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# Introduction

This document is to kick off the following offline discussion.

* [Post119bis-e][114][NR NTN] LS on validity of assistance information (Oppo)

 Scope: Discuss a possible revision of the LS to RAN1

 Intended outcome: LS to RAN1

 Deadline (for companies' feedback): Thursday 2022-10-20 16:00 UTC

Deadline (for LS in R2-2211047): Friday 2022-10-21 10:00 UTC

# 2. Contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Delegate contact |
| COMPANY\_NAME | NAME (email@address.com) |
| Ericsson | robert.s.karlsson AT ericsson.com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Discussion

The current draft CR is based on the vice-chair’s wording suggestions.

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Overall Description:**Regarding RAN1’s agreement on serving cell’s Epoch time referring to the current SFN or the next upcoming SFN after the frame where the message indicating the Epoch time is received, RAN2 has discussed and thinks that there could be an issue with latency (e.g. for initial access) when Epoch time points to a future time and validity timer has not started. To solve this issue, RAN2 kindly requests RAN1 to provide feedback on whether:1. backwards propagation of satellite assistance information is needed, or
2. it can be ensured that Epoch time for serving cell will always refer to a frame nearest to the frame where the message indicating the Epoch time is received (RAN1 to evaluate which RAN1 changes would be needed for this), or
3. this can be addressed by setting the Epoch time properly by the network (i.e. no spec changes).

**2. Actions:****To RAN1****ACTION:** RAN2 kindly requests RAN1 to provide feedback to the above questions. |

**Question 1: Is the content in the draft CR acceptable to you? If not, please share your comments or wording suggestions.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Additional comments** |
| Ericsson | Absolutely not | There has been no agreement in RAN1 nor RAN2 if ephemeris is valid or not valid before the epoch time. “RAN2 has discussed and thinks that there could be an issue with latency (e.g. for initial access) when Epoch time points to a future time and the assistance information is not considered to be valid before the Epoch time.”Point 2 is about enabling indicating an epoch time in the past, but it proposes one way to do this (and it’s a bad way, using nearest frame effectively removes half of the signalled epoch times, the ones in the future). RAN1 can decide themselves how epoch in the past can be enable. Important is that this works for implicit and explicit epoch time. We propose: 1. Epoch time for serving cell can be indicated in the past

Point 3 is not a solution to the latency introduced when epoch time is in the future, it shall be removed. We prefer not sending an LS if anything like point 3 is included.  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We think the point 3 is the key regardless of solution. The network knows how many repetitions of SI message it plans and can set the epoch time appropriately just after the last repetition within SI window.So, we do not agree to change the current text in the draft. In our understanding anyway RAN1 would be discussing this and reach a conclusion regardless of RAN2 LS.Backward propagation means not only for ephemeris, but it also means for common TA parameters which could be problematic. |
| OPPO | Yes | We understand the current text is a good compromise as it includes companies’ proposals raised in RAN2 (including BP’s support). We should try to progress with this LS to RAN1 otherwise there is risk that the issue will stay unresolved. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 4. Summary and Proposals

To be updated…