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# Introduction

This document aims to collect companies’ views for the following offline discussion to complete the MAC correction CR on IoT NTN.

* [Post125][307][NR-NTN Enh] 36.321 CR (Mediatek)

 Scope: draft a MAC CR with meeting agreements

 Intended outcome: Agreed CR

 Deadline for agreed CR (in R2-2401596): short

# 2. Contact information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Delegate contact |
| COMPANY\_NAME | NAME (email@address.com) |
| Qualcomm | Bharat Shrestha (bshrestha@qti.qualcomm.com) |
| vivo | Yitao Mo/Stephen (yitao.mo@vivo.com) |
| OPPO | Haitao Li (lihaitao@oppo.com) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Xubin (xubin10@huawei.com) |
| Nokia | Ping Yuan(Ping.1.Yuan@nokia-sbell.com) |
| CATT | Xiao XIAO (xiaoxiao@catt.cn) |
| ZTE | Lu Ting (lu.ting@zte.com.cn) |
| Ericsson | robert s karlsson (at) ericsson com |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Discussion

## 3.1 Alt1 or Alt1-a

RAN1 has provided options on when timeAlignmentTimer is not infinity how the UL transmission extension is updated and ask RAN2 to select.

[R2-2401925](file:///C%3A%5C%5CData%5C%5C3GPP%5C%5CRAN2%5C%5CInbox%5C%5CR2-2401925.zip%22%20%5Co%20%22C%3AData3GPPRAN2InboxR2-2401925.zip) LS on improved GNSS operations in Rel-18 IoT NTN (R1-2401754; contact: Mediatek) RAN1 LS in Rel-18 IoT\_NTN\_enh-Core To:RAN2

RAN1 has discussed the end of duration X when timeAlignmentTimer is not infinity for improved GNSS operations and made the conclusion on the following:

|  |
| --- |
| AgreementSend an LS to RAN2 with the following:From RAN1 perspective, when timeAlignmentTimer is not infinity, the following alternatives were considered, and it is up to RAN2 to specify:* + Alt-1: the end of X should be at the point where new timer ULTransmissionExtentionTimer expires and ULTransmissionExtentionTimer is reset with length equal to remaining timeAlignmentTimer every time when a MAC CE (to be defined by RAN2) is received
	+ Alt-1a: the end of X should be at the point where new timer ULTransmissionExtentionTimer expires and ULTransmissionExtentionTimer is set to remaining timeAlignmentTimer at the start point of X and ULTransmissionExtentionTimer is reset with length equal to configured timeAlignmentTimer value every time when a MAC CE (to be defined by RAN2) is received
	+ Alt-2: the end of X should be at the point where timeAlignmentTimer expires and timeAlignmentTimer is reset every time when a legacy MAC TAC is received

Note 1: It is up to RAN2 to decide whether the MAC CE is the legacy TAC or a new TAC or a new MAC CE.Note 2: It is up to RAN2 to implement the above behaviour based on new timer, existing timer, or by extending GNSS validity.Note 3: For Alt-1a, from RAN1 perspective, eNB should be able to update TA without extending X |

* We no longer consider Alt2 and continue the discussion between Alt1 and Alt 1a as part [Post125][307] (if there is no consensus we will come back in the next meeting)
* **Noted**

In terms of the MAC CE Type, RAN2 has made the following agreement:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreements:****1. Legacy TAC MAC CE shall not be used for UL transmission extension timer T390 restart. We introduce a new zero-byte MAC CE only to extend X.** |

Therefore, the rapporteur would like to collect the preference of options beside the type of MAC CE. From rapporteur’s understanding, the difference between Alt-1 and Alt-1a is the length of extension timer while restarting. Alt-1 is reset to the **remaining timeAlignmentTimer** while the Alt-1a is reset to **configured timeAlignmentTimer.**

In summry, rapporteur understanding start/restart of T390 as below:

TAT is finite

* At the start of X, T390 is started with **Remaining** TAT time
* Alt-1: T390 is restarted with **Remaining** TAT time every time new MAC CE received
* Alt-1a: T390 is restarted with **Configured** TAT time every time new MAC CE received

TAT is infinite

* At the start of X, T390 is started with **Configured** value (Y)
* T390 is restarted with **Configured** value (Y) the new MAC CE received

The Question is

* TAT is finite, NW send both legacy TAC MAC CE + New MAC CE in one TB, The UE should process legacy TAC MAC CE first.

**Q1: Beside the type of MAC CE, which option do you prefer, Alt-1 or Alt-1a?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Alt-1 or Alt-1a** | **Comments** |
| MediaTek | Alt-1 | It can keep the TAT and T390 aligned |
| Qualcomm |  | We just prefer what we have in TS 36.321 v18.0.1.For TAT < infinity, it is remnaing time of the TAT.For TAT = infinity, it is RRC configured value ul-TransmissionExtensionValue.Why are we even wasting time here for something RAN2 already implemented.  |
| vivo | Alt-1 | We would to have a unified solution for each duration X extension. It is simpler. |
| OPPO | Alt-1 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt-1a | After some further thinking, we think it make more not much sense with Alt-1. Let’s see an example:At T1, GNSS expires: T390 starts and equals to TAT remaining=2s.At T1+1s: TAT remaining=1s, T390=1sAt this time, if a new MAC CE is received to restart T390, it makes no sense T390 still equals to 1s (same as if the MAC CE is not sent). It should be total TAT length.An alternative would be that the NW has to always send a TAC right before (or together with) the new MAC CE to restart the TAT first, which is a hard restriction. |
| Nokia | Alt-1a | We slightly prefer Alt-1a.For Alt-1 with TAT < infinity, it seems a bit problematic if the remaining TAT is short. NW may need to send a TAC to reset TAT and then another new MAC CE to reset the length of X. Alt-1a may help to reduce the overhead of MAC CE since it configure X to the length of configured TAT. Furthermore, Alt-1a may have the benefit to reduce the interations between MAC and RRC layer since the *ULTransmissionExtentionTimer* is in RRC layer instead of MAC layer.Otherwise, the MAC layer needs to inform the TAT remaining time every time it receives a new MAC CE.If Alt-1a is to be used, maybe it is better to have a unified/simple solution to configure the *ULTransmissionExtentionTimer* as configured TAT for the first extension and the following extensions triggered by new MAC CE.  |
| CATT | Alt-1 | For the case that TAT is not infinity, in our understanding, UL transmission extensison is introduced to indicate the UE to perform UL transmission within duration X after original GNSS validity duration expires when it is enabled by the network. If TAT has expires but T390 is still running, the UE can’t perform UL transmission except RACH procedure. This does not align with the intension of introduction of UL transmission extension.Actually this has been captured in the current RRC spec for TAT is set not to be infinity:2> if *timeAlignmentTimer* is not configured to be *infinity*:3> start timer T390 with the timer value set to the remaining time of *timeAlignmentTimer*;3> restart timer T390 upon indication from lower layers, with the timer value set to the remaining time of *timeAlignmentTimer*, as specified in 36.321 [6];For the case that TAT is infinity, we think it can be simply updated to the *ul-TransmissionExtensionValue*. |
| ZTE | Slightly prefer Alt-1a | After double check, we try to understand the interntion of Alt 1a is for a better alignment between UE and NW, by using a fixed length of extension value. We also have sympathy to part of HW and Nokia’s comments.For RRC, if we go for Alt 1a, the change is small, like following:3> restart timer T390 upon indication from lower layers that an UL transmission extension update is applied, with the timer value set to ~~the remaining time of~~ *~~timeAlignmentTimer~~*the configured *timeAlignmentTimerDedicated*. |
| Ericsson | Alt-1a | Alt-1 introduces ambiguity for the eNB on when it can send the new MAC CE to extend X and require multiple transmissions when extending X. This is because in Alt-1, the new extension MAC CE is only useful to send AFTER a legacy TAC MAC CE is sent - or else the T390 will just be extended to the same value it already has (see Huaweis comment above). Then if gNB want to extend TAT and T390 (this is the only useful use case), it must first send the legay MAC CE and after it has been processed by the UE (a period unknown by eNB) – it can send the new MAC CE. To cover this in Alt-1 (and not forcing the eNB to separate a TAC MAC CE and the new MAC CE in different transmission), we need to specify that the UE shall first process a TAC MACE CE before it processes a new MAC CE (that is the UE must at reception of a new MAC CE check whether there is a TAC MAC CE in the same transmission and then process that MAC CE before it process the new MAC CE) – we believe such a restriction is much more severe for UE implememntation than what is required by Alt-1a. The issue described by CATT is no issue. If TAT expires before X expires, the current behaviour is correct – the UE can then only do RACH in UL and to do that it first need a new GNSS position fix. Therefore, it is actually fine to always restart X with the configured TAT value even for the first time when X is started.  |
| Samsung  | Alt 1a | Alt 1a seems to be more flexible compared to Alt 1 and without more complexity. And is in line with having TAT and ul transmission extension independent.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

5 companies vote for Alt1, they think it is simple and it can keep the TAT and T390 aligned.

5 companies vote for Alt1a, they think Alt1 will introduce extra UE/NW restrictions, otherwise T390 will just be extended to the same value it already has.

Since the companies’ views diverge, the Rapporteur suggests RAN2 postpone the discussion to the next RAN2 meeting.

**Proposal 1: RAN2 discuss the time with which T390 restarted in the next RAN2 meeting.**

## 3.2 Whether “or if the UE has initiated the Random Access procedure” is needed

[R2-2401129](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2401129%20Correction%20to%2036.321%20on%20GNSS%20validity%20duration%20reporting.docx) Correction to 36.321 on GNSS validity duration reporting Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell CR Rel-18 36.321 18.0.0 1581 - F IoT\_NTN\_enh-Core

1. When UE has initiated the Random Access procedure due to GNSS validity duration reporting, the UE shall include the corresponding MAC CE in an uplink transmission after RAR.

2. GNSS validity duration reporting is cancelled if the UE has included the GNSS Validity Duration report MAC CE in a transmission or if the UE has initiated the Random Access procedure.

|  |
| --- |
| *Next Modified Subclause*5.4.10 GNSS validity duration reportingFor a NB-IoT UE, a BL UE or a UE in enhanced coverage in a non-terrestrial network, an indication may be sent by upper layer to report the remaining GNSS measurement validity duration.If the GNSS validity duration reporting procedure has been triggered and not cancelled:- if the MAC entity has UL resources allocated for new transmission for this TTI, and;- if the allocated UL resources can accommodate the GNSS Validity Duration Report MAC control element plus its subheader, as a result of logical channel prioritization:- instruct the Multiplexing and Assembly procedure to generate the GNSS Validity Duration Report MAC control element as defined in clause 6.1.3.23.- else:- initiate a Random Access procedure (see clause 5.1).All triggered GNSS validity duration reports shall be cancelled when a GNSS Validity Duration Report MAC control element is included in a MAC PDU for transmission or a Random Access procedure has been initiated. |

* GNSS validity duration reporting is cancelled if the UE has included the GNSS Validity Duration report MAC CE in a transmission
* Discuss in the MAC CR review whether the second part (“or if the UE has initiated the Random Access procedure”) is also needed

Companies are invited to answer the following question:

**Q2: Do you agree that the second part (“or if the UE has initiated the Random Access procedure”) is also needed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | No | Initiating RACH does not mean UE will transmit it. RACH may fail. |
| vivo | No | Agree with QC. Additionally, we think the RACH procedure might be canceled as mentioned in Q3.2a. |
| OPPO | No | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Nokia | See comments. | If the RACH was triggered by TAR MAC CE and the event is not cancelled, the UE may trigger an additional RACH even there is an ongoing RACH. Therefore, the second part is also needed. However, we see the point that a smart UE may not trigger the additional one hence we are OK to not include the second part in MAC CR.Furthermore, when the RACH is triggered, the UE shall include the GNSS Validity Duration MAC CE for reporting in the subsequent uplink transmission.So we think below modification proposed in [R2-2401129](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2401129%20Correction%20to%2036.321%20on%20GNSS%20validity%20duration%20reporting.docx) should also be included.*- if the Random Access procedure was initiated for GNSS validity duration reporting as described in clause 5.4.10, indicate to the Multiplexing and assembly entity to include a GNSS Validity Duration Report MAC control element as defined in clause 6.1.3.23 in the subsequent uplink transmission;* |
| CATT | No | We share the same view that even if a Random Access procedure has been initiated, it does not mean that the GNSS validity duration report MAC CE can successfully reported considering RACH collision may happen.Furthermore, we think the former case *a GNSS Validity Duration Report MAC CE* is *included in a MAC PDU for transmission* covers the case that *a GNSS validity duration Report MAC CE” is included in a MAC PDU which is scheduled by RAR* which is within RACH procedure. |
| ZTE | - | As Nokia mentioned, we also tend to think it may be impossible for UE to trigger another RACH when there is already an ongoing RACH. So it seems no issue even not including the second part in MAC CR.But we are not so sure whether it’s correct understanding that (as mentioned in some above comments), the GNSS validity duration reports cannot be cancelled so that it can still be used when RA fails? Does UE need to generate a new remaining GNSS validity duration Report in such failure case? |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| MediaTek | No |  |
| Samsung | No | Agree with others |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

All 9 companies agreed that the second part (“or if the UE has initiated the Random Access procedure”) is not needed. Because the initiated RA can fail, the report should not be canceled in this case.

**Proposal 2: The second part (“or if the UE has initiated the Random Access procedure”) of GNSS validy duration cancellation condition is not needed.**

## 3.2a Whether cancellation of RACH due to GNSS validity duration reporting is needed

[R2-2400121](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2400121%20Cancellation%20of%20Triggered%20GNSS%20Validity%20Duration%20Reporting.docx) Remaining Issues on GNSS Validity Duration Reporting vivo discussion Rel-18 IoT\_NTN\_enh-Core

Proposal 2: If MAC entity has enough resource for GNSS validity duration report MAC CE, MAC entity shall cancel, if any, initiated RACH procedure for GNSS validity duration report.

|  |
| --- |
| *Next Modified Subclause*5.4.10 GNSS validity duration reportingFor a NB-IoT UE, a BL UE or a UE in enhanced coverage in a non-terrestrial network, an indication may be sent by upper layer to report the remaining GNSS measurement validity duration.If the GNSS validity duration reporting procedure has been triggered and not cancelled:- if the MAC entity has UL resources allocated for new transmission for this TTI, and;- if the allocated UL resources can accommodate the GNSS Validity Duration Report MAC control element plus its subheader, as a result of logical channel prioritization:- instruct the Multiplexing and Assembly procedure to generate the GNSS Validity Duration Report MAC control element as defined in clause 6.1.3.23;- cancel, if any, initiated Random Access procedure for GNSS validity duration reporting.- else:- initiate a Random Access procedure (see clause 5.1).All triggered GNSS validity duration reports shall be cancelled when a GNSS Validity Duration Report MAC control element is included in a MAC PDU for transmission or a Random Access procedure has been initiated. |

Companies are invited to answer the following question:

**Q2a: Do you agree that cancellation of RACH due to GNSS validity duration reporting is also needed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | This is a general principle in both LTE and NR, similar to the cancellation of RACH for SR case,  |
| OPPO | No |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | This seems a corner case. If there is UL grant available, RACH will not be triggered. Otherwise if the RACH is triggered, it is not very likely the GNSS duration will be transmitted in an UL grant before receiving the RAR.  |
| Nokia | See comments | Agree with Huawei. |
| CATT | - | We agree that cancellation of RACH due to GNSS validity duration reporting is helpful. But we think for BSR reporting procedure, there is no RACH cancellation in LTE. Following BSR is also workable. |
| ZTE | No | Considering preamble repetition and that part of preambles may already be received by NW, it may be not easy to determine whether there is suitable timing to cancel the RACH procedure and when?We also agree with some above comments that the scenario is rare case and BSR reporting has no such optimization. |
| Ericsson | No | Agree with Huawei. |
| Samsung | No | Agree with CATTs point that there are many other cases where this is not done.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

2 companies agree that cancellation of RACH due to GNSS validity duration reporting is also needed.

7 companies think it is not necessary as this is a corner case and BSR reporting without such optimization is still workable.

Based on the majority view, the rapporteur tends to not agree the cancellation of RACH due to GNSS validity duration reporting is needed.

**Proposal 3: the the cancellation of RACH due to GNSS validity duration reporting is NOT needed.**

## 3.3 HARQ feedback overridden to enable by DCI

HARQ enhancements

[R2-2401001](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2401001%20-%20Discussion%20on%20HARQ%20enhancement%20for%20IoT%20NTN.doc) Discussion on HARQ enhancement for IoT NTN OPPO discussion Rel-18 IoT\_NTN\_enh-Core

Proposal 3 For multiple TB scheduling for a NB-IoT UE, if the HARQ processes are configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, UE behaviour on DRX follows the case when HARQ feedback is enabled.

* Check during the MAC CR review if anything else is needed on top of what already agreed

Regarding **proposal 3**, for a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, RAN1 had agreement for single TB:

RAN1 agreement for single TB:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement in RAN1#114bis:**For single TB scheduled by DCI, * Working assumption 2 For Option 1 + Option 3 DCI based overridden mechanism, for a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by per-HARQ process bitmap signaling and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, the NBIoT UE does not wait for an RTT+3ms (i.e., till subframe *n+Kmac+3* in TS36.213 section 16.6) before monitoring NPDCCH for the same HARQ process (or monitoring any NPDCCH for the case of single HARQ process configuration).
 |

In RAN1 36.213, it has specified that:

R1-2308693 36.213 CR 1436:

|  |
| --- |
| If a NB-IoT UE is configured with higher layer parameter *twoHARQ-ProcessesConfig*-     and if the UE has a NPUSCH transmission ending in subframe *n*,-    the UE is not required to receive transmissions in the Type B half-duplex guard periods as specified in [3]for FDD ; and-    the UE is not expected to receive an NPDCCH with DCI format N0/N1 for the same HARQ process ID as the NPUSCH transmission in any subframe starting from subframe n+1 to subframe n+3, or in a NTN serving cell, in any downlink subframe that overlaps with uplink subframe *n*+1 to subframe *n*+*K*mac+3 except if the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *uplinkHARQ-mode* set to ‘*HARQModeB*’ for the same HARQ process ID, or if the NPUSCH transmission carries ACK/NACK response, as determined in clause 16.4.2, for the same HARQ process ID, and the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-Bitmap-NB* indicating disabled HARQ-ACK information for the same HARQ process ID and configured with higher layer parameter *downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-DCI-NB;*else if the UE is not using higher layer parameter *edt-Parameters* or if the UE is using higher layer parameter *edt-Parameters* and  -     if the NB-IoT UE has a NPUSCH transmission ending in subframe *n*,-   the UE is not required to receive transmissions in the Type B half-duplex guard periods as specified in [3] for FDD; and -    the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in any subframe starting from subframe *n+1* to subframe *n+3*,or in a NTN serving cell, in any downlink subframe that overlaps with uplink subframe *n*+*1* to subframe *n*+*K*mac+*3* except if the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *uplinkHARQ-mode* set to ‘*HARQModeB*’, or if the NPUSCH transmission carries ACK/NACK response as determined in clause 16.4.2 and the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-Bitmap-NB* indicating disabled HARQ-ACK information and configured with higher layer parameter *downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-DCI-NB*.  |

Here is the rapporteur’s understanding of RAN1 spec: NB-IoT UE starts to monitor PDCCH after NPUSCH transmission (HARQ ACK) + 1ms(i.e., Type B half-duplex guard periods).

Rapporteur ‘s understanding of RAN1 spec:



RAN2 had made the following agreement. Per rapporteur’s understanding, this RAN2 agreement is based on the RAN1 agreement for single TB case, and RAN1 had made different agreement for Multiple TB scheduling case. Therefore, this RAN2 agreement should also be limited to single TB case.

**Corresponding RAN2 agreement:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement in RAN2#123bis:**For a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, UE behaviour on DRX follows the case when HARQ feedback is disabled. |

RAN2 spec:

However, this agreement is not captured in MAC.

P5 in MTK’s R2- 2400428

* For a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, UE behaviour on DRX follows the case when HARQ feedback is disabled.

**Proposal 5: Capture the above agreement in MAC specification clause 5.7.**

Rapporetur also finds that there is a misalignment in monitoring PDCCH between the RAN2 agreement and the RAN1 specification.

Rapporteur’s understanding of RAN2 agreement:



In conclusion, there are three issues relate to above RAN2 agreement:

1. This agreement should be limited to single TB case.
2. This agreement is not captured in the MAC CR.
3. There is a misalignment in monitoring NPDCCH between the RAN2 agreement and RAN1 spec that may need to address.

Companies are invited to answer the following question:

**Q3: Do you agree with the above three issues?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm |  | It is not clear which agreement has this issue?It is not new that RAN1 restrictions and UE’s active time due to RAN2 DRX parameters may not be aligned specially for NB-IoT. UE should not monitor PDCCH due to any RAN1 or RAN2 restrictions. |
| vivo | No | There already might be a misalignment between the DRX ACTIVE time and PDCCH monitoring occasions in both LTE and NR. It is not a specific issue for IoT NTN. Anyway, the L1 can properly monitor the PDCCH based on L1 specification. No issue is found.  |
| OPPO | No | We think it is unclear in RAN1 spec how UE monitors PDCCH in case a HARQ process is configured as HARQ feedback disabled by per-HARQ process bitmap signaling and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| Nokia | See comments. | For 1) and 2), yes.For 3) Agree with QC that UE should not monitor PDCCH due to any RAN1 or RAN2 restrictions. |
| CATT | Agree 1 and 3Disagree 2 | As of RAN2#124 meeting, the agreement is captured in the MAC CR,i.e.,” if the HARQ feedback is disabled by *downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled* for the corresponding HARQ process”If the proposal 3 in R2-2401001 is agreed, the MAC CR should be changed. |
| ZTE | No |  |
| Ericsson | No | Agree with Nokia.  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

1. 3 companies agree this agreement should be limited to single TB case.
2. 2 companies agree that this agreement is not captured and other 2 companies think it has been captured in “if the HARQ feedback is disabled by downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled for the corresponding HARQ process”
3. 2 companies agree there is a misalignment in monitoring NPDCCH between the RAN2 agreement and RAN1 spec that may need to address. Other 7 companies think it is no need to address the misalignment. UE should not monitor PDCCH due to any RAN1 or RAN2 restrictions.

If the answer to Q3 is yes, companies are invited to comment on the revise of the RAN2 agreement:

**Q4: Do you agree the above RAN2 agreement can be revised to**

For single TB scheduling case: for a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, NB-IoT UE start/restarts drx-inactivity timer after the HARQ feedback + 1ms.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | HD NB-IoT UEs do not need to switch UL and DL modes back to back.We think this is also equally applicable for multiTB case.There is no mixed mode allowed in multiTB if further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI.  |
| vivo | No | We prefer to stick to the existing agreement and spec text. That is,For a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, UE behaviour on DRX follows the case when HARQ feedback is disabled. |
| OPPO | No | Agree with vivo |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| Nokia | No | We agree the mentioned RAN2-123bis agreement should be limited to single HARQ process since RAN1 defined different UE behaviour for sing-TB and multi-TB scheduling.Based on RAN1 agreement below, the UE should not wait for an RTT+3 for PDCCH monitoring. The proposal in Q4 seems not aligned with RAN1 intention since UE has to wait RTT+1 ms.* Working assumption 2 For Option 1 + Option 3 DCI based overridden mechanism, for a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by per-HARQ process bitmap signaling and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, the NBIoT UE does not wait for an RTT+3ms (i.e., till subframe *n+Kmac+3* in TS36.213 section 16.6) before monitoring NPDCCH for the same HARQ process (or monitoring any NPDCCH for the case of single HARQ process configuration).

Therefore, even if we revised above RAN2 agreement and limit it to single HARQ process case, the UE has to follow the DRX behaviour for the case when HARQ feedback is disabled. I.e., the drx-inactivity timer (re)restart should follow below agreement.* For NB-IoT NTN with single HARQ process when the HARQ feedback is disabled, the UE will start/restart drx-inactivity timer in the subframe containing the last repetition of the corresponding PDSCH reception plus 12 subframes plus deltaPDCCH
 |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| ZTE | No | Agree with vivo |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

3 companies agree with the agreement revise. Other 6 companies disagree, one of which thinks the agreement should be limited to single HARQ process.

Combined with the companies’ views on Q5, the rapporteur suggests RAN2 discuss whether the above agreement should be limited to single TB case.

Proposal 4: RAN2 discuss whether the following agreement should be limited to single TB case in the next meeting:

* **For a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, UE behaviour on DRX follows the case when HARQ feedback is disabled.**

RAN1 had made agreement for Multiple TBs scheduling case:

RAN1 agreement Multiple TBs

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement in RAN1#115:**When multile TBs are scheduled by a single DCI: For Option 1 + Option 3 DCI based overridden mechanism, when DCI indicates HARQ feedback enabled, then the NB-IoT UE always wait for an RTT+3ms (i.e., till subframe n+Kmac+3 in TS36.213 section 16.6) before monitoring NPDCCH. |

RAN1 spec:

The following TP has been agreed in RAN1#116.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| AgreementThe TP 1-1b in section 3 of R1-2401497 is endorsed for TS36.213 clause 16.6.TP1-1b

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Reason for change:** | Clarify that when multiple TBs are scheduled by a single DCI and DCI indicates HARQ feedback enabled, then the NB-IoT UE always wait for an RTT+3ms (i.e., till subframe n+Kmac+3) before monitoring NPDCCH in clause 16.6. |
|  |  |
| **Summary of change:** | Added condition that NB-IoT UE always wait for an RTT+3ms (i.e., till subframe n+Kmac+3) before monitoring NPDCCH when multiple TBs are scheduled by a single DCI and DCI indicates HARQ feedback enabled. |
|  |  |
| **Consequences if not approved:** | NB-IoT UE will need to monitor NPDCCH during RTT+3ms (i.e., till subframe n+Kmac+3) when multiple TBs are scheduled by a single DCI and DCI indicates HARQ feedback enabled. |

TS36.213<Unchanged parts are omitted>16.6  Narrowband physical downlink control channel related proceduresThroughout this clause, if a NB-IoT UE is configured with higher layer parameter *k-Mac*, *K*mac = *k-Mac* otherwise, *K*mac = 0.<Unchanged parts are omitted>If a NB-IoT UE is configured with higher layer parameter *twoHARQ-ProcessesConfig*-    and if the UE has a NPUSCH transmission ending in subframe *n*,-    the UE is not required to receive transmissions in the Type B half-duplex guard periods as specified in [3]for FDD ; and-    the UE is not expected to receive an NPDCCH with DCI format N0/N1 for the same HARQ process ID as the NPUSCH transmission in any subframe starting from subframe n+1 to subframe n+3, or in a NTN serving cell, in any downlink subframe that overlaps with uplink subframe *n*+1 to subframe *n*+*K*mac+3 except if the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *uplinkHARQ-mode* set to ‘*HARQModeB*’ for the same HARQ process ID, or if the NPUSCH transmission carries ACK/NACK response, as determined in clause 16.4.2, for the same HARQ process ID associated with a transport block scheduled in a NPDCCH scheduling a single transport block, and the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-Bitmap-NB* indicating disabled HARQ-ACK information for the same HARQ process ID and configured with higher layer parameter *downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-DCI-NB;*else if the UE is not using higher layer parameter *edt-Parameters* or if the UE is using higher layer parameter *edt-Parameters* and  -    if the NB-IoT UE has a NPUSCH transmission ending in subframe *n*, -    the UE is not required to receive transmissions in the Type B half-duplex guard periods as specified in [3] for FDD; and -    the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in any subframe starting from subframe *n+1* to subframe *n+3* or in a NTN serving cell, in any downlink subframe that overlaps with uplink subframe *n*+*1* to subframe *n*+*K*mac+3 except if the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *uplinkHARQ-mode* set to ‘*HARQModeB*’, or if the NPUSCH transmission carries ACK/NACK response as determined in clause 16.4.2 and the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-Bitmap-NB* indicating disabled HARQ-ACK information and configured with higher layer parameter *downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-DCI-NB*. <Unchanged parts are omitted> |

 |

Rapporteur’s understanding of RAN1 agreement:



RAN2 Proposal:

P3 in Oppo R2-2401001

Proposal 3 For multiple TB scheduling for a NB-IoT UE, if the HARQ processes are configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, UE behaviour on DRX follows the case when HARQ feedback is enabled.

Rapporteur’s understanding of RAN2 proposal



Companies are invited to answer the following question:

**Q5: Do you agree that, “for multiple TB scheduling for a NB-IoT UE, if the HARQ processes are configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, UE behaviour on DRX follows the case when HARQ feedback is enabled” ?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | No | The purpose of DCI enabled HARQ feedback is for rather link adaptation for network. It is not for retransmission. This is same for single TB or multiple TB. There is no mixed mode allowed in multiTB when DCI enables HARQ feedback.So following agreement applies to both single and multiTB.**Agreement in RAN2#123bis:**For a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, UE behaviour on DRX follows the case when HARQ feedback is disabled. |
| Vivo | Yes | We should follow the RAN1 agreement and clarify the RAN2#123bis agreement is intended for single-TB case, which is commonly accepted by most companies during post email [Post124][309][NR-NTN Enh] 36.321 CR (Mediatek) |
| OPPO | Yes | Fine to follow RAN1 agreement. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | The proposal is aligned with RAN1 agreements. RAN1 defined different UE behaviour for single TB and multo-TB scheduling.* For single TB scheduled by DCI, Working assumption 2 For Option 1 + Option 3 DCI based overridden mechanism, for a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by per-HARQ process bitmap signaling and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, the NBIoT UE does not wait for an RTT+3ms (i.e., till subframe n+Kmac+3 in TS36.213 section 16.6) before monitoring NPDCCH for the same HARQ process (or monitoring any NPDCCH for the case of single HARQ process configuration).
* When multiple TBs are scheduled by a single DCI: For Option 1 + Option 3 DCI based overridden mechanism, when DCI indicates HARQ feedback enabled, then the NB-IoT UE always wait for an RTT+3ms (i.e., till subframe n+Kmac+3 in TS36.213 section 16.6) before monitoring NPDCCH.
 |
| Qualcomm-2 |  | RAN1 seems to cover the case for multi TB when RRC configures one TB with HARQ feedback enabled and other TB HARQ feedback disabled.Then we have following cases:1. First TB with RRC HARQ feedback disabled + DCI HARQ feedback enabled
2. Second TB with RRC HARQ feedback enabled + DCI HARQ feedback enabled
3. Both first and second TBs with RRC HARQ feedback enabled + DcI HARQ feedback enabled.

Above, the case (2) is already clear UE follows the case HARQ feedback enabled for the corresponding HARQ process. This is where may be confusion is.But for the case (1), UE can follow the RAN2 agreement as MAC spec is anyway captured per HARQ process (i.e., of per TB).**Agreement in RAN2#123bis:**For a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, UE behaviour on DRX follows the case when HARQ feedback is disabled.In the case (3), HARQ feedback is only for link adaptation so UE can immediately switch back to PDCCH monitoring phase after completing the HARQ feedback transmission so again RAN2 agreement can apply for both corresponding HARQ processes.Since DCI overridden in multi-TB is single state, we think this way the RAN2 procedure text could be simplified. Thanks |
| CATT | No | Follow the agreement in RAN2#123bis.Since UE does not wait for an RTT+3ms before monitoring NPDCCH for the same HARQ process, UE behaviour on DRX should follow the case when HARQ feedback is disabled. |
| ZTE | Yes | Fine to follow RAN1 agreement. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

7 companies tend to follow RAN1 agreement and agree “for multiple TB scheduling for a NB-IoT UE, if the HARQ processes are configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, UE behaviour on DRX follows the case when HARQ feedback is enabled”.

2 companies disagree and tend to follow the previous RAN2 agreement.

Since there is no consensus, the Rapporteur suggest postpone the discussion to the next RAN2 meeting.

**Proposal 5: RAN2 discuss the UE behavior on DRX for multiple TB scheduling for a NB-IoT UE, if the HARQ processes are configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI in the next RAN2 meeting.**

## 3.4 HARQ RTT Timer for HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled

HARQ enhancements

[R2-2401001](file:///C%3A%5CData%5C3GPP%5CExtracts%5CR2-2401001%20-%20Discussion%20on%20HARQ%20enhancement%20for%20IoT%20NTN.doc) Discussion on HARQ enhancement for IoT NTN OPPO discussion Rel-18 IoT\_NTN\_enh-Core

Proposal 4 For multiple TB scheduling with mixed HARQ feedback enabled/disabled configuration for NB-IoT, if HARQ-ACK bundling is not configured, HARQ RTT Timer for HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled is k+3+N plus RTToffset + deltaPDCCH.

* Continue the discussion during the MAC CR review

**HARQ RTT Timer length for HARQ process with enabled HARQ feedback in multiple TB scheduling for NB-IoT**

In RAN2#124 meeting, the following agreement was made regarding HARQ RTT Timer length for HARQ process with enabled HARQ feedback in multiple TB scheduling.

**Agreements in RAN2#124**:

1. For multiple TB scheduling with mixed HARQ feedback enabled/disabled configuration, if HARQ-ACK bundling is not configured, HARQ RTT Timer for HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled is calculated based on the number of scheduled TBs with HARQ feedback enabled.

For NB-IoT, the above agreement has been captured in the MAC running CR as below.

|  |
| --- |
| For NB-IoT, when single TB is scheduled by PDCCH or when multiple TBs are scheduled for the interleaved case when HARQ-ACK bundling is configured the HARQ RTT Timer is set to k+3+N subframes plus RTToffset + deltaPDCCH, where k is the interval between the last subframe of the downlink transmission and the first subframe of the associated HARQ feedback transmission and N is the transmission duration in subframes of the associated HARQ feedback, and deltaPDCCH is the interval starting from the subframe following the last subframe of the associated HARQ feedback transmission plus 3 subframes plus RTToffset to the first subframe of the next PDCCH occasion.For NB-IoT, when multiple TBs are scheduled by PDCCH for the non-interleaved case or for the interleaved case when HARQ-ACK bundling is not configured, the HARQ RTT Timer is set to k+m\*N+1 subframes plus RTToffset + deltaPDCCH where k is the interval between the last subframe of the downlink transmission and the first subframe of the first HARQ feedback transmission and N is the transmission duration in subframes of the associated HARQ feedback and m is the number of scheduled TBs as indicated in PDCCH whose associated HARQ process is configured with HARQ feedback enabled, and deltaPDCCH is the interval starting from the subframe following the last subframe of the last HARQ feedback transmission plus 1 subframe plus RTToffset to the first subframe of the next PDCCH occasion. |

Note that in legacy, for multiple TB scheduling and if HARQ-ACK bundling is configured, HARQ RTT Timer is k+3+N subframes plus deltaPDCCH, where the 3 subframe includes UE-eNB RTT and eNB processing/scheduling delay. For multiple TB scheduling and if HARQ-ACK bundling is not configured, HARQ RTT Timer is k+2\*N+1 subframes plus deltaPDCCH, where the 1 subframe is the UE processing time, and for this case the 3 subframes for UE-eNB RTT and eNB processing/scheduling delay is not counted since eNB may get ready to schedule the HARQ process used by the first TB when it receives the first HARQ-ACK information, in other words, the UE-eNB RTT and eNB processing/scheduling delay can be coved by the transmission duration of the second HARQ-ACK. In Rel-17 IoT NTN, HARQ RTT Timer is extended by simply adding a RTToffset. In our understanding, for the case of multiple TB scheduling and HARQ-ACK bundling is not configured, if one process is configured with disabled HARQ feedback and the other HARQ process is configured with enabled HARQ feedback, UE would transmit one HARQ feedback, this is more like the case of multiple TB scheduling when HARQ-ACK bundling is configured, so we think in this case the HARQ RTT Timer for the HARQ process with enabled HARQ feedback should be k+3+N plus RTToffset + deltaPDCCH rather than k+N+1 plus RTToffset + deltaPDCCH.

Companies are invited to answer the following question:

**Q6: Do you agree that for multiple TB scheduling with mixed HARQ feedback enabled/disabled configuration for NB-IoT, if HARQ-ACK bundling is not configured, HARQ RTT Timer for HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled is k+3+N plus RTToffset + deltaPDCCH?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We also think only 1ms processing time was considered when multiTB was introduced. There is no need to change here now. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Nokia | No | We prefer to keep current spec as a unified and simple procedure for the cases with or without mixed HARQ feedback disabled.The proposed modification (change from +1 to +3) seems have no impact to UE’s PDCCH monitoring. As indicated by QC in Q3, UE should not monitor PDCCH due to any RAN1 or RAN2 restrictions. In 36.213, RAN1 already has restriction that, if the UE is configured with twoHARQ-ProcessesConfig the UE is not expected to receive an NPDCCH with DCI format N0/N1 for the same HARQ process ID as the NPUSCH transmission in any subframe starting from subframe n+1 to subframe n+3. This means no matter RAN2 define the RTT timer as +1 or +3, UE will only start monitor PDCCH from n+3 instead of n+1.36.213：If a NB-IoT UE is configured with higher layer parameter *twoHARQ-ProcessesConfig*- and if the UE has a NPUSCH transmission ending in subframe *n*,- the UE is not required to receive transmissions in the Type B half-duplex guard periods as specified in [3]for FDD ; and- the UE is not expected to receive an NPDCCH with DCI format N0/N1 for the same HARQ process ID as the NPUSCH transmission in any subframe starting from subframe n+1 to subframe n+3, or in a NTN serving cell, in any downlink subframe that overlaps with uplink subframe *n*+1 to subframe *n*+*K*mac+3 except if the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *uplinkHARQ-mode* set to ‘*HARQModeB*’ for the same HARQ process ID, or if the NPUSCH transmission carries ACK/NACK response, as determined in clause 16.4.2, for the same HARQ process ID, and the UE is configured with higher layer parameter *downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-Bitmap-NB* indicating disabled HARQ-ACK information for the same HARQ process ID and configured with higher layer parameter *downlinkHARQ-FeedbackDisabled-DCI-NB;* |
| CATT | No  | Follow the agreement in RAN2#124 meeting:1. For multiple TB scheduling with mixed HARQ feedback enabled/disabled configuration, if HARQ-ACK bundling is not configured, HARQ RTT Timer for HARQ process with HARQ feedback enabled is calculated based on the number of scheduled TBs with HARQ feedback enabled.

The parameter m should be considered. |
| ZTE | No | Agree with CATT |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |

**Rapporteur Summary**

5 companies vote Yes. 4 compnies disagree the proposal and would like to keep current spec as a unified and simple procedure.

Since the companies’ views diverge, the Rapporteur suggests RAN2 postpone the discussion to the next RAN2 meeting.

**Proposal 6: RAN2 can discuss the HARQ RTT timer length for multiple TB scheduling with mixed HARQ feedback enabled/disabled configuration for NB-IoT in the next RAN2 meeting.**

# 4. Summary and Proposals

This section summarizes the main proposals:

**Proposal 1: RAN2 discuss the time with which T390 restarted in the next RAN2 meeting.**

**Proposal 2: The second part (“or if the UE has initiated the Random Access procedure”) of GNSS validy duration cancellation condition is not needed.**

**Proposal 3: the the cancellation of RACH due to GNSS validity duration reporting is NOT needed.**

Proposal 4: RAN2 discuss whether the following agreement should be limited to single TB case in the next meeting:

* **For a HARQ process configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI, UE behaviour on DRX follows the case when HARQ feedback is disabled.**

**Proposal 5: RAN2 discuss the UE behavior on DRX for multiple TB scheduling for a NB-IoT UE, if the HARQ processes are configured as HARQ feedback disabled by RRC and further reversed to HARQ feedback enabled by DCI in the next RAN2 meeting.**

**Proposal 6: RAN2 can discuss the HARQ RTT timer length for multiple TB scheduling with mixed HARQ feedback enabled/disabled configuration for NB-IoT in the next RAN2 meeting.**
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