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# Introduction

This document is to summarize the following offline discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| * [Post116bis-e][089][IoT NTN] Open Issues (Mediatek)

 Scope: Determine if Company input by Pre117-e discussions shall be used, and how many / which Pre-discussions shall be done. Capture Open Issues not captured in the CR email discussions and suggest how to treat. [After finalization, Merge open issues from other discussions into a WI OI list (OI for which company input is invited in some way shall be listed in the WI-list).  Intended outcome: Open Issues list, and organization of Pre117-e Company input discussions for the WI.  Deadline: Short.  |

NOTE: Each open issue should be associated with suggested treatment/handling.

1.       Company input into Pre117-e-offline (i.e. no company tdocs)

2.       Company tdocs invited.

3.       CR rapporteur handled issue (CR rapporteur will propose resolution as input to next meeting).

4.       Other, e.g., immature area, reference to dependency, unclear status etc.

NOTE: Some open issues may overlap with the discussions for running CRs. The WI rapporteur will merge the open issues into one list in the end.

**Contact information**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Name <email> |
| MediaTek | Abhishek Roy <Abhishek.Roy@mediatek.com>y |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  | odile Rollin(odile.rollinger@huawei.com)  |
| ZTE | lu.ting@zte.com.cn |
| Apple | Pavan Nuggehalli, pnuggehalli@apple.com |
|  |  |

# **Discussion**

## **User Plane – Open Issues**

It has been agreed in RAN2 116bis-e

|  |
| --- |
| * Introduce a new MAC CE for provision of UE specific K\_offset and the size is fixed to 1 byte. FFS on the MAC CE’s name.
 |

OI 1.1a [Pre117-e-offline] Decide on a suitable name for the MAC CE corresponding K\_Offset.

OI 1.1b [Pre117-e-offline] Decide on a suitable name for the UE-specific TA Report MAC CE.

OI 1.2 [Pre117-e-offline]: How to extend SR-Prohibit Timer in IoT-NTN?

O1 1.3 [Pre117-e-offline]: How to extend RLC t-Reordering in IoT NTN?

O1 1.4 [Pre117-e-offline]: Decide whether to use LCID or eLCID for UE-specific TA Report MAC CE.

O1 1.5 [Pre117-e-offline]: Decide whether to use LCID or eLCID for MAC CE corresponding K\_Offset.

**Q1: Do companies agree with the open issues, listed above, for User Plane in IoT-NTN?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | 1.1a(Y/N) | 1.1b(Y/N) | 1.2(Y/N) | 1.3(Y/N) | 1.4(Y/N) | 1.5(Y/N) | Comments |
| Ericsson | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** |  |
| Huawei,HiSilicon | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | For 1a, 1b. we need also specify the contents.  |
| ZTE | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | Agree with HW |
| OPPO | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | Agree with HW |
| Nokia | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | Fine to add OI 1.6 to OI 1.8 as proposed by ZTE |

## **Control Plane – Open Issues**

OI 2.1 [Pre117-e-offline]: Decide on the contents of the new NTN-specific SIB.

OI 2.2 [Company Tdocs invited]: Define a new barring bit for NTN UEs barring.

OI 2.3 [Company Tdocs invited]: Decide on Location Reporting by NAS and Coarse location report.

**Q2: Do companies agree with the open issues, listed above, for Control Plane in IoT-NTN?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | 2.1(Y/N) | 2.2(Y/N) | 2.3(Y/N) | Comments |
| Ericsson | **N** | **N** | **Y** | 2.1 – we have already introduced most content – what else is there to decide on? If anything else is needed we can address via company tdocs. 2.2 Should be decided as pre117-e-offline as the decision is yes/no and there are many companies who have the same view on how it should be implemented. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **N** | **N** | **Y** | 2.1 – agree with E/// 2.2 – agree with E/// |
| ZTE | **N** | **N** | **Y** | 2.1 – agree with E/// 2.2 – agree with E/// |
| Qualcomm | **N** | **Y** | **Y** | For 2.1, we can also wait what RAN1 replies on the content for NR NTN.For 2.2, we doubt we can decide the details via offline. |
| Apple | **Y** | **N** | **Y** | We agree that SIB content is mostly decided, but think there is benefit in consolidating views in pre117-e-offline. On 2.2, we agree with E///. |
| OPPO | **N** | **N** | **Y** | 2.2 – agree with E/// |
| Nokia | **N** | **N** | **Y** | We think below two issues should be discussed:OI 2.X [Company Tdocs invited]: FFS whether anything additional is needed if validity timer for UL synchronization expired.OI 2.Y [Pre117-e-offline]: Define the RRC signalling to report GNSS validity duration to NW according to R1-2112848. |

## **Discontinuous Coverage – Open Issues**

OI 3.1 [Pre117-e-offline]: Decide on the maximum number of satellites, whose ephemeris (assistance) information will be provided.

OI 3.2 [Pre117-e-offline]: How to signal this information (new SIB for this purpose or dedicated signaling)?

OI 3.3 [Pre117-e-offline]: Decide if average ephemeris and almanac information will be useful to the UE for estimating discontinuous coverage.

O1 3.4 [Pre117-e-offline]: What will be the UE behavior on receiving this ephemeris information?

O1 3.5 [Company Tdocs Invited]: Decide on whether additional new parameters like satellite footprint reference point on ground, satellite coverage radius can be used?

**Q3: Do companies agree with the open issues, listed above, for Discontinuous Coverage?**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | 3.1(Y/N) | 3.2(Y/N) | 3.3(Y/N) | 3.4(Y/N) | 3.5(Y/N) | Comments |
| Ericsson | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **N** | **Y** | Company tdocs invited for 3.4.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **N** | **Y** | 3.4: we assume no specified behaviour, up to UE implementation (assistance information) |
| ZTE | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | Fine to discuss 3.4 via Pre117-e-offline |
| Qualcomm | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | For 3.5, we are puzzled, for fixed cell, it is agreed additional information like upcoming satellite start time.But why 3.5 is problem for moving cell. This (3.5 beam information) is needed only for moving cell. |
| Apple | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | For 3.4, we have the same view as Huawei. |
| OPPO | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** | **N** | **Y** | For 3.4, it may need to discuss based on companies’ Tdocs. In our understanding, it could be at least divided into two parts which could be discussed, respectively:OI 3.4.1 How UE to predict discontinuous coverage based on assistance info?OI 3.4.2 What will be the UE behaviour when UE becomes out of coverage / in coverage? |
| Nokia | **Y** | **N** | **N** | **N** | **Y** | Company tdoc invited for 3.2 and 3.3.For 3,2, We are not sure how dedicated signalling works since it is only for RRC Connected mode. For 3.3, it is not clear how this will help in predicting coverage. |

## **Remaining UE Capabilities**

OI 4.1 [Company Tdocs Invited]: UE capability for supporting soft-switching procedure

OI 4.2 [Company Tdocs Invited]: UE capability for supporting PUR Timer modifications

OI 4.3 [Company Tdocs Invited]: Reuse of the existing CHO capability indication for IoT-NTN CHO

**Q4: Do companies agree with the open issues, listed above, for UE capabilities for IoT-NTN topics?**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | 4.1(Y/N) | 4.2(Y/N) | 4.3(Y/N) | Comments |
| Ericsson | **N** | **Y** | **Y** | Clarify what is meant by 4.1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** |  |
| Qualcomm | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** |  |
| Apple | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** |  |
| OPPO | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** |  |
| Nokia | **Y** | **Y** | **Y** |  |

# Conclusion

It is proposed to discuss and decide on the following proposals:

# Reference