for NTN RF BS requirements.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 1-10:** Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam | Based on the above, the moderator suggests for discussion:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** RAN4 should consider both Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam.  **Proposal 2:** Impacts between moving and fixed beam on coexistence study should be clarified. Further discussions are required to identify the respective impact on RF requirements and simulation assumption for Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 1-11:** Simulations | Based on the above, the moderator suggests for discussion:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** The simulation scenarios shall be defined based on the permutation and/or combination between NTN/TN or NTN/NTN scenarios.  **Proposal 2:** Networks layout (cell coverage for NTN and TN) and NTN UEs distribution would need to be further aligned.  **Proposal 3:** Further discuss simulation assumptions and the down selection of scenarios for the coexistence studies.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |

*Recommendations on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | Email discussion summary for [97e][312] NTN\_Solutions 2nd Round | WF |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

According to email discussion before the start of 2nd round, the moderator proposes the following update:

**“Issue 1-2. Proposal 5:** The frequency ranges considered for satellite should be spectrum allocated by ITU to satellite (MSS) as a primary service. FFS whether FSS spectrum can be considered.” **updated to**

**“Issue 1-2. Proposal 5:** The frequency ranges considered for satellite should be spectrum allocated by ITU to satellite services.”.

After a small correction, the following proposal has been also updated:

**“Issue 1-3. Proposal 8:** Consider only NTN complementary cases e.g. 1 worst case and 1 best case (in terms of Doppler, received power) for x2 type of configurations (Earth Fixed Beam, Earth Fixed Beam) x 3-4 BW configurations.” **updated to**

**“Issue 1-3. Proposal 8:** Consider only NTN **extreme** cases e.g. 1 worst case and 1 best case (in terms of Doppler, received power) for x2 type of configurations (**Earth Fixed Beam, Earth Moving Beam**) x 3-4 BW configurations.”

The following update has been also made (in order to better explain VSAT):

“**Issue 1-5. Proposal 1:** At least for FR1, RAN4 shall consider Handheld UE & VSAT UE with described characteristics:

* Handheld: Omnidirectional antenna, 500 km/h (e.g. on board a high speed train), Linear: +/-45°X-pol, up to 200 mW (UE power class 3)
* VSAT: Directive antenna (up to 60 cm equivalent aperture diameter), Up to 1200 km/h (e.g. aircraft mounted), Circular, up to 20 W” **updated to**

“**Issue 1-5. Proposal 1:** At least for FR1, RAN4 shall consider Handheld UE & VSAT UE with described characteristics:

* Handheld: Omnidirectional antenna, 500 km/h (e.g. on board a high speed train), Linear: +/-45°X-pol, up to 200 mW (UE power class 3)
* VSAT: Directive antenna (up to 60 cm equivalent aperture diameter), Up to 1200 km/h (e.g. mounted UE on a building or moving platforms, e.g., aircrafts, trains, vessels or vehicles. Examples of such UE can be ESIM and VSAT), Circular polarisation, up to 20 W Tx power.”.

Moreover, as a result of 1st round discussions, the moderator suggests to postpone some of the discussions for RAN4#98e as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** | **For #97e or Postponed for #98e** |
| **Issue 1-1:** Sources of Information | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 should consider all the relevant sources (including but not limited to ITU-R Radio Regulations, relevant national regulations, pre-existing Harmonized Standards developed for example in ETSI, coexistence studies approved by regulatory bodies and/or 3GPP specifications) in order to specify NTN RF requirements. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** RAN4 should select appropriate exemplary bands for NTN and to carry the needed adjacent channel coexistence studies in order to specify NTN RF requirements. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 3:** 3GPP RAN4 should provide/conduct relative independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements for NTN. | **#97e** |
| **Issue 1-2:** Frequency Ranges | **Proposal 1:** At least one exemplary frequency band per FR1 should be defined for satellite. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** At least one exemplary frequency band per FR2 should be defined for satellite. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 3:** It may be possible to consider an exemplary band (with similar usage conditions as FR2 band) for which UL or DL or both can be below 24.25GHz. | **Postponed to #98e** |
| **Proposal 4:** Although RAN4 will select exemplary band(s) in the current NR-NTN-solutions WI, the definition of additional NR bands for satellite will be part of dedicated RAN4 led Release-17 work items. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 5:** The frequency ranges considered for satellite should be spectrum allocated by ITU to satellite services. | **#97e; Revised version;** |
| **Issue 1-3:** Coexistence studies | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 should further discuss and decide ACS & ACLR requirements to be considered for TN in the coexistence study with NTN, depending on FR and BW configuration. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** Further discuss the frequency reuse factor to be considered for the coexistence studies (which could be FR specific). | **Postponed to #98e** |
| **Proposal 3:** No impact on IMT network is a pre-requisite. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 4:** For coexistence studied, both NTN/NTN and NTN/TN in adjacent channels should be considered. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 5:** NTN RF requirements shall be specified assuming no impact on TN RF requirements. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 6:** RAN4 need to consider how to take into account the heterogeneous cell patterns of NTN and TN networks assuming that they serve the same areas. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 7:** Down-select from a list with approx. 70 coexistence cases (x 2 Frequency Ranges) x 2 scenarios (Earth Fixed Beam, Earth Fixed Beam) x 3-4 BW configurations, from:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | | | **Set 1** | | | | **Set 2** | | | | | **GEO** | **LEO 600km** | **LEO 1200km** | **HIBS** | **GEO** | **LEO 600km** | **LEO 1200km** | **HIBS** | | **NR / NB-IoT** | **Rural** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | **Urban macro** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | **Dense Urban** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | **Micro/small cell outdoor** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | **Indoor hotspot** | | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | | **NTN** | **GEO** | **Set 1** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | **LEO 1200km** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | **LEO 600km** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | **HIBS** | X | X | X | X | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | | **GEO** | **Set 2** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X | | **LEO 1200km** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X | | **LEO 600km** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X | | **HIBS** | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | X | X | X | X | | **Postponed to #98e** |
| **Proposal 8:** Consider only NTN extreme cases e.g. 1 worst case and 1 best case (in terms of Doppler, received power) for x2 type of configurations (Earth Fixed Beam, Earth Moving Beam) x 3-4 BW configurations. | **Postponed to #98e** |
| **Issue 1-4:** HAPS/HIBS | **Proposal 1:** RAN-WG4 may consider the definition of additional NR bands for HAPS as part of dedicated RAN4 led Release-17 work items. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** TSG-RAN to decide the change from “HAPS” to “HIBS” in the NTN WI | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 3:** LS to RAN plenary for guideline and the accurate definition for HAPS. | **#97e** |
| **Issue 1-5:** UE types | **Proposal 1:** At least for FR1, RAN4 shall consider Handheld UE & VSAT UE with described characteristics:   * Handheld: Omnidirectional antenna, 500 km/h (e.g. on board a high speed train), Linear: +/-45°X-pol, up to 200 mW (UE power class 3) * VSAT: Directive antenna (up to 60 cm equivalent aperture diameter), Up to 1200 km/h (e.g. mounted UE on a building or moving platforms, e.g., aircrafts, trains, vessels or vehicles. Examples of such UE can be ESIM and VSAT), Circular polarisation, up to 20 W Tx power. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** Further discuss other UE-types to be considered for FR1 & FR2. | **#97e** |
| **Issue 1-6:** Satellite types | **Proposal 1:** Transparent payload (on board NTN vehicle) to be considered by RAN4 in Rel-17. | **Part of the WID, no discussion required** |
| **Issue 1-7:** Satellite constellation | **Proposal 1:** For exemplary band in FR1, RAN4 should consider **at least** satellite scenarios C1.1, C2.1 (LEO Earth Fixed Beams and Earth Moving Beams) and A1 (GEO):   * C1.1: LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams * C2.1: LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth moving beams * A1: GEO @ 35,786 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** Furtherinclude following scenarios:   * C1.2: LEO @ 1200 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams * C2.2: LEO @ 1200 km altitude, FR1, Earth moving beams | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 3:** Further discuss “worst case” scenarios in terms of orbit, transmission power, coexistence and Doppler. | **Postponed to #98e** |
| **Proposal 4:** Further discuss if and which HAPS scenarios should be considered by RAN4 as part of the WI NR-NTN-solutions. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 5:** ATG is to be considered for separate WI by RAN. | **#97e** |
| **Issue 1-8:** Satellite specific parameters | **Proposal 1:** Use TR 38.821 as a baseline/starting point, as long as HAPS is still included, and NTN study aligns with WID in RAN. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** FFS the down selection of TR 38.821 scenarios for satellite specific parameters. | **Postponed to #98e** |
| **Issue 1-9:** Potential list of NTN-related RF KPIs | **Proposal 1:** Use 3GPP TS 38.101-1 and 38.101-2 for NTN RF UE requirements. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** For some selected UE RF requirements, it is expected to adopt same performance requirements (e.g. REFSENS, Tx Power) for NTN to ensure operational compatibility across NTN and TN. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 3:** Select exemplary bands before going to the detail of RF core requirements. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 4:** Possible adaptations based on the co-existence studies outcomes (NTN with TN or NTN with NTN) may be considered for NTN RF BS requirements. | **#97e** |
| **Issue 1-10:** Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 should consider both Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** Impacts between moving and fixed beam on coexistence study should be clarified. Further discussions are required to identify the respective impact on RF requirements and simulation assumption for Earth fixed beam & Earth moving beam. | **Postponed to #98e** |
| **Issue 1-11:** Simulations | **Proposal 1:** The simulation scenarios shall be defined based on the permutation and/or combination between NTN/TN or NTN/NTN scenarios. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** Networks layout (cell coverage for NTN and TN) and NTN UEs distribution would need to be further aligned. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 3:** Further discuss simulation assumptions and the down selection of scenarios for the coexistence studies. | **#97e** |

Companies are further asked to answer with **AGREE** or **DISAGREE** or **AGREE WITH CHANGES** to the following tables:

**Question:** Do you agree with proposal **Issue 1-x. Proposal y?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-1, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-1, Proposal 2** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-1, Proposal 3** |
| Thales | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| MTK | AGRE WITH CHANGES | AGREE | AGREE |
| Panasonic | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ericsson | agree | agree | agree |
| Huawei | agree | agree | agree |
| Qualcomm | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Hughes/EchoStar | agree | agree | agree |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-2, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-2, Proposal 2** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-2, Proposal 4** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-2, Proposal 5** |
| Thales | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| MTK | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Panasonic | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ericsson | Agree with changes: When possible, ~~At least~~ one exemplary frequency band per FR1 should be defined for satellite | Agree with changes: When possible, ~~At least~~ one exemplary frequency band per FR2 should be defined for satellite | Agree | Agree with changes:  The frequency ranges considered for satellite should be spectrum allocated by ITU to mobile satellite services |
| Huawei | Agree with changes:  Only one exemplary FR1 band | Disagree. We can’t find the suitable FR2 exemplary band. | Agree with changes:  the definition of additional NR bands for satellite ~~will~~ can be part of dedicated RAN4 led ~~Release-17~~ work items based on RANp’s decision. | Agree with changes:  The frequency ranges considered for satellite should be spectrum allocated by ITU to mobile satellite services |
| Qualcomm | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ligado | Agree | Agree | Agree | Agree |
| Hughes/EchoStar | agree | agree | agree | agree |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-3, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-3, Proposal 3** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-3, Proposal 4** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-3, Proposal 5** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-3, Proposal 6** |
| Thales | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| MTK | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | - |
| Ericsson | disagree  Actually, I don’t understand the proposal: ACLR and ACS are deciding based on coexistence simulation results, they are not input to those coex studies… | agree | agree | What’s the difference with proposal 3?? | agree |
| Huawei | Disagree | agree | agree | agree | agree |
| Qualcomm | DISAGREE  Can moderator clarify what does this proposal mean? It is saying the simulation assumptions for TN network? | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ligado |  | Agree | Agree | Agree with change “significant impact” |  |
| Hughes/EchoStar | unclear | Vice-versa | agree | agree |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-4, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-4, Proposal 2** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-4, Proposal 3** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-5, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-5, Proposal 2** |
| Thales | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| MTK | - | - | - | AGREE | AGREE |
| Panasonic | AGREE |  |  | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ericsson | Disagree: no band has been proposed for HAPS so far, why should we already consider additional one? | Agree  As it was commented in the 1st round, HAPS is supposed to be used for fixed service, and fixed service is not in the scope of 3GPP RAN.  Anyway, some clarification is needed to make sure we all have the same understanding. | Disagree. No need to send any LS if the WI is proposed for update in next RAN meeting. | Agree with changes:  I don’t think we have ever agreed ESIM will be considered here, that should be further discussed. ESIM shall be removed from the proposal:  Examples of such UE can be ~~ESIM and~~ VSAT), Circular polarisation, up to 20 W Tx power. | agree |
| Huawei | Disagree: the definition of HAPS should be clarified firstly | Agree | Agree | Agree with changes:  We don’t need so much details. | Agree with changes:  FR2 can be removed. |
| Qualcomm | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ligado |  |  |  | Agree | Agree |
| Hughes/EchoStar | OK, should follow ITU allocation | RAN decision | agree | agree | agree |
| SoftBank | POSITION RESERVED:  It is better to clarify proposals 2/3 first then come back to this issue. | AGREE | AGREE | - | - |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-7, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-7, Proposal 2** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-7, Proposal 4** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-7, Proposal 5** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-8, Proposal 1** |
| Thales | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| MTK | - | - | - | AGREE | - |
| Panasonic | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ericsson | agree | agree | agree | agree | agree |
| Huawei | Agree | agree | Agree | Agree | Agree |
| Qualcomm | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ligado | Agree | Agree | Agree | Agree | Agree |
| Hughes/EchoStar | agree | agree |  | agree | agree |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-9, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-9, Proposal 2** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-9, Proposal 3** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-9, Proposal 4** |
| Thales | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| MTK | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ericsson | agree | Disagree  This is unknown for the time being, Moreover, REFSENS, Tx power are not performance requirements. | agree | Disagree, “adaptations” is too vague and too early to consider right now. |
| Huawei | Disagree, 38.101-2 is not applicable to FDD NTN UE | Disagree | agree | Disagree |
| Qualcomm | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ligado | Agree | Agree | Agree | Agree |
| Hughes/EchoStar | agree |  | agree | unclear |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-10, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-11, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-11, Proposal 2** | **Answer**  **Issue 1-11, Proposal 3** |
| Thales | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| MTK | - | - | - | - |
| Panasonic | AGREE |  |  |  |
| Ericsson | agree | agree | But this is similar proposal to Issue 1-3 proposal 6… | agree |
| Huawei | Agree | agree | Agree | agree |
| Qualcomm | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ligado | Agree |  |  |  |
| Hughes/EchoStar | agree | agree | agree | agree |
|  |  |  |  |  |

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

# Topic #2: System NTN RF core requirements

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [*R4-2015905*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015905.zip) | Ericsson | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 should consider (NTN gateway + satellite) as a repeater or alternatively as a relay. The corresponding requirements shall be specified in a new repeater specification, or alternatively a new relay specification. |
| [*R4-2015906*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015906.zip) | Ericsson | In this contribution, based on Radio Regulations, we made following proposal and observations:  **Observation 1**: A NTN BS might be considered as a “Relay node” or “Remote Radio Head” unit. |
| [*R4-2015252*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015252.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Observation 4:** A HAPS as seen from the UE is a serving gNB and therefore the UE should expect same RF characteristics as a terrestrial gNB.  **Observation 5:** The RF requirements for the service link provided by LEO and GEO deployments should be at least same level as those for a terrestrial gNB.  **Proposal 3:** RF requirements for a terrestrial gNB should be used as baseline for HAPS, LEO and GEO deployments.  **Proposal 4:** Satellites both in transparent and regenerative deployments should provide same performance in terms of RF characteristics. |
| [*R4-2015547*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015547.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Observation 4:** The RF requirements of satellite are different from the base station considering the large propagation distance between UE and satellite. |
| [*R4-2015945*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015945.zip) | THALES | **Proposal 1:** 3GPP does not define RF Tx requirements for a given transparent payload to allow flexibility in the space segment design;  **Proposal 2:** 3GPP does not define RF Tx requirements for a BS in NTN;  **Proposal 3:** 3GPP defines equivalent BS Tx requirements at UE reception level, by taking into account e.g. a frequency spectrum mask corresponding to the cumulated self-interferences generated by the satellite network infrastructure at UE level. |
| [*R4-2015907*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015907.zip) | Ericsson | **Proposal 1:** Co-channel coexistence and coexistence with adjacent services are out of NTN WI’s scope.  **Proposal 3:** For NR and NB-IoT, ACLR and ACS specified in TS 38.104 and 38.101 shall be assumed for NR BS and NR UE when running coexistence simulations. |
| [*R4-2015548*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015548.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Observation 1:** It isn’t expected that the co-existence simulation of NTN will have an impact on RF requirements of terrestrial IMT UE/BS.  **Observation 4:** For the co-existence scenario between two NTN systems, RAN4 need to consider whether to assume the same orbits and partial overlapping about foot print.  **Simulation Parameter/Potential Choice:**  Satellite orbits/GEO, LEO-1200, LEO-600  Center frequency /It depends on the decision about the example band.  Satellite antenna model/Passive reflector antenna or AAS. Antenna Gain and 3dB beam width  Channel bandwidth/It depends on operators’ spectrum allocations, no more than 100MHz.  Transmitter power/Different satellite orbits need different transmitter power  Noise figure/FFS  UE’s type/VSAT or handheld UE  Power control/FFS |
| [*R4-2015908*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015908.zip) | Ericsson | The proposed approach i.e. handling NTN gateway+ satellite as either a repeater or alternatively a relay.  It should be noted that 3GPP specifications E-UTRA contain repeater specification and relay specification where the repeater requirements were derived from various studies, including co-existence studies. The repeater RF requirements overview and structure from TS 36.106 is as following:  - Output power  - Frequency stability  - Out-of-band gain  - Unwanted emissions  - Error Vector Magnitude  - Input intermodulation  - Output intermodulation  - Adjacent channel rejection ration  The Relay requirements overview and structure from specification TS 36.116 is as following. More comprehensive requirements are specified due to the additional signal processing covering both access and backhaul link.  - Output power  - Output power dynamics including ON/OFF masks and transient handling for unpaired spectrum  - Transmit signal quality  - Unwanted emissions covering spurious emission, ACLR and operating band unwanted emission  - Transmit intermodulation  - Receiver sensitivity  - Receiver dynamic range  - In-channel selectivity  - Receiver blocking  - Receiver spurious emission  - Receiver intermodulation  - Access performance Requirements for PUSCH, PUCCH and PRACH  - Backhaul performance requirement covering PDSCH and PDCCH (for NR context)  Considering the relay requirements are more comprehensive, if there is any additional signal processing occurs performed within either the gateway or the satellite, the relay approach should be preferred. It looks then essential to conclude on this choice to progress further. |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 2-1 NTN satellite system view

*Sub-topic description: NTN architecture, system view and architecture split should be discussed*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-1:** NTN System

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
    - RAN4 should consider (NTN gateway + satellite) as a repeater or alternatively as a relay.
    - The corresponding requirements shall be specified in a new repeater specification, or alternatively a new relay specification.
    - A NTN BS might be considered as a “Relay node” or “Remote Radio Head” unit.



Figure 1 Gateway and satellite as repeater

* + Option 2:
    - The RF requirements of satellite are different from the base station considering the large propagation distance between UE and satellite.
    - Different satellite orbits need different transmitter power
  + Option 3:
    - A HAPS as seen from the UE is a serving gNB and therefore the UE should expect same RF characteristics as a terrestrial gNB.
    - The RF requirements for the service link provided by LEO and GEO deployments should be at least same level as those for a terrestrial gNB.
    - RF requirements for a terrestrial gNB should be used as baseline for HAPS, LEO and GEO deployments.
    - Satellites both in transparent and regenerative deployments should provide same performance in terms of RF characteristics.
  + Option 4:
    - 3GPP should not define RF Tx requirements for a given transparent payload to allow flexibility in the space segment design;
    - 3GPP should not define RF Tx requirements for a BS in NTN;
    - 3GPP should define equivalent BS Tx requirements at UE reception level, by taking into account e.g. a frequency spectrum mask corresponding to the cumulated self-interferences generated by the satellite network infrastructure at UE level.



Figure 2: Satellite System with Transparent Payload

* Recommended WF1:
  + HAPS should use same RF characteristics as a terrestrial gNB.
* Recommended WF2:
  + In order to allow flexibility in the space segment design, 3GPP should not define RF Tx requirements for NTN Satellite payload

**Note:** Rational is related to several justifications:

- Satellite component composed from several system sub-components: transparent payload, feeder link, GW. The requirements that apply to the satellite network infrastructure results from a performance allocation trade-off between multiple sub-components, which are not specified one by one.

- Multiple satellites can cover a given area. Therefore, multiple adjacent channel interferences may sum together at UE level, and it might be required to define a maximum allowed level of interference in the adjacent band of the UE, at UE Rx level.

* Recommended WF3:
  + 3GPP may define additional NTN UE Rx parameters
* Recommended WF4:
  + Clarify the gNB-Gateway interface;
  + Clarify the feederlink interface GW-Transparent Payload.

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note1 (general): Options are not exclusive. Companies may answer “Yes” or “No” to multiple options.]  [Note2: **Companies are encouraged to provide justification** for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: Agree  Option 2:  Option 3: “UE should expect same RF characteristics as a terrestrial gNB” should be further clarified but we could agree that, from UE side, RF signals received from a BS or a HIBS shall be equivalent. Coexistence shall still be investigated. The list of gNB RF requirements shall be used as baseline, yes.  Option 4: Why 3GPP should not define NTN BS RF requirements? If so, NTN could not be part of 3GPP , what performance should be expected then |
| Huawei | At this early stage, we agree to consider transparent payload, feeder link and GW as a whole since it helps simply the analysis. We propose to normalize service link from RF perspective. It’s very hard to guarantee the system performance if we don’t specify satellite RF requirements. I have strong concerns on first two bullet in option 4.  From implementation perspective, gateway and gNB may be designed together as a system sub-component. If not, what is the interface between gateway and gNB?  For HAPs, I’m not sure whether we need to specify a new BS Type or just reuse current specification. We need to accurate definition for HAPs. |
| Samsung | In Option 4, “3GPP should define equivalent BS Tx requirements at UE reception level”, no sure if pfd-liked limit is proposed to be defined at the ground/UE Rx side, it seems more like a deployment related parameter rather than RF requirement for equipment, and another problem is how to measure/verify the limits? Further discussion/clarification is needed. |
| DISH | Option 1. Agree  Option 2/3 can be further discussed  Option 4 Disagree. It is not possible to leave some challenging requirements simply undefined. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 2-1: there are no such agreement that Uu between Gateway and gNB. We prefer to define RF requirements for satellite and gateway separately, otherwise this is quite difficult to emulate the interference. |
| Nokia | Option 1: Partly agree. For last bullet further explanation might be needed but the assumptions does in our view not cover all deployments.  Option 2: To some extend true – performance should be ensured regardless.  Option 3: Only if needed and justified.  Option 4: No – requirements are needed to ensure performance. |
| Eutelsat | Option 1: Disagree. RF signal generated by gNodeB is going to be affected by the gateway RF performance in addition to the satellite performance (e.g. mixing products, harmonics, etc.). Gateway has to manage the frequency conversion between the gNodeB output and the air interface (Uu at satellite output). This adds complexity, especially if feeder link and gNodeB are not suitable for direct conversion. This design implies the gNodeB is physically located within (or very close to) the gateway, this impedes any virtualization.  Option 2: Agree |
| Thales | A combination between all options may be considered.  We prefer to consider the NTN “BS” requirements as (gNB + NTNGW + transparent payload on board of satellite) requirements. As per gNB - NTNGW interface, we believe that it is an implementation issue. For example, the interface could be CPRI-like, and therefore not RF.  We would therefore agree to specify the RF requirements at satellite payload output (i.e. service link). Moreover, the specification of RF requirements at satellite payload output (i.e. service link) may not exactly follow a BS specification (TS 38.104), but we believe that it will be more likely correspond to the one of a repeater (TS 36.106-like), and probably more relaxed parameters as with respect to TN. |
| Loon/Google | Option 1: does not account for HAPS use case  Option 2: |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward(s) stated above? Which way forward do you prefer? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward(s) stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson |  | WF1: See comments above  WF2: Totally disagree, see above. The given rationale is not convincing: what kind of performance could be expected from then, or do we guarantee coexistence?  WF3: may be  WF4: According to us, this will be a RF interface as the GW+satellite will be a relay/repeater. |
| Huawei |  | We have to be more careful when we make this decision in general. The interface between different devices should be clarified firstly. We propose to normalize service link from RF perspective in this release. |
| DISH |  | WF2: More clarification is needed. For instance, does this WF mean TX emissions would not be specified at all? Isn’t that quite a risk for the adjacent operator, who might be terrestrial or non-terrestrial? In addition, defining “Maximum allowed level of interference at UE RX level” is entirely new for 3GPP; 3GPP defines only minimum requirements for interference where UE has to meet certain performance requirements, not the maximum level of interference.  WF1/WF3/WF4 can be further discussed |
| Nokia |  | WF1: As starting point we agree but more decision is needed  WF2: No – this can not be accepted  WF3: Only if needed and justified.  WF4: Fine but perhaps out of scope of RAN4 |
| HNS/Ech |  | WF1: not sure (need further discussion)  WF2: OK  WF3: unsure (need further discussion)  WF4: OK. |
| Eutelsat | Partially | WF2: Agree. It is important that flexibility is retained by the system/ subsystem designer to implement/ apportion specifications as most appropriate. RAN4 should not attempt to make this decision or pre-judge the technology choice.  WF4: The gateway to gNodeB interface should support a digital interface and support virtualization of the base band function. |
| Thales | Partially | Satellite component composed from several system sub-components: transparent payload, feeder link, GW. The requirements that apply to the satellite network infrastructure results from a performance allocation trade-off between multiple sub-components, which are not specified one by one. |
| Loon/Google |  | Recommended WF1 |

There is a general understanding that WFs should be further discussed.

Moderator suggests considering at least following proposals/topics to be further discussed:

**Proposal 1:** Interfaces between different NTN entities should be clarified.

**Proposal 2:** Consider Satellite+NTNGW as a single entity (e.g. Repeater or Remote Radio Head).

**Proposal 3:** Consider only the service link from the RAN4 RF perspective in NTN Release-17.

**Proposal 4:** Do not consider the feederlink from the RAN4 RF perspective in NTN Release-17.

**Proposal 5:** Further clarify (taking into account coexistence studies) if NTN BS RF parameters could be adapted with respect to TN BS RF values due to specific deployment and operational constraints.

**Proposal 6:** Further clarify (taking into account coexistence studies) if NTN UE RF parameters could be adapted or if additional NTN UE Rx parameters are required. For selected UE RF parameters, it is expected to adopt same performance requirements (e.g. REFSENS, Tx Power) for NTN to ensure operational compatibility across NTN and TN.

### Sub-topic 2-2 Payload specification

*Sub-topic description: Satellite Payload*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-2:** Transparent Payload

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 should consider (NTN gateway + satellite) as a repeater or alternatively as a relay. The corresponding requirements shall be specified in a new repeater specification, or alternatively a new relay specification.
  + Option 2: 3GPP should not define RF Tx requirements for a given transparent payload to allow flexibility in the space segment design;
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note2: **Companies are encouraged to provide justification** for their choices.]  [Note3 (general): Please provide feedback also for the proposed WF(s)] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: Agree  Option 2: If we have transparent payload, payload is generic so we are not sure what “for a given transparent payload” means… But we think the assumption should be that RF requirements are generic, not specific to a payload.  ….  Others (e.g. feedback/recommendations for proposed WF): |
| Huawei | Option 1: From implementation perspective, gateway and gNB may be designed together as a system sub-component. RAN4 need to consider gateway and gNB is a whole sub-component or two sub-component.  Option 2: As a standard organization, 3GPP have to guarantee the system performance. If we don’t specify satellite RF requirements, how can we guarantee it? |
| DISH | Option 1: This option is certainly worth considering. In addition, we believe it would make a lot of sense not to include NTN UE/BS specifications in TS38.101/TS38.104 but to have dedicated specifications for NTN in RAN4 instead.  Option 2: Disagree |
| ZTE | Sub topic 2-2: clear requirements for satellite and gateway is needed, otherwise it’s quite difficult to simulate the interference. We specify requirements for both IAB/Relay and BS. |
| Nokia | Option 1: Perhaps with further clarifications  Option 2: No – even the space segment has to ensure adequate performance to, and protection of, other NR deployments. |
| Thales | We are fine with the proposal of considering satellite+NTNGW as a component.  Generic RF requirements may be considered without specifying the satellite payload.  The specification of RF requirements at satellite payload output (i.e. service link) may not exactly follow a BS specification (TS 38.104), but we believe that it will be more likely correspond to the one of a repeater (TS 36.106-like), and probably more relaxed parameters as with respect to TN. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Main feedbacks

* Further clarifications are required.

Moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:

**Proposal 1:** RAN4 need to consider NTN-gateway, satellite and gNB is a single component.

**Proposal 2:** Consider only “BS” RF requirements on the service link i.e. at satellite output for DL and at satellite input for UL.

### Sub-topic 2-3 Improved NTN UE specification

*Sub-topic description: UE specification in RAN4*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 2-3:** Improved NTN UE specification(s)

* Proposals
  + Option 1: multiple adjacent channel interferences may sum together at UE level, and it might be required to define a maximum allowed level of interference in the adjacent band of the UE, at UE Rx level.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + Improved NTN UE specification may be considered

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note2: **Companies are encouraged to provide justification** for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: FFS |
| Huawei | It depends on the outcome about the co-existence between NTN systems. |
| DISH | Option 1: Concept is well understood, however how to handle it in specifications is quite challenging. E.g if there is one satellite which causes UR adjacent channel interference of x dB, then should the ACLR be 3dB improved per satellite to keep the aggregate UE adjacent channel interference in x dB? Furthermore, 3GPP cannot define maximum allowed interference, it can only define the interference level under which the UE has to function with certain performance. |
| ZTE | Sub topic 2-3: this should be up to coexistence study and too early to conclude on that. |
| MTK | This statement is too vague for any decision. A decision on whether or not to define additional UE requirements should be made after all relevant UE performance evaluation work has been completed.  Mediatek would like to remind RAN4 members that maximizing the commonality between terrestrial and NTN-capable user equipment will enable healthier NTN ecosystem growth, and therefore NTN-specific performance requirements should only be considered as the last resort. This is particularly critical for handheld UEs using satellite bands L/S. |
| Skyworks | As a starting point can the NR SEM + spurious emissions be considered as limiting the absolute power in first and second adjacent for the coexistence study? |
| Nokia | Option 1: We fail to understand the difference to a terrestrial dense deployment and why this should be treated otherwise. |
| Thales | FFS, if NTN UE requires higher protection than TN UE. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson |  | There is no concrete WF, this is FFS |
| Huawei | Disagree | We can’t improve the requirements without any analysis. |
| DISH | Disagree | WF is very ambiguous. What is the intention? |
| MTK | Disagree | WF not suitable as it is too vague. |
| Nokia | Disagree | WF1- we are fine to consider but see no need to approve this WF at the moment |
| Thales |  | FFS. To be considered later on if required, after coexistence studies. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Moderator comment: For the time being FFS, no proposed WF.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 2-1:  Sub topic 2-2:  Sub topic 2-3:  ….  Others: |
| Nokia | Our comments are reflected in questions/tables included in the sub topics. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Issue 2-1:** NTN System | There is a general understanding that WFs should be further discussed.  Moderator suggests considering at least following proposals/topics to be further discussed:  *Tentative agreements 1:*  **Proposal 1:** Interfaces between different NTN entities should be clarified.  **Proposal 2:** Consider Satellite+NTNGW as a single entity (e.g. Repeater or Remote Radio Head).  **Proposal 3:** Consider only the service link from the RAN4 RF perspective in NTN Release-17.  **Proposal 4:** Do not consider the feederlink from the RAN4 RF perspective in NTN Release-17.  *Tentative agreements 2:*  **Proposal 5:** Further clarify (taking into account coexistence studies) if NTN BS RF parameters could be adapted with respect to TN BS RF values due to specific deployment and operational constraints.  **Proposal 6:** Further clarify (taking into account coexistence studies) if NTN UE RF parameters could be adapted or if additional NTN UE Rx parameters are required. For selected UE RF parameters, it is expected to adopt same performance requirements (e.g. REFSENS, Tx Power) for NTN to ensure operational compatibility across NTN and TN.  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 2-2:** Transparent Payload | Main feedbacks   * Further clarifications are required.   Moderator suggests the following proposals/topics to be further discussed:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** RAN4 need to consider NTN-gateway, satellite and gNB is a single component.  **Proposal 2:** Consider only “BS” RF requirements on the service link i.e. at satellite output for DL and at satellite input for UL.  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 2-3:** Improved NTN UE specification(s) | *Tentative agreements:* Moderator comment: For the time being FFS, no proposed WF.  *Candidate options:-*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:-* |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | Email discussion summary for [97e][312] NTN\_Solutions 2nd Round | WF |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

Please note that during the meeting RAN3#110e, 3GPP introduced in R3-207061 the concept of “NTN Payload”. We therefore suggest updating the following proposal:

**“Issue 2-1. Proposal 2:** Consider Satellite+NTNGW as a single entity (e.g. Repeater or Remote Radio Head)”. to

**“Issue 2-1. Proposal 2:** Consider **NTN Payload**+NTNGW as a single entity (e.g. Repeater or Remote Radio Head).”

As a result of 1st round discussions, the moderator suggests to postpone some of the discussions for RAN4#98e as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** | **For #97e or Postponed for #98e** |
| **Issue 2-1:** NTN System | **Proposal 1:** Interfaces between different NTN entities should be clarified. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** Consider NTN Payload+NTNGW as a single entity (e.g. Repeater or Remote Radio Head). | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 3:** Consider only the service link from the RAN4 RF perspective in NTN Release-17. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 4:** Do not consider the feederlink from the RAN4 RF perspective in NTN Release-17. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 5:** Further clarify (taking into account coexistence studies) if NTN BS RF parameters could be adapted with respect to TN BS RF values due to specific deployment and operational constraints. | **Postponed to #98e** |
| **Proposal 6:** Further clarify (taking into account coexistence studies) if NTN UE RF parameters could be adapted or if additional NTN UE Rx parameters are required. For selected UE RF parameters, it is expected to adopt same performance requirements (e.g. REFSENS, Tx Power) for NTN to ensure operational compatibility across NTN and TN. | **Postponed to #98e** |
| **Issue 2-2:** Transparent Payload | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 need to consider NTN-gateway, satellite and gNB is a single component. | **Postponed to #98e** |
| **Proposal 2:** Consider only “BS” RF requirements on the service link i.e. at satellite output for DL and at satellite input for UL. | **#97e** |
| **Issue 2-3:** Improved NTN UE specification(s) | Moderator comment: For the time being FFS, no proposed WF. | **Postponed to #98e** |

Companies are further asked to answer with **AGREE** or **DISAGREE** or **AGREE WITH CHANGES** to the following tables:

**Question:** Do you agree with proposal **Issue 2-x. Proposal y?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **Issue 2-1, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 2-1, Proposal 2** | **Answer**  **Issue 2-1, Proposal 3** | **Answer**  **Issue 2-1, Proposal 4** | **Answer**  **Issue 2-2, Proposal 2** |
| Thales | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| MTK | - | - | AGREE | AGREE | - |
| Ericsson | agree | Agree with change:  “NTN payload” shall be clarified. Further discussion would be needed to agree on RRH, our current thinking is only a repeater/relay for the time being.  Consider NTN satellite+NTNGW as a single entity entity (e.g. Repeater ~~or Remote Radio Head~~) | Disagree,  This is depending on the NTN GW-eNB interface, to be addressed first. | agree | Disagree  This highly depends on the interface in between NTN GW and eNB. |
| Huawei | Agree | Agree with changes:  Consider NTN satellite+feeder link+NTNGW as a single entity | agree | agree | Disagree |
| Qualcomm |  |  | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Hughes/EchoStar | - | - | agree | agree | agree |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

# Topic #3: FR1 proposed Exemplary Frequency band for NTN

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [*R4-2014785*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014785.zip) | Samsung | **View 2:** It is necessary to prioritize the candidate NTN frequency bands to identify 1 or 2 example bands, which should be within the range of FR1 or FR2, while the confirmed and practical needs from operators should be well taken into account. |
| [*R4-2014066*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014066.zip) | Fraunhofer HHI, Fraunhofer IIS | **Observation 2:** Deployment scenarios in FR1 and FR2 are considered in geostationary (GEO) and low earth orbit (LEO).  **Observation 15:** All requirements shall be specified for both FR1 and FR2.  **Observation 16:** Although RAN4 will select exemplary band(s) in the current NR-NTN-solutions WI, the definition of additional NR bands for NTN will be part of dedicated RAN4 led Release 17 work items. |
| [*R4-2015906*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015906.zip) | Ericsson | In this contribution, based on Radio Regulations, we made following proposal and observations:  **Observation 3:** A NTN UE operating in FR2 might be considered as a relay UE, but most likely not a NR FR2 UE.  **L-band:**  **Observation 5:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of L-band for NTN, the mobile service is also allocated in the ranges 1518-1525 MHz (primary service) and 1525-1535 MHz (secondary service).  **Observation 6:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of L-band for NTN, mobile service is also allocated in the ranges 1668.4-1675 MHz (primary service) and 1668-1668.4 MHz (secondary service).  **Observation 7:** According to past ITU-R discussions on this band for mobile and mobile satellite services, L-band would be used for sensitive mobile satellite service. Further consideration would be needed if NTN would also be using this band.  **S-band:**  **Observation 8:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of S-band for NTN. These ranges are also allocated to mobile. The proposed frequency ranges might be considered for NTN.  **C-band:**  **Observation 9:** The Radio Regulations have not allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of C-band for NTN. The proposed frequency ranges should not be considered for NTN.  Based on previous proposal and observations, following frequency ranges are allocated to mobile satellite and would need further discussion:  - L-band  Downlink (space to earth) 1518 – 1559 MHz, 1613.8 – 1626.5 MHz  Uplink (earth to space) 1626.5 – 1660.5 MHz & 1668 – 1675 MHz, 1610.0 – 1626.5 MHz  - S-band  Downlink (space to earth) 2170 - 2200 MHz & 2483.5 - 2500 MHz  Uplink (earth to space) 1980 - 2010 MHz  - C-band:  None |
| [*R4-2015915*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015915.zip) | THALES | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 work should consider an exemplary FR1 band for NTN.  **Proposal 2:** Propose to use an FDD exemplary band with 1980-2010 MHz for UL and 2170-2200 MHz for DL, for RAN4 KPI evaluation. |
| [*R4-2015913*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015913.zip) | THALES | **Proposal 1:** Consider SCS 15 & 30 kHz for FR1 exemplary band for RAN4 work.  **Proposal 2:** Consider frequency reuse schemes with frequency reuse > 1 for RAN4 work.  **Proposal 3:** Consider exemplary frequency bandwidths of 5, 10, 15, 20 MHz for FR1 RAN4 work.  **Proposal 4:** RAN4 needs to identify coexistence scenarios in adjacent bands. |
| [*R4-2015263*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015263.zip) | Xiaomi | **Proposal 1:** it is proposed at least the type of handheld UE with PC3 should be considered first for FR1. |
| [*R4-2015252*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015252.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Observation 2:** RAN4 should within this WI only consider example NR bands/frequencies.  **Proposal 2:** Choose example NR bands/frequencies in both the FR1 and FR2 range.  **Observation 3:** New NR bands should be defined at least for LEO and GEO deployments. |
| [*R4-2015547*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015547.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Observation 1:** RAN4 should consider the frequency band which are allocated for MSS as the example band firstly. And RAN4 can focus on the MSS scenario when co-existence study is performed.  **Observation 2:** In order to reduce the regulation risk, we can start the work with a frequency band in which there is no incumbent service except for MSS.  **Observation 3:** Band 65/n65 is specified in RAN4’s specification as a terrestrial IMT band instead of MSS. RAN4 can’t simply reuse band n65 as a NTN example band because of the regulation risk.  **Observation 4:** The RF requirements of satellite are different from the base station considering the large propagation distance between UE and satellite.  **Observation 5:** RF requirements of VSAT is totally different from the traditional 3GPP UE. For handheld UE, the general UE RF requirements can be considered as baseline.  **Proposal 1:** It’s proposed to choose 1.6GHz L band as a NTN example band. |
| [*R4-2015907*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015907.zip) | Ericsson | **Observation 1:** For FR1 bands above 3 GHz, NR bands are TDD only while NTN would use FDD duplex mode. This would be a major issue for coexistence. |
| [*R4-2016112*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016112.zip) | ZTE Corporation | **Proposal 1:** to adopt the coexistence scenarios in Table 2.1-1 for NTN coexistence study.  1 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; TN, 30MHz; DL to DL; 2 GHz Rural  2 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; TN, 30MHz; UL to UL; 2 GHz Rural  3 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; NTN, 30MHz; DL to DL; 2 GHz Rural  4 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; NTN, 30MHz; UL to UL; 2 GHz Rural  Note 2: the baseline scenario for NTN coverage should be rural area, FFS for other scenarios.  Note 3: TN should be NR based and it’s not necessary to evaluate LTE based or UTRA based as requirements should be close. |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 3-1 Candidate FR1 exemplary bands

*Sub-topic description:* Candidate FR1 exemplary band(s) for RAN4

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-1:** Candidate FR1 exemplary band(s) for RAN4

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
    - Propose to use MSS (S-band) FDD exemplary band with 1980-2010 MHz for UL and 2170-2200 MHz for DL, for RAN4 KPI evaluation in FR1.
  + Option 2:
    - RAN4 should consider the frequency band which are allocated for MSS as the example band firstly. And RAN4 can focus on the MSS scenario when co-existence study is performed.
    - It’s proposed to choose 1.6GHz L band as a NTN example band.
* Recommended WF
  + Consider MSS S-band as exemplary FR1 band

OR

* + Consider L band as exemplary FR1 band

OR

* + Consider both MSS S-band and L band as exemplary FR1 bands

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note2: **Companies are encouraged to provide justification** for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1:  Option 2: We prefer option 2. |
| Huawei | It’s better to choose a traditional satellite band considering the commercial and technical advantage. Only 1.6GHz L band is preferred |
| Samsung | No strong view to select S-band or L-band as exemplary frequency band for NTN in FR1, but the confirmed and practical needs from operators should be well taken into account. |
| DISH | Option 1: 2GHz S-band should not be agreed at least for Region 2 until RAN has officially agreed on the topics which were endorsed in previous meeting. RAN is assumed to further work on the NTN band topics in December. |
| LGE | Option 1: Yes. It isn’t expected that the co-existence simulation of NTN will have an impact on RF requirements of terrestrial IMT UE/BS..  Option 2. No. If L band is chosen as NTN band, RAN4 may study the coexistence between NTN and GNSS using L band. There may be impact on GNSS. |
| Nokia | No strong opinion. |
| HNS/Ech | Option 1 – OK, MSS band in S-band. Need to be mindful of North Americas |
| Thales | MSS S-Band OK. For L-band some clarification is required with specific potential configuration.  Specific concerns need to be clarified. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson |  | We can’t have 2 examplary bands, that doesn’t make sense really, |
| Huawei |  | Option 2 |
| DISH | Disagree | RAN4 has not agreed on the NTN band topics yet. It would be much easier to agree on the exemplary bands after RAN agreement. |
| MTK |  | MSS S-band in option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Partially | Input from operators should be taken into account. |
| Nokia |  | We prefer to study only one exemplary band in FR1 and if possible, one in FR2 as also comment later. |
| HNs//Ech | Agree see comment | OK, MSS band in S-band. Need to be mindful of North Americas |
| Thales | Agree | MSS band in S-band might be an optimal choice for the following reasons:   * It is required to have an exemplary band for coexistence scenarios. An exemplary FR1 band with some parameterization should be studied in RAN4, but this should not preclude other options. * In order to assure compatibility with existent satellite systems, it would be useful to propose a NTN exemplary band in FR1 which is already used by satellite. * There is already some work done for n65 (TN) and we can probably use (partially) this work for MSS NTN definition. This approach might save us some time; in RAN4 we have very limited resources. * We could consider other bands for satellite use, however the coexistence may be (even more) difficult to handle and also the available bandwidths may not be large enough. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Main feedback:

* Discussions with respect to FR1 exemplary band(s) selection still needed.

Moderator suggestions/proposals for discussion are:

**Proposal 1:** Consider only one exemplary band in FR1 and if possible one in FR2.

**Proposal 2:** Band characteristics (e.g. available BW, UL/DL configuration, maximum configurable BW size, coexistence conditions) of the candidate bands should be considered for comparison purposes. Note that views from operators should be taken into account in priority.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Parameter* | *Band X* | *Band Y* |
| *UL frequency band* | *-* | *-* |
| *DL frequency band* | *-* | *-* |
| *Maximum configurable BW size* | *-* | *-* |
| *BW Configuration* | *-* | *-* |
| *Coexistence conditions* | *-* | *-* |
| *ITU Region Availability* | *-* | *-* |
| *Others, e.g. view from operator* | *-* | *-* |
| *-* | *-* | *-* |

### Sub-topic 3-2 Candidate FR1 band configurations

*Sub-topic description:* Candidate FR1 band configurations

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 3-2:** Candidate FR1 band configurations

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
    - Consider SCS 15 & 30 kHz for FR1 exemplary band for RAN4 work.
    - Consider frequency reuse schemes with frequency reuse > 1 for RAN4 work.
    - Consider exemplary frequency bandwidths of 5, 10, 15, 20 MHz for FR1 RAN4 work.
    - RAN4 needs to identify coexistence scenarios in adjacent bands.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + Consider SCS 15 & 30 kHz for FR1 exemplary band for RAN4 work.
  + Consider exemplary frequency bandwidths of 5, 10, 15, 20 MHz for FR1 RAN4 work.

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note2: **Companies are encouraged to provide justification** for their choices.] |
| XXX | Option 1: Frequency reuse and coex scenarios have already been discussed before, this is redundant. |
| Huawei | As for SCS, 15, 30, 60 has been specified for bands > 1GHz and < 3GHz. Not sure why 60kHz is exclude. RAN4 need to be aligned with RAN1 before making final decision.  What are frequency reuse schemes?  5, 10, 15, 20 MHz for FR1 can be a baseline. |
| DISH | Redundant |
| ZTE | Fine with SCS suggestion and regarding channel bandwidth, it should be depend which bands in FR1 are selected as example band. |
| Panasonic | Option 1: No (We prefer “Consider frequency reuse schemes with frequency reuse = 1 for RAN4 work” rather than frequency reuse > 1. |
| MTK | MTK partially agrees with Option 1, but:   * Current NTN WID scope is restricted to FDD bands, and this should also be clarified on the WF.   Only SCS 15kHz is being used for FDD bands for bandwidths 5, 10, 15, 20MHz. 30 kHz SCS should not be considered. NTN should exclude all other subcarrier spacings to maximize alignment with existing terrestrial UE implementations. |
| Nokia | This is dependent on other redundant issues listed in this summary. |
| HNS/Ech | Consider configuration for MSS band (S-band) that had been used in TR38.821 |
| Thales | Both 15 & 30 kHz could be used if MSS S-band. Down-scope can be also possible. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Huawei | Partially | See comments above. |
| DISH | Partially | For the sake of completeness, 60kHz should be included for Frequencies/BW’s where applicable |
| MTK | Partially | See comments above |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| HNS/Ech | Agree |  |
| Thales | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

4 companies agreed, 3 partially agreed.

Moderator suggests for discussion:

**Proposal 1:** Agree channel BW size once the exemplary band is selected.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 3-1:  Sub topic 3-2:  ….  Others: |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Issue 3-1:** Candidate FR1 exemplary band(s) for RAN4 | Main feedback:   * Discussions with respect to FR1 exemplary band(s) selection still needed.   Moderator suggestions/proposals for discussions are:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** Consider only one exemplary band in FR1 and if possible one in FR2.  **Proposal 2:** Band characteristics (e.g. available BW, UL/DL configuration, maximum configurable BW size, coexistence conditions) of the candidate bands should be considered for comparison purposes. Note that views from operators should be taken into account in priority.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Parameter* | *Band X* | *Band Y* | | *UL frequency band* | *-* | *-* | | *DL frequency band* | *-* | *-* | | *Maximum configurable BW size* | *-* | *-* | | *BW Configuration* | *-* | *-* | | *Coexistence conditions* | *-* | *-* | | *ITU Region Availability* | *-* | *-* | | *Others, e.g. view from operator* | *-* | *-* | | *-* | *-* | *-* |   *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 3-2:** Candidate FR1 band configurations | 4 companies agreed, 3 partially agreed.  Moderator suggests for discussion:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** Agree channel BW size once the exemplary band is selected.  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
|  |  |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | Email discussion summary for [97e][312] NTN\_Solutions 2nd Round | WF |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

This section is dedicated only to FR1 (there is another section for FR2). Hereby, please consider the updated changes:

**“Issue 3-1. Proposal 1:** Consider only one exemplary band in FR1 and if possible one in FR2.” **updated with**

**“Issue 3-1. Proposal 1:** Consider only one exemplary band in FR1.”.

As a result of 1st round discussions, the moderator suggests to postpone some of the discussions for RAN4#98e as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** | **For #97e or Postponed for #98e** |
| **Issue 3-1:** Candidate FR1 exemplary band(s) for RAN4 | **Proposal 1:** Consider only one exemplary band in FR1. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** Band characteristics (e.g. available BW, UL/DL configuration, maximum configurable BW size, coexistence conditions) of the candidate bands should be considered for comparison purposes. Note that views from operators should be taken into account in priority.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Parameter* | *Band “i”* | *Band “i+1”* | | *UL frequency band* | *-* | *-* | | *DL frequency band* | *-* | *-* | | *Maximum configurable BW size* | *-* | *-* | | *BW Configuration* | *-* | *-* | | *Coexistence conditions* | *-* | *-* | | *ITU Region Availability* | *-* | *-* | | *Others, e.g. view from operator* | *-* | *-* | | *-* | *-* | *-* | | **#97e** |
| **Issue 3-2:** Candidate FR1 band configurations | **Proposal 1:** Agree channel BW size once the exemplary band is selected. | **Postponed to #98e** |
|  |  |  |

Companies are further asked to answer with **AGREE** or **DISAGREE** or **AGREE WITH CHANGES** to the following tables:

**Question:** Do you agree with proposal **Issue 3-x. Proposal y?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **Issue 3-1, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 3-1, Proposal 2** |
| Thales | AGREE | AGREE |
| MTK | AGREE | AGREE |
| Panasonic | AGREE |  |
| Ericsson | Agree if one is possible. | Disagree.  Those criteria have never been discussed, it’s even questionable if they are relevant to select an examplary band. |
| Huawei | Agree | Disagree |
| Qualcomm | **AGREE WITH CHANGES**  At least one FR1 band should be considered. | AGREE |
| Hughes/EchoStar | Agree with Qualcomm | agree |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Companies are further asked to provide information with respect to MSS S-band and L-band.

Ericsson: We don’t think building such comparisons table is relevant at this stage, we don’t agree to make any band decision based on the proposed criteria, which have never been discussed, nor agreed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Parameter* | *MSS S-Band* | *L-Band* |
| *UL frequency band* | *Thales: 1980-2010 MHz*  *MTK: 1980-2010 MHz*  *Hughes/EchoStar: 1980-2010 MHz* | *Company X:* |
| *DL frequency band* | *Thales: 2170-2200 MHz*  *MTK: 2170-2200 MHz*  *Hughes/EchoStar: 2170-2200 MHz* | *Company X:* |
| *Maximum configurable BW size* | *Thales: 20 MHz*  *MTK: 20 MHz*  *Hughes/EchoStar: 20 MHz* | *Company X:* |
| *BW Configuration* | *Thales: 5, 10, 15, 20 MHz*  *MTK: 5, 10, 15, 20 MHz*  *Hughes/EchoStar: 5, 10, 15, 20 MHz* | *Company X:* |
| *Coexistence conditions* | *Thales: adjacent-band coexistence (with band 1 & band 34); guard-band required*  *Hughes/EchoStar: adjacent-band coexistence in all regions. Avoid usage of this range in North America* | *Company X:* |
| *ITU Region Availability* | *Thales: R1,R3, (R2)*  *Hughes/EchoStar: All region but avoid North America – follow national regulation and to protect terrestrial deployment* | *Company X:* |
| *Others, e.g. view from operator* | *Thales: Clear regulatory requirement, link budget analysis already done in TR 38.821, some coexistence studies already done in TR 38.891 (including coexistence with adjacent bands), MSS S-band is already used for satellite services (and is operational).*  *Company X:* | *Company X:* |
| *-* | *-* | *-* |

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

# Topic #4: FR2 proposed Exemplary Frequency band for NTN

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [*R4-2014785*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014785.zip) | Samsung | **View 2:** It is necessary to prioritize the candidate NTN frequency bands to identify 1 or 2 example bands, which should be within the range of FR1 or FR2, while the confirmed and practical needs from operators should be well taken into account. |
| [*R4-2014066*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014066.zip) | Fraunhofer HHI, Fraunhofer IIS | **Observation 2:** Deployment scenarios in FR1 and FR2 are considered in geostationary (GEO) and low earth orbit (LEO).  **Observation 15:** All requirements shall be specified for both FR1 and FR2.  **Observation 16:** Although RAN4 will select exemplary band(s) in the current NR-NTN-solutions WI, the definition of additional NR bands for NTN will be part of dedicated RAN4 led Release 17 work items. |
| [*R4-2014467*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014467.zip) | HUGHES Network Systems Ltd, Thales | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 work should consider an exemplary FR2 band for NTN.  **Proposal 2:** RAN4 to use an FR2 exemplary band of 17.7 – 20.2 GHz for DL and 27.5 – 30.0 GHz for UL with FDD duplex mode. |
| [*R4-2015906*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015906.zip) | Ericsson | In this contribution, based on Radio Regulations, we made following proposal and observations:  **Observation 3:** A NTN UE operating in FR2 might be considered as a relay UE, but most likely not a NR FR2 UE.  **Ku-band:**  **Observation 10:** The proposed frequency ranges in Ku-band are currently not covered by RAN4 specifications TS 38.104 and TS 38.101-1/-2.  **Observation 11:** The Radio Regulations have not allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of Ku-band in downlink for NTN. The proposed frequency ranges should not be considered for NTN.  **Observation 12:** The Radio Regulations have not allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of Ku-band in uplink for NTN, except for the 14-14.5 GHz frequency range but as secondary service only.  **Ka-band:**  **Observation 13:** The proposed frequency ranges in Ka-band downlink are currently not covered by RAN4 specifications TS 38.104 and TS 38.101-1/-2.  **Observation 14:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the 19.7-20.2 GHz range of the suggested part of Ka-band in downlink for NTN. However, it is a secondary allocation in the range 19.7-20.1 GHz in Region 1 and Region 3.  **Observation 15:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the 29.5-30.0 GHz range of the suggested part of Ka-band in uplink for NTN.  **Q/V-band:**  **Observation 16:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the 39.5-40.5 GHz range of the suggested part of Q/V-band in downlink for NTN.  **Observation 17:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite as secondary service for the 50.4-51.4 GHz range of the suggested part of Q/V-band in downlink for NTN.  Based on previous proposal and observations, following frequency ranges are allocated to mobile satellite and would need further discussion. The ranges highlighted in red are neither part of FR1 nor FR2 and would then require extra specification effort:  - Ku-band  Downlink (space to earth) None  Uplink (earth to space) 14.0 - 14.5 GHz (secondary)  - Ka-band  Downlink (space to earth) 19.7 – 20.2 GHz in Region 2  Uplink (earth to space) 29.9-30 GHz  - Q/V band  Downlink (space to earth) 39.5 – 40.5 GHz  Uplink (earth to space) ?? |
| [*R4-2015263*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015263.zip) | Xiaomi | **Proposal 1:** it is proposed at least the type of handheld UE with PC3 should be considered first for FR1. |
| [*R4-2015252*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015252.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Observation 2:** RAN4 should within this WI only consider example NR bands/frequencies.  **Proposal 2:** Choose example NR bands/frequencies in both the FR1 and FR2 range.  **Observation 3:** New NR bands should be defined at least for LEO and GEO deployments. |
| [*R4-2015547*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015547.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Observation 1:** RAN4 should consider the frequency band which are allocated for MSS as the example band firstly. And RAN4 can focus on the MSS scenario when co-existence study is performed.  **Observation 2:** In order to reduce the regulation risk, we can start the work with a frequency band in which there is no incumbent service except for MSS.  **Observation 3:** Band 65/n65 is specified in RAN4’s specification as a terrestrial IMT band instead of MSS. RAN4 can’t simply reuse band n65 as a NTN example band because of the regulation risk.  **Observation 4:** The RF requirements of satellite are different from the base station considering the large propagation distance between UE and satellite.  **Observation 5:** RF requirements of VSAT is totally different from the traditional 3GPP UE. For handheld UE, the general UE RF requirements can be considered as baseline.  **Proposal 1:** It’s proposed to choose 1.6GHz L band as a NTN example band. |
| [*R4-2015907*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015907.zip) | Ericsson | **Observation 1:** for all FR2 bands, NR bands are TDD only while NTN would use FDD duplex mode. This would be a major issue for coexistence. |
| [*R4-2016112*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016112.zip) | ZTE Corporation | **Proposal 1:** to adopt the coexistence scenarios in Table 2.1-1 for NTN coexistence study.  5 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; TN, 200MHz; DL to DL; 20 GHz Rural [Note1]  6 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; TN, 200MHz; UL to UL ; 20 GHz Rural [Note1]  7 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; NTN, 200MHz; DL to DL; 20 GHz Rural  8 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; NTN, 200MHz; UL to UL; 20 GHz Rural  Note 1: there are no rural cases above 3GHz according to ITU-R M.2292, coexistence between FR2 NTN and TN should be deprioritized  Note 2: the baseline scenario for NTN coverage should be rural area, FFS for other scenarios.  Note 3: TN should be NR based and it’s not necessary to evaluate LTE based or UTRA based as requirements should be close. |
| [*R4-2015548*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015548.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Simulation Parameter/Potential Choice:**  Channel bandwidth/It depends on operators’ spectrum allocations, no more than 100MHz. |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 4-1 Candidate FR2 exemplary bands

*Sub-topic description:* Candidate FR2 exemplary band(s)

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 4-1:** Candidate FR2 exemplary band

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
    - RAN4 work should consider an exemplary FR2 band for NTN.
    - RAN4 to use an FR2 exemplary band of 17.7 – 20.2 GHz for DL and 27.5 – 30.0 GHz for UL with FDD duplex mode.
  + Option 2:
    - The proposed frequency ranges in Ka-band downlink are currently not covered by RAN4 specifications TS 38.104 and TS 38.101-1/-2.
    - The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the 19.7-20.2 GHz range of the suggested part of Ka-band in downlink for NTN. However, it is a secondary allocation in the range 19.7-20.1 GHz in Region 1 and Region 3.
    - The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the 29.5-30.0 GHz range of the suggested part of Ka-band in uplink for NTN.
  + Option 3:
    - Based on previous proposal and observations, following frequency ranges are allocated to mobile satellite and would need further discussion. The ranges highlighted in red are neither part of FR1 nor FR2 and would then require extra specification effort:
    - - Ka-band
      * Downlink (space to earth) 19.7 – 20.2 GHz in Region 2
      * Uplink (earth to space) 29.9-30 GHz
* Recommended WF
  + Consider at least one FR2 Ka band

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note2: **Companies are encouraged to provide justification** for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: No, this is not a FR2 band  Option 2: Agree  Option 3: Agree |
| Huawei | The frequency ranges considered for NTN should be spectrum allocated by ITU to the Mobile satellite as a primary service.  RAN4 can’t consider to specify 7-24GHz before RAN decide to address this frequency range between FR1&FR2.  Thus, no FR2 example band. |
| Samsung | Generally fine to consider an exemplary band for FR2, if the requirement is confirmed. However, the proposed candidate Ka-band for NTN is out of the range of FR2. Considering the work load of RAN4 and complex situation on coexistence, suggest to deprioritize FR2 exemplary band at this stage. |
| LGE | As commented in Topic #1, for FR2, FDD is assumed in NTN, but, for TN, TDD is assumed. It implies that the system operation may be complicated such as coexistence, UE measurement and so on. For this reason, we propose that RAN4 focus on NTN for FR1 at this stage. |
| Qualcomm | UL frequency range in Option 1 is not a FR2 band. Input from operators should be taken into account. |
| Apple | As pointed out by several companies, the 7-24GHz frequency range is not supported by current RAN4 specifications and FDD is not supported for frequency ranges higher than 2.3GHz. Thus, more discussions are needed which exemplary satellite "FR2" bands we can have |
| Nokia | Option 1: The listed band is not covered by the FR2 range.  Option 2: OK  Option 3: OK and it can be suggested to allow the DL frequency range to be treated as a FR2 band as a starting point for the discussion. Final definition of FR for the DL band is dependent on another SI. However, this does not solve the TDD vs FDD intended operation which would require extensive effort within in this WI. Work on this NTN FRx band within this WI could be percussive of the introduction of a FR2 FDD band. |
| HNS/Ech | Agree with Option 1 |
| Eutelsat | Option 1, 2, 3 – Disagree |
| Thales | Basically agree. Use another naming than “FR2” might be required.  There should be at least one exemplary FR2 band for coexistence scenarios/RAN4 studies, even if is partially covered by 3GPP FR2 (e.g. only by DL or only by UL).  Moreover, the coexistence studies for “FR2-like” scenarios should use frequency bands that are already used by satellite operators. |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Disagree | There is no candidate FR2 band, the proposed frequency ranges are only partly included in FR2. Moreover, the proposed ranges are considering FDD while all FR2 bands are TDD, this would be a major issue for coexistence. |
| Huawei | Disagree | See comments above |
| Panasonic | Agree |  |
| MTK | Agree | It is necessary to identify one suitable band to progress FR2 RF effort. |
| Nokia | Partially disagree | See comments above |
| HNS/Ech | Agree | RAN4 will assess FDD in mmWave. Refer to section 11.2 of TR 38.803 V14.2.0 and R4-1610616,”Way forward on IMT parameters WP5D” (Ericsson). |
| Eutelsat | Disagree | Way forward should focus on FR1 |
| Thales | Agree | Even if FDD (and not TDD), different Ka configurations may be envisaged for mmWave exemplary band in RAN4 (and even if we keep FR2)  There should be at least one exemplary FR2 band for coexistence scenarios/RAN4 studies, even if is partially covered by 3GPP FR2 (e.g. only by DL or only by UL). Propose to change WF into “Consider at least one FR2 band” or “Consider an exemplary band which is partially FR2 (i.e. only UL is FR2 OR only DL is FR2).” |
|  |  |  |

Main feedbacks:

* Concerns are raised for proposed FR2 (with respect to FR2 3GPP defined range but also for coexistence concerns with TDD). Please also see topic #1.
* Companies agreed to consider at least one FR2 Ka band, 3 disagree, 1 partially disagrees.

Moderator suggests new proposals (after removing “Ka” from WF):

**Proposal 1:** Consider an exemplary band which is partially FR2 (i.e. only UL is FR2 OR only DL is FR2).

**Proposal 2:** RAN4 to use as exemplary band of 17.7 – 20.2 GHz for DL and 27.5 – 30.0 GHz for UL with FDD mode.

**Proposal 3:** RAN4 should consider coexistence scenarios NTN FDD with TN TDD in adjacent bands.

### Sub-topic 4-2 Candidate FR2 band configurations

*Sub-topic description:* Candidate FR2 band configurations

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 4-2:** Candidate FR2 band configurations

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Channel bandwidth/It depends on operators’ spectrum allocations, up to 400 MHz in FR2.
  + Option 2: Channel bandwidth/It depends on operators’ spectrum allocations, no more than 100MHz.
* Recommended WF
  + Consider 100, 200, 400 MHz in FR2; then try to downscope.

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note2: **Companies are encouraged to provide justification** for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: Agree with the WF  Option 2: |
| Huawei | We need to decide whether to specify a FR2 band before discussing BW. |
| Samsung | Before discussion on the detail RF characteristics such as BW etc.in FR2, suggest to agree on the exemplary band firstly. |
| Panasonic | Option 1: Yes  Option 2: No |
| MTK | Agree with option 1. |
| Nokia | First a ‘FR2’ band need to be defined. |
| HNS/Ech | Agree with option 1 |
| Thales | Yes for Option 1 & 2. We should consider all configurations and then try to down-scope. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |  |
| Huawei | Disagree | We need to decide whether to specify a FR2 band before discussing BW. |
| Panasonic | Agree |  |
| MTK | Agree |  |
| Nokia |  | Fine but the WF has no meaning before a band is decided. |
| HNS/Ech | Agree | Consider 100, 200, 400 and possibly 500 MHz in FR2 |
| Thales | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

4 companies agreed, and 1 company disagrees.

Moderator suggests for discussion:

**Proposal 1:** Select the channel BW sizes to be considered for in accordance with the selected exemplary band(s).

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 4-1:  Sub topic 4-2:  ….  Others: |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Issue 4-1:** Candidate FR2 exemplary band | Main feedbacks:   * Concerns are raised for proposed FR2 (with respect to FR2 3GPP defined range but also for coexistence concerns with TDD). Please also see topic #1. * Companies agreed to consider at least one FR2 Ka band, 3 disagree, 1 partially disagrees.   Moderator suggests new proposals (after removing “Ka” from WF) for discussion:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** Consider an exemplary band which is partially FR2 (i.e. only UL is FR2 OR only DL is FR2).  **Proposal 2:** RAN4 to use as exemplary band of 17.7 – 20.2 GHz for DL and 27.5 – 30.0 GHz for UL with FDD mode.  **Proposal 3:** RAN4 should consider coexistence scenarios NTN FDD with TN TDD in adjacent bands.  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 4-2:** Candidate FR2 band configurations | 4 companies agreed, and 1 company disagrees.  Moderator suggests for discussion:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** Select the channel BW sizes to be considered for in accordance with the selected exemplary band(s).  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | Email discussion summary for [97e][312] NTN\_Solutions 2nd Round | WF |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

As a result of 1st round discussions, the moderator suggests to postpone some of the discussions for RAN4#98e as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** | **For #97e or Postponed for #98e** |
| **Issue 4-1:** Candidate FR2 exemplary band | **Proposal 1:** Consider an exemplary band which is partially FR2 (i.e. only UL is FR2 OR only DL is FR2). | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** RAN4 to use as exemplary band of 17.7 – 20.2 GHz for DL and 27.5 – 30.0 GHz for UL with FDD mode. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 3:** RAN4 should consider coexistence scenarios NTN FDD with TN TDD in adjacent bands. | **#97e** |
| **Issue 4-2:** Candidate FR2 band configurations | **Proposal 1:** Select the channel BW sizes to be considered for in accordance with the selected exemplary band(s). | **Postponed to #98e** |

Companies are further asked to answer with **AGREE** or **DISAGREE** or **AGREE WITH CHANGES** to the following tables:

**Question:** Do you agree with proposal **Issue 4-x. Proposal y?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **Issue 4-1, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 4-1, Proposal 2** | **Answer**  **Issue 4-1, Proposal 3** |
| Thales | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| MTK | - | - | - |
| Panasonic | AGREE | AGREE |  |
| Huawei | Disagree | Disagree | Disagree if the proposal is for FR2 |
| Qualcomm | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ericsson | Disagree.  This would require a new WI on 7-24GHz to be done before NTN could make any progress. | Disagree | Disagree |
| Hughes/EchoStar | - | agree | agree |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

# Topic #5: Exemplary Frequency band for HAPS/HIBS

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

*Decide if HAPS HIBS exemplary frequency band is required.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [*R4-2014785*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014785.zip) | Samsung | **View 2:** It is necessary to prioritize the candidate NTN frequency bands to identify 1 or 2 example bands, which should be within the range of FR1 or FR2, while the confirmed and practical needs from operators should be well taken into account. |
| [*R4-2015906*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015906.zip) | Ericsson | HIBS  **Observation 18:** The Radio Regulations include HIBS usage in the 2 GHz, further frequency bands below 2.7 GHz will be studied for WRC-23. Decision on introducing HIBS will be taken at WRC-23.  Based on previous proposal and observations, following frequency ranges are allocated to mobile satellite and would need further discussion:  - L-band  Downlink (space to earth) 1518 – 1559 MHz, 1613.8 – 1626.5 MHz  Uplink (earth to space) 1626.5 – 1660.5 MHz & 1668 – 1675 MHz, 1610.0 – 1626.5 MHz  - S-band  Downlink (space to earth) 2170 - 2200 MHz & 2483.5 - 2500 MHz  Uplink (earth to space) 1980 - 2010 MHz  - C-band:  None  For HIBS, following frequency ranges might be considered:  Regions 1 and 3: 1 885-1 980 MHz, 2 010-2 025 MHz, 2 110-2 170 MHz  Region 2: 1 885-1 980 MHz, 2 110-2 160 MHz |
| [*R4-2015263*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015263.zip) | Xiaomi | **Proposal 1:** it is proposed at least the type of handheld UE with PC3 should be considered first for FR1. |
| [*R4-2015252*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015252.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Observation 2:** RAN4 should within this WI only consider example NR bands/frequencies.  **Proposal 2:** Choose example NR bands/frequencies in both the FR1 and FR2 range.  **Observation 3:** Reusing existing bands can be discussed for HAPS deployments. |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 5-1 Candidate HAPS/HIBS exemplary bands

*Sub-topic description:* Candidate HAPS/HIBS exemplary bands

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 5-1:** Candidate HAPS/HIBS exemplary bands

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For HIBS, following frequency ranges might be considered:
    - Regions 1 and 3: 1 885-1 980 MHz, 2 010-2 025 MHz, 2 110-2 170 MHz
    - Region 2 : 1 885-1 980 MHz, 2 110-2 160 MHz
  + Option 2: Reusing existing bands can be discussed for HAPS deployments.
  + Option 3: RAN4 should decide if HAPS/HIBS exemplary bands should be on its own. The range should be covered under FR1 or FR2 category.
* Recommended WF
  + RAN4 should decide if HAPS/HIBS exemplary bands should be on its own.

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note2: **Companies are encouraged to provide justification** for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: Agree  Option 2: The HIBS bands shall be chosen according to the RR.  Option 3: There is no FR2 band considered for HIBS in the RR. |
| Huawei | We need to send a LS to RAN plenary for guideline and the accurate definition for HAPs and revise the WID. After that, we can further discuss the HAPs scenario. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2: Need to confirm: Is it allowed to reuse existing IMT bands for HAPS and/or HIBS from radio regulations perspective? |
| Apple | HAPS already has a set of dedicated bands, so one if them can be used as an exemplary band if needed |
| Nokia | We are fine with options 1 and 2. |
| HNS/Ech | Agree with Ericsson |
| Thales | Agree. The only comment is that HAPS seems to use transparent payload (with ground BS) while HIBS may use regenerative payload (with on-board BS). Both are NTN subjects but they seem different. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| DISH | Disagree | WID is not specific with respect to HAPS/HIBS. Especially, there is not mention about defining specific HAPS/HIBS band(s) within the Core WID. |
| HNS/Ech | Disagree | Agree with Dish |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

No clear decision for WF.

Moderator suggests for discussion:

**Proposal 1:** LS to RAN plenary for guideline and the accurate definition for HAPS.

**Proposal 2:** Leave this topic for FFS.

### Sub-topic 5-2 Candidate HAPS/HIBS band configurations

*Sub-topic description* Candidate HAPS/HIBS band configurations depending on the HAPS/HIBS way forward

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 5-2:** Candidate HAPS/HIBS band configurations

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For FR1 5, 10, 15, 20 MHz
  + Option 2: For FR2 100, 200, 400 MHz
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note2: **Companies are encouraged to provide justification** for their choices.]  [Note3 (general): Please provide feedback also for the proposed WF(s)] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: ok  Option 2: There is no “FR2 band” considered for HIBS in the RR.  ….  Others (e.g. feedback/recommendations for proposed WF): |
| Huawei | Same view with Ericsson |
| ZTE | As suggested before, could start with 3GPP based requirement firstly. |
| Nokia | We are fine with options, but is should be dependent on operator requests. |
| Thales | Yes, but dependent on operator requests. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Moderator suggests for discussion:

**Proposal 1:** Further discuss on HAPS BW configuration for FFS.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 5-1:  Sub topic 5-2:  ….  Others: |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Issue 5-1:** Candidate HAPS/HIBS exemplary bands | No clear decision for WF.  Moderator suggests for discussion:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** LS to RAN plenary for guideline and the accurate definition for HAPS.  **Proposal 2:** Leave this topic for FFS.  *Candidate options:* Other companies are encouraged to provide inputs.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |
| **Issue 5-2:** Candidate HAPS/HIBS band configurations | Moderator suggests for discussion:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** Further discuss on HAPS BW configuration for FFS.  *Candidate options:* Other companies are encouraged to provide inputs.  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | Email discussion summary for [97e][312] NTN\_Solutions 2nd Round | WF |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

As a result of **potential duplication with Issue 1-4, Proposal 3**, a small update has been made to the proposal:

**Issue 5-1, Proposal 1:** “LS to RAN plenary for guideline and the accurate definition for HAPS” **updated to**

**Issue 5-1, Proposal 1:** “LS to RAN plenary for guideline and the accurate definition for HAPS, and HAPS frequency bands.”.

Moreover, as a result of 1st round discussions, the moderator suggests to postpone some of the discussions for RAN4#98e as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** | **For #97e or Postponed for #98e** |
| **Issue 5-1:** Candidate HAPS/HIBS exemplary bands | **Proposal 1:** LS to RAN plenary for guideline and the accurate definition for HAPS, and HAPS frequency bands. | **Postponed to #98e**  (Already partially covered by Issue 1-4, Proposal 3) |
| **Proposal 2:** Leave this topic for FFS. | **Postponed to #98e** |
| **Issue 5-2:** Candidate HAPS/HIBS band configurations | **Proposal 1:** Further discuss on HAPS BW configuration for FFS. | **Postponed to #98e** |

As a result, Issues 5-x are postponed, some of them are already considered by Issue 1-4.

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

# Topic #6: RAN4 Proposed RF core requirements

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [*R4-2014785*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014785.zip) | Samsung | **View 4:** As usual, 3GPP RAN4 should conduct relative independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements (such as ACLR, ACS) for NTN. |
| [*R4-2014066*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014066.zip) | Fraunhofer HHI, Fraunhofer IIS | **Observation 14:** RAN4 is to specify UE RRM and RF core requirements, study bands related to NTN and investigate and specify UE timing and frequency pre-compensation requirements.  **Observation 15:** All requirements shall be specified for both FR1 and FR2. |
| [*R4-2014467*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014467.zip) | HUGHES Network Systems Ltd, Thales | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 work should consider an exemplary FR2 band for NTN.  **Proposal 2:** RAN4 to use an FR2 exemplary band of 17.7 – 20.2 GHz for DL and 27.5 – 30.0 GHz for UL with FDD duplex mode. |
| [*R4-2015263*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015263.zip) | Xiaomi | **Proposal 1:** it is proposed at least the type of handheld UE with PC3 should be considered first for FR1.  **Proposal 2:** it is proposed the UE reference architecture with 1Tx/2Rx could be as baseline to define UE requirements |
| [*R4-2015945*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015945.zip) | THALES | **Proposal 4:** 3GPP should re-use for NTN UE RAN4 core requirements definition the existent TN framework.  **Proposal 5:** Consider parameters from ETSI EN 302 574-2 V2.1.1 for defining specific RAN4 NTN UE core requirements for exemplary FR1 NTN band.  **Proposal 6:** NTN shall consider equivalent ETSI ACS and ACLR parameters.  **Proposal 7:** Consider 3GPP KPIs from TS 38.101-1 for defining RAN4 core requirements for exemplary FR1 NTN band.  **Proposal 8:** Down-select 3GPP core requirements from 3GPP KPI list, for exemplary FR1 NTN proposed RAN4 band.  **Proposal 9:** Define in RAN4 at least specific NTN core requirements for UE Tx Power, UE Output Power Dynamics, UE Tx Frequency Error, UE Tx EVM, UE Tx ACLR, UE Rx ACS, Spectrum Mask, Blocking Characteristics.  **Proposal 10:** A similar exemplary band definition approach should be applied for FR2. |
| [*R4-2015907*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015907.zip) | Ericsson | **Proposal 3:** For NR and NB-IoT, ACLR and ACS specified in TS 38.104 and 38.101 shall be assumed for NR BS and NR UE when running coexistence simulations. |
| [*R4-2015548*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015548.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Observation 1:** It isn’t expected that the co-existence simulation of NTN will have an impact on RF requirements of terrestrial IMT UE/BS.  **Simulation Parameter/Potential Choice:**  Satellite orbits/GEO, LEO-1200, LEO-600  Center frequency /It depends on the decision about the example band.  Satellite antenna model/Passive reflector antenna or AAS. Antenna Gain and 3dB beam width  Channel bandwidth/It depends on operators’ spectrum allocations, no more than 100MHz.  Transmitter power/Different satellite orbits need different transmitter power  Noise figure/FFS  UE’s type/VSAT or handheld UE  Power control/FFS |
| [*R4-2015908*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015908.zip) | Ericsson | The proposed approach i.e. handling NTN gateway+ satellite as either a repeater or alternatively a relay.  It should be noted that 3GPP specifications E-UTRA contain repeater specification and relay specification where the repeater requirements were derived from various studies, including co-existence studies. The repeater RF requirements overview and structure from TS 36.106 is as following:  - Output power  - Frequency stability  - Out-of-band gain  - Unwanted emissions  - Error Vector Magnitude  - Input intermodulation  - Output intermodulation  - Adjacent channel rejection ration  The Relay requirements overview and structure from specification TS 36.116 is as following. More comprehensive requirements are specified due to the additional signal processing covering both access and backhaul link.  - Output power  - Output power dynamics including ON/OFF masks and transient handling for unpaired spectrum  - Transmit signal quality  - Unwanted emissions covering spurious emission, ACLR and operating band unwanted emission  - Transmit intermodulation  - Receiver sensitivity  - Receiver dynamic range  - In-channel selectivity  - Receiver blocking  - Receiver spurious emission  - Receiver intermodulation  - Access performance Requirements for PUSCH, PUCCH and PRACH  - Backhaul performance requirement covering PDSCH and PDCCH (for NR context)  Considering the relay requirements are more comprehensive, if there is any additional signal processing occurs performed within either the gateway or the satellite, the relay approach should be preferred. It looks then essential to conclude on this choice to progress further. |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 6-1 RF core requirements

*Sub-topic description:* RAN4 Proposed RF core requirements

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

**Issue 6-1:** Proposed RF core requirements

* Proposals
  + Option 1:
    - 3GPP should re-use for NTN UE RAN4 core requirements definition the existent TN framework.
    - Consider parameters from ETSI EN 302 574-2 V2.1.1 for defining specific RAN4 NTN UE core requirements for exemplary FR1 NTN band.
    - NTN shall consider equivalent ETSI ACS and ACLR parameters.
    - Consider 3GPP KPIs from TS 38.101-1 for defining RAN4 core requirements for exemplary FR1 NTN band.
    - Down-select 3GPP core requirements from 3GPP KPI list, for exemplary FR1 NTN proposed RAN4 band.
    - Define in RAN4 at least specific NTN core requirements for UE Tx Power, UE Output Power Dynamics, UE Tx Frequency Error, UE Tx EVM, UE Tx ACLR, UE Rx ACS, Spectrum Mask, Blocking Characteristics.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + Define in RAN4 at least specific NTN core requirements for UE Tx Power, UE Output Power Dynamics, UE Tx Frequency Error, UE Tx EVM, UE Tx ACLR, UE Rx ACS, Spectrum Mask, Blocking Characteristics.

**Question: Which option (listed above) do you prefer? Please provide your answer(s) e.g. “Yes” or “No”.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments**  [Note2: **Companies are encouraged to provide justification** for their choices.] |
| Ericsson | Option 1: Already discussed before, option 1 is not acceptable. |
| Huawei | It seems quite general. The requirements should be discussed one by one. And the scenario, exemplary NTN band and co-existence simulation are still under discussion. |
| DISH | Option 1: Disagree. For instance, UE REFSENS is the “heart” of UE RX requirements. No way to leave it unspecified. To us it looks like we are trying to agree everything at the same time, which is not very efficient. |
| ZTE | As suggested before, could start with 3GPP based requirement firstly. |
| MTK | As stated in previous sections and also by other companies, all NTN working procedures and specification work must mirror existing RAN4 working practice and only focus on the definition of 3GPP specifications. This may indeed already be the intention of the moderator proposal, but the current wording is not completely clear.  For UEs supporting L/S bands RAN4 should aim at maximizing alignment between NTN UE requirements and 3GPP terrestrial UE requirements. Aligned NTN/terrestrial requirements will facilitate availability of dual mode devices and will enable the NTN ecosystem to benefit from terrestrial ecosystem economies of scale by re-using already available components already in use for NR terrestrial UE implementations. |
| Nokia | No – all of this is under discussion, so this is simply too early. |
| Thales | Some of parameters such as ACS, ACLR may be different between TN and NTN, so they would require some new definition. Some other parameters (such as REFSENS) should be the same for TN and NTN (at least UE side) in order to assure operational compatibility across TN and NTN.  We agree that we should align as much as possible. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Question: Do you partially agree/disagree with the recommended way forward stated above? Please provide your views on the recommended Way Forward stated above.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree, agree partially, disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Disagree | RAN4 shall define NTN UE RF requirements based on existing UE RF requirements (specifeid in 38.101-1 and 38.101-2) |
| Huawei | Disagree | See comments above. |
| DISH | Disagree | Some of listed requirements don’t seem to make sense; e.g RX ACS and blocking is listed to be defined but no REFSENS. In RAN4 UE RX requirements, almost everything is specified relative to REFSENS. Not defining that for NTN UE would be entirely new approach. |
| MTK | Partially agree | See comments above |
| Qualcomm | Partially | In general, we are OK to further discuss the UE requirements listed in the WF. |
| Nokia | Disagree | See comments above. |
| Thales | Partially |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Moderator suggests for discussion:

**Proposal 1:** RAN4 shall define NTN UE RF requirements based on existing UE RF requirements (specified in TS 38.101-1 and 38.101-2).

**Proposal 2:** Continue discussion with respect to potential NTN UE RF requirements that might be different from TN UE RF.

**Proposal 3:** Continue discussion with respect to NTN UE RF requirements (e.g. REFSENS, Maximum Transmitted Power) that should be kept the same as for TN, in order to allow operational compatibility across NTN and TN.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Sub topic 6-1:  ….  Others: |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Issue 6-1:** Proposed RF core requirements | So far, no agreement to use any kind of parameters, since it is considered too early. Moderator suggests for discussion:  *Tentative agreements:*  **Proposal 1:** RAN4 shall define NTN UE RF requirements based on existing UE RF requirements (specified in TS 38.101-1 and 38.101-2).  **Proposal 2:** Continue discussion with respect to potential NTN UE RF requirements that might be different from TN UE RF.  **Proposal 3:** Continue discussion with respect to NTN UE RF requirements (e.g. REFSENS, Maximum Transmitted Power) that should be kept the same as for TN, in order to allow operational compatibility across NTN and TN.  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* Discuss proposals for 2nd round and agree if possible by the end of the meeting. |

*Suggestion on WF/LS assignment*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **WF/LS t-doc Title** | **Assigned Company,**  **WF or LS lead** |
| #1 | Email discussion summary for [97e][312] NTN\_Solutions 2nd Round | WF |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

As a result of 1st round discussions, the moderator suggests to postpone some of the discussions for RAN4#98e as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** | **For #97e or Postponed for #98e** |
| **Issue 6-1:** Proposed RF core requirements | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 shall define NTN UE RF requirements based on existing UE RF requirements (specified in TS 38.101-1 and 38.101-2). | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 2:** Continue discussion with respect to potential NTN UE RF requirements that might be different from TN UE RF. | **#97e** |
| **Proposal 3:** Continue discussion with respect to NTN UE RF requirements (e.g. REFSENS, Maximum Transmitted Power) that should be kept the same as for TN, in order to allow operational compatibility across NTN and TN. | **#97e** |

Companies are further asked to answer with **AGREE** or **DISAGREE** or **AGREE WITH CHANGES** to the following tables:

**Question:** Do you agree with proposal **Issue 6-x. Proposal y?**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer**  **Issue 6-1, Proposal 1** | **Answer**  **Issue 6-1, Proposal 2** | **Answer**  **Issue 6-1, Proposal 3** |
| Thales | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| MTK | AGREE | AGREE | AGREE |
| Ericsson | Agree | Agree with changes: Continue discussion ~~with respect to potential NTN UE RF requirements that might be different from TN UE RF~~.  We haven’t yet discussed any requirement, we even don’t know the architecture split. This is far too early to make such proposal. | Agree with changes:  Continue discussion on NTN UE RF requirements ~~with respect to NTN UE RF requirements (e.g. REFSENS, Maximum Transmitted Power) that should be kept the same as for TN, in order to allow operational compatibility across NTN and TN~~  We haven’t yet discussed any requirement, we even don’t know the architecture split. This is far too early to make such proposal! |
| Huawei | Disagree:  38.101-2 can’t be reused as baseline for FDD NTN UE | Disagree:  We don’t need to jump into the details at this stage. | Disagree:  We don’t need to jump into the details at this stage. (scenario and co-existence study is still open) |
| Qualcomm | **AGREE WITH CHANGES**  RAN4 shall consider to defineNTN UE RF requirements based on existing UE RF requirements (specified in TS 38.101-1 and 38.101-2) as the starting point. | AGREE | **DISAGREE**  Could not have the conclusion without co-ex study and technical analysis |
| Hughes/EchoStar | A good start | agree | agree |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## Summary on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 2nd round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs/WFs/LSs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 2nd round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

# Updated Work Plan

According to the comments received from Ericsson and Nokia, the work plan has been updated as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **NTN Work Plan** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| *[R4-2014381](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014381.zip" \t "_blank)* | Ericsson: There should a RAN4 specific Work Plan so that RAN4 could accept it.  Why should we discuss any band specific requirement in 98->102? That should be done in separate WI.  It might be too early to start demodulations discussion already in January.  No plan for simulations? |
| Nokia: Similar concerns as Ericsson. |
| Thales proposes to revise the work plan by replacing   * “Further discuss on band(s) specific requirements”   By   * “Further discuss on specific requirements associated **to** the selected exemplary bands as well as the necessary simulations” |

Therefore, the proposed RAN4 work plan for NR support non-terrestrial network WI becomes:

**2-13 November 2020, RAN4#97-e, e-meeting**

* Work plan presented for information.
* Presentation of reference use cases and scenarios to be considered.
* Initial discussion on RF & RRM KPIs for NTN core requirements.
* Initial discussion on the exemplary band(s) relevant for NTN and their regulatory constraints.

**25 January-5 February 2021, RAN4#98-e, e-meeting**

* Agree on use cases and scenarios and exemplary band(s)
* Initial discussion on Demodulation KPIs.
* Further discussion on the RF & RRM KPIs for NTN core requirements (UE and “BS” requirements)
* Further discuss necessary simulations
* Agree on exemplary band(s)

**12-20 April 2021, RAN4#98-bis-e, e-meeting**

* Further discussion on the RF & RRM KPIs (UE and “BS” requirements)
* Further discussion on Demodulation KPIs.
* Further discuss on specific requirements associated to the selected exemplary bands as well as the necessary simulations

**19 – 27 May 2021, RAN4#99, e-meeting**

* Further discussion on the RF & RRM KPIs (UE and “BS” requirements)
* Further discussion on Demodulation KPIs.
* Further discuss on specific requirements associated to the selected exemplary bands as well as the necessary simulations

**23-27 August 2021, RAN4#100, Toulouse**

* Further discussion on the RF & RRM KPIs (UE and “BS” requirements)
* Further discussion on Demodulation KPIs.
* Further discuss on specific requirements associated to the selected exemplary bands and simulation results
* Start drafting CRs

**October 2021, RAN4#100-bis, TBD**

* Further discussion on the RF & RRM KPIs (UE and “BS” requirements)
* Further discussion on Demodulation KPIs.
* Further discuss on specific requirements associated to the selected exemplary bands and simulations results
* Further drafting of CRs

**November 2021, RAN4#101, TBD**

* Further discussion on the RF & RRM KPIs (UE and “BS” requirements)
* Further discussion on Demodulation KPIs.
* Further discuss on specific requirements associated to the selected exemplary bands and simulations results
* Further drafting of CRs

**February 2022, RAN4#102, TBD**

* Agree on the RF & RRM KPIs (UE and “BS” requirements)
* Agree on Demodulation KPIs.
* Agree on specific requirements associated to the selected exemplary bands and simulations results
* Endorse CRs

Companies are further asked to answer with **AGREE** or **DISAGREE** or **AGREE WITH CHANGES** to the following table:

**Question:** Do you agree with the RAN4 Work Plan**?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** |
| Thales | AGREE |
| MTK | AGREE |
| Ericsson | The work plan should better be submitted in a separate document, not in this document which will be noted.  I don’t see how we could start discussing demod in January 2020 if we haven’t agree on the architecture split. Also, demod is usually discussed in the conformance part, when RF requirements have been specified.  Simulations are discussed inJanuary 2020, but there is no plan to run simulations, calibrate results and analyze results to derive requirements.  Looking at all open issues, starting drafting CRs in August 2021 looks over optimistic. |
| Qualcomm | **AGREE WITH CHANGES**  RAN4 needs to align the simulation assumptions and platform calibration before submitting the co-ex simulation results. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Appendix: Companies contribution summary

Contribution summaries are as follows:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [*R4-2015905*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015905.zip) | Ericsson | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 should consider (NTN gateway + satellite) as a repeater or alternatively as a relay. The corresponding requirements shall be specified in a new repeater specification, or alternatively a new relay specification. |
| [*R4-2014785*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014785.zip) | Samsung | **View 1:** At least the Radio Regulations should be taken as basic reference for NTN band selection.  **View 2:** It is necessary to prioritize the candidate NTN frequency bands to identify 1 or 2 example bands, which should be within the range of FR1 or FR2, while the confirmed and practical needs from operators should be well taken into account.  **View 3:** ITU-R Recommendations/Reports on characteristics of satellite systems can be used as references for developing or cross-check the assumptions of coexistence studies in RAN4.  **View 4:** As usual, 3GPP RAN4 should conduct relative independent adjacent channel coexistence studies to develop RF requirements (such as ACLR, ACS) for NTN. |
| [*R4-2014381*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014381.zip) | THALES | **General and work plan** [NR\_NTN\_solutions], updated with RAN4 activity |
| [*R4-2014066*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014066.zip) | Fraunhofer HHI, Fraunhofer IIS | During the early study items, several architectures and deployment scenarios were investigated.  **Observation 1:** In general, two different satellite architectures can be considered: Transparent and Regenerative satellites.  **Observation 3:** The propagation delay for a transparent payload is twice as long as for a regenerative payload.  **Observation 2:** Deployment scenarios in FR1 and FR2 are considered in geostationary (GEO) and low earth orbit (LEO).  A study on the propagation characteristics of non-terrestrial scenarios was conducted and an initial channel model was defined, featuring dynamic attenuation, Doppler effects and fading.  **Observation 5:** Only outdoor conditions are considered for satellite operations.  **Observation 6:** The propagation channel for NTN is a combination of satellite and terrestrial channels.  **Observation 7:** The propagation channel for satellites in medium and low earth orbit features strong variation in delay and Doppler shift due to the fast movement of the satellite.  **Observation 9:** The propagation losses can be as high as 217 dB in GEO and 188 dB in LEO scenarios.  **Observation 4:** The one-way propagation delay can be up to 272 ms in GEO and 14 ms in LEO scenarios.  Based on the investigations, several key issues were identified.  **Observation 12:** Long propagation delays, large Doppler effects and moving cells were identified as key issues.  **Observation 8:** In both architectures (transparent and regenerative), timers have to be extended to cope with the longer delays.  **Observation 11:** Release 15 and 16 NR functionalities are found to form a good basis for supporting LEO and GEO NTN scenarios.  **Observation 10:** While Release 15/16 beam management and BWP procedures are considered as baseline for NTN, they should be further discussed.  In the ongoing Release 17 work item NR\_NTN\_solutions, RAN4 has several objectives.  **Observation 13:** For the current WI, LEO and GEO based satellites with both Earth fixed and moving cells are considered. FDD and UEs with GNSS capabilities are assumed.  **Observation 14:** RAN4 is to specify UE RRM and RF core requirements, study bands related to NTN and investigate and specify UE timing and frequency pre-compensation requirements.  **Observation 15:** All requirements shall be specified for both FR1 and FR2.  **Observation 16:** Although RAN4 will select exemplary band(s) in the current NR-NTN-solutions WI, the definition of additional NR bands for NTN will be part of dedicated RAN4 led Release 17 work items. |
| [*R4-2014467*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2014467.zip) | HUGHES Network Systems Ltd, Thales | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 work should consider an exemplary FR2 band for NTN.  **Proposal 2:** RAN4 to use an FR2 exemplary band of 17.7 – 20.2 GHz for DL and 27.5 – 30.0 GHz for UL with FDD duplex mode. |
| [*R4-2015906*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015906.zip) | Ericsson | In this contribution, based on Radio Regulations, we made following proposal and observations:  **Observation 1**: A NTN BS might be considered as a “Relay node” or “Remote Radio Head” unit.  **Observation 2:** A NTN UE operating in FR1 might be considered as NR FR1 UE.  **Observation 3:** A NTN UE operating in FR2 might be considered as a relay UE, but most likely not a NR FR2 UE.  **Observation 4:** According to the RR definitions, HAPS vehicles fly between 20-50 km.  **Proposal 1:** Only HIBS are in the scope of NTN. The NTN WI shall be updated to clarify this, replacing “HAPS” (*High Altitude Platforms*) with “HIBS” *(HAPS operating as an IMT base station).*  **Proposal 2:** The frequency ranges considered for NTN should be spectrum allocated by ITU to the Mobile satellite as a primary service.  **L-band:**  **Observation 5:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of L-band for NTN, the mobile service is also allocated in the ranges 1518-1525 MHz (primary service) and 1525-1535 MHz (secondary service).  **Observation 6:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of L-band for NTN, mobile service is also allocated in the ranges 1668.4-1675 MHz (primary service) and 1668-1668.4 MHz (secondary service).  **Observation 7:** According to past ITU-R discussions on this band for mobile and mobile satellite services, L-band would be used for sensitive mobile satellite service. Further consideration would be needed if NTN would also be using this band.  **S-band:**  **Observation 8:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of S-band for NTN. These ranges are also allocated to mobile. The proposed frequency ranges might be considered for NTN.  **C-band:**  **Observation 9:** The Radio Regulations have not allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of C-band for NTN. The proposed frequency ranges should not be considered for NTN.  **Ku-band:**  **Observation 10:** The proposed frequency ranges in Ku-band are currently not covered by RAN4 specifications TS 38.104 and TS 38.101-1/-2.  **Observation 11:** The Radio Regulations have not allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of Ku-band in downlink for NTN. The proposed frequency ranges should not be considered for NTN.  **Observation 12:** The Radio Regulations have not allocated mobile satellite service for the suggested part of Ku-band in uplink for NTN, except for the 14-14.5 GHz frequency range but as secondary service only.  **Ka-band:**  **Observation 13:** The proposed frequency ranges in Ka-band downlink are currently not covered by RAN4 specifications TS 38.104 and TS 38.101-1/-2.  **Observation 14:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the 19.7-20.2 GHz range of the suggested part of Ka-band in downlink for NTN. However, it is a secondary allocation in the range 19.7-20.1 GHz in Region 1 and Region 3.  **Observation 15:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the 29.5-30.0 GHz range of the suggested part of Ka-band in uplink for NTN.  **Q/V-band:**  **Observation 16:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite service for the 39.5-40.5 GHz range of the suggested part of Q/V-band in downlink for NTN.  **Observation 17:** The Radio Regulations have allocated mobile satellite as secondary service for the 50.4-51.4 GHz range of the suggested part of Q/V-band in downlink for NTN.  HIBS  **Observation 18:** The Radio Regulations include HIBS usage in the 2 GHz, further frequency bands below 2.7 GHz will be studied for WRC-23. Decision on introducing HIBS will be taken at WRC-23.  Based on previous proposal and observations, following frequency ranges are allocated to mobile satellite and would need further discussion. The ranges highlighted in red are neither part of FR1 nor FR2 and would then require extra specification effort:  - L-band  Downlink (space to earth) 1518 – 1559 MHz, 1613.8 – 1626.5 MHz  Uplink (earth to space) 1626.5 – 1660.5 MHz & 1668 – 1675 MHz, 1610.0 – 1626.5 MHz  - S-band  Downlink (space to earth) 2170 - 2200 MHz & 2483.5 - 2500 MHz  Uplink (earth to space) 1980 - 2010 MHz  - C-band:  None  - Ku-band  Downlink (space to earth) None  Uplink (earth to space) 14.0 - 14.5 GHz (secondary)  - Ka-band  Downlink (space to earth) 19.7 – 20.2 GHz in Region 2  Uplink (earth to space) 29.9-30 GHz  - Q/V band  Downlink (space to earth) 39.5 – 40.5 GHz  Uplink (earth to space) ??  For HIBS, following frequency ranges might be considered:  Regions 1 and 3: 1 885-1 980 MHz, 2 010-2 025 MHz, 2 110-2 170 MHz  Region 2: 1 885-1 980 MHz, 2 110-2 160 MHz |
| [*R4-2015915*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015915.zip) | THALES | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 work should consider an exemplary FR1 band for NTN.  **Proposal 2:** Propose to use an FDD exemplary band with 1980-2010 MHz for UL and 2170-2200 MHz for DL, for RAN4 KPI evaluation.  **Proposal 3:** RAN4 work should consider previous 3GPP relevant references (such as TR 36.861, TR 36.862, TR 38.891), ETSI relevant standardization sources (e.g. ETSI EN 302 574-2), ITU-R regulations (e.g. Resolution 212), regional/national regulations (e.g. ECC/DEC(06)09, EC Decision 2007/98/EC), and coexistence studies approved by regulatory bodies (e.g. ECC Report 298). |
| [*R4-2015913*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015913.zip) | THALES | **Proposal 1:** Consider SCS 15 & 30 kHz for FR1 exemplary band for RAN4 work.  **Proposal 2:** Consider frequency reuse schemes with frequency reuse > 1 for RAN4 work.  **Proposal 3:** Consider exemplary frequency bandwidths of 5, 10, 15, 20 MHz for FR1 RAN4 work.  **Proposal 4:** RAN4 needs to identify coexistence scenarios in adjacent bands.  **Proposal 5:** For exemplary band S, RAN4 should consider scenarios C1.1, C2.1 (LEO Earth Fixed Beams and Earth Moving Beams) and A1 (GEO).  **C1.1:** LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams  **C2.1:** LEO @ 600 km altitude, FR1, Earth moving beams  **A1:** GEO @ 35,786 km altitude, FR1, Earth fixed beams  **Proposal 6:** RAN4 should consider the following UE key reference scenario parameters:  **Handheld:** Omnidirectional antenna, 500 km/h (e.g. on board a high speed train), Linear: +/-45°X-pol, up to 200 mW (UE power class 3)  **VSAT:** Directive antenna (up to 60 cm equivalent aperture diameter), Up to 1200 km/h (e.g. aircraft mounted), Circular, up to 20 W  **Proposal 7:** UE with GNSS capabilities are assumed for RAN4 work.  **Proposal 8:** UE with/without capability for timing and/or frequency pre-compensation should be supported in NTN WI and further considered by RAN4.  **Proposal 9:** RAN4 should follow RAN1 outcomes for the synchronization solutions to be considered.  **Proposal 10:** RAN4 should use TR 38.821 assumptions for satellite parameters. |
| [*R4-2015263*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015263.zip) | Xiaomi | **Proposal 1:** it is proposed at least the type of handheld UE with PC3 should be considered first for FR1.  **Proposal 2:** it is proposed the UE reference architecture with 1Tx/2Rx could be as baseline to define UE requirements |
| [*R4-2015252*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015252.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Proposal 1:** The discussion related to this WI within RAN4 should focus only on LEO, GEO and HAPS deployment until decision for ATG have been made by RAN.  **Observation 1:** ITU separates spectrum for satellite and HAPS deployments in separate groups.  **Observation 2:** RAN4 should within this WI only consider example NR bands/frequencies.  **Proposal 2:** Choose example NR bands/frequencies in both the FR1 and FR2 range.  **Observation 3:** New NR bands should be defined at least for LEO and GEO deployments. Reusing existing bands can be discussed for HAPS deployments.  **Observation 4:** A HAPS as seen from the UE is a serving gNB and therefore the UE should expect same RF characteristics as a terrestrial gNB.  **Observation 5:** The RF requirements for the service link provided by LEO and GEO deployments should be at least same level as those for a terrestrial gNB.  **Proposal 3:** RF requirements for a terrestrial gNB should be used as baseline for HAPS, LEO and GEO deployments.  **Proposal 4:** Satellites both in transparent and regenerative deployments should provide same performance in terms of RF characteristics. |
| [*R4-2015547*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015547.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Observation 1:** RAN4 should consider the frequency band which are allocated for MSS as the example band firstly. And RAN4 can focus on the MSS scenario when co-existence study is performed.  **Observation 2:** In order to reduce the regulation risk, we can start the work with a frequency band in which there is no incumbent service except for MSS.  **Observation 3:** Band 65/n65 is specified in RAN4’s specification as a terrestrial IMT band instead of MSS. RAN4 can’t simply reuse band n65 as a NTN example band because of the regulation risk.  **Observation 4:** The RF requirements of satellite are different from the base station considering the large propagation distance between UE and satellite.  **Observation 5:** RF requirements of VSAT is totally different from the traditional 3GPP UE. For handheld UE, the general UE RF requirements can be considered as baseline.  **Proposal 1:** It’s proposed to choose 1.6GHz L band as a NTN example band. |
| [*R4-2015945*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015945.zip) | THALES | **Proposal 1:** 3GPP does not define RF Tx requirements for a given transparent payload to allow flexibility in the space segment design;  **Proposal 2:** 3GPP does not define RF Tx requirements for a BS in NTN;  **Proposal 3:** 3GPP defines equivalent BS Tx requirements at UE reception level, by taking into account e.g. a frequency spectrum mask corresponding to the cumulated self-interferences generated by the satellite network infrastructure at UE level.  **Proposal 4:** 3GPP should re-use for NTN UE RAN4 core requirements definition the existent TN framework.  **Proposal 5:** Consider parameters from ETSI EN 302 574-2 V2.1.1 for defining specific RAN4 NTN UE core requirements for exemplary FR1 NTN band.  **Proposal 6:** NTN shall consider equivalent ETSI ACS and ACLR parameters.  **Proposal 7:** Consider 3GPP KPIs from TS 38.101-1 for defining RAN4 core requirements for exemplary FR1 NTN band.  **Proposal 8:** Down-select 3GPP core requirements from 3GPP KPI list, for exemplary FR1 NTN proposed RAN4 band.  **Proposal 9:** Define in RAN4 at least specific NTN core requirements for UE Tx Power, UE Output Power Dynamics, UE Tx Frequency Error, UE Tx EVM, UE Tx ACLR, UE Rx ACS, Spectrum Mask, Blocking Characteristics.  **Proposal 10:** A similar exemplary band definition approach should be applied for FR2. |
| [*R4-2015907*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015907.zip) | Ericsson | **Proposal 1:** Co-channel coexistence and coexistence with adjacent services are out of NTN WI’s scope.  **Observation 1:** For FR1 bands above 3 GHz and for all FR2 bands, NR bands are TDD only while NTN would use FDD duplex mode. This would be a major issue for coexistence.  **Proposal 2:** A down-selection of coexistence NTN/NR scenarios is needed, further consideration would be needed to select the most relevant and stringent ones.  **Observation 2:** Networks layout and NTN UEs distribution would need further alignement.  **Proposal 3:** For NR and NB-IoT, ACLR and ACS specified in TS 38.104 and 38.101 shall be assumed for NR BS and NR UE when running coexistence simulations. |
| [*R4-2016112*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2016112.zip) | ZTE Corporation | **Proposal 1:** to adopt the coexistence scenarios in Table 2.1-1 for NTN coexistence study.  1 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; TN, 30MHz; DL to DL; 2 GHz Rural  2 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; TN, 30MHz; UL to UL; 2 GHz Rural  3 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; NTN, 30MHz; DL to DL; 2 GHz Rural  4 eMBB; NTN, 30MHz; NTN, 30MHz; UL to UL; 2 GHz Rural  5 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; TN, 200MHz; DL to DL; 20 GHz Rural [Note1]  6 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; TN, 200MHz; UL to UL ; 20 GHz Rural [Note1]  7 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; NTN, 200MHz; DL to DL; 20 GHz Rural  8 eMBB; NTN, 200MHz; NTN, 200MHz; UL to UL; 20 GHz Rural  **Proposal 2:** only one satellite is assumed for coexistence study at the beginning.  **Proposal 3:** consider the frequency reuse factor 1 as worst case for coexistence study.  Note 1: there are no rural cases above 3GHz according to ITU-R M.2292, coexistence between FR2 NTN and TN should be deprioritized  Note 2: the baseline scenario for NTN coverage should be rural area, FFS for other scenarios.  Note 3: TN should be NR based and it’s not necessary to evaluate LTE based or UTRA based as requirements should be close. |
| [*R4-2015548*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015548.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Observation 1:** It isn’t expected that the co-existence simulation of NTN will have an impact on RF requirements of terrestrial IMT UE/BS.  **Observation 2:** Some scenarios, such as LEO, GEO, HAPS and ATG are considered for NTN system. The outer scenario, such as rural macro, urban macro and dense urban, are considered for terrestrial network. The simulation scenarios are based on the permutation and combination between NTN scenario and TN scenario.  **Observation 3:** RAN4 need to consider how to match two heterogeneous network (NTN and IMT network).  **Observation 4:** For the co-existence scenario between two NTN systems, RAN4 need to consider whether to assume the same orbits and partial overlapping about foot print.  **Simulation Parameter/Potential Choice:**  Satellite orbits/GEO, LEO-1200, LEO-600  Center frequency /It depends on the decision about the example band.  Satellite antenna model/Passive reflector antenna or AAS. Antenna Gain and 3dB beam width  Channel bandwidth/It depends on operators’ spectrum allocations, no more than 100MHz.  Transmitter power/Different satellite orbits need different transmitter power  Noise figure/FFS  UE’s type/VSAT or handheld UE  Power control/FFS |
| [*R4-2015908*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_97_e/Docs/R4-2015908.zip) | Ericsson | The proposed approach i.e. handling NTN gateway+ satellite as either a repeater or alternatively a relay.  It should be noted that 3GPP specifications E-UTRA contain repeater specification and relay specification where the repeater requirements were derived from various studies, including co-existence studies. The repeater RF requirements overview and structure from TS 36.106 is as following:  - Output power  - Frequency stability  - Out-of-band gain  - Unwanted emissions  - Error Vector Magnitude  - Input intermodulation  - Output intermodulation  - Adjacent channel rejection ration  The Relay requirements overview and structure from specification TS 36.116 is as following. More comprehensive requirements are specified due to the additional signal processing covering both access and backhaul link.  - Output power  - Output power dynamics including ON/OFF masks and transient handling for unpaired spectrum  - Transmit signal quality  - Unwanted emissions covering spurious emission, ACLR and operating band unwanted emission  - Transmit intermodulation  - Receiver sensitivity  - Receiver dynamic range  - In-channel selectivity  - Receiver blocking  - Receiver spurious emission  - Receiver intermodulation  - Access performance Requirements for PUSCH, PUCCH and PRACH  - Backhaul performance requirement covering PDSCH and PDCCH (for NR context)  Considering the relay requirements are more comprehensive, if there is any additional signal processing occurs performed within either the gateway or the satellite, the relay approach should be preferred. It looks then essential to conclude on this choice to progress further. |