**3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #112-e *R2-201xxxx***

**Online, 2–13 November 2020**

**Agenda item: 8.10.3.3**

**Source: ZTE Corporation, Sanechips**

**Title: Report of [AT112-e][105][NTN] RRC aspect (ZTE)**

**Document for: Discussion and Agreement**

# 1 Introduction

This is to report the result of the following email discussion in RAN2#112-e Meeting [1].

* [AT112-e][105][NTN] RRC aspects (ZTE)

 Scope: Discuss remaining proposals from [R2-2009803](file:///C%3A%5C%5CData%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5CExtracts%5C%5CR2-2009803_Report%20of%20%5BPost111-e%5D%20%5B911%5D%20%5BNTN%5D%20Connected%20mode%20aspects%20%28ZTE%29.doc%22%20%5Co%20%22C%3AData3GPPExtractsR2-2009803_Report%20of%20%5BPost111-e%5D%20%5B911%5D%20%5BNTN%5D%20Connected%20mode%20aspects%20%28ZTE%29.doc)

Intended outcome: summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

* + - List of proposals for agreement (if any)
		- List of proposals that require online discussions

Initial deadline (for companies' feedback): Monday 2020-11-09 17:00 UTC

Initial deadline (for rapporteur's summary in R2-2010767): Tuesday 2020-11-10 01:00 UTC

Proposals marked "for agreement" in R2-2010767 not challenged until Tuesday 2020-11-10 12:00 UTC will be declared as agreed by the session chair. For the rest the discussion will continue online.

# 2 Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| ZTE | Yuan Gao (gao.yuan66@zte.com.cn) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Discussion

The following proposals from [R2-2009803](file:///C%3A%5C%5CData%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5CExtracts%5C%5CR2-2009803_Report%20of%20%5BPost111-e%5D%20%5B911%5D%20%5BNTN%5D%20Connected%20mode%20aspects%20%28ZTE%29.doc%22%20%5Co%20%22C%3AData3GPPExtractsR2-2009803_Report%20of%20%5BPost111-e%5D%20%5B911%5D%20%5BNTN%5D%20Connected%20mode%20aspects%20%28ZTE%29.doc) [2] will be discussed in this offline:

* NTN specific CHO execution condition

Proposal 2.3a: location based CHO execution condition should be introduced for both moving cell and fixed cell scenario.

Proposal 2.3b: Timer based CHO execution condition should be introduced for moving cell scenario.

* RACH-less HO and DAPS HO

Proposal 3.1: From RAN2’s perspective, RACH-less HO should be introduced in NTN. An LS should be sent to RAN1 to confirm the feasibility of RACH-less HO in NTN.

Proposal 3.2a: DAPS HO for NTN is de-prioritized in this release.

* UE location report

Proposal 5.1: Permission from UE is needed for the network to collect the UE location information for the purpose other than SON/MDT. If the UE location information is collected for other purpose, the UE consent for SON/MDT cannot be reused and a similar but independent procedure for permission should be considered.

Proposal 5.2: The location information report should be supported in NTN for the purpose other than SON/MDT.

* Location-based measurement event

Proposal 6.1: The Location-based measurement event should be supported in NTN for both moving cell and fixed cell scenario.

Proposal 6.2a: For moving cell scenario, a relative area scope expressed as the distance between UE and satellite or cell center will be configured and measurement report will be triggered when UE moves out of or moves in the area scope configured.

Proposal 6.2b: For fixed cell scenario, an absolute area scope will be configured and measurement report will be triggered when UE moves out of or moves in the area scope configured.

##  NTN specific CHO execution condition

The following NTN specific execution conditions for CHO has been studied in the SI phase.

* Condition 1: Location-based execution condition
* Condition 2: Timer based execution condition
* Condition 3: Timing advance based execution condition
* Condition 4: Elevation angle based execution condition

During email discussion [Post111-e][911] [NTN] Connected mode aspects (ZTE)[2], 29 companies showed preference for the above four candidate new execution conditions and the views are summarized in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CHO execution condition** | **Number of supported companies** |
| **Moving beam scenario** | **Fixed beam scenario** |
| #1 Location-based  | 22 | 23 |
| #2 Timer based  | 17 | 13 |
| #3 Timing advance based  | 5 | 4 |
| #4 Elevation angle based | 1 | 1 |

The execution conditions with more than 50% support (i.e. with >=15 supported companies) is considered to be preferred by the majority: Location based CHO execution condition for both moving cell and fixed cell scenarios and timer based CHO execution condition for moving cell scenarios.

A proposal is given based on the majority’s preference (22/29 and 23/29): ***Proposal 2.3a: location based CHO execution condition should be introduced for both moving cell and fixed cell scenario.***

**Question 1.1**: do you agree with the above proposal:

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 1.1 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments (Suggestions on the wording are also welcome if you agree with this proposal.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion:**

**To be added**

A proposal is given based on the majority’s preference (17/29): ***Proposal 2.3b: Timer based CHO execution condition should be introduced for moving cell scenario.***

**Question 1.2**: do you agree with the proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 1.2 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments (Suggestions on the wording are also welcome if you agree with this proposal.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion:**

**To be added**

##  RACH-less HO and DAPS HO

There has been discussion on whether to support RACH-less HO and DAPS HO in NTN [2].

16 companies see the value in introducing RACH less HO in NTN while13 companies do not see urgent need to support it since 2-step RACH based HO, helpful in reducing the mobility interruption time, will be supported. Some companies show concern that supporting RACH less HO may be challenging in some cases (e.g. inter-satellite handover) and the feasibility should be confirmed by RAN1 first.

A proposal is given based on the majority’s preference (16/29): ***Proposal 3.1: From RAN2’s perspective, RACH-less HO should be introduced in NTN. An LS should be sent to RAN1 to confirm the feasibility of RACH-less HO in NTN.***

**Question 2.1**: do you agree with the proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 2.1 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments (Suggestions on the wording are also welcome if you agree with this proposal.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

13 companies would like to support DAPS in NTN with R16 DAPS mechanism as a baseline while 15 companies are concerned about UE’s capability to simultaneously transmit/receive data from multiple satellites, co-existence of CHO and DAPS, complexity of the DAPS feature as well as impact on other RAN WG groups and would prefer to de-prioritize DAPS for NTN in this release.

A proposal is given based on the majority’s preference(15/28): ***Proposal 3.2a: DAPS HO for NTN is de-prioritized in this release.***

**Question 2.2**: do you agree with the proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 2.2 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments (Suggestions on the wording are also welcome if you agree with this proposal.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.3 UE location report

Whether any permission from UE is needed for the gNB to collect the UE location information for the purpose other than SON/MDT has been discussed via email [2].

29 companies showed preference on this topic. 27 companies agree that permission from UE is needed for the network to collect the UE location information for the purpose other than SON/MDT and the UE consent for SON/MDT cannot be reused if the location information collection is for other purpose, for which a similar but independent procedure for permission should be considered.

1 company consider it to be a SA3 or application layer issue while 1 company is not sure about whether to have such permission with the following consideration that for Aerial height based reporting UE can be configured to report location and it may also be that due to the nature of NTN, reporting location to network is mandatory to support.

A proposal is given based on the majority’s preference (27/29):***Proposal 5.1: Permission from UE is needed for the network to collect the UE location information for the purpose other than SON/MDT. If the UE location information is collected for other purpose, the UE consent for SON/MDT cannot be reused and a similar but independent procedure for permission should be considered.***

**Question 3.1**: do you agree with the above proposal:

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 3.1 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments (Suggestions on the wording are also welcome if you agree with this proposal.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion:**

**To be added**

Whether to support UE location report in NTN for purpose other than SON/MDT has also been discussed.

15 companies see the need for UE location report and the location information may be used in the following cases:

* Mobility and service continuity handling
* Measurement configuration
* Registration area management and paging
* Enforce country-specific policies
* Scheduling

14 companies do not see the benefit for UE reporting the location information for purpose other than SON/MDT in NTN and would like not to support it.

A proposal is given based on the majority’s preference (15/29):***Proposal 5.2: The location information report should be supported in NTN for the purpose other than SON/MDT.***

**Question 3.2**: do you agree with the above proposal:

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 3.2 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments (Suggestions on the wording are also welcome if you agree with this proposal.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.4 Location based measurement event

There has been discussion on the location based measurement and 30 companies has shown preference [2].

27 companies agreed that the Location-based measurement event should be supported in NTN as complementary to pure RSRP/RSRQ based triggering condition for both moving cell and fixed cell scenario.

1 company state that the location based measurement event can only be configured for UE to report location information via measurement report. 1 company prefer to rely on the existing measurement events and prefer not to introduce location based measurement event while 1 company emphasize that location shall not be the only factor used in measurement triggering and the measurement triggering should still primarily based on radio measurements.

A proposal is given based on the majority’s preference (27/30)**: *Proposal 6.1: The Location-based measurement event should be supported in NTN for both moving cell and fixed cell scenario.***

**Question 4.1**: do you agree with the above proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 4.1 |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments (Suggestions on the wording are also welcome if you agree with this proposal.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion:**

**To be added**

If location-based measurement event is supported, a measurement report will be triggered when UE moves out of or moves in the area scope configured. Regarding how to configure the area scope, the following alternatives have been discussed via email [2].

* Alt1: A relative area scope, in which case the area scope will change as the movement of satellite.
	+ Alt1-1: The area scope is configured as the relative distance between UE and satellite.
	+ Alt1-2: The area scope is configured as the relative distance between UE and the center of a cell.
* Alt2: An absolute area scope, in which case the area scope will not change unless new configuration is received.
	+ Alt2-1: The area scope can be expressed as single reference location (represented by location coordinates) and a radius associated to the reference location.
	+ Alt2-2: A list of location coordinates.
	+ Alt2-3: A list of TAI (PLMN + TAC) of TN cells. As shown in Figure 2, a list of TAI of TN cell (e.g. TAI#1 and TAI#3) can be configured to represent the cell edge of the serving NTN cell and UE trigger measurement report when it moves in to this area.

Companies’ preference have been summarized in the following table:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Alternatives for configuring the area scope** | **Number of supported companies** |
| **Moving beam scenario** | **Fixed beam scenario** |
| **Alt.1: A relative area scope** | Alt1-1 | 15 | / | 11 | / |
| Alt1-2 | 7 | 5 |
| **Alt.2: An absolute area scope** | Alt2-1 | 11 | 8 | 13 | 10 |
| Alt2-2 | 2 | 3 |
| Alt2-3 | 2 | 2 |
| **Other** | 5 | 4 |

A proposal is given based on the majority’s preference (15/28) for moving cell scenario: ***Proposal 6.2a: For moving cell scenario, a relative area scope expressed as the distance between UE and satellite or cell center will be configured and measurement report will be triggered when UE moves out of or moves in the area scope configured.***

**Question 4.2a**: do you agree with the above proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 4.2a |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments (Suggestions on the wording is also welcome if you agree with this proposal.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

In fixed cell scenario, considering that the number of supported companies for Alt2 is 13, a proposal is also given to see how far we can go: ***Proposal 6.2b: For fixed cell scenario, an absolute area scope will be configured and measurement report will be triggered when UE moves out of or moves in the area scope configured.***

**Question 4.2b**: do you agree with the above proposal?

|  |
| --- |
| Answers to Question 4.2b |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments (Suggestions on the wording is also welcome if you agree with this proposal.) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 4 Conclusion

**TBD**

# 5 References

[1] RAN2-112e - R16 eMIMO-CLI-PRN-RACS - R17 NTN-REDCAP (Sergio)\_2020\_11\_04\_1300.docx

[2] R2-2009803 Report of [Post111-e] [911] [NTN] Connected mode aspects (ZTE) ZTE corporation, Sanechips