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# Introduction

This document aims to summarize the following offline discussion.

* [AT116-e][106][NTN] RACH aspects (Oppo)

Updated scope: Continue the discussion on RACH aspects, based on [R2-2111338](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CRAN2%5CInbox%5CR2-2111338.zip)

Updated intended outcome: Summary of the offline discussion with e.g.:

* + - List of proposals for agreement (if any)
		- List of proposals that require online discussions
		- List of proposals that should not be pursued (if any)

Initial deadline (for companies' feedback): Monday 2021-11-08 1600 UTC

Initial deadline (for rapporteur's summary in [R2-2111351](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CRAN2%5CInbox%5CR2-2111338.zip)): Monday 2021-11-08 1800 UTC

Proposals marked "for agreement" in [R2-2111351](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CRAN2%5CInbox%5CR2-2111338.zip) not challenged until Tuesday 2021-11-09 0800 UTC will be declared as agreed via email by the session chair (for the rest the discussion will further continue offline until the CB session in Week2).

# Phase-1 discussion

This offline discussion mainly focuses on proposals related to TA reporting in [1-18] and touches some other RACH issues which are brought up by companies.

## 2.1 TA reporting

### 2.1.1 TA reporting during RACH

On TA reporting during RACH procedure, RAN2 has made following agreements:

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2#114-e agreement:1. If enabled by the network, the UE reports information about UE specific TA pre-compensation at the random access procedure (MSGA/MSG3 or MSG5) using a MAC CE. Actual content is FFS and also depends on further RAN1 input (we can revise this whole agreement if RAN1 come to a different conclusion in terms of what needs to be conveyed to the NW)
 |

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2#115-e agreement:1. UE specific TA reporting during RACH procedure is enabled/disabled by SI (FFS for RACH in connected mode)
2. The content of UE specific TA pre-compensation reported in RA procedure using MAC CE is UE specific TA (this can be revisited after receiving RAN1 response).
3. If configured, the UE shall report information of the UE specific TA pre-compensation to the target cell during the random access. FFS if a new indication in RRC reconfiguration with sync is needed or not (besides the SIB indication carried in HO command on whether TA report is enabled/disabled in the target cell).
4. Information about UE specific TA pre-compensation is not reported in RA procedures triggered due to “Request for Other SI”
5. No new indication in RRC reconfiguration with sync is needed to configure the UE to report information about UE specific TA in handover procedure (besides the SIB indication carried in HO command on whether TA report is enabled/disabled in the target cell).
 |

**Content of TA reporting**

RAN2#115e has agreed that the content of UE specific TA pre-compensation reported in RA procedure using MAC CE is UE specific TA, and we also received RAN1 LS on TA reporting in R2-2111221. RAN1’s definition of UE’s TA is provided to RAN2 as shown below, and it is stated that it is up to RAN2 to decide which component or what combination of the components in the UE’s TA formula to use in TA reporting.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:The Timing Advance applied by an NR NTN UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED is given by:$$T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$$Where:* $N\_{TA}$ is defined as 0 for PRACH and updated based on TA Command field in msg2/msgB and MAC CE TA command.
	+ FFS: details of NTA update/accumulation.
* $N\_{TA, UE-specific}$  is UE self-estimated TA to pre-compensate for the service link delay.
* $N\_{TA,common}$ is network-controlled common TA, and may include any timing offset considered necessary by the network.
* $N\_{TA,common}$ with value of 0 is supported.
	+ FFS:  details of signaling including granularity.
* $N\_{TA,offset}$ is a fixed offset used to calculate the timing advance.

Agreement:The granularity of the reported TA is slot.* FFS how to round TA value to slot level granularity
 |

Relevant RAN2 proposals on the content of TA reporting are listed below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [1] R2-2109498 | Proposal 6: Include UE-specific TA (i.e.$ T\_{TA}$) in the new TA Report MAC CE. | OPPO |
| [2] R2-2109660 | Proposal 2: TA reporting during RACH and in connected mode is via MAC CE and the content is NTA, UE-specific. | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [7] R2-2110733 | Proposal 3: TA reported via RACH procedure is Full TA, i.e, $T\_{TA}$ (applied TA for UL transmission) as defined in the UE’s TA formula: $T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$  | ZTE |
| [9] R2-2110774 | Proposal 1: If enabled by the network in SI, the UE reports in random-access procedure (MSGA/MSG3 or MSG5) the difference between the full TA that UE applies and the configured common TA. | Samsung Research America |
| [11] R2-2110952 | Proposal 1 When information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation is reported, the reporting quantity is [Cell-specific-Koffset \* 10-3 – TTA] / [slot time] rounded down to closest integer, that is the cell-specific- Koffset minus the full TA as defined by RAN1 divided by the slot time rounded down to closest integer.Proposal 2 The new MAC CE format for TA reporting during random access uses one field of fixed size 8 bits. | Ericsson |
| [15] R2-2111207 | Proposal 1: The UE specific TA $N\_{TA, UE-specific}$ specified in RAN1 is used for the content of information about UE-specific TA pre-compensation. | CATT |

In summary, four options are proposed by companies:

* Option 1: Full TA (i.e., $T\_{TA}$ as defined in the UE’s TA formula) [1][7]
* Option 2: UE’s service link TA (i.e., NTA, UE-specific as defined in the UE’s TA formula) [2][15]
* Option 3: The difference between the full TA that UE applies and the configured common TA (i.e., $T\_{TA}-N\_{TA,common}$) [9]
* Option 4: The difference between full TA and the cell-specific Koffset (i.e., [Cell-specific-Koffset \* 10-3 – $T\_{TA}$] / [slot time] rounded down to closest integer) [11]

Option 1, 2 and 3 use some component or whole of the UE’s TA formula defined by RAN1. It is stated in [1] that option 1 is the simplest and most straightforward way for the purpose of configurating UE-specific K-offset. For Option 2, it is stated by [2][15] that the network is aware of the other parameters besides **NTA, UE-specific**, and network can obtain the **TTA** from **NTA, UE-specific** to save signalling overhead. While it is stated in [7] that the signalling cost on the required bit-string length between full TA and partial TA reported, when slot level is used, is only 1 bit assuming worst case, however, Option 2 would lead to extra complexity at NW’s implementation, and could lead to possible error case when UE and NW’s understanding on common TA broadcast. Option 3 is similar to Option2. For Option 4, it is the difference between TTA (the TA applied by the UE as defined by RAN1) and the cell-specific Koffset, and it is proposed by [11] that it would limit the range of values that need to be reported in the TA report by using that.

**Question 1: Which is the preferred option regarding the content of TA reporting?**

* **Option 1: Full TA (i.e.,** $T\_{TA}$ **as defined in the UE’s TA formula)**
* **Option 2: UE’s service link TA (i.e., NTA, UE-specific as defined in the UE’s TA formula)**
* **Option 3: The difference between the full TA that UE applies and the configured common TA (i.e.,** $T\_{TA}-N\_{TA,common}$**)**
* **Option 4: The difference between full TA and the cell-specific Koffset (i.e., [Cell-specific-Koffset \* 10-3 –** $T\_{TA}$**] / [slot time] rounded down to closest integer)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 | Option 1 is the simplest and most straightforward way for the purpose of configurating UE-specific K-offset. Note that TA is reported in both initial access and connected mode and RAN2 has just agreed the following event trigger (which is related to reported TA):1. A TA offset threshold can be used for event-triggered reporting, at least the offset threshold can be between current information about UE specific TA and the last successfully reported information about UE specific TA

We think using full TA for TA reporting is more straightforward for network to configure the offset threshold. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | The motivation for TA reporting is to inform the gNB about UE specific TA that the NW is not aware of. There is no need to tell the NW what the NW already knows. Therefore reporting **NTA, UE-specific** as defined by RAN1 is clear and enough. As for the possible misunderstanding of common TA between the gNB and UE as mentioned, we don't think it exists as validity timer for common TA has been introduced. |
| Samsung  | Option 3 | Note $N\_{TA}$ is updated/accumulated based on TA Command field in msg2/msgB and MAC CE TA command. NW may not track the value of $N\_{TA}$. The configured common TA $N\_{TA,common}$ is known to the network so it’s not needed and it just brings more overheads. Also note we may have Msg3 size restriction. |
| Apple | Option 1 or 2 | Reporting full TA seems straightforward, so a slight preference for Option 1 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 or 2 | Option 1 is more straight-forward. We also see some advantages of Option 2 including smaller value range and accuracy (from network’s view Option 1 includes a common TA applied by UE when received, which may vary after TA reporting). |
| Xiaomi | Option 4 | We think it is key to limit the size of TA within 1 byte to have minimum impact on the size increase of MsgA/Msg3, which will heavily impact PUSCH coverage.Depends on the position of reference point, the full TA (i.e. TTA) can be as large as 541.46 ms. Even not consider the common TA part (i.e. $N\_{TA,common}$**,** which represents the TA between the satellite and the reference point on feederlink as RAN1 has clarified thatThe estimate of gNB-satellite RTT is equal to the sum of and K\_mac). Thus, option 3 will only represent service link RTT, same as option 2. For both option 2 and 3, the service link RTT would be as large as 270.73 ms. As RAN1 has agreed that the granulaty for TA report is slot. 541.46 ms would require (10 + u) bits, 270.73ms would require (8+u) bits, where u is the index of SCS. Thus, option 1 and option 2 and option 3 require TA size larger than 1 byte.For option 4, it actually represents d1-d0 in TR38.821, i.e. differential TA, the maximum range of differential TA is 10.3 ms, which would only require (4+u) bits. For the maximum value of u=4, 1 byte is enough to carry TA.Thus, we suggest to adopt option 4.[Ericsson] We noticed an error in our contribution 10.3 ms is the differential one-way delay, so I guess Option 4 needs (5 + u) bits. For the highest SCS, it is sufficient to report only every second slot in the TA report to keep the reported bits down. |
| vivo | Option 1 | Three parameters (common TA, common TA drift rate and Common TA drift rate variation) are defined in RAN1. Common TA drift rate and common TA drift rate variation are defined to avoid frequent update of common TA parameter. Based on RAN1 design, UE calculates the actual common TA based on these three parameters. This means that the actual common TA may change over time. If the actual common TA calculated and compensated by UE is not reported to NW, NW has to calculate the actual common TA after receiving TA MAC CE, which may be different from the common TA compensated by the UE itself.Considering that the intention of reporting TA is to inform gNB of the TA value which is actually compensated by UE, it is more reasonable to report the full TA. |
| LG | Option 2 | The network already knows the TA except for UE specific TA. Thus, only UE specific TA should be transmitted.  |
| Nokia | Option 1 | Option 2 will save the Uu interface overhead while Option 1 is simple for NW implementation. We think both of them can work but slightly prefer Option 1.  |
| Spreadtrum | Option 2 | In this formula, gNB knows all the value of all other parameters except **NTA, UE-specific**. So report this parameter is straight. |
| MediaTek | Option 2 | **NTA, UE-specific** is the only parameter that is unknown to the network.  |
| Intel | Option 1 or 3 | Considering the signalling overhead for extra $N\_{TA,common} $may be only 1 bit, these two options are basically the same. |
| Sony | Option 1 | Option 1 is the simplest and helps in configuration of UE-specific K-Offset |
| InterDigital | Option 2 preferred | Option 2 is preferred if NW and UE have common understanding on what other parameters were used. However, we think the issue raised by vivo is valid and this may not always be the case. If there is an issue we could accept Option 1. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | Option 1 or 2 or 3 works. We are fine with option 1.  |
| CATT | Option 2 | We also think it is not necessary to tell the NW what the NW already knows. And the related calculation is very simple addition for the network, we don’t it should be a very critical criterion for the option selection. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | When slot level is used, the additional overhead saved by option 1 is only 1bits out-of-14 bits; while option 1 is simpler for NW’s implementation. Even when validityTimer comes for usage, since NW has no control of when or whether UE has successfully received the SIB containing common TA, it is possible NW’s understanding on common TA might differ from that in UE’s, especially around the time when common TA is updated. Considering the differential overhead is very small, we perfer option 1 for the benefits of NW’s implementation.  |
| Ericsson | Option 4 | Using this method will limit the size of the TA report to 8 bits. This is very important as the MAC CE may be sent in Msg3 which usually defines the coverage of a cell.  |
| ASUSTeK | Option 1 or 2 | Option 2 seems to be enough for NW to know UE specific TA. Also option 1 is acceptable. |
| Thales | Option 1 or 4 |  |
| ETRI | Option 2 | Option 2 is simple. This is the only parameter unknown to the network. |
| China Telecom | Option 2 | Since the TA report is to inform the UE compensation of TA to NW, UE just needs to report service link TA. |
| NEC | Option 1 or 4 | We agree with Xiaomi’s comment that for GEO, only Option 4 can result in the TA report being less than 1 byte. However, if companies are fine to use more bits then we prefer Option 1. |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

Option 1: 12 supporting companies

Option 2: 11 supporting companies

Option 3: 2 supporting companies

Option 4: 4 supporting companies

Given that there is no clear majority between option 1 and option 2 and less support for option 3 and 4, rapporteur suggests RAN2 to further discuss between option 1 and 2.

**Proposal 1: Regarding the content of TA reporting, RAN2 further discuss between the following two options:**

* **(12) Option 1: Full TA (i.e.,** $T\_{TA}$ **as defined in the UE’s TA formula)**
* **(11) Option 2: UE’s service link TA (i.e., NTA, UE-specific as defined in the UE’s TA formula)**

**Where to report TA during RACH**

As shown above, RAN2 has agreed that UE may report information about UE specific TA pre-compensation at RA procedure (MSGA/MSG3 or MSG5) using MAC CE. In [2], [3], [5], [7], [9] and [16], it is proposed for further discussion regarding where to include TA report during RACH, i.e., in MSG3/MSGA or MSG5.

Here are the related proposals:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [2] R2-2109660 | Proposal 1: Include TA report in MSG5 rather than MSG3/MSGA.  | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [3] R2-2110019 | Proposal 4 During RACH, TA report MAC CE can either be included in MsgA/Msg3, or Msg5, depending on the UL grant size for Msg3 or MsgA PUSCH resource size. | Xiaomi |
| [5] R2-2110125 | Proposal 3: Whether the TA report is via msgA/msg3 or msg 5 shall be fixed in specification.Proposal 4: If the size of TA MAC CE does not worse the coverage performance, msgA/msg3 shall be applied, else msg5 shall be applied. | Spreadtrum Communications |
| [7] R2-2110733 | Proposal 4: Msg3 is used for TA report via 4stepRACH if enabled by NW. | ZTE |
| [9] R2-2110774 | Proposal 1: If enabled by the network in SI, the UE reports in random-access procedure (MSGA/MSG3 or MSG5) the difference between the full TA that UE applies and the configured common TA. | Samsung Research America |
| [16] R2-2110859 | Proposal 3: Network can implicitly control which message UE transmits UE-specific TA reporting during RACH procedure by modifying the size of the UL grant for Msg3 transmission. Proposal 5: If UE specific TA reporting during RACH procedure is enabled and UE did not include UE-specific TA MAC CE in Msg3/MsgA transmission, UE-specific TA MAC CE to be included in Msg5. | InterDigital |

It seems that most of the companies have the understanding that the TA report via MSG3/MSGA is supported [3][5][7][9][16]. One company [2] holds the different view that TA report should be included in MSG5 rather than MSG3/MSGA to minimize standard efforts and avoid decreasing the coverage.

Note that in the MAC running CR, TA reporting in MSGA/MSG3 has been captured, see the excerpt as below. Rapporteur understands that it might be difficult to capture Msg5 in MAC spec.

|  |
| --- |
| 5.1.4 Random Access Response reception(omit the text...)6> if the Random Access procedure was not initiated due to SI Request and *enableTA-Report* with value *enabled* is configured:7> indicate to the Multiplexing and assembly entity to include a UE-Specific TA Report MAC CE in the subsequent uplink transmission.Editor’s note: The above can be revisited if RAN1 comes to a different conclusion in terms of what needs to be conveyed to NW.Editor’s note: If *enableTA-Report* with value *enabled* is configured and UE-specific TA Report MAC CE was not included in Msg3 transmission e.g. due to limited UL grant size or explicit indication (if additional bit added in SI indication), additional procedural text may be necessary to ensure MAC CE is multiplexed in Msg5. This may be updated pending further RAN2 discussion.(omit the text...) |

**Question 2: Do companies agree that the existing procedure captured in the MAC running CR on MsgA/Msg3 is sufficient? or do companies disagree and think that some other procedures, e.g. related to Msg5, need to be captured?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | If TA reporting during RACH procedure is enabled and the TA report MAC CE is not included in Msg3/MsgA, e.g. due to no enough Msg3 size, it would be included in the next available UL resource, e.g., Msg5, as long as the TA report MAC CE is not released. In any case, we don’t see the need to specify anything on top of what is captured in the running CR. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | Whether the content of TA report can be included in MSG3/MSGA is correlated with other discussions, e.g. the size of TA report. Besides, we may need RAN1 confirmation that this will pose no issue of uplink coverage if TA report is carried in MSG3/MSGA as history discussions of adding information to MSG3/MSGA have always been cautious. Anyway, in addition to MSG3/MSGA, procedures related to MSG5 need to be further considered in MAC specs as currently the TA MAC CE is “stored in the Msg3 buffer” and we should make sure it can be transmitted in MSG5. |
| Samsung | Agree | We think the MAC running CR on MsgA/Msg3 including editor’s note on Msg5 is sufficient, i.e. if Msg3 with limited UL grant cannot include TA report MAC CE, Msg5 is used to carry TA report MAC CE. |
| Apple | Agree | Editor’s note captures RAN2 intent |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree | If Msg3/MsgA size limits the TA report, it can be carried by Msg5. |
| Xiaomi  | Agree | All the three messages should be allowed. Which message to use depending on the UL grant size/MsgA PUSCH resource size and TA report MAC CE logical channel priority. If the UL grant size/MsgA PUSCH resource size can only accommodate CCCH, TA report MAC CE will obviously be included in Msg5; Otherwise, there is no reason to not include TA report MAC CE in MsgA/Msg3.Besides, we agree that it would require additional spec effort to only allow Msg5 to transmit TA report MAC CE, which is much more unflexible. |
| vivo | Agree | We slightly prefer to specify only one message (i.e. msg5) to transmit TA MAC CE. However, the existing procedure in MAC running CR is acceptable to us, as long as TA MAC CE can be guaranteed to be transmitted via msg5 if it is not included in Msg3 due to lack of enough UL resource. We think this can already be realized by existing texts without further Spec impact need.  |
| LG | Disagree | In order to simplify the specification, we want to fix whether the TA report MAC CE is transmitted in Msg3/A or Msg5. In our view, there is a case where the TA report MAC CE would not be transmitted via Msg3/A because the UL grant size is not enough. Thus, we prefer that the TA report MAC CE should be transmitted in Msg5.  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree, but see comments | Slot has been agreed as the granularity of the reported TA, but the exact duration of slot has not been decided by RAN1, so the size of TA report is still FFS. If this TA report is too large to be transmitted via msg3, this procedure captured in the MAC running CR shall be revised |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Intel | agree | Legacy LCP mechanism can be applied to determine if MSG3 or MSG5 is used. |
| Sony | Agree | Msg3/MsgA provide TA report earliest. |
| InterDigital | Agree | The network will be able to control whether TA report goes in Msg3 vs Msg5 via size of the UL grant and no further specification text is needed. Regarding concerns on impact to UL coverage, based on in Rel-18 scoping discussions this is one of the main objectives for future study. We suggest the current text is sufficient and any potential coverage issues be addressed in Rel-18. |
| Qualcomm | Agree | The MAC CE priority should decide whether it can report it in Msg3 or Msg5. |
| CATT | Agree but | Based on the second Editor’s note in the running CR is kept.If possible, we prefer to TA reporting in Msg3, and then the network can schedule the following signalling properly, e.g. Msg5, based on the updated TA.Editor’s note captures the possibility to send the TA report in MSG5 due to the limited size of MSG3 |
| ZTE | Fixed in Msg3 is preferred, but based on existing procedure is also acceptable | One of the motivation to support TA report in RACH is to reduce access delay, if Msg3 is used than NW can sent Msg4 without assuming maximum transmission delay. As point out by many companies, this can be realized by configuring larger UL grant, which is applicable for most of the cases. But for RRC Resume with long I-RNTI it might be difficult to configure larger UL grant. However, considering this is first release, we are also fine to based on implementation if it is majority view. |
| Ericsson | Agree with comment | The text above can be modified to make it clear that the MAC CE report shall not be discarded in case the TB size of Msg3/MsgA is not sufficiently to accommodate the new MAC CE. That means the new MAC CE can be transmitted in a later transmission according to normal LCP procedure. For example, for Msg3 (similar for MsgA): 5.1.4 Random Access Response reception(omit the text…)6> if the Random Access procedure was not initiated due to SI Request and *enableTA-Report* with value *enabled* is configured:7> indicate to the Multiplexing and assembly entity to include a UE-Specific TA Report MAC CE in one of the subsequent uplink transmissions. |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Thales | Agree |  |
| ETRI | Agree | If the TA Report MAC CE is not reported in Msg3/MsgA, it would be included in Msg5. The existing capture is sufficient. |
| China Telecom | Agree with comment  | We think the Msg 5 for TA report is still in the scope for lager size, just not in MAC running CR. |
| NEC | Agree | We agree with Intel, legacy LCP mechanism can be applied to determine if MSG3 or MSG5 is used. |

**[Rapporteur summary] :**

21 out of 23 agree to the way the current MAC runnign CR is captured and understand that Msg3/5 can carry TA report earliest whenever it has sufficient grant. 2 companies disagree. One company point out that MAC spec should be modified to ensure that the MAC CE report shall not be discarded in case the TB size of Msg3/MsgA is not sufficient to accommodate the new MAC CE. Rapporteur think the details can be discussed in the MAC running CR.

**Proposal 2: (21/2) Do not mandatory Msg3/MsgA or Msg5 to include TA report MAC CE, and whether it can be included depends on the TB size of Msg3/MsgA or Msg5.**

**TA report MAC CE design**

Regarding TA report MAC CE, two companies [3] [11] suggested to minimize the size of TA report MAC CE and use reserved LCID(1byte) instead of Elcid(2-3 bytes) to reduce the impact on UL coverage.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [3] R2-2110019 | Proposal 9 Reserved LCID instead of Elcid is used for TA report MAC CE.Proposal 10 The size of TA report MAC CE is limited within 1 byte. | Xiaomi |
| [11] R2-2110952 | Proposal 2 The new MAC CE format for TA reporting during random access uses one field of fixed size 8 bits.Proposal 3 The new MAC CE shall use one of the reserved LCID codepoints, that is not one of the reserved Elcid codepoints. | Ericsson |

Rapporteur would like to ask the following question:

**Question 3:** **Do companies agree that reserved LCID instead of Elcid is used for TA report MAC CE and the size of TA report MAC CE is 1byte?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Partially agree | We are ok to use the reserved LCID. Regarding the size of TA report MAC CE, we can discuss after RAN2 agrees to the content of TA reporting in Q1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Partially agree | Same view with OPPO. |
| Samsung | Partially agree | To use the reserved LCID is fine. For the size of TA report MAC CE, when slot granularity as agreed by RAN1 is used, according to TR 38821, if full TA is used, the TA range is up to 541.46 ms and 41.77 ms for GEO and LEO respectively, if only service link delay is considered, the TA value range is up to 270.73ms and 20.89ms respectively for GEO and LEO. Assuming worst scenario, where one slot equals to 1/16 ms, than the value range for TA report is 541.46\*16= 8664 = 14 bits for full TA or 270.73\*16=4332=13bits for service link delay. So 1 byte is not enough. |
| Apple | Partially agree | We are also ok to use reserved LCID space. But the size of TA report needs more discussion. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Partially agree | Agree with OPPO’s view. |
| Xiaomi | Agree | Regarding the size of TA report, as we analysed in Q1, for option 4, it will only consume at most 8 bits. So 1 byte is enough. |
| Vivo | Partially agree | We are fine to use the reserved LCID considering that reporting TA MAC CE may be frequent in NTN.Regarding the size of TA report MAC CE, one byte is not enough if full TA is reported to NW. Agree that this issue should be postponed.  |
| LG | Disagree | The usage of the reserved LCID should be carefully decided because the reserved LCID would not be enough. In our view, the transmission of the TA report MAC CE is fixed in Msg3, the reserved LCID should be used. However, the transmission of the TA report MAC CE is fixed in Msg5, the Elcid should be used.Same view with OPPO for the size of TA report MAC CE.  |
| Nokia | Partially Agree | Agree with OPPO. |
| Spreadtrum | Partially agree | If size of TA report is not a limitation, reserved LCID is OK. |
| MediaTek | Partially agree | Share same view as OPPO. |
| Intel | No | We don’t have many reserved LCID now. Since TA reporting MAC CE is only for uplink scheduling optimization, it’s not very urgent. |
| Sony | Partially agree | We are ok to use LCID and the size could be discussed once the contents of TA report are clear. |
| InterDigital | Partially agree | OK to use LCID, and size to be discussed pending agreement on content. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with LCIDDiscuss size | We are ok to use reserved LCID. But we may need discussion on 1 byte vs 2 byte. For LEO 1 byte is sufficient. But for GEO, it may not be. |
| CATT | See the comments | It depends on the content of TA report, and the concern of possible impact on UL coverage of Msg3. We can come back after we achieve agreement on other related issues, or we can check further whether 1byte has serious impact on Msg3 coverage in NTN.  |
| ZTE | Partially agree | We share the same view as Oppo. Regarding the required size, we think we shall respect RAN1’s decision on report granularity, and if slot is used, the required length is 14 bits for full TA and 13 bits for partial TA.  |
| Ericsson | Agree | Correct choice of what to report (cell-specific Koffset – TTA) will limit the size, and 8 bits is sufficient.  |
| ASUSTeK | Partially agree | The size of TA report MAC CE should depend on the TA content. |
| Thales | Agree | Agree with Ericsson. |
| ETRI | Partially agree | The reserved LCID can be used but we have the same view as oppo regarding the size of TA report MAC CE.  |
| China Telecom | Agree |  |
| NEC | Partially agree | As noted by many companies, it will depend on the agreed TA report size. |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

Regarding LCID, 20 out of 23 agree that reserved LCID can be used, while 2 companies disagree. Rapporteur would propose to use the reserved LCID.

Regarding the size of the TA report MAC CE, 18 out of 23 share the view that it can be further discussed after RAN2 concludes on the content of TA report, while 4 companies want to limit it to 1 byte. Rapporteur thinks that it would not be harmful to postpone the discussion.

**Proposal 3a: (20/2) Reserved LCID is used for the TA report MAC CE.**

**Proposal 3b: (18/4) Postpone the discussion on the size of the TA report MAC CE until RAN2 concludes on the content of TA report.**

For Msg3/MsgA to carry the TA information, [7] proposed that to avoid impact on RACH coverage, enhancements are required to allow inclusion of TA information without extending Msg3 size. The proposals are listed below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [7] R2-2110733 | Proposal 5: Enhancements is needed to allow inclusion of TA information without extending message size.Proposal 6: It is kindly asked RAN2 to further discuss enhancement on RACH at least based on the alternatives listed below: Option 1: CCCH with cut-off UE identity Option 2: 64-bit CCCH is always configured in NTN when TA report is enabled Option 3: Additional Msg3 for TA report in 4stepRACH  | ZTE |

The possible alternatives to allow TA inclusion in Msg3 without decrease Msg3 coverage are listed as below:

* Option 1: CCCH with cut-off UE identity
* Option 2: 64-bit CCCH is always configured in NTN when TA report is enabled
* Option 3: Additional Msg3 for TA report in 4stepRACH

**Question 4: Which option do companies prefer regarding the enhancement on RACH to allow inclusion of TA information without extending Msg3 size?**

* **Option 1: CCCH with cut-off UE identity**
* **Option 2: 64-bit CCCH is always configured in NTN when TA report is enabled**
* **Option 3: Additional Msg3 for TA report in 4stepRACH**
* **Option 4: No enhancement**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 4 | If TA reporting during RACH procedure is enabled and the TA report MAC CE is not included in Msg3/MsgA, e.g. due to no enough Msg3 size, it would be included in the next available UL resource, e.g., Msg5, as long as the TA report MAC CE is not released. We don’t see the need for any enhancement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 4 | See our reply for Q2. If MSG3 coverage is seen as an issue, we should exclude the option to report TA via MSG3/MSGA.  |
| Samsung | Option 4 | We agree to use Msg5 to handle limited size of Msg3. |
| Apple | Option 4 |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 4 | Msg5 can do the work if Msg3 size is not enough. |
| Xiaomi | Option 4 | We have already supported network enabling/disabling TA report during RACH procedure. If coverage is an issue, network will not enable it. Otherwise, network is free to eable it without coverage concern. |
| Vivo | Option 4 | TA reporting should not impact the transmission of CCCH message. There is no time to discuss any related enhancement, considering the remaining time of this WI.  |
| LG | Option 4 | See the comment in Q2 |
| Nokia | Option 4 | We don’t see the motivation to always include the MAC CE in msg3. Msg5 is also fine. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 4 | If size of msg3 is a problem, TA report shall be in msg5. |
| MediaTek | Option 4 |  |
| Intel | Option 4 |  |
| Sony | Option 4 | We don’t think there is a need to discuss beyond what is already captured in draft MAC CR. |
| InterDigital | Option 4 | No need to optimize now. Coverage issues can be discussed in Rel-18 as mentioned in Q2 response. |
| Qualcomm | Option 4 | The TA MAC CE priority should decide whether to use Msg3 or Msg5. |
| CATT  | Option 4 | If we agree that Msg5 can be used as the fall-back option, no enhancement is needed.  |
| ZTE | Option 4  | As commented in Q2, we prefer to fix the transmission in msg3 to reduce access delay. But considering this is late stage of NTN, we are fine to go with no enhancements, and leave it up to NW’s implementation. |
| Ericsson | Option 4 |  |
| ASUSTeK | Option 4 |  |
| Thales | Option 4 |  |
| ETRI | Option 4 |  |
| China Telecom | Option4 | The choice of Msg5 for TA reporting can solve size limitation |
| NEC | Option 4 |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

All companies agree not to have any enhancements.

**Proposal 4: (23/0) RAN2 do not pursue any enhancements to allow inclusion of TA information without extending Msg3 size.**

**Logical channel priority of TA report MAC CE**

As RAN2 has agreed to use MAC CE for TA report, the issue is how to define the logical channel priority of TA report MAC CE. Based on TS38.321, the current logical channel priority is given as below.

|  |
| --- |
| Logical channels shall be prioritised in accordance with the following order (highest priority listed first):- C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH;- Configured Grant Confirmation MAC CE or BFR MAC CE or Multiple Entry Configured Grant Confirmation MAC CE;- Sidelink Configured Grant Confirmation MAC CE;- LBT failure MAC CE;- MAC CE for SL-BSR prioritized according to clause 5.22.1.6;- MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding;- Single Entry PHR MAC CE or Multiple Entry PHR MAC CE;- MAC CE for the number of Desired Guard Symbols;- MAC CE for Pre-emptive BSR;- MAC CE for SL-BSR, with exception of SL-BSR prioritized according to clause 5.22.1.6 and SL-BSR included for padding;- data from any Logical Channel, except data from UL-CCCH;- MAC CE for Recommended bit rate query;- MAC CE for BSR included for padding;- MAC CE for SL-BSR included for padding. |

Relevant proposals on TA report MAC CE’s logical channel priority are listed below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [1] R2-2109498 | Proposal 3 RAN2 discuss the logical channel priority for the new TA Report MAC CE. | OPPO |
| [2] R2-2109660 | Proposal 3: The priority of TA report MAC CE should be lower than the LBT failure MAC CE and higher than the the MAC CE for SL-BSR. | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [3] R2-2110019 | Proposal 8 The logical channel priority of TA report MAC CE is higher than MAC CE for SL-BSR prioritized and lower than LBT failure MAC CE. | Xiaomi |
| [5] R2-2110125 | Proposal 5: In LCP, the priority of this new MAC CE is between BSR and PHR. | Spreadtrum Communications |
| [6] R2-2110703 | Proposal 6: The priority of new UE-specific TA Report MAC CE should below C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH but above BSR MAC CE.  | Nokia, Noia Shanghai Bell |
| [7] R2-2110733 | Proposal 7: The priority of TA report MAC CE is right below C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH. | ZTE |
| [8] R2-2110765 | Proposal 3: MAC CE for TA report is mapped to a low priority logical channel. | NEC Telecom MODUS Ltd. |
| [14] R2-2111140 | Proposal 1. The priority of MAC CE for TA pre-compensation should be same as Configured Grant Confirmation MAC CE. | LG Electronics Inc. |
| [16] R2-2110859 | Proposal 4: Priority of new UE-specific TA MAC CE is at least lower than BFR MAC CE, and higher than “data from any Logical Channel” | InterDigital |
| [17] R2-2110951 | Proposal 12 The priority of the new MAC CE in the prio list in MAC spec section 5.4.3.1.3 shall be lower than “C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH” but higher than “data from any Logical Channel, except data from UL-CCCH”.Proposal 13 The priority of the new MAC CE in the prio list in the MAC spec section 5.4.3.1.3 shall be between “Single Entry PHR MAC CE or Multiple Entry PHR MAC CE” and “MAC CE for the number of Desired Guard Symbols”. | Ericsson |

Majority companies think that the priority of the new TA report MAC CE is lower than “C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH”, and higher than “data from any Logical Channel, except data from UL-CCCH”.

Rapporteur would like to confirm whether this is a common understanding.

**Question 5:** **Do companies agree that logical channel priority of the TA report MAC CE should be lower than that of “C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH” and higher than that of “data from any Logical Channel, except data from UL-CCCH”?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | The overall RACH performance should not be impacted by TA report, e.g. due to pre-emption of TA report.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Samsung | agree | TA report should not impact RACH, but is needed for UL data transmission scheduling |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree, but | We can further agree that the priority of TA report MAC CE is higher than regular BSR. |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Intel | agree |  |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree  |  |
| CATT | Agree | We prefer to set higher priority for TA report MAC CE, for it is very important for the subsequent UL/DL scheduling. |
| ZTE | Agree | And we also consider priority of TA report MAC CE shall be at least higher than BSR. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Thales | Agree |  |
| ETRI | Agree |  |
| China Telecom | Agree |  |
| NEC | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

All companies agree to the question.

**Proposal 5: (23/0) Logical channel priority of the TA report MAC CE should be lower than that of** **“C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH” and higher than that of “data from any Logical Channel, except data from UL-CCCH”.**

Regarding the detailed priority, companies’ views are:

* Option 1: Higher than “LBT failure MAC CE” [6][7][14][16]
* Option 2: Between “LBT failure MAC CE” and “MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding” [2][3][6][16]
* Option 3: Lower than “MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding” [5][16][17]

Rapporteur would like to ask the following question:

**Question 6:** **Among all the possible priorities (including but not limited to option ½/3) between “C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH” and “data from any Logical Channel, except data from UL-CCCH”, which is the suggested priority for the TA report MAC CE?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred priority** |
| OPPO | Between “LBT failure MAC CE” and “MAC CE for SL-BSR prioritized according to clause 5.22.1.6” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2When evaluating the priority of the MAC CE, we should consider its contribution to the data transmission. LBT failure MAC CE is indispensable for the subsequent data transmission and should have higher priority. While BSR is just ancillary for scheduling and anyway BSR is not accurate. TA report MAC CE is important for UL synchronization between UE and gNB but not indispensable and should thus be higher than BSR but lower than LBT failure MAC CE.  |
| Samsung | Above BSR to allow blind UL scheduling |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 2 |
| Xiaomi | higher than MAC CE for SL-BSR prioritized and lower than LBT failure MAC CE, i.e. above BSR to allow blind scheduling. |
| Vivo | At least higher than BSR MAC CETA report MAC is related to scheduling delay, whose priority should be higher than BSR MAC CE.NTN is not possibly applied to unlicensed scenario. Theoretically, whether the priority of TA report MAC CE is higher than LBT failure MAC CE or not is not that important. However, in terms of the specific position where the TA MAC CE should be inserted, considering the intention of LBT failure MAC CE, it is preferable that the priority of TA MAC CE is higher than LBT failure MAC CE. In NR-U, LBT failure MAC CE is used to inform NW that serving cell(s) encounter consistent failure, and then NW will remove or reconfigure the serving cell(s) which encounter consistent failure. Considering that there may be serving cell for which consistent LBT failure has not been triggered, the TA MAC CE should be reported in time to flexible that scheduling transmission on the serving cells which do not encounter consistent LBT failure. |
| LG | Option 1. In last meeting, we agreed that event-based TA report is introduced. Considering that, if the TA reporting is triggered, the UE should transmit the TA report MAC CE as soon as possible in order to prevent the un-synchronization between UE and network. Thus, we think that the TA report MAC CE should have a high priority than BSR. |
| Nokia | Same view as OPPO |
| Spreadtrum | Option 3 |
| MediaTek | Option 1, between Sidelink Configured Grant Confirmation MAC CE and LBT failure MAC CE. |
| Intel | Option 3. Since TA reporting MAC CE is only for uplink scheduling optimization, it’s not very urgent. |
| InterDigital | Option 2 |
| Qualcomm | Higher than BSR MAC CE |
| CATT | At least Option 2. If the TA report is triggered by an event, .e.g., the TA change has been greater than the configured threshold, it is very urgent to let the network know latest UE specific TA.  |
| ZTE | Option 1, it seems unlikely we will support NR-U in NTN, thus even TA report MAC CE has higher priority than LBT failure MAC CE it won’t cause a problem. And we share similar view as LG since event triggered mechanism is used, TA report is expected to transmit in a higher priority to avoid further delay.  |
| Ericsson | The early PHR report that may be triggered in Msg5 (by configuring PHR reporting in Msg4) or in Msg3 (for RA in connected mode) is normally much more important than the TA report, as it enables link adaptation to select a correct TBS. Having a TA report that in best case may decrease the HARQ RTT with 3.8% in GEO, 15.2% in 1200 km LEO, and 24.2% in 600 km LEO, is not comparable to getting a first PHR report that may increase the TBS with a large factor. Thus with early PHR on higher prio than TA report, the UE data may be empty before an UE specific Koffset takes effect in the UE – making the delay much smaller. Low TBS in the early phase may also slow down TCP slow start, with huge impact on the QoS.  |
| ASUSTeK | Option 2 |
| China Telecom | Option 2 |
| NEC | Option 2 |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

Following is the statistics on companies’ input.

* Option 1: Between “LBT failure MAC CE” and “MAC CE for SL-BSR prioritized (OPPO, Xiaomi, Nokia)
* Option 2: Between “LBT failure MAC CE” and “MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding (Huawei, Lenovo, InterDigital, CATT, ASUSTeK, China Telecom, NEC)
* Option 3: above BSR (Samsung, Qualcomm)
* Option 4: at least higher than BSR MAC CE, preferable that the priority of TA MAC CE is higher than LBT failure MAC CE (vivo)
* Option 5: Higher than “LBT failure MAC CE (LG, MediaTek, ZTE)
* Option 6: Lower than “MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding” (Spreadtrum, Intel)
* Option 7: lower than “Single Entry PHR MAC CE or Multiple Entry PHR MAC CE” (Ericsson)

The common part among option 1/2/3/4/5 is that the priority is all higher than BSR MAC CE and it has 16 companies’ support. The common part of option 6/7 is that the priority is lower than BSR MAC CE and it has 3 companies’ support. Given this situation, rapporteur suggests to narrow down the options, i.e. higher than BSR MAC CE.

**Proposal 6: (16/3) RAN2 further discuss the exact priority of the TA report MAC CE between “C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH” and “MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding”.**

**TA reporting during connected mode RACH**

In RAN2#115-e meeting, following agreement has been made.

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2#115-e agreement:1. UE specific TA reporting during RACH procedure is enabled/disabled by SI (FFS for RACH in connected mode)
 |

Regarding TA reporting during RACH in connected mode, following proposals were brought up by companies:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [3] R2-2110019 | Proposal 6 In connected mode, TA report MAC CE can be sent during RACH (i.e. in MsgA/Msg3/Msg5) if it is triggered based on the trigger condition configuration, regardless of the enable/disable configuration of TA report during RACH in SI. | Xiaomi |
| [5] R2-2110125 | Proposal 2: UE in connect mode does not report UE specific TA value in RA procedure. | Spreadtrum Communications |
| [6] R2-2110703 | Proposal 7: In RACH procedure triggered by UE in RRC Connected mode and when the UE has successfully reported TA information to current serving cell, whether the UE reports UE-specific TA during RACH procedure depends on whether a TA update event is triggered. | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [7] R2-2110733 | Proposal 1: For connected UE, TA can be configured to report via RACH procedure if timeAlignmentTimer is stopped. | ZTE |
| [8] R2-2110765 | Proposal 1: From RAN2 point of view, information about UE specific TA pre-compensation is not reported in RA procedures triggered due to “UL data arrival during RRC\_CONNECTED when there are no PUCCH resources for SR available”, “SR failure”, “Beam failure recovery”, and “Consistent UL LBT failure on SpCell”.Proposal 2: From RAN2 point of view, information about UE specific TA pre-compensation is reported in RA procedures triggered due to “DL or UL data arrival during RRC\_CONNECTED when UL synchronisation status is "non-synchronised"”. Ask RAN1 for confirmation. | NEC |

It is proposed in [8] that whether to report TA during RACH in connected mode is up to the events which trigger the RACH procedure, and the UE should report its UE specific TA during initial access and when out of RRC CONNECTED mode, but not report during RRC CONNECTED mode if the cause for triggering RACH is not related to synchronisation.

In [3][6], companies think TA reporting is not always necessary for the RACH in connected mode and suggest that whether to report TA during RACH in connected mode depends on whether a TA update event is triggered before, and it is proposed in [3] that the enable/disable configuration of TA report during RACH in SI has no impact on whether to report TA during RACH in connected mode.

**Question 7:** **Regarding whether** **TA reporting during RACH in connected mode should be controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI, which option do companies prefer?**

* **Option 1: Yes, TA reporting during RACH in connected mode is also controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI**
* **Option 2: No, it** **depends on which event triggers RACH procedure**
* **Option 3: No, it depends on whether a TA update event is triggered**
* **Option 4: Other**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 3 | In connected mode, whether UE can report TA is up to the configuration of event, and the indication configured in SI only controls RACH procedure that is not triggered in connected mode.For Option 2, note that if it depends on which event triggers RACH procedure, we need to specify case by case for all RACH triggers, which is not small spec impact. However, reporting TA value is always beneficial for NW to facilitie the update of UE specific K-offset. Therefore, whenever TA update event is triggered, it should be reported in any available UL resources. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | For option 3, if a TA update event is triggered, there is another mechanism that we agreed for connected mode separately and no need to mix the usage with TA report via RACH. For option 2, if RACH procedure is triggered by at least the following event, it is beneficial to report TA during RACH:*- DL or UL data arrival during RRC\_CONNECTED when UL synchronisation status is "non-synchronised"* |
| Samsung | Option 3 | Agree with OPPO |
| Apple | Option 3 | There is no need to report TA when there is no loss of synchronization. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 3 | Event triggering is sufficient. |
| Xiaomi | Option 3 | Different from RACH procedure during initial access where MsgA/Msg3 will have to accommodate CCCH data, for connected mode, MsgA/Msg3 would carry DTCH data or DCCH RRC message in most cases (only in RRC reestablishment case, MsgA/Msg3 would carry CCCH data), So PUSCH coverage is less a issue for connected mode, TA report MAC CE priority based solution is enough.For option 2, TAT expire does not necessarily mean that the reported TA is invalid, it only means that TA needs to be adjusted. If the trigger condition is not met, it means that TAT expire is not related to TA report unvalid.  |
| vivo | Option 2 | For a connected UE, whether report TA in RACH procedure or not should not be controlled by the flag in SI.RAN2 has agreed UE shall not report TA in the RACH procedure for requesting other SI. we think the similar principle that depends on the RACH trigger events can be applied to other types of RACH procedures. |
| LG | Option 3 | Event triggering is sufficient |
| Nokia | Option 4 | In connected mode, the TA reporting function should be controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI and the reporting should be triggered by event. - If the function is disabled (which means NW decide to use maximum TA of the cell for UL scheduling), then no TA reporting in connected mode as well as during RACH procedure.- If the function is enabled, whether UE report TA information depends on whether TA update event is triggered. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 3 | If UE TAT is still running, it is not need to report TA. |
| MediaTek | Option 2 | If RACH is triggered by DL/UL data arrival during RRC\_CONNECTED when UL synchronisation status is "non-synchronised", TA report can be sent. |
| Intel | Option 3 |  |
| Sony | Option 1 |  |
| InterDigital | Option 3 | Preference to Option 3 but Option 1 is also acceptable. We would primarily like to avoid over-complication by specifying on a per-event basis. If Option 1 then network can simply ignore if it doesn’t need it, and if Option 3 then the event triggered reporting covers the case when it is most necessary.  |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 | RACH triggered for not having SR resource does not need to carry TA report. It can carry only when necessary, i.e., TA report is triggered in connected mode. |
| CATT | Option 2 | Agree with Huawei. If UL synchronisation status is "non-synchronised", TA report via RACH is necessary. |
| ZTE | Option 2 | If RACH triggered in connected mode when TAT is not running, then UE shall report TA via RACH.  |
| Ericsson | Option 3 |  |
| ASUSTeK | Option 3 |  |
| Thales | Option 3 |  |
| ETRI | Option 3 |  |
| China Telecom | Option3 |  |
| NEC | Option 3 | Even in the case where RACH is triggered because of “non-synchronized and UL data arrival”, with Option 3, a TA report will only be triggered if the new estimated TA is different from the last reported TA by a threshold, and the corresponding MAC CE will be included in the next available PUSCH (including Msg3/5). Then Option 2 is not needed. |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

16 out of 23 replied option 3 (i.e., TA reporting during RACH in connected mode should not be controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI, but should depend on whether a TA update event is triggered).

5 companies replied option 2 (i.e. TA reporting during RACH in connected mode should not be controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI, but should depend on which event triggers RACH procedure).

1 company replied option 1 and 1 replied option 4.

Given the majority view, rapporteur would propose option 3.

**Proposal 7: (16/5) TA reporting during RACH in connected mode should not be controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI, but should depend on whether a TA update event is triggered.**

### 2.1.2 TA reporting in connected mode

**How to report TA in connected mode**

For TA reporting in connected mode, following agreements and working assumption have been made in RAN2#115-e meeting.

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2#115-e agreement:1. Under the work assumption “the UE location information cannot be reported in connected mode”, the content of UE specific TA reported in connected mode is UE specific TA pre-compensation(for the details of the TA value, confirmation from RAN1 is needed).
2. If the reported content of information about UE specific TA is UE location information in connected mode, RRC signalling is used to report.
3. Under the work assumption “the UE location information can be reported in connected mode”, for TA reporting purposes in connected mode, the network can configure the UE to send either the UE specific TA pre-compensation (for the details of the TA value, confirmation from RAN1 is needed) or the UE location information
4. Working Assumption: If the reported content of information about UE specific TA is TA pre-compensation value in connected mode, MAC CE is used to report
 |

It has been agreed that if the reported content of information about UE specific TA is UE location information, RRC signalling is used to report. However, for the case of TA pre-compensation value, it is still a working assumption on using MAC CE to report.

Proposals in [2], [3], [4], [6], [7], [11] and [15] related to how to report TA in connected mode are listed below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [2] R2-2109660 | Proposal 2: TA reporting during RACH and in connected mode is via MAC CE and the content is NTA, UE-specific.  | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [3] R2-2110019 | Proposal 5 RAN2 to agree “If the reported content of information about UE specific TA is TA pre-compensation value in connected mode, MAC CE is used to report”. | Xiaomi |
| [4] R2-2110044 | *Proposal 3: RAN2 to consider a unified RRC Message for UE reporting of UE specific TA pre-compensation*  | Apple |
| [6] R2-2110703 | Proposal 2: In the case UE location information can be reported to network, network can configure UE report either the UE location or the UE specific TA information via RRC for the purpose of TA reporting. | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [7] R2-2110733 | Proposal 10: When event triggered TA is configured, UE reports full TA using RRC signalling in a first report, and reports delta TA in subsequent TA report using MAC CE. | ZTE |
| [11] R2-2110952 | Proposal 4 If the UE reports TA value or UE position after random access procedure, RRC signalling is used after security has been activated. | Ericsson |
| [15] R2-2111207 | Proposal 2: If the reported content of information about UE specific TA is TA pre-compensation value in connected mode, MAC CE is used to report. | CATT |

There are still 4 companies who are in favour of RRC signalling, however, RAN2 has already made a working assumption on using MAC CE. Rapporteur would like to ask if companies would like to confirm the working assumption, or they want to reverse it.

**Question 8: Do companies agree to confirm the working assumption that “If the reported content of information about UE specific TA is TA pre-compensation value in connected mode, MAC CE is used to report”?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | We can compromise to this although we prefer RRC approach which is more secure. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree | TA pre-compensation value does not imply accurate UE location, so privacy issue is not a concern. |
| Apple | Disagree | We think that using MAC for reporting TA can expose UE location (e.g., reports sent by the same UE to different satellites). So prefer RRC. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree | The major concern for using MAC CE is privacy. Similar to the discussion for TA report using MAC CE during RACH, in our view, there is no privacy issue using MAC CE. UE specific TA will not disclose UE location but only a range to the satellite. Even for the range, the accuracy may be very coarse to be any useful. The range from the UE to the reference point of satellite on earth is considered. It can be seen that the minimum range error is ±151Km. |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| LG |  | RAN1 will discuss this WA in upcoming meeting. Thus, we should wait for the RAN1 confirmation. |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Intel | agree |  |
| Sony | Agree | We are also ok for RRC approach |
| InterDigital | Agree | If network prefers RRC-based approach it can configure UE to report UE location for TA reporting purposes. Both can be supported. |
| Qualcomm  | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree | If companies do have concerns on privacy then we can at least make it as an working assumption, and consult SA3 to check if there will be an issue. |
| Ericsson | Disagree | RRC shall be used, it has much less spec impact. The MAC CE is anyway not much faster, and with RRC we get everything for free (triggering of BSR/SR if no grant is available, integrity protection and encryption).  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Thales | agree |  |
| ETRI | Agree |  |
| China Telecom | Disagree | Agree with Ericsson. We prefer RRC signaling in connected mode. |
| NEC | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

19 out of 23 want to confirm the working assumption, while still 3 companies prefer RRC signalling. 1 company wants to wait for RAN1 confirmation. Given the majority view, rapporteur propose to confirm the working assumption.

**Proposal 8: (19/3) RAN2 confirm the working assumption that if the reported content of information about UE specific TA is TA pre-compensation value in connected mode, MAC CE is used to report.**

**Event trigger for TA reporting**

It is proposed in [9] that to define the triggering event for reporting information on UE specific TA in connected mode, related parameters other than triggering offset threshold, like hysteresis, time to trigger, etc., may be considered, i.e., defining entering condition and leaving condition by introducing parameter hysteresis $Hys$, and introducing parameter $timeToTrigger$ to define the duration for which the event needs to be met to trigger reporting.The following is the company’s proposal.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [9] R2-2110774 | Proposal 2: RAN2 considers additional parameters including hysteresis and time to trigger to define the trigger event for reporting information on UE specific TA in connected mode. | Samsung Research America |

**Question 9: Do companies agree that** **additional parameters, e.g. hysteresis and time to trigger, are needed to define the trigger event for TA reporting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Disagree | For TA report in MAC CE rather than in RRC, event configuration should be kept simple, like phr-Tx-PowerFactorChange for PHR reporting configuration. So no need to introduce hysteresis and time to trigger. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | FFS | We should first settle down the basic mechanism before discussing any additional enhancements. |
| Samsung | Agree | UE specific TA can be jiggled, thus if considering jiggled value in event triggering, additional parameters may take into account. Otherwise, it will cause signaling overheads between the event is met and not met. |
| Apple | Disagree | The benefit of these enhancements is unclear and can be deprioritized. The network is expected to configure threshold values suitably. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Disagree | We would like to keep it simple in this release. |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | Same view as oppo, no need for hysteresis and time to trigger. |
| Vivo | Disagree | We prefer a simple TA report trigger mechanism. |
| LG | Disagree | We do not see the benefit to introduce the additional parameter.  |
| Nokia | Disagree | Considering there is TA change threshold for event triggered TA report and the UE’s movement in short period will not change the actual TA a lot, there is no need to have TimeToTrigger and Hys for enhancement. |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | It is not needed to introduce extra parameter. |
| MediaTek | Disagree | If the TA has changed more than +/-delta\_TA with respect to the last reported TA, a new TA report can be triggered. We do not need a hysteresis or time to trigger value as there are no ping-pong cases to cover. |
| Intel | Disagree | Unnecessary to further complicate this mechanism. |
| Sony | Disagree | We should keep it simple. |
| InterDigital | Disagree |  |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | No need to add complexity. |
| CATT | Disagree |  |
| ZTE | Disagree | For RSRP case where the RSRP could be impact by multipath impact thus to filter variance cause due to such effects we introduce Hys and timeToTrigger. For TA based threshold the situation seems to be different. It is doubtful whether there is a use case for this. |
| Ericsson | Disagree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Disagree |  |
| Thales | Disagree |  |
| ETRI | Disagree |  |
| China Telecom | Disagree |  |
| NEC | Disagree | The main component of the RTT will vary in a deterministic U shape as the satellite goes above the cell and the movement from the UE (perceived as a small random variation in TA) should not have a strong impact on TA. A simple threshold configured by the NW should suffice. |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

21 out of 23 do not agree to introduce additional parameters, e.g. hysteresis and time to trigger, while 1 company disagrees and 1 company prefer to keep it FFS. Given majority view, rapporteur propose not to introduce.

**Proposal 9: (21/1) Do not introduce additional parameters, e.g. hysteresis and time to trigger, to define the trigger event for TA reporting.**

**Trigger condition of TA reporting in connected mode**

In the last meeting, NW requested TA reporting, periodical TA reporting and event-triggered TA reporting were discussed for connected mode, and only event-triggered TA reporting was agreed. Following proposals are brought up by companies.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [3] R2-2110019 | Proposal 11 Network request based TA report is supported.Proposal 12 Periodic TA report is not supported. | Xiaomi |
| [7] R2-2110733 | Proposal 1: For connected UE, TA can be configured to report via RACH procedure if timeAlignmentTimer is stopped.Proposal 11: TA report via PDCCH ordered RACH is supported in NTN. | ZTE |
| [9] R2-2110774 | Proposal 3: RAN2 considers semi-persistent report of information on UE specific TA pre-compensation in connected mode, by which periodical report is configured by the network and actual reporting is activated and deactivated dynamically.Proposal 4: Semi-persistent reporting of information on UE specific TA pre-compensation in connected mode is configured by RRC signalling.Proposal 5: The periodic reporting of information on UE specific TA pre-compensation in connected mode that is configured in semi-persistent report is activated and deactivated by MAC CE. | Samsung Research America |
| [15] R2-2111207 | Proposal 3: Periodically triggering the UE-specific TA reporting can be configured by network in NR NTN. | CATT |

Rapporteur would like to ask, in addition to event-triggered reporting, whether other options need to be introduced.

**Question 10: In addition to event-triggered TA reporting, what else do companies think is needed for TA reporting in connected mode?**

* **Option 1:** **NW requested TA reporting**
* **Option 2: Periodical TA reporting.**
* **Option 3:** **Semi-persistent TA reporting**
* **Option 4: None**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 4 | We think event trigger is sufficient in Rel-17. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 4 | No need of additional trigger conditions. |
| Samsung | Option 3 | The work assumption is agreed in RAN2-115e that "the UE location information can be reported in connected mode", for TA reporting purposes in connected mode, the network can configure the UE to send either the UE specific TA pre-compensation (for the details of the TA value, confirmation from RAN1 is needed) or the UE location information. If the reported content of information about UE specific TA is UE location information in connected mode, RRC signalling is used to report.We think event-triggered TA reporting may not be enough for NW UL scheduling in certain scenarios, that due the movement of satellite and UE during the large propagation time, event-triggered report of information on UE specific TA pre-compensation may lose validity when received by the network. Also considering periodic report may not be necessary when TA is not changing fast or only change within certain threshold, we think semi-persistent TA reporting can be considered. |
| Apple | Option 4 |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 4 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | For network request based TA report, it can be used in case that network can predict UE’s TA with some level but not always confident. In this case, network can configure a larger TA offset threshold and request UE for TA report when it is not confident with the predicted TA in between event triggered TA report. |
| vivo | Option 4 | Event-triggered TA reporting is enough. We do not observe a motivation to introduce additional trigger conditions. |
| LG | Option 4 | Event triggered TA reporting is enough.  |
| Nokia | Option 4 | Event trigger is efficient and enough for Rel-17. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 4 |  |
| MediaTek | Option 4 |  |
| Intel | Option 4 |  |
| Sony | Option 1 and Option 2 | NW needs UE-specific TA for PDCCH monitoring restrictions |
| InterDigital | Option 4 | Event triggering covers most important case already. |
| Qualcomm | Option 4 | Event trigger based reporting is enough. |
| CATT | Option 2 | For the option 2, periodically triggering UE-specific TA reporting is beneficial for timely TA tracking and most useful for earth-fixed cell scenario. When NTN cell can be fixed in a period of time, the timely TA tracking is useful for the network to adjust UE-specific K\_offset for DL and UL timing relationship enhancement. |
| ZTE | Option 4 with clarification | For NW requested mechanism it can be triggered implicitly by PDCCH ordered RACH, e.g., for the case DL data arrival when TAT is not running.  |
| Ericsson | Option 4 | If a new measurement quantity is defined in the RRC framework, it is possible to get only one report – thus in effect a NW requested TA report.  |
| ASUSTeK | Option 4 |  |
| Thales | Option 4 |  |
| ETRI | Option 4 | Event-triggered TA reporting is enough. |
| China Telecom | Option4 |  |
| NEC | Option 4 | Event-triggered is sufficient. |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

19 out of 23 think that event-triggered TA reporting is sufficient. 2 companies prefer NW requested TA reporting and 1 company prefers semi-persistent TA reporting. Given majority views, rapporteur proposes to not consider any other triggers.

**Proposal 10: (19/4) Other than event-triggered TA reporting, no more triggers are introduced for TA reporting in connected mode.**

**Content of TA reporting in connected mode**

Regarding the content of TA reporting in connected mode, companies’ proposals are listed below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [2] R2-2109660 | Proposal 2: TA reporting during RACH and in connected mode is via MAC CE and the content is NTA, UE-specific.  | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [6] R2-2110703 | Proposal 2: In the case UE location information can be reported to network, network can configure UE report either the UE location or the UE specific TA information via RRC for the purpose of TA reporting. | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [11] R2-2110952 | Proposal 5 The information about UE specific TA pre-compensation in connected mode is the UE position. | Ericsson |

It is note that in RAN2#115-e meeting, following agreement has been made.

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2#115-e agreement:1. Under the work assumption “the UE location information cannot be reported in connected mode”, the content of UE specific TA reported in connected mode is UE specific TA pre-compensation(for the details of the TA value, confirmation from RAN1 is needed).
2. If the reported content of information about UE specific TA is UE location information in connected mode, RRC signalling is used to report.
3. Under the work assumption “the UE location information can be reported in connected mode”, for TA reporting purposes in connected mode, the network can configure the UE to send either the UE specific TA pre-compensation (for the details of the TA value, confirmation from RAN1 is needed) or the UE location information
4. Working Assumption: If the reported content of information about UE specific TA is TA pre-compensation value in connected mode, MAC CE is used to report
 |

Under the work assumption “the UE location information can be reported in connected mode”, RAN2 has agreed that NW can configure either UE specific TA pre-compensation reporting or UE location information reporting for TA reporting in connected mode. Proposal in [6] seems to suggest that this should be done via RRC.

Rapporteur would like to ask the following question:

**Question 11: Do companies agree that in case UE location information can be reported to network, network can configure UE to report either the UE location or the UE specific TA information via RRC for the purpose of TA reporting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree, but | We’re not sure about the difference between Q11 and the agreement from previous meeting:1. Under the work assumption “the UE location information can be reported in connected mode”, for TA reporting purposes in connected mode, the network can configure the UE to send either the UE specific TA pre-compensation (for the details of the TA value, confirmation from RAN1 is needed) or the UE location information

Do we need an additional agreement or do we want re-evaluate the agreement? |
| Samsung | agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| LG |  | RAN1 will discuss this WA in upcoming meeting. Thus, we should wait for the RAN1 confirmation. |
| Nokia | Agree | RRC should be used to configure UE reports either the UE location or the UE specific TA information in case UE location information can be reported to NW.  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Disagree | We need to wait for SA3 response before considering UE location reporting options. |
| Intel | agree |  |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | With comment | In our understanding, we didn’t capture the interpretation properly. Network should be able to configure both location and TA report. However, in the same message, both should not be included.Of course, it is up to network if it wants to configure only one of them, we do not need to specify. What needs to be specify is, if both are configured, only location information needs to be reported in the same UL TBS. But they can be reported in UL TBS at different time. |
| CATT | Agree | If this question just wants to confirm the configuration is delivered by RRC signalling. |
| ZTE |  | If there are location information available for usage, then there is no reason to forbid NW to use location information for such purpose. However, we don’t think the two mechanism is exclusive from each other, and whether configure location report and/or TA report (configure both is also possible) is totally a NW implementation issue. Location report is also subjected to SA3’s response. We don’t think there is a need to further discuss in this meeting. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Thales | Agree |  |
| ETRI | Agree |  |
| China Telecom | Agree |  |
| NEC | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

The intention of Q11 is to confirm the configuration is done via RRC signaling. 19 out of 23 agree to that.

**Proposal 11: (19/4) In case UE location information can be reported to network, RRC signaling is used to configure UE to report either the UE location or the UE specific TA information for the purpose of TA reporting.**

**Event-triggered TA reporting**

In RAN2#115-e meeting, following agreement has been made.

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2#115-e agreement:1. Event-triggers for reporting on the information about UE specific TA in connected mode is supported. FFS on the details. Confirmation by RAN1 is also needed
2. The event-triggers for reporting information about UE specific TA are based on TA values (confirmation from RAN1 is needed)
3. A TA offset threshold can be used for event-triggered reporting, at least the offset threshold can be between current information about UE specific TA and the last successfully reported information about UE specific TA
4. The event-triggers for reporting information about UE specific TA based on time threshold is not supported in NTN.
 |

Relevant proposals are shown below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [6] R2-2110703 | Proposal 3: To enable event-triggered UE specific TA reporting, network should configure a TA change threshold via RRC.Proposal 4: For UE specific TA information reporting, if the UE detects the TA change between current UE-estimated TA and the last successfully reported TA is larger than network configured threshold, the UE should send the latest UE-estimated TA to the NW.Proposal 5: For UE location information reporting, if the UE detects that the TA deviation between TA estimation based on current UE location and the TA estimation based on last successfully reported UE location is larger than network configured threshold, the UE should send a location update to the NW. | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [11] R2-2110952 | Proposal 5 The information about UE specific TA pre-compensation in connected mode is the UE position.Proposal 6 If Proposal 5 is agreed, then the event triggered report of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation is based on the UE movement above a threshold compared to the last successfully reported UE location.Proposal 7 If Proposal 5 is not agreed, then the quantity used by the UE to trigger TA reports is Qta = [UE-specific-Koffset \* 10-3 – TTA], that is the UE-specific- Koffset minus the full TA as defined by RAN1.Proposal 8 If Proposal 7 is agreed, then the UE may be configured with two thresholds to trigger TA reports based on Qta. Th1 triggers a TA report if Qta < Th1. Th2 triggers a TA report if Qta > Th2. | Ericsson |

For UE location information reporting, two options are proposed in [6] [11]:

* Option 1: TA-based trigger condition, i.e., when TA change between current UE-estimated TA and the last successfully reported TA is larger than network configured threshold.
* Option 2: Location-based trigger condition, i.e., the UE movement above a threshold compared to the last successfully reported UE location

**Question 12: If the content of TA reporting is UE location information, which is the preferred option regarding the trigger condition?**

* **Option 1: TA-based trigger condition, i.e. when TA change between current UE-estimated TA and the last successfully reported TA is larger than network configured threshold.**
* **Option 2: Location-based trigger condition, i.e. when UE moves above a threshold compared to the last successfully reported UE location.**
* **Option 3: Other.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 | For simplicity, we prefer to reuse the same event for TA reporting. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 |  |
| Samsung | Option 1 | Agree with OPPO. It can be hard to define a threshold for UE location. If a threshold of UE movement distance is used, a large movement distance may not imply a large TA change since the trajectory of UE movement is unknown. |
| Apple | Option 1 |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 1 | Event triggering is sufficient. |
| Xiaomi  | Option 1 |  |
| vivo | Option 1 |  |
| LG | Option 1 |  |
| Nokia | Option 1 | Option 1 is simple and share the same concept of TA change threshold as UE-specific TA reporting. |
| Spreadtrum | Option 1 |  |
| MediaTek | - | TA report should not contain UE location information, it should only contain the UE-specific TA. |
| Intel | Option 1 |  |
| Sony | Option 2 | If ‘TA-based trigger condition’ is based on full TA, this can change because due to feeder link delay changes even if UE location is fixed. Better to explicitly use threshold UE location change as trigger. |
| InterDigital | Option 1 |  |
| Qualcomm | None | We do not understand how location information can be content of the TA report MAC CE.We should decouple location aspect from TA report. |
| CATT | Option 1 |  |
| ZTE | - | The agreed location report mechanism is course location report in Msg5 and location Report based on MDT structure. We don’t recall agreeing on event triggered location information. 1. Under the work assumption "the UE location information can be reported in connected mode", for TA reporting purposes in connected mode, the network can configure the UE to send either the UE specific TA pre-compensation (for the details of the TA value, confirmation from RAN1 is needed) or the UE location information

Our understanding on above agreements is that in case user consent is available, NW can configure UE to report location information based on existing MDT framework(via OtherConfig). In such case, if UE location information is available, NW can use this information also for TA adjustment. However, for event-triggered TA report, the report content is TA. Moreover, since we are still awaiting for confirmation from SA3, perhaps it is better to postpone the discussion until hearing from SA3. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 |  |
| ASUSTeK | Option 2 | It has been agreed that if the reported content of TA report is UE location information, RRC signalling is used. The UE location-based TA report can be reported using existing mechanism. Since the reporting content is UE location information, the trigger condition should be based on location. |
| Thales | Option 2 |  |
| ETRI | Option 1 |  |
| China Telecom | Option 1 |  |
| NEC | Option 1 |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

16 out of 23 replied option 1. 4 companies prefer option 2. 2 companies do not prefer to report location information for the purpose of TA reporting, however rapporteur thinks that this has been agreed by RAN2. 1 company suggests to postpone.

**Proposal 12: (16/4) If the content of TA reporting is UE location information, reuse the TA-based trigger condition, i.e. when TA change between current UE-estimated TA and the last successfully reported TA is larger than network configured threshold.**

**Whether TA reporting can trigger SR/RACH?**

It is proposed in both [1] and [2] that TA reporting can trigger SR when there is no available UL-SCH resources, so that TA report can still reach the network and assist network to update K-offset. However, company in [3] holds different view.

Relevant proposals are listed below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc Num | Involved Proposals | Source |
| [1] R2-2109498 | Proposal 4 SR can be triggered if TA reporting has been triggered but there is no available UL-SCH resources, or if the UL-SCH resources cannot accommodate the TA report MAC CE plus its subheader as a result of LCP.Proposal 5 TA report MAC CE can be mapped to one SR configuration, which is configured by RRC using a new parameter, e.g. schedulingRequestID-TA-Report-r17. | OPPO |
| [2] R2-2109660 | Proposal 4: If UL resource is not available for TA report, UE triggers an SR if SR is configured or triggers RACH if SR is not configured. | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [3] R2-2110019 | Proposal 7 Do not support TA report MAC CE triggering SR/RACH procedure. | Xiaomi |

**Question 13: Do companies agree that SR/RACH should be triggered when TA reporting has been triggered but there is no available UL-SCH resources for TA reporting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | TA reporting is important for NW to adjust UE-specific K-offset. If it has no chance to report, it may impact the subsequent UL/DL transmission by using the old K-offset. Therefore, we think SR/RACH should be triggered for TA reporting as soon as possible. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | Similar with BFR MAC CE mechanism. But we may not need to specify a dedicated SR for TA MAC CE. Common SR will do. |
| Samsung | disagree | No need to trigger SR. If there is UL data, SR will be triggered anyway by BFR. If there is no data, then report TA is not needed. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | The same view as samsung |
| vivo | Agree | TA MAC CE is beneficial for the subsequent scheduling. UE should report to NW in time. If UE dose not report TA MAC CE when TA reporting is trigger due to lack of PUSCH, UE may miss DL transmission which is scheduled by NW based on the outdated TA information. |
| LG | Disagree | The same view as Samsung |
| Nokia | Disagree | It is NW implementation to consider how to configure the K-offset based on UE reported TA information (e.g. add some margin to accommodate the TA update delay). Considering the high priority of TA MAC CE, we don’t expect big TA update delay during UL data transmission. Furthermore, as a last resort, NW can schedule UE with maximum TA to make the system work (e.g. if it detects UL failure), then UE can report the TA in the following PUSCH. |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | The object of TA report is data transmission, so if UL data arrives, SR shall be triggered. |
| MediaTek | Disagree | TA report is only necessary if there is data to transmit, which would trigger SR/RACH anyways, so there is no need to trigger SR/RACH separately. |
| Intel  | Disagree | The same view as Samsung, but BSR instead of BFR. |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Neutral | No strong view, okay to go with majority |
| Qualcomm | Agree | If there is no UL data, UE will not trigger SR. This means network stays with UE’s old outdated Koffset. So, it is better to update network sooner.If there is any DL data arrival, then network may have to use updated Koffset to enhance PDSCH to HARQ-ACK timing relationship. |
| CATT | Agree | We think if the TA report is triggered by the defined event, or the Periodical TA report is supported, the UE should deliver the TA report to network, even there is no UL data arrival.  |
| ZTE | Agree | Agree with Qualcomm, to keep an updated TA is more efficient for NW to maintain K-offset, which is beneficial for scheduling of subsequent transmission if arrival.  |
| Ericsson |  | If RRC is used for the report, then a BSR will be triggered and an SR if no grant is available. If MAC CE is used, then we have a similar view as Samsung. In case gNB did not get a TA report for a long time it may adapt k1/k2 so that the UE can send any UL data with sufficient processing time even with an outdated UE specific Koffset. |
| ETRI | Disagree | SR can be triggered if the UE has data to send. |
| China Telecom | Agree |  |
| NEC | Agree | TA report is essential for DL scheduling so the UE should report it as soon as possible, using SR if necessary. |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

11 out of 21 agree that TA report MAC CE can trigger SR/RACH, while 9 companies disagree. 1 company has no strong view. Given no clear majority view, rapporteur suggests RAN2 to further discuss.

**Proposal 13: (11/9) RAN2 further discuss whether SR/RACH should be triggered when TA reporting has been triggered but there is no available UL-SCH resources for TA reporting.**

**Impact of TA report on timeAlignmentTimer**

The timeAlignmentTimer is used for the maintenance of UL time alignment, which controls how long the MAC entity considers the Serving Cells belonging to the associated TAG to be uplink time aligned. For NTN, UE’s TA is not only controlled by network via Timing Advance Command. It is proposed in [2] that after UE reports its TA to the gNB, the timeAlignmentTimer should also be started or restarted.

And it is further proposed in [2], in order to make sure the timeAlignmentTimer in UE and gNB are aligned, the propagation delay should be taken into consideration. Two options can be considered:

* Option 1: UE starts or restarts the timeAlignmentTimer after RTT/2 after UE reports its TA to the gNB.
* Option 2: UE starts or restarts the timeAlignmentTimer after UE reports its TA to the gNB. The gNB starts or restarts the timeAlignmentTimer after receiving the TA report and decreases the duration of the timeAlignmentTimer by RTT/2.

Companies’ proposal is listed below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [2] R2-2109660 | Proposal 5: The timeAlignmentTimer is started or restarted after UE reports its TA. FFS whether started or restarted instantly or after RTT/2.  | Huawei, HiSilicon |

Rapporteur would like to ask the following question:

**Question 14: Do companies agree that the timeAlignmentTimer is started or restarted after UE reports its TA?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | Each time TA is communicated between UE and NW, the timer should be restarted. Otherwise, it has to unnecessarily rely on TAC MAC CE to keep UE synchronized even though UE has not lost synchronization. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | This aligns with the legacy principle that when UE and gNB have reached UL synchronization, the timeAlignmentTimer should be started or restarted (two mechanisms for UL synchronization now: TA command and TA report). Otherwise the timeAlignmentTimer may run out shortly after TA is reported which will lead to another unnecessary UL synchronization. |
| Samsung | Agree | The timer should be restarted for each TA update. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | No matter UE report TA or not, the error of the TA part for network adjustment will accumulate. Once it reach a threshould, TA in UE side will be invalid. This kind of fine adjustment by gNB can not be well compensated by UE itself. Thus, we think TAT should not be restarted. |
| Vivo | Disagree | The MAC PDU carrying TA MAC CE may suffer from multiple retransmissions. If UE starts or restarts the *timeAlignmentTimer* after UE reports its TA, there’ll be misalignment between the UE and NW on the understanding of the starting point of timeAlignmentTimer, which may impact the subsequent scheduling. |
| LG | Disagree | Same view as Xiaomi |
| Nokia | Disagree | We think UE reports TA to NW (for K\_offset configuration) and NW use TA command to adjust UE’s TA value (to keep UE in UL sync status) is two different things. UE cannot assume it is UL synchronized and restart TAT timer after it sends TA information to NW. |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | The TA report is slot level, which is very coarse compared with TA command adjustment by gNB. |
| MediaTek | FFS | If the TA report accuracy is not enough to maintain UE-network synchronization as some companies suggest, then TAT should not be started/restarted. Otherwise, TAT can be started/restarted. Needs more discussion. |
| Intel | Disagree | We tend to keep the legacy operation of TAT. |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Disagree | Same view as Nokia |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | TAT is for closed loop TA update. It has nothing to do with TA report. |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Disagree | Share similar view as Xiaomi and Nokia. |
| Ericsson | Disagree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Disagree | Share the same view with Nokia. |
| ETRI | Disagree | Share the same view as Xiaomi and Nokia. |
| China Telecom | Disagree |  |
| NEC | Disagree | TA report is not the same granularity or purpose and the UE cannot assume it is UL synchronised after sending TA report, only after receiving TA command. |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

7 out of 22 think that the timeAlignmentTimer should be started or restarted after UE reports its TA, while 14 companies disagree. Given majority views, following is proposed.

**Proposal 14: (14/7) do not start or restart the timeAlignmentTimer after UE reports its TA.**

**Question 15: If Q14 is agreed, which option do companies prefer?**

* **Option 1: UE starts or restarts the timeAlignmentTimer after RTT/2 after UE reports its TA to the gNB.**
* **Option 2: UE starts or restarts the timeAlignmentTimer after UE reports its TA to the gNB.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 2 | Option 2 is simple. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | It is up to gNB implementation to align the timeAlignmentTimer with UE.  |
| Samsung | Option 2 | Note RTT may not be the correct value used to align timer at UE and gNB. The alignment can depend on NW implementation.  |
| Apple | Option 2 |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 2 |  |
| Xiaomi | None | See comments to Q14 |
| LG | None |  |
| MediaTek | Option 2 |  |
| Sony | Option 2 |  |
| CATT | Option 2 |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

Given proposal 14, no proposal is given on Q15.

## Other RACH issues

**Broadcasting K-mac**

RAN1 has agreed to broadcast K-mac value for UE to acquire UE-gNB RTT. In the following contribution, it is proposed to discuss how to broadcast K-mac.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [1] R2-2109498 | Proposal 1 RAN2 discuss where to provide K\_mac value in SIB, e.g. in SIB1, or in the NTN-specific SIB carrying satellite ephemeris. | OPPO |

In Monday’s online discussion, more companies favour the new SIB since UE anyway needs to acquire the common TA and ephemeris in another SIB during RA procedure. For progress, following question is asked to collect more companies’ views.

**Question 16: Which SIB is preferred to be used to carry K-mac?**

* **Option 1: SIB1**
* **Option 2: the new SIB, e.g. the one carrying satellite ephemeris and/or common TA**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Option** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Option 2 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 |  |
| Samsung | Option 2 | K\_mac is used together with UE TA to delay or extend a specific MAC timer, i.e. UE-gNB RTT (i.e. UE's TA+K\_mac) is used as the offset for MAC timers (including delay ra-ResponseWindow, msgB-ResponseWindow, and ra-ContentionResolutionTimer, extend drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerUL and drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDL). Meanwhile satellite ephemeris and common TA is used by UE to derive UE TA, so they can always be carried in the same SIB. |
| Apple | Option 2 |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Option 2 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option 2 |  |
| vivo | Option 2 |  |
| LG | Option 2 |  |
| Nokia | Option 2 |  |
| Spreadtrum | Option 2 |  |
| MediaTek | Option 2 | However we don’t have a strong preference as both options would work. |
| Intel |  | It seems that we are trying to make an agreement that “the new SIB includes satellite ephemeris and common TA”. If this is the case, it’s ok to also include K-mac. |
| Sony | Option 2 |  |
| InterDigital | Option 2 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | Ok to provide K\_mac and common TA in the same SIB. |
| ZTE | Option 2 | Since such information will only be used for UE connected to NTN, it is preferred to have NTN related parameters broadcasted in a NTN specific SIB.  |
| CATT | Option 2 |  |
| Ericsson  | Option 2 |  |
| ASUSTeK | Option 2 |  |
| Thales | Option 2 |  |
| ETRI | Option 2 |  |
| China Telecom | Option 2 |  |
| NEC | Option 2 |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

All 23 companies agree to use the new SIB.

**Proposal 16: (23/0) K-mac is included in the new SIB, e.g. the one carrying satellite ephemeris and/or common TA.**

**Other RACH enhancement**

In Monday’s online discussion, proposals on enhanced RACH type selection were discussed and following agreements were made.

Agreements:

1. Enhancements for RA type selection in NTN will not be pursued in Rel-17. FFS for BSR

Regarding enhancements on BSR over 2-step RACH, some companies think that it is not related to RACH type selection, while some other companies believe that they are optimization not needed now. Since it is now marked as FFS, it would be good to check companies’ views here.

**Question 17: Do companies agree to introduce additional enhancement on BSR over 2-step RACH?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Company** | **Agree/disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Disagree | We think the current MAC spec is sufficient to support BSR over 2-step RACH, e.g. by not configuring SR resources for some logical channel if NW wants UE to send BSR over 2-step RACH. No need for any enhancement in Rel-17. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | No enhancement is needed. |
| Apple | Disagree | If needed, enhancements can be pursued in later releases |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | See comments | Additional enhancements may not be that necessary in this release. Our concern is that the UE behaviour when **both** CG and 2-step RA are configured for BSR is not clear enough. UE may 1) always use CG or 2) use the next available UL resource for BSR. For 1) the configuration of 2-step RA for BSR is meaningless. For 2) there is a chance that 2-step RA resource is earlier but 2-step RA cannot be selected (i.e. RSRP< *msgA-RSRP-Threshold*). |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | It can be addressed by not configuring SR resource for those LCHs requiring low latency. |
| vivo | Disagree | Share the same view with OPPO, the current spec can support BSR over 2-step RACH, e.g. by not configuring SR resources for some logical channel. There is no need to introduce additional enhancement. |
| LG | Disagree  | If there is a remaining time for discussing it, we can discuss it.  |
| Nokia | Agree with comments | If BSR over 2-step RACH should be used to save UL scheduling latency, according to current specification, NW should not configure SR resources for the LCH who trigger the BSR. However, UE may select 4-step RACH or 2-step RACH based on RSRP threshold. If UE selects 4-step RACH, the latency will not be reduced, but the 4-step RACH resource is wasted just to report BSR.On the other hand, to avoid overload 4-step RACH, an enhancement is that the UE can select 2-step RACH if the UE’s RSRP is above the threshold, otherwise select legacy SR-BSR procedure if its RSRP is below the threshold.We think it is more resource-efficient to use legacy SR-BSR procedure since 4-step RACH resource is expensive. E.g. RACH overload means more collision and low RACH successful rate.  |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | The current focus is selection between CG and 2-step RA. If most of data transmission is via CG, the period of CG resource is short, so the benefit of transmission BSR in 2-step RA is margin. |
| MediaTek | Disagree |  |
| Intel | disagree |  |
| Sony | Disagree | This can be done in later release |
| InterDigital | Disagree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree with comments. | Additional enhancement is not necessary. It is just the priorities between use of SR resource vs 2 step RACH resource.If SR resource is not configured, then it is possible to use 2 step RACH for BSR.Either we specify, SR resource and 2 step RACH are NOT configured for same LCH or we specify priority which one to use. Either way is fine but we need clarification on UE behaviour. |
| ZTE | Disagree | The same purpose can be achieved by not configuring specific SR resource. Then UE will trigger RACH, and whether to use 2stepRA will still rely on RSRP\_threshold, which is also the RSRP requirement to guarantee transmission of PUSCH, otherwise even when 2step is used, than it is possible PUSCH cannot be transmitted successfully e.g., due to contention, in such case UE might still fallback to 4step, and the 2stepRA resource is still wasted. |
| CATT | Agree | The RA type selection enhancements can be considered for sending BSR due to the large delay in RTT.  |
| Ericsson | Disagree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree | Agreed with Nokia. |
| Thales | disagree | Same comment as Sony |
| ETRI | Disagree  |  |
| NEC | Disagree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

17 out of 21 do no agree to introduce addition enhancement, while 4 companies want to have the enhancement. Given majority views, following is proposed:

**Proposal 17: (17/4) Do not introduce additional enhancement on BSR over 2-step RACH.**

**ra-ContentionResolutionTimer**

In RAN2#111-e and RAN2#115-e meeting, following agreements have been made.

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2#111-e agreement:An offset to the start of the ra-ContentionResolutionTimer is introduced for both LEO and GEO scenarios.RAN2#115-e agreement:In the MAC specification section 5.1.5, delay the start of ra-ContentionResolutionTimer by the UE-gNB RTT (i.e. sum of UE’s TA and K\_mac). |

It is stated in [13] that if ra-ContentionResolutionTimer would be restarted after the end of Msg3 retransmission plus UE-gNB RTT, ra-ContentionResolutionTimer could expire during the UE-gNB RTT after Msg3 retransmission, which may lead to issue that the UE considers Contention Resolution as not successful, even if Msg4 would arrive later.

To avoid this issue, [13] proposed that the UE should stop ra-ContentionResolutionTimer upon Msg3 retransmission and start ra-ContentionResolutionTimer after the end of the Msg3 retransmission plus UE-gNB RTT, then the ra-ContentionResolutionTimer would not unexpectedly expire in the case of Msg3 retransmission. One more benefit brought by this solution is power saving since the UE could reduce PDCCH monitoring during UE-gNB RTT [13].

Companies’ proposal is listed below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc No. | Relevant Proposals | Source |
| [13] R2-2111006 | Proposal 1: RAN2 should consider the issue that ra-ContentionResolutionTimer would expire during UE-gNB RTT after Msg3 retransmission (i.e., ra-ContentionResolutionTimer would expire before it is restarted).Proposal 2: The UE stops ra-ContentionResolutionTimer once Msg3 is retransmitted and then starts ra-ContentionResolutionTimer after the end of the Msg3 retransmission plus UE-gNB RTT. RAN2 could take the proposed text into account. | ASUSTeK |

Rapporteur would like to ask the following question:

**Question 18: Do companies agree that the UE should stop ra-ContentionResolutionTimer once Msg3 is retransmitted and then start ra-ContentionResolutionTimer after the end of the Msg3 retransmission plus UE-gNB RTT?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| OPPO | Agree with comments | We share the intention of ASUSTeK’s proposal. However, to further decrease the UE power consumption, we think it would be more reasonable to stop the timer upon receiving PDCCH scheduling Msg3 retransmission. Therefore, we suggest the following updated proposal:**Proposal: the UE should stop ra-ContentionResolutionTimer once receiving PDCCH which schedules Msg3 retransmission and then start ra-ContentionResolutionTimer after the end of the Msg3 retransmission plus UE-gNB RTT.** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with comments | Agree with OPPO.  |
| Samsung | Agree with comments | Agree with OPPO |
| Apple | Agree  | OPPO’s suggestion is reasonable |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree with comments | Agree with OPPO |
| Xiaomi | Agree with comments | Agree with OPPO |
| vivo | Agree with comments | The issue pointed out by ASUSTeK is valid.We prefer the solution proposed by OPPO. |
| LG | Agree with comments | Agree with OPPO.  |
| Nokia | FFS | We think the question is valid. How to restart the timer can be further studied. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with comments | Agree with OPPO. |
| MediaTek | Agree with comments | Agree with OPPO’s suggestion. |
| Intel | Agree with comments | Agree with OPPO. |
| InterDigital | Agree with comments | Okay with OPPO suggestion |
| Qualcomm | Agree with OPPO. |  |
| ZTE | Agree | We also consider the observation is valid. And either solution proposed by ASUSTeK and Oppo is fine for us. |
| CATT | Agree | Agree with OPPO |
| Ericsson  | Agree with OPPO |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree | We are fine with either the original proposal or OPPO’s proposal. |
| ETRI | Agree | Agree with OPPO |
| China Telecom | Agree with OPPO |  |
| NEC | Agree | Agree with OPPO. |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

20 out of 21 agree to the updated proposal suggested by OPPO. 1 company prefers FFS.

**Proposal 18: (20/1) UE should stop ra-ContentionResolutionTimer once receiving PDCCH which schedules Msg3 retransmission and then start ra-ContentionResolutionTimer after the end of the Msg3 retransmission plus UE-gNB RTT.**

# 3. Phase-1 summary and proposals

This section summarizes the discussion and reports the following proposals:

*For easy agreements:*

**Proposal 1: Regarding the content of TA reporting, RAN2 further discuss between the following two options:**

* **(12) Option 1: Full TA (i.e.,** $T\_{TA}$ **as defined in the UE’s TA formula)**
* **(11) Option 2: UE’s service link TA (i.e., NTA, UE-specific as defined in the UE’s TA formula)**

**Proposal 2: (21/2) Do not mandatory Msg3/MsgA or Msg5 to include TA report MAC CE, and whether it can be included depends on the TB size of Msg3/MsgA or Msg5.**

**Proposal 3a: (20/2) Reserved LCID is used for the TA report MAC CE.**

**Proposal 3b: (18/4) Postpone the discussion on the size of the TA report MAC CE until RAN2 concludes on the content of TA report.**

**Proposal 4: (23/0) RAN2 do not pursue any enhancements to allow inclusion of TA information without extending Msg3 size.**

**Proposal 5: (23/0) Logical channel priority of the TA report MAC CE should be lower than that of “C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH” and higher than that of “data from any Logical Channel, except data from UL-CCCH”.**

**Proposal 6: (16/3) RAN2 further discuss the exact priority of the TA report MAC CE between “C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH” and “MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding”.**

**Proposal 7: (16/5) TA reporting during RACH in connected mode should not be controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI, but should depend on whether a TA update event is triggered.**

**Proposal 8: (19/3) RAN2 confirm the working assumption that if the reported content of information about UE specific TA is TA pre-compensation value in connected mode, MAC CE is used to report.**

**Proposal 9: (21/1) Do not introduce additional parameters, e.g. hysteresis and time to trigger, to define the trigger event for TA reporting.**

**Proposal 10: (19/4) Other than event-triggered TA reporting, no more triggers are introduced for TA reporting in connected mode.**

**Proposal 11: (19/4) In case UE location information can be reported to network, RRC signaling is used to configure UE to report either the UE location or the UE specific TA information for the purpose of TA reporting.**

**Proposal 12: (16/4) If the content of TA reporting is UE location information, reuse the TA-based trigger condition, i.e. when TA change between current UE-estimated TA and the last successfully reported TA is larger than network configured threshold.**

**Proposal 16: (23/0) K-mac is included in the new SIB, e.g. the one carrying satellite ephemeris and/or common TA.**

**Proposal 17: (17/4) Do not introduce additional enhancement on BSR over 2-step RACH.**

**Proposal 18: (20/1) UE should stop ra-ContentionResolutionTimer once receiving PDCCH which schedules Msg3 retransmission and then start ra-ContentionResolutionTimer after the end of the Msg3 retransmission plus UE-gNB RTT.**

*For further discussion:*

**Proposal 13: (11/9) RAN2 further discuss whether SR/RACH should be triggered when TA reporting has been triggered but there is no available UL-SCH resources for TA reporting.**

**Proposal 14: (14/7) do not start or restart the timeAlignmentTimer after UE reports its TA.**

# Phase-2 discussion

This offline discussion mainly focuses on phase-1 summary proposals that are not agreed via email and to check if companies are willing to compromise for the sake of progress.

Proposal 1: Regarding the content of TA reporting, RAN2 further discuss between the following two options:

 (12) Option 1: Full TA (i.e., T\_TA as defined in the UE’s TA formula)

 (11) Option 2: UE’s service link TA (i.e., NTA, UE-specific as defined in the UE’s TA formula)

- Ericsson thinks the section the questions is asked in is related to reporting during RACH, this should be reflected in the proposals, this is also related to the size of the report P3b

- Oppo (offline rapporteur) thinks that “during RACH” can be added to the proposal, but meanwhile we should also discuss the case for connected mode reporting not during RACH

- VC suggests to reword as:

"Regarding the content of TA reporting during RACH, RAN2 further discuss between the following two options:

 Option 1: Full TA (i.e., T\_TA as defined in the UE’s TA formula)

 Option 2: UE’s service link TA (i.e., NTA, UE-specific as defined in the UE’s TA formula)

FFS for TA reporting during connected mode"

Rapporteur understands Ericsson’s concern is that the size of TA reporting MAC CE (e.g. resulted from different reporting content) may impact the uplink coverage of Msg3. Note that the current agreements do not mandate TA reporting in Msg3, but rather TA can be reported in Msg3/Msg5, whichever has the earliest available UL grant. If NW cares about Msg3’s coverage, then probably may not allocate a larger UL grant than Rel-16, in which case UE can report TA in Msg5.

**Question 1: Can companies agree to proposal 1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Agree | No need to add the FFS for the Connected mode, the decision should apply to any TA reporting regardless of the RRC state. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with comments | We share the same concern of MSG3 coverage. But as long as we make sure TA can be included in MSG5 if MSG3 doesn’t allow, there should be no big issue. This is more related to another proposal than the one here.Regarding to the FFS, we think TA reporting during connect mode should have the same content with the TA reporting during RACH. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Not agree. Please add option 4 to the discussion. We insist to adopt option 4 | For us, TA report MAC CE more than 1 byte is not acceptable. Neither option 1 and 2 can achieve 1 byte TA MAC CE size. And we insist to adopt option 4. All companies agree that increasing Msg3 size would degrade PUSCH coverage. For this very reason, we introduce network signalling to enable/disable TA report during RACH. Further, majority company think that TA report in Msg3 is allowed and based on network scheduling. Then we should ensure that the size of TA report MAC CE do not scare away network’s potential preference about using msg3 to transmit TA report MAC CE. Never try to introduce a design that is over detrimental to one of network’s choice if we decide to give network that option. |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree with comments | There is no to add “during RACH” to the proposal, since the same content of TA reporting should be used for both initial access and Connected mode. However, if it can address Ericsson’s concern, we are also ok to keep the connected mode as FFS. |
| ZTE | Agree | Since we already agreed that TA report MAC CE will be included in msg3/MsgA only when the size is enough, and the UL grant configuration is under NW control, the coverage won’t be a problem. |
| Apple  | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Not agree.Agree the updated P1 from VC | For connected mode, we think the content of reporting can be UE UE specific TA or UE location information. |
| Ericsson | Disagree | To ensure Msg3 coverage, the size of the new MAC CE must be kept low. This is simpler if the report is the [cell-specififc Koffset – TTA]/[slot time] as the range of this report will always be small, regardless of the propagation RTT.  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree with comments | Same view as OPPO. |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Agree |  |
| NEC | Agree | We think TA reporting should be the same in RRC Connected so the FFS is not needed. |
| Sequans | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

17 out of 20 agree to P1. 2 companies disagree. 1 company prefers updated P1 from VC. Rapporteur assumes companies agreeing to P1 can also agree to updated P1. Given this situation, rapporteur would propose to go for updated P1 from VC.

**Proposal 1: (18/2) Regarding the content of TA reporting during RACH, RAN2 further discuss between the following two options:**

* **Option 1: Full TA (i.e., T\_TA as defined in the UE’s TA formula)**
* **Option 2: UE’s service link TA (i.e., NTA, UE-specific as defined in the UE’s TA formula)**

**FFS for TA reporting during connected mode.**

Proposal 6: (16/3) RAN2 further discuss the exact priority of the TA report MAC CE between “C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH” and “MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding”.

* Ericsson would like to further discuss this.

**Question 2: Can companies agree to proposal 6?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | The exact priority can be between “LBT failure MAC CE” and “MAC CE for SL-BSR prioritized according to clause 5.22.1.6” |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Not Agree | 16 out of 19 companies think the priority of TA report MAC CE is higher than BSR. We suggest the to revise the P6 as follow:**The priority of the TA report MAC CE is larger than “MAC CE for BSR. FFS on whether it is larger than all BSRs or only part of BSRs (e.g. BSR included for padding).** |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree | The suggested priority is between “LBT failure MAC CE” and “MAC CE for SL-BSR prioritized according to clause 5.22.1.6”The priority of TA report MAC CE should be higher than BSR MAC CE, since if TA cannot be reported to NW as soon as possible, UL synchronisation status between NW and UE might be non-synchronised, thus it makes no sense to report BSR.  |
| ZTE | Agree | And we prefer a higher priority consider TA report is used to assist scheduling.  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Disagree | Much more important than the TA is for the gNB to know the PHR in order to make efficient link adaptation.If the first PHR is delayed it affects the TBS and result in much longer delay because all data may be finished before a UE-specific Koffset takes effect in the UE. NOTE, that the majority of connections are for short time transferring a small amount of data. The early PHR report that may be triggered in Msg5 (by configuring PHR reporting in Msg4) or in Msg3 (for RA in connected mode). Having a TA report, that in best case may decrease the HARQ RTT with 3.8% in GEO, 15.2% in 1200 km LEO, and 24.2% in 600 km LEO, is not comparable to getting a first PHR report that may triple or quadruple the TBS. Thus, with early PHR on higher prio than TA report, the UE buffer may be empty before the UE specific Koffset takes effect in the UE. New TA MAC CE before PHR may thus slow down the connection in the earliest phase and delay the data (especially for the most common case of small data transfer). Further, low TBS in the early phase will slow down TCP slow start, with huge impact on the QoS. |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Agree |  |
| NEC | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

18 out of 20 agree to P6. 2 companies disagree. Given majority views, rapporteur would propose to go for P6.

**Proposal 6: (18/2) RAN2 further discuss the exact priority of the TA report MAC CE between “C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH” and “MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding”.**

Proposal 7: (16/5) TA reporting during RACH in connected mode should not be controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI, but should depend on whether a TA update event is triggered.

* Vivo thinks there is still a concern on whether the TA reporting events to be specified can cover all the RACH trigger events related to the loss of Sync. If not, then p7 does not seem to be sufficient and we should have a further discussion on this issue.
* Nokia doesn’t agree on p7 since it seems to mandate the UE and NW to implement TA reporting for UE in RRC Connected mode. If the TA reporting is disabled in SI for RACH in RRC idle, we want to clarify the expected behaviour for UE when it enters RRC Connected mode. Does it mean UE is mandated to report a TA once it is in connected mode? Otherwise how UE can trigger a TA update event for RACH in connected mode? Nokia thinks it is NW implementation to decide UE should report a TA or not and proposes to revise the proposal as: “(modified) P7: If the TA reporting is enabled by NW, TA reporting during RACH in connected mode depends on whether a TA update event is triggered.”

Regarding Nokia’s concerns on mandating the UE and NW to implement TA reporting for UE in RRC Connected mode, rapporteur understands that this is not the case. So far, RAN2 has agreed the event triggered for connected mode TA reporting. Therefore, it is fully up to NW to configure the event and enable the reporting. The modified P7 may cause confusion as it is not clear if the enabled indication is new or the same as for IDLE. To address Nokia’s concerns, rapporteur suggested the following rewording:

**Proposal 7bis: If TA update event is configured, TA reporting during RACH in connected mode is not controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI,** **but depends on whether a TA update event is triggered.**

**Question 3: Can companies agree to proposal 7bis?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Agree | TA reporting would comprise of several parameters such as the thresholds for event trigger. When that configuration is present, the UE could perform TA reporting in Connected mode. Indication in SI could be used for initial access, when the UE does not yet have TA reporting configuration.We suggest to simplify the proposal as:**TA reporting during RACH in connected mode is not controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI.**Because, P7bis seems to imply that if TA update event is not configured, TA reporting during RACH in connected mode is controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI, which we think is not the intention. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | Actually we are not sure we need TA reporting during RACH in connected mode. We already have a connected mode TA reporting mechanism when a TA update event is triggered.  |
| Apple | Disagree | We should first confirm the working assumption that “if the reported content of information about UE specific TA is TA pre-compensation value in connected mode, MAC CE is used to report”. In any case, TA reporting is only needed if the UE has lost synchronization.  |
| Xiaomi | Agree | Network can already control UE whether to report TA using MAC CE or RRC. There is no need for the enabling/diabling indication in SI. Besides, for connected mode, MsgA/Msg3 would carry DTCH data or DCCH RRC message in most cases (only in RRC reestablishment case, MsgA/Msg3 would carry CCCH data), So TA report MAC CE in connected mode RACH procedure has no coverage issue. |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree | We are ok with the updated proposal from MediaTek. |
| ZTE | Agree | So far only event triggered TA report in connected mode is confirmed, whether it is allowed depends on presence of event-triggered configuration. If there is no configuration, UE will never trigger a report in connected state. But if such configuration is given, UE can trigger a TA report, and generate corresponding TA report MAC SDU. In such case if there are UL grant given by RAR available, UE shall be able to includes the TA report in the RAR UL grant if allowed by LCP. And that’s our understanding on the proposal.To us, what really worth discussing is that if there is any RACH event in connected state can also be used to trigger TA report. And we prefer to let UE trigger TA report when RACH is triggered due to out-of-sync event to help also establish the TA.  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | Since TA report in connected mode has been agreed, the report in RA procedure is unnecessary. |
| CATT | Agree partially | For TA report in connected mode, we think this can be controlled by network in a UE specific way. That is, if a UE in connected mode is configured for TA report, the UE can report TA if necessary via RACH procedure or MAC CE as a data, according to its state. However, for “**but depends on whether a TA update event is triggered.**”, it seems like only event-triggered case is included. Actually, other mechanism for TA report is still under discussion.  |
| Nokia | Disagree | The new P7bis would like to use “If TA update event is configured” as an **implicit** flag to enable/disable the TA reporting function for UE in RRC Connected mode. We agree the intention that NW can control whether and when UE can be enabled to report UE-specific TA information to NW.RAN2-115 agreed that UE specific TA reporting during RACH procedure is enabled/disabled by SI, but FFS if this is applicable for RACH in connected mode.

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2-115 Agreement:UE specific TA reporting during RACH procedure is enabled/disabled by SI (FFS for RACH in connected mode) |

Instead of using “implicit” flag to enable/disable UE-specific TA reporting for UE in RRC Connected mode, we think using the flag in SI is clean and simple, not only for NW design but also for UE implementation.Please note, the flag only control the TA reporting function is enabled or disabled. If the function is enabled, we agree the TA reporting during RACH in connected mode depends on whether a TA update event is triggered.  |
| Ericsson | Disagree | What is the intent? Is it that TA report in connected mode shall be enabled disabled implicitly by configure/not configure an TA reporting event? Is it that if the TA reporting during RA is enabled in SI, then UE report during RA in connected only when the triggering event is configured and indicates that a report is needed?  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree with MediaTek |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree partially | For connected UE, it is up to NW implementation to configure the TA update event. The proposal 7bis may cause confusion e.g. if TA update event is not configured, TA reporting during RACH in connected mode can still be controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI. We guess this is not the intention of proposal 7bis. Thus, we proposal to modify the proposal 7bis to the following:TA reporting during RACH in connected mode is not controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI. If TA update event is configured, TA reporting during RACH in connected mode depends on whether a TA update event is triggered.Also, we are a bit not sure how TA reporting during CONNECTED RACH should be done if TA update event is not configured. Do we need to conclude this case as well, or leave it as FFS? |
| Turkcell | Disagree | We share Nokia’s concerns.  |
| NEC | Disagree | We agree with Huawei, the event-tiggered procedure in connected mode should be sufficient, we do not need TA reporting during RACH. |
| Sequans | Disagree | The proposal is not very clear. We are ok with Mediatek wording. |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

12 out of 20 agree to P7bis, and rapporteur assumes these companies can also accept the wording suggestions from MediaTek. 8 companies disagree and some companies even don’t support TA reporting in connected mode RACH. Given majority views, rapporteur would propose to go for the modified proposal from MediaTek.

**Proposal 7ter: (12/8) TA reporting during RACH in connected mode is not controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI.**

Proposal 8: (19/3) RAN2 confirm the working assumption that if the reported content of information about UE specific TA is TA pre-compensation value in connected mode, MAC CE is used to report.

* Ericsson would like to further discuss this.

**Question 4: Can companies agree to proposal 8?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Agree | Better to use one single mechanism to signal the TA report. Reduces the complexity on UE and network implementations. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Apple | Disagree | We think RRC based solution is more secure, and really see no strong reason, e.g., in terms of latency to go with MAC CE approach. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree | We can compromise to this although we prefer RRC approach which is more secure. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree but | We need a RAN1 confirmation  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree but | We agree that the content of TA report in connected mode is TA pre-compensation value. If the risk of security is not a problem, MAC CE is OK. |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Disagree | We think the RRC must be used to not give away information about the UE to unwanted parties. If using MAC CE, we may need to ask SA3 if this is feasible. Further, if MAC CE is used, the same quantity as in P1 shall be reported and not another MAC CE.  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Agree |  |
| NEC | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

18 out of 20 agree to P8 to use MAC CE. 2 companies still want to use RRC. Given majority views, rapporteur would propose to go for P8.

**Proposal 8: (18/2) RAN2 confirm the working assumption that if the reported content of information about UE specific TA is TA pre-compensation value in connected mode, MAC CE is used to report.**

Proposal 9: (21/1) Do not introduce additional parameters, e.g. hysteresis and time to trigger, to define the trigger event for TA reporting.

* Ericsson would like to postpone until more details are available for the report, for example if UE location is reported, or if TA pre-compensation value is reported.

**Question 5: Can companies agree to proposal 9?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Agree | For Rel-17, simple event trigger mechanism is sufficient. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree | Event configuration should be kept simple for a MAC CE. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| Samsung | FFS | Suggest to FFS details of trigger event. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Disagree | Postpone until we have decided what shall be reported, and how event triggering shall be defined.  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Disagree | We agree to postpone until more details are available for the report. |
| NEC | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

15 out of 19 agree to P9, i.e., not to introduce additional parameters. 4 companies want to postpone discussion.

**Proposal 9: (15/4) Do not introduce additional parameters, e.g. hysteresis and time to trigger, to define the trigger event for TA reporting.**

Proposal 10: (19/4) Other than event-triggered TA reporting, no more triggers are introduced for TA reporting in connected mode.

* Ericsson would like to postpone until more details are available for the report

**Question 6: Can companies agree to proposal 10?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MewdiaTek | Agree | For Rel-17, simple event trigger mechanism is sufficient. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Ok |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree | We can agree with majority view to settle down simple mechanism first. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| CATT | Disagree | We agree to postpone the discussion. |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Disagree | Postpone until we have decided what shall be reported, and how event triggering shall be defined.  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Disagree | We agree to postpone until more details are available for the report. |
| NEC | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

16 out of 20 agree to P10, i.e., not to introduce more triggers for TA reporting. 4 companies want to postpone discussion.

**Proposal 10: (16/4) Other than event-triggered TA reporting, no more triggers are introduced for TA reporting in connected mode.**

Proposal 11: (19/4) In case UE location information can be reported to network, RRC signaling is used to configure UE to report either the UE location or the UE specific TA information for the purpose of TA reporting.

* Ericsson thinks there is a difference between the question and the proposal
* Mediatek would like to flag this (and p12) as these two proposals involve Location information, which is still a Working Assumption, pending confirmation from other Working Groups (SA3). We need to wait for SA3 response before considering further on UE location reporting options and making agreements based on Working Assumptions.
* Oppo (offline rapporteur) thinks both p11 and p12 have the pre-conditions “In case UE location information can be reported to network” and “If the content of TA reporting is UE location information” and this should already address the concerns

With rapporteur’s above explanation and clarification, following question is asked to check if company can agree to p11.

**Question 7: Can companies agree to proposal 11?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Disagree | Wait for SA3 response to discuss this. There is no need to agree on the proposal prematurely. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | Should be OK with the pre-condition. |
| Apple | Disagree | Agree with MediaTek. No need to build castles in the air before receiving SA3 input. |
| Xiaomi | Agree | 19:4 is clearly majority view. |
| Qualcomm | Agree but | It should be possible both are configured but UE should only report one at a time. |
| OPPO | Agree | For the sake of progress, we should agree this based on the pre-conditions. Note that even though we agree this proposal, we still can wait for SA3 response to reconsider. |
| ZTE | Agree but | In our understanding the TA report and location report is independent, NW shall be able to configure with any of them, including both. |
| LG | Disagree | Agree with MediaTek. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree | Whether to report the TA report or not is due to RRC configuration. |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | Agree with Rapporteur, SA3’s confirmation is needed and it is already included as pre-condition in the proposal (e.g. “In case UE location information can be reported to network”) |
| Ericsson | Disagree | The original question asked if UE location or UE specific TA information was reported via RRC or not. We think the configuration, and the report in RRC connected mode shall be made using RRC signalling.  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree | Allows discussion to progress and has pre-conditions in case SA3 has an issue. |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Disagree | We can wait for SA3 response. |
| NEC | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

13 out of 19 agree to P11. 6 companies disagree and want to wait for SA3 response.

**Proposal 11: (13/6) In case UE location information can be reported to network, RRC signaling is used to configure UE to report either the UE location or the UE specific TA information for the purpose of TA reporting.**

Proposal 12: (16/4) If the content of TA reporting is UE location information, reuse the TA-based trigger condition, i.e. when TA change between current UE-estimated TA and the last successfully reported TA is larger than network configured threshold.

* Ericsson would like to further discuss this
* Mediatek would like to flag this
* ZTE would like to flag this as well: so far RAN2 only agreed on two methods for location report, one is coarse location report in Msg5, and the other is MDT frame work based location report by OtherConfig. No explicit agreement has been made on event triggered location report. Considering the feasibility has not yet confirmed by SA3 as well, we prefer to avoid discussion on event triggered location report at this stage, and focus on resolving details on event triggered TA report.

Regarding ZTE’s concern on the feasibility pending SA3’s confirmation, rapporteur understands that P12 has a pre-condition “If the content of TA reporting is UE location information”. So SA3’s confirmation still applies here.

**Question 8: Can companies agree to proposal 12?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Disagree | Wait for SA3 response to discuss this. There is no need to agree on the proposal prematurely. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Apple | Disagree | See previous comment. |
| Xiaomi | Disagree | Wait for SA3 response first. And we think distance difference threshold instead of TA difference is much simpler from UE calculation point of view. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Content of TA reporting cannot be UE location. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Disagree | Wait for SA3 response. |
| OPPO | Agree | As replied on Question 7. |
| ZTE | Disagree | The feasibility of event triggered location report has not yet be confirmed and discussed. Therefore we think the discussion shall be postponed. |
| LG | Disagree | Wait for SA3 response. |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | Agree with ZTE. |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | Agree with Rapporteur, SA3’s confirmation is needed and it is already included as pre-condition in the proposal (e.g. “If the content of TA reporting is UE location information”) |
| Ericsson | Disagree | Agree with ZTE. |
| ASUSTeK | Disagree | The trigger condition for TA report with UE location information can be further discussed. |
| InterDigital | Agree | Agree with Nokia. The event is configured/triggered based on a need to update timing. Whether the UE’s TA or UE location information is used to perform that update shouldn’t matter. |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Disagree | Agree with ZTE |
| NEC | Agree | We are fine with the pre-condition. |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

7 out of 19 agree to P12. 12 companies disagree and want to wait for SA3 response.

**Proposal 12bis: (12/7) Postpone discussion on the trigger condition for reporting UE location information and wait for SA3 response.**

Proposal 16: (23/0) K-mac is included in the new SIB, e.g. the one carrying satellite ephemeris and/or common TA.

* Ericsson would like to postpone and treated together for Kmac, cell-specific Koffset, ephemeris and common TA because the update frequencies are not yet decided by RAN1/RAN2, for example it seems RAN1 have assumed ephemeris and common TA is in the same SIB but ephemeris may change much slower than common TA thus they may be suitable in different SIBs
* Oppo (offline rapporteur) notes the wording “K-mac is included in the new SIB, e.g. the one carrying satellite ephemeris and/or common TA” does not exclude the case Ericsson mentioned. Or is it acceptable to reformulate the proposal as “K-mac is not carried in SIB1”?

With above explanation, can companies agree to P16?

**Question 9: Can companies agree to proposal 16?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Apple | Disagree | We can postpone this discussion until we have a clear understanding of the contents of information to be broadcast (Kmac, Koffset, ephemeris, common TA) and their periodicity requirements. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree | This can be working assumption to further look. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree  |  |
| Samsung  | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree, but | If companies have concern on this, we are also fine to postpone it to wait for further RAN1 conclusions. |
| Ericsson | Disagree | Postpone until info size and info update frequencies are known for all the broadcasted quantities.  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Disagree | We need a clear understanding of the contents of the information |
| NEC | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

16 out of 20 agree to P16. 4 companies want to postpone discussion until RAN2 has a clear view on the contents of the information.

**Proposal 16: (16/4) K-mac is included in the new SIB, e.g. the one carrying satellite ephemeris and/or common TA.**

Proposal 17: (17/4) Do not introduce additional enhancement on BSR over 2-step RACH.

* QC would like to flag p17. Unless it is clarified that network will provide configuration such that UE will not have both SR and 2 step RACH to send BSR triggered by a LCH, p17 is incomplete.
* Oppo (offline rapporteur) thinks that in the current MAC spec, as long as SR is available for a LCH, 2-step RACH will not be triggered for sending BSR unless SR max is reached. The intention of P17 is that any enhancement is not pursued even when both SR and 2-step RACH are configured to the UE.
* Nokia shares the understanding from OPPO that SR (for a LCH) can be configured with 2-step RACH while 2-step RACH will not be triggered for sending BSR unless SR max is reached. Nokia proposes to revise the proposal as: “(modified) P17: Do not introduce additional enhancement on BSR over 2-step RACH in Rel-17.”

With above clarification, can companies agree to Nokia’s modified p17bis?

**Proposal 17bis: Do not introduce additional enhancement on BSR over 2-step RACH in Rel-17.**

**Question 10: Can companies agree to proposal 17bis?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree  | In that case, we prefer:In NTN, no specification change is needed to send BSR over 2 step RACH. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree  |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree | We are ok to discuss this in next release.  |
| Nokia | Agree | As commented in phase-1, current specification to support BSR over 2-step RACH will overload 4-step RACH in the case UE’s RSRP is below the threshold. This will be even worse with more and more UE served in the cell. It is fine to leave the enhancements to be considered in later release.  |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Agree |  |
| NEC | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

All companies agree to P17bis.

**Proposal 17bis: (19/0) Do not introduce additional enhancement on BSR over 2-step RACH in Rel-17.**

Proposal 18: (20/1) UE should stop ra-ContentionResolutionTimer once receiving PDCCH which schedules Msg3 retransmission and then start ra-ContentionResolutionTimer after the end of the Msg3 retransmission plus UE-Gnb RTT.

* Nokia would like to further discuss this as P18 implicitly adds a restriction to NW implementation. The blind scheduling of MSG3 retransmissions is not possible since the contention resolution timer is stopped immediately after UE receiving one Msg3 retx grant. This really limits the scheduling flexibility for NW. If the proposal is agreed, the delay of the RA procedure may be increased a lot considering the long RTT in NTN as the Msg3 retx can only be scheduled after another UE-Gnb RTT.

Rapporteur understands that for Msg3’s initial transmission scheduling, RAN2 has already agreed that UE starts the CR timer after the Msg1 transmission plus UE-Gnb RTT, and during this UE-Gnb RTT timer, UE is not required to monitor PDCCH, which means that blind scheduling of Msg3 retransmissions is not expected from the NW. The same logic should apply for the subsequent Msg3 retransmissions, i.e. no blind scheduling of Msg3 retransmission is expected.

**Question 11: Can companies agree to proposal 18?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree, but | If companies have concern on this, we can accept making the proposal as an FFS. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree  |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Disagree, FFS for further discussion. | We don’t see the motivation to disable a legacy function (i.e. blind Msg3 retransmission scheduling) in NTN which is supported in TN from legacy (both LTE and NR). With the proposal, the NW can only *schedule the Msg3 retx one by one after every UE-gNB RTT*. Considering the long RTT in NTN and possible coverage issue due to wide coverage of NTN cells, the blind scheduling of MSG3 retransmission would be even more beneficial to reduce the delay of the RA procedure and improve the RACH successful rate.For Rapporteur’s argument on initial Msg3 transmission where no blind retransmission is expected from the NW, this is only appliable for **initial** Msg3 transmission where NW has no knowledge of the decoding result and coverage issues. It is different from the case we discussed here where Msg3 dmiecoding is failed in NW and there are inevitable Msg3 retransmissions. So, the logic is not the same.For the issue of contention resolution timer expired during UE-gNB RTT to wait for the next Contention Resolution timer restart, UE knows there is a future CR timer restart triggered by current Msg3 retransmission, could simply say the UE does not consider contention resolution failure for such case since there has been MSG3 retransmitted. So we agree with Huawei and prefer to put it as “*FFS how to handle contention resolution timer expired during UE-gNB RTT to wait for the next Contention Resolution timer restart*”. |
| Ericsson | Agree, but fine to postpone the discussion or add FFS  |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree | If companies have concern on coverage issue, we are fine to further discuss how to handle the Contention Resolution timer for Msg3 retransmission. Proposal 18 could be modified such as: “The handling of ra-ContentionResolutionTimer expiry during UE-gNB RTT after Msg3 retransmission should be considered. FFS if UE stops ra-ContentionResolutionTimer once receiving UL grant for Msg3 retransmission and then starts ra-ContentionResolutionTimer after the end of the Msg3 retransmission plus UE-gNB RTT.” |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Agree but | If companies have concern on this, it’ll be FFS |
| NEC | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree but fine with FFS too |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

19 out of 20 agree to P18, and 4 among them are also ok to keep it FFS. One company disagree to P18 and want to further discuss it.

**Proposal 18: (19/5) UE should stop ra-ContentionResolutionTimer once receiving PDCCH which schedules Msg3 retransmission and then start ra-ContentionResolutionTimer after the end of the Msg3 retransmission plus UE-gNB RTT.**

Proposal 13: (11/9) RAN2 further discuss whether SR/RACH should be triggered when TA reporting has been triggered but there is no available UL-SCH resources for TA reporting.

**Question 12: Do companies agree that SR/RACH should be triggered when TA reporting has been triggered but there is no available UL-SCH resources for TA reporting?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Disagree | TA report is only necessary if there is data to transmit, which would trigger SR/RACH anyways, so there is no need to trigger SR/RACH separately. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | During Phase-1 discussion, some companies think that if there is UL data, SR will be triggered anyway and if not, TA reporting is not needed. However we think even if there is not UL data for now, TA should be reported as soon as possible. Otherwise, when UL data arrives, UE specific TA may already have changed too much. SR transmission is not possible anymore and RACH will be triggered. This will bring large latency to data transmission and should be avoided. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree | It is also needed for DL data arrival to enhance PDSCH to HARQ-ACK timing relationship. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree | In order to avoid the impact on UL/DL transmission, SR/RACH should be triggered for TA reporting as soon as possible to help NW to configure new UE-specific K-offset. Regarding MediaTek, we think TA report is also necessary for DL reception. This is because TA report is used for NW to configure K-offset, and DL scheduling will also use K-offset. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree  |  |
| Samsung | Disagree | TA reporting is mainly for UL scheduling. We share same view as MediaTek. When UE-specific K\_offset is not configured or out-dated, cell-specific K\_offset can always be used to adjust timing relationship. For PDSCH to HARQ-ACK timing relationship, NW can also adjust timing by K1.  |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | Agree with MediaTek. |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Disagree | Agree with Samsung. |
| Ericsson | Disagree | Postpone until decided if RRC or MAC CE reporting is used. Waste of time to discuss before that. If RRC is used for the report, then a Regular BSR will be triggered and an SR if no grant is available – no spec change needed for this. If MAC CE is used, then we have a similar view as Samsung. In case gNB did not get a TA report for a long time it may adapt k1/k2 so that the UE can send any UL data/feedback with sufficient processing time even with an outdated UE specific Koffset!  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree | We are fine to go with majority. |
| InterDigital | Neutral |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Disagree | Agree with Samsung |
| NEC | Agree | TA report is essential for DL scheduling so the UE should report it as soon as possible, using SR if necessary. |
| Sequans | Disagree | Same view as Ericsson |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

12 out of 20 agree that SR/RACH should be triggered. 7 companies disagree. 1 company is neutral.

**Proposal 13bis: (13/8) SR/RACH should be triggered when TA reporting has been triggered but there is no available UL-SCH resources for TA reporting.**

Proposal 14: (14/7) do not start or restart the timeAlignmentTimer after UE reports its TA.

**Question 13: Do companies agree that the timeAlignmentTimer is not started/restarted after UE reports its TA?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Additional comments** |
| MediaTek | Agree | It seems that the TA report is not as accurate as the TA command due to the RAN1 agreement that the granularity of the TA report will be at slot level, so TAT should not be started/restarted. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | During the Phase-1 discussion, some companies have a concern that TA reporting cannot assure common TA synchronization. But for common TA parameters, RAN1 has already agreed on another timer, i.e. validity timer. So as long as the validity timer is running, the common TA is assumed synchronized between gNB and UE. For the accuracy concern: the start/restart of TAT upon TA reporting can prevent the TAT from running out shortly after TA is reported which will lead to unnecessary UL resource release and RACH triggering. Once TA report is received, the NW can send TA MAC CE for finer UL synchronization. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree | TAT should be controlled by the closed loop TA update. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Disagree | In NTN, UE’s TA is updated by NW via TAC MAC CE and by UE through TA pre-compensation. When NW adjusts UE’s TA via TAC MAC CE, i.e. TA communication from NW to UE, timeAlignmentTimer is restarted. Similarly, when UE reports its TA, i.e. TA communication from UE to NW, UE should also restart the timeAlignmentTimer. Otherwise, to avoid timeAlignmentTimer running out too soon, it has to unnecessarily rely on TAC MAC CE to keep UE synchronized even though UE has not lost synchronization, which would lead to unnecessary big ignaling overhead. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree  |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | TAT timer should not be (re)started after UE reports its TA information. Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Turkcell | Agree |  |
| NEC | Agree |  |
| Sequans | Agree |  |

**[Rapporteur summary]:**

17 companies think that the timeAlignmentTimer is not started/restarted after UE reports its TA. 2 companies hold the opposite views.

**Proposal 14: (17/2) Do not start or restart the timeAlignmentTimer after UE reports its TA.**

# 5. Phase-2 summary and proposals

This section summarizes the discussion and reports the following proposals:

*For easy agreements:*

**Proposal 17bis: (19/0) Do not introduce additional enhancement on BSR over 2-step RACH in Rel-17.**

*For further discussion:*

**Proposal 1: (18/2) Regarding the content of TA reporting during RACH, RAN2 further discuss between the following two options:**

* **Option 1: Full TA (i.e., T\_TA as defined in the UE’s TA formula)**
* **Option 2: UE’s service link TA (i.e., NTA, UE-specific as defined in the UE’s TA formula)**

**FFS for TA reporting during connected mode.**

**Proposal 6: (18/2) RAN2 further discuss the exact priority of the TA report MAC CE between “C-RNTI MAC CE or data from UL-CCCH” and “MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding”.**

**Proposal 7ter: (12/8) TA reporting during RACH in connected mode is not controlled by the enable/disable indication configured in SI.**

**Proposal 8: (18/2) RAN2 confirm the working assumption that if the reported content of information about UE specific TA is TA pre-compensation value in connected mode, MAC CE is used to report.**

**Proposal 9: (15/4) Do not introduce additional parameters, e.g. hysteresis and time to trigger, to define the trigger event for TA reporting.**

**Proposal 10: (16/4) Other than event-triggered TA reporting, no more triggers are introduced for TA reporting in connected mode.**

**Proposal 11: (13/6) In case UE location information can be reported to network, RRC signaling is used to configure UE to report either the UE location or the UE specific TA information for the purpose of TA reporting.**

**Proposal 12bis: (12/7) Postpone discussion on the trigger condition for reporting UE location information and wait for SA3 response.**

**Proposal 13bis: (13/8) SR/RACH should be triggered when TA reporting has been triggered but there is no available UL-SCH resources for TA reporting.**

**Proposal 14: (17/2) Do not start or restart the timeAlignmentTimer after UE reports its TA.**

**Proposal 16: (16/4) K-mac is included in the new SIB, e.g. the one carrying satellite ephemeris and/or common TA.**

**Proposal 18: (19/5) UE should stop ra-ContentionResolutionTimer once receiving PDCCH which schedules Msg3 retransmission and then start ra-ContentionResolutionTimer after the end of the Msg3 retransmission plus UE-gNB RTT.**
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