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# Introduction

A study item on solutions for NR to support non-terrestrial networks (NTN) was completed in Rel-16 [1]. The Rel-17 work item on solutions for NR to support NTN was approved at RAN#86 and the work item description is updated in [2]. One objective is to specify timing relationship enhancements for NTN. The last feature summary from RAN1#105-e on this topic can be found in [3].

In this contribution, we summarize the related issues and proposals based on the contributions submitted to RAN1#105-e under agenda item 8.4.1 [4] – [32].

There are in total 14 issues summarized in this contribution. For the first round of discussion:

* Companies are encouraged to provides views on the following issues by filling in comments in the provided tables:
	+ Issue #1, Issue #2, Issue #3, Issue #5, Issue #7, Issue #9, Issue #10, Issue #13, Issue #14
* Companies are encouraged to have offline discussions on the following issues:
	+ Issue #4, Issue #6, Issue #8, Issue #11, Issue #12

For the second round of discussion:

* Companies are encouraged to provides views on the following issues by filling in comments in the provided tables:
	+ Issue #2, Issue #3, Issue #10, Issue #13, Issue #14

# 1 Issue #1: K\_offset update

## 1.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, many companies provide views on K\_offset update after initial access.

**[Huawei, HiSilicon]**

Proposal 4: K\_offset update after initial access is supported via MAC-CE.

Proposal 6: Differential indication with granularity of one slot are adopted for both UE-specific K\_offset update and TA report to reduce the signaling overhead.

**[vivo]**

Proposal 3：Support both MAC-CE and RRC reconfiguration for the update of K\_offset.

**[Spreadtrum]**

Proposal 3: The method to avoid frequent K\_offset update with dedicated RRC signaling/MAC CE should be considered.

**[Zhejiang Lab]**

Proposal 3: Both cell/beam specific and UE specific updating of K\_offset should be supported as follows,

* For cell/beam specific K\_offset updating, K\_offset can be broadcasted in system information;
* For UE specific K\_offset updating, the following cases should be considered,
	+ if UE location is available to the gNB, UE specific K\_offset can be configured by gNB without any reporting from UE;
	+ if UE location is not available to the gNB, UE specific K\_offset can be derived from common TA and UE specific TA, which requires UE specific TA reporting.

Proposal 4: For updating K\_offset after initial access, both RRC reconfiguration and MAC CE should be supported and offset values of the first K\_offset value can be signaled for update to save signaling overhead.

**[Baicells]**

Proposal 1: For clarity, we propose to explicitly state UE-specific K\_offset, beam-specific K\_offset, or cell-specific K\_offset when discussing K\_offset.

Proposal 2: For GEO, UE-specific K\_offset can be updated by RRC reconfiguration.

Proposal 3-1: For LEO, determine the update rate of UE-specific K\_offset according to (1) orbit height, (2) SCS, (3)whether or not the network dynamically compensates the drifting part of the feeder link.

Proposal 3-2: For LEO, update UE-specific K\_offset by RRC reconfiguration or MC CE according to system configurations.

Proposal 4: UE calculates UE-specific K\_offset autonomously according to UE’s TA, using a formula such as: UE-specific K\_offset = ceiling (TA\_ue/slot duration).

Proposal 5: UE acquires from the network the location information of the gNB and the distance information between gNB and RP (or TA\_network) to calculate TA\_ue, and then get UE-specific K\_offset according to Proposal 4. If TA\_network does not change, UE can update UE-specific K\_offset autonomously.

**[Samsung]**

Proposal 1: The update of K\_offset value after initial access is done by the combination of RRC configuration and MAC CE. MAC indicates only one of the multiple values configured by the gNB.

**[CATT]**

Proposal 4: Both MAC CE and RRC reconfiguration to indicate K\_offset can be supported.

**[NEC]**

Proposal 3: Support UE based triggering for K\_offset update after initial access.

**[CAICT]**

Proposal 1: Support three options for $K\_{offset}$ updating: RRC reconfiguration, MAC CE, RRC reconfiguration and MAC CE in the specification.

**[Hyundai Motors]**

Proposal 1: A new RRC signalling should be considered to provide update frequency of K\_offset.

Proposal 2: Even after the initial access, cell-specific or beam-specific K\_offset values provided by SIBs can be used to update K\_offset.

Proposal 3: SIB of the target cell provides the handover UE with its cell-specific K\_offset after connection to the target cell.

Proposal 4: The serving cell provides the handover UE with the cell-specific K\_offset of the target cell using RRC reconfiguration during handover procedure.

**[OPPO]**

Proposal 2: Support UE requesting K offset update to the network in an event triggered manner.

**[Qualcomm]**

Proposal 1: Support updating K\_offset after initial access at least by MAC-CE

* FFS: details of signaling

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 1: Regarding UE-specific K\_offset update after initial access, both MAC CE option and RRC reconfiguration option can be supported.

Proposal 2: If further down-selection is needed, MAC CE option is preferred for universality.

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 2: Support both RRC reconfiguration and MAC CE for the update of Koffset. Relative indication should be used for MAC CE.

**[LGE]**

Proposal 4: Support at least MAC-CE based K\_offset update after initial access.

Proposal 5: Apply new K\_offset value X slot/symbol after transmission of RRC reconfiguration complete message or acknowledgement for MAC-CE reception.

**[Intel]**

Proposal 2:

* At least RRC-based K\_offset update after initial access shall be supported
	+ MAC CE-based K\_offset update can be additionally considered for non-GEO scenario

**[Ericsson]**

Proposal 1: $K\_{offset}$ is updated by $K\_{offset}+ΔK\_{offset}$, where $ΔK\_{offset}$ is configured after initial access and is zero if not configured.

Proposal 2: For updating K\_offset after initial access, support both MAC CE option and RRC reconfiguration option.

**[Apple]**

Proposal 2: For signaling of updating $K\_{offset}$ after initial access, both RRC reconfiguration and MAC CE are supported.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal-2: Updating K\_offset via MAC CE only should be supported.

Proposal-3: Signalling of the adjustment value of K\_offset is preferred via MAC CE.

**[NTT DOCOMO]**

Proposal 3: A RRC parameter to configure UE-specific K\_offset.

* If this parameter is provided, the UE uses the parameter as K\_offset.
* Otherwise, the UE uses K\_offset provided in initial access.

**[Xiaomi]**

Proposal 3: Both RRC and MAC CE are supported to update the K\_offset.

**[Lenovo, Motorola Mobility]**

Proposal 1: Support MAC CE signaling to update K-offset after initial access.

Proposal 3: Update of K-offset can be indicated by a drift rate or by indication of a coordinate of a position.

**[ITL]**

Proposal 1. It is preferred to adopt MAC CE signaling for updating K\_offset value after initial access.

Proposal 2. gNB controlled and UE-initiated mechanisms can be supported for update of K\_offset value.

**[InterDigital]**

Proposal-4: MAC-CE is used for updating K-offset value after initial access

Proposal-5: RRC is not used additionally for updating K-offset value after initial access

**[Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI]**

Proposal 5: RAN1 to discuss first the scope of $K\_{offset}$ update a) whether or not UE specific $K\_{offset}$ is supported, or b) only cell-specific and beam-specific $K\_{offset}$ update is supported, or c) both options a) and b) are supported.

**[Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell]**

Proposal 6: RAN1 to adopt MAC-CE as the baseline mechanism for K\_offset update.

The main discussion point is about using MAC CE or both RRC reconfiguration and MAC CE to update K\_offset.

The table below presents a summary of the proposed design options and the corresponding proponents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Design option | Proponent(s) |
| Both RRC reconfiguration and MAC CE | [14] sources: [vivo, Spreadtrum, Zhejiang Lab, Baicells, Samsung, CATT, CAICT, CMCC, Panasonic, LGE, Intel, Ericsson, Apple, Xiaomi] |
| MAC CE | [7] sources: [Huawei/HiSilicon, Qualcomm, ZTE, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, ITL, InterDigital, Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] |
| RRC reconfiguration | [2] sources: [Hyundai Motors, NTT DOCOMO] |

Based on companies’ positions, Moderator holds the view that supporting both RRC reconfiguration and MAC CE to update UE specific K\_offset is a reasonable middle ground, and hope that it is an acceptable compromise to the group.

## 1.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 1.2 (Moderator):**

UE can be provided by network with a UE-specific K\_offset in RRC reconfiguration. The UE-specific K\_offset can be updated by MAC CE.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | Support the proposal. When $K\_{offset}$ is updated frequently (e.g., in LEO scenario), MAC CE is suitable due to its lower latency. When $K\_{offset}$ is updated infrequently (e.g., in GEO scenario), RRC reconfiguration can be used. |
| Zhejiang Lab | Support the proposal. Both MAC CE and RRC should be supported depending on circumstances. |
| FGI | **Support**. However, since no clear action time for RRC reconfiguration is defined in the current spec, this makes impact on Initial proposal 3.2. |
| Xiaomi | Although we share the spirit that Koffset can be updated by RRC or MAC CE. We have one clarification question on the RRC reconfiguration as RRC reconfiguration happens after the RRC connection is established. Does it preclude that the Koffset can be updated during the initial access such as in MSG4. |
| ZTE | Following the agreement in GTW session. Only focus on the MAC CE based solution. |
| Intel | The following agreement was made during the GTW.Agreement: * The UE-specific K\_offset can be provided and updated by network with MAC CE.
* FFS: UE can be provided and updated by network with a UE-specific K\_offset in RRC reconfiguration
	+ FFS: Details on whether and how the two solutions work together
 |
| OPPO | agree |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No need for having RRC reconfiguration – we would prefer just use MAC-CE for the updating of the K\_offset. In our preference the FFS is simply dropped, but for now we are OK with the agreement. |
| Lenovo/MM | We stil slightly prefer MAC CE only solution for a common framework for different scenarios as anyway MAC CE can work. Another cons of RRC+MAC CE is that there should be mechanism to determine the scenario. For now we are fine with the agreement. |
| Samsung | We suggest that* UE can be provided and updated by the combination of RRC configuration and MAC CE.

The reason why we propose to use MAC CE is to avoid the ambiguity of the scheduling timing. With the current initial proposal, there is still an ambiguity. But MAC CE only is also okay because it does not have the ambiguity on the timing. |
| Panasonic | Support initial proposal 1.2. RRC reconfiguration is suitable for GEO and MAC CE is suitable for LEO.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This was addressed at 17/08 GTW. We continue to think that MAC-CE based signaling can also cover the case when K\_offset is updated infrequently, and can be the only mechanism used. |
| CAICT | Support the proposal. |
| LG | Our preference is removing FFS in the agreement made in GTW session, but we are ok for at this stage. |
| Sony | Support proposal. |
| InterDigital | We don’t support this proposal. We already have a working solution without any issue and introducing RRC signaling for Koffset update will require additional standards efforts which is not desirable at this stage. |
| CMCC | Both MAC CE and RRC should be supported depending on circumstances. |
| Fraunhofer  | We are generally fine with agreement achieved in GTW.  |
| Baicells | **Follow the agreement** in GTW session in 17 Aug that the UE-specific K\_offset can be provided and updated by network with MAC CE. Besides, it should be noted that:Network determines UE-specific K\_offset according to TA\_common (RTT between satellite and RP) + TA\_servicelink (RTT between satellite and UE), in which TA\_servicelink depends on UE report. On the other hand, UE can also determine UE-specific K\_offset according to TA\_common + TA\_servicelink, in which TA\_common depends on network indication. Therefore, both network and UE can determine UE-specific K\_offset if only they exchange the information on TA\_common and TA\_servicelink. It would be redundant if network broadcast both TA\_common and UE-specific K\_offset.Based on the analysis above, we propose:**FFS:** UE and network determine UE-specific K\_offset independently using a same formula according to TA\_common + TA\_servicelink. Alignment should be guaranteed between UE and network by a mechanism. |
| MediaTek | We have preference for UE-specific K\_offset updated by MAC CE, which can also be used in case K\_offset does not need to be updated often. |

## 1.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

At the GTW session on August 17, 2021, the following agreement was made:

Agreement:

* The UE-specific K\_offset can be provided and updated by network with MAC CE.
* FFS: UE can be provided and updated by network with a UE-specific K\_offset in RRC reconfiguration
	+ FFS: Details on whether and how the two solutions work together

Based on the views expressed, it can be seen that there are a number of companies that would like to support the RRC reconfiguration method, but there are also several companies that question the necessity and raise some issues.

Given this situation, it is recommended that the proponents further justify the necessity of the RRC reconfiguration method at the next RAN1 meeting to convince the suspicious companies. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss issue #1 further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #1:**

Proponents are encouraged to further justify the necessity of the RRC reconfiguration method for updating UE-specific K\_offset at the next RAN1 meeting.

# 2 Issue #2: K\_offset value determination

## 2.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, many companies provide views on K\_offset configuration.

**[Huawei, HiSilicon]**

Proposal 1: For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, K\_offset is equal to the sum of two offset values

* The first offset value is equal to common TA signaled in system information
* The second offset is signaled in system information and covers the maximum service link RTD within the cell.

**[vivo]**

Proposal 2: Support to signaling one offset value for K\_offset (Option 1) in system information.

**[Spreadtrum]**

Proposal 1: One offset value indicated by system information for K\_offset is cover the RTT of service link plus the RTT between serving satellite and reference point.

**[Zhejiang Lab]**

Proposal 2: The initial value(s) of K\_offset should be chosen considering the worst case, i.e., cell edge UE and the K\_offset value(s) should depend on numerology and satellite type.

**[Baicells]**

Proposal 7: For determination of cell-specific K\_offset, support as many as possible options to facilitate different system deployments:

* Option 1: Signal 1 value as the cell-specific K\_offset. It is an upper limit value to cover all possible TA in the cell during the total period of a feeder link connection, so that it does not need update during this feederlink connection.
* Option 2: Signal 2 values. Value1 is to cover TA\_servicelink\_max. Value2 is to cover TA\_common. Cell-specific K\_offset is the sum of Value1 and Value2.
* Option 3: Signal 3 values. Value1 is TA\_servicelink\_max. Value2 is gNB’s location. Value3 is TA\_network. UE calculates TA\_feederlink base on value2 and ephemeris information. Then UE calculate cell-specific K\_offset using the formula:
cell-specific K\_offset = ceiling ( (TA\_servicelink\_max + TA\_feederlink -TA\_network) / slot duration )

Where,

TA\_servicelink\_max is the TA to cover the maximum RTT of the servicelink in a cell.

TA\_feederlink is the TA to cover the feeder link.

TA\_common is the TA to cover the RTT between RP and satellite.

TA\_network is the TA compensated by the network.

**[Sony]**

Proposal 1: Part of K\_offset value should be implicitly derived by calculation at the UE from the .

Proposal 2: RAN1 should support to signal a first offset value and a second offset value for determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information.

**[Samsung]**

Proposal 2: Configure only a single value for K\_offset.

**[CATT]**

Proposal 1: For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, signaling two offset values is preferred.

Proposal 2: Indicating cell-specific K\_offset by SIB1 to UE is supported.

Proposal 3: TA should be reported in Msg3, and signal UE\_specific K\_offset in Msg4.

**[NEC]**

Proposal 2: Support explicit signaling of K\_offset used in initial access in system information.

**[MediaTek]**

Proposal 4: Signal one offset value for K\_offset and TA report are supported.

**[OPPO]**

Proposal 4: decide whether beam-specific K offset is supported in system information before selecting the K offset indication option 1 vs. option 2.

Proposal 5: decide whether common TA can be used to determine the K offset before selecting the K offset indication option 1 vs. option 2.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 5: For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, Option 2 (K\_offset is equal to the sum of the two indicated offset values) should be supported, wherein,

* K\_offset (in unit of slot) = offset\_1 + offset\_2, where offset\_2 is explicitly indicated in system information, and offset\_1 is implicitly determined by common TA ($N\_{TA,common}$) as following.

$$offset\_{1}=\left⌈\frac{N\_{TA,common}∙T\_{c}}{2^{-μ}×10^{-3}}\right⌉$$

**[LGE]**

Proposal 1: Support explicit signaling of K\_offset.

Proposal 2: For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, support signaling one offset value for K\_offset (Option 1).

**[Ericsson]**

Proposal 7 For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, signal one offset value for K\_offset.

Proposal 8 For determination of K\_offset value, down-select one option: Option 1 – signal one K\_offset value with a unit of ms; Option 2 – signal one K\_offset value with a unit of slot associated with a reference numerology.

**[Intel]**

Proposal 3:

* Indication of K\_offset is done using two values for K\_offset determination: K\_offset\_1 and K\_offset\_2
* K\_offset, Common TA and K\_mac are determined based on K\_offset\_1 and K\_offset\_2 values and value of bit a indicated together with K\_offset\_1 and K\_offset\_2
	+ If a = 0,
		- K\_offset = K\_offset\_1 + K\_offset\_2,
		- Common TA = K\_offset\_2, K\_mac = 0
	+ If a = 1,
		- K\_offset = K\_offset\_1,
		- Common TA = 0, K\_mac = K\_offset\_2

**[Apple]**

Proposal 1: Support to signal a single offset value for cell specific $K\_{offset}$.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal-1: Option-1 is preferred with single value to cover the RTT of service link plus the RTT between serving satellite and reference point.

**[NTT Docomo]**

Proposal 1: K\_offset is signaled in SIB1 or in SIB following SIB1.

Proposal 4: For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, signal one offset value for K\_offset.

**[Xiaomi]**

Proposal 2: It is slightly preferred to signal one single value to determine the cell-specific K\_offset in system information.

**[Lenovo, Motorola Mobility]**

Proposal 2: Support K-offset indication with one values. The value corresponding to RTT between UE and reference point.

**[ITL]**

Proposal 4. Single one offset value for K\_offset can be adopted.

**[InterDigital]**

Proposal-1: K-offset value is independently determined/indicated from common TA in the system information (Alt-1)

Proposal-2: a single K-offset value is signaled in SIB (Option-1)

**[Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI]**

Proposal 1: NTN UE should derive the initial value of $K\_{offset}$ from the broadcast system information, e.g., RRC timers T300, T301, T319, and T310.

Proposal 2: Common Timing Advance should be used for determination of the first offset value, capturing the RTT of the satellite to RP, in Option-2 to reduce signaling overhead and avoid duplicate signaling.

Proposal 3: NTN UE should derive the initial value of $K\_{offset}$ from the broadcast system information, e.g., “ra-ContentionResolutionTimer” and common TA for option-2.

Proposal 4: RAN1 to down-select Option-2 for determination of the value of initial $K\_{offset}$.

**[Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell]**

Proposal 3: RAN 1 to adopt one single offset value for K\_offset to be signaled.

Proposal 4: RAN 1 to consider implicit signalling of differential K\_offset in the time/frequency values of the UL scheduling in the RAR as an alternative to explicit NR-beam level signalling in the SI.

Proposal 5: RAN 1 to consider implicit signalling of differential K\_offset in the temporary C-RNTI in RAR as an alternative to explicit NR-beam level signalling in the SI.

The main discussion point is about selection between the two options agreed at RAN1#104bis-e to determine K\_offset value: signal one offset value vs. signal two offset values. The table below presents a summary of the proposed design options and the corresponding proponents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Design option | Proponent(s) |
| Option 1: Signal one offset value for K\_offset  | [16] sources: [vivo, Spreadtrum, Baicells, Samsung, NEC, MediaTek, LGE, Ericsson, Apple, ZTE, NTT Docomo, Xiaomi, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, ITL, InterDigital, Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] |
| Option 2: Signal a first offset value and a second offset value. K\_offset is equal to the sum of the two offset values | [7] sources: [Huawei/HiSilicon, Baicells, Sony, CATT, CMCC, Intel, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI] |

Recall the discussions at the previous meeting, which led to the following recommendation.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #2:**

Companies are encouraged to rethink about their position and come back to this issue at the next RAN1 meeting, taking the following into account.

* The signaling overhead saving in Option 2 vs. Option 1 is only about 1 bit.
* The ~1-bit saving might appear free, but comes at the cost of many disadvantages (more complexity for UE, more specification impact, more sources of inaccuracies, scheduling restriction, etc.)
* 1 bit saving in higher layer signaling is negligible.

It is good to see that now companies are more converging on this issue, with many more companies supporting Option 1 (Signal one offset value for K\_offset).

Besides the limited signaling overhead saving, indeed Option 2 is unnecessarily complicated. For example, the following observations are made in [Apple]’s contribution:

**[Apple]**

The signaling of RTT between satellite and timing reference point is still in discussion under AI 8.4.2. Although a common TA broadcast is supported, whether or not to broadcast common TA drift rate and its high order derivatives is still open. If the common TA drift rate and its high order derivatives are broadcasted, then $K\_{offset1}$ may be maintained by UE, based on broadcasted common TA parameters. This is not desirable since it is not guaranteed that the same $K\_{offset1}$ is maintained by all UEs. Furthermore, the specification impact and UE complexity of Option 2 is higher than Option 1.

Therefore, in Moderator’s view,

* Making K\_offset dependent on common TA is a too much optimization for a basic scheduling parameter as fundamental as K\_offset.
* It is error prone. Think about the misalignment between gNB and UE, the time-varying delay for a message to traverse from gNB to UE, the burden that the network needs to have in order to track the time-varying K\_offset, etc.

The following figure provides an illustration of the complications of making K\_offset dependent on common TA, which may be time varying.



Therefore, it is much more robust that network just signals one value to UE and ask UE to use it for K\_offset. And if necessary, network can send an updated value for UE to use as time goes.

Also, it would be good to start discussing the unit and value range for K\_offset.

## 2.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 2.2 (Moderator):**

1. If the value of K\_offset depends on time-varying common TA, do you agree that there would be a misalignment between gNB and UE about the value of K\_offset? And why?
2. For determination of K\_offset value, which option do you think is better? And why?
	1. Option 1: milliseconds
	2. Option 2: slots for a given subcarrier spacing in a frequency range
3. What is the range of values that should be supported for K\_offset?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | For 1), we think the misalignment between gNB and UE about K\_offset may exist. For example, UE may derive the common TA as 4.4999 ms and gNB may derive the common TA as 4.5000 ms. With the rounding rule, the Koffset derived by gNB could be one larger than the Koffset derived by UE. In another example, UE updates the common TA from 4.4990 ms to 4.5000 ms during its uplink transmissions. gNB is unsure which K\_offset value is used by the UE in its uplink transmissions. For 2). We sligtly prefer Option 2. If the K\_offset is in unit of milliseconds while the sub-carrier spacing is larger than 15 kHz, then some slot numbers cannot be indicated by K\_offset value. For 3). We think the range of K\_offset should be large enough to cover the UE-gNB RTT, which is upper bounded by 542 ms according to 38.821. Hence, the value range of K\_offset is [0, 542] ms (or, in equivalent slots). Some optimization based on scenarios (e.g., LEO, GEO) could be considered. For example, the value range of K\_offset could be [0, 26] ms (or, in equivalent slots) in case of GEO-600.  |
| Zhejiang Lab | I guess the focus should be 2) and 3). For 2), we support option 2 since it is more clear. For 3), we think different value range can be defined for different scenario. For example, one for LEO and one for GEO.  |
| FGI | 1. YES
2. Option2 (that fits K1 and K2)
3. Range of UE’s TA (which shall be defined as well)
 |
| Xiaomi | For 1), we are discussing the value determination of cell-specific Koffset. In our understanding, signaling one value or two value depending on the common TA may not lead to misalignment issue between gNB and UEFor 2), we don’t have a strong view. Either option is fine to us. As the DL/UL operation is numerology dependent, if option 2 is used, a reference numerology needs to be definedFor 3), the range of Koffset is up to gNB’s configuration as it is dependent on the scenarios such as GEO/LEO and RP location. The value range can be large enough to cover the UE-gNB RTT. For example, the value range can be up to [0, 540]ms for GEO case in some cases.  |
| ZTE | For Q1, Yes, if K\_offset(in fact only partial K\_offset) is associated to common TA, different UEs may calculate the value of K\_offset in different time instant based on the common TA drift rate, that leads to different results of configuration of first value of K\_offset which are supposed to be common. Besides, there would be misalignment between gNB and UE if they derive the first value of K\_offset at different time instant, respectively. For Q2, Both are fine. And configurable granularity is preferred, because proper unit of K\_offset corresponding to different scenarios may reduce signalling overhead.For Q3, the range of K\_offset is related to the value range of RTT in specific scenarios. E.g., for GEO, assume the max RTT is 541.46 ms (service and feeder links) , the value range of K\_offset could be 238 ms~542 ms. |
| Intel | 1. In our view cell-specific K\_offset should be based only on constant Common TA indicated in the SI and any additional parameters (e.g. Common TA drift rate) shall be ignored for K\_offset determination. Thus, any issue with time-varying Common TA can be avoided.
2. Option 1 and Option 2 are similar since translation of milliseconds to slots is trivial to specify
3. We prefer to have full range of K\_offset from 0 to maximum value (according to the max RTT). In order to decrease the overhead value of K\_offset can be downsampled especially for higher SCS.

Also, regarding the benefit from dividing K\_offset into two parts, the overhead savings is more than 1 bit if K\_mac is considered jointly with Common TA and K\_offset. Since those 3 parameters are related to feeder link delay it is redundant to do separate indication. We propose to consider the following solution which enables deployments with aligned DL-UL timing and not aligned DL-UL timing at the gNB.* Indication of K\_offset is done using two values for K\_offset determination: K\_offset\_1 and K\_offset\_2
* K\_offset, Common TA and K\_mac are determined based on K\_offset\_1 and K\_offset\_2 values and value of bit a indicated together with K\_offset\_1 and K\_offset\_2
	+ If a = 0,
		- K\_offset = K\_offset\_1 + K\_offset\_2,
		- Common TA = K\_offset\_2, K\_mac = 0
	+ If a = 1,
		- K\_offset = K\_offset\_1,

Common TA = 0, K\_mac = K\_offset\_2 |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | As a starting point, we do not support UE autonomous update of K\_offset values. The K\_offset value is expected to be broadcast by the gNB, and potentially updated on a per-need and per-UE basis. There is no need for defining a UE autonomous behaviour for the K\_offset value. We think that there may be potential misalignment – for the transition period – if the K\_offset depends on the common TA.For the second part of the question we are a bit uncertain if this question is related to the actual indication of the K\_offset (the granularity of the parameter) or for the UE autonomous determination of K\_offset value. For the granularity of the parameter, the slot unit seems reasonable. For the third question the range of values would vary by the deployment scenario, such that LEO, MEO and GEO would most likely have a need for different value ranges.  |
| Ericsson | On 1): Yes. Coupling K\_offset value determination with common TA is a too much optimization for a basic scheduling parameter as fundamental as K\_offset.On 2): Either option is fine.On 3): Either a single value range defined for all scenarios (simple with a bit more overhead) or different value ranges for different scenarios (more involved with some potential overhead saving). |
| Lenovo/MM | For (1), we don’t think there is misalignment between gNB and UE on time-varing common TA. The reason is that when common TA is indicated by a value and the drift rate, and even the derivation of the drift rate, gNB will know the indicated parameteres and gNB can also estimate the time when common TA related parameteres are received by UE. And meanwhile, common TA indication is also used for TA determination for uplink transmission, and TA has a finer granularity than K-offset, so to guarantee the uplink transmission accuracy, gNB and UE should have common understandong in common TA.For (2), We prefre option 2 with slot level K-offset indication as this is straight forward for schedulilng.For (3), We think there should be different sets of values for different scenarios (GEO,LEO, MEO). Different sets can be selected by high layer signaling. For the values in a set, only values associated with nearest distance between UE-satellite-gNB and farthest distance between UE-satellite-gNB need to be configured and signaled. |
| Samsung | 1. There is no misalignment. But, if RRC configuration is only used to update, there could be a misalignment.
2. Option 2.
3. It depends on the altitude of a satellite. K\_offset should cover all range of the delay for a given altitude.
 |
| Panasonic | 1. If the Koffset is derived from common TA drift rate based on UE calculation, misalignment between gNB and UE may occur.
2. We slightly prefer option 2 (based on slot) because K1/K2 is slot basis.
3. Agree with ZTE and Nokia. Value range would depend on the deployment scenario (GEO/LEO/MEO, etc).
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. It is not clear why there will be any misalignment between the gNB and UE. Even if common TA is time varying, it will be derived based on the same formula with the same set of parameters, e.g. common TA, common timing drift rate, higher order derivative of common TA (if agreed), etc. In the end, the values of these paratemeters will be decided together with a corresponding granularity. Hence there will be no misalignment between the gNB and UE.
2. Option 2. The reference SCS for each freqeuncy range can be predefined. The specification impact might be smaller for the timing relationships.
3. The value of K\_offset should cover the sum of feeder link RTD and maximum service link RTD. As an example, this corresponds to 541 ms for GEO.
 |
| Spreadtrum | 1): Yes. We agree with ZTE’s point of view.2): Both are fine.3): The value of K\_offset depends on the maximum possible TA compensation value in the cell or beam coverage area. TA compensation value is related to the altitude of the satellite and the position of the reference point. |
| CAICT | On 1) YES since UE might update the common TA autonomously. we share the same view with Nokia that UE autonomous behavior for the K-offset update shoub be avoid here.On 2) Either option is fineOn 3) We slightly prefer that multiple value ranges can be introduced here to cover the max RTTs of different scenarios.  |
| LG | For Q1, yesFor Q2, we slightly prefere option 2.For Q3, K\_offset value ranges depends on deployment scenarios, e.g., GEO, LEO-600, LEO-1200.  |
| QC | Yes for Q1. In addition, we don’t see the need/benefits of having Koffset explicitly dependent on varying common TA.For Q2, we prefer option 2 but option 1 is also acceptable. |
| Sony | 1. YES
2. Option 2.
3. The range could be difference between the one way delay between TN and GEO NTN.
 |
| CMCC | 1. No. If common\_TA related parameters (e.g. common TA, common timing drift rate, higher order derivative of common TA (if agreed), etc.) and offset\_2 are indicated in the same SIB, there seems no misalignment between the gNB and UE since offset\_1 is derived on the same formula with the same set of common\_TA related parameters.
2. Option 2 is slightly preferred for straightforward.
3. Regarding the potential solution of different value ranges for different scenarios (e.g., GEO, MEO, LEO), how to indicate the scenario?
 |
| vivo | For 1), YES, if the value of Koffset is derived from time varying common TA, there would be a misalignment between gNB and UE about the value of K\_offset. Because the timing between gNB and UE can not be perfectly aligned, then they could calculate the Koffset based on different time instant. For 2), we slight prefer option 1. For option 2, the K\_offset may have differrent value range due to the different numerology.For 3), different value range can be defined based on different scenarios, for example, GEO, MEO, or LEO-600, or LEO-1200. |
| Fraunhofer | Our opinion with respect to this issue did not reflect properly in FL summary. We agree with Intel that signaling overhead reduction is more than 1 bit. In particular, in our contribution, we pointed out to other procedures that may benefit (reducing signaling overhead) from K\_offset signaling with two parameters such as feeder link switch. With respect to the questions asked above: 1. We do not agree that there will be a misalignment between gNB and UE. The reason is simply because the broadcast parameters are also known at gNB. Moreover, the parameters broadcast by gNB for common delay estimation are also used for calculation of common TA, which has a finer granularity. Several companies, including Fraunhofer, provided simulation results to AI 8.4.2 showing the accuracy of common TA estimation via the broadcast parameters by the gNB. Also, we are a bit puzzled to see some of the companies challenging the accuracy of common delay estimation here have a different opinions for common TA estimation. We do understand that depending on the choice of subset of parameters going to be broadcast by gNB, e.g. common delay, delay drift rate, and higher order derivatives of common delay, the accuracy of the common TA estimation can be different. If this is the concern, then perhaps we can wait for the progress in AI 8.4.2 for this issue.
2. Either option is fine as the conversion is straightforward. We have a slight preference over Option#2.

The range is scenario dependent, but should be large enough to cover the the end-to-end UE-gNB RTT. |
| OPPO | 1. It is correct that if K offset is determied by common TA, there might be the case that gNB and UE mis-understand each other as the gNB does not know the time instance the UE calculates the K offset.
2. Because the K offset usage is for slot offset, thus take slot unit seems natural.

The range of the K offset should cover the maximum range of the RTT.  |
| Baicells | For clarity, we propose to state ‘Cell-specific K\_offset’ explicitly instead of ‘K\_offset’ in this issue.1. For Q1, YES, if Cell-specific K\_offset is time-varying, misalignment between gNB and UE may occur. A mechanism to avoid the misalignment should be discussed.
2. For Q2, Option 2.
3. For Q3, Value range should depend on the deployment scenario (GEO/LEO/MEO, etc).
 |
| MediaTek | Q1: Yes. Misalignment could happen due to the timing-varying delay for a message from gNB to reach UE. Hence, it seems un-necessary and simpler not to make K\_offset depends on time-varying common TA. Q2: Option 2.a. K\_offset can be coarse granularity of a slot. This is sufficient to ensure more efficient UL scheduler operations.Q3: If necessary, the network can update K\_offset with MAC CE from time to time. This may depend on the scenario – e.g. LEO earth-moving beam, LEO earth-fixed bam, GEO. A single range or several ranges could be further discussed.  |

## 2.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

### 2.3.1 On coupling K\_offset with common TA

[15] companies hold the view that if the value of K\_offset depends on time-varying common TA, there would be a misalignment between gNB and UE about the value of K\_offset.

* [Apple, FGI, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Panasonic, Spreadtrum, CAICT, LG, QC, Sony, vivo, OPPO, Baicells, MediaTek]

[7] companies hold the view that the misalignment issue may not occur.

* [Xiaomi, Intel, Lenovo/MM, Samsung, Huawei/HiSi, CMCC, Franuhofer]

Besides, [Intel, Fraunhofer] point out that coupling K\_offset with common TA can save more than 1 bit overhead.

Given this situation, it is recommended that companies check each other’s comments, analyze the implications of coupling K\_offset with common TA, and bring more inputs at the next RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #1 – Coupling K\_offset with common TA:**

It is recommended that companies check each other’s comments, analyze the implications of coupling K\_offset with common TA, and bring more inputs to the next RAN1 meeting.

### 2.3.2 On the unit of K\_offset

There is good consensus on the unit of K\_offset, as summarized in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Option 1: milliseconds | [vivo] |
| Option 2: slots for a given subcarrier spacing in a frequency range | [Apple, Zhejiang Lab, FGI, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo/MM, Samsung, Panasonic, Huawei/HiSi, LG, QC, Sony, CMCC, Fraunhofer, OPPO, Baicells, MediaTek] |
| Either is fine | [Xiaomi, ZTE, Intel, Ericsson, Spreadtrum, CAICT] |

Therefore, the following proposal was made and discussed in the email reflector:

**Proposal 1 – v0**

The unit of K\_offset is number of slots for a given subcarrier spacing in a given frequency range.

The following version is stable in the reflector:

**Proposal 1 – v1**

The unit of K\_offset is number of slots for a given subcarrier spacing.

* FFS: one subcarrier spacing value or different subcarrier spacing values for different scenarios.

### 2.3.3 On the range of K\_offset

[14] companies comment that different ranges can be considered for different scenarios

* [Apple, Zhejiang Lab, Xiaomi, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo/MM, Samsung, Panasonic, CAICT, LG, CMCC, vivo, Fraunhofer, Baicells]

[Intel] prefer to have full range of K\_offset from 0 to maximum value.

Based on the views expressed, the following proposal is made. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Proposal 2.3.3 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

Support different value ranges of K\_offset for different scenarios.

* FFS: types of scenarios
* FFS: the corresponding value range of K\_offset for each scenario

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | The range of the K offset should cover the maximum range of the RTT – e.g. LEO 600 km and 1200 km, MEO, GEO. The assumption for RTT can be based on TR 38.811. |
| Apple | We support the proposal.  |
| Zhejiang Lab | Support |
| Lenovo/MM | Support. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 3 Issue #3: K\_offset usage

## 3.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, many companies provide views on K\_offset update after initial access.

**[Baicells]**

Proposal 8-1: Explicitly state cell-specific K\_offset instead of ‘The K\_offset value signaled in system information’.

Proposal 8-2：In RAN1, we suggest to use the specific types of K\_offset, i.e. cell-specific K\_offset, beam-specific K\_offset or UE-specific K\_offset, when discussing its usage.

Proposal 8-3：Cell-specific, beam-specific and UE-specific K\_offset need to be maintained separately so that it can be assigned, updated and used independently.

Proposal 9-1：Cell/Beam specific K\_offset configured in system information or msg2 should be used for timing relationships related to random access.

Proposal 9-2：If UE is provided with UE-specific K\_offset, it should be used for timing relationships that not related to random access processes.

Proposal 9-3：If UE-specific K\_offset is aging, cell/beam specific value should be used instead of it.

Proposal 9-4：When beam/UE specific K\_offset is not available, cell-specific value can be applied for all the timing relationships.

**[Sony]**

Proposal 3: When enhancing relationships by K\_offset extension, apply the extension before the TA.

**[Samsung]**

Proposal 5: More than one of above Koffset configurations can be supported, and using which one is dependent on gNB configuration.

**[CAICT]**

Proposal 2: Use cell-specific $K\_{offset}$ for the timing relationships related to fallback DCI formats and use updated $K\_{offset}$ for the timing relationships related to non-fallback DCI formats.

**[FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI]**

Proposal 6 Support the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI.

Proposal 7 Support the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI.

Proposal 8 No additional transmission timings related to fallback DCI formats are needed if the MAC CE option is supported for updating K\_offset after initial access.

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 3: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 and HARQ-ACK to PDSCH scheduled by DCI 1\_0, Koffset value signaled in system information should be used.

**[Ericsson]**

Proposal 3 The K\_offset value signaled in system information is always used for the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI and C-RNTI.

Proposal 4 The K\_offset value signaled in system information is always used for the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by MsgB-RNTI and C-RNTI

Proposal 5 The K\_offset value signaled in system information is always used for any fallback DCI 1\_0 / 0\_0 scheduled transmission timing in which K\_offset is applicable.

**[Ericsson]** – cont’d

Proposal 6 Clarify how K\_offset is used in each timing relationship as follows:

* For the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH (including CSI on PUSCH), the slot allocated for the PUSCH is $\left⌊n⋅\frac{2^{μ\_{PUSCH}}}{2^{μ\_{PDCCH}}}\right⌋+K\_{2}+K\_{offset}$.
* For the transmission timing of RAR grant scheduled PUSCH, the UE transmits the PUSCH in slot $n + K\_{2} +Δ+K\_{offset}$.
* For the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH, the UE provides corresponding HARQ-ACK information in a PUCCH transmission within slot $n+K\_{1}+K\_{offset}$.
* For the CSI reference resource timing, the CSI reference resource is given in the downlink slot $n-n\_{CSI\_{ref}}-K\_{offset}$.
* For the transmission timing of aperiodic SRS, the UE transmits aperiodic SRS in each of the triggered SRS resource set(s) in slot $\left⌊n∙2^{\frac{μ\_{SRS}}{μ\_{PDCCH}}}\right⌋+k+K\_{offset}$.

**[Apple]**

Proposal 5: If a UE is provided with a $K\_{offset}$ value beyond system information, then that $K\_{offset}$ value is used for the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to Msg4/MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI.

Proposal 6: If a UE is provided with a $K\_{offset}$ value beyond system information, then that $K\_{offset}$ value is used for the transmission timings scheduled by fallback DCI formats.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal-7: It is preferred that initial K\_offset can be applied for following timing relationships:

* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI

Proposal-8: If there is signaling of K\_offset conveyed in Msg2 (e.g., beam-specific value), the K\_offset value can be applied in the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to Msg4.

Proposal-9: No need to define the limitation that only cell-specific K\_offset is used for transmission scheduled by fallback DCI formats.

**[ITL]**

Proposal 3. It is agreeable to use cell-specific K\_offset value for the case where fallback DCI is used.

**[Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell]**

Proposal 1: For Fallback DCI formats, the cell-specific K\_offset, which is broadcasted in SI, should be used.

The proposals mainly focus on addressing the FFS’s in the following agreement made at RAN1#105-e:

Agreement:

The K\_offset value signaled in system information is always used for

* The transmission timing of RAR / fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH
* The transmission timing of Msg3 retransmission scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI
	+ FFS: The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by MsgB-RNTI
	+ FFS: The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI

FFS: how to treat additional transmission timings related to fallback DCI formats

FFS: how to update this formulation with beam-specific K\_offset if beam-specific K\_offset is agreed to be supported

Since the last FFS is related to beam-specific K\_offset, the support of which is still pending, the following discussions focus on the first three FFS’s.

### 3.1.1 On the “FFS: The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI” and the “FFS: The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI”

The table below presents a summary of the proposed design options and the corresponding proponents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI
 | Proponent(s) |
| Always use the cell-specific K\_offset (i.e., the K\_offset value signaled in system information) | [8] sources: [Baicells, CAICT, FGI/Asia Pacific Telecom/III/ITRI, Panasonic, Ericsson, ZTE, ITL, Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] |
| UE-specific K\_offset if provided (otherwise, use the cell-specific K\_offset) | [1] sources: [Apple] |

Several observations are in order.

* Based on companies’ positions, many hold the view that the cell-specific K\_offset (i.e., the K\_offset value signaled in system information) should always be used when the CRC of the DCI format 1\_0 is scrambled by C-RNTI for the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH, which is same behavior as when the CRC of the DCI format 1\_0 is scrambled by TC-RNTI.
* Similarly, many hold the view that the cell-specific K\_offset (i.e., the K\_offset value signaled in system information) should always be used when the CRC of the DCI format 1\_0 is scrambled by C-RNTI for the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB, which is same behavior as when the CRC of the DCI format 1\_0 is scrambled by MsgB-RNTI.

In Moderator’s view, having consistent behavior can simplify implementation, as proposed by many companies. That said, it would be good to collect views from more companies.

### 3.1.2 On the “FFS: how to treat additional transmission timings related to fallback DCI formats”

The table below presents a summary of the proposed design options and the corresponding proponents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| How to treat additional transmission timings related to fallback DCI formats | Proponent(s) |
| Always use the cell-specific K\_offset (i.e., the K\_offset value signaled in system information) | [5] sources: [CAICT, Panasonic, Ericsson, ITL, Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] |
| UE-specific K\_offset if provided (otherwise, use the cell-specific K\_offset) | [4] sources: [Baicells, FGI/Asia Pacific Telecom/III/ITRI, Apple, ZTE] |

It can be seen that the views are more polarized in this case. Thus, it would be good to collect views from more companies.

## 3.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 3.2 (Moderator):**

1. On the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, which option do you think is better? And why?
	1. Option 1: Always use the cell-specific K\_offset (i.e., the K\_offset value signaled in system information)
	2. Option 2: UE-specific K\_offset if provided (otherwise, use the cell-specific K\_offset)
2. On the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, which option do you think is better? And why?
	1. Option 1: Always use the cell-specific K\_offset (i.e., the K\_offset value signaled in system information)
	2. Option 2: UE-specific K\_offset if provided (otherwise, use the cell-specific K\_offset)
3. On the “FFS: how to treat additional transmission timings related to fallback DCI formats”, which option do you think is better? And why?
	1. Option 1: Always use the cell-specific K\_offset (i.e., the K\_offset value signaled in system information)
	2. Option 2: UE-specific K\_offset if provided (otherwise, use the cell-specific K\_offset)

Note: how to update this formulation with beam-specific K\_offset can be discussed later if beam-specific K\_offset is agreed to be supported.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | For 1) and 2), we prefer Option 2, since it achieves higher scheduling efficiency. For 3), we prefer Option 2. In many cases, UE only needs to monitor fallback DCIs. Using a UE-specific K\_offset has the advantage of efficient scheduling. Considering the number of times that UE receiving fallback DCIs for uplink scheduling, it is preferred to support Option 2.  |
| Zhejiang Lab | For all situations, we prefer option 2 since UE-specific K\_offset should always be used if provided. |
| FGI | Q1) Option 1 (cell-specific) Q2) Option 1 (cell-specific)Q3) Option 1 (cell-specific)For 1) and 2) It seems less problematic if CBRA in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE/CONNECTED and CFRA in RRC\_CONNECTED only use cell-specific K\_offset.For 3), to support UE-specific K\_offset in RRC reconfiguration, option 1 may be better to handle the ambitious period of 10ms. |
| Xiaomi | For 1) and 2) we prefer option 2.For 3), we prefer option 2, as long as UE-specific Koffset is provided, it should be used. As in NTN scenario, due to strictly link budget, fallback DCI is mostly used to gurantee the control information reliability. In this sense, option 2 is preferred to acheive higher efficiency. |
| ZTE | For Q1, for this case, in our view, only Option-1 shoud be consdiered since the contention resolution related behavior occurs during the initial access. In this way, the UE specific value is not available.For Q2, similar to Q1, option 2 may not work, specifically, assume updated K\_offset is indicated in MsgB, the value can’t be applied for NACK reporting since the value can’t be got when transport block in MsgB isn’t detected. For Q3, option 2 is more reasonable, it has been agreed that when UE is not provided updated information, the initial K\_offset value can be used. |
| Intel | We don’t see significant issue for Option 2, Option 2 is more efficient from the delay perspective.  |
| OPPO | We think the question 1) and 2) are not valid questions. There does not exisit contention resolution PDSCH scheudled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC C-RNTI. At least from the current spec, the contention resolution PDSCH is always scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC TC-RNTI. Our proposal is that * For any uplink transmisisons within RACH procedure, apply a cell-specific K offset.
* For any uplink transmission after RACH procedure, apply a UE-specific K offset

if no UE-specific K offset, apply a cell-specific K offset |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | On aspect (1), we arepinion opinoin that the contention resolution is part of the initial access procedure. For such case, the gNB will have had the chance to update the UE specific K\_offset value. Hence, the gNB would need to assume that UE applies the cell-specific K\_offset value.On aspect (2), the same argumentation would apply, so cell-specific K\_offset would need to be applied here as well.On aspect (3), the gNB would use fallback DCI formats when there is a risk of the UE not being able to understand the other configured DCI formats. Hence, the UE should not be expected to have any understanding of any configured UE specific K\_offset. |
| NTT DOCOMO | For 1) and 2), we prefer Option1, since it’s better to have the same mechansim with the PUCCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI. |
| Ericsson | On (1): Option 1 – to be consistent with the behavior agreed for TC-RNTI* Note that there does exist contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI. Please check TS 38.321, Section 5.1.5.

On (2): Option 1 – to be consistent with the behavior agreed for MsgB-RNTIOn (3): Option 1 – A natural choice if Option 1 is agreed for (1) and (2) |
| Lenovo/MM | For (1) and (2), We prefer Option 1 for simplicity and common framework.For (3), we prefer Option 2. The reason is that fallback DCI can be used in many circumstances, e.g. channel status not good enough, however it doesn’t mean synchronization is lost, so cell-specific K-offset is not necessary. |
| Samsung | 1. Option 1
2. Option 1
3. Option 1
 |
| Panasonic | 1), 2) As commented by OPPO, our understanding is also that the contention resolution PDSCH is always scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC TC-RNTI accoding to 38.213 section 8.4. According to 38.321 section 5.1.5, random access procedure ends if PDCCH with C-RNTI is received. There are no description of contention resulution PDSCH scheduled by DCI scrambled by C-RNTI, although we may misunderstand something. If there exist contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI scrambled by C-RNTI, we support option 1 as same behavior with for TC-RNTI. 3) Agree with Nokia. Cell specific Koffset (Koffset signaled in system information) should be used for fallback DCI.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 for cases 1 and Option 2 for case 2 and 3. |
| CAICT | 1) Option 12) Option 13) Option 1During initial access, in the transition period of RRC reconfigurations, during handover procedure, and etc, gNB and UE may have inconsistent understanding of UE-specific propagation delay or the updated UE-specific $K\_{offset}$ may be outdated and could not cover the current UE-gNB RTT. Use cell-specific K\_offset signaled in system information could be feasible and get robustness performance in these procedures.  |
| LG | For all cases, we prefer option 2.  |
| QC | Not sure if Q1 is a valid case. Regardless, if C-RNTI is used, it means that network knows the UE identity and UE specific Koffset, if available, should be used. |
| Sony | Q1) Option 2Q2) Option 2 |
| CMCC | 1) Option 12) Option 13) Option 1 |
| vivo | Prefer Option 2 for all case. |
| OPPO2 | In our understanding, when TC-RNTI is considered, the netowrk cannot differentiate idle UE and connected UE, thus, naturally cell-specific K offset is used. But when C-RNTI is considered, the network already identifies the UE, therefore, UE-specific K offset should be used. Regarding whether there exists a contention resolution PDSCH, we share similar view as Panasonic that when the scheduling DCI is CRC with C-RNTI, RACH procedure should stop here and the scheduled PDSCH does not contain a UE contention resolution ID MAC-CE. That’s why we say the contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by a DCI with CRC C-RNTI does not exsit. But if our understanding is not correct, please excuse us.  |
| Baicells | 1. On the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, **we prefer Option 1 to reduce complexity.**
2. On the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI, **we prefer Option 1 to reduce complexity.**

**Furthermore, since that both 1) and 2) are related to random access,** the cell/beam specific K\_offset should be used for timing relationships related to random access. Considering different situations in random access：(1) In initial access, UEs have not accessed the network and can’t obtain the UE-specific K\_offset, so the cell/beam specific K\_offset (signaled in system information or msg2) should be used.(2) UEs perform random access in connected state, for example, cell handover. If UE is provided with UE-specific K\_offset, when multiple UEs use their respective values, the network may not be able to track these values in time, which will lead to conflict and waste of system resources. Therefore, in order to ensure access, cell/beam specific K\_offset instead of UE specific should be used.1. On the “FFS: how to treat additional transmission timings related to fallback DCI formats”，**we prefer Option 2 to reduce scheduling delay.**

We think that “additional transmission timings related to fallback DCI formats” is other than the following timing relationships:* The transmission timing of RAR / fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH
* The transmission timing of Msg3 retransmission scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI and C-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by MsgB-RNTI and C-RNTI

In order to make it complete, we suggest to clarify the statement of *“*additional transmission timings related to fallback DCI formats*”.* |
| MediaTek | Q1: Option 1: During contention resolution, only the cell-specific K\_offset broadcast on SIB can be used by UE for UL scheduling of Msg 3.Q2: Option 2: Similar to Q1, the issue here is the UL scheduling of NACK reporting for Msg B in case MsgB cannot be detected (Option 2 in this erroneous case does not work).Q3: Option a seems more robust in case fall back DCI needs to be used.  |

## 3.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

For further discussion, it is worth clarifying whether Questions 1 and 2 are valid, as raised by [OPPO, Panasonic].

* Regarding Question 1, according to TS 38.321, 5.1.5: Contention Resolution, there may be PUSCH scheduled if the PDCCH is addressed to C-RNTI in Contention Resolution procedure. So indeed, there is no “contention resolution PDSCH” in this case.

3> if the Random Access procedure was initiated by the MAC sublayer itself or by the RRC sublayer and the PDCCH transmission is addressed to the C-RNTI and contains a UL grant for a new transmission:

4> consider this Contention Resolution successful;

4> stop *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer*;

4> discard the *TEMPORARY\_C-RNTI*;

4> consider this Random Access procedure successfully completed.

* Regarding Question 2, according to TS 38.321, 8.2A: Random access response - Type-2 random access procedure, there may be PDSCH scheduled by PDCCH scrambled by C-RNTI, but it appears this PDSCH is not called MSGB (the spec text just refers to it as MAC PDU). It would be good to hear companies’ views in this regard.

4> if a downlink assignment has been received on the PDCCH for the C-RNTI and the received TB is successfully decoded:

5> if the MAC PDU contains the Absolute Timing Advance Command MAC CE:

6> process the received Timing Advance Command (see clause 5.2);

6> consider this Random Access Response reception successful;

6> stop the *msgB-ResponseWindow*;

6> consider this Random Access procedure successfully completed and finish the disassembly and demultiplexing of the MAC PDU.

2> if a valid (as specified in TS 38.213 [6]) downlink assignment has been received on the PDCCH for the MSGB-RNTI and the received TB is successfully decoded:

3> if the MSGB contains a MAC subPDU with Backoff Indicator:

Regarding Question 3, the views are polarized. Companies are encouraged to check the views expressed by other companies.

In the second round of this discussion, companies are encouraged to provide views on the following proposal.

**Proposal 3.3 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

1. Do you agree that there is no need to further address the “FFS: The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI”?
2. For the PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI in the random access response in Type-2 random access procedure, is the PDSCH a MsgB?
	1. If no, do you agree that there is no need to further address the “FFS: The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI”?
3. On the “FFS: how to treat additional transmission timings related to fallback DCI formats”, do you have updated views regarding the following two options after checking other companies’ comments in the 1st round of email discussion?
	1. Option 1: Always use the cell-specific K\_offset (i.e., the K\_offset value signaled in system information)
	2. Option 2: UE-specific K\_offset if provided (otherwise, use the cell-specific K\_offset)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | 1. Yes
2. Yes. To our understanding the MAC PDU is carried on PDSCH and it is mentioned *“stop the msgB-ResponseWindow*“ according to TS 38.321, 8.2A
3. Option a
 |
| Apple | Q1: We agree when C-RNTI is used to scramble the DCI CRC, then the random access procedure is completed. There is no contention resolution PDSCH (Msg4) scheduled by DCI with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI. No need to further discuss. Q2: We agree when C-RNTI is used to scramble the DCI CRC, then the random acces procedure is completed. There is no contention resolution PDSCH (MsgB) scheduled by DCI with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI. No need to further discuss.Q3: We still prefer Option 2. Considering that MAC CE is used to carry UE specific Koffset, there is no ambiguity on the activation timing of the UE specific Koffset. Hence, UE-specific Koffset is more scheduling efficient.  |
| Zhejiang Lab | 1. Yes
2. Yes
3. Option 2.
 |
| Lenovo/MM | Q1: Yes.Q2: Yes.Q3: We still prefer Option 2 for scheduilng efficiency. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 4 Issue #4: Beam-specific K\_offset in initial access

## 4.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**Proposals that support introducing beam specific Koffset**

**[vivo]**

Proposal 1: Support beam-specific K\_offset for initial access.

**[Spreadtrum]**

Proposal 2: Beam-specific values of K\_offset configuration for initial access should be supported.

**[Zhejiang Lab]**

Proposal 1: Per beam K\_offset configuration should be supported and for the case of implicit configuration derived from per cell common TA, the difference between the per cell K\_offset and the per beam K\_offset can be signaled in the system information to reduce the signaling overhead, i.e., in the second offset value.

**[Baicells]**

Proposal 6：Support beam-specific K\_offset to to achieve better efficiency in UL response or achieve better efficiency in signaling overhead.

Proposal 10-3: In order to support beam-specific K\_offset, we suggest to support beam-specific system information, which carries beam-specific K\_offset value and is broadcast in each beam.

Proposal 10-4: Temporary C-RNTI in msg2 is suitable to carry beam-specific K\_ offset, due to its large range and thus flexibility.

Proposal 10-5: Support beam-specific K\_ offset in initial access, using one or more modes from Mode 1 to Mode 4 elaborated above.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 6: gNB has the flexibility of configuring cell-specific or beam specific value of K\_offset.

* Beam specific SIB can be supported, i.e., different beam specific SIB may carry different beam specific values (e.g., K\_offset).

**[LGE]**

Proposal 3: Support beam (group)-specific K\_offset signaling in addition to cell-specific K\_offset in initial access.

**[Intel]**

Proposal 1: Support beam specific K\_offset configured in system information for initial access

* Support indication of K\_offset difference between adjacent beams with up to X bits per beam (e.g. X = 2)
* K\_offset for all beams should be indicated in the SI transmitted in every beam

**[Xiaomi]**

Proposal 1: Beam-specific K\_offset configuration during the initial access should be supported.

**[Lenovo, Motorola Mobility]**

Proposal 4: Support indication of beam specific K-offset.

Proposal 5: The beam specific K-offset can be indicated by an associated RS explicitly or implicitly.

**[InterDigital]**

Proposal-6: beam-specific K-offset indication is also supported optionally

**Proposals that do no support introducing beam specific Koffset**

**[Samsung]**

Proposal 4: Only Cell-specific K\_offset in initial access is supported.

**[NEC]**

Proposal 1: Support cell specific K\_offset value only configured in system information for use in initial access.

**[FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI]**

Proposal 9 Postpone the discussion on beam-specific K\_offset update for waiting for more progress on the association between satellite beams and BWPs.

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 1: Beam specific Koffset is not necessary.

**[NTT DOCOMO]**

Proposal 2: K\_offset in initial access is a cell-specific parameter. Beam-specific K\_offset is not supported.

**[ITL]**

Proposal 5. Cell-specific K\_offset is only supported in initial access procedure.

**[Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell]**

Proposal 2: For initial access, only cell-specific K\_offset is provided.

**Proposals on how to support beam specific Koffset (if supported)**

**[Huawei, HiSilicon]**

Proposal 2: For determination of beam specific K\_offset used in initial access if supported, K\_offset is equal to the sum of two offset values

* The first offset value is equal to common TA signaled in system information
* The second offset is signaled in Msg2 and covers the maximum service link RTD within the beam.

Proposal 3: If a UE is provided with a beam-specific K\_offset value, the beam-specific K\_offset value will be used for

* The transmission timing of RAR/fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH
* The transmission timing of Msg3 retransmission scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by MsgB-RNTI

This issue has been discussed at 4 RAN1 meetings with several rounds of email discussion and debated at GTW session. The pros and cons of supporting beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access are clear to the group – same comments have been made by both sides over the meetings.

In fact, given the views expressed at RAN1#104-e, and RAN1#104bis-e, it was recommended at the two RAN1 meetings that the proponents to offline discuss with other companies to make progress.

However, the proponents had not brought to the Moderator’s attention whether there had been such offline discussion, and if yes, what the outcome was.

Further, at RAN1#105-e, another round of views from companies were collected but convergence turned out to be not possible.

Reading through the submitted contributions, the status does not change much compared to where we have been in over the past several RAN1 meetings.

Therefore, Moderator would like to continue to encourage the proponents of beam-specific K\_offset to offline convince the other camp to make progress and let Moderator know if there is a possibility for potential consensus.

# 5 Issue #5: MAC CE timing relationships

## 5.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[Spreadtrum]**

Proposal 4: Time-varying value of unalignment should be supported.

**[CATT]**

Proposal 9: Updating the common delay, K\_mac, feeder link RTT with feeder link RTT drift is supported.

Proposal 10: Updating the feeder link RTT and feeder link RTT shift with MAC CE is supported.

**[FGI,** **Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI]**

Proposal 1 For K\_mac used in initial access, the information of K\_mac shall be carried explicitly in SIB1, if NTN-SIB is not supported.

Proposal 2 Updating K\_mac after initial access shall be supported to benefit DRX operation, at least for quasi-earth-fixed cells.

Proposal 3 MAC CE shall be considered to update K\_mac after initial access to prevent an ambiguous period due to an unclear action time for applying an RRC reconfiguration.

Proposal 4 For an uplink configuration, if a UE is provided with a K\_mac value, when the UE would transmit a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information in uplink slot n corresponding to a PDSCH carrying a MAC CE command on the uplink configuration, the UE action and assumption on the downlink configuration shall be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}$, where µ is the SCS configuration for the PUCCH.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 7: The K\_mac value provided by network can be fixed.

Note: The K\_mac is used to compensate the fixed unalignment caused by the distance between NTN GW and gNB in Scenario 2-b (RU located at gateway, with gateway and gNB located away from each other).

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 5: Update of K\_mac should be supported. The same signaling mechanism as K\_offset should be used.

**[Apple]**

Proposal 7: The scheduling offset $K\_{mac}$ is carried in system information, in the unit of milli-seconds or in the unit of slots for a given subcarrier spacing in a frequency range.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal 10: Update K\_mac via MAC CE can be supported.

The main theme of these proposals is about whether and how to update K\_mac.

* [Spreadtrum, CATT, FGI/Asia Pacific Telecom/III/ITRI, Panasonic, ZTE] propose that K\_mac update is supported.
* [CMCC] propose that K\_mac value provided by network can be fixed.

Besides, [FGI/Asia Pacific Telecom/III/ITRI, Apple] propose that the information of K\_mac is carried in system information.

* [Apple] further proposes that the unit of K\_mac is milliseconds or slots for a given subcarrier spacing in a frequency range.

## 5.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 5.2 (Moderator):**

1. The information of K\_mac is carried in system information.
2. For the unit of K\_mac, down-select one option from below:
	1. Option 1: milliseconds
	2. Option 2: slots for a given subcarrier spacing in a frequency range
3. How to update the information of K\_mac?
	1. Option 1: No update (fixed in system information)
	2. Option 2: System information update
	3. Option 3: UE specific RRC
	4. Option 4: MAC CE
		1. Should the update of K\_mac via MAC CE be considered as downlink configuration update or uplink configuration update? This question is relevant because the MAC CE application timing requires K\_mac for downlink configuration but not for uplink configuration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We support 1). The K\_mac needs to be carried in system information since it is used in determining the RAR window starting time in the initial access procedure. For 2), we slightly prefer Option 2. If the K\_mac is in unit of milliseconds while the sub-carrier spacing is larger than 15 kHz, then some slot numbers cannot be indicated by K\_mac value.For 3). we think the K\_mac should be cell-specific as it is common to all UEs. Hence, Option 3 and Option 4 are not efficient and may lead to different UEs having different K\_mac values. We are fine with the update of K\_mac, considering the feeder link RTT (and the RTT between timing reference point and gateway/gNB) may be time-varying. Hence, we support Option 2.  |
| FGI | Support. Q2) Option 2 (slot)Q3) Option 2/3/4 (better to align with how to update common TA) |
| Xiaomi | Generally we think the Kmac could follow the Koffset design.For 1) we support the proposal.For 2), no strong view. Follow the same principle with it in Koffset design.For 3), we support option 2 as K\_mac is a cell-specific parameter. |
| ZTE | In general, we prefer to reuse the design as K\_offset to simplify the changes on spec.Regarding the update of K\_mac, certainly that should be supported due to the various RTT in feeder link. We are open for both Option-2 and Option 4. More specifically,W.r.t the detaield signaling, since this parameter is cell specific one, Option-2 can also be acceptable. For option 4, for this MAC CE for update/adjustment of K\_mac, it can be considered like original downlink configuration is still applicable before the confirmation of a new value of K\_mac. |
| Intel | 1. Support. Furthermore, as it is proposed in our tdoc, K\_mac, K\_offset and Common TA can be determined together (by using one bitfield and additional bit A) since they are related to feeder link.
2. Both Option 1 and Option 2 can be considered
3. For simplicity Option 1 can be considered. In our view if Option 1 is supported then Option 2 is also supported by default.
 |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Aspect (1): OKAspect (2): OK to have the options for now, but our preference would be to have option 2.Aspect (3): In principle option 1 and 2 are supposed to be jointly operating. As with any other system configuration parameter, it is possible to change it. Any such change should happen through system information update procedure. Our preference would be to have option1+2, and we have not seen any solid argumentation as to why it should be possible to update this value on a per-UE basis. K\_mac was introduced because potential UL-DL timing misalignment at gNB, so it is a generic problem that affects all UEs equally.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | 1) K\_mac may be used for the stating RAR window, so that it is carried in system information.3) We may consider with the discussion of the feeder link timing drift compensated by the UE under 8.4.2. |
| Ericsson | 1): Support2): Either option is fine3): Option 2 is sufficient |
| Lenovo/MM | For (1), we support K-mac is carried in system information.For (2), we prefre option 2 as K\_mac is related to the misalignment betwen DL Tx and UL Rx at gNB side, and difference between timings is alwayes expressed in unit of slot.For (3), we prefer Option 4 to use MAC CE to update K-mac as similarity to K-offset update. In this case, K\_mac via MAC CE should be considered as uplink configuration update. The reason is that when applying K\_mac, an uplink transmission is transmitted(A/N) firstly, so there is no additional K\_mac delay for the MAC CE carrying K\_mac. |
| Samsung | 1. Agree
2. Option 2
3. Option 1 or Option 2
 |
| Panasonic  | 1) support.2) It is preferable to use the same principle as Koffset signaling. 3) For LEO, update of K\_mac is necessary because feeder link delay is time-variant. Option 4 has similarity with Koffset signaling. Option 2 would also be fine similar to common TA related parameters considering K\_mac is cell specific parameter. |
|  |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. Support.
2. Option 2.
3. Option 2. Our understanding is K\_mac is cell-specific and can be provided in the system information. There is no need to force it to be fixed all the time.
 |
| Spreadtrum | 1): Support.2): We prefer Option 2.3): Because the RTT on feeder link is variable, we support the introduction of an update mechanism for the value of K\_mac. |
| LG | For Q1, we are ok with the proposalFor Q2, both options can be considered, but slightly prefer option 2 for the commonality of signaling perspective with K\_offset.For Q3, Option 1 or 2 are preferred.  |
| QC | For Q3, Option 1 is preferred. |
| Sony | Q1) SupportQ2) Option 2Q3) We think the K\_mac should be cell-specific. So, we support option 2. |
| InterDigital | 1. Agree
2. Option 2
3. Option 2
 |
| CMCC | 1. Support since K\_mac may be used for the stating RAR window.
2. Both Option 1 and Option 2 can be considered.
3. Option 1.

In our view, the K\_mac is used to compensate the fixed unalignment caused by the distance between NTN GW and gNB in Scenario 2-b (RU located at gateway, with gateway and gNB located away from each other). Thus, if GW keeps unchanging, the K\_mac is time-invariant. |
| Fraunhofer | 1 – Support 2 – Option 2 3 – Option 2 |
| OPPO | For 1) K\_mac should be carried in system informationFor 2) the unit of K\_mac is preferred to be slotFor 3) the original definition of the K\_mac is an offset between gNB DL and UL timing. Thus, it could be a static offset which does not need to be updated. But if RAN1 decides that the K\_mac is expected to be updated, then we need to discuss how frequent it is to be updated. When the updating rate is not high, we think both system information updating and RRC reconfiguration based updating can be used, based on R15 principle.  |
| MediaTek | Q1: Option 1Q2: Option 1 or 2 should be fine for MAC CE application timingQ3: Option 2 should be sufficient as K\_mac only needed to be configured for MAC CE application timing fordownlink configuration and can be updated from time to time. It could be discussed further for this option on which SIB the K\_mac could be indicated.  |

## 5.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

All companies support / are fine with that the information of K\_mac is carried in system information. There is also good consensus on the unit of K\_mac, as summarized in the table below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Option 1: milliseconds |  |
| Option 2: slots for a given subcarrier spacing in a frequency range | [Apple, FGI, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo/MM, Samsung, Panasonic, Huawei/HiSi, Spreadtrum, LG, Sony, InterDigital, Fraunhofer, OPPO] |
| Either is fine | [Xiaomi, ZTE, Intel, Ericsson, CMCC, MediaTek] |

Therefore, the following proposals are made and are being discussed in the email reflector:

**Proposal 2 – v0**

The information of K\_mac is carried in system information.

**Proposal 3 – v0**

The unit of K\_mac is number of slots for a given subcarrier spacing in a given frequency range.

The following version is stable in the reflector:

**Proposal 2 – v0**

The information of K\_mac is carried in system information.

**Proposal 3 – v1**

The unit of K\_mac is number of slots for a given subcarrier spacing.

* FFS: one subcarrier spacing value or different subcarrier spacing values for different scenarios.

Regarding how to update the information of K\_mac, given it is carried in system information, it can be updated through system information update procedure, as correctly pointed out by several companies.

The remaining question is whether additional updating mechanism(s) should be supported. It can be seen that several companies have doubts on this aspect.

Given this situation, it is recommended that the proponents further justify the necessity of supporting additional updating mechanism(s) (besides the usual system information update procedure) at the next RAN1 meeting to convince the suspicious companies. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss issue #5 further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #5:**

Proponents are encouraged to further justify the necessity of supporting additional K\_mac updating mechanism(s) (besides the usual system information update procedure) at the next RAN1 meeting.

# 6 Issue #6: Exceptional MAC CE timing relationships

## 6.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, only two companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[Huawei, HiSilicon]**

Proposal 8: The MAC CE action timing for the aperiodic CSI Trigger State subselection indication and updating the spatial relation of the aperiodic SRS are for the CSI request and SRS triggering respectively.

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 7: The following alternatives for the timing definition of Aperiodic CSI trigger state subselection MAC CE action timing should be discussed.

Alt1: new subselection is applied for the CSI report after the UL related MAC CE action timing

Alt2: new subselection is applied for the CSI request after the DL related MAC CE action timing

Proposal 8: Aperiodic CSI trigger state subselection MAC CE should be reflected for the transmission of the CSI report after the UL related MAC CE action timing, i.e. slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}$.

Proposal 9: AP SRS spatial relation Indication MAC CE should be reflected for the SRS transmission after the MAC CE action timing, i.e. slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}$. No specification modification would be necessary because in the current specification the applied timing is defined as “for SRS transmission”.

At RAN1#104-e, RAN1#104bis-e, RAN1#105-e, this issue was discussed. Based on the submitted contributions at RAN1#106-e, the interest in this topic is quite low.

Given (1) the low interest in this topic and (2) discussions happened at the last 3 meetings already, it does not seem helpful to spend online/email effort discussing this topic again.

Given this situation, Moderator would like to recommend the proponents to offline discuss with other companies to make progress and let Moderator know if there is a possibility for potential consensus.

# 7 Issue #7: On K1 range extension

## 7.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[Huawei, HiSilicon]**

Proposal 9: K1 indication can be enhanced without impact on the size of DCI by re-interpreting PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field.

**[vivo]**

Proposal 4: Support to extend the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field up to 4.

**[Samsung]**

Proposal 7: Do not change the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI.

**[CATT]**

Proposal 11: Extend K1 range without changing the DCI with 8 different K1 candidates, and dynamically configure the list of K1 values corresponding to the DCI size.

Proposal 12: In case of K1 indication extension for larger HARQ process, utilize existing 3 bits without changing the DCI and the highest bit of the HARQ process ID to extend the K1 range to support 16 different K1 candidates.

**[NEC]**

Proposal 4: The size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI is not changed when the range of the K1 value is extended from (0..15) to (0..31).

**[CAICT]**

Proposal 4: Enhance the HARQ-ACK timing indication without extending the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI.

Proposal 5: Configure two sets of candidate K1 values. The slot index of scheduled PDSCH is used to decide one candidate K1 set.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 8: If increased K1 value range in DCI is supported, Option 4 (the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 bits in non-fallback DCI 1\_1/1\_2) is preferred for less spec impact.

**[LGE]**

Proposal 6: Do not increase the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI.

* For non-fallback DCI, increase the range of dl-DataToUL-ACK in PUCCH-config IE from (0,…,15) to (0,…,31).
* For fallback DCI, consider introducing fixed or configurable offset.

**[Ericsson]**

Proposal 9 Increase the maximum number of entries in the higher layer parameter dl-DataToUL-ACK from 8 to 16.

Proposal 10 In non-fallback DCI 1\_1/1\_2, the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 bits, depending on the number of entries in the higher layer parameter dl-DataToUL-ACK (which is proposed to be increased up to 16).

**[Apple]**

Proposal 9: The K1 range extension does not change the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field size in DCI.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal 14: Indication of the extended K1 value via enhanced DCI should be supported.

**[NTT DOCOMO]**

Proposal 5: Keep the K1/K2 range for paired spectrum.

Proposal 6: A new RRC parameter (e.g., dl-DataToUL-ACK-r17) is adopted at least for DCI format 1\_1.

Proposal 7: Keep the field size for K1 indication in DCI.

**[Xiaomi]**

Proposal 4: The bit-length of PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in the fallabck DCI is kept unchanged.

**[ITL]**

Proposal 6. Followings on K1 range extension issue are proposed:

* It is not supported to extend the K1 range for FDD
* DCI field range related to the K1 range extension should not be increased.

In summary:

* [Samsung, NEC, LGE, Apple, NTT DOCOMO, Xiaomi, ITL] propose not to change the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI.
* [Huawei/HiSi, vivo, CATT, CAICT, CMCC, Ericsson, ZTE] hold the view that enhancement can be considered to accommodate more flexible scheduling.
	+ [Huawei/HiSi] proposes to reinterpret the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI to accommodate the increased K1 value range.
	+ [vivo, CMCC, Ericsson] consider increasing the max # of RRC configured K1 values from 8 to 16, for which the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 bits in non-fallback DCI 1\_1/1\_2.
		- [Ericsson] points out that increasing the maximum number of K1 values that can be configured to a UE from 8 to 16 will not only benefit NTN but also offer significant deployment flexibility for terrestrial 5G NR networks.
	+ [CATT] proposes to utilize existing 3 bits in DCI and the highest bit of the HARQ process ID to extend the K1 range to support 16 different K1 candidates.
	+ [CAICT] propose to configure two sets of K1 values and use slot index of scheduled PDSCH to signal which K1 set is used.
	+ [ZTE] proposes that indication of the extended K1 value via enhanced DCI should be supported.

Based on the proposals submitted at this RAN1#106-e, it appears that the group is still not converging on this issue.

Recall that at the end of RAN1#105-e, Moderator made the following recommendation. But the input on this is limited in the submitted contributions. In Moderator’s view, to make further progress in this topic, it is worthwhile asking companies to provide views on whether it is necessary to address the following scenario.

Companies are encouraged provide input to the next RAN1 meeting on whether it is necessary to address the following scenario.

*[ZTE]:*



*As the example shown above, for the scheduling with larger HARQ process number, since currently the DCI field (3 bits) can only support 8 different K1 candidates, the flexibility of scheduling is quite limited. So, there is need to further enhance it, e.g., extending the value range with 4 bits or other solutions.*

## 7.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 7.2 (Moderator):**

Is it necessary to address the following scenario? And why?

*[ZTE]:*



*As the example shown above, for the scheduling with larger HARQ process number, since currently the DCI field (3 bits) can only support 8 different K1 candidates, the flexibility of scheduling is quite limited. So, there is need to further enhance it, e.g., extending the value range with 4 bits or other solutions.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We do not think it is necessary to address the scenario. With the support of 8 different K1 candidates, we do not lose a lot on scheduling, which is aligned with terrestrial network.  |
| FGI | Not essential in Rel-17. Rel-18 may have a new SI for HAPS, which may be a better place to handle this enhancement. |
| Xiaomi | We think it is a valid scenario as we already done some enhancements such as the HARQ process number extension in other agenda. Regarding the enhancement, we prefer not to change the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI. For the fallback DCI, some implicit method can be used. For non-fallback DCI, extend the value range in dl-DataToUL-ACK can beconsidered. Although teh flexibility is lost to some extend, it is good enough make the system work for this special case. |
| ZTE | Yes, We are supportive to enhance the indication in DCI with enhanced flexiblity for scheduling. In this way, the performance for TDD scenario can be improved for both DL and UL.  |
| OPPO | The current spec can already address this issue. Note that R16 defines a inapplicable K1, when the UE receives an inapplicable K1, the UE will report the HARQ-ACK in a PUCCH slot determined by an applicable K1 from the next DCI. Thus, we don’t think that we need additioal enhancement to address this issue.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No need to enhance. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think it’s not necessary to address the scenario, since current 8 K1 values are sufficient to supprot multiplexing up to 8 HARQ-ACH bits on a single PUCCH as well as that for TN. |
| Lenovo/MM | We think K1 range extension is necessary. With extended K1 range, issue mentioned by ZTE can be solved with improvement of scheduling efficiency, and meanwhil, extended K1 range can also absorb some effect of differential TA among different UEs with cell/beam specific K-offset. |
| Samsung | K1 extension is not needed in this case. The network can update K\_offset instead.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support to address the issue. The solution can be generic and there is no need to be tied to NTN or ATG.  |
| CAICT | It is beneficial to have enhancements for this scenario considering scheduling flexibility would be really impacted and specification efforts for the enhancements could be marginal. |
| LG | For non-fallback DCI, we think it is sufficient to use 8 K1 values. For fallback DCI, some enhancement is needed since the K1 value is fixed to {1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8} as in the TS38.213. |
| QC | K1 extension is not needed. |
| CMCC | In our view, at least for ATG scenario, the network can be workable even if the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI does not change.Nevertheless, in order to allow higher scheduling flexibility, extend the value range in dl-DataToUL-ACK for non-fallback DCI is preferred for less spec impact. |
| vivo | Support to address this issue. Considering the extension of HARQ progress number, the scheduling flexibility is limited due to only 8 different K1 candidates. |
| MediaTek | For unified solution with ATG and NTN, it seems reasonable to increase the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field by 1 bit for enhanced scheduler flexibility.  |

## 7.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

Below is a summary of the companies’ comments:

* [9] companies support to address the issue.
	+ [Xiaomi, ZTE, Lenovo/MM, Huawei/HiSi, CAICT, LG, CMCC, vivo, MediaTek]
* [7] companies consider it not necessary to address the issue
	+ [Apple, FGI, OPPO, Nokia/NSB, NTT DOCOMO, Samsung, QC]

Compared to the previous meeting, the number of companies that question the need of addressing the issue is reduced, while the number of companies that support addressing the issue is increased.

Nevertheless, there are still quite several companies that are not convinced by the necessity.

Given this situation, it is recommended that proponents further justify the necessity of enhancing K1 (besides the already agreed range extension) at the next RAN1 meeting to convince the suspicious companies. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss issue #7 further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #7:**

Proponents are encouraged to further justify the necessity of enhancing K1 (besides the already agreed range extension) at the next RAN1 meeting.

# 8 Issue #8: Configured grant type 1 timing relationship

## 8.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, three companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[Huawei, HiSilicon]**

Proposal 7: By extending the range of timeReferenceSFN-r16, there can be sufficient scheduling flexibility to fulfil the timing relationship for configured grant type 1.

**[Samsung]**

Proposal 6: The timing relationship for Configured Grant Type 1 should be left to Network implementation.

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 10: Koffset is not necessary for type 1 configured grant.

All the proposals are not in favor of introducing K\_offset for configured grant type 1. Therefore, in Moderator’s view, there is no need to discuss this issue further at RAN1#106-e.

# 9 Issue #9: Start of RAR window

## 9.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[CATT]**

Proposal 8: Estimate the UE-gNB RTT with the equation UE\_RTT = UE-satellite RTT(service link RTT)+feeder link RTT, where feeder link RTT= common delay+K\_mac+dela\_T\*feeder link drift.

**[FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI]**

Proposal 5 LS to RAN2 that the estimated UE-gNB RTT provides a slot-level accuracy and may have issues to support DRX operations, e.g., offset for drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerUL is equal to UE-gNB RTT.

**[Apple]**

Proposal 8: In estimating the UE-gNB RTT for RAR window offset, set $N\_{TA}$ to 0 and set $N\_{TA, offset}$ based on the signaled value or default value for a given frequency range.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal 11: Determining start of Msg2/MsgB RAR window considering following options:

* Option 1: Introducing an offset of UE specific RTT
	+ Note: UE may need to start monitoring earlier
* Option 2: Introducing an offset of Minimum RTT

**[ITL]**

Proposal 7. The RAR window starting time is determined based on UE-specific RTT. Also, consider how the K\_offset is used for deriving the UE-specific RTT.

Note that this issue has been largely addressed already by the agreement made in RAN1#105-e:

Agreement:

The starts of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow are delayed by an estimate of UE-gNB RTT.

* The estimate of UE-gNB RTT is equal to the sum of UE’s TA and K\_mac.

Note 1: The UE’s TA is based on the RAN1#104bis-e agreement on Timing Advance applied by an NR NTN UE given by  $N\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$$T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$. The estimate of gNB-satellite RTT is equal to the sum of $N\_{TA,common}×T\_{c}$ and K\_mac.  How to treat $N\_{TA}$ and $N\_{TA,offset}$ can be further discussed.

Note 2: According to the RAN1#104bis-e agreement: When UE is not provided by network with a K\_mac value, UE assumes K\_mac = 0.

Note 3: The accuracy of the estimated UE-gNB RTT with respect to the true UE-gNB RTT can be further discussed.

Note 4: Other options of determining the estimate of UE-gNB RTT can be further discussed.

From the agreement, the remaining issue is about how to treat $N\_{TA}$ and $N\_{TA,offset}$.

The above agreement says that the estimate of UE-gNB RTT is equal to the sum of UE’s TA and K\_mac. According to the agreement below:

* $N\_{TA}=0$ in the TA for PRACH transmission. Thus, it is natural that the $N\_{TA}$ should be set to 0 in estimating the UE-gNB RTT.
* The effect of $N\_{TA,offset}$ is included in the TA for PRACH transmission. Thus, it is natural that the $N\_{TA,offset}$ is also included in estimating the UE-gNB RTT.

Agreement:

The Timing Advance applied by an NR NTN UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED is given by:

Where:

* is defined as 0 for PRACH and updated based on TA Command field in msg2/msgB and MAC CE TA command.

* + FFS: details of NTA update/accumulation.
* is UE self-estimated TA to pre-compensate for the service link delay.

* is network-controlled common TA, and may include any timing offset considered necessary by the network.

* with value of 0 is supported.

* + FFS:  details of signaling including granularity.
* is a fixed offset used to calculate the timing advance.

Note-1: Definition of  is different from that in RAN1#103-e agreement.

Note-2: UE might not assume that the RTT between UE and gNB is equal to the calculated TA for Msg1/Msg A.

Note-3:  is the common timing offset X as agreed in RAN1 #103-e.


## 9.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 9.2 (Moderator):**

In the estimate of UE-gNB RTT, which is equal to the sum of UE’s TA and K\_mac, for delaying the starts of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow, the UE’s TA is equal to $T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$ with $N\_{TA}=0$.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | Agree. Without the MAC CE TA command information, UE could by default assume N\_TA= 0.  |
| FGI | **Support**. N\_TA = 0 is meaningful because the current spec only defines UE assumes N\_TA = 0 for PRACH transmission. See TS 38.211, Clause 5.3.2. |
| ZTE | Fine with the meaning of the proposal, but it seems there no new information added in this proposal. |
| Intel | Agree |
| OPPO | It is still vague. Note that the $N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}$ is timing varying. We need to clarify at what reference time UE shall determine these two values.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are OK with this proposal. If clarification related to the reference time is needed, we could use the “time when the signals are supposed to arrive at the gNB”. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We support this proposal. Alternatively, we may consider a similar formulation as the one specified for BFR, e.g.,*For PRACH transmission in uplink slot n, the UE monitors the corresponding PDCCH starting from downlink slot n+1 within a corresponding RAR window…* |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with moderator’s proposal as this is RACH procedure. |
| Samsung | Okay |
| Panasonic  | Agree.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |
| Spreadtrum | Support |
| CAICT | Agree |
| LG | Ok with the proposal. |
| QC | OK. |
| Sony | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| MediaTek | Support |

## 9.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

Below is a summary of the companies’ comments:

* [20] companies support / are fine with the proposal 9.2 in the feature lead summary.
	+ [Apple, FGI, ZTE, Intel, Nokia/NSB, NTT DOCOMO, Ericsson, Lenovo/MM, Samsung, Panasonic, Huawei/HiSi, Spreadtrum, CAICT, LG, QC, Sony, InterDigital, CMCC, Fraunhofer, MediaTek]
* [OPPO] suggest that the reference time for N\_{TA,UE-specific} and N\_{TA,common} should be clarified.
	+ [Moderator response]: The below updated proposal adds a FFS on this aspect.

Based on the views expressed, the following proposal was made and discussed in the email reflector:

**Proposal 4 – v0**

In the estimate of UE-gNB RTT, which is equal to the sum of UE’s TA and K\_mac, for delaying the starts of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow, the UE’s TA is equal to $T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$ with $N\_{TA}=0$.

* FFS: the reference time for $N\_{TA, UE-specific}$ and $N\_{TA,common}$.

The following version is stable in the reflector:

**Proposal 4 – v1**

In the estimate of UE-gNB RTT, which is equal to the sum of UE’s TA and K\_mac, for delaying the starts of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow, the UE’s TA is equal to $T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$ with $N\_{TA}=0$.

# 10 Issue #10: PDCCH ordered PRACH

## 10.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[Huawei, HiSilicon]**

Proposal 10: For PDCCH ordered PRACH, K\_offset can be introduced for PRACH occasion selection.

**[Spreadtrum]**

Proposal 5: Introducing K\_offset to enhance the timing relationship of PDCCH ordered PRACH should be supported.

**[NEC]**

Proposal 5: An additional timing offset for PDCCH ordered PRACH is supported.

**[CAICT]**

Proposal 3: Introduce a timing offset explicitly or implicitly in PDCCH ordered RACH to align the understanding of “next available mapping cycle in a SSB-RO association period after the PDCCH order” for gNB and UE, and thus to reduce the blind detection.

**[OPPO]**

Proposal 6: the UE behavior after receiving PDCCH order should be clarified in RAN1 meeting.

**[FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI]**

Proposal 12 On the timing relationship of PDCCH ordered PRACH, Option 1: Introduce K\_offset to enhance the timing relationship of PDCCH ordered PRACH shall be supported.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 9: Introduce K\_offset to enhance the timing relationship of PDCCH ordered PRACH.

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 6: Cell specific Koffset should be used to determine RO for PDCCH order RACH.

**[LGE]**

Proposal 7: For RACH procedure triggered by PDCCH order in Rel-17 NTN, define timing offset in addition to minimum gap, $N\_{T,2}+ ∆\_{BWPSwitching}+∆\_{Delay}+T\_{switch}$.

**[Intel]**

Proposal 4:

* PDCCH ordered PRACH should be supported for NTN without blind detection at the gNB
	+ Alt. 1: PRACH occasion is determined at the gNB based on UE-specific TA reported by the UE
	+ Alt. 2: UE selects PRACH occasion based on slot offset K\_offset

**[ZTE]**

Proposal 12: For PDCCH ordered PRACH, using K\_offset for determination of RO can be considered.

**[NTT DOCOMO]**

Proposal 8: K\_offset is introduced for PDCCH ordered PRACH.

**[InterDigital]**

Proposal-7: introduce K-offset for PDCCH ordered PRACH

**[Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell]**

Proposal 9: The common K\_offset value shall be used also for the PDCCH ordered RACH.

It has also been brought to Moderator’s attention that [CAICT] has been kindly coordinating the offline discussion, which results in this converging status.

From the proposals, it can be seen that only [OPPO] raises another issue about PDCCH ordered PRACH, while all the other companies are fine / support to introduce K\_offset for PDCCH ordered PRACH.

The issue raised by [OPPO] is about the TA value that the UE should apply upon receiving a PDCCH order.

In existing NR, UE applies $N\_{TA}=0$ in PRACH transmission as seen in the following specification clauses:

**TS 38.133:**

The reference point for the UE initial transmit timing control requirement shall be the downlink timing of the reference cell minus .

**TS 38.211:**

The starting position $t\_{start}^{RA}$ of the PRACH preamble in a subframe (for ) or in a 60 kHz slot (for ) is given by

 *[Equations omitted]*

where

- the subframe or 60 kHz slot is assumed to start at  ;

- a timing advance value $N\_{TA}=0$ shall be assumed;

In NR NTN, the Timing Advance applied by an NR NTN UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED is given by the following agreement. Note that UE applies $N\_{TA}=0$ in PRACH transmission, which is consistent with existing PDCCH ordered PRACH.

Agreement:

The Timing Advance applied by an NR NTN UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED is given by:

Where:

* is defined as 0 for PRACH and updated based on TA Command field in msg2/msgB and MAC CE TA command.

* + FFS: details of NTA update/accumulation.
* is UE self-estimated TA to pre-compensate for the service link delay.

* is network-controlled common TA, and may include any timing offset considered necessary by the network.

* with value of 0 is supported.

* + FFS:  details of signaling including granularity.
* is a fixed offset used to calculate the timing advance.

Note-1: Definition of  is different from that in RAN1#103-e agreement.

Note-2: UE might not assume that the RTT between UE and gNB is equal to the calculated TA for Msg1/Msg A.

Note-3:  is the common timing offset X as agreed in RAN1 #103-e.

After discussions at several meetings, now it is common understanding that simply relying on “the next available PRACH occasion” would require blind detection at gNB side. As illustrated in the figure below, UE 1 would transmit PRACH in PRACH occasion 3 and UE 2 would transmit PRACH in PRACH occasion 4, causing some blind detection burden at the gNB side.



To resolve this issue, cell-specific K\_offset may be used. In particular, for a PDCCH ordered PRACH received in downlink slot n, UE may select “the next available PRACH occasion” after uplink slot “n + K\_offset”. As illustrated in the figure below, both UE1 and UE2 would transmit PRACH in PRACH occasion 5, removing the blind detection burden at the gNB side.



## 10.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 10.2 (Moderator):**

For random access procedure initiated by a PDCCH order received in downlink slot $n$, UE determines the next available PRACH occasion after uplink slot $n+K\_{offset}$ to transmit the ordered PRACH, where $K\_{offset}$ is given by the value signaled in system information.

Note: The UE’s TA is based on the RAN1#104bis-e agreement on Timing Advance applied by an NR NTN UE given by  $N\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$$T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$, where $N\_{TA}=0$ is assumed for PDCCH ordered PRACH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| FGI | **Support**. This is beneficial for UE’s processing time an gNB’s decoding complexity. Agree N\_TA = 0 for the start the RAR window. Note: both cell-specific and UE-specific K\_offset shall be feasible.  |
| ZTE | Support with modification as following deletion, because K\_offset can also be an updated K\_offset.~~Where~~ $K\_{offset}$ ~~is given by the value signaled in system information.~~ |
| Intel | Support |
| OPPO | What is the reason that the UE shall apply this K offset? There is not a specific RO resource for the UE to transmit, the UE will select a suitable RO accoridng to whether or not it is ready to transmit. Thus, the motivation of adding K offset is not justfied.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are OK with this proposal. |
| OPPO2 | In today’s GTW, due to the limited time, we probably didn’t make our view clear enough. Since the intention is to resolve the gNB complexity issue (blind detection), we should also consider the following cases. 1. After UE receives a PDCCH order and it implies that the UE’s UL synchronization is lost, whether the UE shall re-read the SIB for obtaining an updated ephemeris or common TA before transmitting a PRACH.
2. After UE receives a PDCCH order, if the ephemeris timer is expired, the UE shall read the SIB to update the ephemeris, shall the gNB expects that the UE will not transmit the PRACH before the upcoming SIB to reduce the gNB complexity issue?
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with moderator’s proposal. |
| Samsung | Okay |
| Panasonic | Agree with the proposal.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree. K*offset* would either be the value provided in system information or the UE specific K*offset* value. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree to ZTE’s modification |
| CAICT | We support the proposal and share the same view with FGI that the introduced k-offset can be cell-specific or UE-specific, which can be FFS. Agree that N\_TA = 0 shall be assumed, and the way to apply TA here is not different from the case with non-PDCCH ordered RACH.Note that allocation of a UE-specific RO indicated by PRACH mask ID here is a key function of PDCCH order PRACH, which we have discussed in the early rounds that PDCCH ordered RACH should be included in NTN scenario. As for the UE behavior of reading SIB to acquire the updated common TA or ephemeris before the RACH procedure as OPPO suggested, we think it is nature that UE will use the most updated common TA and ephemeris to calculate the TA in regardless of the RACH type, i.e., PDCCH ordered RACH or non-PDCCH ordered RACH. However, it is a separate issue here and can be discussed in the 8.4.2 section I suppose. |
| LG | We are generally fine with the proposal. One clarification is whether the minimum gap ($N\_{T,2}+ ∆\_{BWPSwitching}+∆\_{Delay}+T\_{switch}$) defined in TS 38.213 is needed or not.  |
| QC | In principle OK. Need to clarify about UE specific Koffset. Does the proposal mean UE specific Koffset is no longer valid? |
| Sony | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| OPPO3 | @CAICT: thanks to comment on our question. When the UE receives a PDCCH order in slot n, in case the UE needs to update the ephemeris during n+K offset, the K offset should be extended until the next SIB. Because the blind detection performed by the gNB after the n+K offset until the next SIB is wasted.  |
| MediaTek | Support |

## 10.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

Below is a summary of the companies’ comments on PDCCH ordered PRACH:

* In general, all companies except [OPPO] support / are fine with the proposal.
	+ Some companies [FGI, ZTE, Huawei/HiSi, Spreadtrum, QC] suggest further discussion on whether to use cell-specific K\_offset or UE-specific K\_offset
	+ [LG] suggest clarifying whether the minimum gap ($N\_{T,2}+ ∆\_{BWPSwitching}+∆\_{Delay}+T\_{switch}$) defined in TS 38.213 is needed or not.
* [OPPO2] raise the following questions:
	+ *After UE receives a PDCCH order and it implies that the UE’s UL synchronization is lost, whether the UE shall re-read the SIB for obtaining an updated ephemeris or common TA before transmitting a PRACH.*
	+ *After UE receives a PDCCH order, if the ephemeris timer is expired, the UE shall read the SIB to update the ephemeris, shall the gNB expects that the UE will not transmit the PRACH before the upcoming SIB to reduce the gNB complexity issue?*
* [CAICT] provide a response to [OPPO2], which does not seem to address [OPPO2]’s questions satisfactorily (based on the follow-up in [OPPO3]).

To make progress, Moderator holds the view that the proponents would need to address the questions raised in [OPPO2].

Based on the views expressed, the following proposal is made. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Proposal 10.3 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

Companies are encouraged to provide answers to the following questions raised by [OPPO]:

* *[OPPO] After UE receives a PDCCH order and it implies that the UE’s UL synchronization is lost, whether the UE shall re-read the SIB for obtaining an updated ephemeris or common TA before transmitting a PRACH.*
* *[OPPO] After UE receives a PDCCH order, if the ephemeris timer is expired, the UE shall read the SIB to update the ephemeris, shall the gNB expects that the UE will not transmit the PRACH before the upcoming SIB to reduce the gNB complexity issue?*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | First bullet is an error case not very likelywhere UE has good DL sync and can receive a PDCCH order, but unfortunately it has lost the UL sync. The prediction of UE pre-compensation is very accurate for at least 10 seconds or more. The UE implementation can take care not to have this issue based on the validity timer for UL synchronisation configuration. On second bullet, assuming the good configuration of validity timer for UL synchronisation configuration and good implementation of the UE, this error case should not happen if UE re-acquires ephemeris in timely fashion before the timer expires and can then re-start it. |
| Lenovo/MM | Q1: We understand that when there is a PDCCH order, the UE’s UL synchronization is lost. However, the UE’s UL synchronization lost may be due to many reasons: RTT change on feeder link, RTT change on service link, channle stats change of service link (RSRP decrease, path reflection, etc). Only when the ephemeris/common TA timer expried, the UE needs to reread SIB and recalculate TA for uplink transmission. It can be seen that PDCCH order reception is not always means epemeris/common TA timer expriration and SIB rereading.Q2: We think this is a reasonable assumption. As rereading of SIB is only based on epemeris/common TA timer expriation. However, we think UE should avoid timer expriation by refresh the timer before expriation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 11 Issue #11: SFI timing relationship

## 11.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, there is only one proposal on this topic:

**[Xiaomi]:**

Proposal 5: The enhancement on the SFI timing relationship is not supported

Therefore, in Moderator’s view, there is no need to discuss this issue further at RAN1#106-e.

# 12 Issue #12: Timing of preamble retransmission

## 12.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, there is only one proposal on this topic:

**[ZTE]**

Proposal 13: No timing relationship enhancement is needed for preamble retransmission.

Therefore, in Moderator’s view, there is no need to discuss this issue further at RAN1#106-e.

# 13 Issue #13: Beam failure recovery timing relationship

## 13.1 Background

At RAN1#106-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[Huawei, HiSilicon]**

Proposal 11: The timing relationship for beam failure recovery needs to be enhanced with timing offset of K\_mac, i.e. a UE monitors PDCCH from slot n+4+K\_mac within a window configured by BeamFailureRecoveryConfig.

**[vivo]**

Proposal 5: Support to introduce the K\_mac for enhance the timing relationship of PDCCH monitor in beam failure recovery.

Proposal 6: Not support to enhance the timing enhancement of beam reset for PUCCH in beam failure recovery.

**[Apple]**

Proposal 10: RAN1 to enhance the timing relationship on the beam failure recovery response window offset, by introducing $K\_{mac}$.

Proposal 11: RAN1 to introduce $K\_{offset}$ to enhance the timing relationship on the PUCCH transmission with new beam in the beam failure recovery procedure.

**[NTT DOCOMO]**

Proposal 9: Extension of BFR timer is not necessary for NTN.

**[Lenovo, Motorola Mobility]**

Proposal 6: The timing relationship between PRACH transmission in beam failure recovery and start of PDCCH monitoring is 4+K\_mac.

Proposal 7: K\_offset is added to the delay between PDCCH reception and PUCCH/PUSCH transmission in beam failure revoery. Cell-specific K\_offset can be used.

There are two main discussion points under this topic, which are described below respectively.

### 13.1.1 Delay between PRACH and start of PDCCH monitoring

The delay between PRACH transmission and start of PDCCH monitoring is described in TS 38.213:

For the PCell or the PSCell, the UE can be provided, by *PRACH-ResourceDedicatedBFR*, a configuration for PRACH transmission as described in Clause 8.1. For PRACH transmission in slot  and according to antenna port quasi co-location parameters associated with periodic CSI-RS resource configuration or with SS/PBCH block associated with index  provided by higher layers [11, TS 38.321], the UE monitors PDCCH in a search space set provided by *recoverySearchSpaceId* for detection of a DCI format with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI or MCS-C-RNTI starting from slot  within a window configured by *BeamFailureRecoveryConfig*.

The “slot n” is about PRACH transmission and hence naturally refers to uplink slot. The slot “n+4” is about PDCCH reception and hence naturally refers to downlink slot.

Because the downlink and uplink frame timing may not be aligned at the gNB side, there may be a causality issue if the slot “n+4” is reused. For example, as illustrated in the figure below, the gNB may not have received PRACH in slot “n+4” and thus cannot send a PDCCH response.

Therefore, as several companies have correctly proposed, the slot “n+4” needs to be extended to the slot “n + K\_mac + 4”, as illustrated by the slot marked by green color below.



### 13.1.2 Delay between PDCCH reception and application of new PUCCH beam

The delay between PDCCH reception and application of new PUCCH beam is described in TS 38.213. Below is one example clause:

For the PCell or the PSCell, after 28 symbols from a last symbol of a first PDCCH reception in a search space set provided by *recoverySearchSpaceId* for which the UE detects a DCI format with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI or MCS-C-RNTI and until the UE receives an activation command for *PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo* [11, TS 38.321] or is provided *PUCCH-SpatialRelationInfo* for PUCCH resource(s), the UE transmits a PUCCH on a same cell as the PRACH transmission using

- a same spatial filter as for the last PRACH transmission

- a power determined as described in Clause 7.2.1 with , , and 

Note that in this case, there is no explicit slot numbering, which is unlike the previous case on the delay between PRACH and start of PDCCH monitoring.

Therefore, there may be two interpretations on the “28 symbols”, as illustrated in the figure below.

* Interpretation 1: “28 symbols” is the absolute time between the time UE receives PDCCH and the time UE applies new PUCCH beam
	+ In this case, K\_offset enhancement is not needed
* Interpretation 2: for a PDCCH reception in downlink slot n, “28 symbols” is the time between UE’s uplink slot n and the time UE applies new PUCCH beam
	+ In this case, K\_offset enhancement is needed

In Moderator’s view, Interpretation 1 is more reasonable, whereas Interpretation 2 implicitly adds slot numbering which is not present in the existing specification clause.



## 13.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 13.2 (Moderator):**

On beam failure recovery procedure:

1. Do you agree that the slot “n + 4” need to be revised to the slot “n + K\_mac + 4” for the delay between PRACH and start of PDCCH monitoring? And why?
2. On the “28 symbols” delay between PDCCH reception and application of new PUCCH beam, which of the following is your interpretation? And why?
	1. Interpretation 1: “28 symbols” is the absolute time between the time UE receives PDCCH and the time UE applies new PUCCH beam
		1. In this case, K\_offset enhancement is not needed
	2. Interpretation 2: for a PDCCH reception in downlink slot n, “28 symbols” is the time between UE’s uplink slot n and the time UE applies new PUCCH beam
		1. In this case, K\_offset enhancement is needed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We agree with the first bullet. Considering the case where downlink and uplink frame timings are not aligned at gNB. The beam failure recovery request has to reach gNB before it can send back beam failure recovery response. Hence, the additional $K\_{mac}$ needs to be added to enhance the time relationship on the beam failure recovery response window offset. This is similar to RAR window starting time, where $K\_{mac}$ is used to capture the RTT between timing reference point and gNB. For the second bullet, we think in interpretation 1, “28 symbols” is the absolute time between UE receives PDCCH and the time UE applies new PUCCH beam, gNB does not know the timing of receiving using the new beam. This is because the UE-gNB RTT is unknown at gNB side, as shown in the following figure. Timeline  Description automatically generated with medium confidenceHere, to align the timing between gNB and UE, we think the introduction of Koffset is needed. Instead of interpretation 2 of the existing specifications, we think the timing alignment between gNB and UE could be addressed in terms of interpretation 2.Regarding the comment that no PUCCH transmissions during the time when UE sends beam failure recovery request and UE receives beam failure recovery response, we think UE may still have PUCCH transmissions, e.g., periodic CSI reporting, etc.  |
| FGI | Interpretation 1 (K\_offset enhancement is not needed) seems reasonable. |
| ZTE | For Q1, Yes, in this case, K\_mac should be added. Basically the gNB DL timeline is advanced with value of K\_mac, so gNB needs to delay the transmission of PDCCH to compensate it, e.g., transmit at slot n+4+K\_mac **after** receiving PRACH at gNB UL slot n.For Q2, we prefer interpretation 1. According to current design of beam failure recovery, no additional transmission will occur within duration by using the old beam. Then, there will be no ambiguity issue. Moreover, from implementation perspective, the changes of UE’s beam has less impact on the performance in NTN since the footprint of Tx beam is pretty large. |
| Intel | 1. Agree

We agree with interpretation 1. Regarding the issue described in the above comment from Apple, we agree that there is some uncertainty at the gNB side, so solution which is based on K\_offset can be considered to solve it (so the gNB knows the exact slot for reception with new beam). |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | On aspect (1): We agree – the K\_mac is introduced to compensate/offset the UL and DL slots. This should also apply for the beam failure recovery procedure.On aspect (2), we would have the understanding according to interpretation 2, since we need to accommodate the timing offsets for the long propagation delays as experienced in the NTN scenarios. |
| Ericsson | On (1): We agree with the Moderator’s analysis.On (2): Interpretation 1 is more aligned with the existing specification. Regarding the uncertainty period issue described by Apple, this is similar to the “3 ms” MAC CE activation timing, for which the necessity of K\_offset is not identified. Similarly, here K\_offset is not needed. |
| Lenovo/MM | For (1), we think addingk K\_mac is necesary. The reson is that this is the timing relationship between uplink transmisison(PRACH) and downlink reception(PDCCH). For (2), We slightly prefer Interpretation 1 as 28ms is an absolute time. |
| Samsung | 1. Agree
2. Interpretation 1 seems reasonable.
 |
| Panasonic | 1) agree that K\_mac is needed because gNB transmission is delayed by K\_mac due to DL-UL timing difference as explained above (13.1.1). 2) interpretation 1 would be reasonable considering no slot numbering in the current spec as commented by Moderator. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. Support. We share the similar view the FL. K\_mac shall be applied between PRACH transmission and PDCCH monitoring if the UL and DL frame timing are not aligned at the gNB.
2. We think interpretation 1 assume an absolution time but have taken the effect of TA into account. It is essentially not different from interpretation 2. It is just a matter of how this is desribed in specfication. Both alternatives would require some specification change to our understanding.
 |
| LG | Interpretation 1 seems reasonable. |
| QC | 1). Support2). We interpretation 1 and 2 are the same for the current spec. For NTN, we can use interpretation 1. Doing so, there will be a duration during which network does not know the spatial filtering, which may not be an issue though. Suggest further discussion. |
| Sony | Agree on first bullet. Reason: Situation is similar to RAR window offset. |
| InterDigital | 1. Not needed. It is just related to start time of monitoring PDCCH. The only problem is a UE starts monitoring PDCCH associated with CORESET-BFR earlier than needed if k\_mac is not added. BFR does not occur frequently in NTN due to large Tx beam footprint, therefore the power saving gain will be negligible.
2. Interpretation 1 is our understanding
 |
| vivo | For 1), agree.For 2), we think interpretation 1 is reasonable. In our opinion, the “28 symbols“ is the absolute time between the time UE receives PDCCH and the time UE applies new PUCCH beam, the time to apply the new PUCCH beam is clear for UE. Moreover, UE-specific TA reporting was agreed to be supported, the time of receiving using the new beam is also clear for gNB. Hence, K\_offset enhancement is not needed. |
| OPPO | For Q1: we agree that K\_mac is needed, the n+4 should cover the RTT, and therefore the offset between gNB DL/UL timing should be counted. For Q2: we understand that 28 symbols are the duration for the UE to confirm a BFR response from the detection of PDCCH. Thus, Interpretation 1 is more in line with our understanding. As long as the UE confirms a reception of the BFR response, the UE can change the PUCCH beam.  |
| MediaTek | Q1: SupportQ2: Interpretation 1 is our understanding of the specifications. |

## 13.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

Below is a summary of the companies’ comments on the delay between PRACH and start of PDCCH monitoring:

* [14] companies support / are generally fine with introducing K\_mac for the delay between PRACH and start of PDCCH monitoring
	+ [Apple, ZTE, Intel, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Lenovo/MM, Samsung, Panasonic, Huawei/HiSi, QC, Sony, vivo, OPPO, MediaTek]
* [InterDigital] consider it not necessary to introduce K\_mac with the reason being that it is fine for the UE to start monitoring early from power saving perspective.
	+ [Moderator response]: K\_mac may be as large as the delay of feeder link, which can range from tens of ms to hundreds of ms. In addition, if the UE monitors early, the monitoring window length is not long enough, i.e., UE would stop monitoring before a PDCCH would arrive. So, the functionality would be broken without K\_mac.

Below is a summary of the companies’ comments on the delay between PDCCH reception and application of new PUCCH beam:

* [13] companies hold the view of interpretation 1, “28 symbols” is the absolute time between UE receives PDCCH and the time UE applies new PUCCH beam.
	+ [Apple, FGI, ZTE, Intel, Ericsson, Lenovo/MM, Samsung, Panasonic, LG, InterDigital, vivo, OPPO, MediaTek]
* [1] company hold the view of interpretation 2.
	+ [Nokia/NSB]
* [Huawei/HiSi] hold the view of interpretation 1 but have taken the effect of TA into account, and thus essentially it becomes interpretation 2.
* [Apple, Intel] consider introducing K\_offset necessary to align the timing between gNB and UE to resolve potential ambiguity issue
	+ [ZTE] hold the view that there is no ambiguity issue.
	+ [Ericsson] point out that the issue is similar to “3 ms” MAC CE action timing, for which the need of K\_offset has not been considered necessary.
	+ [QC] suggest further discussion.

Based on the views expressed, the following proposal is made. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Proposal 13.3 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

* On beam failure recovery procedure, for PRACH transmission in uplink slot n, UE monitors the corresponding PDCCH starting from downlink slot “n + K\_mac + 4” within a corresponding RAR window.
* FFS: the timing between PDCCH reception and application of new PUCCH beam in the beam failure recovery procedure.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | Support |
| InterDigital | We still don’t think the optimization for beam failure recovery is necessary with following reasons:* Not sure whether beam failure recovery is even needed in NTN and we haven’t discussed NTN scenarios where beam failure recovery is needed. In TN, beam failure occurs due to blocking and UE rotation which could happen within short time instance even for a UE staying in the same geographical location. In NTN, with large beam footprint, there won’t be beam failure due to blocking and UE rotation as a beam is associated with a geographical location (even a beam is blocked, not sure if there is any alternative beam). Beam failure only occurs when UE moves to a new geographical location which is very slow and can be handled by beam management, and/or handover procedure.
* Assuming that BFR is actually used for NTN (not sure yet though), the Rel-16 specification works from our perspective. A UE can be configured with up to 200ms for monitoring BFR search space as a part of BFR timer; and even after BFR timer expires, a UE will start using contention-based PRACH for beam recovery. We don’t think beam failure recovery is needed for GEO scenario and the feeder link propagation delay in other NTN cases within the range of BFR monitoring window.
* Regarding power consumption for monitoring BFR search space, gNB can configure monitoring periodicity large enough if power consumption is an issue for this case. Also, anyhow UE has to keep monitoring previously configured search spaces other than BFR search space which means that there could be almost no power saving gain

Before we discuss whether any enhancement is needed for BFR in NTN, we should have a common understanding that in which NTN scenario, the BFR can be used. |
| Apple  | We support the proposal. We think the beam failure recovery procedure is used in NTN, e.g., in earth beam moving scenario or UE mobility in earth beam fixed scenario. Also, the current maximum configured „beamFailureRecoveryTimer“ value itself is not larger than Kmac in GEO case, not counting other processing time. Regarding the comment the issue is similar to 3ms MAC CE activation timing, we assume this is for MAC CE with DL configuration, since MAC CE with UL configuration does not involve DL-UL transit. MAC CE with DL configuration involves UL->DL transit, and this case involves DL->UL transit. For MAC CE with DL configuration, we did not introduce Koffset is mainly becasue the assumption of TA=0 is made for MAC CE activation timing (R1-1911583). However, for the switch timing of new beam, we do not notice such assumption of TA=0. If no such assumption, we think the Koffset should be introduced to align the timing between UE and gNB. (Since UE‘s TA is unknown to gNB, we could rely on Koffset for the timing alignment.) |
| Lenovo/MM | Suppor the proposal.We also think beam failure recovery is necesary in NR NTN. Although there won’t be blocking due to LOS of satellite scenario. However, as the satellite moving, for LEO and MEO, the UE have large chance to be within the neighboring areas between two adjacent beams, and BFR in this case is necessary. Regarding BFR search space monitoring and other configured search spaces, our thinking is that they are DL signal reception and if there is a previous UL signal associated with the DL signal, K\_mac is always necessary to delay the first DL signal reception, and time domian distance between remaining DL singal reception(search space monitoring) and the first DL signal reception can be subject to the periodicity configuration. In a word, we think BFR is necesary in NR NTN, and K\_mac is necessary for the BFR procedure.For the FFS part. Now we think K-offset may be necessary if TA is not 0. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 14 Issue #14: UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation

## 14.1 Background

In RAN2 LS on LS on TA pre-compensation (R1-2104230), one of the requests is about UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation:

***3)*** *RAN2 respectfully requests RAN1 to provide input on the exact content and frequency of UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation at least for uplink scheduling adaptation.*

Note that RAN2 made the following agreement at RAN2#114-e:

Agreement:

1. If enabled by the network, the UE reports information about UE specific TA pre-compensation at the random access procedure (MSGA/MSG3 or MSG5) using a MAC CE. Actual content is FFS and also depends on further RAN1 input (we can revise this whole agreement if RAN1 come to a different conclusion in terms of what needs to be conveyed to the NW)

At RAN1#105-e, RAN1 held initial discussions, leading to the following Moderator recommendation:

**Moderator recommendation on TA reporting:**

Companies are encouraged to provide input on this issue at the next RAN1 meeting, taking into account the questions asked by RAN2 LS:

1. At least for uplink scheduling adaptation, what is the exact content of UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation?
	1. Option 1: UE specific TA: [Apple, MediaTek, CATT, Lenovo/MM(?)]
	2. Option 2: Full TA: [ZTE, Lenovo/MM(?)]
	3. Option 3: UE location: [Panasonic]
	4. Option 4: Difference between UE-specific K\_offset and cell-specific K\_offset: [CMCC]
	5. Other option(s)?
2. At least for uplink scheduling adaptation, how frequent is the UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation?
	1. Option 1: Event triggered: [Apple, Panasonic, LG, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, CMCC, CATT]
	2. Option 2: Network request: [ZTE, Qualcomm]
	3. Option 3: Periodic: [Xiaomi, Lenovo/MM]
	4. Other option(s)?

At RAN1#106-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[Huawei, HiSilicon]**

Proposal 5: UE-specific TA related information is reported in Msg3 or MsgA for update of K\_offset.

Proposal 6: Differential indication with granularity of one slot are adopted for both UE-specific K\_offset update and TA report to reduce the signaling overhead.

**[Samsung]**

Proposal 3: UE’s estimated TA value is reported to gNB by MAC CE.

**[CATT]**

Proposal 5: On UE\_specific TA reporting, both event triggered based reporting and periodic reporting can be supported for different scenarios.

Proposal 6: Using RRC signaling to report TA can be supported.

Proposal 7: Reporting TA change between current TA and previous TA is preferred.

**[MediaTek]**

Proposal 1: The UE-specific TA report is reported by UE when its UE-specific TA has changed by no more than half subframe duration.

Proposal 2: Support UE-specific TA report by the UE via MAC CE.

Proposal 3: Support Option 1 Event triggered (i.e. autonomous decision by the UE to send the TA report) and Option 2: Network request for UE-specific TA report.

**[OPPO]**

Proposal 1: Support UE reporting the service link RTT to the network during initial access.

Proposal 3: Support network requesting UE to report service link RTT in connected phase.

**[FGI, Asia Pacific Telecom, III, ITRI]**

Proposal 10 TA reporting at least for Option 1: UE-specific TA and for Option 2: Full TA shall include UL timing adjustment contributed by the gradual timing adjustment requirements.

Proposal 11 TA reporting shall at least support Option 2: NW request as a baseline, and the support of Option 1: event-triggered shall be considered if further enhancement is needed.

**[Qualcomm]**

Proposal 2: Support UE specific TA report by MAC-CE

* FFS: details of signaling

Proposal 3: Support periodic TA report.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 3: Regarding TA report, option 5 can be supported.

* Option 5: Difference between the last applied K\_offset (e.g., cell-specific K\_offset or UE-specific K\_offset indicated by the network) and one new K\_offset suggested by UE.

Proposal 4: TA report is supported with at least one of following information:

* Option 5: Difference between the last applied K\_offset (e.g., cell-specific K\_offset or UE-specific K\_offset indicated by the network) and one new K\_offset suggested by UE.
* Option 4: Difference between UE-specific K\_offset and cell-specific K\_offset.
* Option 3: UE location.

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 4: In order to determine UE specific Koffset, UE location report should be utilized if available. If it is not available, UE report of RTT value with slot level granularity should be specified.

**[Intel]**

Proposal 5: Consider UE-specific TA reporting from the UE to the gNB with slot granularity

* Reporting of UE-specific TA should be controlled by the gNB

**[Apple]**

Proposal 3: Support UE reports the preferred differentiated UE specific $K\_{offset}$ for the purpose of uplink scheduling adaptation.

Proposal 4: Support at least event-triggered UE reporting for the purpose of uplink scheduling adaptation.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal-4: Full TA reporting is preferred to enable the updates of K\_offset.

Proposal-5: For the reporting mechanism, Option 3 is preferred with simple periodic reporting.

Proposal-6: For 2-step RACH, a refined value of K\_offset can be directly configured for a UE if TA is reported via Msg-A PUSCH.

**[InterDigital]**

Proposal-3: a UE report UE-specific TA value for K-offset update in RRC connected status if requested by the network

**[Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI]**

Proposal 6: For updating $K\_{offset}$ in a UE specific manner, UE reports the differential value of UE specific TA.

Proposal 7: RAN1 to discuss the granularity of the differential UE specific TA report.

Proposal 8: RAN1 to support both event triggered and network request UE TA report.

**[Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell]**

Proposal 7: RAN 1 to consider alternatives to minimize the TA reporting.

Proposal 8: RAN 1 to consider both trigger event on UE side and network request as mechanisms to trigger UE coarse reporting of TA.

About the exact content of UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation, the table below presents a summary of the proposed design options and the corresponding proponents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| At least for uplink scheduling adaptation, what is the exact content of UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation? | Proponent(s) |
| Option 1: UE specific TA | [6] sources: [OPPO, FGI/Asia Pacific Telecom/III/ITRI, Qualcomm, Panasonic, Intel, InterDigital] |
| Option 2: Full TA | [2] sources: [FGI/Asia Pacific Telecom/III/ITRI, ZTE] |
| Option 3: UE location | [2] sources: [CMCC, Panasonic] |
| Option 4: Difference between UE-specific K\_offset and cell-specific K\_offset | [1] sources: [CMCC] |
| Option 5: Difference between the last applied K\_offset (e.g., cell-specific K\_offset or UE-specific K\_offset indicated by the network) and one new K\_offset suggested by UE | [2] sources: [CMCC, Apple] |
| Option 6: Differential indication | [3] sources: [Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI] |

About the frequency of the UE reporting of the UE specific TA pre-compensation, the table below presents a summary of the proposed design options and the corresponding proponents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| At least for uplink scheduling adaptation, how frequent is the UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation? | Proponent(s) |
| Option 1: Event triggered | [6] sources: [CATT, MediaTek, FGI/Asia Pacific Telecom/III/ITRI, Apple, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] |
| Option 2: Network request | [6] sources: [MediaTek, OPPO, FGI/Asia Pacific Telecom/III/ITRI, InterDigital, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] |
| Option 3: Periodic | [3] sources: [CATT, Qualcomm, ZTE] |

Several observations can be made in order.

* For uplink scheduling adaptation, network needs to configure UE specific K\_offset
* UE specific K\_offset can be determined if UE reports its TA information
* Whether UE reports full TA, UE specific TA, difference between K\_offset values, or difference between TA values is detailed signaling design. It can be left to RAN2 to decide. To reply to RAN2’s LS, it is sufficient to provide one example that, e.g., receives the majority support
* What matters more from RAN1’s perspective is the granularity of the reported TA information. Several companies propose to have slot-level granularity
* On the frequency of reporting, Option 1: Event triggered, and Option 2: Network request receive more support than Option 3: Periodic
* A different alternative is to report UE location, which can reduce the frequency required for reporting but may lead to some privacy concern (a topic beyond RAN1 scope)

Given that RAN2 has been discussing this topic for relatively long already and has made good progress, it would be preferred to let RAN2 to converge further, rather than RAN1 start to duplicate the discussion which might interfere with RAN2 discussion.

Therefore, Moderator suggests that we focus on answering RAN2’s questions and recommends that we make a conclusion as follows, which can then be used as a basis to draft a reply LS to RAN2.

*Proposed conclusion:*

*At least for uplink scheduling adaptation, the content of UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation should enable the network to configure UE-specific K\_offset. Such information can be based on, e.g., UE specific TA, and has slot-level granularity.*

*Regarding the frequency of the UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation, it can be, e.g., event triggered or upon network request. The triggering event may be, e.g., the change of UE specific TA exceeds*

*Detailed signaling design is up to RAN2.*

## 14.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 14.2 (Moderator):**

Make the following as a conclusion for answering the RAN2’s question on the UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation:

*At least for uplink scheduling adaptation, the content of UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation should enable the network to configure UE-specific K\_offset. Such information can be based on, e.g., UE specific TA, and has slot-level granularity.*

*Regarding the frequency of the UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation, it can be, e.g., event triggered or upon network request. The triggering event may be, e.g., the change of UE specific TA exceeding a configured threshold.*

*Detailed signaling design is up to RAN2.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We are supportive to the proposal in general. The only comment we have is to remove the example of (e.g.,UE specific TA), since the detailed signaling design is up to RAN2, and we do not want to impact the RAN2 direction of the signaling design.  |
| FGI | **Support**. RAN1 only needs to define 1) content, 2) granularity, and 3) usage.  |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal in general. |
| ZTE | In our view, we need to conclude on the detailed solution firstly before provide the general descriptio with certain examples. It will mislead the discussion in other WGs. W.r.t the technica part, we share the views that the applied TA by UE (i.e., full TA including both feederlink and service link) for UL transmission should be reported to UE and from signaling overhead perspective, the granularity can be enlarged. For the frequency on reporting, the basic principle from RAN1 perspective is tha t such report should be done to enable the correct scheduling by gNB. In this wya, either the network request or periodic report can be considered with clear benefits on the signalling overhead and specific efforts. W.r.t the event triggered based solution, we have strong concerns on this approach since in NTN case, the updates of such value may be needed for a group of UE simulataneously. In this case, the unexpected load on signalling will occur and the system performance will degraded. |
| Intel | Support |
| OPPO | We are fine with the initial proposal.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are OK with this proposal for conclusion. |
| Ericsson | We support this proposal. |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with moderator’s proposal. |
| Samsung | Okay. But we think this TA reporting is also needed in RRC\_connected mode not only in random access procedure. This is because the UE can update UE-specific TA values continuously. |
| Panasonic | We are ok with the proposal although our preference was location information. We understand the situation and concern on privacy.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer to have the discussion in RAN1 regarding the content of the reporting scheme. To reduce signalling overhead, UE-specific TA can be updated by indicating a differential value as explained in our contribution. |
| CAICT | We are OK with the initial proposal.  |
| LG | Ok with this proposal |
| QC | OK in principle.  |
| Sony | We support the proposal but we also think the example of (e.g.,UE specific TA) should be removed |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| CMCC | We have the same concern with Apple and ZTE that example of (e.g.,UE specific TA) may mislead the discussion in other WGs.Thus, it is suggested to remove the example of (e.g.,UE specific TA), or keep all the options, or wait for conclusion in RAN1. |
| Fraunhofer | Support the proposal  |
| MediaTek | Support |

## 14.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

Below is a summary of the companies’ comments:

* [18] companies support / are generally fine with the proposal 14.2 in the feature lead summary.
	+ [Apple, FGI, Xiaomi, Intel, OPPO, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Lenovo/MM, Samsung, Panasonic, CAICT, LG, QC, Sony, InterDigital, CMCC, Fraunhofer, MediaTek]
* [Apple, CMCC] suggest removing the example of (e.g., UE specific TA).
	+ [Moderator response]: The below updated proposal removes the example.
* [ZTE] prefers to conclude on detailed solutions in RAN1. For the frequency on reporting, [ZTE] has concern on event triggered method and prefers periodic reporting
	+ [Moderator response]: To address the concern, instead of listing only event triggered method and network request method, the below updated proposal revises the wording to include periodic reporting method. The final decision can be up to RAN2.
* [Huawei/HiSi] prefers to have the discussion in RAN1 regarding the content of the reporting scheme.
	+ [Moderator response]: Given the vast majority is fine with leaving the discussion to RAN2, Moderator hope the below updated proposal is acceptable.

Based on the views expressed, the following proposal was made and discussed in the email reflector:

Proposal 5 – v0

Make the following as a conclusion for answering the RAN2’s question on the UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation:

*At least for uplink scheduling adaptation, the content of UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation should enable the network to configure UE-specific K\_offset. Such information can have slot-level granularity.*

*Regarding the frequency of the UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation, RAN1 has discussed methods including event triggered, network request, and periodic reporting. The triggering event may be, e.g., the change of UE specific TA exceeding a configured threshold.*

*Detailed signaling design is up to RAN2.*

In the reflector, two companies ([Zhejiang Lab] and [ZTE]) commented that they would like to have further discussion in RAN1 before replying to RAN2,

From Moderator’s perspective, it is fine to take another round of discussion to check where companies stand. The bottom line is that we cannot debate for too long in RAN1 among the many options, as RAN2 is waiting for RAN1 input (even the input containing limited information will be helpful for RAN2 progress). If we cannot converge promptly, we will need to fall back to the current approach with high-level text to reply to RAN2.

Based on the views expressed, the following proposal is made. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Proposal 14.3 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

1. At least for uplink scheduling adaptation, what is the exact content of UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation? Please elaborate the pros and cons of each option to justify why you support or do not support a certain option.
	1. Option 1: UE specific TA
	2. Option 2: Full TA
	3. Option 3: UE location
	4. Option 4: Difference between UE-specific K\_offset and cell-specific K\_offset
	5. Option 5: Difference between the last applied K\_offset (e.g., cell-specific K\_offset or UE-specific K\_offset indicated by the network) and one new K\_offset suggested by UE
	6. Option 6: Differential indication
2. For the option(s) you support in Question 1), what is the granularity/unit for the reported information?
3. At least for uplink scheduling adaptation, how frequent is the UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation? Please elaborate the pros and cons of each option to justify why you support or do not support a certain option.
	1. Option 1: Event triggered
	2. Option 2: Network request
	3. Option 3: Periodic

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | Frequency of UE-specific TA report depends on the numerology. Assuming worst case of 100 us/s delay drift rate, a UE-specific report may be needed in worst case every 5 seconds assuming it is reported if TA changes by hald a subframe. It could be in the order of 10 seconds assuming reasonable delay drift rate. For other numerologies, it scales by 2^μ.On 1) Support Option aOption a: A smaller Koffset value could be used to handle the UE-specific differential delay in NTN if the UE reports the autonomous UE-specific TA report. Option b Full TA is the sum of the UE-specific TA and common TA, with the latter being known by the network. No need for gNB to determine the full TA which is used for UL scheduling. Option c The need is unclear since UE location would be used to determine the full TA, hence it seems simpler to either have Option 1 or Option 2. Processing of UE location will add impact on network implementation and Location Service (LCS) application protocols, requiring frequent use of Location Centre network entity for UL scheduling. We have some concern for regulatory and security aspects where UE location may need to be shared un-necessarily without user consent to support essential functionality of NTN. Option d,e,f It may save one bit signaling but increases the implementation complexity in the device and eNB. It seems also to complicate the discussion on K\_offset value determination. On 2) granularity cab be 1 subframe / slot for Option aOn 3)Option 1 Event triggered: fit autonomous decision by the UE to send the TA report, as the UE knows when its autonomously calculated UE-specific TA has changed by half subframe duration. Mechanisms for UE to report UE-specific TA and configuration of resources could be further discussed. Option 2 Network request: This seems to increase significantly the network complexity. The network having received at least one UE-specific TA report from a given UE need to predict when the next TA report by the UE will be needed to optimize UL scheduling and make a network request to the UE to report the UE-specific TA. Option 3 Periodic: This option seems to be a special case included in Option 2 assuming that due to the deterministic motion of the satellite, the UE-specific TA will change by approximately half subframe at regular or periodical intervals.  |
| InterDigital | 1. Option 1
2. Slot
3. All options can be supported
 |
| Apple | Q1: Option 5/Option 6: If the reported information has the granularity of slot, then we could report the suggested UE specific $K\_{offset}$ directly, as it is agreed that $K\_{offset}$ is unit of slot. We do not support Option 3 as it has security concern. Option 1/Option 2 could be accepted as long as their granularity is in units and differential value are used for indication. Q2: We support the granularity for reported information should be in slot.Q3: We support at least Option 1. A UE reports to gNB only if it detects the necessity of updating UE specific $K\_{offset}$. For example, UE’s TA changes about 1 ms (or 1 slot) since last UE specific $K\_{offset}$ update. The event triggered reporting could largely save the signaling of UE reporting. This could be via high layer signaling for less spec impact. We think Option 3 may have large signaling overhead and waste UE reporting power. Consider a LEO satellite with speed of 7.56 km/s. It will take about 20 seconds to make 1 ms TA difference. If UE reports information about UE specific TA with granularity of 1 slot, then the reporting periodicity is suitable of around 20 seconds for subcarrier spacing of 15 kHz. It may not be beneficial to support UE’s periodic reporting with such a large periodicity.  |
| Zhejiang Lab | 1. Option 4 and 5
2. Slot
3. All options can be supported.
 |
| Lenovo/MM | Q1: WE support Option 1 with UE specific TA. For option 4/5, we think there may be error propagtion. For full TA, we think the common TA part reporting is not necessary. For UE location reporitng, we are not sure the details and the accuracies, and it is not quite straight forward to covert to the scheduling delay.Q2: We think the granularity is slot level as this is for scheduling adapatation, so it should be comparable with K-offset, K\_mac.Q3: We prefer event triggered and network request. The reason is for signaling reduction. UE-speficic TA is only necessary when network needs it to determine scheduling parameters. To maintain a suitable UE-specific TA, only when there is a significant change, reporting is necessary. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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# Appendix I: RAN1 agreements on timing relationship

**RAN1#102-e:**

Agreement:

* Introduce K\_offset to enhance the following timing relationships:
	+ The transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH (including CSI on PUSCH).
	+ The transmission timing of RAR grant scheduled PUSCH.
	+ The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH.
	+ The CSI reference resource timing.
	+ The transmission timing of aperiodic SRS.
* Note: Additional timing relationships that require K\_offset of the same or different values can be further identified.

Agreement:

For K\_offset used in initial access, the information of K\_offset is carried in system information.

* FFS implicit and/or explicit signaling of K\_offset in system information.
* FFS a cell specific K\_offset value used in all beams of a cell and/or each beam in a cell uses a beam-specific K\_offset value.
* FFS whether/how to update K\_offset after initial access.

**RAN1#103-e:**

Agreement:

Introduce K\_offset (may or may not be the same as the K\_offset value in other timing relationships) to enhance the timing relationship of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB.

Agreement:

* For K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access, at least a cell specific K\_offset configuration, which is used in all beams of a cell, should be supported.
* FFS: Beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access.

Working Assumption:

K\_offset can be applied to indicate the first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2 in the same way as K\_offset is applied to the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH.

**Conclusion:**

The agreement made at RAN1#102-e about introducing K\_offset in the transmission timing of RAR grant scheduled PUSCH is also applicable to fallbackRAR scheduled PUSCH.

Agreement:

Denote by K\_mac a scheduling offset other than K\_offset:

* If downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB:
	+ For UE action and assumption on downlink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac is not needed.
	+ For UE action and assumption on uplink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac is not needed.
* If downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB:
	+ For UE action and assumption on downlink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac **is needed**.
	+ For UE action and assumption on uplink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac is not needed.
* Note: This does not preclude identifying exceptional MAC CE timing relationship(s) that may or may not require K\_mac.

**RAN1#104-e:**

Agreement:

Confirm the following working assumption:

K\_offset can be applied to indicate the first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2 in the same way as K\_offset is applied to the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH.

Agreement:

Update of K\_offset after initial access is supported

Agreement:

For unpaired spectrum, extend the value range of K1 from (0..15) to (0..31)

FFS: Whether there is an impact on the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI.

Working assumption:

Introduce K\_offset to enhance the adjustment of uplink transmission timing upon the reception of a corresponding timing advance command.

**RAN1#104bis-e:**

Agreement:

For updating K\_offset after initial access, at least one of the following options is supported:

* Option 1: RRC reconfiguration
* Option 2: MAC CE

FFS: Other options

Agreement:

* For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, down-select one option from below:
	+ Option 1: Signal one offset value for K\_offset
		- Note: For example, the value is expected to cover the RTT of service link plus the RTT between serving satellite and reference point
	+ Option 2: Signal a first offset value and a second offset value. K\_offset is equal to the sum of the two offset values
		- Note: For example, the first offset value is expected to cover the RTT between serving satellite and reference point or is determined by common TA, and the second offset value is expected to cover RTT of service link

Agreement:

Confirm the following working assumption:

Introduce K\_offset to enhance the adjustment of uplink transmission timing upon the reception of a corresponding timing advance command.

Agreement:

When UE is not provided with K\_offset value other than the one signaled in system information, the K\_offset value signaled in system information is used for all timing relationships that require K\_offset enhancement.

Agreement:

UE can be provided by network with a K\_mac value.

* When UE is not provided by network with a K\_mac value, UE assumes K\_mac = 0.

**RAN1#105-e:**

Agreement:

If a UE is provided with a K\_mac value, when the UE would transmit a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information in uplink slot *n* corresponding to a PDSCH carrying a MAC CE command on a downlink configuration, the UE action and assumption on the downlink configuration shall be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}+K\_{mac}$, where µ is the SCS configuration for the PUCCH.

Note: Here K\_mac is assumed to have the unit of the PUCCH slot. This can be revisited after the K\_mac signaling design is finalized.

Agreement:

The starts of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow are delayed by an estimate of UE-gNB RTT.

* The estimate of UE-gNB RTT is equal to the sum of UE’s TA and K\_mac.

Note 1: The UE’s TA is based on the RAN1#104bis-e agreement on Timing Advance applied by an NR NTN UE given by  $N\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$$T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$. The estimate of gNB-satellite RTT is equal to the sum of $N\_{TA,common}×T\_{c}$ and K\_mac.  How to treat $N\_{TA}$ and $N\_{TA,offset}$ can be further discussed.

Note 2: According to the RAN1#104bis-e agreement: When UE is not provided by network with a K\_mac value, UE assumes K\_mac = 0.

Note 3: The accuracy of the estimated UE-gNB RTT with respect to the true UE-gNB RTT can be further discussed.

Note 4: Other options of determining the estimate of UE-gNB RTT can be further discussed.

Agreement:

The K\_offset value signaled in system information is always used for

* The transmission timing of RAR / fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH
* The transmission timing of Msg3 retransmission scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI
	+ FFS: The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by MsgB-RNTI
	+ FFS: The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI

FFS: how to treat additional transmission timings related to fallback DCI formats

FFS: how to update this formulation with beam-specific K\_offset if beam-specific K\_offset is agreed to be supported