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# 1 Introduction

This document is aimed at providing the open issues, related to Discontinuous Coverage, submitted in R2-2202053 [1] in IoT-NTN, identify potential agreements, alternatives, and further enhancements. This is also available in OI 3.1 ~ OI 3.4 under Section 9.2.3.1 of R2-117-e Agenda v3.docx.

* [Pre117-e][013][IOT-NTN] Discontinuous Coverage Open Issues Input (MediaTek)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Delegate Contact |
| MediaTek | Abhishek Roy (Abhishek.Roy@mediatek.com) |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 2 Discussion

RAN2 agreements related to IoT NTN’s Discontinuous Coverage are mentioned below.

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN2 115-e [2]**1. RAN2 confirms that the following will be supported: discontinuous coverage without excessive UE power consumption and without excessive failures / recovery actions. It is expected that this need to be taken into account at least for Idle mode. The requirement is applicable for all reference scenarios (GEO, MEO and LEO).
2. Sattelite assistance information will be used by the UE for predicting coverage discontinuity. The details of the assistance information is FFS. FFS whether any applicable agreements made in NR-NTN can be reused.
3. The details of UEs actions when predicted to be out of coverage is FFS, e.g., stopping unnecessary cell search in the Idle mode, and FFS to what extent this need to be specified.
4. It is FFS to what extent it needs to be specified the details of UE’s prediction of discontinuous coverage and its ability to detect when it is back in coverage.
5. RAN2 sends an LS to SA2 and CT1 (cc: RAN3) for the possible alignment work in their specification due to the support of discontinuous coverage.
 |
| **RAN2 116-e [3]**1. Satellite Ephemeris Parameters (not same as for L1 pre-compensation, for the constellation, not just single satellite) is needed for the UE for predicting coverage discontinuity. Other info, e.g., beam info, elevation angle, reference location or corresponding is FFS.
2. Providing the start-time of (incoming) satellite’s coverage and end-time of serving satellite’s coverage is needed for Quasi-Earth Fixed satellites.
3. From RAN2 point of view, the existing power saving mechanisms e.g., DRX, PSM, eDRX, relaxed monitoring, and WUS can be reused in IoT-NTN. Minor enhancements in existing power saving mechanisms to support discontinuous coverage is FFS.
 |
| **RAN2 116bis-e [4]**1. The contents of the ephemeris / assistance info for non-continuous coverage:

Confirm that we Reuse the satellite ephemeris orbital parameters, already agreed for UL pre-compensation, for multiple satellites (Ref L1 params from R1). 1. FFS on the maximum number of satellites, whose ephemeris information will be provided.
2. FFS whether avg ephemeris (using same format as instant) + alamanc can be used (Gatehouse Proposal)
3. FFS how to signal this (new SIB for this particular purpose, dedicated signalling).
4. FFS if to introduce additional new parameters like satellite footprint reference point on ground, satellite coverage radius etc.
 |

3.1 Number of Satellites Considered

In RAN2 #116-e it was agreed that satellite ephemeris parameters “for the constellation, not just single satellite” is needed for the UE for predicting coverage discontinuity. Hence, for providing the UE with sufficient information, there should be an upper bound of the maximum number satellites. The joint contribution in R2-2200623 [5] has suggested that ephemeris information of up to 5 satellites are sufficient for the UE to predict the coverage discontinuity with a good accuracy. Hence, based on this discussion, the rapporteur ass the following question:

**Question 1: Do companies agree that five is a reasonable number for the maximum number of satellites whose ephemeris information will be provided? Please provide an alternative number and associated comments and arguments for disagreement.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree / Disagree | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

3.2 Sharing of Satellite Ephemeris Information

Once the ephemeris information is finalized, the next step is to determine how to provide this information to the UEs. This information can be provided either using a new SIB [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11] or dedicated RRC Signalling [5] as well. The advantage of using RRC signalling lies in the relative easiness of signalling modifications and updates in future releases. Hence, based on this discussion, the rapporteur asks the following proposal:

**Question 2: Companies are requested to mention their preference for providing this ephemeris information between the two options mentioned below:**

* **Option-1: Using a new SIB.**
* **Option-2: Dedicated RRC Signalling.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option-1 / Option-2 | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

3.3 Using Average Ephemeris and Almanac Information

During RAN2 116bis-e [4] it was discussed that instead of using instantaneous ephemeris information across multiple satellites, it will be better to use an average ephemeris and almanac information. However, the size and feasibility of specifying almanac needs to be taken into account. Hence, based on the discussion during RAN2 116bs-e, the rapporteur asks the following question:

**Question 3: Companies are requested to mention their preference for using this average ephemeris and Almanac information between the options given below:**

* **Option-1: Use only average ephemeris across multiple satellites.**
* **Option-2: Use average ephemeris and almanac across multiple satellites.**
* **Option-3: Do not use average ephemeris and almanac, rely only on instantaneous ephemeris of multiple satellites.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option-1 / Option-2 / Option-3 | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

3.4 UE Behaviour in Discontinuous Coverage

UE behaviour during discontinuous coverage is discussed in RAN2 116bis-e [4]. The options for UE behaviour can be broadly classified into two categories:

1. UE’s behaviour during the coverage discontinuity is left on UE implementation [6], [7], [13].
2. Specify UE behaviour during discontinuous coverage [8], [10], [12], [14]. This includes maintaining AS states, running related timers and informing NAS about coverage discontinuity etc.

Hence, the rapporteur raises the following question:

**Question 4: Regarding UE behaviour in Discontinuous Coverage companies are requested to mention their preference between the two options mentioned below:**

* **Option-1: Leaving UE behaviour during discontinuous coverage on UE Implementation**
* **Option-2: Specify UE behaviour (maintaining AS states, running related timers and informing NAS) during discontinuous coverage.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option-1 / Option-2 | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 5 Conclusion

**<Will be updated after companies’ responses>**
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