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# Introduction

This document is to kick off the following offline discussion..

* [AT121bis-e][103][IoT NTN Enh] HARQ enhancements (Oppo)

Updated scope: Discuss the remaining proposals from R2-2304243 and draft an LS to RAN1 on RAN2 meeting agreements and agreed questions to RAN1

Updated intended outcome: Summary of the offline discussion and Draft LS to RAN1

Deadline for companies' feedback: Tuesday 2023-04-25 06:00 UTC

Deadline for rapporteur's summary (in R2-2304254) and draft LS (in R2-2304255): Tuesday 2023-04-25 08:00 UTC

Proposals marked "for agreement" in R2-2304254 not challenged until Tuesday 2023-04-25 20:00 UTC will be declared as agreed via email by the session chair (for the rest the discussion might continue online in the Wednesday CB session).

# 2. Contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Delegate contact |
| COMPANY\_NAME | NAME ([email@address.com](mailto:email@address.com)) |
| OPPO | Haitao Li (lihaitao@oppo.com) |
| CATT | Xiangdong Zhang (zhangxiangdong@catt.cn) |
| Nokia | Ping Yuan ([Ping.1.Yuan@nokia-sbell.com](mailto:Ping.1.Yuan@nokia-sbell.com)) |
| Xiaomi | Xiaowei jiang(jiangxiaowei@xiaomi.com) |
| MediaTek | Abhishek Roy (Abhishek.Roy@mediatek.com) |
| Qualcomm | Bharat Shrestha (bshrestha@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| Lenovo | Xu Min (xumin13@lenovo.com) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Xubin (xubin10@huawei.com) |
| Samsung | Jonas Sedin (j.sedin@samsung.com) |
| Ericsson | robert.s.karlsson@ericsson.com |
| CMCC | Jiayao Tan (tanjiayao@chinamobile.com) |
| Apple | Yuqin Chen (yuqin\_chen@apple.com) |
| Sequans | Olivier Marco (omarco@gmail.com) |
| Turkcell | İzzet Sağlam (izzet.saglam@turkcell.com.tr) |
| Transsion Holdings | Wen wu(wen.wu5@transsion.com) |
| ZTE | Ting Lu (lu.ting@zte.com.cn) |
| InterDigital | Brian Martin (brian.martin@interdigital.com) |

# Discussion

## 3.1 DL HARQ enhancements

***Correcting previous agreements?***

In following contribution, companies want to correct a previous agreement.

1. For NB-IoT NTN with single HARQ process when the HARQ feedback is disabled, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception plus 12 subframes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [5] | Proposal 1: To correct a previous agreement as below:  For NB-IoT NTN with single HARQ process when the HARQ feedback is disabled, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception plus 12 subframes plus deltaPDCCH. |
| [4] | Observation 1: The drx-inactivity timer also applies to two DL HARQ processes case.  Observation 2: The drx-inactivity timer is in unit of PP, if it is not started at the beginning of PDCCH period, it will lead to a PDCCH decode failure.  Proposal 1: For NB-Iot NTN, when the HARQ feedback is disabled for the transmission, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception + 12 subframes + PDCCH offset. |

Note that in RAN2#120, comments related to deltaPDCCH was raised but not agreed.

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 1 For NB-IoT NTN with single HARQ process when the HARQ feedback is disabled, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception plus 12 subframes.   * Oppo wonders if we need to take into account deltaPDCCH. Nokia thinks this should not be considered * CATT supports this * ZTE would like to reconsider this * Oppo thinks we should keep it simple and align to RAN1. Samsung agrees with Oppo * Ericsson wonders about the situation for eMTC * Agreed |

**Question 1: Do companies support correcting a previous agreement by adding “plus deltaPDCCH”?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | As drx-inactivity timer is in unit of PP, it would be better if it starts at the beginning of a PDCCH period. |
| CATT |  | Understand the intention, but as the Rapporteur reminded, maybe not necessary to re-open the discussion on this issue. |
| Nokia |  | Though it is a further optimization, we can accept the proposal to revise the agreement if this is the majority review. |
| Xiaomi |  | Do not see strong need to further optimize this. |
| MediaTek | Agree | As mentioned in our Tdoc [4], to avoid monitoring partial PDCCH occasion, PDCCH offset is required. |
| Qualcomm | Agree | This is needed to start the timer from the PDCCH occasion. The value of deltaPDCCH can be zero. |
| Lenovo |  | We see no essential need but can follow majority’s view |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | Not essential but reasonable. |
| Samsung |  | Same view as others – not essential but acceptable |
| Ericsson | Disagree | This is a possible optimization, but the same issue seems to be there for legacy too. For onDurationTimer there is this clarification in MAC 5.7:  For NB-IoT, *onDurationTimer* may start within a PDCCH period and end within a PDCCH period. The UE shall monitor NPDCCH during these partial PDCCH periods while *onDurationTimer* is running.  We may include a similar statement for InactivityTimer instead, to make it clear how the UE shall behave. |
| CMCC |  | Share similar view with CATT. |
| Apple | No strong views |  |
| Turkcell | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |

Rapporteur summary:

Majority companies (9/13) agree or can accept adding deltaPDCCH.

**Proposal 1: [9/13] RAN2#121’s agreement is revised to “For NB-IoT NTN with single HARQ process when the HARQ feedback is disabled, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception plus 12 subframes plus deltaPDCCH”.**

***How to enable/configure DCI-based HARQ feedback enabling/disabling indication?***

For DL HARQ feedback enabled/disabled, currently RAN1 is considering both RRC-based and DCI-based solutions. In the last meeting, RAN1 has confirmed the following working assumption, with updates:

|  |
| --- |
| Confirm the following working assumption with the following update:  Working assumption  For NB-IoT NTN and eMTC NTN for CE Mode B, to configure/indicate enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink transmission:   * Support Option 1 in case only per-HARQ process bitmap signaling is configured * Support Option 3 DCI direct indication of HARQ feedback enable/disable in case only DCI solution enabling/disabling signaling is configured * Support Option 3 DCI indication to override Option 1 configuration for corresponding transmission in case both per-HARQ process bitmap and DCI solution enabling/disabling signaling are configured   + FFS #1: Option 3 DCI-based overridden mechanism is applied to both semi-statically HARQ feedback enabled and disabled processes or only applied to semi-statically HARQ feedback disabled processes or only applied to semi-statically HARQ feedback enabled processes.   + FFS #2: whether/how to support Option 3 overriding Option 1 configuration for corresponding transmission for multiple TBs scheduled by single DCI   + FFS#3：Option 3 DCI-based overridden mechanism is DCI signaling to reverse the HARQ feedback enable/disable for the corresponding transmission from per-HARQ process RRC configuration or DCI signaling to directly indicate the HARQ feedback enable/disable for the corresponding transmission regardless of per-HARQ process RRC configuration.   RAN1 strives to have a common design (in terms of DCI design, PDCCH monitoring, etc.) for “Option 3” and “Option 3 + Option 1”.  For eMTC NTN, to configure/indicate enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink transmission, take Option 1 for CE Mode A. |

Some proposals have been raised by companies in RAN2 on the RRC signalling (e.g. per UE or per HARQ process) to enable the DCI-based solution as follows.

* Per UE: if RRC signaling configures Option 3 will be used to configure the HARQ feedback state, the HARQ feedback state of all the HARQ process of the UE can be configured by DCI.
* Per HARQ process: if RRC signaling configures Option 3 will be used to configure the HARQ feedback state of a specific HARQ process, only the HARQ feedback state of the specific HARQ process of the UE can be configured by DCI

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [3] | Proposal 6: RAN2 to discuss the following granularity options for RRC signaling enabling Option 3 based on RAN1 further input of DCI design:   * Per UE * Per HARQ progress |
| [9] | Proposal 3a: A single bit is introduced for configuring DCI based HARQ feedback enable/disable. |

Note that according to the latest RAN1 agreement “” above, the additional RRC signalling is not agreed by RAN1 yet.

**Question 2: On DL HARQ feedback enabling/disabling, how to enable/configure the DCI-based solution (e.g. using RRC signalling)?**

* **Option 1: per UE (using a single bit)**
* **Option 2: per HARQ process**
* **Option 3: wait for RAN1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 | From RAN2’s perspective, a RRC signalling is need to enable the DCI-based solution. Regarding the granularity, we see no need to support per HARQ process configured, it is sufficient to introduce a single bit for this configuration. But we are also ok to wait for RAN1 or even check with RAN1. |
| CATT | Option 2/Option 3 | Firstly, if a new DCI format is used, the length of the DCI is different according to including the enabling/disabling bit or not. If the configuration is per HARQ process, the UE can determine whether the received DCI for a given HARQ process has the new enabling/disabling bit. Otherwise, for example, if the network only wants to configure one HARQ process to use DCI-based solution, the DCI for all the HARQ process will have to include the enabling/disabling bit. RAN1 is discussion the DCI format:   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  For DCI-based overridden/direct indication, down select one of the following based on the criteria DCI overhead, PDCCH monitoring behavior, impact on scheduling flexibility, UE implementation complexity, etc   * Option 1: Indication by adding one field in DCI * Option 2: Indication by reusing/reinterpreting existing field in DCI |   So at least we can wait for RAN1 (Option 3).  Secondly, the HARQ state (enabling/disabling) is configured by RRC signalling per HARQ process, we think we use the same logic, to keep the network configuration flexibility. |
| Nokia | Option 3 | How to configure Option3 (DCI direct indication of HARQ feedback enable/disable) is still open in RAN1. |
| Xiaomi | Option 3 | We are not sure RAN1 has any intention to use RRC signalling to configure option 3. But we are ok to wait for RAN1 further progress on this. |
| MediaTek | Option 3 | We need to wait for RAN1 regarding this, as RAN1 has brought this out and is already discussing this one since quite long. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 | Let them settle the DCI based solution. |
| Lenovo | Option 3 | Better to wait for RAN1 on the DCI-based option. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 3 | Wait for RAN1 to avoid any potential misalignment and unnecessary coordination. |
| Samsung | Option 1 | We tend to think that we should allow RAN1 to decide, but we cannot see how the configuration to use DCI to turn OFF HARQ feedback can be done per HARQ process. RAN2 should able to make these decisions to keep the specs from becoming too complicated. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 but fine to wait for RAN1 (option 3) |  |
| CMCC | Option 3 | Prefer to wait for RAN1. |
| Apple | Option 3 | Also prefer waiting for RAN1. |
| Sequans | Option 3 | We prefer to wait for RAN1. |
| Turkcell | Option 3 | We prefer to wait for RAN1. |
| InterDigital | Option 1 | Agree with Samsung and OPPO. Single RRC configuration is more than sufficient. |

Rapporteur summary:

Majority companies (13/14) prefer or are ok with waiting for RAN1.

**Proposal 2: [13/14] Wait for RAN1’s decision on the RRC signalling of enabling DCI-based solution to indicate HARQ feedback enabled/disabled, and the signalling granularity, e.g. per UE or per HARQ process.**

***DRX for HARQ process with HARQ feedback disabled***

RAN1 has the following agreement in RAN1#110bist meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback in NB-IoT, UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in a period of Y=12(ms) from the end of reception of the NPDSCH. |

In last RAN2 meetings, RAN2 has discussed and made agreement on impact of disabled HARQ feedback on DRX for the case of NB-IoT UEs with single HARQ process. One company thinks RAN2 needs to further discuss the case of NB-IoT UEs with two HARQ processes.

Following proposals are related to drx-InactivityTimer for HARQ process with HARQ feedback disabled for NB-IoT UEs configured with two HARQ processes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [3] | Proposal 2: For NB-IoT NTN with two HARQ processes, the HARQ feedback of at least one the two HARQ processes is disabled, the UE should stop the drx-inactivity timer if running after the UE receiving a PDSCH and start/restart drx-inactivity timer:   * in the subframe containing the corresponding PDSCH reception plus 12 subframes for the HARQ process with HARQ feedback disabled; * when HARQ RTT Timer expires for the HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled. |

For P2 in [3], in the discussion part there is no mentioning of multiple TB scheduling, therefore, rapporteur assumes this P2 is related to single TB scheduling (maybe proponent company can help to clarify if rapporteur’s interpretation is wrong). It is also mentioned in the contribution that “The reason that UE stops the drx-inactivity timer if running is to avoid UE PDCCH monitoring”.

**Question 3: Do companies agree to P2 in [3]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Disagree | We understand the intention of this proposal is to keep drx-inactivity timer from running during the period of 12 subframes after a PDSCH reception with HARQ feedback disabled, given that UE is not required to monitor PDCCH during this period based on RAN1 agreement.  Note that in legacy, a NB-IoT UE is not required to monitor PDCCH during PDSCH reception or PUSCH transmission even if the UE is DRX Active Time due to e.g. drx-inactivity timer is running.   |  | | --- | | - during the Active Time, for a PDCCH-subframe, if the subframe is not required for uplink transmission for half-duplex FDD UE operation, and if the subframe is not a half-duplex guard subframe, as specified in TS 36.211 [7], and if the subframe is not part of a configured measurement gap and if the subframe is not part of a configured Sidelink Discovery Gap for Reception, and for NB-IoT if the subframe is not required for uplink transmission or downlink reception other than on PDCCH; or  - monitor the PDCCH; |   Therefore, we think it may be sufficient to capture this restriction of 12 subframes in RAN1 spec, and there is no need to modify UE behaviour on drx-InactivityTimer in the case of NB-IoT UEs with two HARQ processes and without multiple-TB scheduling.  In our understanding, for the case mentioned in [3], operation of drx-Inactivity Timer should follow legacy, i.e. start the timer after PDCCH reception and no need to introduce the new stop and start/restart operation. |
| CATT | Agree (the proponent) | Yes, the proposal is only related with single TB scheduling, thanks to the Rapporteur for the clarification.  Firstly, we think we need keep the same logic for the similar procedure. RAN1 has agreed that, for a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback in NB-IoT, UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in a period of Y=12(ms) from the end of reception of the NPDSCH. There is no restriction whether the DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback is a HARQ process of a UE configured with one or two HARQ process. We should give clear description on this to avoid confusion or unnecessary cross-spec check. Otherwise, if we only give clarification on single HARQ process case, people may assume the clarification is not adaptable to two HARQ processes case, very easily.  Secondly, according the current 36.321:  **Active Time:** Time related to DRX operation, as defined in clause 5.7, during which the MAC entity monitors the PDCCH.  And  When a DRX cycle is configured, the Active Time includes the time while:  *- onDurationTimer* or *drx-InactivityTimer* or *drx-RetransmissionTimer* or *drx-RetransmissionTimerShortTTI* or *drx-ULRetransmissionTimer* or *drx-ULRetransmissionTimerShortTTI* or *mac-ContentionResolutionTimer* (as described in clause 5.1.5) is running; or  …..  And for the HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, one of the intentions to start drx-Inactivity Timer is to monitor potentially blind re-transmission, to guarantee the reliability.  So we can assume the UE will monitor PDCCH during the drx-Inactivity Timer. |
| Nokia | Disagree | The change is not needed. As legacy, if UE receives a PDSCH from one HARQ process, we don’t think the drx-inactivity timer should be stopped since UE may need to monitor PDCCH for the grant for the other HARQ process. |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | No intention to change legacy behavior |
| MediaTek | Disagree | UE does not need to stop the running drx-inactivitiy timer after NPDSCH. The drx-inactivity timer is not HARQ process specific but UE specific. It is possible that UE needs to monitor NPDCCH for another HARQ process after the NPDSCH of this HARQ process. Also, as mentioned in the previous questions, PDCCH offset is needed to avoid monitoring partial PDCCH occasion. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | No need to stop the timer as the other HARQ process is ongoing. |
| Lenovo | Disagree | Legacy behaviour is OK. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | FFS | It seems there are different understandings on RAN1’s agreement:   1. If one HARQ process is disabled and the other not, UE should still monitor NPDCCH after NPDSCH. 2. If one HARQ process is disabled and the other not, UE should stop monitoring NPDCCH for “Y=12(ms)” after NPDSCH.   The way we see it, understanding 2 is RAN1’s intention. Maybe we can clarify this first and then discuss whether the inactivity timer should be stopped, i.e., whether the current spec is already clear as indicated by OPPO. |
| Samsung | Disagree | Agree with the others. |
| Ericsson | Disagree | **Alternative Proposal 2:** **For NB-IoT NTN UE with two HARQ processes, the HARQ feedback of one the two HARQ processes is disabled 7and one is enabled, scheduled with single TB:**   * **stop the drx-InactivityTimer (as in legacy, no spec change expected);** * **for the HARQ process with HARQ feedback disabled: start/restart drx-InactivityTimer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception plus 12 subframes;** * **for the HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled: start HARQ RTT Timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception (as in legacy no spec change expected) [and then start/restart drx-InactivityTimer when HARQ RTT Timer expires (as in legacy, no spec change expected)];** |
| Apple | Disagree | Agree with others. |
| Sequans | Disagree | Agree with QC. But open for an alternative proposal. |
| Turkcell | Disagree | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| InterDigital | Disagree |  |

Rapporteur summary:

Majority companies (11/13) do not agree to the proposal.

**Proposal 3: [11/13] P2 in R2-2302557 is not agreed.**

***DCI indicating overriding RRC configuration***

RAN1 has agreed to support both RRC-based and DCI-based solutions for indicating HARQ feedback enabled/disabled. In [5], DRX impact is further discussed when DCI indication overrides RRC configuration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [5] | Proposal 2a: For NB-IoT NTN with two HARQ processes and eMTC NTN for CE Mode B, if the HARQ feedback has been enabled for a HARQ process by RRC and later a DCI for disabling the HARQ feedback of this HARQ process is received, the UE won’t start/restart the corresponding HARQ RTT timer.  Proposal 2b: For NB-IoT NTN with single HARQ process, if the HARQ feedback has been enabled by RRC and disabled by DCI and later a DCI for disabling the HARQ feedback is received, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer.  Proposal 4: An indication from PHY is introduced to indicate to MAC that the HARQ feedback of a HARQ process is enabled/disabled by DCI. |

**Question 4: Do companies agree to P2a, P2b and P4 in [5]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree with P2a and P2b | For P4, we think no agreement is needed. Just like NDI, the HARQ enabling/disabling bit in DCI (if included) will of course be delivered to MAC. |
| Nokia | See comments. | P2a: Agree. But it is already covered by current RAN2 agreement for HARQ feedback disabled case.   1. RAN2 agree to take R17 NR NTN DRX solution as baseline for IoT NTN, e.g. for HARQ process with DL HARQ feedback disabled, the UE will not start the corresponding DL HARQ RTT timer.   P2b: Disagree. UE should follow the single HARQ process behaviour when the HARQ feedback is disabled. E.g. the agreement as below and further update as question1.   |  | | --- | | Agreements:  1. For NB-IoT NTN with single HARQ process when the HARQ feedback is disabled, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception plus 12 subframes. |   P4: FFS. It is not clear how to indicate the HARQ feedback disabling or enabling in DCI. Therefore, it is not clear whether MAC can directly know the information. Can be discussed after RAN1 reach conclusion. |
| Xiaomi | See comments | Agree with Nokia |
| MediaTek | Disagree: P2a, P2b  Agree: P4 | P2a and P2b: We need RAN1's input whether enable by RRC and disable by DCI is finally agreed.  P4 could be agreed if we assume that HARQ process is enabled/disabled by DCI. |
| Qualcomm | Wait for RAN1 | See Q2, how can we now decide on this when Q2 depends on RAN1.  This is also being discussed by RAN1 on how to use DCI based solution together with RRC-based, we can wait RAN1 progress. |
| Lenovo | Wait for RAN1 | Agree with Qualcomm, better to wait for RAN1 on the DCI-based option. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | Agree with Nokia that P2a and PP2b may be covered already and not need to be discussed at all.  For P4, same view with CATT: no need to explicitly introduce a inter-layer indication for this. MAC can directly capture something like “if the HARQ feedback is disabled….” Which includes both “RRC disable” and “DCI disable” |
| Samsung | Wait for RAN1  P4 is OK | For P4, we would assume it would be an indication like any other indication to MAC, i.e “If HARQ process is turned OFF, then …” |
| Ericsson | Disagree | P2a: Maybe. This shall be covered by the existing RAN2 agreement – if implemented correctly in the MAC spec (that is, MAC can say “if HARQ feedback is enabled, start HARQ RTT Timer; else do not start HARQ RTT Timer”.  P2b: Maybe, but this is normal PDCCH reception for disabled HARQ feedback, right? No spec changes?  P4: Possibly, but lets wait RAN1 progress on this issue first. |
| CMCC | Wait for RAN1 | How to use DCI-based solution is still under RAN1 discussion. |
| Apple | Wait for RAN1 | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Sequans | Wait for RAN1 |  |
| Turckell | Wait for RAN1 |  |
| InterDigital |  | We agree the behaviour for enabling/disabling based on DCI needs to be captured in MAC but maybe these proposals can be better evaluated based on stage 3 TP.  For example, if we base on NR MAC spec, it could be sufficient to just clarify that HARQ feedback can be enabled/disabled by RRC or DCI, and the rest is generic enough as it checks if HARQ feedback is enabled/disabled.. |

Rapporteur summary:

Majority companies either do not agree to the proposals or prefer to wait for RAN1. Some companies commented that P2a might be agreeable but it is already covered by earlier RAN2 agreements.

**Proposal 4: On DCI indication overriding RRC configuration for the HARQ feedback enabled/disabled, wait for RAN1’s progress on DCI-based solution before discussing related DRX impact in RAN2.**

***DL multiple TB scheduling***

With DL HARQ feedback disabled being introduced, multiple TB scheduling needs to be discussed. Following proposals are mentioned by companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [1] | Proposal 1: For DL, it is up to RAN1 to decide how to support multiple TB scheduling with a single DCI in NTN, i.e. allow those HARQ processes corresponding to the scheduled multiple TBs to be configured with different HARQ modes or restrict all the HARQ processed corresponding to the scheduled multiple TBs always configured with the same HARQ mode.  Proposal 4: For a NB-IoT UE configured with two HARQ processes, if PDCCH indicates the transmission is for multiple TBs and if at least one DL HARQ process is configured with disabled HARQ feedback, UE starts drx-InactivityTimer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the PDSCH corresponding to the last scheduled TB plus 12 subframes.  Proposal 5: For DL multiple-TB scheduling, if the scheduled multiple TBs are configured with different HARQ modes, HARQ RTT Timer is calculated based on the scheduled TBs for which the corresponding HARQ process is configured with DL HARQ feedback enabled. |
| [3] | Proposal 5: Postpone the discussion for enhancements for the case for a multi-TB block until RAN1 has made decision on the solutions for transmitting HARQ feedback for this case. |
| [6] | Proposal 5: RAN2 discuss how to address the issue of HARQ processes for the multiple TBs scheduled by the same PDCCH. |
| [11] | Proposal 1: Whether the HARQ RTT timer calculation needs to be changed for Multiple TBs scheduling, should wait for RAN1’s outcome. |
| [12] | Proposal 2: From RAN2 point of view, there is no need to enhance for Multiple TBs scheduling, unless RAN1 requests to do so. |

**Question 5: On DL multiple TB scheduling, which of below options do companies agree to?**

* **Option 1: RAN2 to discuss the change of inactivity timer and HARQ RTT Timer based on [1] and [6]**
* **Option 2: postpone the discussion until RAN1 makes decision.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 | From RAN2’s perspective, we can first discuss DRX impact for the potential cases. Once RAN1 makes decision on the cases to be supported, we can work on the MAC spec based on RAN1 agreements. |
| CATT | Option 2 | It is necessary to have a clear and stable assumption, before we start our work. |
| Nokia | Option 2. | RAN2 can wait for RAN1 decision on multi-TB HARQ feedback indication. |
| Xiaomi | Option 2 |  |
| MediaTek | Option 1 | Discussion can be started, but need to consider RAN1’s progress as well. |
| Qualcomm | See comments  (Option 3: discuss) | Ok to consider the RAN1 progress. It is not necessarily about changing DRX inactivity timer and HARQ RTT timer.  But at least we should discuss whether network implementation can resolve it by configuring same HARQ type for the multiple TBs. |
| Lenovo | Option 2 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 |  |
| Samsung | Option 2 | Better to wait for RAN1 to finish. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 |  |
| CMCC | Option 2 |  |
| Apple | Option 2 |  |
| Sequans | Option 2 |  |
| Turkcell | Option 2 |  |
| InterDigital | Option 2 |  |

Rapporteur summary:

Majority companies [11/14] prefer to wait for RAN1.

**Proposal 5: [11/14] On DL multiple TB scheduling, wait for RAN1’s progress before discussing related DRX impact in RAN2.**

***eMTC with single HARQ process***

RAN2 made the following agreement for eMTC in RAN1# 112 meeting:

**Agreement**

For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback in eMTC, UE is not expected to receive another MPDCCH carrying a DCI scheduling a PDSCH for a given HARQ process or to receive another PDSCH without corresponding MPDCCH for the given HARQ process that starts at a BL/CE DL subframe until X=3 (ms) have passed after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH for that HARQ process.

Following proposals are related to drx-InactivityTimer for eMTC with single HARQ process.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [3] | Proposal 4: For eMTC NTN with single HARQ process when the HARQ feedback is disabled, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception plus 3 subframes. |
| [7] | Proposal 1. For the case where only one DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback in a MAC entity of an eMTC UE, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing end of reception of the last PDSCH plus 3 subframes. |

Rapporteur understands that the above two proposals are mentioning the same thing. Perhaps proponent companies can help to clarify if this is not the case.

Note that in the current spec, single HARQ process is only mentioned for NB-IoT

**Question 6: Do companies agree to P4 in [3]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Disagree | In legacy, we did not mention the case of eMTC configured with single HARQ process in MAC spec. We are not sure whether to include it for NTN.  Plus, the P4 in [3] may also require that a stop operation would be needed for the drx-Inactivity Timer after PDCCH/PDSCH reception. |
| CATT | Agree(the proponent) | In legacy, the UE behaviour can be described uniformly, regardless the UE is configured with one or more than one HARQ processes.  However, for HARQ disabling scenario, the UE behaviour is different according to single HARQ process or more than one HARQ processes configured:   * For single HARQ process case, when the HARQ feedback is disabled, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception plus 3 subframes * For more than one HARQ processes case, no gap is needed, because the UE can receive another MPDCCH carrying a DCI or another PDSCH without corresponding MPDCCH, for any other HARQ process, the HARQ feedback of which can be enabled or disabled   So we think we need to make it clear. |
| Nokia | Disagree | For eMTC, the drx-inactivity timer should be started if the PDCCH indicates a new transmission. No special handling for single HARQ process for eMTC as what specified for NB-IoT. |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | Agree with Nokia |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Agree with Nokia |
| Lenovo | Disagree | Agree with Nokia |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | Agree with Nokia  The case is different from NB-IoT. |
| Samsung | Disagree | Drx-InactivityTimer is different for eMTC compared to NB-IoT, so this is not needed. |
| Ericsson | Disagree |  |
| CMCC | Agree | We agree with P4, but we understand P4 in [3] and P1 in [7] are two different cases. P4 means an eMTC UE with a single HARQ process which is similar as NB-IoT UE with single HARQ process, and P1 means a MAC entity with a single HARQ process but there maybe multiple MAC entities in a UE.  For latter case, considering the drx-inactivity timer is per MAC entity, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing end of reception of the last PDSCH plus 3 subframes. |
| Apple | Disagree | Agree with Nokia |
| Sequans | Disagree | Similar view as Nokia |
| Turkcell | Disagree | We share Nokia’s view. |
| InterDigital | Disagree |  |

Rapporteur summary:

Majority companies [11/14] replied with “disagree”.

**Proposal 6: [11/14] P4 in R2-2302557 is not agreed, i.e. no special handling for single HARQ process for eMTC.**

***ACK/NACK for SPS activation***

In [5], following proposal is mentioned.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [5] | Proposal 6: For eMTC NTN, a parameter harq-FeedbackEnablingforSPSactive could be configured for a UE. If harq-FeedbackEnablingforSPSactive is configured to enable HARQ feedback, UE reports ACK/NACK for the first SPS PDSCH after activation, regardless of if HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled corresponding to the first SPS PDSCH after activation. |

**Question 7: Do companies agree to P6 in [5]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | Fine to follow RAN1 agreement. |
| CATT | Agree | Keep align with the CR in NR NTN. |
| Nokia | Agree | Follow NR NTN is fine. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |

Rapporteur summary:

All companies support the proposal.

**Proposal 7: [13/13] For eMTC NTN, a parameter harq-FeedbackEnablingforSPSactive could be configured for a UE. If harq-FeedbackEnablingforSPSactive is configured to enable HARQ feedback, UE reports ACK/NACK for the first SPS PDSCH after activation, regardless of if HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled corresponding to the first SPS PDSCH after activation.**

## 3.2 UL HARQ enhancements

***Processing time for NB-IoT with single HARQ process in HARQ mode B***

For UL HARQ mode B, following proposals are mentioned on the processing time for drx-InactivityTimer.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [1] | Proposal 1: For a NB-IoT UE configured with a single HARQ process, if the HARQ process is configured with HARQ mode B, UE starts drx-InactivityTimer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PUSCH transmission plus 3 subframes. |
| [3] | Proposal 3: For the processing time for inactivity timer of HARQ mode B, RAN2 wait for the input of RAN1. |
| [4] | Propose 2: For NB-IoT NTN with a HARQ process in HARQ mode B, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PUSCH transmission + 1ms + PDCCH offset. |
| [5] | Proposal 5: To clarify a previous agreement as below:  For NB-IoT NTN with single HARQ process in HARQ mode B, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PUSCH reception plus 3 subframes plus deltaPDCCH. |
| [6] | Proposal 1: For NB-IoT NTN with single HARQ process in HARQ mode B, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PUSCH transmission plus 4 + deltaPDCCH subframes. |
| [7] | Proposal 2: The decision on the additional processing time for drx-inactivity timer for HARQ mode B can be left to RAN1, similarly to DL discussion. |
| [9] | Proposal 4: For IoT NTN with single HARQ process in HARQ mode B, the UE shall start/restart drx-inactivity timer after the end of (N)PUSCH + 3 subframes. |
| [10] | Proposal 1: RAN2 to discuss for HARQ mode B, whether the drx-InactivityTimer is (re)started after a period equal to the minimum time between two grants for the same HARQ process.  Proposal 2: Send LS to RAN1 asking about the minimum time between two grants for the same HARQ process. |
| [12] | Proposal 1: Send LS to RAN1 to clarify whether the behavior of NPDCCH monitoring need to be changed to support HARQ mode B, and if so, asks RAN1 to change it accordingly. |

In [1], it is mentioned that the additional processing time of 3 subframes follows the legacy for the same HARQ process in 36.213, i.e. UE is not expected to receive NPDCCH within 3 ms after NPUSCH transmission.

|  |
| --- |
| If a NB-IoT UE is configured with higher layer parameter *twoHARQ-ProcessesConfig*  - and if the UE has a NPUSCH transmission ending in subframe *n*,  - the UE is not required to receive transmissions in the Type B half-duplex guard periods as specified in [3]for FDD ; and  - the UE is not expected to receive an NPDCCH with DCI format N0/N1 for the same HARQ process ID as the NPUSCH transmission in any subframe starting from subframe n+1 to subframe n+3 or in a NTN serving cell, in any downlink subframe that overlaps with uplink subframe *n*+1 to subframe *n*+*K*mac+3*;*  else if the UE is not using higher layer parameter *edt-Parameters* or if the UE is using higher layer parameter *edt-Parameters* and  - if the NB-IoT UE has a NPUSCH transmission ending in subframe *n* , the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in any subframe starting from subframe *n+1* to subframe *n+3* or in a NTN serving cell, in any downlink subframe that overlaps with uplink subframe *n*+*1* to subframe *n*+*K*mac+*3*.  otherwise,  - If the NB-IoT UE has a NPUSCH transmission for Msg3 ending in subframe with transport block size , whereas if would have been selected the NPUSCH transmission would have ended in subframe *n*, the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in any subframe starting from subframe *n'+1* to subframe *n+3* or in a NTN serving cell, in any downlink subframe that overlaps with uplink subframe *n'*+*1* to subframe *n*+*K*mac+*3*. |

In [4], it is mentioned that the minimum gap between the PUSCH transmission and the next possible PDCCH occasion is Type B half duplex guard periods as specified in 36.211, which is 1ms.

|  |
| --- |
| 36.211 6.2.5 Guard period for half-duplex FDD operation For type A half-duplex FDD operation, a guard period is created by the UE by  - not receiving the last part of a downlink subframe immediately preceding an uplink subframe from the same UE.  For type B half-duplex FDD operation, guard periods, each referred to as a half-duplex guard subframe, are created by the UE by  - not receiving a downlink subframe immediately preceding an uplink subframe from the same UE, and  - not receiving a downlink subframe immediately following an uplink subframe from the same UE. |

In [6], it is mentioned that “For TN, this gap between PUSCH and NPDCCH is 3 + deltaPDCCH subframes. Therefore, we propose to have same gap length between PUSCH and PDCCH in UL HARQ mode B”.

**Question 8: For a NB-IoT UE configured with a single HARQ process in HARQ mode B, which of below options do companies support for the additional processing time for drx-InactivityTimer?**

* **Option 1: UE starts drx-InactivityTimer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PUSCH transmission plus 3 subframes [1] [9]**
* **Option 2: the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PUSCH transmission + 1ms + PDCCH offset [4]**
* **Option 3: the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PUSCH reception plus 3 subframes plus deltaPDCCH [5]**
* **Option 4: the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PUSCH transmission plus 4 + deltaPDCCH subframes [6]**
* **Option 5: wait for RAN1’s decision [3]**
* **Option 6: send LS to RAN1 and ask [10] [12]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 3 or option 6 | In legacy, processing time of 3 subframes is defined for the same HARQ process in 36.213, and we think it suits here for the case with single HARQ process.  We are also ok to check with RAN1. |
| CATT | Option 5 |  |
| Nokia | Option 5 and Option 6 | We prefer to ask RAN1 on the minimum gap between the PUSCH transmission and PDSCH reception in HARQ ModeB. Send LS to RAN1 is fine. |
| Xiaomi | Option 5 and 6 | We think it should be RAN1 to decide when to start PDCCH monitoring for the HARQ Mode B case. RAN2 can then decide the start of DRX inactivity timer based on RAN1 agreement. |
| MediaTek | Option 2 | We think only 1 ms is needed, as 3 subframes contains the network processing time for UL transmission, which is not needed for HARQ mode B. We have explained it in [4]. |
| Qualcomm | Option 4/3/1 | The counting starts from the last subframe (including) so it should be processing time + 1.  We think it is better to follow current HARQ definition which is 3 subframes gap.  We understand Option 1, Option 3 and Option 4 are same, its just wording issue how we capture in the specification. |
| Lenovo | Option 5 (and possibly Option 6) | It should be RAN1 to decide but we can ask RAN1 tofor further progress. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 6 | Since there are different understandings, better to check with RAN1. |
| Samsung | Option 5 and 6 |  |
| Ericsson | Option 6 |  |
| CMCC | Option 5 or option 6 |  |
| Apple | Option 5 and 6 |  |
| Sequans | Option 5 or 6 |  |
| Turkcell | Option 5 and 6 |  |
| InterDigital | Option 6 | In general agree with QC but it may be more efficient to ask RAN1. |

Rapporteur summary:

Majority companies (11/14) are ok with sending LS to RAN1 and ask what would be the processing time.

**Proposal 8: [11/14] For a NB-IoT UE configured with a single HARQ process in HARQ mode B, send LS to RAN1 and ask for the additional processing time for starting drx-InactivityTimer (i.e. start to monitor NPDCCH).**

***Ambiguity in PUSCH subframe***

In [6], the ambiguity issue for PUSCH subframe was mentioned as follows:

In case of starting HARQ RTT timer, there is no ambiguity between UE and network as the timer is extended by UE-eNB RTT which includes UE’s TA. However, in case of starting DRX inactivity timer from the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PUSCH transmission, the UE and network may not be synchronized.

As the network may not know exact UE’s TA, it will not know the exact subframe where UE performs UL transmission. If UE’s TA is less than scheduling Koffset, then UE will be starting DRX inactivity timer later than eNB expected because (Koffset – UE’s TA) is the ambiguity period.

We think the network implementation can resolve the issue by not scheduling the NPDCCH back-to-back during the ambiguity period (i.e., Koffset – UE’s TA).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [6] | Proposal 2: network implementation resolves the issue of ambiguity on start of DRX inactivity timer after the PUSCH transmission by not scheduling the NPDCCH back-to-back during the ambiguity period (i.e., Koffset – UE’s TA). |

**Question 9: Do companies agree to P2 in [6]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree | But maybe adding “No spec impact is needed” |
| Nokia |  | We are not sure the issue is valid since the NW know exactly when the UE should start the PUSCH transmission which is based on NW configured Koffset instead of TA. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree | Ok Nokia’s claim is new to us. NW only knows its own UL timing but not the UE’s UL timing. |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Partly agree | this is partly correct but still needs to observe the time between two grants for the same HARQ process (we need ask RAN1 about “how long after a PUSCH transmission can it receive a grant for the same HARQ process) |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |

Rapporteur summary:

Majority companies (12/14) agree to the proposal.

**Proposal 9: [12/14] Network implementation resolves the issue of ambiguity on start of DRX inactivity timer after the PUSCH transmission by not scheduling the NPDCCH back-to-back during the ambiguity period (i.e., Koffset – UE’s TA).**

***UL multiple TB scheduling***

Following proposals are related to DRX operation for UL multiple TB scheduling.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [1] | Proposal 2: For UL, RAN2 discuss how to support multiple TB scheduling with a single DCI in NTN.   * Option 1: Allow those HARQ processes corresponding to the scheduled multiple TBs to be configured with different HARQ modes. * Option 2: Restrict all the HARQ processed corresponding to the scheduled multiple TBs always configured with the same HARQ mode.   Proposal 6: For a NB-IoT UE configured with two HARQ processes, if PDCCH indicates the transmission is for multiple TBs and if at least one HARQ process is configured with HARQ mode B, UE starts drx-InactivityTimer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the PUSCH corresponding to the last scheduled TB plus 3 subframes. |
| [12] | Proposal 2: From RAN2 point of view, there is no need to enhance for Multiple TBs scheduling, unless RAN1 requests to do so. |

**Question 10: On UL multiple TB scheduling, which of below options do companies agree to?**

* **Option 1: P2 and P6 in [1]**
* **Option 2: P2 in [12]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 | Different from disabling HARQ feedback for DL, UL HARQ mode A/B is introduced in RAN2. In our understanding, the impact of UL HARQ mode A/B is mainly on MAC spec, i.e. DRX and LCP, except the UE processing time for HARQ mode B, which needs to be checked by RAN1. So it should be RAN2 to decide how to support multiple TB scheduling and the impact on DRX procedure. |
| CATT | Option 2 | There is no strong motivation on the enhancement. |
| Nokia | None | We think how to support multiple TB scheduling with a single DCI in UL should also be discussed in RAN1. (For example, any restriction on HARQ mode for different TBs as proposed in Option1 or Option2 above). Maybe RAN2 can include this point in LS to RAN1 as well. On the drx-inactivityTimer start in case of no HARQ process available after multi-TB scheduling, it can just follow single HARQ process behaviour. |
| Xiaomi | See comment | We think we can wait for RAN1 progress on this. |
| MediaTek | see comments | For P2 in [1], mediatek prefer option 2. For NB-IoT, UE cannot select specific UL HARQ process to send the UL data, so there no point to configure different HARQ mode when multiple TBs are configured.  For P6 in [1], we think it should be “1 subframe + PDCCH offset”, where 1 subframe is for tx-rx transition and PDCCH offset is to align with PDCCH occasion to avoid partial PDCCH occasion.  As mentioned before, 3 subframes contains the network processing time for UL transmission, which is not needed for HARQ mode B. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | It should be discussed whther P2, option 2 in [1] can resolve the issue. |
| Lenovo | See comment | Agree with Xiaomi to wait for RAN1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comment | Check with RAN1. |
| Samsung | Discuss Option 1 | As far as we know, RAN1 does not work a lot on turning off HARQ in the UL, so RAN2 needs to discuss this. |
| Ericsson | Wait RAN1 progress |  |
| CMCC | Option 2 |  |
| Apple | See comments | Option 2 in P2 seems promising but we can wait for RAN1. |
| Turkcell | Wait RAN1 progress |  |
| InterDigital | Wait for RAN1 | We are fine to discuss but based on comments so far it will be a waste of time so we should wait for RAN1. |

Rapporteur summary:

Quite a few companies mentioned waiting for RAN1 progress, however, RAN1 is currently not working on UL HARQ B. Some companies mentioned that RAN2 can check with RAN1 on which options to support. Rapporteur understands that this is reasonable to trigger RAN1’s discussion and then we can wait for RAN1’s decision.

**Proposal 10: Send LS to RAN1 to check for UL multiple TB scheduling, which UL HARQ mode combination(s) are to be supported.**

***Signalling of UL HARQ mode***

For UL HARQ mode, following contributions discussed the signalling options, e.g. RRC and/or DCI.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [6] | Proposal 3: The configuration for UL HARQ mode is kept simple with only option 1, i.e., per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling. |
| [7] | Proposal 3: The same mechanism can be applied to configure/indicate enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink and uplink transmission, i.e. support of the configuration via RRC signaling or DCI indication per HARQ process, and support of the DCI indication to override RRC configuration. |
| [9] | Proposal 5: RAN2 to consider whether uplink HARQ mode based on DCI should be supported.  If so, then:  Proposal 5b: Send an LS to RAN1 indicating RAN2 conclusion.  Proposal 5c: Specify in MAC that a HARQ process use Uplink HARQ mode A or B, based on RRC configuration or DCI indication.  Proposal 5d: Study whether any further changes are needed to support DCI based HARQ mode setting (E.g. timer handling, LCP restriction handling) |
| [11] | Proposal 1: The way of indicating enabling/disabling of UL HARQ should follow the mechanism designed for DL HARQ. |

The main arguments for having both RRC-based and DCI-based solutions (similar as for DL HARQ) is to have more flexibility for network control. Having RRC-based solution only is trying to be simple as mentioned in [6] that “RAN2 has agreed to support HARQ mode A and B for UL HARQ process but RAN1 has not yet discussed the solution on DCI-based dynamically switching the HARQ mode”.

**Question 11: which option do companies prefer for the signalling of UL HARQ mode?**

* **Option 1: RRC only**
* **Option 2: RRC and DCI**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 | We see no motivation to introduce DCI based configuration for UL HARQ mode. Prefer to reuse NR solution. |
| CATT |  | Suggest confirming with RAN1 if there is any necessity for uplink to support DCI-based solution. |
| Nokia | Option 2 | We would like to have a unified solution for both DL and UL. Furthermore, the motivation on why DCI solution should be supported for DL is appliable to UL as well. |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | RAN2 can introduce option 2 only if RAN1 askes to do so |
| MediaTek | Option 1 | We cannot see any user case for option 2. If HARQ mode B is configured, network predict the next UL data is important and might needs a retransmission, network can 1) send a blind retransmission UL grant right after the first UL grant. 2) wait for receiving the UL data and decide whether to retransmit the last UL data. There is no need to change the UL HARQ mode dynamically. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | There is no need of DCI-based solution in UL HARQ as network knows what to do, new transmission or retransmission. |
| Lenovo | Option 1 | If RAN1 want Option 2 then RAN2 can consider. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | Same view with Nokia. Also fine to check with RAN1. |
| Samsung | Option 1 | It is not as crucial as for DL, thus we would like to keep the solution simple. We see no need to check in with RAN1 to make this decision. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 | Agree with Nokia |
| CMCC | Option 2 | We would like to have a unified solution for both DL and UL. |
| Apple | No strong view | We can ask RAN1 if RAN2 cannot make a decision. |
| Sequans | Option 2 | Similar view as Nokia. |
| Turkcell | Option 2 | We share Nokia’s concern. |
| InterDigital | Option 2 |  |

Rapporteur summary:

Some companies think RRC only is simple, while some other companies prefer to have a unified solution for both DL and UL, i.e. using both RRC and DCI. It seems the common understanding to support at least RRC-based solution and whether DCI is supported or not will be up to RAN1. Some companies want to check with RAN1 on the DCI part.

**Proposal 11: For the UL HARQ mode, at least RRC configuration is supported. Send LS to RAN1 and ask whether RAN1 intends to introduce the DCI-based solution.**

There are also some proposals in [5] about DRX impact when DCI indication overrides RRC configuration, but those can be discussed after RAN2 has made agreements on the signalling options for indicating UL HARQ mode.

***SPS and PUR configured with HARQ mode B?***

It is mentioned in [4] that when the HARQ mode B apply to SPS and PUR, it is beneficial for the purpose of blind retransmission

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [4] | Proposal 4: UL transmission using SPS can be configured with HARQ mode B.  Proposal 5: UL transmission using PUR can be configured with HARQ mode B. |

**Question 12: Do companies agree to P4 and P5 in [4]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | It is up to NW implementation. |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree with P4  Not sure what the use of P5 is | We think P4 comes slightly for free as in NR NTN.  Enabling PUR to use HARQ mode requires us to change PUR-Config. We think more motivation of the use case is needed. PUR is already a special case of delivering a small message whereas turning off HARQ is to be able to deliver high rates. Thus the use of these two features collide and we see limited use of PUR in NTN. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree |  |
| Turckell | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |

Rapporteur summary:

All companies agree to P4 and P5 except one company is not sure about the use of P5.

**Proposal 12a: (14/14) UL transmission using SPS can be configured with HARQ mode B.**

**Proposal 12b: (13/14) UL transmission using PUR can be configured with HARQ mode B.**

***UL HARQ ACK feedback***

In [5], following proposal is mentioned.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [5] | Proposal 7: For eMTC NTN, it can be left to eNB’s implementation to enable HARQ feedback if mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig is configured. |

**Question 13: Do companies agree to P7 in [5]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| CATT | See the comments | Agree the intention, but maybe the proposal should be:  Proposal 7: For eMTC NTN, it can be left to eNB’s implementation to ~~enable~~ disable HARQ feedback if mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig is configured. |
| Nokia |  | We are not sure the issue is valid since the early termination for PUSCH repetition relies on the PDCCH-based Ack in DL instead of HARQ feedback in UL. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | No spec impact | There is nothing needs to be done. It is up to network whether it will send feedback in DL to UE or not. Regardless of HARQ mode, network can decide whether UE needs to terminate PUSCH transmission or not. |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Disagree | Agree this is an issue, but solution is that the UE shall not start/restart drx-ULRetransmissionTimer in case HARQ mode B is configured for the HARQ process and UL HARQ -ACK feedback has not been received. |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |

Rapporteur summary:

Majority companies (10/13) agree to P7, and one company mentioned that there is no spec impact.

**Proposal 13: (10/13) For eMTC NTN, it can be left to eNB’s implementation to enable HARQ feedback if mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig is configured.**

***TA report transmission issue***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [8] | Observation 1: The eNB may maintain an outdated Timing Advance information if the TAR MAC CE was not transmitted to eNB successfully, especially when the MAC CE was transmitted in UL HARQ Mode B.  Observation 2: The outdated Koffset will be used by UE for PUSCH transmission if the eNB maintain an outdated Timing Advance information.  Observation 3: The outdated Koffset may cause PUSCH transmission failure in eMTC NTN.  Proposal 1: RAN2 confirm that, if NR NTN solution is reused by eMTC NTN in which the LCP restriction based on allowed HARQ mode is not applicable for TAR MAC CE, the UE may suffer from PUSCH transmission failure.  Proposal 2: Enhancements on TAR MAC CE transmission should be considered for eMTC NTN to avoid or mitigate the outdated TA and Koffset impact. |

It is also mentioned in [8] that the relevant issue was discussed for NR NTN in late stage of Rel-17 while the solution was not concluded due to time limitation. Therefore, the issue was not resolved in NR NTN as well.

**Question 14: Do companies agree to P1 and P2 in [8]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Disagree | Prefer to follow NR. We see no strong need for enhancement. |
| CATT | Disagree |  |
| Nokia | Agree (Proponent) | Indeed, the issue was discussed but not concluded for NR NTN due to time limitation in the late stage of Rel-17. We propose to discuss the issue now in Rel-18 since it may result in PUSCH transmission failure and waste system resource in vain because of TA Report transmission error.  The typical case is that, when the UE’s TA is increased due to the increase of UE-Satellite-eNB distance, the UE may trigger a TA report to update the latest TA to NW. However, if the TAR MAC CE was not transmitted to eNB successfully (*e.g. due to MAC CE transmission in HARQ Mode B and MAC CE has no RLC retx*), the eNB would not know TA is updated/increased in UE hence the outdated TA is maintained in eNB. Therefore, the eNB has no way to update/increase its Koffset based on the outdated TA. In the end, when the *UE’s actual TA* is larger than (*UE's outdated Koffset + 4 - UE's UL processing delay*), the UE cannot perform UL transmission at all due to not enough processing time in UE in between PDCCH grant and the corresponding PUSCH transmission.  Furthermore, the motivation to report TA to NW is to facilitate NW configure proper Koffset hence reduce the latency for UE located in the cell centre. Configuring a larger Koffset to mitigate the issue is not a reasonable solution since NW has to configure a Koffset which can cover largest TA of all the UEs under the cell. While this solution will kill the motivation to support TA report which implies the TA report is not useful at all. |
| Xiaomi | No strong view | If time allow, we are ok to consider this. |
| MediaTek | No Strong Preference |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree | We agree with Nokia. Support of UE specific Koffset is important, that’s why we have TA report MAC CE. |
| Lenovo | No strong view | OK to discuss. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | Agree with Nokia and QC. This is something we should fix. |
| Samsung | No strong view | We do not see this enhancement as crucial, but we can consider it |
| Ericsson | Strongly Disagree | Was discussed and agreed in NR, no need to repeat that here. |
| CMCC | Disagree |  |
| Apple | No strong view |  |
| Turkcell | Agree |  |
| InterDigital |  | OK to consider it |

Rapporteur summary:

Agree: 4

Disagree: 4

No strong view: 5

Given no majority views, rapporteur suggests treating this online even though it was discussed and concluded not to have in NR.

**Proposal 14: (4:4:5) Discuss online for IoT NTN whether to enhance the TAR MAC CE transmission which was discussed in Rel-17 NR NTN.**

***HARQ-based LCP restriction***

In [9], it is observed that to minimise the risk of protocol stalling at RLC when using higher data rates, initial RLC transmission could be sent using HARQ processes configured with HARQ Mode B to improve throughput, and RLC retransmissions and RLC STATUS PDUs could be sent using HARQ processes configured with HARQ mode A to ensure reliable delivery. Following proposal are given.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [9] | Proposal 1: At least for eMTC: LCP restriction based on uplinkHARQ-Mode can be configured for different RLC PDU types, such that RLC initial transmissions, retransmission, and STATUS PDUs can be restricted to a particular HARQ Mode. |

**Question 15: Do companies agree to P1 in [9]?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Disagree | This not IoT NTN-specific issue. Prefer to not have this enhancement. |
| CATT | Disagree |  |
| Nokia | Disagree | It seems not reasonable to mix the RLC layer function and MAC layer function (LCP). |
| Xiaomi | Disagree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | It is sufficient to align with NR NTN. We prefer to avoid RLC impacts. |
| Lenovo | Disagree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree |  |
| Samsung | Disagree | Similar LCP prioritization to mix RLC and LCP was discussed in Rel-16 NTN SI but it did not gain traction. |
| Ericsson | Disagree |  |
| CMCC | Disagree |  |
| Apple | Disagree | Agree with others that this is not NTN specific. |
| Sequans | Disagree |  |
| Turkcell | Disagree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree | Agree that the issue is not IoT specific, however the L2 buffer size limitation is more problematic for low complexity devices and the risk of protocol stalling is higher for this reason. |

Rapporteur summary:

Majority companies (13/14) do not support the proposal.

**Proposal 15: (13/14) P1 in R2-2303713 is not agreed, i.e. do not enhance the LCP restriction based on uplinkHARQ-Mode for different RLC PDU types.**

## 3.3 Others

***LS to RAN1 to inform RAN2’s agreements?***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contributions | Relevant proposals: |
| [1] | Proposal 7: Send a LS to RAN1 regarding RAN2 agreements on disabling HARQ feedback and UL HARQ mode B. |
| [4] | Proposal 6: RAN2 should send an LS to RAN1 to notify the RAN2’s agreement about HARQ mode B and the possible RAN1 spec impact. |

Maybe the LS to RAN1 can include relevant RAN2 agreements and also questions to be checked with RAN1.

**Question 16: Do companies agree to send LS to RAN1 informing RAN2’s agreements together with questions to be checked with RAN1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | In the LS, RAN2 can   * inform RAN1 of RAN2’s agreements on UL HARQ mode B and check with RAN1 on the processing time * on DCI-based solution for indicating DL HARQ feedback enable/disable, check RAN1’s views on RRC signalling’s granularity, e.g. per UE or per HARQ process * check RAN1’s views on whether to introduce DCI-based solution for UL HARQ mode A/B indication |
| CATT | Agree | One LS can be sent to inform RAN2 agreements, and check the view of RAN1 on RAN2 concerned issue, not only HARQ aspect. |
| Nokia | Agree with comments | Also the aspects discussed in Question 8 and Question 10 can be included. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | See comments | RAN1 has not worked on UL HARQ process. It is because it is left to RAN2 as it is in RAN2 scope. There is no need to ask RAN1 on UL HARQ.  But sending LS on informing RAN2 agreements will be OK. |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree | There seem to be a need for a rather large LS to RAN1 on a range of issues. RAN2 should discuss which |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |

Rapporteur summary:

Majority companies agree to send LS to RAN1 informing RAN2’s agreements. Some companies also mentioned the questions to checked with RAN1.

**Proposal 16: (13/13) Send LS to RAN1 informing RAN2’s agreements and also including potential questions to be checked with RAN1, e.g.:**

* **the additional processing time for starting drx-InactivityTimer for NB-IoT UE with single HARQ process in HARQ mode B;**
* **which UL HARQ mode combination(s) are supported for UL multiple TB scheduling;**
* **whether RAN1 intends to introduce the DCI-based solution for indicating UL HARQ mode.**

# Summary and Proposals

This section summarizes the main proposals:

**Proposal 1: [9/13] RAN2#121’s agreement is revised to “For NB-IoT NTN with single HARQ process when the HARQ feedback is disabled, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception plus 12 subframes plus deltaPDCCH”.**

**Proposal 2: [13/14] Wait for RAN1’s decision on the RRC signalling of enabling DCI-based solution to indicate HARQ feedback enabled/disabled, and the signalling granularity, e.g. per UE or per HARQ process.**

**Proposal 3: [11/13] P2 in R2-2302557 is not agreed.**

**Proposal 4: On DCI indication overriding RRC configuration for the HARQ feedback enabled/disabled, wait for RAN1’s progress on DCI-based solution before discussing related DRX impact in RAN2.**

**Proposal 5: [11/14] On DL multiple TB scheduling, wait for RAN1’s progress before discussing related DRX impact in RAN2.**

**Proposal 6: [11/14] P4 in R2-2302557 is not agreed, i.e. no special handling for single HARQ process for eMTC.**

**Proposal 7: [13/13] For eMTC NTN, a parameter harq-FeedbackEnablingforSPSactive could be configured for a UE. If harq-FeedbackEnablingforSPSactive is configured to enable HARQ feedback, UE reports ACK/NACK for the first SPS PDSCH after activation, regardless of if HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled corresponding to the first SPS PDSCH after activation.**

**Proposal 8: [11/14] For a NB-IoT UE configured with a single HARQ process in HARQ mode B, send LS to RAN1 and ask for the additional processing time for starting drx-InactivityTimer (i.e. start to monitor NPDCCH).**

**Proposal 9: [12/14] Network implementation resolves the issue of ambiguity on start of DRX inactivity timer after the PUSCH transmission by not scheduling the NPDCCH back-to-back during the ambiguity period (i.e., Koffset – UE’s TA).**

**Proposal 10: Send LS to RAN1 to check for UL multiple TB scheduling, which UL HARQ mode combination(s) are to be supported.**

**Proposal 11: For the UL HARQ mode, at least RRC configuration is supported. Send LS to RAN1 and ask whether RAN1 intends to introduce the DCI-based solution.**

**Proposal 12a: (14/14) UL transmission using SPS can be configured with HARQ mode B.**

**Proposal 12b: (13/14) UL transmission using PUR can be configured with HARQ mode B.**

**Proposal 13: (10/13) For eMTC NTN, it can be left to eNB’s implementation to enable HARQ feedback if mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig is configured.**

**Proposal 14: (4:4:5) Discuss online for IoT NTN whether to enhance the TAR MAC CE transmission which was discussed in Rel-17 NR NTN.**

**Proposal 15: (13/14) P1 in R2-2303713 is not agreed, i.e. do not enhance the LCP restriction based on uplinkHARQ-Mode for different RLC PDU types.**

**Proposal 16: (13/13) Send LS to RAN1 informing RAN2’s agreements and also including potential questions to be checked with RAN1, e.g.:**

* **the additional processing time for starting drx-InactivityTimer for NB-IoT UE with single HARQ process in HARQ mode B;**
* **which UL HARQ mode combination(s) are supported for UL multiple TB scheduling;**
* **whether RAN1 intends to introduce the DCI-based solution for indicating UL HARQ mode.**

# Round-2 discussion

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 3: [11/13] P2 in R2-2302557 is not agreed.   * CATT would like to further discuss this * P2 is about checking which option is RAN1 agreement “[1) If one HARQ process is disabled and the other not, UE should still monitor NPDCCH after NPDSCH (for other HARQ processes). 2) If one HARQ process is disabled and the other not, UE should stop monitoring NPDCCH for “Y=12(ms)” after NPDSCH (for all HARQ processes).” * CATT thinks some update to legacy behaviour is needed * ZTE has a different understanding on option 2 (this is only for HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback) and no need to change anything. Nokia agrees * Continue offline |

P2 in R2-2302557 is related to drx-InactivityTimer for HARQ process with HARQ feedback disabled for NB-IoT UEs configured with two HARQ processes, considering the following RAN1 agreement:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**  For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback in NB-IoT, UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in a period of Y=12(ms) from the end of reception of the NPDSCH. |

During 1st round offline and online discussion, some companies commented that there may be different understandings on RAN1 agreements, and thought RAN2 can clarify the understanding first before discussing the DRX impact. Therefore, following questions are asked.

**Question 1: Regarding the above RAN1 agreement, which is the preferred understanding?**

* **Option 1: For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback in NB-IoT, UE should still monitor NPDCCH in a period of “Y=12(ms)” after NPDSCH, e.g. for other HARQ processes.**
* **Option 2: For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback in NB-IoT, UE should stop monitoring NPDCCH in a period of “Y=12(ms)” after NPDSCH for all HARQ processes.**
* **Option 3: check with RAN1, e.g. include this question in the LS.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | 1 (fine with Option 3) | We can see how the RAN1 agreement would have some ambiguities, but we doubt that they are trying to change legacy behaviour. If there are still doubts we can include this is in LS to RAN1. |
| CATT | Option 2(fine with Option 3) | We think that RAN1 agreement is clear that, the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in a period of Y=12(ms) from the end of reception of the NPDSCH, for all HARQ process. Otherwise, “for given HARQ process” has to be used, as the agreement of eMTC:  **Agreement**  For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback in eMTC, UE is not expected to receive another MPDCCH carrying a DCI scheduling a PDSCH for a given HARQ process or to receive another PDSCH without corresponding MPDCCH for the given HARQ process that starts at a BL/CE DL subframe until X=3 (ms) have passed after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH for that HARQ process.  But we are ok to check with RAN1 again. Anyway, RAN2 has to achieve a common and correct understanding on the RAN1 agreement, before we confirm the legacy UE behaviour can be followed. |
| OPPO | Option 2(fine with Option 3) | Regarding RAN1 agreement, we have the same understanding as CATT. If RAN2 cannot achieve a common understanding, we are also ok to check with RAN1. |
| Transsion Holdings | Option1 (fine with Option 3) | Our understanding is Option1, however to make more clear, we think it is better to check with RAN1. |
| Xiaomi | Option 2 | Our understanding is option 2, 12ms is used for decoding NPDSCH. It is meaningless to ask UE to not monitor only NPDCCH for a specific HARQ process, since UE needs to decode the NPDCCH to know which HARQ process is scheduled (i.e. after NPDCCH monitoring). |
| ZTE | Option1 (fine with Option 3) | We understand RAN1 agreement is only for the HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback. Therefore, for other HARQ processes, UE should still monitor NPDCCH after NPDSCH. We assume NB-IoT with two HARQ processes should have similar process as eMTC.  For NB-IoT with two HARQ processes, the most possible scenario is that one HARQ process is with HARQ feedback disabled while the other is with HARQ enabled. In this scenario, HARQ RTT timer should be started as legacy. And also the UE-specific *drx-inactivitiy* timer should keep running as UE needs to monitor PDCCH for the grant for the HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled.  Meanwhile, following the RAN1 agreement, for the HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in a period of Y=12(ms) from the end of reception of the NPDSCH. As there is no timer to control such UE’s process in this HARQ process, it can be left to gNB’s implementation to schedule the next PDCCH after Y=12(ms) plus *deltaPDCCH* from the ending of the last PDSCH for this HARQ process with HARQ feedback disabled. |
| MediaTek | Option 2 | The agreement may be ambiguous, but the following specification in RAN1 is clear.  According to RAN1 spec 36.213  If a NB-IoT UE receives a NPDSCH transmission ending in subframe *n,*and if the UE is not required to transmit a corresponding NPUSCH format 2, the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in any subframe starting from subframe *n+1* to subframe *n+12.*  This spec in Rel-17 is for the case of SIB reception. This restriction of not monitoring PDCCH in 12ms was specified for DL process. The NTN capable UE should be as same level of capability of legacy UE. We think this restriction also applies to disabling HARQ feedback.  Hence the understanding of this agreement should be option 2. |
| Lenovo | Option 2 (fine with Option 3) | After checking with RAN1 colleague our understanding is Option 2, which is different from eMTC. We are OK to ask RAN1 to confirm. |
| Nokia | Option1 (fine with Option 3) | Option1 makes more sense. But as the RAN1 agreement is ambiguous, we are OK to check with RAN1. |
| CMCC | Option 2(fine with Option 3) | We have the same understanding as CATT that the agreements for NB-IoT and eMTC are different. And we are fine to check with RAN1. |
| InterDigital | Option 2 |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Rapporteur assumes that proposals in R2-2302557 are based on the above understanding option 2. Therefore, if option 2 is preferred in Question 1, companies are further asked whether to agree to the P2 in R2-2302557.

**Question 2: If option 2 is preferred in Question 1, do companies agree to P2 in R2-2302557?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| CATT | Agree (the proponent) | HARQ feedback disabling is a new feature for NB-IoT, we don't think it is a forbidden zone to touch to give some update on the legacy UE behaviour. And as we have shown in previous round that, we should have the same or at least similar logic on the same even, that is, for a HARQ process with HARQ disabling, UE **should stop monitoring NPDCCH in a period of “Y=12(ms)” after NPDSCH for all HARQ processes,** no matter the UE is configured with one or two HARQ processes. Another issue is, if configured with RAN1, we have to match with the RAN1 agreement, that, if the UE need not monitor the NPDDCH according the RAN1 agreement, RAN2 should at least avoid ambiguity that UE may monitor NPDCCH according RAN2 spec. |
| OPPO | Disagree | As we commented in phase-1, we see no need to introduce such new stop and (re)start triggering condition for drx-InactivityTimer. This agreement has already been captured in RAN1 spec. Anyway, UE would not monitor PDCCH during this period of 12ms after NPDSCH reception regardless of whether drx-InactivityTimer is running or not. |
| Xiaomi |  | For two HARQ processes without multiple TB transmission, *drx-InactivityTimer* is started after receiving PDCCH indicates a new transmission:   |  | | --- | | - if the PDCCH indicates a new transmission (DL, UL or SL):  - except for an NB-IoT UE configured with a single DL and UL HARQ process and when PDCCH indicates the transmission is not for multiple TBs:  - start or restart *drx-InactivityTimer*. |     Considering that we have done the alignment for one HARQ process case, we are generally fine to correct the start of *drx-InactivityTimer* for two HARQ process case to align with RAN1. |
| MediaTek | Disagree | If option 2 is preferred in Q1, we don’t think the drx-inactivity timer should be stopped here.  For non-NTN case, drx-inactivity timer may be started for HARQ process 0 but was not stopped for HARQ process 1’s 12ms restriction of not monitoring PDCCH.  Since the RAN1 PDCCH monitoring restriction still works when DRX is configured, and in legacy the drx-inactivity timer was not stopped for this reason, we think it is not necessary to stop the drx-inactivity timer now either. |
| Lenovo | Disagree | Stop drx-inactivity timer is not necessary. |
| InterDigital | Disagree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 12b: (13/14) UL transmission using PUR can be configured with HARQ mode B.   * Samsung wonders what is the need for HARQ mode B for PUR. * MTK thinks this is to support blind retx * Continue offline |

There is majority support for P12b in the 1st round discussion. During online session, one company was not sure about the use case to support HARQ mode B for PUR. They thought that PUR is a special case of delivering a small message, however, turning off HARQ is expected to deliver high rates. They thought that the use of these two features collide and saw limited use of PUR in NTN.

**Question 3: Do companies agree that UL transmission using PUR can be configured with HARQ mode B?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | FFS | Pre-configured uplink was introduced to allow for a UE to deliver data in idle mode. In 36.300 the following can be seen:  *Transmission using PUR allows one uplink transmission from RRC\_IDLE using a preconfigured uplink resource without performing the random access procedure.*  Turning OFF HARQ is useful because one does not want HARQ stalling to limit the data rates.  So the question is what is the use to combine them?  It was mentioned that it is being introduced to support blind retransmissions. However in our understanding, HARQ mode B is not needed in order for blind retransmissions to be supported in PUR as PUR retransmissions are more similar to Msg3 transmissions where a response window is started. Thus if we introduce blind PUR retransmissions, then it would be similar to blind msg3 retransmissions.  Unless we have misunderstood anything in the above, we think that the discussion shall be whether blind retransmissions in PUR is supported or not. We are not certain whether this requires some spec change, but we think it should be discussed. |
| CATT | Agree | It can be left to network implementation, but just have no restriction on PUR. |
| OPPO | FFS | Now we kind of get Samsung’s point. For PUR transmission, as it is not scheduled via PDCCH by the NW, NW may not know exactly which PUR occasion the UE is using before NW receives the PUR transmission, therefore, NW may not blindly schedule the retransmission. In that sense, it seems that PUR best suits HARQ mode A. |
| Transsion Holdings | FFS | Agree with Samsung that it should be discussed. |
| Xiaomi | FFS | For NR NTN, HARQ Mode B is only applicable to connected mode, applying HARQ Mode B to idle mode should be further discussed. |
| ZTE | FFS | Our initial thinking is also that either HARQ mode A or HARQ mode B is possible for HARQ process for transmission using PUR, e.g., HARQ process identifier 0. This can be left to eNB implementation.  But yes, now we agree it’s unclear what specification impact will be when configuring HARQ mode B for HARQ process for PUR transmission. For example, is there any intention not to start *pur-ResponseWindowTimer*? If this is the case, we disagree. Or is it just not to plus UE-eNB RTT before the *pur-ResponseWindowTimer*? We agree to further check and discuss it in next meeting. |
| MediaTek | Agree (Proponent) | Thanks to Samsung for the response.  The blind retransmission for PUR we proposed here is different from the msg3. The blind retransmission for msg3 is referring to the second retransmission that can be blind (i.e., the transmission sequence is msg3, the retransmission of msg3, the blind retransmission of msg3). What we propose for PUR here is the first retransmission (i.e., the transmission sequence is PUR, the blind retransmission of PUR).  If HARQ mode B is configured for PUR, UE should start the PUR response window without a delay of UE-eNB RTT, even if UE supports delaying the start of the PUR response window timer.  Based on this understanding, companies can continue to discuss whether to support HARQ mode B for PUR transmission. |
| Lenovo | FFS | We prefer to leave it open to NW implementation (no restriction is introduced). |
| Nokia | FFS | OK to have further check. |
| CMCC | FFS | It can be further discussed. |
| InterDigital | FFS | Postpone this to the next meeting |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 13: (10/13) For eMTC NTN, it can be left to eNB’s implementation to enable HARQ feedback if mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig is configured.   * Ericsson thinks that if we do this then this is not applicable to eMTC * Continue offline |

Rapporteur realises that the configuration of mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig applies to UL, so the original wording is not so accurate and it should be reformulated as below.

Proposal 13: (10/13) For eMTC NTN, it can be left to eNB’s implementation to ~~enable HARQ feedback~~ configure HARQ mode A if mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig is configured.

**Question 4: Do companies agree that for eMTC NTN, it can be left to eNB’s implementation to configure HARQ mode A if mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig is configured?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| CATT |  | We still have some confusion on the description, according to the description of the **mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig**,  “TRUE indicates E-UTRAN may send UL HARQ-ACK feedback or UL grant corresponding to a new transmission for early termination of PUSCH transmission, or positive acknowledgement of completed PUSCH transmissions as specified in TS 36.321 [6] and TS 36.212 [22]”  If **mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig** is configured with value TRUE, the network can send ACK to UE, early. So If **mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig** is configured, HARQ mode A can of course be configured. We are not sure what the issue here is.  In NR, there is “***harq-FeedbackEnablingforSPSactive***” for SPS, if this IE is configured with value TRUE, for the first transmission on the SPS, the UE will report ACK/NACK, regardless of if HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled.  We think, the same logic can be reused that, if **mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig** is configured, the network can terminate the PUSCH repetition based on its determination, regardless the HARQ mode. |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Transsion Holdings | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree | The main intention of the proposal is to clarify that, it can be left to eNB's implementation **not** to configure *mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig* and HARQ mode B at the same time. |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree with revision | For ZTE’s comment, in our understanding, even network configure a HARQ process with HARQ mode B, it does not prevent NW send DL Ack to early terminate the PUSCH repetitions.  In our view, HARQ mode B is to schedule the retx which is not based on the decoding results but it has no restriction to limit when NW can send DL ack in early termination case.  So, we propose to modify as below:  **it can be left to eNB’s implementation to configure HARQ mode for UL transmission ~~A~~ if mpdcch-UL-HARQ-ACK-FeedbackConfig is configured** |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

On Tuesday’s online session, RAN2 has agreed to send LS to RAN1 regarding HARQ mode B. Relevant agreements are as below.

Agreements:

1. For a NB-IoT UE configured with a single HARQ process in HARQ mode B, send LS to RAN1 and ask for the “processing time for starting drx-InactivityTimer (i.e. start to monitor NPDCCH)”. (can further check the detailed wording of the question)
2. Send LS to RAN1 to check for UL multiple TB scheduling, which UL HARQ mode combination(s) are to be supported.
3. Send LS to RAN1 informing RAN2’s agreements and also including potential questions to be checked with RAN1

Based on the agreement, a draft LS is provided in [14].

**Question 5: Do companies agree to the content in the draft LS? If not, please indicate the suggested changes to the concerned part.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| Samsung | Agree | May need to add depending on outcome of Q1. |
| CATT | Agree with comments | If RAN2 have a common understanding on the RAN1 agreement on Q1, no content related with Q1 is needed. |
| OPPO | Agree with comments | May add Q1 in the LS depending on the discussion outcome. |
| Transsion Holdings | Agree | The outcome of Q1 may needed to be added. |
| Xiaomi | No | The current Question 1 in the LS is misleading:   |  | | --- | | “**Question 1**: For an UL HARQ process with HARQ mode B for NB-IoT UEs, what is the minimum time between the end of NPUSCH transmission and NPDCCH reception for the same HARQ process? ” |   Because we can see from the current 36.213 that the time gap between NPUSCH reception and NPDCCH monitoring is not per HARQ process:   |  | | --- | | if the NB-IoT UE has a NPUSCH transmission ending in subframe *n* , the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in any subframe starting from subframe *n+1* to subframe *n+3* or in a NTN serving cell, in any downlink subframe that overlaps with uplink subframe *n*+*1* to subframe *n*+*K*mac+*3*. |   Suggested Q1:  **Question 1**: For an UL HARQ process with HARQ mode B for NB-IoT UEs, what is the minimum time gap between the end of NPUSCH transmission and the start of NPDCCH monitoring?  Rapp’s response:  The text Xiaomi quoted in 36.213 is corresponding to the branch where NB-IoT UE is configured with single HARQ process, which is why “for the same HARQ process ID” is not mentioned there. For the two HARQ processes case, the minimum time applies to the same HARQ process. Please check below.   |  | | --- | | If a NB-IoT UE is configured with higher layer parameter *twoHARQ-ProcessesConfig*  - and if the UE has a NPUSCH transmission ending in subframe *n*,  - the UE is not required to receive transmissions in the Type B half-duplex guard periods as specified in [3]for FDD ; and  - the UE is not expected to receive an NPDCCH with DCI format N0/N1 for the same HARQ process ID as the NPUSCH transmission in any subframe starting from subframe n+1 to subframe n+3 or in a NTN serving cell, in any downlink subframe that overlaps with uplink subframe *n*+1 to subframe *n*+*K*mac+3*;*  else if the UE is not using higher layer parameter *edt-Parameters* or if the UE is using higher layer parameter *edt-Parameters* and  - if the NB-IoT UE has a NPUSCH transmission ending in subframe *n* , the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in any subframe starting from subframe *n+1* to subframe *n+3* or in a NTN serving cell, in any downlink subframe that overlaps with uplink subframe *n*+*1* to subframe *n*+*K*mac+*3*. |   Therefore, the current wording for Q1 in the draft LS covers both single-HARQ-process and two-HARQ-process cases. |
| ZTE | Generally fine. | Taking into account the Xiaomi’s concern, we’d better to firstly ask RAN1 the processing time in the case of NB-IoT NTN with single HARQ process and it’s configured with HARQ mode B.  Then we can ask RAN1 to further clarify the case of NB-IoT NTN with two HARQ processes, which may be similar as the issue in the Q1 in this Round-2 discussion.  Rapp’s response:  Please check above response to Xiaomi’s comments. |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Lenovo | Agree with comments | May also include outcome of RAN1. |
| Nokia |  | Also need to add the outcome of Q1. |
| CMCC | Agree with comments | May add the outcome of Q1. |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Round-2 Summary and Proposals

This section summarizes the main proposals:
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