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# Introduction

This summary document captures issues related to general and measurement-related NR NTN RRM requirements, and proposes an updated work plan for NTN RRM. It contains a summary of the contributions under section 8.8.4.1 and 8.8.4.3 at TSG-RAN WG4 #98-bis-e, together with identified key open issues and recommends topics/questions to be handled via email discussions. The goal of this document is also to provide recommendation on prioritization of discussion and whether any issues should be postponed. Timing-related requirements and TDocs related to the LS reply to R1-2102263 (R4-2104763 in part and R4-2104764) shall be treated in [223] NR\_NTN\_solutions\_RRM\_2.

According to the RAN4#98-bis-e E-Meeting Arrangements and Guidelines, the following schedule has been proposed:

* Stage 1: Moderators kick off email discussion (Monday, Apr. 12)
* Stage 2: Companies provide comments for the 1st round (Apr. 12 – **Wednesday 8am UTC Apr. 14**)
* Stage 3: Moderators summarize the status and possible proposals, recommending what decisions can be made for 1st round. A formal TDoc will be used (**Wednesday 11pm UTC, Apr. 14**)
* Stage 4: After receiving the summary from moderators, session chair may approve documents, make agreements or assign new CRs, WFs, LSs, etc. (no later than Friday 3pm UTC, Apr. 16)
* Stage 5: Companies provide comments for 2nd round starting from **Thursday 8am UTC, Apr. 15**
* Stage 6: Moderators provide 2nd round summary with a formal TDoc by **Tuesday 9am UTC, Apr. 20**
* Stage 7: Session chairs announce close of sessions (no later than **5pm UTC, Apr. 20**). Final decisions will be captured in Chairman meeting report (to be shared after the meeting is closed)

A total of 15 TDocs have been provided for this agenda:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc Number** | **Title** | **Source** | **For** |
| [**R4-2104598**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104598.zip) | NTN RRM measurement requirements | CMCC | Discussion |
| [**R4-2104603**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104603.zip) | Discussion on general NTN RRM related issues | CMCC | Discussion |
| [**R4-2104690**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104690.zip) | Discussion on measurement requirements for NR NTN | Xiaomi | Discussion |
| [**R4-2104763**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104763.zip) | Discussion on RRM requirements for NTN | CATT | Discussion |
| [**R4-2104766**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104766.zip) | Discussion on measurement requirements for NTN | CATT | Discussion |
| [**R4-2104816**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104816.zip) | Measurement RRM requirements for NTN | Ericsson | Discussion |
| [**R4-2104834**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104834.zip) | On GNSS measurement for NTN | Apple | Discussion |
| [**R4-2104986**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104986.zip) | Discussion on RRM measurement requirements for NTN | NEC | Approval |
| [**R4-2105142**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2105142.zip) | Discussion on NTN GNSS requirement | LGE UK | Discussion |
| [**R4-2105143**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2105143.zip) | Discussion on measurement requirements for NTN | LGE UK | Discussion |
| [**R4-2106939**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106939.zip) | Discussion on measurement in NTN | Huawei, HiSilicon | Discussion |
| [**R4-2107030**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107030.zip) | Discussion on general issues for NTN RRM | Huawei, HiSilicon | Discussion |
| [**R4-2107254**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107254.zip) | NTN - On reference points | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Discussion |
| [**R4-2107256**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107256.zip) | NTN - On measurement requirements | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Discussion |
| [**R4-2107292**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107292.zip) | Measurement requirements in NTN Systems | Qualcomm Incorporated | Discussion |

# Topic #1: General RAN4 RRM NTN related aspects

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

General RAN4 RRM NTN related aspects discussions are required to decide on the way forward, and to provide an initial RRM list of parameters to be considered by RAN4 RRM work.

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104603 | CMCC | **Proposal 1:** Do not define the timing RP in RAN4, further study the frequency RP after RAN1’s final decision about frequency pre-compensation scheme. |
| R4-2107030 | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1:** RAN4 can consider to send LS to RAN1 regarding the observed implementation impact of the DL-UL delay depending on the RP for time synchronization. |
| R4-2107254 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Observation 1:** Having the time reference point at the satellite means RAN4 has to define timing requirement for both gNB and UE towards the satellite.  **Observation 2:** Implementation of time reference point at the gNB requires less RAN4 specification work, and is less complex in terms of gNB implementation.  **Proposal 1:** RAN4 to specify at least requirements for the gNB as time reference point. |
| R4-2104986 | NEC | **Proposal 1:** If RAN4 confirms the IDC interference aspect of GNSS and L-band issue, RAN4 to look at performance degradation using simulation framework. Based on the performance degradation observed in simulation framework, RAN4 to study the solution for handling IDC interference aspect of GNSS and L-band. |
| R4-2104834 | Apple | **Proposal:** RRM room would determine whether interruptions or measurement gaps is expected for GNSS measurements during NTN operation after the IDC interference from L-band NTN to GNSS is evaluated/confirmed in RF session. |
| R4-2105143 | LGE | **Proposal 1.** L-band in-device coexistence problem can be handled in the RF session since it is caused by out-of-band RF leakage issues such as IDC harmonic/emission interference. Discussion about MG for GNSS measurement can be triggered in RRM session once the potential issue for in-device coexistence is verified in the RF session. |

## Open issues summary

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

### Sub-topic 1-1: Reference point (RP) to be considered for time and frequency synchronization

In the WF R4-2103680 developed during RAN4#98-e it was concluded to

* Defer sending an LS to RAN1. Further discuss the impacts of different reference points on RRM requirements and inform RAN1 in case any common observations are identified.
* Further investigate the impact of different timing and frequency reference points based on RAN1 design on the RRM requirements. Inform RAN1 if any issues are identified.

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

**Issue 1-1: Definition of reference point**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Do not define timing RP in RAN4, further study frequency RP after RAN1’s final decision about frequency pre-compensation scheme.
  + Option 2: RAN4 to specify at least requirements for the gNB as time reference point.
  + Option 3: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 1-2: LS to RAN1 regarding observed implementation impact of DL-UL delay**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 can consider sending an LS to RAN1 regarding the observed implementation impact of the DL-UL delay depending on the RP for time synchronization.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 1-2: In device coexistence (IDC) issue of GNSS and L-band

L-band UL is very close to GNSS which may be a potential IDC issue.

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

**Issue 1-3: Confirmation of IDC issue**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: If RAN4 confirms the IDC interference aspect of GNSS and L-band issue, RAN4 to look at performance degradation using simulation framework. Based on the performance degradation observed in simulation framework, RAN4 to study the solution for handling IDC interference aspect of GNSS and L-band.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + If Option 1 is agreeable, RAN4 RF should confirm the IDC interference aspects. Based on the outcome of the RF considerations, RAN4 RRM can study solutions for handling IDC interference aspects of GNSS and L-band. Defer discussion of Issue #6-14 until then.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

*One of the two formats, i.e. either example 1 or 2 can be used by moderators.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Issue 1-1: Option 1. RAN4 could wait for RAN1’s agreement.  Issue 1-2: Option 2. RAN4 could wait for RAN1’s agreement, we do not see particular need to send LS.  Issue 1-3: Agree with Option 1 and the Recommended WF. |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 1-1:  Issue 1-1: Agree with Recommended WF.  Issue 1-2: Agree with Recommended WF.  Sub topic 1-2:  Issue 1-3: Agree with Recommended WF. It should be discussed in RF session. |
| Apple | Issue 1-1: Option 1.  Issue 1-2: Option 2.  Issue 1-3: fine with recommended WF. RRM room could determine whether interruptions or measurement gaps is expected for GNSS measurements during NTN operation after the IDC interference from L-band NTN to GNSS is evaluated/confirmed in RF session |
| CMCC | **Issue 1-1:** We support Option1. For timing RP, it can be any point within feeder link from RAN1’s perspective. We propose not to define explicit RP in RAN4.  However, we can specify the RAN4 requirements with some RP assumptions. We prefer the gNB as time reference point and the satellite as frequency RP.  **Issue 1-2:** Option 2. We don’t see any issues which are needed to inform RAN1, we can wait for RAN1’s conclusion.  **Issue 1-3:** We are OK to first discuss and confirm the IDC interference in RF session, and we believe IDC mechanism specified in RAN2 can cover any in-device interference. So, there is no need to spend time in RAN4 to discuss the interruptions or measurement gaps for GNSS measurements during NTN operation. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Qualcomm | Issue 1-1: Option 1.  Issue 1-2: Option 2.  Issue 1-3: Fine with recommended WF. Both in-device and inter-device coexistence/interference between NR transceiver and UE GNSS receiver need to be investigated and confirmed in RF session. After that, RAN4 can discuss the detailed solutions. Depending on the impact, if identified, RAN2 may also have to be involved. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ZTE | Issue 1-1: Agree with Recommended WF. The definition of RP is up to RAN1, however, RP at gNB could be a start point for RAN4 requirement discussion. Option 2 is acceptable for us.  Issue 1-2: Option 1.It will be helpful for RAN1 to get observations from RAN4’s view.  Issue 1-3: Agree with recommended WF. The issue should be identified by RF session firstly. |
| Xiaomi | Sub topic 1-1:  Issue 1-1: Support option 1, RAN4 should wait for RAN1’s agreement on the RP.  Issue 1-2: Option 2, agree with CMCC, do not see the necessity to send LS to RAN1.  Sub topic 1-2:  Issue 1-3: Agree with Recommended WF. Wait for the conclusion in RF session. |
| Samsung | Issue 1-3: Agree with the recommended WF. Conclusion from RF session is needed. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Issue 1-1: It is OK to wait for the outcome of RAN1 as it is not clear whether there is an impact of reference point definition on RRM specification – Option 1.  Issue 1-2: This issue is related to Issue 1-1 and prefer to get clarify on whether the impact of reference point is limited to implementation only.  Issue 1-3: The recommended WF is OK. |
| Intel | Issue 1-1: Option 1  Issue 1-2: We understand much on this matter and we also echo with colleague BS vendors that it is important to consider the RP defined somewhere within BS’s reach. The only thing is that we believe RAN1 is extensively aware of this aspect.  Issue 1-3: Fine for us to go with recommended way. |
| THALES | Issue 1-1: Option 1.  Issue 1-2: Option 2.  Issue 1-3: Fine with Option 1 and the Recommended WF. |
| LGE | Issue 1-1: Option 1.  Issue 1-2: Option 2.  Issue 1-3: Agree with recommended WF. |
| NEC | Issue 1-3: Support option 1 and the recommended WF |
| Huawei | Issue 1-1: We have one question on option 1. It seems timing RP is considered to be RAN1 issue, but frequency RP is suggested to be studied in RAN4? Do the proponents have some particular aspects in mind that RAN4 should study for frequency RP? Option 2 is fine for us but it can be discussed after RAN1 concludes on the timing RP.  Issue 1-2: Option 1 is our proposal and the intention is to inform RAN1 about possible implementation impact, but if majority companies believe this is well known to RAN1, we are also fine to wait for RAN1 conclusion (not to send LS).  Issue 1-3: Agree with Recommended WF. |
| CATT | Issue 1-1 and Issue 1-2: It’s better to wait RAN1’s conclusion of RP. It is reasonable to define RP in RAN1. No need to send LS now.  Issue 1-3: Agree the recommended WF. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize WIs and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Issue 1-1: Definition of reference point** | ***Tentative agreements****: Do not define timing RP in RAN4, further study frequency RP after RAN1’s final decision about frequency pre-compensation scheme. Assume gNB as starting point for further requirement discussion.*  ***Candidate options****:*  ***Recommendations for 2nd round****: Proponents of option 1 should clarify particular aspects RAN4 should study for frequency RP.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue 1-2: LS to RAN1 regarding observed implementation impact of DL-UL delay** | ***Tentative agreements****: Most companies do not see the need to send LS to RAN1.*  ***Candidate options****:*  ***Recommendations for 2nd round****: Companies in support of the LS to RAN1 should clarify the intention and proposed content of the LS, otherwise defer sending the LS.* |
| **Issue 1-3: Confirmation of IDC issue** | ***Tentative agreements:*** *Defer discussion about IDC interference from L-Band NTN to GNSS after the issue has been evaluated/confirmed by the RAN4 RF room.*  ***Candidate options:***  ***Recommendations for 2nd round:*** |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

**Issue 1-1: Definition of reference point**

**Tentative agreements:** Do not define timing RP in RAN4, further study frequency RP after RAN1’s final decision about frequency pre-compensation scheme. Assume gNB as starting point for further requirement discussion

***Recommendations for 2nd round****: Proponents of option 1 should clarify particular aspects RAN4 should study for frequency RP. Clarify if RP at gNB should be assumed for timing only, or for timing and frequency.*

**Issue 1-2: LS to RAN1 regarding observed implementation impact of DL-UL delay**

***Tentative agreements****: Most companies do not see the need to send LS to RAN1.*

**Recommendations for 2nd round**: Companies in support of the LS to RAN1 should clarify the intention and proposed content of the LS, otherwise defer sending the LS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm, via Email to Reflector (added by moderator) | Issue 1-1: Definition of reference point  Does “assume gNB as starting point” apply to timing and frequency? Option 2 doesn’t say anything about frequency reference point.  What does “assuming gNB as RP” really mean? Isn’t RP anyway transparent to UE? Can anyone help us understand what the implications of the above have?  If the group is not crystal clear about what and how RRM requirement development work will be affected by the definition of RP, we think there is no point of agreeing this. I’m wondering if I’m missing something here. |
| Huawei, via Email to Reflector (added by moderator) | Issue 1-1: Definition of reference point  On 1-1, actually we have asked some questions about the first sentence in our comments, but the proposal is to ‘further study’, so we are fine to take it as tentative agreement. On the second sentence we understand it is coming from other 2, which was only about timing RP, but the wording now seems to also include frequency RP, so it maybe needs more discussion in the 2nd round. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks Mathis for including our email comments in the summary.  In our understanding of RP, whether and where RP should be assumed to be placed can be a design factor that needs to be considered when infra deploys the system and determines system parameters. However, from UE perspective, it will just follow TA pre-compensation and adjustment formula based on configured system parameters and values. Of course, depending on the parameter set and values, if there are multiple sources that can potentially affect a total TA budget, they need to be factored in to the TA accuracy CORE requirement. On the other hand, if there are other factors that will cause additional uncertainties on top of UE GNSS positioning error, we believe those factors should be considered as a part of test margin. I.e. we can consider RP, if needed, when we develop test cases and test parameters and/or margin. Unless RAN1/2 introduce more parameters that can potentially eat up TA total budget, we don’t see a reason to discuss this issue in RAN4. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Moderator | **Issue 1-1: Definition of reference point**  Suggested WF: Do not define timing RP in RAN4, further study frequency RP after RAN1’s final decision about frequency pre-compensation scheme. Assume frequency RP at gNB as starting point for further requirement discussion.  **Issue 1-2: LS to RAN1 regarding observed implementation impact of DL-UL delay**  Suggested WF: Do not send LS to RAN1. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ericsson | Issue 1-1:  We don’t see frequency RP or frequency pre-compensation scheme direct impact to RRM requirement. Doppler shift like issue can cause measurement accuracy error, but it should be concluded in RAN1/RAN2.  Similar methodology also happens in timing RP, reference point is only a factor impacting total timing error budget, it’s difficult to define RP from RRM perspective, it should be concluded in RAN1/RAN2. Timing accuracy based on the outcome is what RRM is aware of.  Issue 1-2:  No need to send LS. |
| CMCC | Issue 1-1:  For RP definition, we agree with the first sentence "Do not define timing RP in RAN4, further study frequency RP after RAN1’s final decision about frequency pre-compensation scheme".  However, for RP assumption in RAN4, we prefer assuming gNB as **timing** RP. |
| Intel | Issue 1-1  Agree with the recommendation.  We see no point in discussion in RRM about the RP definition. The RP is transparent to UE.  Issue 1-2  Agree with the recommendation. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 1-1:  Similar comments as QC, this issue should not be discussed in RAN4, UE will follow the time compensation formula introduced by RAN1. And RP does not impact the requirement defined in RAN4. |
| Huawei | **Issue 1-1: Definition of reference point**  We have some concerns on the suggested WF.  We are fine to not define timing RP in RAN4, but for frequency RP, it is still unclear what should be further studied in RAN4 RRM considering that the frequency sync requirements are to be defined in RF session, but if companies have strong view to keep this as an open issue in RRM, we are also fine  We suggest to remove the last sentence because so far it is unclear which RRM requirements would be impacted by the assumption of frequency RP, and it is also unclear why frequency RP at gNB should be used as starting point (this was not proposed by either option for Issue 1-1 if our understanding is not wrong).  **Issue 1-2: LS to RAN1 regarding observed implementation impact of DL-UL delay**  We are fine with the Suggested WF. |
| CATT | **Issue 1-1: fine with the “Do not define timing RP in RAN4”. But for further study on RP frequency, it is not RRM related.**  **Issue 1-2: fine with the suggested WF.** |
| LGE | **Issue 1-1: Definition of reference point**  Reference point should be concluded in RAN1.  **Issue 1-2: LS to RAN1 regarding observed implementation impact of DL-UL delay**  Agree with moderator’s WF. Do not send LS to RAN1. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Issue 1-1: Definition of reference point**  Since no time RP is defined, the same should be applied to frequency RP for consistency reasons. In RAN4, gNB can be assumed as the RP for both timing and frequency, which is in line with the NR terrestrial networks. |
| Moderator | **Issue 1-1: Suggested WF “Do not define timing or frequency RP in RAN4”** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | **Issue 1-2: LS to RAN1 regarding observed implementation impact of DL-UL delay**  We are fine with the Suggested WF. |

## Summary for 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| R4-2105795 WF on NR NTN RRM general and measurement requirements | *Based on the discussions, the moderator has prepared a way forward with the following conclusions:*   * + **Issue 1-1: Definition of reference point** Do not define timing or frequency RP in RAN4.   + **Issue 1-2: LS to RAN1 regarding observed implementation impact of DL-UL delay** Do not send LS to RAN1.   + **Issue 1-3: Confirmation of IDC issue** Defer discussion about IDC interference from L-Band NTN to GNSS after the issue has been evaluated/confirmed by the RAN4 RF room. |

# Topic #2: GNSS requirements

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

The topic should at least cover:

* GNSS used on UE, precision and accuracy requirements
* GNSS used on Satellite, precision and accuracy requirements

Based on the outcome of RAN4#98-e captured in the WF R4-2103680 the requirements shall be defined with on-board GNSS as the baseline and FFS on how to handle satellites/HAPS without on-board GNSS capabilities. RRM requirements can be assumed to be impacted by GNSS accuracy, although the degree of impact and specific RRM requirements that are impacted are FFS. Furthermore it was concluded that companies should define typical and worst-case scenarios.

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104603 | CMCC | **Proposal 2:** PVT accuracy requirements should consider the on-board GNSS requirements.  **Proposal 3:** Define two sets of PVT accuracy requirements with and without on-board GNSS respectively. Prioritize the study of requirements with on-board GNSS requirements.  **Proposal 4:**   * The worst-case scenario should be considered with first priority; the corresponding minimum requirements are as below:  | **System** | **Success rate** | **2-D position error** | **Max response time** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | All | 95 % | 100 m | 20 s |  * The typical-case scenario can be studied as well, the corresponding minimum requirements are as below:  | **System** | **Success rate** | **2-D position error** | **Max response time** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | All | 95 % | 50 m | 2 s | |
| R4-2107030 | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 2:** RAN4 assumes that ephemeris of the satellite/HAPS is made available to UE in defining the RRM requirements. No further discussion on whether the satellite or HAPS has on-board GNSS.  **Proposal 3:** RAN4 not to identify the list of RRM requirements impacted by GNSS accuracy, but the impact of GNSS accuracy should be considered when defining each requirement.  **Proposal 4:** Take the worst case from 38.171 as the assumption of GNSS accuracy for defining RRM requirements. |
| R4-2105142 | LGE | **Proposal 1:** GNSS accuracy has no impact for RRM requirement/performance at least in FR1.  **Proposal 2:** RAN4 further studies position accuracy of without on-board GNSS satellite to verify the degree of impact for its requirement. |
| R4-2104816 | Ericsson | **Observation 1:** Requirement of UE specific TA isn’t defined specifically now. It implies no clear evaluation criteria of GNSS accuracy for impact Timing Advance. We assume total Timing Advance achieved is based on GNSS accuracy.  **Observation 2:** Before time® and location based CHO are fixed in RAN2, it is difficult to discuss ‘t®(r)’ and ‘location’ impact to RRM.  **Proposal 1:** Criteria of GNSS accuracy must be more stringent than current TA accuracy requirement anyhow. Further evaluation of GNSS needs calculation with available satellite speed and elevation/azimuth angle and UE position in cell and needs to take error introduced between satellite and gateway into account.  **Proposal 2:** GNSS accuracy for location-based CHO need to be checked after location-based CHO is clear in RAN2.  **Proposal 3:** It is recommended to separate time to first fix (TTFF) and time to subsequent fix (TTSF) of GNSS signal impact to RRM requirements. 20s in TTFF is only defined as addition for initialization/ramp up.  **Proposal 4:** Measurement period needs to further study with assumption securing Timing Advance in proper scope: 1: Te ; 2: Timing Advance adjustment accuracy. Further evaluation of GNSS needs calculation with available satellite speed and elevation/azimuth angle and UE position in cell and needs to take error introduced between satellite and gateway into account. |
| R4-2104763 | CATT | **Observation 1:** The ephemeris can be used for satellites and achieved from satellite system such as measured by earth station.  **Observation 2:** The gNB can handle the HAPS without on-board GNSS with time and frequency pre-compensation and uplink transmit timing control signal NTA. UE pre-compensation should not be expected.  **Observation 4:** The requirements of UE transmit timing can be defined based on UE capability of GNSS accuracy. |

## Open issues summary

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

### Sub-topic 2-1 GNSS usage

This sub-topic discusses if on-board GNSS capabilities are assumed or not.

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

**Issue 2-1: Definition of GNSS requirements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 assumes that ephemeris of the satellite/HAPS is made available to UE in defining the RRM requirements. No further discussion on whether the satellite or HAPS has on-board GNSS.
  + Option 2: The ephemeris can be used for satellites and achieved from satellite system such as measured by earth station. The gNB can handle the HAPS without on-board GNSS with time and frequency pre-compensation and uplink transmit timing control signal NTA. UE pre-compensation should not be expected.
  + Option 3: RAN4 further studies position accuracy of without on-board GNSS satellite to verify the degree of impact for its requirement.
  + Option 4: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

### Sub-topic 2-2: GNSS accuracy

This sub-topic discusses the impact of GNSS accuracy on various RRM requirements.

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

**Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: PVT accuracy requirements should consider the on-board GNSS requirements.
  + Option 2: Define two sets of PVT accuracy requirements with and without on-board GNSS respectively. Prioritize the study of requirements with on-board GNSS requirements.
  + Option 3: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 2-3: GNSS accuracy impact on RRM requirements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: GNSS accuracy has no impact for RRM requirement/performance at least in FR1.
  + Option 2: RAN4 not to identify the list of RRM requirements impacted by GNSS accuracy, but the impact of GNSS accuracy should be considered when defining each requirement.
  + Option 3: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 2-4: Criteria of GNSS accuracy**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Criteria of GNSS accuracy must be more stringent than current TA accuracy requirement anyhow. Further evaluation of GNSS needs calculation with available satellite speed and elevation/azimuth angle and UE position in cell and needs to take error introduced between satellite and gateway into account.
  + Option 2: The requirements of UE transmit timing can be defined based on UE capability of GNSS accuracy.
  + Option 3: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 2-5: GNSS accuracy for location-based CHO**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: GNSS accuracy for location-based CHO need to be checked after location-based CHO is clear in RAN2.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 2-6: Impact of time to first fix/time to subsequent fix on RRM requirements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: It is recommended to separate time to first fix (TTFF) and time to subsequent fix (TTSF) of GNSS signal impact to RRM requirements. 20s in TTFF is only defined as addition for initialization/ramp up.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 2-7: Measurement period**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Measurement period needs to further study with assumption securing Timing Advance in proper scope: 1: Te ; 2: Timing Advance adjustment accuracy. Further evaluation of GNSS needs calculation with available satellite speed and elevation/azimuth angle and UE position in cell and needs to take error introduced between satellite and gateway into account.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario**

* Proposals
  + Option 1:   
    The worst-case scenario should be considered with first priority; the corresponding minimum requirements are as below:

| **System** | **Success rate** | **2-D position error** | **Max response time** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 95 % | 100 m | 20 s |

The typical-case scenario can be studied as well, the corresponding minimum requirements are as below:

| **System** | **Success rate** | **2-D position error** | **Max response time** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 95 % | 50 m | 2 s |

* + Option 2: Take the worst case from 38.171 as the assumption of GNSS accuracy for defining RRM requirements.
  + Option 3: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

**Example 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Issue 2-1: Option 1.  Issue 2-2: Option 1.  Issue 2-3: Option 1. Based on the simulation result, the impact because of UE timing compensation error is marginal. (0.012 = 3% error budget of Te of 0.39 us in FR1.)  Issue 2-4: More discussion would be needed. Option 1 seems reasonable in general, A bit unclear how these criteria would impact on the UE requirement.  Issue 2-5: Option 1. RAN4 could wait for RAN2’s agreement.  Issue 2-6: Option 1.  Issue 2-8: Disagree on defining based on the worst case (option 1 and option 2), which would be un-realistic for NTN system.  To ensure that the relevant system needs (e.g. PRACH timing), the nominal value of 15m / 30 m would be assumed and also including the prediction error in Gateway. |
| Erisson | Sub topic 2-1:  Issue 2-1: Support option 1.  Sub topic 2-2:  Issue 2-2: Support option 1.  Issue 2-3: Agree with Recommended WF  Issue 2-4: Support option 1.  Issue 2-5: Support option 1.  Issue 2-6: Support option 1.  Issue 2-7: Agree with Recommended WF. We encourage the discussion.  Issue 2-8: Agree with Recommended WF. |
| Apple | Issue 2-1: option 1  Issue 2-2: option 1  Issue 2-3: agree with option 2. The impacts could be studied during the requirement design.  Issue 2-4: option 3. GNSS accuracy shall be based on the legacy GNSS capability since we did not have such GNSS enhancement in this NTN WI.  Issue 2-5: option 1.  Issue 2-6: Option 2. Need more discussion in RAN4 to figure out the accuracy or response time difference between TTFF and TTSF before this conclusion.  Issue 2-7: fine with recommended WF.  Issue 2-8: Option 2, and also fine with the recommended WF. |
| CMCC | Issue 2-1: We partially agree with Option1 that RAN4 assumes that ephemeris of the satellite/HAPS is made available to UE in defining the RRM requirements. However, whether the ephemeris is precise or has some error should be further studied.  Issue 2-2: We prefer Option2. We are also Ok with Option1 if the satellites with on-board GNSS is the typical scenario.  Issue 2-3: We support Option2 which provides a general guidance for the specification of all RRM requirements.  Issue 2-4: Basically, we agree with Option1 and Option2, we think they are not conflict Options.  For Option1, we agree that GNSS accuracy must be more stringent than current TA accuracy requirement, and further evaluation is needed. We also observed that the current GNSS accuracy in TS 38.171 is only applied for RRC-CONNECTED UE and the response time is TTFF which may not meet the GNSS application scenarios in NTN.  Issue 2-5: We support Option1.  Issue 2-6: We support Option1. We agree with Apple that the difference between TTFF and TTSF should be studied.  Issue 2-7: Option2. Further investigate after final decision about where to capture UE specific TA estimation error.  Issue 2-8: We support Option1. We propose Option1 in our contribution, and we would like to add some clarification here. We think that we can consider the worst-case scenario with first priority and study the typical-case scenario as well. We are also open to further investigate the value of position error and response time in the Table above. |
| Qualcomm | Issue 2-1: Option 1  Issue 2-2: Option 1. For the detailed formats of satellite’s ephemeris are supposed to be discussed and determined by other working groups.  Issue 2-3: Option 2  Issue 2-4: The discussion needs to be based on more specific RRM measurement requirements.  Issue 2-5: Option 1  Issue 2-6: The discussion needs to be based on more specific RRM requirements and respective scenarios.  Issue 2-7: Is the measurement period for GNSS signal reception? It is a bit unclear what the issue is for and what the context of the proposals is.  Issue 2-8: The worst set of performances from 38.171 doesn’t necessarily have to be considered for defining RRM requirements. However, a reference set of GNSS accuracy and response time can differ by target requirements and scenarios, e.g. RRC state, DRX configuration, UE mobility, UE type such as handheld vs. VSAT, UE position relative to beam footprint, satellite type, etc. |
| ZTE | Issue 2-1: Agree with recommended WF.  Issue 2-2: Option 1.  Issue 2-3: Agree with recommended WF. Further study is needed to identify GNSS accuracy impact on RRM requirements.  Issue 2-4: Agree with recommended WF.  Issue 2-5: Option 1.  Issue 2-6: Option 2.  Issue 2-7: Agree with recommended WF.  Issue 2-8: Fine with recommended WF. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 2-1: Support option 1.  Issue 2-2: Support option 1  Issue 2-3: Prefer option 2  Issue 2-4: the criteria of GNSS accuracy should be considered when defining the corresponding RRM requirements.  Issue 2-5: Support option 1;  Issue 2-6: More discussion is needed.  Issue 2-7: Need more discussion, need to clarify the motivation of this proposal.  Issue 2-8: Prefer option 1, and we also think the further discussion on the typical position error assumed in NTN scenario is needed. |
| Samsung | Issue 2-1  Support Option 1. Suggest to prioritize the scenario that on-board GNSS is supported.  Issue 2-4  More discussion is needed. It’s still unclear whether such criteria would have impact on UE requirements.  Issue 2-7  Fine with the recommended WF. More discussion is needed. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Issue 2-1: Option 1  Issue 2-2: Option 1  Issue 2-3: Option 2  Issue 2-4: Option 1  Issue 2-5: Option 1  Issue 2-6: Option 1  Issue 2-7: Option 1  Issue 2-8: Options 1 and 2 are not in disagreement with each other, i.e., both options consider the worst case scenario. Option 2 can be used as a baseline. |
| THALES | Issue 2-1: Option 1  Issue 2-2: Option 1  Issue 2-3: Option 2  Issue 2-4: Option 2  Issue 2-5: Option 1  Issue 2-6: Option 1  Issue 2-7: Option 1  Issue 2-8: To be further discussed. The UE self-estimated TA accuracy requirement can be defined as a separate accuracy requirement, as a function of GNSS precision/accuracy.  The precision depends on the GNSS-acquired position and the serving satellite ephemeris. |
| LGE | Issue 2-1: Option 1. In Rel 17., Prioritize the study of requirements with on-board GNSS requirements.  Issue 2-2: Option 1.  Issue 2-3: Option 1. If impact of RRM requirement is identified, Option2 is also fine to us.  Issue 2-5: Option 1. Wait RAN2 decision. |
| Huawei | Issue 2-1: option 1.  Issue 2-2: The accuracy of the ephemeris info can be discussed after RAN1 has conclusions on the format etc. Not sure if we need to prioritize scenarios in RAN4 at this stage.  Issue 2-3: option 2.  Issue 2-4: option 3, it has been agreed that GNSS accuracy is used as assumption to define RRM requirements. If any new requirements on GNSS accuracy are to be assumed than the current requirements in 38171, it needs to be carefully studied.  Issue 2-5: option 1.  Issue 2-6: option2, this can be discussed based on specific RRM requirements.  Issue 2-7: FFS, the dependency of measurement period on GNSS accuracy has not been discussed.  Issue 2-8: Option 2 |
| CATT | Issue 2-1: We describe how to use GNSS.  Issue 2-2: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-3: Support Option 2. As mentioned in R4-2104763, we think UE transmit timing error requirement will be impacted at least.  Issue 2-4: Support Option 2.  Issue 2-5: Fine with Option 1.  Issue 2-6: Need further study.  Issue 2-7: Need further study. In our discussion paper, the measurement period can be shorter than TN system.  Issue 2-8: Prefer to Option 2. But need to further study whether it can be enhanced. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Issue 2-1: Definition of GNSS requirements** | **Tentative agreements**: RAN4 assumes that ephemeris of the satellite/HAPS is made available to UE in defining the RRM requirements. No further discussion on whether the satellite or HAPS has on-board GNSS. Further study on the precision of the ephemeris data.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment** | **Tentative agreements:** For PVT accuracy requirements, RAN4 should consider the on-board GNSS requirements.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 2-3: GNSS accuracy impact on RRM requirements** | **Tentative agreements:** No clear consensus, although most companies agree with Option 2.  **Candidate options:** RAN4 not to identify the list of RRM requirements impacted by GNSS accuracy, but the impact of GNSS accuracy should be considered when defining each requirement.  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Further discuss if Option 2 can be changed slightly to be agreeable. |
| **Issue 2-4: Criteria of GNSS accuracy** | **Tentative agreements:** No clear consensus yet, further discussion and clarification yet.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Proponents of Options 1 and 2 should clarify |
| **Issue 2-5: GNSS accuracy for location-based CHO** | **Tentative agreements:** GNSS accuracy for location-based CHO need to be checked after location-based CHO is clear in RAN2.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 2-6: Impact of time to first fix/time to subsequent fix on RRM requirements** | **Tentative agreements:** RAN4 shall figure out the accuracy or response time difference between TTFF and TTFS before concluding this issue.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Further discuss the issue and clarify the impact on specific RRM requirements and respective scenarios. |
| **Issue 2-7: Measurement period** | **Tentative agreements:** Most companies agree with Option 1.  **Candidate options: o** Option 1: Measurement period needs to further study with assumption securing Timing Advance in proper scope: 1: Te ; 2: Timing Advance adjustment accuracy. Further evaluation of GNSS needs calculation with available satellite speed and elevation/azimuth angle and UE position in cell and needs to take error introduced between satellite and gateway into account.  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Further clarification of the context of the issue is encouraged. Dependency of measurement period on GNSS accuracy has to bee discussed. |
| **Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario** | **Tentative agreements**: No clear consensus, although a slight preference of Option 1 can be seen. Moderator suggests the following WF: Further discuss typical and worst-case scenario parameters with worst-caste parameters of Option 1 as starting point.  **Candidate options**:   * Option 1 The worst-case scenario should be considered with first priority; the corresponding minimum requirements are as below:  | **System** | **Success rate** | **2-D position error** | **Max response time** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | All | 95 % | 100 m | 20 s |  * Option 2: Take the worst case from 38.171 as the assumption of GNSS accuracy for defining RRM requirements.   **Recommendations for 2nd round**: Further discuss typical and worst-case scenario parameters. |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

**Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment**

**Tentative agreements:** For PVT accuracy requirements, RAN4 should consider the on-board GNSS requirements.

**Candidate options:**

**Recommendations for 2nd round:**

**Issue 2-3: GNSS accuracy impact on RRM requirements**

**Tentative agreements:** No clear consensus, although most companies agree with Option 2.

**Candidate options:** RAN4 not to identify the list of RRM requirements impacted by GNSS accuracy, but the impact of GNSS accuracy should be considered when defining each requirement.

**Recommendations for 2nd round:** Further discuss if Option 2 can be changed slightly to be agreeable.

**Issue 2-4: Criteria of GNSS accuracy**

**Tentative agreements**: No clear consensus yet, further discussion and clarification yet**.**

**Candidate options:**

o Option 1: Criteria of GNSS accuracy must be more stringent than current TA accuracy requirement anyhow. Further evaluation of GNSS needs calculation with available satellite speed and elevation/azimuth angle and UE position in cell and needs to take error introduced between satellite and gateway into account.

o Option 2: The requirements of UE transmit timing can be defined based on UE capability of GNSS accuracy.

**Recommendations for 2nd round:** Proponents of Options 1 and 2 should clarify

**Moderator: This was handled in the GTW on 15.04. The outcome will be added once the notes are available.**

**Issue 2-6: Impact of time to first fix/time to subsequent fix on RRM requirements**

**Tentative agreements**: RAN4 shall figure out the accuracy or response time difference between TTFF and TTFS before concluding this issue.

**Candidate options**:

**Recommendations for 2nd round**: Further discuss the issue and clarify the impact on specific RRM requirements and respective scenarios.

**Issue 2-7: Measurement period**

**Tentative agreements:** Most companies agree to FFS on this issue. Moderator suggests to use Option 1 as starting point for discussion as several companies tentatively agreed with it.

**Candidate options: o** Option 1: Measurement period needs to further study with assumption securing Timing Advance in proper scope: 1: Te ; 2: Timing Advance adjustment accuracy. Further evaluation of GNSS needs calculation with available satellite speed and elevation/azimuth angle and UE position in cell and needs to take error introduced between satellite and gateway into account.

**Recommendations for 2nd round:** Further clarification of the context of the issue is encouraged. Dependency of measurement period on GNSS accuracy has to bee discussed.

**Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario**

**Tentative agreements**: No clear consensus, although a slight preference of Option 1 can be seen. Moderator suggests the following WF: Further discuss typical and worst-case scenario parameters with worst-caste parameters of Option 1 as starting point.

**Candidate options**:

* Option 1 The worst-case scenario should be considered with first priority; the corresponding minimum requirements are as below:

| **System** | **Success rate** | **2-D position error** | **Max response time** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All | 95 % | 100 m | 20 s |

* Option 2: Take the worst case from 38.171 as the assumption of GNSS accuracy for defining RRM requirements.

**Recommendations for 2nd round**: Further discuss typical and worst-case scenario parameters.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm, via Email to Reflector (added by moderator) | Issue 2-3: GNSS accuracy impact on RRM requirements  As Option 2 doesn’t preclude Option 1 and it is supported by most companies like mentioned above, we think the tentative conclusion should be Option 2. Effectively, the point of the discussion here is “agreeing to no-impact to all cases now” vs. “check if no-impact is okay for each requirement”. Unless Option 1 is acceptable to all companies, let’s just go with Option 2 and do not spend time on this. Besides, Option 1 seems to be in conflict with the tentative agreement of Issue 2-5.  Issue 2-4: Criteria of GNSS accuracy  We believe both options should be discussed in #223 because option 2 is really about Tx timing requirement and option 1 is also related to the same. |
| Apple, via Email to Reflector (added by moderator) | Issue 2-7: Measurement period  However, in the 1st round discussion, 8 companies commented to FFS and 2 companies commented to support option 1. So I think we need to revise the tentative agreements: most companies agree to FFS; and we can further discuss in 2nd round. Thanks! |
| Huawei, via Email to Reflector (added by moderator) | Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment  On 2-2, the wording ‘PVT accuracy requirements’ is a bit unclear – are we going to define some accuracy requirements for PVT accuracy? Also it seems conflict with tentative agreement in 2-1. Our comments was that the PTV accuracy can be discussed after RAN1 has conclusions on the format of the ephemeris info etc, and the impact of with or without on-board GNSS is still a bit unclear (at least to us), so maybe we can discuss more on this in the 2nd round? |
| Moderator, to Huawei | To my understanding, Issue 2-2 is about whether or not on-board GNSS equipment can be assumed when defining PVT accuracy requirements. In this issue, no accuracy requirements will be defined, it’s just a clarification of assumptions for when they will be defined in accordance with the outcome of the RAN1 conclusion, as per Issue 2-1. |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment**  In our understanding, what matters to RAN4 is whether and how much inaccuracy on a given information about satellites should be factored in to UE performance requirements. We think RAN4 can work on requirement development assuming a certain form of the composite inaccuracy, e.g. [x, y, z] in terms of position, velocity, and time, if needed, and the values can be determined later when all the relevant details are made available by RAN1 and RAN2. With this understanding, the current tentative agreement may incur an unnecessary confusion such as “does this agreement limit deployment scenarios to on-board GNSS only?” which we believe is not the intention of the agreement. As long as a certain level of PVT accuracy can be assured, we don’t think whether it is on-board GNSS or not doesn’t much matter to UE RRM requirement work.  **Issue 2-7: Measurement period**  Is **the measurement period** for GNSS signal reception? It is a bit unclear what the issue is for and what the context of the proposals is. Please proponents of the proposal clarify what the proposal means and elaborate on it a bit. Without a clear understanding of the proposal and background, we don’t even know what to discuss further.  Just to make it clear, required GNSS accuracies for UL transmission and DL measurement can be different. I.e. when UE is in Idle/Inactive mode or when UE is in DRX mode, UE GNSS receiver may not need to receive GNSS signals as frequently as it does prior to UL transmission. We should not assume the required GNSS accuracy for UL transmission can be always applied to DL measurements.  **Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario**  Option 1. We can first start with the worst-case scenario. If a technical issue is found for specific requirements in specific circumstances, RAN4 can discuss whether and how to address it. For example, if necessary and justified, we can consider a better GNSS requirement for the identified specific requirements. |
| CMCC | Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment  We share similar views with moderator that issue 2-2 is not about defining the accuracy requirement, it is just a clarification of assumptions.  Issue 2-3: GNSS accuracy impact on RRM requirements  In GTW session, we achieved an agreement in issue 2-4 which is “The impact of GNSS accuracy should be considered when defining each RRM requirement”, we think it is a general description and this issue can also follow this agreement.  Issue 2-6: Impact of time to first fix/time to subsequent fix on RRM requirements  The requirements such as response time in TTFF and TTSF scenario is different. We agree to discuss based on more specific RRM requirements and respective scenarios as proposed by QC and HW.  Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario  We support Option1. |
| Moderator | **Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment**  Suggested WF: Assume on-board GNSS equipment for further PVT accuracy requirement discussion.  **Issue 2-3: GNSS accuracy impact on RRM requirements**  Suggested WF: Follow agreement of Issue 2-4: The impact of GNSS accuracy should be considered when defining each RRM requirement  **Issue 2-4: Criteria of GNSS accuracy**  **WF agreed in GTW:** The impact of GNSS accuracy should be considered when defining each RRM requirement   * GNSS accuracy (e.g. as a function of UE GNSS capability) and side conditions and exact impact on the RRM requirements are FFS. * GNSS accuracy enhancements are out of scope   **Issue 2-6: Impact of time to first fix/time to subsequent fix on RRM requirements**  Suggested WF: RAN4 shall figure out the accuracy or response time difference between TTFF and TTFS before concluding this issue. The impact on specific RRM requirements and respective scenarios is FFS.  **Issue 2-7: Measurement period**  Suggested WF: FFS, proposing companies need to elaborate.  **Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario**  Suggested WF: Typical and worst-case scenario parameters are FFS. For worst-case parameters, the following minimum requirements can be used as starting point:   | **System** | **Success rate** | **2-D position error** | **Max response time** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | All | 95 % | 100 m | 20 s | |
| Apple | **Issue 2-7: Measurement period**  We are fine with FFS. The usage of the measurement period requirement is unclear to us so far. If this GNSS measurement is for UE specific TA estimation, and then this discussion could be covered by issue 1.2.1-1 on thread #223. According to the GTW discussion for thread #223,  Agreements on GTW session:   * + - The UE specific TA estimation accuracy is counted into the UE transmit timing error requirement       * UE specific TA estimation accuracy is FFS       * FFS whether the UE specific TA estimation accuracy shall be also defined as a separate accuracy requirement       * Specify UE behavior related to UE specific TA estimation and the detailed behavior is FFS   We are thinking if such UE behavior could cover the GNSS measurement period, However, if the GNSS measurement is used for other RRM requirement, then more discussion is needed.  **Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario**  Fine with option 1. |
| Ericsson | Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment  Our interpretation of tentative agreement is ‘GNSS equipment requirement is one of factors impacting PTV accuracy requirement.’ If so, we agree with tentative agreement because GNSS is mandatory, even its requirement is unclear.  Issue 2-4: Criteria of GNSS accuracy  We proposed option 1 based on RRM requirement which can be impacted by GNSS possibly, before TA accuracy link budget is available. As mentioned in GTW, it is not the only stuff GNSS accuracy impacts. For our understanding, issue 2-4 conflicts with issue 2-3. If we agree issue 2-3, particular RRM requirements impacted by GNSS accuracy should not be discussed. Not only issue 2-4, 2-7 also is impacted. Because measurement period is also derived by total accuracy budget. And, please Moderator help to confirm if session 223 handle it or not, we can’t secure it.  Issue 2-6: Impact of time to first fix/time to subsequent fix on RRM requirements  Agree with tentative agreement.  Issue 2-7: Measurement period  Option 1 is based UE transmitting timing and timing advance and follows their definitions about DRX also. Similar with issue 2-4, we try to capture UE transmitting timing and timing advance may be impacted by measurement period. Due to lacking of timing link budget in NTN, we are open to any discussion.  Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario  We support option1. |
| Xiaomi | **Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment**  Similar comments as QC, whether it is on-board GNSS or not doesn’t much matter to UE RRM requirement.  **Issue 2-3: GNSS accuracy impact on RRM requirements**  Fine with the suggested WF from moderator.  **Issue 2-4: Criteria of GNSS accuracy**  Follow the agreements made in GTW session  **Issue 2-7: Measurement period**  Fine with the suggested WF from moderator.  **Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario**  Both typical and worst-case scenario should be considered. It also depends on how much total timing error budget can UE can consume. |
| Huawei | **Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment**  Thanks for the moderator’s feedback.  However, we still have some concerns on the Suggested WF. Based on moderator’s feedback, it seems the issue is essentially about PVT accuracy so it may be better to be handled under Topic#3? Also, it seems what we are discussing is the assumption but not the requirements of PVT accuracy, so we suggest to change the wording to avoid possible confusion. Last, we share similar view as QC that maybe we can focus the discussion on the PVT accuracy itself once we have conclusions from RAN1/2 on the e.g. ephemeris format, and we may not need to have explicit assumption on whether satellite has on-board GNSS or not.  **Issue 2-3: GNSS accuracy impact on RRM requirements**  We are fine with the Suggested WF.  **Issue 2-6: Impact of time to first fix/time to subsequent fix on RRM requirements**  We are fine with the Suggested WF.  **Issue 2-7: Measurement period**  We are fine with the Suggested WF.  **Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario**  We are fine with the Suggested WF. |
| CATT | **Issue 2-2: We support the suggested WF**  **Issue 2-3: We support the suggested WF**  **Issue 2-4: It is the agreement in GTW. We support it.**  **Issue 2-7: We support the suggested WF.**  **Issue 2-8: As the wording is “FFS”, we support the suggested WF. In addition, should it be narrow down from 3GPP’s spec such as 38.171? Otherwise, the discussion is extensive. Another typo in current WF, it should be 2-8 but not 2-4.** |
| LGE | Issue 2-3  Agree with the suggested WF.  Issue 2-4  Agree with the suggested WF.  Issue 2-7  Agree with the tentative agreements.  Issue 2-8  Fine with option1. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment**  The recommended WF is OK.  **Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario**  Ok with the worst-case parameters proposed in the recommended WF. |
| Moderator | **To Ericsson: I don’t see how 2-3 is conflicting 2-4. In my understanding, we merely agreed not to discuss GNSS accuracy as an overall requirement, but to take the GNSS accuracy into account when discussing/defining other RRM requirements. I don’t see the conflict here.**  **To Huawei: I agree now that this issue would be better handled under Topic #3. Let’s keep it here for this meeting though. In my opinion it is quite clear that we are discussing an assumption and not a requirement. Do you have a suggestion how to make it clearer?**  **Issue 2-8: I suggest the following extended WF**  Typical and worst-case scenario parameters are FFS. For worst-case parameters, the following minimum requirements can be used as starting point:   | **System** | **Success rate** | **2-D position error** | **Max response time** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | All | 95 % | 100 m | 20 s |  * **FFS how much total timing error budget the UE can consume** * **FFS on how to narrow down from 3GPP spec such as 38.171 to avoid extensive discussion** |
| Moderator | **Issue 2-2: I suggest the following WF**  **Consider on-board GNSS requirements for further PVT accuracy requirement discussion. Take into account further RAN1 input when available.** |
| Huawei, via Email to reflector (added by moderator) | **Issue 2-2:**  **Based on our understanding, 3 companies (QC/Xiaomi/HW) commented in the 2nd round that such assumption (whether on-board GNSS is available for satellite/HAPS) may not be needed for RAN4 RRM, and so far there was no reply on how this assumption would impact RRM requirements...**    **On the other hand, we are willing to compromise to your latest WF in order to move forward, but still we have some questions/comments:**  **- What does “on-board GNSS requirements” mean?**  **- The “PVT accuracy requirement” should be changed to “PVT accuracy assumption”. This point was also clarified by CMCC (who proposed option 1 for issue 2-2) in their 2nd round comments for issue 2-2 and 3-1.** |
| Moderator | **Issue 2-2: Suggest to change the WF to**  **Consider on-board GNSS requirements for further PVT accuracy assumptions. Take into account further RAN1 input when available** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Issue 2-3: Fine with the suggested WF from moderator.  Issue 2-6: Fine with the suggested WF from moderator.  Issue 2-8: Fine with the suggested WF from moderator. |

* 1. Summary for 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| R4-2105795 WF on NR NTN RRM general and measurement requirements | *Based on the discussions, the moderator has prepared a way forward with the following conclusions:*   * + **Issue 2-1: Definition of GNSS requirements** RAN4 assumes that ephemeris of the satellite/HAPS is made available to UE in defining the RRM requirements. No further discussion on whether the satellite or HAPS has on-board GNSS. Further study on the precision of the ephemeris data.   + **Issue 2-2: Consideration of on-board GNSS equipment** Consider on-board GNSS requirements for further PVT accuracy assumptions. Take into account further RAN1 input when available   + **Issue 2-3: GNSS accuracy impact on RRM requirements** Follow agreement of Issue 2-4: The impact of GNSS accuracy should be considered when defining each RRM requirement   + **Issue 2-4: Criteria of GNSS accuracy** The impact of GNSS accuracy should be considered when defining each RRM requirement     - GNSS accuracy (e.g. as a function of UE GNSS capability) and side conditions and exact impact on the RRM requirements are FFS.     - GNSS accuracy enhancements are out of scope   + **Issue 2-5: GNSS accuracy for location-based CHO** GNSS accuracy for location-based CHO need to be checked after location-based CHO is clear in RAN2.   + **Issue 2-6: Impact of time to first fix/time to subsequent fix on RRM requirements** RAN4 shall figure out the accuracy or response time difference between TTFF and TTFS before concluding this issue. The impact on specific RRM requirements and respective scenarios is FFS.   + **Issue 2-7: Measurement period** The measurement period is FFS.   + **Issue 2-8: Reference GNSS scenario** Typical and worst-case scenario parameters are FFS. For worst-case parameters, the following minimum requirements can be used as starting point:  | **System** | **Success rate** | **2-D position error** | **Max response time** | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | All | 95 % | 100 m | 20 s |  * + - FFS how much total timing error budget the UE can consume     - FFS on how to narrow down from 3GPP spec such as 38.171 to avoid extensive discussion |

1. Topic #3: PVT Satellite precision

During RAN4#98-e, it was concluded to postpone the discussion until RAN1 has reached a decision. While the discussion is still not concluded, some agreements were made in RAN1.

* 1. Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104603 | CMCC | **Proposal 5**: PVT accuracy requirements should be first studied based on the ephemeris format which includes the satellite position and velocity state vectors. |

* 1. Open issues summary

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

* + 1. Sub-topic 3-1: Requirements for PVT computation and distribution

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

**Issue 3-1: NTN PVT Accuracy Aspects**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: PVT accuracy requirements should be first studied based on the ephemeris format which includes the satellite position and velocity state vectors.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA
  1. Companies views’ collection for 1st round
     1. Open issues

**Example 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Issue 3-1: To clarify, would this accuracy be the side condition for defining the UE requirement, instead of a UE requirement? |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 3-1:  Issue 3-1: Support recommended WF. Ephemeris is one of factors impacting PVT accuracy measured, should RRM check PVT accuracy or should take PVT accuracy as input? |
| Apple | Issue 3-1: agree with recommended WF. Is this PVT accuracy given by RAN1 or assumed by RAN4? |
| CMCC | Issue 3-1: For the question raised by MTK and Ericsson, we would like to reply that the accuracy should be the side condition for defining the RRM requirement.  In RAN1, there are two options of ephemeris format below:  Option 1: Ephemeris format based on satellite position and velocity state vectors;  Option 2: Ephemeris format based on orbital elements  We think we can start the PVT accuracy requirements study based on Option1 as the baseline in RAN4. |
| Qualcomm | Issue 3-1: For the detailed formats of satellite’s ephemeris are currently being discussed and will be determined by other working groups. A similar question as MTK and Ericsson. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 3-1: similar question as Apple, the PVT accuracy is discussed in RAN1 or RAN4? |
| Samsung | Issue 3-1: Not clear whether such PVT accuracy should be defined by RAN1 or RAN 4. |
| Nokia, Nokia shanghai Bell | Issue 3-1: Option 1 is OK. Further clarification is required on what accuracy means. |
| THALES | Issue 3-1: The satellite ephemeris is broadcasted in the NTN SI under a standardized format. The formats are FFS.  However, the precision also depends on the reporting period between the NTN control function and GW. |
| Huawei | Same question as MTK/Ericsson. |
| CATT | Issue 3-1: We think only UE transmit timing error requirement will be affected but no other RRM requirement. |







* + 1. CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

* 1. Summary for 1st round
     1. Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Issue 3-1: NTN PVT Accuracy Aspects** | ***Tentative agreements****:* *PVT accuracy requirements should be first studied based on the ephemeris format which includes the satellite position and velocity state vectors.* *Ephemeris format based on satellite position and velocity state vector.*  ***Candidate options****:*  ***Recommendations for 2nd round****: Further clarification by proponents and FFS if the issue is to be discussed in RAN1 or RAN4.* |

* + 1. CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

* 1. Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

**Issue 3-1: NTN PVT Accuracy Aspects**

***Tentative agreements****:* *PVT accuracy requirements should be first studied based on the ephemeris format which includes the satellite position and velocity state vectors.* *Ephemeris format based on satellite position and velocity state vector.*

***Candidate options****:*

***Recommendations for 2nd round****: Further clarification by proponents and FFS if the issue is to be discussed in RAN1 or RAN4.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | For the detailed formats of satellite’s ephemeris are currently being discussed and will be determined by other working groups. The options in RAN1 are as below:   * Option 1: Ephemeris format based on satellite position and velocity state vectors; * Option 2: Ephemeris format based on orbital elements   Note that both formats can be adopted. In that case, if a significant difference in terms of accuracy is expected between the two options, and if RAN4 is not planning to introduce two different sets of requirements for the two formats, the minimum UE requirements may have to be defined based on the worst one. If it is decided that one format is for serving satellite and the other one is for neighbor satellites, then RAN4 should consider different formats/accuracies for different requirements.  Again, we believe RAN4 can work on requirement development assuming a certain form of inaccuracy in the meantime, i.e. ephemeris format is not immediately related to RAN4 work for now. |
| CMCC | The proposal is from our contribution. After checking with our RAN1’s colleague, the PVT accuracy should be first discussed in RAN1 and then give the information to RAN4. We agree to defer this issue until RAN1 achieve the conclusion.  Besides, we want to clarify that we are not intend to define the PVT accuracy requirement, the PVT accuracy can be the assumption or side conditions when defining the NTN RRM requirements. It is the same logic with GNSS accuracy. |
| Moderator | Suggested WF: Defer discussion until RAN1 concludes on the issue. |
| Apple | Agree with moderator WF to defer it. |
| Ericsson | Agree with above views. We can defer it before more information from RAN1 about PVT accuracy. |
| Xiaomi | Agree with moderator WF. |
| Huawei | We are fine with the Suggested WF. |
| CATT | Agree with the suggested WF |
| LGE | Agree with moderator’s suggestion. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | The recommended WF is OK. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Fine to defer discussion until RAN1 concludes on the issue |

* 1. Summary for 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| R4-2105795 WF on NR NTN RRM general and measurement requirements | *Based on the discussions, the moderator has prepared a way forward with the following conclusions:*   * + **Issue 3-1: NTN PVT Accuracy Aspects** Defer discussion until RAN1 concludes on the issue. |

1. Topic #4: NTN UL Time synchronization requirements

The issues for this topic are treated in [223] NR\_NTN\_solutions\_RRM\_2.

1. Topic #5: NTN UL Frequency synchronization requirements

During RAN4#98-e, it was tentatively agreed for RAN4 to investigate factors that can affect time and frequency pre-compensation accuracy requirements. Specific requirements are FFS.

* 1. Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104603 | CMCC | **Proposal 6**: At least the following factors will affect time/frequency pre-compensation accuracy requirements: • The accuracy of GNSS • PVT information accuracy • The frequency of reading GNSS information • The frequency of acquiring PVT information |
| R4-2107030 | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 5:** RAN4 not to further discuss time/frequency pre-compensation accuracy requirements as a general issue. |
| R4-2104763 | CATT | **Observation 5:** The legacy requirement for UE transmit frequency error can be reused for NTN UE.  **Observation 6:** Relaxed Te will be defined including time pre-compensation accuracy based on UE capability of GNSS accuracy. |

* 1. Open issues summary

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

* + 1. Sub-topic 5-1: Frequency accuracy requirements

*Sub-topic description:*

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

**Issue 5-1: Time/Frequency pre-compensation accuracy requirements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 not to further discuss time/frequency pre-compensation accuracy requirements as a general issue.
  + Option 2: At least the following factors will affect time/frequency pre-compensation accuracy requirements:  
    • The accuracy of GNSS  
    • PVT information accuracy  
    • The frequency of reading GNSS information  
    • The frequency of acquiring PVT information
  + Option 3: The legacy requirement for UE transmit frequency error can be reused for NTN UE. Relaxed Te will be defined including time pre-compensation accuracy based on UE capability of GNSS accuracy.
  + Option 4: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA
  1. Companies views’ collection for 1st round
     1. Open issues

**Example 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Issue 5-1: Option 1, it can be discussed in the corresponding timing/frequency requirement threads. |
| Ericsson | Sub topic 5-1:  Issue 5-1: (2021-04-13): Option1. |
| Apple | Issue 5-1: option 1 from RRM perspective. |
| CMCC | Issue 5-1: Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Issue 5-1: Frequency accuracy requirement is supposed to be discussed in RF session as per the agreement made in the previous RAN4 meeting. Timing accuracy requirement is in our understanding supposed to be discussed in the email thread#223 as per the email discussion guideline. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 5-1: Support option 1, this issue should be discussed in email thread#223. |
| Intel | Issue 5-1: Option 1: not from RRM perspective or from general perspective. We agree with Apple & Qualcomm. |
| THALES | Issue 5-1:  >>For **frequency pre-compensation** requirements:  Option 4: RAN4 shall use the maximum tolerated Doppler shift pre-compensation error to derive the precision of ephemeris data such as transmission periodicity, NTN UE acquisition periodicity and the NTN UE prediction parameters (e.g. method, maximum duration, etc.).  Please see R4-2107275 and discussion from [98-bis-e][309] NTN\_Solutions\_Part3:  For initial access (i.e. PRACH transmission) and for UL transmissions in RRC Connected State, the NTN UE modulated carrier frequency shall be accurate to within ±0.1 ppm, as observed over a period of 1 ms by the gNB.  The NTN UE residual frequency error shall be sufficiently low such that it can be considered as included in the tolerated frequency error of ±0.1 ppm already captured in the specification.  >>For **time pre-compensation** requirements:  Please see discussion from [98-bis-e][223] NR\_NTN\_solutions\_RRM\_2 |
| Huawei | Option 1. |
| CATT | For frequency, we think the legacy requirement for UE transmit frequency error can be reused for NTN UE. |

* + 1. CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

* 1. Summary for 1st round
     1. Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Issue 5-1: Time/Frequency pre-compensation accuracy requirements** | *Defer discussion on frequency pre-compensation to RF thread [309] and discussion on time pre-compensation to RRM thread [223].* |

* + 1. CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

* 1. Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

1. Topic #6: NTN Measurements

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

* 1. Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2106939 | Huawei, HiSilicon | **Proposal 1:** Legacy CHO delay requirements can be used as a baseline to define NTN specific CHO delay requirements.  **Proposal 2:** NTN specific location based measurement can consider requirements for A-GNSS in 38.171 as a starting point.  **Proposal 3:** The existing accuracy of RRM measurement quantity in current spec can be reused for NTN RRM measurement as a starting point.  **Proposal 4:** No interruption needs to be specified for GNSS and L-band.  **Proposal 5:** Regarding SMTC and MG in NTN, RAN4 wait for the progress in RAN2. |
| R4-2107292 | Qualcomm | Network Topologies  **Observation 1**: In NTN with frequency reuse factor larger than 1, inter-cell mobility under the same satellite can be seen as BWP switching based L1 mobility.  **Proposal 1**: To facilitate technical discussion about mobility/measurement development, RAN4 to discuss the following aspects and define reference scenarios:   * Frequency reuse factor, e.g. 3 or 7 * Mapping between frequency resource of beam footprint and Cell-ID/ SSB-ID/ BWP-ID, e.g. frequency resource in a cell group for frequency-reuse under a satellite   + cells share a common Cell-ID and use different BWP-IDs with different SSB-IDs   + cells have different Cell-IDs   L1/L3 Measurements  **Proposal 2**: RAN4 to further discuss the following aspects:   * Whether to define same or different measurement accuracy and/or latency requirements for intra-satellite cell mobility and inter-satellite cell mobility * Whether to define same of different requirements in terms of the number of measurement cells for intra-satellite and inter-satellite, e.g. 7 cells for intra-satellite and 3 cells for inter-satellite, etc. * Location and/or timer based measurement relaxation, e.g. measurement interval can be relaxed when UE is close to the centre of beam footprint for GEO and/or non-GEO with at least earth-fixed cell   **Proposal 3**: RAN4 to investigate L1/L3 measurement requirements for GEO and non-GEO separately.   * Whether or not the requirements can be defined in the same manner for GEO and non-GEO will be determined after the investigation * Whether legacy RLF and BFD requirements are relevant for NTN UEs, e.g. legacy BLER value of a hypothetical PDCCH transmission and/or PDCCH format for out-of-sync and BFD can be reused   Interruption/Measurement Gaps for GNSS Measurements  **Proposal 4**: If a coexistence issue in terms of interruption to GNSS receiver from NTN uplink signals/channels (in-device and/or inter-devices, i.e. inter-UEs’ uplinks) is identified for certain frequencies/bands, RAN4 to consider the following approaches:   * If interruption to GNSS receiver from intra-UE and/or inter-UE NTN uplink is identified,   + consider introducing a UE specific uplink gap and/or a common uplink gap for GNSS measurement for multiple inter-UEs, or   + consider defining uplink interruption requirements in terms of, e.g. interruption ratio every [X]ms |
| R4-2104598 | CMCC | **Proposal 1**: RAN4 to discuss measurement and mobility for the following scenarios with high priority. • Intra-NTN for both RRC Connected and Idle/Inactive modes with higher priority  • between GEO type satellites • between LEO type satellites at the same altitude • between earth fixed cells or between earth moving cells • FFS: whether/which to prioritize • depending on satellite/cell deployment topologies consider both scenarios where cells are within a satellite and belong to different satellites  • FFS: between HAPs • between NTN and TN for RRC Inactive/Idle modes  (note) not all possible mix of scenarios may be available  **Proposal 2**: Since IDC mechanism will be specified in Rel-17 RAN2 TEI, there is no need for RAN4 to discuss interruptions or measurement gaps for GNSS measurements during NTN operation.  **Proposal 3**: RAN4 to study the following aspects for further discussion of (new) SMTC and Measurement Gap based requirements in NTN  • Propagation delay and/or reception power differences between cells • between GEO type satellites • between LEO type satellites at the same altitude • between earth fixed cells or between earth moving cells • FFS: whether/which to prioritize • depending on satellite/cell deployment topologies consider both scenarios where cells are within a satellite and belong to different satellites  • FFS: between HAPs • whether/how to account for delay propagation from feeder link is up to RAN1/RAN2 assumption/design • Detailed requirements will be discussed when RAN2 solutions, if any, are provided • No new measurement gap pattern is needed according to RAN2 latest email discussion • FFS: whether/how to split detailed work between Rel-17 work items, NTN and MG enhancement • The multiple measurement gaps of NTN should be based on the outcome of MG enhancement WI, and further enhancement in NTN WI may be considered for NTN scenario if needed. |
| R4-2104690 | Xiaomi | **Observation 1**: The propagation time difference between serving cell and target neighbour cell will cause the reference signal window of target neighbour cell is not within the measurement gap window configured by the serving cell.  **Proposal 1**: it is not necessary to introduce new SMTC window or new measurement gap in NTN.  **Proposal 2**: The starting point of measurement gap can be determined by the following aspects:  1. Gap offset 2. Measurement gap timing advance (mgta) 3. Propagation delay difference between serving cell and neighbour cell  **Proposal 3**: The existing cell reselection delay requirement based on the existing S criteria can be reused for cell reselection in NTN scenarios.  **Proposal 4**: RAN4 need to define the reasonable cell reselection margin for cell reselection in NTN scenarios.  **Proposal 5**: RAN4 is to define the RRM requirements for satellite/HAPS ephemeris based cell selection and reselection once RAN2 completes the cell reselection procedure for NTN.  **Proposal 6**：The timeline for NTN CHO should be defined the time between the end of the last TTI containing the RRC command and the end of the reception of the new PRACH.  **Proposal 7**: The existing conditional handover delay requirement defined in Rel-16 can be reused as baseline for NR NTN CHO, the additional propagation delay should be considered in NTN CHO delay requirement.  **Proposal 8**: RAN4 is to define the RRM requirements for time/timer and location based CHO triggering event. |
| R4-2104816 | Ericsson | **Proposal 5:** It is feasible to receive GNSS positioning signals without any measurement gap or interruption in 3GPP radio reception or transmission.  **Observation 2**: Before time(r) and location based CHO are fixed in RAN2, it is difficult to discuss ‘time(r)’ and ‘location’ impact to RRM.  **Proposal 6**: Current Cell (re)selection and CHO based on RSRP/RSRQ should still be a fundamental requirement in NTN. Current idle/active mobility requirements should be start point without change. |
| R4-2105143 | LGE | **Proposal 2**. RAN4 should study the RAN4 impact of multiple configuration and multiple (or one) offsets for SMTC/MG.  **Proposal 3**. To prevent the performance degradation, RAN4 needs to study conditions that new or enhanced SMTC/MG is required.  **Proposal 4**. RAN4 should consider UE behavior for misaligned between measurement resources and SMTC/MG window due to inaccurate information such as propagation delay or location.  **Proposal 5**. Existing requirements for conditional HO in NR could be reused for intra/inter-NTN handover with service link switching.  **Proposal 6**. RAN4 needs to determine whether feeder link switching based handover for one NTN satellite would be handled in Rel-17. |
| R4-2104986 | NEC | **Proposal 2:** RAN4 to at least prioritize the measurement requirements for earth moving cells.  **Proposal 3:** RAN4 to discuss multiple and concurrent MG based solution for NTN in MG enhancements WI. |
| R4-2104766 | CATT | **Observation 1:** The DRX should not be longer than 320ms for NTN system.  **Observation 2:** The side condition for RRM measurement requirements may be defined at Es/Iot ≥ -3 dB.  **Observation 3:** NTN FR2 UE should not need receiving beam sweep, or reduced beam sweeping, e.g. 2 times.  **Observation 4:** It may be appropriate that the update rate of ephemeris parameters is 1 time per second.  **Observation 5:** How to do the pre-compensation of feeder link should be decided by RAN1 and its error may be negligible compare with pre-compensation of service link done by UE.  **Observation 6:** The priority for GEO, LEO, and HAPS may not be defined their priority ahead and can be set measurement frequency priority by network as TN NR system.  **Observation 7:** HAPS can be measured as very large cell.  **Observation 8:** The existing mobility methodologies can be reused for NTN scenarios with limitation of DRX cycle and the number of measurement samples.  **Observation 9:** The GNSS receiving should not be interrupted, and interrupting data communication can be allowed.  **Observation 10:** The propagation delay difference can’t impact SMTC configuration and measurement not using GAP. Using longer measurement GAP and supporting multiple GAP patterns may solve this issue for measurement using GAP. How to deal with these issues should be decided by RAN1/RAN2. |
| R4-2107526 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Observation 1:** A static SMTC window duration may be unable to handle serving and neighbour cell propagation delay variations.  **Observation 2:** The transparent satellite amplification type impacts UE and network interpretation of measurements. |
| R4-2104834 | Apple | **Proposal:** RRM room would determine whether interruptions or measurement gaps is expected for GNSS measurements during NTN operation after the IDC interference from L-band NTN to GNSS is evaluated/confirmed in RF session. |

* 1. Open issues summary

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

* + 1. Sub-topic 6-1: General RRM NTN measurement requirements

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

**Issue 6-1: DRX cycle**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: The DRX should not be longer than 320ms for NTN system.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: The side condition for RRM measurement requirements may be defined at Es/Iot ≥ -3 dB.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-3: Beam sweeping**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: NTN FR2 UE should not need receiving beam sweep, or reduced beam sweeping, e.g. 2 times.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-4: RRM procedures based on UE position**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For NTN-specific location based measurements, consider the requirements for A-GNSS in 38.171 as a starting point.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-5: Update rate of ephemeris**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: It may be appropriate that the update rate of ephemeris parameters is 1 time per second.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-6: Feeder link pre-compensation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: How to do the pre-compensation of feeder link should be decided by RAN1 and its error may be negligible compare with pre-compensation of service link done by UE.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA
    1. Sub-topic 6-2: Mobility

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

**Issue 6-7: Definition of mobility/measurement aspects**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: To facilitate technical discussion about mobility/measurement development, RAN4 to discuss the following aspects and define reference scenarios:
    - Frequency reuse factor, e.g. 3 or 7
    - Mapping between frequency resource of beam footprint and Cell-ID/ SSB-ID/ BWP-ID, e.g. frequency resource in a cell group for frequency-reuse under a satellite  
      ─ cells share a common Cell-ID and use different BWP-IDs with different SSB-IDs  
      ─ cells have different Cell-IDs
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 to further discuss the following aspects:
    - Whether to define same or different measurement accuracy and/or latency requirements for Intra-satellite cell mobility and inter-satellite cell mobility
    - Whether to define same of different requirements in terms of the number of measurement cells for intra-satellite and inter-satellite, e.g. 7 cells for intra-satellite and 3 cells for inter-satellite, etc.
    - Location and/or timer based measurement relaxation, e.g. measurement interval can be relaxed when UE is close to the centre of beam footprint for GEO and/or non-GEO with at least earth-fixed cell
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-9: L1/L3 measurement requirements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 to investigate L1/L3 measurement requirements for GEO and non-GEO separately.
    - Whether or not the requirements can be defined in the same manner for GEO and non-GEO will be determined after the investigation
    - Whether legacy RLF and BFD requirements are relevant for NTN UEs, e.g. legacy BLER value of a hypothetical PDCCH transmission and/or PDCCH format for out-of-sync and BFD can be reused
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 to discuss measurement and mobility for the following scenarios with high priority.
    - Intra-NTN for both RRC Connected and Idle/Inactive modes with higher priority
    - between GEO type satellites
    - between LEO type satellites at the same altitude
    - between earth fixed cells or between earth moving cells
    - FFS: whether/which to prioritize
    - depending on satellite/cell deployment topologies consider both scenarios where cells are within a satellite and belong to different satellites
    - FFS: between HAPs
    - between NTN and TN for RRC Inactive/Idle modes
    - (note) not all possible mix of scenarios may be available
  + Option 2: The priority for GEO, LEO, and HAPS may not be defined their priority ahead and can be set measurement frequency priority by network as TN NR system. HAPS can be measured as very large cell.
  + Option 3: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: The existing cell reselection delay requirement based on the existing S criteria can be reused for cell reselection in NTN scenarios.
  + Option 1a: The existing mobility methodologies can be reused for NTN scenarios with limitation of DRX cycle and the number of measurement samples.
  + Option 2: RAN4 need to define the reasonable cell reselection margin for cell reselection in NTN scenarios.
  + Option 3: RAN4 is to define the RRM requirements for satellite/HAPS ephemeris based cell selection and reselection once RAN2 completes the cell reselection procedure for NTN.
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Use existing cell (re)-selection and conditional handover (CHO) delay requirements as baseline. Additional propagation delays should be considered.
  + Option 2: The timeline for NTN CHO should be defined the time between the end of the last TTI containing the RRC command and the end of the reception of the new PRACH.
  + Option 3: RAN4 is to define the RRM requirements for time/timer and location based CHO triggering event.
  + Option 4: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-13: Feeder link switching based handover**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 needs to determine whether feeder link switching based handover for one NTN satellite would be handled in Rel-17.
  + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA
    1. Sub-topic 6-3: Measurement gap and SMTC

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

**Issue 6-14: Interruptions or measurement gaps for GNSS measurements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Since IDC mechanism will be specified in Rel-17 RAN2 TEI, there is no need for RAN4 to discuss interruptions or measurement gaps for GNSS measurements during NTN operation.
  + Option 2: It is feasible to receive GNSS positioning signals without any measurement gap or interruption in 3GPP radio reception or transmission. No interruption needs to be specified for GNSS and L-band.
  + Option 3: If a coexistence issue in terms of interruption to GNSS receiver from NTN uplink signals/channels (in-device and/or inter-devices, i.e. inter-UEs’ uplinks) is identified for certain frequencies/bands, RAN4 to consider the following approaches:
    - If interruption to GNSS receiver from intra-UE and/or inter-UE NTN uplink is identified,

─ consider introducing a UE specific uplink gap and/or a common uplink gap for GNSS measurement for multiple inter-UEs, or

─ consider defining uplink interruption requirements in terms of, e.g. interruption ratio every [X]ms

* + Option 4: The GNSS receiving should not be interrupted, and interrupting data communication can be allowed.
  + Option 5: RRM room would determine whether interruptions or measurement gaps is expected for GNSS measurements during NTN operation after the IDC interference from L-band NTN to GNSS is evaluated/confirmed in RF session
* Recommended WF
  + Defer discussion about this issue #1-3 is cleared. The issue has to be looked at by the RF session, and only if issues are identified there, the discussion can continue in RRM.

**Issue 6-15: Discussion of SMTC and MG**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Regarding SMTC and MG in NTN, RAN4 wait for the progress in RAN2.
  + Option 1a: The propagation delay difference can’t impact SMTC configuration and measurement not using GAP. Using longer measurement GAP and supporting multiple GAP patterns may solve this issue for measurement using GAP. How to deal with these issues should be decided by RAN1/RAN2.
  + Option 2: It is not necessary to introduce new SMTC window or new measurement gap in NTN.
  + Option 3: RAN4 to discuss multiple and concurrent MG based solution for NTN in MG enhancements WI.
  + Option 4: To prevent the performance degradation, RAN4 needs to study conditions that new or enhanced SMTC/MG is required.
  + Option 5: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-16: SMTC and MG based requirements**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 to study the following aspects for further discussion of (new) SMTC and Measurement Gap based requirements in NTN
    - Propagation delay and/or reception power differences between cells
    - between GEO type satellites
    - between LEO type satellites at the same altitude
    - between earth fixed cells or between earth moving cells
    - FFS: whether/which to prioritize
    - depending on satellite/cell deployment topologies consider both scenarios where cells are within a satellite and belong to different satellites
    - FFS: between HAPs
    - whether/how to account for delay propagation from feeder link is up to RAN1/RAN2 assumption/design
    - Detailed requirements will be discussed when RAN2 solutions, if any, are provided
    - No new measurement gap pattern is needed according to RAN2 latest email discussion
    - FFS: whether/how to split detailed work between Rel-17 work items, NTN and MG enhancement
    - The multiple measurement gaps of NTN should be based on the outcome of MG enhancement WI, and further enhancement in NTN WI may be considered for NTN scenario if needed.
  + Option 2: RAN4 to at least prioritize the measurement requirements for earth moving cells.
  + Option 3: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-17: Measurement gap starting point**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: The starting point of measurement gap can be determined by the following aspects:

1. Gap offset  
2. Measurement gap timing advance (mgta)   
3. Propagation delay difference between serving cell and neighbour cell

* + Option 2: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA

**Issue 6-18: SMTC and gap window misalignment**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: RAN4 should consider UE behavior for misaligned between measurement resources and SMTC/MG window due to inaccurate information such as propagation delay or location.
  + Option 2: RAN4 should study the RAN4 impact of multiple configuration and multiple (or one) offsets for SMTC/MG.
  + Option 3: TBA
* Recommended WF
  + TBA
  1. Companies views’ collection for 1st round
     1. Open issues

**Example 1**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| MTK | Issue 6-1: More discussion would be needed. Is option 1 only for LEO or also apply for GEO?  Issue 6-3: It would be too eerily to decide on the FR2 beam sweeping.  Issue 6-4: It should be a case-by-case discussion. It may need to firstly identify which requirement would be impacted by the GNSS accuracy.  Issue 6-5: Fine with Option 1.  Issue 6-6: It should be decided by RAN1.  Issue 6-7: The mapping should be RAN1/RAN2 discussion.  Issue 6-13: Fine with Option 1.  Issue 6-15: Option 1.  Issue 6-17: Bullet 3 under option 1 is ongoing discussion in RAN2.  Issue 6-18: Option 2 is ongoing discussion in RAN2.  One comment on Option 1, UE should not be required to measure the SSB not in the SMTC for L3, when the SSB and SMTC are misaligned. |
| ERICSSON | Sub topic 6-1:  Issue 6-1: (2021-04-13): It should be RAN2 scope, we suggest no discussion here before RAN2’s outcome.  Issue 6-2: Agree with Recommended WF.  (2021-04-13): It should be RAN1 scope, we suggest no discussion here before RAN1’s outcome.  Issue 6-3: (2021-04-13): FR2 isn’t in current scope.  Issue 6-4: Support option 1.  Issue 6-5: Agree with Recommended WF.  Issue 6-6: Support option 1. It’s not about RRM.  Sub topic 6-2:  Issue 6-7: Agree with Recommended WF.  (2021-04-13):  Issue 6-8: Agree with Recommended WF.  Issue 6-9: (2021-04-13): It should be studied after RAN2 fixes mobility and BM.  Issue 6-10: (2021-04-13): Support option 1.  Issue 6-11: (2021-04-13): Options are not contradictory.  Issue 6-12: Agree with Recommended WF.  Issue 6-13: (2021-04-13): Essentially, it’s just handover based on RAN2’s outcome.  Issue 6-14: Agree with Recommended WF. The issue must be looked at by the RF session .  Issue 6-15: (2021-04-13): Support option 1.  Issue 6-16: (2021-04-13): Support option 1.  Issue 6-17: (2021-04-13): RAN2 needs fix SMTC issue firstly.  Issue 6-18: (2021-04-13): RAN2 needs fix SMTC issue firstly. |
| Apple: | Sub topic 6-1:  Issue 6-1: Option 2.  Issue 6-2: Option 2; need to discuss case by case in requirement design, e.g., HO may have different SNR condition from neighbor cell measurement.  Issue 6-3: Option 2. Need more conclusions from RAN1.  Issue 6-4: Option 1.  Issue 6-5: Option 2.  Issue 6-6: Option 1  Sub topic 6-2:  Issue 6-7 ~ issue 6-13: agree with the recommended WF and more RAN1/RAN2 inputs are needed  Sub topic 6-3:  Issue 6-14: Option 5 and agree with recommended WF.  Issue 6-15: Option 1. |
| CMCC | **Issue 6-1: DRX cycle**  RAN4 should wait for RAN2 decision on applicable DRX cycle for NTN system  **Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements**  More analysis on the side condition for NTN scenario is needed.  **Issue 6-3: Beam sweeping**  RAN4 should wait for RAN1 decision on the beam sweepting  **Issue 6-4: RRM procedures based on UE position**  OK with option 1 as a starting point. But whether the worst case or typical case of GNSS requirements should be used still need further discussion.  **Issue 6-5: Update rate of ephemeris**  Need further discussion.  **Issue 6-6: Feeder link pre-compensation**  OK with option 1  **Issue 6-7: Definition of mobility/measurement aspects**  More RAN1/RAN2 input are needed  **Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility**  More RAN1/RAN2 input are needed  **Issue 6-9: L1/L3 measurement requirements**  Option 1 can be used as the guidance for further discussion. But still more RAN1/RAN2 input are needed  **Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility**  For option 1, we prefer to prioritize earth moving cells. Since in our view, from RRM perspective, earth fixed scenario is a subset of earth moving scenario.  And we also prefer to remove HAPs from the priority list and work on the common part between HAPs and NTN first.  **Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection**  There is no dependency between the options. More RAN1/RAN2 input are needed  **Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements**  More RAN1/RAN2 input are needed  **Issue 6-13: Feeder link switching based handover**  From RRM HO requirements perspective, there is no special for the case of feeder link switching. This can be handled in Rel-17 following RAN2 agreements.  **Issue 6-15: Discussion of SMTC and MG**  Option1, option2, option3.  **Issue 6-16: SMTC and MG based requirements**  This issue overlaps with issue 6-10 and 6-15  **Issue 6-17: Measurement gap starting point**  Option1 can be considered as starting point. But RAN2 is discussing this, prefer to avoid conflict discussion.  **Issue 6-18: SMTC and gap window misalignment**  More RAN1/RAN2 input are needed |
| Qualcomm | Issue 6-1: Option 1 is unclear whether it is only for non-GEO and whether it should be applicable to all types of non-GEO irrespective of altitude. And even for GEO, it is also unclear whether UE speed matters or not. Note that aircraft scenario is also included in use case in our understanding. Does Option 1 propose to limit DRX configuration or consider requirement applicability rules and/or limitations in RAN4 RRM spec?  Issue 6-2: For Option 1, premature to discuss and we want to see more supporting arguments and contexts.  Issue 6-3: For Option 1, we can see the motivation. However, we can’t see where the number 2 comes from. And this is also typically dependent on PC.  Issue 6-4: What does the “starting point” exactly mean? We don’t want to repeatedly discuss the same topic at almost the same level of detail and make almost the same agreement. In the previous RAN4#98e meeting, “RAN4 shall consider requirements for A-GNSS in 38.171 as a starting point when defining requirements for further RRM procedures based on UE position.” was agreed.  Issue 6-5: We understand the context of Option 1. However, the way it is written in the list of proposals is incomplete that we can’t see the implication for further RAN4 discussion. For example, it is unclear whether it is for network broadcasting periodicity requirement, UE SIB reading frequency, all types of satellites, etc.  Issue 6-6: We don’t even know whether there was any agreement about feeder link pre-compensation in any working group and if there is any plan to make a decision in RAN1.  Issue 6-7: Okay with leaving it to RAN2.  Issue 6-8: Seems RAN4 is not ready for the relevant discussion on the first two bullets of Option 1. For the third bullet of Option 1, we believe RAN4 can start a discussion about measurement relaxation in terms of, e.g. measurement interval, even without RAN2 input.  Issue 6-9: For the second bullet of Option 2, we believe the group can start a discussion even without RAN2 input. For non-GEO, UE may have to predict radio link issue because service link quality can change much faster than GEO due to, e.g. pathloss change. In GEO, due to a large round trip delay, UE may also have to predict radio ink issue in a similar manner as non-GEO to avoid radio link re-establish procedure.  Issue 6-11: We can further discuss all Options.  Issue 6-12-13: Wait for RAN2 progress.  Issue 6-14: Agree with recommended WF  Issue 6-15: Option 1  Issue 6-16: Do not see the significance of the discussion for now.  Issue 6-17: Wait for RAN2 progress.  Issue 6-18: Option 2 is ongoing discussion in RAN2. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 6-1: Need more discussion on DRX cycle, it is too early to make any conclusion on DRX cycle. And the conclusion from RAN2 is also needed,  Issue 6-2: Need more discussion.  Issue 6-3: RAN4 need more conclusion from RAN1 on the beam sweeping before discussing this issue.  Issue 6-4: Option 1 can be used as the starting point.  Issue 6-5: need more discussion.  Issue 6-6: The pre-compensation of feeder link should be decided by RAN1. Whether its error can be negligible is FFS  **Mobility**  Issue 6-7: The frequency reuse factor and beam mapping should be discussed in RAN1.  Issue 6-8: it is too early to discuss these aspects and more RAN1/2 conclusions are needed.  Issue 6-9: Need more discussion and more RAN1/2 conclusions are needed.  Issue 6-10: Option 1 is fine.  Issue 6-11/12: these are our proposals, which are some general thinking on cell reselection requirement and HO requirement for NTN scenarios. They can be as the starting point to have some analysis and more RAN1/2 conclusion is needed.  Issue 6-13: To clarify, do we need to specify the requirements for NTN satellite in RRM session?  Issue 6-14: Fine option 1 and option 5, it is not urgent to conclude this issue in RRM session.  Issue 6-15: Fine with option 1 and option 2. For option 3, we prefer to use Rel-15/16 MG design as baseline.  Issue 6-17: This is our proposal which can resolve the timing misalignment between MG and SMTC of neighbour cell.  Issue 6-18: Need more conclusions from RAN2. |
| Samsung | Issue 6-6: Fine with Option 1  Issue 6-14: Fine with the WF  Issue 6-15: Option 1  Issue 6-17: Fine Option 1. It looks reasonable to have such starting point. But we need to avoid conflict discussion with that in RAN2. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Issue 6-1: The rationale behind DRX cycle < 320 ms is not clear. So further analysis and discussions are required.  Issue 6-2: No technical analysis regarding how the side condition is derived. Should the side condition be the same for both FR1 and FR2?  Issue 6-3: Concerning the reduction in the number of RX sweeping beams, is the reduction valid for all NTN deployment scenarios?  Issue 6-4: It seems Option 1 has already been captured in the WF of the last meeting.  Issue 6-5: Further discussions are needed on different use cases/deployment scenarios on the update rate of ephemeris.  Issue 6-6: Detailed discussions are needed to understand what the open issue concerning feeder link is.  Issue 6-7: It seems the open issues are more relevant to RAN2.  Issue 6-8: Each bullet focuses on different aspects, which should be prioritized to ease discussions.  Issue 6-9: The same comment as Issue 6-8. L1 measurement requirements should be separated from L3 unless the open issues are common?  Issue 6-10: No strong view.  Issue 6-11: These options are not in disagreement with each other. These options can be grouped, where discussions can be based on.  Issue 6-12: The same comment as Issue 6-11. Some options (e.g., Option 2) depend on RAN2.  Issue 6-13: To be further discussed.  Issue 6-14: The recommended WF is OK.  Issue 6-15: Option 1.  Issue 6-16: Not aspects in Option 1 are relevant. So, further discussions are needed.  Issue 6-17: Depending on RAN2 outcome  Issue 6-18: The same comment as Issue 6-17. |
| THALES | Issue 6-1: For GEO or LEO? What cell size? What time in the cell?  Issue 6-2: Too early to discuss. Some TN-NTN coexistence results might be useful as well.  Issue 6-3: Too early to discuss.  Issue 6-4: Option 1  Issue 6-5: The conclusion should be derived based on timing and frequency error requirements.  Issue 6-6: No agreement on the feeder link pre-compensation in any working group. In RAN3 it has been decided that the GW and the feederlink will not be specified in Rel-17. This is therefore implementation-dependent and in any case, the result will be negligible.  Since is under the control of the GW, the error may be negligible compared with pre-compensation of service link done by UE.  Issue 6-7: RAN2 subject.  Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite cell mobility with priority.  Issue 6-9: Option 1 seems fine.  Issue 6-11: Option 1.  Issue 6-12: Wait RAN2  Issue 6-13: Wait RAN2 & RAN3  Issue 6-14: Option 5. Ok with WF, if all options included.  Issue 6-15: Option 1  Issue 6-16: Too early to discuss  Issue 6-17: Too early to discuss  Issue 6-18: Wait for RAN2 discussion results. |
| LGE | Sub topic 6-1:  Issue 6-2: Agree with recommended WF.  Issue 6-3: Agree with Recommended WF.  Issue 6-5: Need more study for the value of update rate.  Issue 6-7: We think second bullet (mapping between frequency resource of beam footprint and Cell-ID/ SSB-ID/ BWP-ID) is related to topic 7 and it highly depends on RAN1/2.  Issue 6-8: Agree with recommended WF.  Issue 6-9: Agree with recommended WF.  Issue 6-12: Option 1  Issue 6-13: Option 1  Issue 6-14: Option 5. It can be discussed in RF session.  Issue 6-15: Option 3 and option 4.In RAN2 post email discussion, the draft conclusion for multiple MG have been made. To finalize the RRM issues on time, RAN4 start discussing multiple MG/SMTC.  Issue 6-18: Option 1. Option 2 can be discussed in issue 6-15. |
| NEC | Issue 6-1: This is RAN2 aspect.  Issue 6-3: Need more input from RAN1  Issue 6-4: Option 1  Issue 6-5: May need more details.  Issue 6-7: We may need more input from RAN1/2  Issue 6-9: Option 1  Issue 6-10: option 1 can be starting point for further discussion  Issue 6-12: Option 1 and 3  Issue 6-15: Option 1  Issue 6-16: May be early for discussion and also overlaps with issue 6-10  Issue 6-17: This depends on RAN2 conclusion  Issue 6-18: This depends on RAN2 conclusion. |
| Huawei | **Issue 6-1: DRX cycle**  Option 2, wait the conclusion in RAN2  **Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements**  As side condition is critical for requirements, more analysis is needed.  **Issue 6-3: Beam sweeping**  The beam sweeping framework in NTN doesn’t settled down in RAN1. The conclusion is premature.  **Issue 6-4: RRM procedures based on UE position**  Support option 1. In RAN2, location based CHO triggering event is introduced.  **Issue 6-5: Update rate of ephemeris**  The logic is fine, however the conclusion is no clear enough, e.g. is it for LEO or GEO?  **Issue 6-6: Feeder link pre-compensation**  First half part of option 1 is ok. How to do the pre-compensation of feeder link should be decided by RAN1.  **Issue 6-7: Definition of mobility/measurement aspects**  More RAN1/RAN2 input are needed  **Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility**  More RAN1/RAN2 input are needed  **Issue 6-9: L1/L3 measurement requirements**  Option 1 can be used as the guidance for further discussion. The items in option 1 needs investigation.  **Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility**  For option 1, “between NTN and TN for RRC Inactive/Idle modes” is suggested to be deprioritized.  **Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection**  More RAN2 input are needed  **Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements**  There is a parallel discussion in RAN2. The timer/location based CHO requirements in RAN4 can be discussed after RAN2 has detailed solution and procedure.  **Issue 6-13: Feeder link switching based handover**  More RAN2 input are needed  **Issue 6-14: Interruptions or measurement gaps for GNSS measurements**  Support option 2, option 4 and option 5. The in-device coexistence interference issue between L-band and GNSS band issue raised during last meeting. In our understanding, GNSS measurement and reception/transmission in L-band can be TDM. No interruption needs to be specified. Further discussion will be carried out in RF session.  **Issue 6-15: Discussion of SMTC and MG**  Option1.  For mobility management, the neighbour cell measurement is an essential functionality. For UE, SSB transmitted to UE shall experience the feeder link and the service link. When UE is in the overlapping area between two satellites, the experienced propagation path through two transparent satellite can be very various. Then the SMTC window for measurement and the configured gap window may not be aligned. RAN2 had separate on-line and offline email discussion on this topic. Several candidate solutions are under discussion. RAN4 can wait for the progress in RAN2.  **Issue 6-16: SMTC and MG based requirements**  Depends on Issue 6-15  **Issue 6-17: Measurement gap starting point**  Wait for RAN2’s conclusion  **Issue 6-18: SMTC and gap window misalignment**  Wait for RAN2’s conclusion |
| CATT | Issue 6-1: The motivation is to reducing the DRX value. We are fine to open discuss about the upper limit.  Issue 6-2: The motivation is to enhancement about the cell search to be quickly. We are fine to open discuss about the exact value.  Issue 6-3: The reason is : UE has gravity detector, and has the capability to know what direction is up. 8 in current spec is not needed for NTN. We are fine to open discussion about the value.  Issue 6-4: Option 1 is the mentioned in last WF. Support it.  Issue 6-5: Support option 1. It is calculated by using reasonable velocity and position. We are also fine to open discussion about the exact value.  Issue 6-6: Support option 1.  Issue 6-7: agreement on recommended WF  Issue 6-8/6-9/6-10: need further study.  Issue 6-11: Option1. Several options are similar but not exclusive.  Issue 6-12: agreement on recommended WF  Issue 6-13: Need RAN2’s input.  Issue 6-14: Option 4.  Issue 6-15: Option 1 and 1a  Issue 6-16/6-17/6-18: do not discuss now |

* + 1. CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

* 1. Summary for 1st round
     1. Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Issue 6-1: DRX cycle** | **Tentative agreements**: Some companies propose that this is a RAN2 issue and should not be discussed in RAN4 before RAN2 concludes. Further clarification on the applicability on LEO and/or GEO by the proposing company is necessary.  **Candidate options**:  **Recommendations for 2nd round**: The proposing company should clarify on LEO/GEO applicability. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements** | **Tentative agreements:** More discussion is necessary before an agreement can be made.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Proposing company should elaborate and answer questions. |
| **Issue 6-3: Beam sweeping** | **Tentative agreements:** Defer discussion about beam sweeping until RAN1 has concluded on the topic.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 6-4: RRM procedures based on UE position** | **Tentative agreements:** For NTN-specific location based measurements, consider the requirements for A-GNSS in 38.171 as a starting point.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** No further discussion on this issue. |
| **Issue 6-5: Update rate of ephemeris** | **Tentative agreements:** Option 1 is not agreeable yet. Further discussion necessary.  **Candidate options:** Option 1: It may be appropriate that the update rate of ephemeris parameters is 1 time per second.  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Proponents should clarify  • Types of satellites  • Use cases/deployment scenarios  • Timing/frequency error requirements |
| **Issue 6-6: Feeder link pre-compensation** | **Tentative agreements:** Feeder link pre-compensation is outside the scope of this room and WI. Defer discussion until other working groups have reached a conclusion.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 6-7: Definition of mobility/measurement aspects** | **Tentative agreements:** Frequency reuse factor and beam mapping should be discussed in RAN1/RAN2 first. Defer discussion until conclusion is reached there.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility** | **Tentative agreements:** Most companies agree that more RAN1/RAN2 input is necessary before concluding. Location and/or timer based measurement relaxation could be discussed in RAN4 without RAN2 input.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Prioritize different aspects. |
| **Issue 6-9: L1/L3 measurement requirements** | **Tentative agreements:** Most companies agree that more RAN1/RAN2 input is necessary before concluding, but Option 1 can be used as guidance for further discussion.  **Candidate options:** Option 1: RAN4 to investigate L1/L3 measurement requirements for GEO and non-GEO separately.   Whether or not the requirements can be defined in the same manner for GEO and non-GEO will be determined after the investigation   Whether legacy RLF and BFD requirements are relevant for NTN UEs, e.g. legacy BLER value of a hypothetical PDCCH transmission and/or PDCCH format for out-of-sync and BFD can be reused  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility** | **Tentative agreements:** Most companies agree with Option 1, although further input from RAN1/RAN2 might be necessary.  **Candidate options:** RAN4 to discuss measurement and mobility for the following scenarios with high priority.   Intra-NTN for both RRC Connected and Idle/Inactive modes with higher priority   between GEO type satellites   between LEO type satellites at the same altitude   between earth fixed cells or between earth moving cells   FFS: whether/which to prioritize   depending on satellite/cell deployment topologies consider both scenarios where cells are within a satellite and belong to different satellites   FFS: between HAPs   between NTN and TN for RRC Inactive/Idle modes   (note) not all possible mix of scenarios may be available  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Further discuss the prioritization. Earth moving cells could be treated with higher priority, “between NTN and TN” with lower priority |
| **Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection** | **Tentative agreements:** Most companies feel that the options are not contradictory and that more RAN1/RAN2 input might be necessary.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Proponents of the options should try to combine them into one agreeable option. **Moderator suggestion:**  The existing cell reselection delay requirements and mobility methodologies can be reused for NTN scenarios with limitation of DRX cycle and the number of measurement samples. RAN4 shall define reasonable cell reselection margins in NTN scenarios. RAN4 shall furthermore define the RRM requirements for satellite/HAPS ephemeris based cell selection and re-selection once RAN2 completes the cell reselection procedure for NTN. |
| **Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements** | **Tentative agreements:** Combine the proposed options and use them as starting point, but more progress from RAN1/RAN2 is necessary before the issue can be concluded.  **Candidate options**: o Option 1: Use existing cell (re)-selection and conditional handover (CHO) delay requirements as baseline. Additional propagation delays should be considered.  o Option 2: The timeline for NTN CHO should be defined the time between the end of the last TTI containing the RRC command and the end of the reception of the new PRACH.  o Option 3: RAN4 is to define the RRM requirements for time/timer and location based CHO triggering event.  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** Proponents of the options should try to combine them into one agreeable option. |
| **Issue 6-13: Feeder link switching based handover** | **Tentative agreements:** Defer discussion until RAN2 has concluded on the issue.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 6-14: Interruptions or measurement gaps for GNSS measurements** | **Tentative agreements:** Defer discussion about this issue. It has to be looked at by the RF session, and only if issues are identified there, the discussion can continue in RRM.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 6-15: Discussion of SMTC and MG** | **Tentative agreements:** Most companies agree with “Regarding SMTC and MG in NTN, RAN4 wait for the progress in RAN2.”  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 6-16: SMTC and MG based requirements** | **Tentative agreements:** Most companies prefer to defer the discussion for now and see an overlap with issues 6-10 and 6-15.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 6-17: Measurement gap starting point** | **Tentative agreements:** Most companies prefer to defer the discussion to avoid conflicting discussions with RAN2.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |
| **Issue 6-18: SMTC and gap window misalignment** | **Tentative agreements:** Most companies prefer to defer the discussion to wait for input from RAN2.  **Candidate options:**  **Recommendations for 2nd round:** |

* + 1. CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

* 1. Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

**Issue 6-1: DRX cycle**

**Tentative agreements**: Some companies propose that this is a RAN2 issue and should not be discussed in RAN4 before RAN2 concludes. Further clarification on the applicability on LEO and/or GEO by the proposing company is necessary.

**Recommendations for 2nd round**: The proposing company should clarify on LEO/GEO applicability.

**Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements**

**Tentative agreements:** More discussion is necessary before an agreement can be made.

**Recommendations for 2nd round:** Proposing company should elaborate and answer questions.

**Open Questions:**

* need to discuss case by case in requirement design, e.g., HO may have different SNR condition from neighbor cell measurement.
* premature to discuss and we want to see more supporting arguments and contexts.
* No technical analysis regarding how the side condition is derived. Should the side condition be the same for both FR1 and FR2?

**Issue 6-5: Update rate of ephemeris**

**Tentative agreements:** Option 1 is not agreeable yet. Further discussion necessary.

**Candidate options:** Option 1: It may be appropriate that the update rate of ephemeris parameters is 1 time per second.

**Recommendations for 2nd round:** Proponents should clarify

• Types of satellites

• Use cases/deployment scenarios

• Timing/frequency error requirements

**Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility**

**Tentative agreements:** Most companies agree that more RAN1/RAN2 input is necessary before concluding. Location and/or timer based measurement relaxation could be discussed in RAN4 without RAN2 input.

**Recommendations for 2nd round:** Prioritize different aspects.

**Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility**

**Tentative agreements:** Most companies agree with Option 1, although further input from RAN1/RAN2 might be necessary.

**Candidate options:** RAN4 to discuss measurement and mobility for the following scenarios with high priority.

 Intra-NTN for both RRC Connected and Idle/Inactive modes with higher priority

 between GEO type satellites

 between LEO type satellites at the same altitude

 between earth fixed cells or between earth moving cells

 FFS: whether/which to prioritize

 depending on satellite/cell deployment topologies consider both scenarios where cells are within a satellite and belong to different satellites

 FFS: between HAPs

 between NTN and TN for RRC Inactive/Idle modes

 (note) not all possible mix of scenarios may be available

**Recommendations for 2nd round:** Further discuss the prioritization. Earth moving cells could be treated with higher priority, “between NTN and TN” with lower priority

**Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection**

**Tentative agreements:** Most companies feel that the options are not contradictory and that more RAN1/RAN2 input might be necessary.

**Recommendations for 2nd round:** Proponents of the options should try to combine them into one agreeable option. **Moderator suggestion:**

The existing cell reselection delay requirements and mobility methodologies can be reused for NTN scenarios with limitation of DRX cycle and the number of measurement samples. RAN4 shall define reasonable cell reselection margins in NTN scenarios. RAN4 shall furthermore define the RRM requirements for satellite/HAPS ephemeris based cell selection and re-selection once RAN2 completes the cell reselection procedure for NTN.

**Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements**

**Tentative agreements:** Combine the proposed options and use them as starting point, but more progress from RAN1/RAN2 is necessary before the issue can be concluded.

**Candidate options**:

o Option 1: Use existing cell (re)-selection and conditional handover (CHO) delay requirements as baseline. Additional propagation delays should be considered.

o Option 2: The timeline for NTN CHO should be defined the time between the end of the last TTI containing the RRC command and the end of the reception of the new PRACH.

o Option 3: RAN4 is to define the RRM requirements for time/timer and location based CHO triggering event.

**Recommendations for 2nd round:** Proponents of the options should try to combine them into one agreeable option.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | **Issue 6-1: DRX cycle**  If Option 1 is about a restriction on DRX range configuration, it is technically out of RAN4 scope unless the proponents plan to provide a suggestion for RAN2 with observations/assessment results.  If it is about whether to consider restricting DRX cycle for RAN4 requirements, e.g. requirement applicability, please the proponents clarify the following questions:   * whether it is only for non-GEO or not * even for GEO, whether UE speed matters or not   **Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements**  No need to discuss it at this stage. Not to mention no supporting analysis results.  **Issue 6-5: Update rate of ephemeris**  Please proponents elaborate on the rationale behind the proposal and the value “1 time per second”. Also please clarify whether or not it is UE SIB reading frequency and whether it is always required irrespective of any parameters/configuration/etc. What is expected UE power consumption? How often the ephemeris parameters will be broadcasted?  **Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility**  For UEs in RRC Idle/Inactive, it is premature to deprioritize “TN and NTN measurement” in Rel-17. We are open to further discussion when detailed measurement framework is made available by RAN2  **Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection**  “The existing cell reselection delay requirements and mobility methodologies can be reused for NTN scenarios with limitation of DRX cycle and the number of measurement samples.”  Please proponents of the proposal answer the following questions.   * For both FR1 and FR2? * Any specific example values for DRX cycle and # of samples? * For both handheld device and VSAT?   “RAN4 shall define reasonable cell reselection margins in NTN scenarios.”  Please proponents of the proposal clarify the definition of “reasonable”. Any specific example value? “Margin” with respect to what?  “RAN4 shall furthermore define the RRM requirements for satellite/HAPS ephemeris based cell selection and re-selection once RAN2 completes the cell reselection procedure for NTN.”  RAN4 can discuss it once RAN2 completes the relevant work. However, we don’t think we can say RAN4 **SHALL** define the requirements at this point in time.  **Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements**  As for Option 3, RAN4 can discuss it once RAN2 completes the relevant work. However, we don’t think we can say RAN4 **is to define** the requirements at this point in time. |
| CMCC | Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements  It may need case by case discussion or different for FR1 and FR2. But we think it is premature to discuss the side conditions.  Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility  Earth moving cells scenario should have higher priority.  Intra-NTN for connected mode should have higher priority.  Intra-NTN for idle/inactive and between NTN and TN for RRC Inactive/Idle modes should have lower priority.  Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection  It is too early to conclude that existing cell reselection delay requirements can be reused for NTN. More analysis is needed.  We propose to modify the recommended WF as follows:  The existing cell reselection delay requirements and mobility methodologies can be considered as baseline for NTN scenarios with limitation of DRX cycle and the number of measurement samples. RAN4 can consider define reasonable cell reselection margins in NTN scenarios. RAN4 shall furthermore define the RRM requirements for satellite/HAPS ephemeris based cell selection and re-selection once RAN2 completes the cell reselection procedure for NTN. |
| Moderator | **Issue 6-1: DRX cycle**  Suggested WF: FFS, clarification by proposing company necessary  **Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements**  Suggested WF: FFS, defer discussion until supporting analysis results are available.  **Issue 6-5: Update rate of ephemeris**  Suggested WF: FFS, proponents need to elaborate.  **Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility**  Suggested WF: RAN1/RAN2 input necessary before conclusion can be made. FFS on location and/or timer based measurement relaxations.  **Issue 6-9: L1/L3 measurement requirements**  Suggested WF: Moderator suggestion: RAN1/RAN2 input necessary before conclusion can be made. For further discussion, assume: RAN4 to investigate L1/L3 measurement requirements for GEO and non-GEO separately.   * Whether or not the requirements can be defined in the same manner for GEO and non-GEO will be determined after the investigation * Whether legacy RLF and BFD requirements are relevant for NTN UEs, e.g. legacy BLER value of a hypothetical PDCCH transmission and/or PDCCH format for out-of-sync and BFD can be reused   **Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility**  Suggested WF: Moderator suggestion: Further input from RAN1/RAN2 necessary. FFS on the prioritization of scenarios.  **Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection**  Suggested WF: The existing cell reselection delay requirements and mobility methodologies can be considered as baseline for NTN scenarios with limitation of DRX cycle and the number of measurement samples. RAN4 can consider define reasonable cell reselection margins in NTN scenarios. RAN4 shall furthermore define the RRM requirements for satellite/HAPS ephemeris based cell selection and re-selection once RAN2 completes the cell reselection procedure for NTN.  **Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements**  Suggested WF: FFS, but defer conclusion until RAN2 completes relevant work. |
| Apple | **Issue 6-1: DRX cycle**  DRX cycle shall be the mobility related discussion in RAN2 for IDLE/INACTIVE mode. No need to discuss it in RAN4. In our understand what RAN4 may be able to do is requirement applicability associated with DRX cycle in case RAN4 identified issues with certain DRX cycles.  **Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements**  Need more discussion. The side condition could be discussed case by case.  **Issue 6-5: Update rate of ephemeris**  More RAN1 conclusion is needed before RAN4 decision. Also would like to understand how it would be captured in to RRM requirement; or it would be used as an intermediate conclusion before we defining corresponding RRM requirement, e.g., timing requirement?  **Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility**  We have concern on “Location and/or timer based measurement relaxation could be discussed in RAN4 without RAN2 input.” Could proponents clarify what kind of measurement relaxation would be assumed? If the scope is the measurement interval for CHO purpose in connected mode, it’s better to wait RAN2 to finish the CHO design, otherwise we are not sure which criteria RAN4 could use to design the relaxation.  **Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection**  Fine with moderator suggested WF.  **Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements**  Time/timer and location based CHO in in RAN2 scope and under discussing now, so RAN4 scope could include both of them but the discussion of requirement could start once RAN2 completes their works on those two CHO types. |
| Ericsson | Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements  It is too early to deeply study and define Es/Iot, it is closely relevant with scenario.  Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility  For our understanding, it is difficult to decide ‘measurement relaxation could be discussed in RAN4 without RAN2 input’ now. As reference, low mobility in TN scenarios study also refer to RAN2.  Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility  Intra-NTN for both RRC Connected and Idle/Inactive modes with higher priority  between GEO type satellites  between LEO type satellites at the same altitude  between earth moving cells  Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection  How to interpretate ‘reuse’ here? Maybe it should be only ‘reuse of format’, the number of existing cell reselection delay requirements should be FFS.  Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements  A simple method is keeping option 3 only. Option 1 is covered by issue 6-11. Option 2 can be taken into discussion in other session. |
| Xiaomi | **Issue 6-1: DRX cycle**  Need more RAN2 input on DRX cycle for NTN  **Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements**  It is too early to discuss the side condition for NTN RRM requirements, in addition, the side condition for RRM requirement should be discussed case by case.  **Issue 6-5: Update rate of ephemeris**  Need more discussion. Need clarify the impact on RRM requirements first, then RAN4 can study how to consider this when defining RRM requirements.  **Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility**  Agree with the recommended WF from the moderator  **Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility**  Need more information from RAN1/2 before we prioritize the scenarios.  **Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection**  Fine with the recommended WF from moderator  **Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements**  Fine with the recommended WF from moderator |
| Huawei | **Issue 6-1: DRX cycle**  DRX configuration is under discussion in RAN2. RAN2 will decide the DRX cycle range. In RAN4, the requirements for measurement is still vague, the DRX cycle applicability needs further discussion.  **Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements**  As side condition is critical for requirements, more analysis is needed.  **Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility**  The second half of the tentative agreements is not aligned with our thinking. In RAN2, the detailed discussion on Location and/or timer based measurement relaxation are still under discussion. RAN4 can not define corresponding requirements without concrete solutions.  **Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility**  “between NTN and TN for RRC Inactive/Idle modes” is suggested to be deprioritized.  **Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection**  Still think it is premature to draw the conclusion as  “The existing cell reselection delay requirements and mobility methodologies can be reused for NTN scenarios with limitation of DRX cycle and the number of measurement samples. RAN4 shall define reasonable cell reselection margins in NTN scenarios.”  As far we don’t know the DRX cycle in NTN, and the number of measurement samples are not fully discussed, how can draw conclusion that limitation of DRX and measurement sample numbers?  **Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements**  There is a parallel discussion in RAN2. The timer/location based CHO requirements in RAN4 can be discussed after RAN2 has detailed solution and procedure. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Issue 6-1: wait for RAN2’s discussion  Issue 6-5: fine with Moderator’s suggestion. And it would be the inter-mediate conclusion/side condition to define the requirement to our understanding. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| NEC | **Issue 6-10:** RAN4 to discuss measurement and mobility for the following scenarios with high priority.  **** Intra-NTN for both RRC Connected and Idle/Inactive modes with higher priority   GEO type satellites   LEO type satellites at the same altitude   earth moving cells  **Issue 6-12:**  Option 1 and 3 can be starting point. Exact requirements can be started after RAN2 concludes framework. |
| CATT | **Issue 6-1: We don't want to redefine the DRX cycle. It is for the RRM requirements of applicability. We propose to discuss the DRX cycle for each RRM measurement such as detailed RRM measurements for different scenarios. The analysis of LEO in our discussion paper is just an example to start. So we are fine with: RAN4 should further study the applicability of DRX cycle in RRM requirements.**  **Issue 6-2: We suggest discussing the side condition of RRM measurements because the side condition in NTN system might be different from that in TN system. We are fine to further decide the final value of Es/Iot in different scenarios.**  **Issue 6-5: We don't want to define the requirement of update rate of ephemeris. We just want to use it as the reference to define RRM requirements such as timing. E.g. GEO may has no issue of update rate of ephemeris. Non-GEO such as LEO may aware of the update rate of ephemeris for RRM requirements. Suggest revising it to: RAN4 should further study whether and how update rate of ephemeris has impact when defining detailed RRM requirements.**  **Issue 6-8: Agree suggested WF mostly just with concern of final wording of "relaxation". Suggest removing the word "relaxation".**  **Issue 6-11: Agree suggested WF mostly with concern of "RAN4 can consider define reasonable cell reselection margins in NTN scenarios”. What is the exact explanation of margin and this sentence looks like conclusion too early.** |
| LGE | Issue 6-2  Need more discussion.  Issue 6-5  Need more discussion on the value update rate and detailed principle. We agree that the requirement for update rate needs to be discussed in RAN4. However, it is too early to make the value of update rate and detailed principle since other issues discussed in RAN1 may have impact such as ephemeris format.  Issue 6-8, 6-10  Wait for RAN2 decision. For the measurement scenario, we think that more RAN1/RAN2 input is needed.  Issue 6-12  Support option1. We also fine with moderator’s suggested WF. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | **Issue 6-1: DRX cycle**  As this issue concerns reducing DRX values, it might vary depending on uses cases. Consequently, the recommended WF is OK.  **Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements**  The recommended WF is OK.  **Issue 6-5: Update rate of ephemeris**  The recommended WF is OK.  **Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility**  Could the proponent elaborate on what location or timer-based measurements are?  **Issue 6-9: L1/L3 measurement requirements**  The recommended WF is OK**.**  **Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility**  The recommended WF is OK.  **Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection**  With regard to the recommended WF, it is not clear what the following means:   * RAN4 can consider define reasonable cell reselection margins in NTN   **Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements**  The recommended WF is OK. |
| Moderator | **Issue 6-1:**  CATT suggestion for WF: RAN4 should further study the applicability of DRX cycle in RRM requirements.  **Issue 6-2:**  Moderator suggests following WF: More discussion on side condition for RRM measurements necessary. The discussion should be done on a case by case basis and take the scenario into account.  **Issue 6-5:**  CATT suggestion for WF: RAN4 should further study whether and how update rate of ephemeris has impact when defining detailed RRM requirements.  **Issue 6-8:**  Moderator suggests following WF: RAN1/RAN2 input necessary before conclusion can be made.  **Issue 6-10:**  Moderator suggests following WF: Although further input from RAN1/RAN2 is necessary, RAN4 should discuss measurement and mobility for the following scenarios with high priority:   * Intra-NTN for both RRC Connected and Idle/Inactive modes * between GEO type satellites * between LEO type satellites at the same altitude * between earth moving cells   The scenario “between NTN and TN for RRC Inactive/Idle modes” is suggested to be deprioritized.  **Issue 6-12:**  Moderator suggests following WF: RAN4 is to define the RRM requirements for time/timer and location based CHO triggering events after RAN2 concludes on the framework. |
| Ericsson, via Email to reflector (added by Moderator) | We have some comments on several issues in WF.  For issue 6-9 and issue 6-11. Our general impression is the statements are narrowed down a bit at current stage.  We have some suggestions to remove the detailed specs. and open to comments from all.     * Issue 6-9: L1/L3 measurement requirements   + Moderator suggestion: RAN1/RAN2 input necessary before conclusion can be made. ~~For further discussion, assume: RAN4 to investigate L1/L3 measurement requirements for GEO and non-GEO separately.~~     - ~~Whether or not the requirements can be defined in the same manner for GEO and non-GEO will be determined after the investigation~~     - ~~Whether legacy RLF and BFD requirements are relevant for NTN UEs, e.g. legacy BLER value of a hypothetical PDCCH transmission and/or PDCCH format for out-of-sync and BFD can be reused~~      * + Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection     - CMCC suggestion: ~~The existing cell reselection delay requirements and mobility methodologies can be considered as baseline for NTN scenarios with limitation of DRX cycle and the number of measurement samples. RAN4 can consider define reasonable cell reselection margins in NTN scenarios.~~ RAN4 shall furthermore define the RRM requirements for satellite/HAPS ephemeris based cell selection and re-selection once RAN2 completes the cell reselection procedure for NTN.       For issue 6-15, the difference from issue 6-16 is 6-15 is mainly about definition of SMTC and MG themselves. Agree we should wait for RAN2 result, but we can stop and remove issue 6-15 because RRM only cares about the requirements based on it, not study on it.   * + Issue 6-15: Discussion of SMTC and MG     - Wait for progress in RAN2   + Issue 6-16: SMTC and MG based requirements     - Defer discussion, overlaps with issues 6-10 and 6-15 |

* 1. Summary for 2nd round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP/LS/WF number** | **T-doc Status update recommendation** |
| R4-2105795 WF on NR NTN RRM general and measurement requirements | *Based on the discussions, the moderator has prepared a way forward with the following conclusions:*   * + **Issue 6-1: DRX cycle** RAN4 should further study the applicability of DRX cycle in RRM requirements   + **Issue 6-2: Side condition for RRM measurement requirements** More discussion on side condition for RRM measurements necessary. The discussion should be done on a case by case basis and take the scenario into account.   + **Issue 6-3: Beam sweeping** Defer discussion about beam sweeping until RAN1 has concluded on the topic.   + **Issue 6-4: RRM procedures based on UE position** For NTN-specific location based measurements, consider the requirements for A-GNSS in 38.171 as a starting point.   + **Issue 6-5: Update rate of ephemeris** RAN4 should further study whether and how update rate of ephemeris has impact when defining detailed RRM requirements.   + **Issue 6-6: Feeder link pre-compensation** Feeder link pre-compensation is outside the scope of this room and WI. Defer discussion until other working groups have reached a conclusion.   + **Issue 6-7: Definition of mobility/measurement aspects** Frequency reuse factor and beam mapping should be discussed in RAN1/RAN2 first. Defer discussion until conclusion is reached there.   + **Issue 6-8: Intra-satellite/Inter-satellite cell mobility** RAN1/RAN2 input necessary before conclusion can be made.   + **Issue 6-9: L1/L3 measurement requirements** RAN1/RAN2 input necessary before conclusion can be made.   + **Issue 6-10: Scenarios for measurement and mobility** Moderator suggestion: Although further input from RAN1/RAN2 is necessary, RAN4 should discuss measurement and mobility for the following scenarios with high priority:     - Intra-NTN for both RRC Connected and Idle/Inactive modes     - between GEO type satellites     - between LEO type satellites at the same altitude     - between earth moving cells   The scenario “between NTN and TN for RRC Inactive/Idle modes” is suggested to be deprioritized.   * + **Issue 6-11: Cell selection and re-selection** RAN4 shall define the RRM requirements for satellite/HAPS ephemeris based cell selection and re-selection once RAN2 completes the cell reselection procedure for NTN.   + **Issue 6-12: Conditional hand over requirements** RAN4 is to define the RRM requirements for time/timer and location based CHO triggering events after RAN2 concludes on the framework.   + **Issue 6-13: Feeder link switching based handover** Defer discussion until RAN2 has concluded on the issue.   + **Issue 6-14: Interruptions or measurement gams for GNSS measurements** Related to Issue 1-3. Defer discussion about this issue. It has to be looked at by the RF session, and only if issues are identified there, the discussion can continue in RRM.   + **Issue 6-15: Discussion of SMTC and MG** Wait for progress in RAN2. Issue overlapping with Issue 6-16.   + **Issue 6-16: SMTC and MG based requirements** Defer discussion, overlaps with issues 6-10 and 6-15.   + **Issue 6-17: Measurement gap starting point** Wait for progress in RAN2, avoid conflicting discussions   + **Issue 6-18: SMTC and gap window misalignment** Defer discussion and wait for input from RAN2 |

1. Topic #7: RRM requirements for beam switching

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

* 1. Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2104603 | CMCC | *Agreement in RAN4#98-e meeting:*   * *RAN4 is to study the RRM requirements for beam switching once RAN1 has determined the final PCI mapping mechanism for NTN scenario.* * *Further clarification and input from RAN1 and RAN2 is necessary, especially on beam/BWP/PCI mapping mechanisms and details.*   According to the current PCI mapping progress in RAN1, both Option a and Option b in Figure 1 is supported. In Option a and FRF>1 case, beam switching may result in a BWP switching, and a re-synchronization may be needed. The specific mechanisms of BWP/beam switching have not been completed yet in RAN1, RAN4 should wait for the conclusion of BWP/beam switching scheme.    **Figure 1: PCI mapping mechanism for NTN scenario** |

* 1. Open issues summary

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

* 1. Companies views’ collection for 1st round
     1. Open issues

**Example 1**

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

**Example 2**

Sub topic 1-1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |

Sub topic 1-2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |

* + 1. CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

* 1. Summary for 1st round
     1. Open issues

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary** |
| **Sub-topic#1** | *Tentative agreements:*  *Candidate options:*  *Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

* + 1. CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

* 1. Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

# Updated (RRM) Work Plan

## Companies’ contributions summary

Please see current work plan reflected in **R4-2104879 (revision of R4-2017661**). Companies are invited to provide their feedback, if any.

## Open issues summary

In this section RAN4 RRM work plan for NR support non-terrestrial network WI is proposed for the next meetings:

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

* Further discussion on the RRM core requirements for NTN
* Prepare reply RAN1 LS on timing advance estimation and error
* Discuss if there is any specific requirement associated to the exemplary bands agreed by RF group as well as the necessary simulations if needed.

**May 2021, RAN4#99, e-meeting**

* Further discussion on the RRM core requirements for NTN
* Further discuss if there is any specific requirement associated to the exemplary bands agreed by RF group as well as the necessary simulations if needed

**August 2021, RAN4#100, Toulouse**

* Further discussion on the RRM core requirements for NTN
* Further discuss if there is any specific requirement associated to the exemplary bands agreed by RF group as well as the necessary simulations if needed
* Start drafting CRs provided there is sufficient progress

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

* Further discussion on the RRM core requirements for NTN
* Further discuss on specific requirements associated to the selected exemplary bands and simulations results
* Further drafting of CRs

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

* Agree on the RRM core requirements for NTN
* Agree if there is any specific requirement associated to the selected exemplary bands and simulations results
* Agree CRs

**April 2022, RAN4#103, TBD**

* Discuss and decide RRM test cases and related parameters
* Discuss and specify measurement accuracy

**May 2022, RAN4#104, TBD**

* provide draft CRs to TS 38.133 for the RRM performance part

**August 2022, RAN4#105, TBD**

* approve the CRs for TS 38.133 for the RRM performance part

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree/Agree with Changes** | **Work Plan update recommendation** |
| THALES | Agree |  |
| Fraunhofer HHI | Agree |  |
|  |  |  |

## Summary for 1st round

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| WF on … | YYY |  |
| LS on … | ZZZ | To: RAN\_X; Cc: RAN\_Y |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation** | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | WF on on NR NTN RRM general and measurement requirements | Fraunhofer |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
   1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
   2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents