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# Introduction

In RAN#86 meeting, a new Study Item was approved for IoT Non Terrestrial Network (NTN) [1]. In this meeting, company views on UL synchronization for IoT NTN are summarized and observations/proposals on identified issues are made. Observations and proposals in Company’s TDoc contributions are listed in the Appendix.

# Enhancements to time and frequency synchronization common to NR NTN and IoT NTN

ZTE mentioned similar to NR-NTN, UEs in IoT-NTN are assumed with GNSS capability [1]. Therefore, GNSS-assist UL pre-compensation methods proposed for NR-NTN should also be considered in IoT-NTN. There seems to be consensus on this view. OPPO, Huawei, CATT, Vivo, MediaTek, Intel, Spreadtrum, Sony, Ericsson, Asia Pacific Telecom, CMCC, Xiaomi, Samsung, Apple, Interdigital, Qualcomm mentioned in some form to re-use timing and frequency compensation mechanisms or principles for UL synchronization agreed in NR NTN in IoT NTN.

To avoid re-discussing every agreement on Enhancements to time and frequency synchronization, it is the view of the moderator that the related NR NTN agreements with no FFS should at least be included in a TP to TR 36.763. Agreements in NR NTN including FFS can also be included on the understanding that the FFS should first be discussed in NR NTN and revised in TR 36.763 timely. Companies may flag issues with a particular agreement if it needs to be revised for IoT NTN. Agreements in NR NTN containing FFS on options should not be included at this stage. The other way would be not to include these NR NTN agreements in the TR 36.763. It is not clear during a follow up WI phase for IoT NTN, which agreement in NR NTN WI would apply to IoT NTN and which would not, and where to find these agreements. This approach would increase the risk of re-opening discussions on the NR NTN WI agreements during an IoT NTN WI. The other way would be to reference the TR 38.821 in rel-16 NR NTN SI [2]. It is not clear for aspects such as UE pre-compensation using GNSS-acquire UE position and satellite ephemeris were not much discussed and further agreements were made in the normative phase in Rel-17. Hence, it is the view of the moderator to include NR NTN WI agreements in TR 36.763.

## TP#1 Proposal 1 for TR 36.763

***Initial Proposal Section 2.1:***

***Include in TR 36.763, the listed agreements on enhancements to time and frequency synchronization from NR NTN WI:***

***It is recommended that the following enhancements are considered for timing and frequency synchronization for UL transmission for normative phase:***

***An NTN UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE states is required to at least support UE specific TA calculation based at least on its GNSS-acquired position and the serving satellite ephemeris.***

***An NR NTN UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE states shall be capable of at least using its acquired GNSS position and satellite ephemeris to calculate frequency pre-compensation to counter shift the Doppler experienced on the service link.***

***An NR NTN UE in RRC\_CONNECTED states shall be capable of at least using its acquired GNSS position and satellite ephemeris to perform frequency pre-compensation to counter shift the Doppler experienced on the service link.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| ZTE | Fine to reuse the conclusion in NR-NTN for UL timing and frequency synchronization. But not sure whether to capture it in the TR at this stage given the solution is actually not complete yet. |
| Huawei | We are supportive to reuse the conclusion in NR-NTN for UL time and frequency synchronization but share a similar view with ZTE that the TP can wait a bit given the discussion is still ongoing and solution is not complete. |
| Qualcomm | This is too early for the SI phase, or for the TR. We should focus on studying impacts of different variables on the design first, and document those in the TR. The kinds of agreements listed here should be made in the WI phase. |
| Spreadtrum | We shared the similar views with Qualcomm. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We support to reuse the NR conclusion on UL timing and frequency synchronization for IoT NTN. We also think we should wait for further agreement and conclusion on NR when we prepare the IoT NTN TR. |
| CATT | In principle, the solutions of NTN can be reused as much as possible for IoT NTN. However, the difference of IoT NTN seems to be diverse. So we agree other companies view, and need wait for some time to see what is to be enhanced in IoT NTN. |
| vivo | Considering that the solution from NR NTN is not completed, capture this solution into the TR could be postponed.But we support to reuse the solutions in NR NTN as much as possible. |
| Nokia, NSB  | First of all, no RRC\_INACTIVE status in LTE, which should be removed. Generally, we agree that the agreement in NR NTN could be a baseline for IoT over NTN. But there are differences between LTE and NR, between IoT UE and NR normal UE on reduction of cost/complexity/power consumption, etc. Also there are difference on deployment of normal UE and IoT UE for different purpose. So whether the baseline can be used directly or not is a problem. Only the one suitable for IoT over NTN can be confirmed to be used in 36.763. If the moderator wants to add NR NTN in 36.763, we suggest to add following as the beginning of NR NTN agreement: The agreements are from 3GPP RAN1 meeting on NR NTN, which could be baseline for IoT over NTN. FFS for any possible issue related to IoT over NTN. For IoT UE pre-compensation based on GNSS acquisition, we suggest to add following possible issue: FFS for 1, impact of complexity/power consumption for GNSS on NB-IoT and eMTC UE 2, whether GNSS accuracy can be same from IoT UE and normal UE, for different deployment and device type. 3, etc. |
| Ericsson | The baseline should be to reuse solutions for time and frequency synchronization from NR NTN but the level of detail of the NR NTN agreements is more suited for a WI. Further, UE support of GNSS in RRC\_CONNECTED state for IoT NTN should be discussed by RAN1. Therefore we think these agreements should not be captured in the TR. |
| Xiaomi | We are supportive to reuse the conclusion in NR NTN. But capturing the TP in TR is too early.  |
| MediaTek | Support proposal. |
| SONY | It seems too early to agree to put these agreements in the IoT-NTN TR. We share similar views to Qualcomm and Nokia-NSB.  |
| APT | No. Prefer to develop TR36.763 based on contributions for this SI only.  |

## TP#2 Proposal 1 for TR 36.763

***Initial Proposal Section 2.2:***

***Include in TR 36.763, the listed agreements on enhancements to time and frequency synchronization from NR NTN WI:***

***It is recommended that the following enhancements are considered for timing and frequency synchronization for UL transmission for normative phase:***

* ***In NTN, the network may broadcast***
	+ ***A common timing offset value***
		- ***FFS details of the common timing offset***
	+ ***FFS: A common timing drift rate***
* ***Before Msg1/MsgA transmission, the NR NTN UE in idle/inactive mode calculates its TA as follows:***

$$TA= \left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA, offset}[+X]\right)×T\_{c}[+X]$$

***where:***

$N\_{TA} $***is derived from the User specific TA self-estimation***

$X$ ***is derived at least from the common timing offset value if broadcasted by the network. The granularity of*** $X$ ***and whether*** $X$ ***is indicated as a Timing Advance or as a Timing Offset value [unit] are FFS. Upon resolving the FFS, one of the X in the equation will be removed.***

$N\_{TA, offset} $***depends on band and LTE/NR coexistence and is specified in TS 38.213 section 4.2.***

$T\_{c}$ ***is specified in TS 38.211 section 4.1.***

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| ZTE | Same concern as in initial Proposal Section 2.1. Moreover this part is still under discussion. |
| Huawei | See comments on Initial Proposal Section 2.1: |
| Qualcomm | This is too early for the SI phase, or for the TR. We should focus on studying impacts of different variables on the design first, and document those in the TR. The kinds of agreements listed here should be made in the WI phase. |
| Spreadtrum | See comments on Initial Proposal Section 2.1: |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We support the TA indication solution adopted in NR and hope to wait further agreement for the FFS part when we prepare to capture in TR.  |
| CATT | Same comments as section 2.1. Too early to make the conclusion. |
| vivo | See the comments in Initial Proposal Section 2.1.Besides, we prefer that FFS in above proposal should be firstly discussed and decided in NR NTN, to avoid re-discussion. |
| Nokia, NSB  | See comments in section 2.1.Additionally, “Tc is specified in TS 38.211 section 4.1. “ should be updated to LTE related time unit. |
| Ericsson | We have a similar view for this proposal as for Initial Proposal Section 2.1. I.e., the baseline should be to reuse solutions for time and frequency synchronization from NR NTN but the level of detail of the NR NTN agreements is more suited for a WI. Therefore, we think these agreements should not be captured in the TR. |
| Xiaomi | This part is still under discussion in NR NTN. Capturing this is too early.  |
| MediaTek | Wait for NR NTN progress |
| SONY | Too early to capture this in the TR. The group needs to further discuss timing advance and timing relationships first. An updated TP would need to reference 36.xxx series specs, rather than 38.xxx series specs. We also need to refer to “eNB” rather than “gNB”. There should not be a reference to “Msg A” in the LTE context. |
| APT | No. Prefer to develop TR36.763 based on contributions for this SI only.  |

## NR NTN WI time and frequency synchronization issues

Several companies contributed aspects on issues of time and frequency synchronization that are still under discussion in NR NTN [3]. It is un-desirable to have this approach unless there is a clear difference for IoT NTN for these aspects, which may lead to different conclusions. One exception is TA update in connected mode with autonomous TA adjustment by the UE (Issue#2), which could be one potential enhancement for long UL transmission

On GNSS accuracy requirements, MediaTek commented in [4] that the GNSS time reference in a typical GNSS chipset implementation can be guaranteed within a ±10 ns [5]. The GNSS position accuracy is in the order of ±3 m (=c\*t=3. 108 m/s \*10.10-9 s). GPS-enabled smartphones are accurate within a 4.9 m radius under open sky [6]. NTN use cases are targeted at outdoor coverage, where UE GNSS-based position should be always available. For LEO, the GNSS receiver on board of satellite is at least as accurate as GNSS receiver in device. The satellite position and UE position can be known with great accuracy in the order of 1 m - 3 m. The velocity can also be known with great accuracy since based on GNSS receiver in satellite and GNSS time can be accurate within ±10 ns. Eutelsat provided analysis showing that LEO satellites are typically equipped with onboard GNSS receivers with position accuracy in the order of 10 meters and velocity accuracy in the order of 10 cm / s [7].

On autonomous TA acquisition based on Timestamp, Nokia proposed timestamp method using time reference broadcast on SIB16 (in NR NTN, time reference is broadcast on SIB9) and make observations on the requirements for GNSS based time synchronization for the RACH preamble transmission. Nokia propose to evaluate whether GNSS based time frequency synchronization could be accurate for IoT cases with reduced number of receiver antenna, reduced power consumption, not covered by GNSS satellite (in this case consider a second synchronization solution). The moderator view is that the timestamp method does not require specification change. The timestamp on SIB16 has already been specified in Rel-15. A GNSS time reference to generate the internal clock in device will require tight integration between the GNSS module and NB-IoT/eMTC module to measure accurately the total satellite delay and determine the Doppler shift to apply for the UE pre-compensation. In effect, the timestamp method could be already used within the current specifications providing both the UE and eNB can be synchronized accurately to GNSS with impact on specifications mainly in RAN4. There could be limitation on using simultaneously the GNSS module and IoT module and high reliance of the device on GNSS to synchronize its internal clock to GNSS. This would require very accurate GNSS time acquisition and tracking. This seems to be higher requirement for GNSS accuracy than the approximate GNSS position with several hundred meters accuracy for UE pre-compensation based on GNSS-acquired position and satellite ephemeris. To the moderator understanding the GNSS antenna configuration and more generally GNSS module design is not specified in 3GPP and is an implementation consideration.

Specific aspects of use of GNSS module such as Half Duplex for UL, DL and GNSS reception, GNSS accuracy, UE capability, and UE power consumption are further discussed in section 4 and section 5.

***Working assumption Section 2.3:***

***The following aspects are still for further study in NR NTN WI and should not be prioritized for discussions in IoT NTN SI***

* ***Common timing offset with value X if broadcast by the network (Issue#1)***
* ***Common timing drift if broadcast by the network (Issue#1)***
* ***Autonomous TA acquisition based on Timestamp (Issue#1)***
* ***Indication of TA margin for over UE pre-compensation with autonomous TA (Issue#1-2)***
* ***Indication of common frequency offset pre-compensation and post-compensation at gNB side (Issue 3-2)***
* ***Serving satellite ephemeris format with orbital parameters or Position and velocity state vectors (Issue #5)***
* ***GNSS accuracy requirements (Issue#6)***
* ***UL time synchronization requirements (Issue#7)***
* ***UL time synchronization requirements (Issue#8)***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| ZTE | We are supportive for the intention, but for some issue, e.g., Issue 7/8, difference between IoT and NR eMBB may be distinguished. |
| Huawei | This working assumption seems to be guidance to the overall discussion. We are fine with the list in general. We assume one of Issue#7 and Issue #8 should be “UL frequency synchronization requirements”. |
| Qualcomm | We shouldn’t “preclude” items from the study here. Instead we should prioritize things for study—e.g., Issues #6, #7, #8 need to be studied.Also, we need to study “potential issues for NPRACH” under uplink time and frequency synchronization issues. This is intimately related to other elements of the UL sync discussion, such as the power consumption and accuracy of GNSS and associated “initial” UL doppler frequency offsets than can be corrected under different assumptions, etc. |
| Spreadtrum | In our view, issues #7, #8 can be studied in the SI phase. |
| Lenovo, Moto | We share the similar view as Qualcomm. The first 5 issues have already studied in NR NTN, the remaining 3 issue is the specific/different for IoT NTN (e.g., new requirement, new SYNC signal, new RS), so we should prioritize these 3 issues in SI. |
| CATT | We think Issue#7 and Issue #8 should be separately discussed for IoT NTN. The synchronization requirement and impact of UL long repetition and the gap configuration can be discussed firstly. |
| vivo | Fine with the Working assumption above in general. Considering the difference between IOT UE and NR UE, some aspects, e.g., ***Issue#7/8*** may not reuse the conclusions in NR NTN and need further discussion.**Revised issue:*****UL frequency synchronization requirements (Issue#8)*** |
| Nokia, NSB  | We suggest to add: At least some of these should be revisited when there is agreement in NR NTN, considering the difference between IoT UE and NR UE, e.g. reduced cost/complexity/power consumption of IoT UE will degrade performance in some of the issues e.g. GNSS accuracy and GNSS error, etc.. |
| Ericsson | We do not think it is necessary to make a working assumption on not to prioritize these issues in the discussions. It is proper to look into relevant aspects in a SI. |
| Xiaomi | We support the intention. But Issue#8 is UL Time and frequency synchronization requirements. |
| MediaTek | Support proposal. Wait for NR NTN progress on these issues, but it is fine to discuss these issues if there are IoT NTN specific aspects not covered in NR NTN.  |
| SONY | Issue#1 -> Issue#5 should be deferred until progress is made in NR NTN, rather than deprioritised.Issue#6 -> Issue#8 need to be studied and the study can start now. |
| APT  | Support ***Working assumption Section 2.3*** with vivo’s concern |

# IoT NTN specific enhancements to time and frequency synchronization

It is noted that companies mainly avoided to re-discuss the same issues that were concluded in NR NTN and instead mainly contributed on IoT specific issues. This is very appreciated by the moderator, as it highly preferable to avoid re-discussing the same issue and potential designs that were concluded in NR NTN, unless there is a specific difference where these cannot apply to IoT NTN. Companies also contributed on the delta specific to IoT NTN to further refine the solutions within the agreements in NR NTN. We list the main differentiators of IoT NTN compare to NR NTN:

1. GNSS measurement window: ZTE mentioned GNSS search and data scheduling should be investigated to achieve a tradeoff between power saving and synchronization performance.
2. GNSS Position fix impact on UE power consumption: Ericsson proposed RAN1 should discuss whether GNSS positioning in RRC\_CONNECTED state is to be supported by IoT NTN UE and also proposed to study the impact of GNSS measurements on UE battery consumption prior to initial access and means to minimize the amount of GNSS measurements. Qualcomm proposed restricting alternate starting subcarriers for NPRACH transmissions to allow to correct for potentially large initial uplink frequency synchronization errors (e.g., up to 1 kHz) to save UE power with fewer GNSS fixes.
3. NTN SIB reading impact on UE power consumption: Qualcomm also proposed restricting alternate starting subcarriers for NPRACH transmissions to avoid frequent SIB reads (to acquire satellite ephemeris) required for UE pre-compensation to save UE power consumption.
4. Long UL transmission time: Huawei, ZTE, CATT, Vivo, MediaTek, Lenovo, Xiaomi mentioned this needs further discussions for UE pre-compensation.
5. DL synchronization: ZTE, CATT, Qualcomm, MediaTek [8] have proposed a new channel raster for DL synchronization. Ericsson also proposed to investigate DL synchronization. Qualcomm also proposed as a solution to include a portion of the ARFCN in the (NB-)MIB.

CATT proposed to study resource isolation mechanism for different users in UL signal transmission with 3.75 kHz sub-carrier spacing if UL frequency error is large. Consider the following:

* Huawei, Ericsson, and MediaTek have provided analysis and simulations using Eutelsat orbit data showing very good accuracy of UE determination of satellite Doppler shift and delay with an UL frequency error <10 Hz and UL time error < 0.10 us assuming propagation of orbital parameters or satellite position and velocity state vectors over 60 seconds (i.e. based on prediction of satellite position and velocity up to 60 seconds after reading serving satellite ephemeris on NTN SIB). This suggest that the accuracy of UE pre-compensation using GNSS capability can be sufficiently accurate.
* MediaTek mentioned in case of IoT NTN device with mobility ([4], section 4.1), acquiring position at most once per 10 seconds (@120 km/h would only result in a maximum UE position changes by ~300 m or 40 Hz worst additional Doppler (or per 30 seconds, it is 900 m or 120 Hz) which would still be well within the ≠0.1 ppm UL frequency error requirement.

A note in the Rel-17 IoT NTN SID states clearly that assumption of GNSS capability is that UE can estimate and pre-compensate timing and frequency offset with sufficient accuracy for UL transmission.

*NOTE: GNSS capability in the UE is taken as a working assumption in this study for both NB-IoT and eMTC devices. With this assumption, UE can estimate and pre-compensate timing and frequency offset with sufficient accuracy for UL transmission. Simultaneous GNSS and NTN NB-IoT/eMTC operation is not assumed.*

This would suggest that items (2) and (3) are out of scope of the Study Item, as it is not an objective to optimize UE power consumption to achieve sufficient accuracy.

While UE power consumption is not in scope of SID, it is reasonable and desirable to discuss this important aspect in the context of UE pre-compensation with GNSS capability assumption. Studying impact of GNSS use on IoT NTN power consumption and impact of NTN SIB reading could be considered to determine whether the GNSS accuracy would lead to un-acceptable impact on UE power consumption. This would need to be studied first before considering RACH enhancements, UL frequency correction, and sub-carrier isolation for UL transmission with sub-carrier spacing 3.75 kHz are needed and beneficial.

***Initial Proposal Section 3:***

***Do companies agree to at least study the following for UE pre-compensation based on GNSS capability and satellite ephemeris:***

1. ***GNSS measurement window***
2. ***GNSS Position fix impact on UE power consumption***
3. ***NTN SIB reading impact on UE power consumption***
4. ***Long UL transmission time***
5. ***DL synchronization***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| ZTE | Agree to at least study these issues as a start point. |
| Huawei | We think this is an important topic and the impact to power consumption should be carefully studied. In order to facilitate the study, maybe it would be good clarify the above aspects and agree on a set of simulation assumptions for further evaluation. |
| Qualcomm | Agree. We should also add “GNSS accuracy” to this list.GNSS accuracy may include things like trade-offs between accuracy and relaxation of GNSS fix requirements, as well as environments where—even temporarily—GNSS coverage/accuracy may dip. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Agree, the 5 issues should be studied. I am wondering do we need a priority list. |
| CATT | Regarding the GNSS measurement window, we think it can be discussed with RAN4 jointly. |
| vivo | Agree |
| Nokia, NSB  | 1, All these study should be based on the reduced number of antenna for IoT UE, i.e. single receiving antenna for most of LTE IoT UE. 2, The deployment of IoT UE should be considered, i.e. indoor or outdoor, vegetation, etc. 3, The GNSS accuracy will impact the items in the list. We propose to change from “GNSS capability” to “GNSS capability/accuracy”. |
| Ericsson | We support studying these issues which are needed for properly carrying out this study item. |
| Xiaomi  | Agree  |
| MediaTek | Agree |
| SONY | Agree that at least this list needs studying. |
| APT | Agree Initial Proposal Section 3. Btw, GNSS measurement gap might belong to RAN4. |

# GNSS measurement window

Simultaneous GNSS and NTN NB-IoT/eMTC operation is not assumed. GNSS module always on is neither desirable nor necessary. In case UE is paged, the GNSS module can be switched on for GNSS position fix followed by NTN specific SIB read to obtain the serving satellite ephemeris for UE pre-compensation before UL transmission. A GNSS Time To First Fix (TTFF) typically take 1 second (hot fix if GNSS ephemeris known with last TTFF within 4 hours) or less than 5 seconds (warm start if GNSS Almanac known with last TTFF within 180 days). The time duration between the WUS and paging and UL transmission shown on the figure below should be sufficient for the GNSS TTFF. ZTE propose to study mechanism to trigger GNSS search when UE wakes up and UL transmission begins after GNSS receiving.

It is not clear whether there is specification change required or existing paging procedure can be used with adequate configuration of timer T3413. In cellular UE in extreme coverage, the MME initiated paging procedure can take several seconds as WUS then the NPDCCH on Common Search Space Type-1 needs to be received. The NPDCCH can be transmitted with up to Rmax=2048 repetitions. The paging message with many repetitions is then decoded before the UE initiates the Random access procedure. The RACH preamble may be transmitted with up to 1024 repetitions, followed by RAR, Msg 3, and Msg 4 with many repetitions for the RRC Connection request and RRC RRC Connection Request Complete.

The UE may autonomously stop receiving on NB-IoT module, switch on GNSS module for GNSS TTFF, then switch off the GNSS module, and switch on the NB-IoT module back to initiate the random access procedure. This should be fine as long as the timer T3413 is configured properly.

The moderator view is that RAN2 could first discuss this potential issue for configuration of T3413 and whether it is needed to enhance the paging procedure for IoT NTN.

***FL Recommendation Section 4:***

***Moderator view is that RAN2 could first discuss this potential issue of GNSS measurement window and whether configuration of T3413 and paging procedure need to be enhanced for IoT NTN.***



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| ZTE | Disagree. The GNSS measurement issue is related to the whole pre-compensation behavior, parallel discussion in RAN1 is also needed. |
| Huawei | We think the assumption of GNSS measurement window will have an impact on the overall synchronization procedure, data transmissions and UE power consumption. Maybe there is no need to wait for RAN2 conclusion.  |
| Qualcomm | Agree. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Agree |
| CATT | Agree |
| vivo | Agree |
| Nokia, NSB  | Similar analysis should also be done for contention based random access in RAN1 and RAN2. |
| Ericsson | We agree that this is mainly a RAN2 topic. RAN1 can wait for RAN2 progress in this regard. |
| Xiaomi | GNSS measurement issue is related to the whole pre-compensation behaviour. RAN1 should discuss the issue. It is not necessary to wait RAN2.  |
| MediaTek | Agree |
| SONY | RAN1 also need to discuss this issue. In addition to paging, there is the issue of the GNSS measurement window needed in the case that the UE operates with a long eDRX cycle.RAN1 should generally be studying the implications of the requirement for a GNSS measurement window, given that the GNSS measurement and IoT modem don’t operate at the same time (half-duplex issue). |
| APT | Agree ***FL Recommendation Section 4*** |

# GNSS Position fix impact on UE power consumption

The moderator view is that the following issues are being discussed in NR NTN WI and should be de-prioritized in discussions in IoT NTN to avoid overlap between NR NTN WI and IoT NTN SI.

- GNSS accuracy requirements (Issue#6)

- UL time synchronization requirements (Issue#7)

- UL time synchronization requirements (Issue#8)

Studying whether the use of GNSS capability in device to get position TTFF for accurate UL time and frequency synchronization could be to un-acceptable impact on UE power consumption will be helpful. This would need to be studied first before considering whether enhancements for RACH, UL frequency correction, and sub-carrier isolation for UL transmission with sub-carrier spacing 3.75 kHz are needed and beneficial.

Huawei provided NB-IoT UE battery life analysis with GNSS fix with transmission of 50 bytes with 2 hours interval using GNSS signal reception with power consumption of 216 mW [9]. This shows that with a GNSS position fix of 2 seconds the reduction in battery life could be up to 50%. This assumes GNSS signal reception

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Protocol flow assumptions** | **Duration(ms)/each report** | **Power(mW)** | **Power consumption(mWh)** |
| **GNSS signal reception**  | X | 216 | 216X/36e5 |
| **NPSCH(DL)** | 291 | 70 | 0.00566 |
| **NPBCH(DL)** | 10 | 60 | 0.00017 |
| **NPRACH(UL)** | 40 | 500 | 0.00556 |
| **NPDCCH(DL)** | 30 | 60 | 0.0005 |
| **NPUSCH(UL, 50bytes)** | 320(50bytes) | 500 | 0.04444 (50bytes) |
| **NPDCCH(DL)** | 30 | 60 | 0.0005 |
| **NPDCCH(DL)** | 30 | 60 | 0.0005 |
| **NPDSCH(DL)** | 100 | 60 | 0.00167 |
| **NPUSCH(UL)** | 40 | 500 | 0.00556 |
| **NPDCCH(DL)** | 30 | 60 | 0.0005 |
| **NPDCCH(DL, monitor)** | 120 | 60 | 0.002 |
| **Standby** | 7200000 | 0.015 | 0.03 |



MediaTek contributed on NB-IoT UE battery life analysis in [10]. Using same methodology and including GNSS power consumption of 30 mW (note that typical GNSS power consumption is 37 mW for acquisition and 27 mW for tracking [5]), it can be shown that over PSM typical cycle with GNSS ON for 1 to 2 seconds, the reduction in battery life is between -1% and -21%. Using same use case as Huawei with transmission of 50 bytes with 2 hours interval, the reduction in battery life is 21.47% assuming GNSS TTFF of 24 seconds or 4.09 % assuming GNSS TTFF o 2 seconds with coupling loss of 144 dB. This reduces to 13.31% and 3.77% assuming GNSS TTFF of 24 seconds with coupling loss 154 dB and 164 dB respectively. Much lower battery life reductions are shown in the table blow for larger packet size of 200 Bytes or more infrequent transmission – i.e. once a day.



Note that the Huawei and MediaTek analysis are worst case scenarios for IoT NTN. In practical IoT NTN deployment:

* Assuming a fixed IoT NTN device (e.g. sensor on a gas/petrol pipeline, heat temperature sensor), a GNSS position fix will be needed only once during set up phase and not be needed whenever a UE wakes up from DRX either via a timer setup via RRC configuration or via application layer.
* Assuming a moving IoT NTN device (e.g. used for vehicular tracking) would may require frequent GNSS position fix but may not be a problem if he IoT NTN device is connected to the vehicle battery via the dashboard or if embedded within the vehicle.
* IOT NTN devices will be typically left outdoors for a period greater than a year. They are unlikely to be in a protected environment where they cannot be damaged by the weather, people, or simply normal wear and tear.

Hence, it seems unlikely that the GNSS position fix for UE pre-compensation could be a serious concern for the battery life. Moderator views is that companies can contribute analysis based on rel-13 UE battery life methodology in [8].

***Initial Proposal Section 5:***

***Do companies agree to at least study the GNSS Position fix impact on UE power consumption based on Rel-13 NB-IoT battery life methodology with GNSS power consumption 30 mW.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| ZTE | Fine to reuse the Rel-13 NB-IoT battery life methodology. The GNSS searching time and the GNSS receiving frequency (e.g. periodic) will impact on UE power consumption, which needs to be investigated. W.r.t the 30 mW, it can be taken as one candidate value. |
| Huawei  | We are fine to reuse the same methodology. However, it is important to settle down the assumptions on GNSS measurement window. The GNSS power consumption value can be FFS. |
| Qualcomm | In principle, the methodology seems OK; however, we need to check the 30 mW number further. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We are fine to reuse the same methodology. |
| CATT | In principle, reusing the Rel-13 NB-IoT battery life methodology is fine to us. One comment is that whether same accuracy and same power consumption for IoT NTN scenario should be evaluated separately. |
| Nokia, NSB  | The deployment of IoT UE should also be studied, where the GNSS processing time will be longer to guarantee accurate GNSS acquisition and the power consumption increasing because of this should be studied. Additionally, the value of 30mW should be further checked. |
| Ericsson | We agree that it is important to evaluate UE battery life while accounting for GNSS power consumption in this SI.We are open to discuss the battery life evaluation methodology, as long as it reflects the state-of-the-art 3GPP development in this regard. |
| Xiaomi | Fine to reuse the Rel-13 NB-IoT battery life methodology. The GNSS power consumption value can be FFS. |
| MediaTek | Agree with proposal. Re-use Rel-13 NB-IoT battery life numerology. GNSS power consumption 30 mW is one candidate.  |
| SONY | Support that the GNSS position fix impact on UE power consumption is studied. It should be clarified that the “Rel-13 NB-IoT battery life methodology” can be applied to both eMTC and NB-IoT. We understand that the proposal is about the methodology rather than the technology. |
| APT | Support ***Initial Proposal Section 5*** |
|  |  |

# NTN SIB reading impact on UE power consumption

The moderator view is that the following issues are being discussed in NR NTN WI and should be de-prioritized in discussions in IoT NTN to avoid overlap between NR NTN WI and IoT NTN SI.

- GNSS accuracy requirements (Issue#6)

- UL time synchronization requirements (Issue#7)

- UL time synchronization requirements (Issue#8)

Studying whether reading NTN SIB carrying the satellite ephemeris as needed for accurate UL time and frequency synchronization could lead to un-acceptable impact on UE power consumption will be helpful. This would need to be studied first before considering whether enhancements for RACH, UL frequency correction, and sub-carrier isolation for UL transmission with sub-carrier spacing 3.75 kHz are needed and beneficial.

A UE needs to prepare for UE pre-compensation on receiving paging or before initiating data transfer. This requires UE to synchronize on DL and obtain at least once the system information for RRC configuration when first accessing a satellite cell or waking up from long DRX. If UE re-selects a cell, the UE may read the MIB and SIB1, which contains indication on whether the system information needs to be refreshed.

MediaTek observed that it is not necessary for the UE to re-acquire the whole system information for RRC configuration for UE pre-compensation. Similarly to SIB9 in NR URLLC and SIB16 in LTE HRLLC that is acquired to get GNSS timestamp with low latency, the UE could acquire the serving satellite ephemeris Position and Velocity in an NTN-specific SIB. The SIB1 can indicate the scheduling of the new NTN-specific SIB carrying the satellite Position and Velocity. Once there is paging or UE needs to transmit data, the UE may need to acquire the NTN-specific SIB with the satellite position and velocity. This only requires the UE to decode 16 bytes every time it wakes up from DRX and is either paged or needs to transmit data.

Receiving and decoding small payload of 16 bytes on an NTN-specific SIB has no significant impact on power consumption as it is a small fraction of the processing and transmission power required by the device needs to transmit / receives Msg1, Msg2, Msg3, Msg4, Msg5 in the initial cell access procedure to transmit data and further messages to receive data.

Assuming UE power consumption figure for Rx in previous section, NTN SIB with 16 bytes transmitted in 10 ms for worst case of 50 Bytes every 2 hours, the impact on battery life of NTN SIB reading to acquire 16 bytes satellite ephemeris for UE pre-compensation if UE is paged or UE needs to transmit data is a negligible reduction of approximately 0.32%. The reduction will be expected to be smaller at lower coupling loss of 154 dB or 164 dB, or at larger packet size of 200 bytes.

***FL Recommendation Section 6:***

***Moderator view is that impact on battery life of NTN SIB reading to acquire 16 bytes satellite ephemeris for UE pre-compensation if UE is paged or UE needs to transmit small data packet is a not significant. Companies are encouraged to provide analysis on impact on NTN-specific SIB carrying satellite ephemeris for UE pre-compensation.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Huawei | The satellite ephemeris has not been decided including the format and periodicity. We are fine to study this further but maybe no need to have the moderator view in the recommendation given there has not been much input yet. |
| Qualcomm | To the best of our knowledge, monitoring SIB every time before an uplink transmission is not standard behavior today. Any impact (big or small), and any change in UE behavior, therefore, should be clearly documented in the TR.We agree with studying this issue further.We agree with Huawei that “moderator view” should not be provided at this stage, given that the study of this topic hasn’t yet commenced. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We are fine to study the issue |
| CATT | Need more input for power consumption of reading SIB before making the conclusion. |
| Nokia, NSB  | The size of the SIB depends on the content of the SIB, may not just 16 bytes for the purpose of the SIB. Agree with Huawei that the format of SIB need to be studied first before any assumptoin on that. |
| Ericsson | We think it’s worthwhile to look into NTN SIB reading issue, which is a proper topic for a SI. |
| Xiaomi | * + The satellite ephemeris has not been decided including the format and periodicity. We are fine to study this further. It is early to get the recommendation now.
 |
| MediaTek | Further study this issue |
| SONY | This needs to be studied further. The power consumption requirements depending on the frequency and size (bytes) of the NTN SIB information. We also need to consider the power consumption requirements of having to speculatively read NTN SIB. E.g. if the UE has to read NTN SIB before monitoring PDCCH in a DRX\_ON period, there would be increased power consumption, even if no PDCCH were sent to the UE. |
| APT | Support ***FL Recommendation Section 6***To clarify, this is mainly for RRC\_IDLE since a NB-IoT UE would not monitor SI in RRC\_CONNECTED. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Long UL transmission

The long UL transmission in NB-IoT / eMTC are discussed for PUSCH and PRACH. The general issues related to the long UL transmissions and potential solutions should have high synergies between NB-IoT and eMTC.

## Long UL transmission on PUSCH

In IoT NTN, depending on the coverage class many repetitions may be needed. In NB-IoT, up to 1024 repetitions of NPUSCH Format 1 may be scheduled for UL transmission on data on the PUSCH. In the NB-IoT specification 36.211, the NPUSCH UL Compensation Gap (UCG) is used to allow UE to re-synchronize on DL during long UL transmission exceeding 256 ms. UCG definition is given as “*After transmissions and/or postponements due to NPRACH of time units, a gap of time units shall be inserted where the NPUSCH transmission is postponed. The portion of a postponement due to NPRACH which coincides with a gap is counted as part of the gap*.” When 2 HARQ processes are configured, the total maximum duration of both NPUSCH transmissions is not more than 256 ms, and any scheduling gap between the two NPUSCHs counts as part of the 256 ms as illustrated in an example in Figure 2.



The time drift in LEO @ 600 km is around 0.71 us in one RTD of 28.4 ms as given in TR 38.821. In a time duration of 256 ms, the total drift can be around 6.4 us which is larger than the Cyclic Prefix for UL transmission on NPUSCH. The Doppler shift variation can be 544 Hz/s. There are several solutions possible:

* Option 1: Use UE-specific TA calculation. The UE uses UE-specific TA calculation based on acquired GNSS position and satellite ephemeris for UE pre-compensation during long UL transmission. Similarly the UE can determine the UE-specific Doppler shift to apply for UE pre-compensation.
* Option 2: Use the timing drift rate. The UE can use knowledge of the timing drift rate to determine the UE-specific TA for UE pre-compensation during the long UL transmission
* Option 3: Use segmented pre-compensation. The UE can interrupt transmission, determine the UE-specific TA / Doppler shift for UE pre-compensation during long continuous repetition transmission.

Option 1: Supported by MediaTek, Spreadtrum

Option 2: Supported by Huawei, Lenovo

Option 3: Supported by ZTE, Vivo

***Initial Proposal Section 7.1:***

***Do companies agree to at least study the following options for UE pre-compensation during long UL transmission on NPUSCH:***

* **Option 1: Use UE-specific TA calculation.**
* **Option 2: Use the timing drift rate.**
* **Option 3: Use segmented pre-compensation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| ZTE | Supportive for this proposal. Actually, from specification perspective, all these options are not exclusive, e.g., Option-3 can be results of Option 2 or Option-1. The only thing matter is to how to define the “segment”.  |
| Huawei | Option 1 cannot be applied during long UL transmission when there is no gap for DL reception. Even with 40ms DL gap for each 512 UL transmission, the GAP may not long enough for acquiring a full information of satellite ephemeris according to the updating period of system information. Option 2 can be combined with Option 1. The timing drift rate can be derived from the acquired GNSS position and satellite ephemeris and the indicated common timing drift rate. The UE specific TA can be calculated based on these information.Option 3 seems to suggest the adjustment derived from Option 1 and Option 2 can be applied with segmented pre-compensation.  |
| Qualcomm | Agree.The pros and cons of these solutions should be studied and summarized in the TR. |
| Spreadtrum | We shared the similar views with HW. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Agree the proposal. Our preference is both option 1 and option 2. During the uplink transmission, UE can calculate a) the feeder link time offset based on initial common time offset and time drift; b) the service link time offset based on the information of satellite ephemeris. |
| CATT | The differences of these three options are unclear. The purpose of Option 2 is to calculate the TA, so it is equivalent to option 1. Option 3 is to describe whether to do pre-compensation for each NPUSH or a set of NPUSCH. It seems re-organizing these options are necessary.For detailed compensation, how to define the UE behaviour or making test should be studied further. Simple TA adjustment is not feasible due to signal overlapped in consecutive slot transmission. |
| vivo | Prefer option3.First, the common TA part should be included in all three options. Secondly, due that the DL time for UE to acquire GNSS position and satellite ephemeris is necessary, option1 and option2 cannot be applied for long UL transmission. Moreover, the DL time to receive the residual timing error through TA command sent by network is also required. |
| Nokia, NSB  | One important thing is the adjustment of TA during long UL transmission should be in control of eNB, to guarantee accurate adjustment and alignment between UE and eNB. We propose to study how eNB to control UE specific TA during long UL transmission, to guarantee that TA used by UE is always sync with eNB.  |
| Ericsson | Perhaps it would be more helpful if companies can first agree on what the problem is, before looking into the options. |
| Xiaomi | We support this proposal.  |
| MediaTek | Support proposal.  |
| SONY | Tend to agree with Ericsson. A big motivating factor for UCG in Rel-13 was to allow frequency tracking in the UE, rather than TA. We think the problem is frequency tracking, rather than timing misalignment. We should also determine whether long NPUSCH / PUSCH transmissions are going to be necessary in IoT-NTN. This depends on the link budget and LLS assumptions, which have not been resolved. If the transmission time of NPUSCH / PUSCH is less than 256ms, then there is no issue / problem to be resolved.While we can consider this list of options to deal with timing drift, we should also be considering frequency drift.These issues need to be considered for PUSCH in eMTC as well as NPUSCH in NB-IoT. |
| APT | Support Initial Proposal Section 7.1Based on current discussion on AI 8.15.1, long NPUSCH / PUSCH transmissions are going to be necessary in IoT-NTN. |

##  Long transmission on PRACH

In NB-IoT, NPRACH may be transmitted with up to 2048 repetitions. The time drift in LEO @ 600 km in 2 seconds can be around 51.2 us. NB-IoT UE supports three CP lengths, 66.7us, 266.7us and 800us. Similarly to long transmission of NPUSCH, Option 1 and Option 2 could be considered. Segmented pre-compensation would require RACH interruption, which seems high impact on specifications and implementation.

***Initial Proposal Section 7.2:***

***Do companies agree to at least study the following options for UE pre-compensation during long UL transmission on NPRACH:***

* **Option 1: Use UE-specific TA calculation.**
* **Option 2: Use the timing drift rate.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| ZTE | Same comments as above for NPUSCH. Moreover, since the issue is similar we prefer to take same all Options including Option-3 also for NPRACH. |
| Huawei  | Similar to the last comment, Option 1 cannot be applied during the UL transmission as not GAP is available during 64 times of preamble repletion. So, calculating the timing drift rate for the long UL transmission for ephemeris is needed. |
| Qualcomm | Agree.Also include Option 3 from 7.1 as part of the study of solutions. |
| Spreadtrum | For PRACH transmission, Option 3 should also be included. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | See comments above |
| CATT | Same as NPUSCH, option 3 is also useful for NPRACH. |
| vivo | See the comments in Initial Proposal Section 7.1 |
| Nokia, NSB  | We propose also to study 2 items: One important thing is the adjustment of TA during long UL transmission should be in control of eNB, to guarantee accurate adjustment and alignment between UE and eNB. ENB will configure TA in RAR, based on reception of PRACH from UE. If UE changes TA in PRACH or NPRACH, one another item to study is how can eNB derive the TA for RAR and how UE to interpret the TA command in RAR. |
| Ericsson | Perhaps it would be more helpful if companies can first agree on what the problem is, before looking into the options. |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support proposal |
| SONY | Comments are similar to those for section 7.1:* UCG is used for frequency correction
* Do we expect NPRACH / PRACH transmissions longer than 256ms given the link budget / LLS?

These issues are also relevant to eMTC PRACH, not just NPRACH |
| APT | Support ***Initial Proposal Section 7.2***Based on current discussion on AI 8.15.1, long NPUSCH / PUSCH transmissions are going to be necessary in IoT-NTN. |

# DL Synchronization

Eutelsat set 3 (234km) is very close to the maximum beam size that can be supported. Sateliot Set 4 (e.g. 1000km) beam sizes @Nadir point cannot be supported with current CS algorithms. Current Doppler maximum NB-IoT budget for 2.17GHz:

• ±50KHz: Half Tone raster for Initial Cell Search for NB-IoT

• ±10 ppm, ± 20 ppm: typical free running oscillator accuracy

• ± 1ppm : margin. E.g to account for overlapping coverage at beam edge.

• Doppler budget: ±50 kHz - ±11ppm (or ±20 ppm) \*2.17GHz = ± 26.13 kHz (or 6.6 kHz)

The nominal frequency of DL signal is not broadcast. It needs to be determined using a frequency grid with 100 kHz sync raster. If the uncertainty on DL raster is +/-Raster/2=+/-50 kHz, the UE can know exactly the DL frequency. It will first determine in which frequency grid the DL signal can be found, and then can synchronize with great accuracy on DL signal. If the uncertainty > +/-Raster/2, then the UE cannot know its DL frequency. If the UE does not know the DL frequency it does not have a DL synchronization source to use the right sampling rate and correctly generate the UL frequency. A new Channel Raster of 200 kHz could be potential solution to support beam diameter size with ±20 ppm. Another alternative is to broadcast the DL frequency, e.g. as part of the NTN SIB. Table below shows maximum Doppler shift at LEO 600 km for IoT NTN. There are two solutions that have been considered in companies contribution:

* Option 1: New Channel raster increased from 100 kHz
* Option 2: Include a portion of the ARFCN in the (NB-)MIB

Option 1: proposed by ZTE, CATT, Qualcomm, MediaTek

Option 2: proposed by Qualcomm

Qualcomm proposed NR not having the “always on” CRS and PDCCH control region in first 3 symbols of subframe in standalone deployment, the NPBCH can be mapped to a larger set of REs, thereby improving coverage by 1.81 dB.

***Initial Proposal Section 8:***

***Do companies agree to at least study the following options for DL synchronization:***

* **Option 1: New Channel raster increased from 100 kHz**
* **Option 2: Include a portion of the ARFCN in the (NB-)MIB**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Beam diameter size @Nadir point | 93 km | 234 km | 1000 km | 2000 km |
| 3dB Beam-width in degrees (2γ) | 8.86 deg | 22.03 deg | 77.7 deg | 111.5 deg |
| Elevation angle at beam edge | 85.15 deg | 77.93 deg | 46.63 deg | 25.26 deg |
| Maximum Differential Doppler @fc=2GHz | ± 3.89 kHz | ± 9.63 kHz | ± 31.63 kHz | ± 41.65 kHz |
| Maximum Differential Doppler @fc=2.17GHz | ± 4.22 kHz | ± 10.44 kHz | ± 34.32 kHz | ± 45.19 kHz |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| ZTE | We are supportive for this proposal. Meanwhile, one important issue related to the synchronization performance degradation, e.g., PSS detection, DL timing/frequency offset estimation/maintenance should also be discussed. |
| Huawei | Agree with ZTE that the basic DL time and frequency synchronization performance should also be studied. The detailed solutions would be a second level discussion when problems are identified during the studied. |
| Qualcomm | Agree. The potential for improving coverage of sync signals (e.g., NPBCH) should also be discussed (either here, or as a separate item).There is also the related aspect of “deployment modes” (standalone, in-band, etc.) for NB-IoT, towards which we made a comment in the summary for 8.15.1. However, we are also OK to discuss it under “DL synchronization” in 8.15.2, if that is convenient (since supported deployment modes may influence DL sync signals’ coverage, etc.). |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |
| Lenovo, MotoM | We are supportive for this proposal, option 1 can be the baseline solution if ambiguous centre frequency issue is confirmed due to large Doppler shift. |
| CATT | Agree |
| Nokia, NSB  | Agree with ZTE that the DL synchronization performance should be studied. After that we can check whether there is issue for IoT NTN DL synchronization. |
| Ericsson | Before studying enhancement options, our view is that DL synchronization performance should be evaluated first in this SI to identify if there is an issue. |
| Xiaomi | We support the proposal.  |
| MediaTek | Support proposal |
| SONY | Support the proposal. Agree with Ericsson that the DL synchronisation performance should be studied |
| APT | Support ***Initial Proposal Section 8*** |

# Summary of 1st Round Discussion

The following aspects are still for further study in NR NTN WI.

* Common timing offset with value X if broadcast by the network (Issue#1)
* Common timing drift if broadcast by the network (Issue#1)
* Autonomous TA acquisition based on Timestamp (Issue#1)
* Indication of TA margin for over UE pre-compensation with autonomous TA (Issue#1-2)
* Indication of common frequency offset pre-compensation and post-compensation at gNB side (Issue 3-2)
* Serving satellite ephemeris format with orbital parameters or Position and velocity state vectors (Issue #5)
* GNSS accuracy requirements (Issue#6)
* UL time synchronization requirements (Issue#7)
* UL frequency synchronization requirements (Issue#8)

Several companies commented that there is no need to make a working assumption to de-prioritize these aspects. They may be some prioritization on some issues that are specific to IoT NTN. Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, CATT proposed to study Issue#7 and Issue#8. Overall, companies understand the motivation to avoid discussing issues that are currently discussed in NR NTN WI unless there are aspects of these issues relevant to IoT NTN specific.

On issues NR NTN Issues #7 and Issue#8, Qualcomm, Huawei mentioned different UL time and frequency synchronization requirements for IoT NTN could be discussed due to impact of GNSS position TTFF and SIB reading on UE power consumption. This is difference from NR NTN.

On issue#6, Qualcomm and Lenovo want to discuss it for IoT NTN. Simultaneous GNSS and NTN NB-IoT/eMTC operation is not assumed. This is difference with NR NTN. ZTE proposed GNSS measurement windows. The GNSS accuracy requirements could be discussed in Issue#3 – GNSS measurement window.

## Issue#1 - UL time and frequency synchronization accuracy

For this issue, it is could further discussed why UL time and frequency synchronization requirement should be different whether UL physical channels in NB-IoT and eMTC or NR are considered. There is on-going discussion on UL time synchronization requirement in Rel-17 NR NTN WI (Issue#7 and #8). There is assumption UE GNSS capability with UE can estimate and pre-compensate timing and frequency offset with sufficient accuracy for UL transmission in Rel-17 IoT NTN SID.

*NOTE: GNSS capability in the UE is taken as a working assumption in this study for both NB-IoT and eMTC devices. With this assumption, UE can estimate and pre-compensate timing and frequency offset with sufficient accuracy for UL transmission. Simultaneous GNSS and NTN NB-IoT/eMTC operation is not assumed.*

Related aspects for UL time and frequency synchronization accuracy due to potential impact on UE power consumption of GNSS position TTFF impact and SIB reading in IoT NTN can be discussion in Section 9.3 and 9.4. These were possible reasons mentioned by proponents to discuss UL time and frequency requirements in IoT NTN. A possible way forward would be to include considerations on UL time synchronization accuracy when GNSS position TTFF or SIB reading is done less frequently to compromise with UE power consumption.

***First Round Proposal – Section 9.1:***

***Add a note to include UL time and frequency synchronisation accuracy in the study of the following issues***

* ***GNSS position TTFF impact on impact on UE power consumption***
* ***SIB reading impact on UE power consumption***

Moderator view is that this issue #1 can be discussed after progress on Section 9.3 and 9.4.

## Issue#2 - GNSS measurement window

A note in the Rel-17 IoT NTN SID states clearly that assumption of GNSS capability is that UE can estimate and pre-compensate timing and frequency offset with sufficient accuracy for UL transmission.

*NOTE: GNSS capability in the UE is taken as a working assumption in this study for both NB-IoT and eMTC devices. With this assumption, UE can estimate and pre-compensate timing and frequency offset with sufficient accuracy for UL transmission. Simultaneous GNSS and NTN NB-IoT/eMTC operation is not assumed.*

ZTE, Huawei, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, CATT, Vivo, Nokia, Ericsson, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Sony, Asia Pacific Telecom commenting supported study on GNSS measuremet window. Since simultaneous GNSS and NTN NB-IoT/eMTC operation is not assumed, it seems reasonable to discuss need for GNSS measurement window when IoT module is switched off. ZTE, Xiaomi commented the GNSS measurement issue is related to the whole pre-compensation behaviour. Huawei commented GNSS measurement window will have an impact on the overall synchronization procedure, data transmissions and UE power consumption. Nokia commented analysis also needed for Contention Based PRACH. Sony commented that the issue of the GNSS measurement window needed in the case that the UE operates with a long eDRX cycle, and also commented GNSS measurement and IoT modem don’t operate at the same time (half-duplex issue).

***First Round Proposal – Section 9.2:***

***Do companies agree to discuss whether GNSS measurement window is needed and beneficial for initial access.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Xiaomi | Agree  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| APT | Support *First Round Proposal – Section 9.2* |
| CATT | Agree.In the initial access, GNSS measurement is needed to get UE position. However, not sure what is impact to access latency. Support to further study required time length of GNSS measurement duration. |
| ZTE | Agree. It’s necessary to discuss it.  |
| Huawei  | Agree |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |
| vivo | Agree |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree |
| CMCC | Agree. |
| MediaTek | Agree |

## Issue#3 - GNSS Position fix impact on UE power consumption

ZTE, Huawei, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, CATT, Nokia, Ericsson, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Sony, Asia Pacific Telecom supported study of GNSS Position fix impact on UE power consumption using battery life methodology in Rel-13 TR 45.820 (Section 5.4).

Studying whether the use of GNSS capability in device to get position TTFF for accurate UL time and frequency synchronization could be to un-acceptable impact on UE power consumption will be helpful. ZTE, Huawei, Qualcomm, Lenovo, CATT, Nokia, Ericsson, Xiaomi, MediaTek commented using Rel-13 NB-IoT battery life methodology for this issue is fine [10, 11]. The methodology as described in TR 45.820 Section 5.4 Energy consumption evaluation methodology provide an example of the different events that affect energy consumption when an MS has to send an IP packet and receive an IP acknowledgement for that packet. It also the key input parameters for energy consumption analysis for battery power during Tx, Rx, Idle, PSM (Table 5.4-1). MediaTek proposed GNSS power consumption value of 30 mW. This is based on [5] which mentions typical GNSS chipset power consumption (GPS+GLONASS) for Acquisition: 37 mW and Tracking: 27 mW. Huawei considered a higher value. Sony commented that the Rel-13 NB-IoT battery life methodology” can be applied to both eMTC and NB-IoT.

***First Round Proposal – Section 9.3:***

***Study GNSS Position fix potential impact on UE power consumption using battery life methodology in Rel-13 TR 45.820 (Section 5.4)***

* ***FFS GNSS power consumption value – e.g. 30 mW***

Outcome of GTW Session on first round proposal

***Agreement:***

***Study potential impact of GNSS Position fix on UE power consumption using battery life methodology in Rel-13 TR 45.820 (Section 5.4)***

***FFS: Details of the study***

In TR 45.820, Section 5.4 provides a table 5.4-1 with Key input parameters for energy consumption and Section 7.2.4.5.2 provide power consumption assumptions.

Table 5.4-1: Key input parameters for energy consumption analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| (1) Battery capacity(Wh) | (2) Battery power during Tx(mW) | (3) Battery power for Rx(mW) | (4) Battery power when Idle but not in PSS (mW) | (5) Battery power in Power Save State (PSS)(mW) | (6) Time between end of IP packet carrying "report" and start of IP packet carrying "ack" on radio (ms) | (7) Number of reports per day |
| 5 |  |  |  | [0,015] | 1000 |  |
| For each report (refer to Figure 5.4-1): |
| (8) Rx time from PSS exit to re-entry into PSS (ms) | (9) Idle time from PSS exit to re-entry into PSS (ms) | (10) Tx time from PSS exit to re-entry into PSS (ms) | (11) Time from last Rx or Tx activity to entry into PSS1(ms) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 20000 |  |  |  |

Table 7.2.4.5-1: Power consumption assumptions

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Activity*** | ***Power consumption******(mW)*** | ***Comments*** |
| TX active | 545 | Transmitter active at +23 dBm, assuming 44% PA efficiency and 90 mW for other analog and baseband circuitry |
| RX active | 90 | Analog RF and digital baseband processing for active receiver |
| Idle (light sleep) | 3 | Maintenance of precision oscillator reference for RF synthesizers |
| Deep Sleep | 0.015 | Low power crystal, sleep counters and state machine |

Companies can re-use the same methodology as in agreement for IoT NTN. In effect, companies that contributed on the UE power consumption in rel-13 cellular IoT can re-use the same calculation using the example of events affecting energy consumption for IP packet exchange which is also shown in Section 5.4 providing they know the GNSS power consumption analysis and the GNSS position Time To First Fix (TTFF).

During GTW discussions, it was discussed further the assumptions for

* GNSS power consumption
* GNSS Position Time To First Fix (TTFF)

Based on typical GNSS chipset power consumption (GPS+GLONASS) for Acquisition: 37 mW and Tracking: 27 mW in [5] and GTW discussions. For an intermittent transmission of a packet – e.g. every 2 hours, once a day, GNSS acquisition power consumption of 37 mW with a typical GNSS TTFF of <1 s (hot fix) or 2 seconds (warm fix) respectively could be assumed as an example. For continuous IP packet transmissions, GNSS tracking power consumption of 27 mW and GNSS TTFF < 1 s (hot fix) can be assumption. For GNSS impact on power consumption, worst case of GNSS acquisition power consumption of 37 mW and GNSS position TTFF could be considered as example. We make the revised proposal

***Updated proposal based on First Round discussion – Section 9.3:***

***For study GNSS Position fix potential impact on UE power consumption consider at least the following assumptions***

* ***GNSS power consumption value – e.g. 37 mW***
* ***GNSS position Time To First Fix – e,g. 2 s***

***Other values based on typical GNSS receivers are not precluded for the study***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. Additionally, the values of this proposal should be further checked. |
| Qualcomm | We are unsure about these numbers—particularly, the 2 second time to fix. Sure, the “other values not precluded” is present in the proposal as a backstop, but we are not sure how much value the numbers provided add.We would instead prefer that each company provides their own analysis, and indeed, a “trade-off” may also be studied between time-to-fix and accuracy, among other things. |
| APT | Support *Updated proposal based on First Round discussion – Section 9.3* |
| CATT | Support it. These values are critical for UE power assumption and latency evaluation. |
| ZTE | We are supportive for the main bullet and the 1st sub-bullet. But w.r.t the 2nd bullet, we are in general fine to take one example for aligning the study, but it should be noticed that further discussion on other values is needed. More specifically, w.r.t the hot start for GNSS, the proposed 2s can be acceptable. But for warm and cold start, much longer time, e.g., 30s for warm and up to minutes for cold start, respectively. |
| Huawei | We are fine with the main bullet but hold the view that there is no need to list the example values for GNSS power consumption value and GNSS position Time To First Fix. These assumptions are part of the study. Suggest changes below***For study GNSS Position fix potential impact on UE power consumption consider at least the following assumptions**** ***GNSS power consumption value ~~– e.g. 37 mW~~***
* ***GNSS position Time To First Fix ~~– e,g. 2 s~~***

***~~Other values based on typical GNSS receivers are not precluded for the study~~*** |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree for further study. But the example value could removed now, which can be added later after discussion/confirm.For GNSS position TTFF, we suggest to cover both warm start and cold start of GNSS cases in IoT UE implementation. As we commented in 1st round, the GNSS acquisition will be impacted by the deployment of the IoT UE, e.g. more time will be needed for UE in area with bad GNSS link status. In these areas, power consumption will be impacted. We suggest to add additional note: Power consumption for IoT UE in NTN should be studied and guaranteed for cases with bad GNSS link status. |
| CMCC | Similar view with ZTE. The proposed values can be chosen as example for aligning the study, but further discussion on other values is needed. |
| MediaTek | Agree. We are also open to companies bringing their own values for • GNSS power consumption value • GNSS position Time To First Fix |
|  |  |

## Issue#4 - NTN SIB reading impact on UE power consumption

Huawei, Qualcomm, Lenovo, Nokia, Ericsson, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Sony, Asia Pacific Telecom indicated support to study this issue.

Studying whether reading NTN SIB carrying the satellite ephemeris as needed for accurate UL time and frequency synchronization could lead to un-acceptable impact on UE power consumption will be helpful. CATT commented more input on power consumption for SIB reading is needed. Huawei commented that the satellite ephemeris has not been decided including the format and periodicity. Huawei commented that the satellite ephemeris format and periodicity have not been agreed. In NR NTN WI, Huawei proposed 140bits (17.5 bytes) overhead every 30 seconds [12]; MediaTek proposed 128 bits or 144 bits (18 bytes) with high periodicity – e.g. 1 s or 2 s [13] . For UE power consumption impact, the periodicity of NTN SIB is not the determining factor. The worst case assumption corresponds to UE acquiring the NTN SIB carrying the serving satellite ephemeris for UE pre-compensation everytime it needs to transmit a packet on the UL. This would be suitable assumption for UEs that transmit very occasionally and otherwise in long eDRX. In case the UE transmit continuously or in in short DRX cycle, this assumption is not typical. It seems reasonable to assume NTN SIB carrying the satellite ephemeris is 18 bytes

***First Round Proposal – Section 9.4:***

***Study NTN SIB carrying the satellite ephemeris potential impact on UE power consumption in NB-IoT and eMTC using battery life methodology in Rel-13 TR 45.820 (Section 5.4)***

* ***UE is assumed to read NTN SIB carrying the satellite ephemeris for UE pre-compensation every time it needs to transmit a packet on the UL***
* ***FFS Payload size of NTN SIB carrying the satellite ephemeris – e.g. 18 bytes***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We disagree with the “- UE is assumed to read NTN SIB carrying the satellite ephemeris for UE pre-compensation every time it needs to transmit a packet on the UL” subtext.We should study what are the trade-offs—in terms of satellite location tracking accuracy and power consumption, *depending on how frequently the UE reads SIB*. Reading SIB before “every transmission” is unrealistic (at least at this point in time) as an assumption, in our view. This is not how NB-IoT devices operate today. If a device sends NPUSCH 2 seconds after its previous transmission (as a crude example), the UE wouldn’t be forced to read SIB again before this today.We propose to reword the subtext as “- The impact of the frequency of SIB reads by a UE are also to be studied, both from a UE power consumption perspective, as well as with regards to the accuracy of satellite location tracking.” |
| APT | Support *First Round Proposal – Section 9.4.*Clarification: “**a packet** on the UL” is not RAN1 wording. Is it possible to replace by “a random-access procedure” or anything like “TB?” |
| CATT | Not sure why UE should read SIB with satellite ephemeris for each UL transmission. If based on predication, UE can ignore the SIB reading for the neighbouring UL transmissions without long gap.  |
| ZTE | Supportive for this proposal as baseline. |
| Huawei  | Fine with further study. The UE power consumption due to SIB reading is highly dependent on the assumptions such as the format of satellite ephemeris and SIB periodicity. We are supportive of the direction QC is proposing.  In addition, for UL transmission with large number of repetitions, the required number of SIB reading for a packet transmission need further study. But maybe this can be studied in section 9.5. |
| Nokia, NSB | The content/format and period of the ephemeris is important for this study for IoT UE. Before there are agreements for these, the study can not be completed. |
| CMCC | Supportive for this proposal as baseline.Regarding power consumption, “UE is assumed to read NTN SIB carrying the satellite ephemeris for UE pre-compensation every time it needs to transmit a packet on the UL” seems like the worst case, which at least needs to be evaluated.Power consumption due to other SIB reading mode, e.g., predication based, can be further evaluated. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Issue#5 - Long UL transmission on PUSH

ZTE, Huawei, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, CATT, Vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Asia Pacific Telecom support study of this issue. Ericsson commented the companies can first agree on what the problem is, before looking into the options. Sony commented it is needed to determine whether long NPUSCH / PUSCH transmissions are going to be necessary in IoT-NTN and further commented the UCG is for frequency tracking in the UE rather that the TA. If the transmission time of NPUSCH / PUSCH is less than 256ms, then there is no issue / problem to be resolved.

The moderator understanding is that NPUSCH transmission can be with up to 128 repetitions, where a TBS can be transmitted over up to 10 RUs. With sub-carrier spacing of 15 kHz, the transmission time can be up to 1 second; with single tome transmission with sub-carrier spacing 3.75 kHz, , the transmission time can be up to 4 second. Assuming a transmission time of 1 second, the Doppler shift can be about 544 Hz. The delay drift can be 26 us. This would result in loss of OFDM orthogonality with significantly impact on NPUSCH demodulation performance.

### UE pre-compensation of satellite delay during long transmission on PUSCH

Several companies discussed options for UE pre-compensation during long UL transmission on NPUSCH:

* Option 1: Use UE-specific TA calculation is supported by MediaTek, Spreadtrum
* Option 2: Use the timing drift rate is supported by Huawei, Lenovo
* Option 3: Use segmented pre-compensation is supported by ZTE, Vivo.

Huawei commented that Option 2 can be combined with Option 1, suggests the adjustment derived from Option 1 and Option 2 can be applied with segmented pre-compensation in Option 3. Section 7 described the issue of the delay drift and Doppler shift drift which would impact the long UL transmission. Xiaomi supported study. CATT commented that Option 2 calculates the TA, so it is equivalent to option 1, and Option 3 describes whether to do pre-compensation for each NPUSH or a set of NPUSCH. Based on companies’s feedback, we revised the proposal in Section 7

***First Round Proposal - Section 9.5.1:***

***Study options for the UE pre-compensation of satellite delay on during long UL transmission on PUSCH in NB-IoT and eMTC:***

* ***Option 1: Use UE-specific TA calculation based on GNSS-acquired UE position and serving satellite ephemeris.***
* ***Option 2: Use UE-specific TA calculation based on the timing drift rate.***

***Whether segmented UE pre-compensation of satellite delay is needed and beneficial can be studied.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Agree in general. Just that there may be a case that more than one of the option(s) are used/specified. It would be good if the language captures that. |
| APT | Support *First Round Proposal - Section 9.5.1.*Small question. We understand TA variation is needed, but why only consider service link. For an earth fixed cell, as a satellite moves, the service link may get longer, and the feeder link may get shorter. Option 1 may not have a correct estimate if it is based on a service link. |
| CATT | One question is how to get the timing drift rate. For option 1, it is same as NR NTN, but for option 2, how to get the UE specific timing drift rate is one problem. |
| ZTE | Fine with current proposal. The segmented proposal can be considered to specify the final solution. |
| Huawei  | It is still not clear to us how option 1 could work for the long UL transmission. In our understanding, if the timing drift rate is calculated from GNSS-acquired UE position and serving satellite ephemeris, UE can do the pre-compensation during long UL transmission. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine with current proposal. |
| vivo | In order to obtain more accurate TA, GNSS operation is needed during long UL transmission. One question is when to operate the TA calculation based on GNSS-acquired UE position.And the timing drift rate is cell-specific or UE-specific? |
| Nokia, NSB | As we have identified in 1st round, the alignment of the TA used in repetition of PUSCH should be aligned between IoT UE and eNB. Additionally, the TA in the repetition used by IoT UE should be in control of eNB, to avoid consistent TA error to cause UL interference. |
| CMCC | Similar concern with APT. Why don’t consider the RTD change on the feeder link? |
| MediaTek | Agree. For option 2, indication of timing drift is open issue. For Option 1, RAN1 made agreement Agreement:An NTN UE in RRC\_CONNECTED state is required to support UE specific TA calculation based at least on its GNSS-acquired position and the serving satellite ephemeris.FFS: Operation of closed loop and open loop TA controlAgreement:For TA update in RRC\_CONNECTED state, combination of both open (i.e. UE autonomous TA estimation, and common TA estimation) and closed (i.e., received TA commands) control loops shall be supported for NTN.FFS: Details of the combination of open and closed loop TA control |

### UE pre-compensation of satellite Doppler shift during long transmission on PRACH

UE pre-compensation of satellite Doppler shift during long transmission on PUSCH was discussed in Section 7. It was agreed in RAN1#103e in NR NTN WI that “*An NR NTN UE in RRC\_CONNECTED states is capable of at least using its acquired GNSS position and satellite ephemeris to perform frequency pre-compensation to counter shift the Doppler experienced on the service link*.”. This agreement can be assumed to be valid for IoT NTN in short UL transmission, but it could be studied for long transmission.

***First Round Proposal - Section 9.5.2:***

***Study whether UE is capable of at least using its acquired GNSS position and serving satellite ephemeris for the UE pre-compensation of satellite Doppler shift during long UL transmission on PUSCH in NB-IoT and eMTC.***

***Whether segmented UE pre-compensation of satellite Doppler shift is needed and beneficial can be studied.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | As it stands, the proposal may run the risk of implicitly assuming some level of accuracy (e.g., near-perfect accuracy) in terms of the “acquired GNSS position and serving satellite”, which shouldn’t be interpreted as such, at this stage.As such, “how accurate” these acquired parameters should be, need to be further discussed (which may also involve RAN4, etc.). We would like a subtext under the first sentence as:* FFS the accuracy requirements (including the use of prior-acquired values) of this acquired GNSS position and serving satellite ephemeris

As we have said before, the assumption shouldn’t default to “UE gets all fixes just before transmission, every time”. |
| APT | Support *First Round Proposal - Section 9.5.2* |
| CATT | Support it. |
| ZTE | Support this proposal. |
| Huawei |  Agree |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |
| vivo | Agree |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Agree |

## Issue#6 Long transmission on PRACH

ZTE, Huawei, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, CATT, Vivo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Asia Pacific Telecom support study of this issue. Companies provided similar comments on long transmission on PRACH as for long transmission on PUSH as discussed in previous section 9.6.

The moderator understanding is that NPRACH transmission can be with up to 1024 repetitions. With format 0 and 1, transmission time can be up to about 1.3 seconds and 1.5 seconds (2 seconds minus the gap for maximum TA of about 701 us and 522 us for format 0 and 1 respectively). With Format 2, transmission time can be up to about 3 seconds. Format 2 may fail due to the high Doppler shift without UE pre-compensation of satellite delay and Doppler during long UL transmission on PRACH. For format 0 and 1, UE pre-compensation could improve detection at low SNR and allow PRACH transmissions with fewer repetitions. A similar analysis can be shown for eMTC which also use large number of repetitions for PRACH depending on coverage class.

### UE pre-compensation of satellite delay during long transmission on PRACH

Similar options for long transmission of PRACH with similar comments from companies as discussed in Section 9.6.1.

***First Round Proposal - Section 9.6.1:***

***Study whether UE pre-compensation of satellite delay and Doppler during long UL transmission on PRACH in NB-IoT and eMTC is needed and beneficial:***

* ***Option 1: Use UE-specific TA calculation based on GNSS-acquired UE position and serving satellite ephemeris.***
* ***Option 2: Use UE-specific TA calculation based on the timing drift rate.***

***Whether segmented UE pre-compensation of satellite delay is needed and beneficial can be studied.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Agree in general. Just that there may be a case that more than one of the option(s) are used/specified. It would be good if the language captures that. |
| APT | Support *First Round Proposal - Section 9.6.1.*Small question. We understand TA variation is needed, but why only consider service link. For an earth fixed cell, as a satellite moves, the service link may get longer, and the feeder link may get shorter. Option 1 may not have a correct estimate if it is based on a service link. |
| CATT | Same comment with 9.5.1, not so sure how to get UE specific timing drift rate. |
| ZTE | Support this proposal. |
| Huawei  | Same comment as ***First Round Proposal - Section 9.5.1:***It is not clear how option 1 could work for the long UL transmission. In our understanding, if the timing drift rate is calculated from GNSS-acquired UE position and serving satellite ephemeris, UE can do the pre-compensation during long UL transmission. |
| Spreadtrum | Support this proposal. |
| vivo | See the comments in Initial Proposal Section 9.5.1 |
| Nokia, NSB | As we mentioned in 1st round, one important thing to be considered is ENB will configure TA in RAR, based on reception of PRACH from UE. If UE changes TA in PRACH or NPRACH, one another item to study is how can eNB derive the TA for RAR and how UE to interpret the TA command in RAR. Other comments are similar as in section 9.5.1. |
| CMCC | Same comments as Section 9.5.1:Regarding pre-compensation of satellite delay, why don’t consider the RTD change on the feeder link? |
| MediaTek | AgreeFor option 2, indication of timing drift is open issue.  |

### UE pre-compensation of satellite Doppler shift during long transmission on PRACH

Similar proposal for long transmission of PRACH as discussed in Section 9.6.2.

***First Round Proposal - Section 9.6.2:***

***Study whether UE is capable of at least using its acquired GNSS position and serving satellite ephemeris for the UE pre-compensation of satellite Doppler shift during long UL transmission on NPRACH.***

***Whether segmented UE pre-compensation of satellite Doppler shift is needed and beneficial can be studied.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | As it stands, the proposal may run the risk of implicitly assuming some level of accuracy (e.g., near-perfect accuracy) in terms of the “acquired GNSS position and serving satellite”, which shouldn’t be interpreted as such, at this stage.As such, “how accurate” these acquired parameters should be, need to be further discussed (which may also involve RAN4, etc.). We would like a subtext under the first sentence as:* FFS the accuracy requirements (including the use of prior-acquired values) of this acquired GNSS position and serving satellite ephemeris

As we have said before, the assumption shouldn’t default to “UE gets all fixes just before transmission, every time”. |
| APT | Support *First Round Proposal - Section 9.6.2* |
| CATT | Support it. |
| ZTE | Support this proposal. |
| Huawei | Agree |
| Spreadtrum | Support this proposal. |
| vivo | Agree |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Agree |

## Issue#7 DL Synchronization

### New sync raster, ARFCN in MIB

ZTE, Huawei, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, CATT, Nokia, Ericsson, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Sony, Asia Pacific Telecom support study of this issue. Ericsson commented whether there is issue with DL performance study should be studied first.

Assuming larger beam size of up to 1700 km proposed by Thales, typical crystal accuracy of ±20 ppm. This can result in large frequency offset exceeding half the tone raster of 100 kHz used in cellular IoT. Study of potential solutions discussed during first round are increase tone raster and include a portion of ARFCN in MIB are supported by ZTE, Huawei, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Lenovo, CATT, Nokia, Xiaomi, MediaTek. It was also commented by most companies including Ericsson that DL synchronization performance should be studied.

***First Round Proposal - Section 9.7.1:***

***Study the following options for DL synchronization performance***

* **Option 1: New Channel raster increased from 100 kHz**
* **Option 2: Include a portion of the ARFCN in the (NB-)MIB**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Agree. |
| APT | Support *First Round Proposal - Section 9.7.1*In the RAN1#113-e agreement, the max beam size is given by 1000 km rather than 1700 km. However, if typical crystal accuracy is ±20 ppm, then some enhancement seems unavoidable. Shall RAN1 confirm this ±20 ppm uncertainty is the common understanding in the group? |
| CATT | Support option 1. |
| ZTE | Support this proposal. In addition, as also highlighted by other, we need to further evaluate the DL synchronization performance. |
| Huawei | Disagree. We think the baseline DL synchronization performance should be studied first before agreeing any optimizations.  |
| Nokia, NSB | We keep our comment in 1st round: DL synchronization performance should be studied. After that we can check whether there is issue for IoT NTN DL synchronization.  |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Agree |
|  |  |

### Re-use first 3 symbols for NPBCH

Qualcomm commented the potential for improving coverage of sync signals (e.g., NPBCH) should also be discussed. Re-use first 3 symbols for NB-IoT in standalone was proposed and discussed in Rel-15 Further enhancements of NB-IoT WI in Reduced system acquisition time Agenda Item (Qualcomm R1-1718145, Ericsson R1-1717020, Nokia R1-1717231). This improves coverage by 1.81 dB. It seems not necessary to study this potential enhancements which was extensively discussed in a Rel-15 WI phase in cellular NB-IoT. The solution is well known. Companies are encouraged to comment first on whether there is a need to enhance NPBCH coverage.

***First Round Proposal - Section 9.7.2:***

***Do companies agree to discuss whether improve NPBCH coverage for DL synchronization is needed and beneficial?***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Xiaomi | Agree  |
| Qualcomm | Agree.Also, as a small comment, before companies have had a chance to express their views, moderator views such as “It seems not necessary to study this potential enhancements” may not be essential as a part of the summary. |
| APT | Clarify whether the intention is to support an existing Rel-15 feature of NB-IoT. If Yes, then support *First Round Proposal - Section 9.7.2.*  |
| CATT | Need more study. |
| ZTE | Agree |
| Huawei  | Disagree. There is no need to discuss if the solution is well known from Rel'15 NB-IoT. There must first be evidence that coverage enhancement is indeed needed, which has not yet been demonstrated at this stage of the SI. |
| Spreadtrum | We shared the similar views with Huawei. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree to study. |
| CMCC | Agree to study. |
| MediaTek | Agree |
|  |  |
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# Appendix

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contribution | Observation/Proposals |
| OPPO (R1-2100161) | Proposal 1: RAN1 shall decide if GNSS non-capable UE is in the scope of this release. Proposal 2: For GNSS capable UE, reuse NR-NTN agreements for time and frequency synchronization. |
| Huawei (R1-2100234) | Observation 1: The UL time and frequency synchronization enhancement of NR NTN can be applied to IoT NTN.Observation 2: RACH failure may happen for an NB-IoT UE since it may stay in the cell for a short time, which leads to increased power consumption.Proposal 1: Reuse the UL time and frequency synchronization enhancement design and conclusions of NR NTN in IoT NTN.Proposal 2: Study the effects of long UL transmission duration on UL time synchronization.Proposal 3: The timing drift rate can be accounted for by the UE to compensate the timing offset during the long UL transmission.Proposal 4: Study solutions for the possible RACH failure due to the insufficient time to stay in a given cell’s coverage. |
| ZTE (R1-2100249) | Observation 1: 100 kHz channel raster may not be large enough to avoid ambiguity in DL synchronization of IoT over NTN when multiple cells from different satellites could cover same UE.Observation 2: Performance degradation will be experienced in IoT over NTN for different satellite parameters.Observation 3: Performance degradation will occurs for the continuous transmission with larger repetition.Observation 4: The NPRACH design can still work for UL synchronization in NTN scenario once the accurate UL pre-compensation is done.Proposal 1: Channel raster should be enhanced in IoT over NTN when multiple cells from different satellites are allowed to cover same area.Proposal 2: DL synchronization performance should be evaluated with potential enhancement for target scenarios.Proposal 3: Scheduling of GNSS search and data transmission should be investigated to achieve a tradeoff between power saving and synchronization performance.Proposal 4: Segmented pre-compensation for long continuous repetition transmission should be considered.Proposal 5: Study PRACH format to improve UE density. |
| CATT (R1-2100266) | Observation 1: UE may have the maximum initial frequency error more than 50KHz contributed by oscillator, Doppler shift and anchor carrier offset in S band.Observation 2: Except for format 4, preamble format needn’t be enhanced for GNSS-capable UE. Observation 3: The accumulated timing error produced within a single transmission duration with multiple times repetition may exceed the tolerance of CP for NB-IoT and eMTC.Proposal 1: Study the impact to channel raster configuration due to higher frequency error in IoT NTN. Proposal 2: Reuse timing and frequency compensation mechanism of NR NTN to IoT NTN by taking into account UE power assumption. Proposal 3: Defining specific requirement on synchronization accuracy for IoT NTN is needed. Proposal 4: Study resource isolation mechanism for different users in UL signal transmission to guarantee UL transmission performance of NB-IoT NTN.Proposal 5: RAN1 needs to study if Preamble format 4 is supported for eMTC NTN due to higher timing accuracy requirement. Proposal 6: Further study the timing and synchronization issue in UL repetition transmission. |
| Vivo (R1-2100481) | Observation 1: TA information is out of date during NPRACH repetitions.Observation 2: Frequency is out of synchronization during repetitions.Proposal 1: Time synchronization can reuse relevant design and conclusions of NR NTN.Proposal 2: The start time of RAR time window and Msg3 transmission should be redesigned.Proposal 3: The update or re-calculation of TA information should be consideredProposal 4: The extension of UL gap should be considered.Proposal 5: Enhancement on UL gap and repetition number should be considered.Proposal 6: Compensation methods of frequency synchronization in NR NTN can be applied to IoT NTN.Proposal 7: For frequency synchronization, reduced duration of repetitions transmission could be considered. |
| MediaTek (R1-2100601) | Proposal 1: The value of X in $T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA offset}+\left[X\right]\right)×T\_{s} \left[+X\right]$ shall be determined as:* UL subframe and DL subframe timing aligned at the gNB: $X×T\_{s}=RTD\_{feeder link}$ if X is expressed at a unit of Ts or $X=RTD\_{feeder link}$ if expressed as a unit of time
* UL subframe and DL subframe timing aligned at the satellite: X = 0.

It is up to the network to configure the value of X.Proposal 2: The common timing drift over the feeder link is broadcast.Proposal 3: for UE with Autonomous acquisition of the TA, UE shall use one of:* TA\_offset of half the cyclic prefix of PRACH preamble which is added to Timing Offset value X broadcast by the network when applying the TA pre-compensation.
* Timing Offset value X including a margin TA\_offset broadcast by the network when applying the TA pre-compensation.

Observation 1: UE pre-compensation using satellite ephemeris can be applied to NR, NB-IoT, or eMTC with accuracy in the prediction of the serving satellite position and velocity in the order of a meter and 0.18 m/s respectively up to 10 seconds after reading the instantaneous serving satellite position and velocity state vectors broadcast on an NTN-specific SIB (i.e. corresponding to implicit reference time linked to the Downlink subframe where the SIB is broadcast). Observation 2: The UE can autonomously determine its UE-specific TA support for UL time synchronization during continuous UL transmission up to 256 ms without need for more frequent UL Compensation Gaps for UL synchronization.Proposal 4: For UE pre-compensation of satellite delay: * An IoT NTN UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE states is required to at least support UE specific TA calculation
* An IoT NTN UE in RRC\_CONNECTED state is required to at least support UE specific TA calculation.

Proposal 5: For UE pre-compensation of satellite Doppler shift* An IoT NTN UE in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE states shall be capable of at least using its acquired GNSS position and satellite ephemeris to calculate frequency pre-compensation to counter shift the Doppler experienced on the service link.
* An IoT NTN UE in RRC\_CONNECTED states is capable of at least using its acquired GNSS position and satellite ephemeris to perform frequency pre-compensation to counter shift the Doppler experienced on the service link.

Proposal 6: The base Station broadcast Position/ Velocity and implicit Time in each beam in the satellite cell:- Satellite location/velocity in ECEF coordinates- Validity Time is the end of SFN where SIB was transmitted (from the satellite)Proposal 7: Satellite Position and Velocity information field sizes broadcast on SIB with periodicity X* The field size for position is 78 bits
* The field size for velocity is 54 bits
* Value of X – e.g. 200 ms, 500 ms, 1000 ms, 1500 ms, 2000 ms

Observation 3: UE pre-compensation is sufficiently accurate to fulfill the timing and synchronization requirements necessary for UL transmission as listed below:* For TA update in RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE states, UE pre-compensation of satellite delay of PRACH transmission is within a timing error at the gNB $∆T=\pm \frac{CP}{2}$ corresponding to a satellite position error ΔU
	+ PRACH format 0, $∆T=56.6 μs$ or $∆U<\pm 7735 m$
* For TA update in RRC\_CONNECTED state, UE pre-compensation of satellite delay of UL transmission is within a timing error at the satellite $∆T=\pm \frac{CP}{2}$ corresponding to a satellite position error ΔU
	+ $∆T=2.34 μs$ or $∆U<\pm 351 m$ .
* For UE in RRC\_IDLE, RRC\_INACTIVE, and RRC\_CONNECTED states, accuracy of UE pre-compensation of satellite Doppler shift is within maximum UL frequency error of ± 0.1ppm.

Observation 4: The UE does not needed to read all the system information necessary to configure a device before accessing satellite cell. It is sufficient if the UE acquired at least once the system information with SIB1 to know the scheduling of NTN-specific SIB carrying the serving satellite ephemeris position and velocity state vector with a payload of around 16 bytes.Observation 5: The device only needs to acquire the serving satellite ephemeris position and velocity state vector broadcast on SIB if it is paged or if it needs to transmit data. This is small additional SIB reading over the baseline where the System Information for RRC configuration is read when there is a change of system information when there is a change of cell or satellite. Receiving and decoding small payload of 16 bytes on an NTN-specific SIB has no significant impact on power consumption as it is a small fraction of the processing and transmission power required by the device needs to transmit / receives Msg1, Msg2, Msg3, Msg4, Msg5 in the initial cell access procedure to transmit data and further messages to receive data. Observation 6: With sufficient accuracy of time and frequency for UE pre-compensation to achieve UL synchronization and broadcast with low latency of 16 bytes for serving satellite Position and Velocity on NTN-specific SIB, the legacy PRACH procedure and signals for NB-IoT and eMTC can be re-used to support Non Terrestrial Networks without enhancements. |
| Intel (R1-2100683) | Proposal 1: * Accurate UL synchronization is achieved by using pre-compensation of delay and Doppler for UL transmission based on GNSS at the UE and satellite ephemeris broadcasted by the gNB
	+ Enhancements on PRACH and closed-loop UL frequency control are not needed

Proposal 2: * Time and frequency offset introduced in service link is pre-compensated by the UE for UL transmission based on UE location (from GNSS) and satellite ephemeris (broadcasted by the gNB)
* The following options are considered for compensation of time and frequency offset introduced in feeder link for UL transmission
	+ Post-compensation at the gNB side
	+ Pre-compensation at the UE side based on broadcast information from the gNB

Proposal 3: * Enhancements for non-GEO satellite deployment with moving beams and frequency reuse should be discussed assuming existing features of eMTC and NB-IoT (e.g. multi-carrier operation and mobility)
	+ Increased number of anchor carriers for NB-IoT multi-carrier operation can be considered
 |
| Lenovo. Motorola Mobility (R1-2100763) | Proposal 1: A common timing offset (TO) and a TO drift rate for the propogation delay of feeder-link are broadcast in SIB.Proposal 2: UE can calculate distance/delay for service link and update the distance/delay based on the satellite velocity.Observation 1: For NPUSCH transmission with large number repetition, the TA adopted in the beginning is not suitable in the middle/end of the TB transmission.Proposal 3: TA value drift during the repetitions should be considered in UL transmission in IoT on NTN. |
| Spreadtrum (R1-2100810) | Proposal 1: Reuse UL timing compensation mechanism of NTN WI in IoT NTN.Proposal 2: Reference point for autonomous acquisition of the TA at UE is located at the satellite.Proposal 3: Both open and closed control loops are supported in connected mode for IOT NTN.Proposal 4: Reuse frequency compensation mechanism of NTN WI in IoT NTN.Proposal 5: In IOT NTN, the reference point for frequency synchronization is located at the satellite.Proposal 6: Updates on the pre-compensation value of time delay and frequency offset during the repetitions should be considered in UL transmission. |
| Sony (R1-2100875) | Proposal 1: RAN1 studies the following two methods for the UE determining timing advance:* Option 1: Autonomous acquisition of the TA at the UE based on satellite ephemeris and knowledge of UE and eNB location
	+ Further refinement of TA can be signaled in the RAR message
	+ Distance from eNodeB to satellite may be signaled instead of eNodeB location
* Option 2: Timing advance by network indication
	+ Network broadcasts a common TA to be applied in the cell
	+ Extended values of TA may be signaled in RAR

Proposal 2: The UE pre-compensates the frequency of its UL transmissions in order to mitigate for Doppler shift.Proposal 3: The frequency compensation that the UE is to apply to UL transmissions is based on:* UE GNSS receiver measurements of UE position and velocity
* SIB signaling of either satellite ephemeris information or satellite position and velocity information

Proposal 4: RAN1 studies ways of mitigating PRACH congestion when IDLE mode UEs simultaneously transmit PRACH after receiving satellite position and velocity information. |
| Ericsson (R1-2100931) | Observation 1 As GNSS-equipped UEs can perform timing/frequency pre-compensation before MSG1 transmission, the existing (N)PRACH formats for NB-IoT/eMTC in TN are also sufficient for NTN scenarios.Proposal 1 UE should pre-compensate its timing and frequency before transmitting MSG1.Proposal 2 As a baseline, the time and frequency synchronization for eMTC and NB-IoT should follow the same principles as outlined in the NR NTN WI.Proposal 3 RAN1 should investigate DL synchronization performance for NB-IoT and eMTC NTN.Proposal 4 RAN1 should discuss whether GNSS positioning in RRC\_CONNECTED state is to be supported by IoT NTN UEProposal 5 Study the impact of GNSS measurements on UE battery consumption prior to initial access and means to minimize the amount of GNSS measurements. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom (R1-2100976) | Observation 1 A reference point for calculating UL transmission timing can be set on the ground, in the air, at the satellite, at the eNB, or a certain point on the service link or a feeder link.Proposal 1 To guarantee the robustness of initial cell search with low complexity, e.g., one-shot detection, enhancement on time and frequency synchronization shall be considered.Proposal 2 Evaluate the existing NPRACH formats and determines whether all of them can be reused in NTN.Proposal 3 A reference point for UL transmission timing shall be set at the eNB, if needed.Proposal 4 To maintenance UL frequency, any update of NW assistance information may need a signaling mean other than using system information. |
| Nokia (R1-2101028) | Observation 1: If GNSS based time synchronization is used for IoT over NTN, the entire cyclic prefix of the random access preamble should be able to cover multipath propagation delay as well as the inaccuracy imposed by the compensation algorithm based on the GNSS information. Observation 2: the maximum doppler shift supported by current LTE NB-IoT/eMTC design is much lower than expected doppler shift in NTN scenario.Observation 3: The power consumption and impact on timing and frequency accuracy for NB-IoT/eMTC UE with GNSS processing is unclear.Observation 4: Using referenceTimeInfo-R16 and UE based understanding of GNSS time will suffer less from the satellite movement in terms of timing advance as the reference point is at a static location (the gNB).Proposal 1: DL synchronization performance based on LTE NPBCH/NPSS/NSSS and LTE PBCH/PSS/SSS in NTN scenario should also be evaluated, like for SSB in Rel-15.Proposal 2: If GNSS based time synchronization is used for IoT over NTN, the aggregate contribution of all sources of inaccuracy must not violate the limits imposed by the cyclic prefix of the random access preamble. Proposal 3: The GNSS-assisted pre-compensation solution used by the UE shall meet the demands of the preamble format chosen by the operator, i.e., UE must be prepared to fulfil all preamble format requirements. Proposal 4: link budget of GNSS and IoT in NTN should be evaluated.Proposal 5: it should be evaluated whether GNSS based time frequency synchronization could be accurate for following IoT cases· With reduced number of receiver antenna· With reduced power consumption· Not covered by GNSS satelliteProposal 6: how to compensate large doppler shift for IoT UE should be studied, where simplification of IoT UE processing could be considered.Proposal 7: RAN1 and RAN4 should select one alternative of reference point to be working assumption and it is preferred that the selection should be also base line for IoT NTN scenario.Proposal 8: power consumption should be studied for time/frequency sync in IoT over NTN when UE wake up and sync in UL gap, expecially with GNSS cold or warm starting. Proposal 9: In case GNSS accuracy is not accurate enough or not always available, UL random access procedure should be studied, with baseline as NR over NTN solutions but power consumption and complexity/cost reduction should also be considered.Proposal 10: it should be evaluated whether GNSS based time frequency synchronization could be accurate for IoT cases.Proposal 11: Considering all issues on GNSS accuracy and GNSS fault for IoT UE with reduced antenna number, second synchronization solution should be studied, not based on GNSS or with less dependence on GNSS.Proposal 12: Half duplex for UL, DL and GNSS reception should be studied considering GNSS accuracy and UE capability.Proposal 13: in CONNECTED mode, power consumption and accuracy for NB-IoT/eMTC UE with GNSS processing should be studied.Proposal 14: Network should be in control of the timing advance updates applied at the UE.Proposal 15: If UE is performing autonomous update of timing advance during RRC\_CONNECTED mode, the network should know the details of such adjustments in advance.Proposal 16: Self adjustement by the UE based on GNSS time and the time provided by referenceTimeInfo-R16 is a feasible solution and should be standardized as well.Proposal 17: TA value changing during the repetitions should be configured by Node B for UL transmission in IoT over NTN. |
| CMCC (R1-2101070) | Proposal 1: To support NB-IoT and eMTC over satellite, the conclusions of NR NTN WI should be reused as much as possible with necessary enhancements focus on coverage, capacity, power consumption and complexity (cost).Proposal 2: Broadcast instant position and velocity vector in system information, if indication of satellite ephemeris is needed.Proposal 3: For GNSS capability assumption, at least a reference time and frequency can be derived.Proposal 4: Potential enhancement to enhance the coverage for IoT should be studied. |
| Xiaomi (R1-2101105) | Observation 1: Existing NB-IoT/eMTC PRACH formats and preamble sequences can be reused with the assumption UE having GNSS capability.Proposal 1: Pre-compensation on the Doppler shift for DL transmission should be considered.Proposal 2: Reuse the UL time and frequency synchronization mechanism of NR NTN in IoT NTN while taking into account UE processing complexity. Proposal 3: Study the effects of long UL transmission duration on UL time synchronization. |
| Samsung (R1-2101243) | Proposal 1: TA estimation should be supported for GNSS-capable UE at least for initial access.Proposal 2: Common TA should be indicated to cover the roundtrip delay between Satellite and Gateway at least for position based TA estimation.Proposal 3: Whether or not to support reporting of UE’s estimated TA should be further discussed.Proposal 4: Frequency offset estimation should be supported by GNSS-capable UE for pre-compensation. |
| Apple (R1-2101369) | Proposal 1: IoT over NTN does not enhance PRACH formats and/or preamble sequences in release 17.Proposal 2: In IoT over NTN, UE obtains UE specific TA based on its GNSS location and serving satellite ephemeris.Proposal 3: In IoT over NTN, the timing reference point is set at satellite. Proposal 4: UE calculates and pre-compensates the Doppler shift on service link based on its GNSS location and serving satellite ephemeris. Proposal 5: Support network pre-compensates the frequency offset in downlink transmissions. |
| Interdigital (R1-2101402) | Proposal 1: The location-based timing compensation technique agreed in NR NTN is adopted for NB-IoT/eMTC.Proposal 2: For UL frequency offset compensation, network indicates the required frequency offset to be compensated for UL transmission is supported for NB-IoT/eMTC. |
| Qualcomm (R1-2101513) | Observation 1: In S-band frequencies, the frequency error during initial downlink synchronization (initial cell access) can be up to 47.5 kHz + FO\_doppler.Proposal 1: RAN1 to study enhancements to prevent an UE from locking on to an incorrect frequency corresponding to a (N)cell, such as increasing the raster size, or including a portion of the ARFCN in the (NB-)MIB.Proposal 2: Support NB-IoT over NTN in standalone and in-band/guard-band with NR modes only.Proposal 3: Include the first three symbols in a subframe as well as the REs corresponding to the 4 CRS ports for rate matching the NPBCH. Proposal 4: RAN1 to study potential enhancements to (N)PRACH design, depending on the agreements on satellite location accuracy at the UE (including the frequency of SIB reads required to facilitate that accuracy).Observation 2: Restricting alternate starting subcarriers for NPRACH transmissions allows to correct for potentially large initial uplink frequency synchronization errors (e.g., up to 1 kHz)* Such a scheme may facilitate significant UE power savings by requiring less tight pre-compensation requirements in the form of relaxations in the frequency and accuracy of GNSS fixes and SIB reads (to acquire satellite ephemeris) required.
 |
| Fraunhofer (R1-2101692) | Observation 1: To the best of our knowledge, the performance of GNSS data for NB-IoT over satellite has not been subject to detailed investigations yet.Proposal 1: The performance of GNSS data shall be evaluated in detail for NB-IoT over satellite by RAN1. The analysis shall be conducted with respect to the limited processing capability according to NB-IoT along with satellite IoT specific requirements such as strong limited power. |