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# Introduction

This document captures the outcome of the following email discussion:

* [Post123bis][302][IoT-NTN Enh] 36.331 running CR (Huawei)

Scope: running CR update and list of open issues

Intended outcome:

* + - * + Endorsed running CR
        + List of open issues to be addressed by company Tdocs

Deadline: Long

|  |
| --- |
| \*\*\* Detailed scope for all e-mail discussions on running CRs and open issues \*\*\*  1.     Update the running CR with agreements from the meeting  2.     Rapporteur to propose resolutions for straightforward open issues which can already be included in the running CR  3.     For Stage 3 running CRs, get input on stage-3 issues that require further input from companies to make a decision:   * Focus on stage-3 issues which are better handled via offline, e.g. signaling details, parameter values/ranges, NOT functionality discussion. For these issues, if any, the CR rapporteur should submit a separate report with proposals to the next meeting by the submission deadline, while input via company Tdocs should be avoided   4.     Identify the remaining open issues that need to be solved for WI completion in the next meeting:   * Company Tdocs for the next meeting should focus on these issues |

For RRC running CR review, please insert your comments (using bubble comments) to the draft CR.

In this document, please share your views on:

1. Some stage-3 issues not involving functionality change (i.e. no company Tdocs on these issues);
2. The open issue list for the next meeting (i.e. company Tdocs are welcome).
3. Contact Information

To make it easier to find the contact delegate for potential follow-up questions, delegates are encouraged to provide their contact information in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Lili Zheng | zhenglili4@huawei.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Stage-3 issues handled offline

## Editor’s Notes

A new Clause 5.5.x on GNSS measurement triggering and reporting was added to the RRC running CR, and this Clause was referenced in the procedures related to MSG4 reception and *RRCConnectionReconfiguration* reception.

It was commented by several companies during post-123 RRC CR review that the references are not needed, so an Editor’s Note was added:

Editor’s Note: The reference to 5.5.x can be revisited and removed if deemed not needed. Same to the reference to 5.5.x in 5.3.3.4a, 5.3.5.3, 5.3.5.4 and 5.3.7.5.

Rapp clarification: Normally when an RRC configuration is provided, it needs to be clarified in the procedure text how to use this configuration. For instance, regarding legacy LTE measurements, Clause 5.5.2 on measurement configuration is referenced in *RRCConnectionReconfiguration* reception procedure; regarding R17 NB-IoT measurements in RRC\_CONNECTED, 5.5.8 is also referenced in msg4 reception procedures. Referring to 5.5.x in msg4 or Reconfiguration does not imply that the measurement behaviour is triggered right away after receiving msg4 or Reconfiguration, it is simply because the signalling for autonomous gap enabling (*gnss-AutonomousEnabled-r18*) is included in msg4 and Reconfiguration.

**Q1: Please share your views on whether the references to 5.5.x (in Section 5.3.3.4, 5.3.3.4a, 5.3.5.3, 5.3.5.4 and 5.3.7.5) should be removed:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes (removed)/**  **No (keep the references)** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Consequently, the Editor’s Note can be removed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Regarding SIBxx acquisition based on T317/T318, the following Editor’s Note was added because some companies want to make this behaviour optional and use a note instead:

|  |
| --- |
| 5.3.18 T317 expiry  The UE shall:  1> if in RRC\_CONNECTED:  2> inform lower layers that the UL synchronisation is lost;  2> start timer T318;  2> acquire *SystemInformationBlockType31* (*SystemInformationBlockType31-NB* in NB-IoT) as specified in 5.2.2;  2> acquire *SystemInformationBlockTypeXX* (*SystemInformationBlockTypeXX-NB* in NB-IoT) as specified in 5.2.2, if the UE determines validity duration of the neighbour satellite assistance information has expired;  Editor’s Note: FFS whether to make it an optional behaviour (i.e. up to UE to reacquire SIBxx). |

Rapp clarification: The issue lies in the wording “may” in the agreement in RAN2 #123 “*For re-acquisition of SIBXX the UE may rely on T317/T318 in connected mode*”. Some companies interpret it as an optional behaviour, but in my understanding this “may” is due to the fact that UE does not need to re-acquire SIBxx if it has not expired. We should have a clearly defined UE behaviour in the spec.

**Q2: Please share your views on whether the currently implementation of SIBxx reacquisition is ok:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes (removed the Editor’s Note)/**  **No (remove the procedure and use a note instead)** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

A related issue is how to solve the case where T318 is stopped before successful acquisition of SIBxx. In R17, T318 is stopped once SIB31 is acquired. During the online discussion, it seems that some companies do not want to introduce an additional timer for SIBxx acquisition, therefore the simplest solution could be: UE stops T318 when both SIB31 and SIBxx have been acquired.

**Q3: Do you agree with “UE stops T318 when both SIB31 and SIBxx have been acquired”:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Parameter values

The maximum number of neighbour satellites for which satellite assistance information is provided in SIBxx is still FFS.

maxSat-r18 INTEGER ::= ffsValue -- Maximum number of neighbour satellites

Rapp clarification: For BL UEs and UEs in CE, the maximum SIB and SI message size is 936 bits. For NB-IoT, the maximum SIB and SI message size is 680 bits. Based on rough calculation, the satellite assistance information (including ephemeris, common TA parameters, epochTime, Koffset and Kmac) is around 260 bits. Considering t-ServiceStartNeigh may also be put in SIBxx (as it is agreed to be per satellite) and further extensions, the maximum number of satellites for which assistance information can be provided in one SI is 3 for eMTC and 2 for NB-IoT if all optional fields are included. Based on this, we can use 4 as the maximum number for simplicity (in case some optional fields are not present).

**Q4: Do you agree with setting *maxSat-r18* as 4?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The value range of Satellite Id is also FFS.

The IE *SatelliteId* is used to identify the satellite assistance information of neighbour satellites.

***SatelliteId* information element**

-- ASN1START

SatelliteId-r18 ::= INTEGER (1.. ffsValue)

-- ASN1STOP

In R17, the satellite id in SIB32 has a value range from 0 to 255.

Rapp’s preference is to have the same value range as R17 (allowing 256 values), either “INTEGER (1..256)” or “INTEGER (0..255)”

**Q5: Please indicate your preference on the value range of *SatelliteId-r18*.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Value range** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | INTEGER (1..256) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Open issue list

* **GNSS**

**Issue 1-1: How to determine GNSS invalid (considering duration X and Y), this affects 1) condition for entering RRC\_IDLE, and 2) the start of autonomous gap**

Rapp clarification: This is related to the following agreement in RAN2 #123.

Editor’s Note: *Agreement*: If there is neither network aperiodically trigger nor network configuration of UE autonomously GNSS measurement, UE moves to RRC\_IDLE after GNSS becomes invalid. It’s FFS how to decide GNSS valid or invalid considering duration X and Y.

Options listed during the RAN2 #123bis offline discussion [1]:

* Option 1: It is up to RAN1 whether/how to decide GNSS validity duration considering X and Y.
* Option 2: Even if duration X is provided, the remaining GNSS validity duration keeps unchanged.
* Option 3: UE considers the GNSS position as outdated and goes to RRC\_IDLE, upon the expiry of X on top of the expiry of the GNSS validity duration.

Whether X is added to the GNSS validity duration also impacts how we capture the start of autonomous gap for GNSS measurement: whether the autonomous gap starts right after GNSS validity duration expiry or starts after duration X on top of GNSS validity duration expiry, as indicated in the following Editor’s Note:

Editor’s Note: FFS the start of autonomous gaps, e.g. “after X expires on top of GNSS validity duration expiry” or X is included within the GNSS validity duration. The exact X (and Y) is pending on RAN1 further discussion.

* **Mobility**

**Issue 2-1: Regarding RLF based measurement enhancements for eMTC UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED, which frequencies to measure (frequencies in *MeasObject*s, or frequencies in SIB, or both)**

Rapp clarification: RAN2 agreed to apply the RLF enhancements (time/location-based measurement initiation) to eMTC UEs as well. However, in the legacy spec, eMTC UEs are already capable of performing Connected mode measurements based on *MeasObject*s, it is unclear for the moment which frequencies to measure if time/location-based measurement initiation configuration is present in the SIB: whether the UE only measures frequencies in *MeasObject*s, or frequencies in SIB, or both.

For NB-IoT, I think it is straightforward to follow the R17 NB-IoT in TN that it is up to UE implementation which cells/carriers to be measured (agreements in RAN2 #115-e: “*Provision of information regarding which cells/carriers to be considered is not supported. It is up to UE implementation to choose and prioritize carrier/cell list for measurement.*”). But it would be good if a formal agreement is made also on NB-IoT.

**Issue 2-2: Whether time/location based CHO can be configured simultaneously for the same target cell**

Rapp clarification: In NR NTN, it was agreed in RAN2 #117 that “*Joint time-based and location-based CHO execution triggering for the same candidate cell is not supported in Rel-17 NTN.*” No online/offline discussion has been conducted so far for IoT NTN.

**Issue 2-3: Whether to allow joint configuration among time/location/RSRP-based measurements in RRC Idle/Connected, and if allowed, the intended UE behaviour**

Rapp clarification: In R17 NR NTN, the joint configuration of time and location based measurement initiation was discussed. Even though no clear conclusion was given, according to the TS 38.304, the procedures for time-based and location-based are defined independently and there is no restriction in the spec that they cannot be configured jointly. Therefore, the understanding is that, time-based and location based measurement initiation can be configured jointly, and if configured simultaneously, the UE starts measurement when either of the condition is satisfied. No online/offline discussion has been conducted so far for IoT NTN.

* **Discontinuous coverage**

**Issue 3-1: Whether to capture a note in RRC about “UE may directly go to RRC\_IDLE after RLF is triggered, if there is not enough time for the UE to finish the procedure of RRC re-establishment due to the discontinuous coverage”**

Rapp clarification: This is currently captured as an Editor’s Note in Clause 5.3.11.3:

Editor’s Note: *Agreement*: RAN2 understands that UE may directly go to RRC\_IDLE after RLF is triggered, if there is not enough time for the UE to finish the procedure of RRC re-establishment due to the discontinuous coverage (FFS whether this needs to be captured in the specs, e.g. a NOTE)

**Q6: Companies are welcome to provide comments on the open issues identified above (detailed technical discussion can be provided in company Tdoc to the next meeting, here we focus on whether the open issue list is reasonable/justified).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Open issue** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Q7: Do you think anything essential for WI completion is missed? Please elaborate on the missing issues if any.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Open issue** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion

To be completed
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