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# Introduction

This document is the feature lead (FL) summary of contributions for the “IoT-NTN Timing relationship enhancements” agenda item.

This Study will evaluate and confirm solutions to address the minimum necessary specifications for NB-IoT and eMTC according to the following objectives.

The second objective is, for the above identified scenarios, to study and recommend necessary changes to support NB-IoT and eMTC over satellite, reusing as much as possible the conclusions of the studies performed for NR NTN in TR38.821. This objective will address the following items:

- Aspects related to random access procedure/signals [RAN1, RAN2]

- Mechanisms for time/frequency adjustment including Timing Advance, and UL frequency compensation indication [RAN1, RAN2]

- Timing offset related to scheduling and HARQ-ACK feedback [RAN1, RAN2]

- Aspects related to HARQ operation [RAN2, RAN1]

- General aspects related to timers (e.g. SR, DRX, etc.) [RAN2]

- RAN2 aspects related to idle mode and connected mode mobility [RAN2]

- RLF-based for NB-IoT

- Handover-based for eMTC

- System information enhancements [RAN2]

- Tracking area enhancements [RAN2]

NOTE 3: 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.

# Overview of Main Issues from company contributions

The following table lists the issues covered by companies’ contributions to this AI at RAN1#104-e. FL has added a comment to indicate FL proposal of how to treat each issue at this meeting.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue #** | **Issue** | **Proposed Treatment** |
| 1 | Timing relationships requiring enhancement | 1st round email discussion |
| 2 | Koffset Configuration | 1st round email discussion |
| 3 | MAC-CE Activation timing | 1st round email discussion |
| 4 | HD-FDD operation | 1st round email discussion |
| 5 | PDCCH monitoring timing after PRACH | 1st round email discussion |
| 6 | Scheduling delay | Dealt with in issues 1 & 2 |
| 7 | Timing advance | AI 8.15.2 |
| 8 | MAC contention resolution timer | RAN2 Issue? |
| 9 | NPDCCH / MPDCCH monitoring restrictions | 3rd round discussions |
| 10 | UE time / frequency tuning time | 3rd round discussions /RAN4? |
| 11 | UE GNSS measurement | 3rd round discussions |
| 12 | Power saving | 3rd round discussions |
| 13 | PUR and EDT | 3rd round discussions |
| 14 | (N)PRACH before SIB1 | Later discussions |
| 15 | Terrestrial eMTC / NB-IoT timing relationships | Noted |

In the above table, main issues not to be treated in first round appear in red. Companies are urged to concentrate only on the issues to be treated in the first round of email discussions.

## Timing relationships requiring enhancement

Various companies listed the timing relationships that require enhancement (enhancement relative to legacy terrestrial NB-IoT / eMTC operation). The identified timing relationships are taken from the baseline that has been agreed in the NR NTN work.

RAN1 needs to agree which timing relationships need to be altered for IoT-NTN. The following list is suggested by companies:

For NB-IoT, the following timing relationship enhancements are required:

* NPDCCH to NPUSCH format 1 extended by Koffset.
* RAR grant to NPUSCH format 1 extended by Koffset.
* NPDSCH to HARQ-ACK on NPUSCH format 2 extended by Koffset.
* NPDCCH order to NPRACH extended by Koffset.

For eMTC, the following timing relationship enhancements are required:

* MPDCCH to PUSCH extended by Koffset.
* RAR grant to PUSCH extended by Koffset.
* PDCCH order to PRACH extended by Koffset.
* MPDCCH to scheduled uplink SPS extended by Koffset.
* PUSCH to HARQ-ACK on PUCCH extended by Koffset.
* CSI reference resource timing altered by Koffset.
* MPDCCH to aperiodic SRS extended by Koffset.

### Company views

For NB-IoT, the following timing relationship enhancements are required:

* NPDCCH to NPUSCH format 1 extended by Koffset. CATT, vivo , MTK-Eutelsat, Intel, Len-MM, Spreadtrum, SONY, Xioami, Samsung, Apple
* RAR grant to NPUSCH format 1 extended by Koffset. CATT, vivo, MTK-Eutelsat, Len-MM, Spreadtrum, SONY, APT, Xiaomi, Samsung, Apple
* NPDSCH to HARQ-ACK on NPUSCH format 2 extended by Koffset. CATT , vivo, MTK-Eutelsat, Intel, Len-MM, Spreadtrum, SONY, Xiaomi, Samsung, Apple
* NPDCCH order to NPRACH extended by Koffset. APT, Samsung

For eMTC, the following timing relationship enhancements are required:

* MPDCCH to PUSCH extended by Koffset. CATT, Intel, Len-MM, SONY, Xiaomi, Samsung, Apple
* RAR grant to PUSCH extended by Koffset. CATT, Len-MM, SONY, Xiaomi, Samsung, Apple
* PDCCH order to PRACH extended by Koffset. CATT, Samsung
* MPDCCH to scheduled uplink SPS extended by Koffset. CATT
* PDSCH to HARQ-ACK on PUCCH extended by Koffset. CATT, Intel, SONY, Xiaomi, Samsung, Apple
* CSI reference resource timing altered by Koffset. CATT, Intel, Len-MM, Xiaomi, Apple
* MPDCCH to aperiodic SRS extended by Koffset. CATT, Intel, Len-MM, Xiaomi, Apple

### Related proposals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Contribution** | **Proposals** |
| CATT | Proposal 1: is required to introduce to enhance following transmission timing for NB-IoT:   * The transmission timing of DCI scheduled NPUSCH format 1. * The transmission timing of RAR grant scheduled NPUSCH format 1. * The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on NPUSCH format 2.   Proposal 2: is required to introduce to enhance following transmission timing for eMTC:   * The transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH (including CSI on PUSCH). * The transmission timing of RAR grant scheduled PUSCH. * The transmission timing of "PDCCH order" scheduled PRACH. * The transmission timing of MPDCCH scheduled uplink SPS. * The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH. * The CSI reference resource timing. * The transmission timing of aperiodic SRS. |
| Vivo | Proposal 3: Reuse the K\_offset introduced in NR NTN to enhance the following timing relationships in IoT NTN.   * The transmission timing of DCI scheduled NPUSCH. * The transmission timing of RAR grant scheduled NPUSCH. * The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on NPUSCH. |
| MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 1: Introduce K\_offset to enhance the following timing relationships for NB-IoT NTN is beneficial:   * For NB-IoT, on receiving UL grant on DCI format N0 in slot n, NPUSCH Format 1 is transmitted in subframe n+k0+K\_offset. * For NB-IoT, on receiving DL assignment on DCI format N1 in slot n, HARQ-ACK on NPUSH Format 2 is transmitted in subframe n+k0+K\_offset. * For NB-IoT, on receiving a NPDSCH with a RAR message in slot n, message 3 is transmitted on NPUSCH format 1in subframe n+k0+K\_offset. |
| Intel | Proposal 1:   * For eMTC additional slot offset K\_offset is needed at least for PUSCH, HARQ-ACK feedback on PUCCH, aperiodic SRS and CSI reference resource definition * For NB-IoT additional common slot offset K\_offset is needed at least for NPUSCH format 1 and HARQ-ACK feedback on NPUSCH format 2 |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 1: At least the following timing relationship should be updated by additional timing offset for IoT NTN   * Transmission timing for (N)PUSCH scheduled by DCI (including CSI on PUSCH (eMTC)) * Transmission timing for (N)PUSCH scheduled by RAR grant * Transmission timing for HARQ-ACK on PUCCH (eMTC) or NPUSCH format 2 (NBIoT) * CSI reference resource timing (eMTC) * Aperiodic SRS transmission timing (eMTC) |
| Sony | Proposal 3: The legacy Rel-16 timing relationship is applied between MPDCCH and PDSCH.  Proposal 4: The MPDCCH to PUSCH timing relationship is extended by *Koffset* subframes.  Proposal 5: The RAR to PUSCH timing relationship is extended by *Koffset* subframes.  Proposal 6: The PDSCH to PUCCH timing relationship is extended by *Koffset* subframes. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom, FGI | Proposal 3: Additional scheduling offset for Msg3 shall be considered regarding a need of NW to ensure UE to complete the Msg3 transmission with a required TA value.  Proposal 5: The UE processing time for an NPDCCH ordered NPRACH may need a revisit considering a potential need of using a TA value on the NPRACH transmission.  Proposal 7: For NPUSCH scheduling, a new offset value might be needed if the current spec context describes the procedure by assuming TA = 0.  Proposal 8: For HARQ-ACK feedback, a new scheduling offset value on top of k0 shall be considered if the current specs describe the procedure assuming TA = 0. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 1: The timing relationship agreed in NTN WI can be reused as the baseline design. |
| Samsung | Proposal 1: For NTN-IoT, a timing offset Koffset is required for   * the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH (including CSI on PUSCH) * the transmission timing of RAR grant scheduled PUSCH * the transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH * the transmission timing of PRACH triggered by a PDCCH order |
| Apple | Proposal 3: A cell specific is used to enhance the timing relationship of RAR grant scheduled PUSCH and HARQ-ACK to Msg 4.  Proposal 5: The is used to enhance the timing relationship of DCI scheduled PUSCH, DCI scheduled aperiodic SRS, HARQ-ACK on PUCCH, and CSI reference resource timing. |

### Timing relationships requiring enhancement Issues for email discussion

It seems from 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 that there is broad consensus as to which timing relationships should be enhanced and in most cases, how they should be enhanced to follow at least the solutions agreed in NR NTN. Based on this assertion, the FL proposals are as follows.

FL Proposal 1.1:

For NB-IoT, at least the following timing relationships shall be enhanced with an additional timing offset as required:

* NPDCCH to NPUSCH format 1
* RAR grant to NPUSCH format 1
* NPDSCH to HARQ-ACK on NPUSCH format 2
* NPDCCH order to NPRACH

Companies are invited to indicate (Yes/No) on FL Proposal 1.1 and comment as necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | FL Proposal 1.1 | Comment |
| Ericsson | Too early | There are various timing relationships specified for eMTC and NB-IoT, e.g., timing offset related to scheduling and HARQ-ACK feedback. However, it is not often clear whether it takes into account timing advance (TA). It is our view that RAN1 should first discuss existing eMTC and NB-IoT timing relationships to reach a common understanding, before discussing any potential required adjustment(s) within the context of NTN.  In fact, understanding of existing timing relationships was heavily discussed in Rel-15 NR maintenance. Common understanding based on the conclusion at RAN1#98bis can be found in R1-1911583. This eventually formed the basis for NR NTN work. Similar exercise is needed for IoT NTN.  In short, it is necessary to first align common understanding of existing specification text instead of jumping into conclusion directly. |
| ZTE | Discussion is needed per case | For the NB-IoT and eMTC, more complicated timing indication is designed including additional parameters and assumption. As identified in our contribution (R1-2100250), in some cases, e.g., RAR scheduled PUSCH, additional enhancements may not be needed. Then, considering the new scenario of IoT-NTN, the timing relationships mentioned in the contributions should be identified one by one with common understanding on the existing specification. |
| Huawei | Need further study | Agree with Ericsson that it is too early to make a decision. In principle, similar timing relationship enhancement to that of NR NTN can be considered but we need to check carefully whether enhancement is needed. |
| CMCC | Need further study | Same comment as above. |
| Xiaomi | Need further study | We share Ericsson’s view |
| Spreadtrum | Need further discussion | In principle, similar timing relationship enhancement in NR NTN can be considered. |
| Samsung | Further study | A timing offset should be taken into account in the timing relationships of these channels. The specific impact to the various timing equations can be different for the different channels and needs to be studied. |
| CATT | Need further study | We share same view with Ericsson. |
| vivo | Further study | These timing relationships have to be studied firstly. |
| MediaTek | Further study | The K\_offset solution used in NR NTN for the timing relationships can be used on a per case basis for NB-IoT / eMTC NTN timing relationships.  We would prefer the proposal to align with RAN1#98bis conclusions as proposed in our TDoc on a case by case   * For NB-IoT, on receiving UL grant on DCI format N0 in slot n, NPUSCH Format 1 is transmitted in subframe n+k0+K\_offset. * For NB-IoT, on receiving DL assignment on DCI format N1 in slot n, HARQ-ACK on NPUSH Format 2 is transmitted in subframe n+k0+K\_offset. * For NB-IoT, on receiving a NPDSCH with a RAR message in slot n, message 3 is transmitted on NPUSCH format 1in subframe n+k0+K\_offset.   It would be helpful to discuss the impact of long RTT on each timing relationship in NB-IoT / eMTC. Identify if there are specific issues for NB-IoT / eMTC NTN compare to NR NTN that would require further discussion.  We are fine with Ericsson suggestion to further discuss the TA understanding with long RTT. The TA is used in cellular NB-IoT or eMTC for UL synchronization. To our understanding, longer RTT in LEO / GEO would still require use of TA similarly to NR NTN for UL synchronization. The Koffset is a solution used for the timing relationships. This is needed even with assumption that UE is perfectly synchronized on UL as was discussed in NR NTN.  In eNB, there is no overlapping of UL and DL subframes in FDD assuming UE are synchronized on UL. It is up to the eNB to schedule UL transmissions taken into account the long RTT. The Koffset is needed to avoid scenario where for example UE receives UL grant on DCI in slot n, but would need to advance the transmission by several hundreds of ms due to long RTT before transmitting NPUSCH Format 1 in UL subframes n+k0. This would not be possible without the Koffset for the same reasons as in NR NTN for corresponding case. We see no difference for this case. |
| SONY | Can discuss on case by case basis | We think that all of the items in the FL proposal need a timing offset added. We think that a single offset can be applied to each of the timing relationships, i.e. there is a single K\_offset value that the UE would apply.  Our understanding of the existing timing relationships is that they are defined for the case where there is zero timing advance. Any timing advance applied thus “eats into” the UE processing timeline between channels. We are OK to first clarify existing timing relationships before moving on to IoT-NTN timing relationships.  We are OK to discuss each timing relationship on a case by case basis, but assume that the outcome is that the enhancement will be the same for each relationship. |
| Nokia, NSB | Further study | Same view as Ericsson. It is too early to say enhancement is needed or not before any discussion on that. Further study is needed for each case. |

FL Proposal 1.2:

For eMTC, at least the following timing relationships shall be enhanced with an additional timing offset as required:

* MPDCCH to PUSCH
* RAR grant to PUSCH
* PDCCH order to PRACH
* MPDCCH to scheduled uplink SPS
* PUSCH to HARQ-ACK on PUCCH
* CSI reference resource timing
* MPDCCH to aperiodic SRS

Companies are invited to indicate (Yes/No) on FL Proposal 1.2 and comment as necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | FL Proposal 1.2 | Comment |
| Ericsson | Too early | There are various timing relationships specified for eMTC and NB-IoT, e.g., timing offset related to scheduling and HARQ-ACK feedback. However, it is not often clear whether it takes into account timing advance (TA). It is our view that RAN1 should first discuss existing eMTC and NB-IoT timing relationships to reach a common understanding, before discussing any potential required adjustment(s) within the context of NTN.  In fact, understanding of existing timing relationships was heavily discussed in Rel-15 NR maintenance. Common understanding based on the conclusion at RAN1#98bis can be found in R1-1911583. This eventually formed the basis for NR NTN work. Similar exercise is needed for IoT NTN.  In short, it is necessary to first align common understanding of existing specification text instead of jumping into conclusion directly. |
| ZTE | Discussion is needed per case | Similar as the comment for Proposal 1.1. |
| Huawei | Need further study | Same comment as for the FL proposal 1.1. |
| CMCC | Need further study | Same comment as above. |
| Xiaomi | Need further study | Same comment as the previous proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Need further discussion | In principle, similar timing relationship enhancement in NR NTN can be considered. |
| Samsung |  | Same comment as in Proposal 1.1. |
| vivo | Further study | Same comment as in Proposal 1.1. |
| MediaTek | Further discuss | Same comment as in Proposal 1.1 |
| SONY | Can discuss on case by case basis | Similar to the comment for proposal 1.1. i.e.:   * Can consider on case by case basis * OK to initially confirm common understanding of legacy terrestrial operation   A specific concern is the CSI resource reference timing. CSI measurements are likely to be out of date after a long RTT and so may not be useful. However, it might be necessary to define the timing relationship even if CSI is of limited use. |
| Nokia, NSB | Further study | Same view as Ericsson. It is too early to say enhancement is needed or not before any discussion on that. Further study is needed for each case. |

FL Proposal 1.3: Use NR NTN solutions (addition of Koffset) as baseline.

Companies are invited to indicate (Yes/No) on FL Proposal 1.3 and comment as necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | FL Proposal 1.3 | Comment |
| Ericsson | Too early | There are various timing relationships specified for eMTC and NB-IoT, e.g., timing offset related to scheduling and HARQ-ACK feedback. However, it is not often clear whether it takes into account timing advance (TA). It is our view that RAN1 should first discuss existing eMTC and NB-IoT timing relationships to reach a common understanding, before discussing any potential required adjustment(s) within the context of NTN.  In fact, understanding of existing timing relationships was heavily discussed in Rel-15 NR maintenance. Common understanding based on the conclusion at RAN1#98bis can be found in R1-1911583. This eventually formed the basis for NR NTN work. Similar exercise is needed for IoT NTN.  In short, it is necessary to first align common understanding of existing specification text instead of jumping into conclusion directly. |
| ZTE |  | W.r.t the solution, if the necessity for corresponding case is identified for timing enhancement, introduction of K\_offset can be the baseline solution for discussion, e.g., to address the impact of larger RTT. Other solution to address different issue will be discussed case by case. |
| Huawei | Need further study | The principle of NR NTN can be considered, but we need to discuss the existing timing relationship first and figure out whether NR NTN solutions could work out as the baseline. |
| CMCC |  | Same view as ZTE. |
| Xiaomi | Support if introduction of K\_offset is needed |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Samsung |  | We think that the various timing relationships have to be studied first. No need to agree to this proposal. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| MediaTek |  | Same comment as in Proposal 1.1 |
| SONY |  | Preference is to align with the NR NTN solution (addition of Koffset to timing relationships).  If the conclusion of FL proposals 1.1 and 1.2 is that each timing relationship is going to be considered individually, then at this stage it seems premature to agree that the NR NTN solution will be applied for each timing relationship. |
| Nokia, NSB | Further study | Possible but further study needed before any agreement. |

### SECOND ROUND: Timing relationships

Many responding companies suggest that we study timing relationships in NB-IoT and eMTC first and then for each timing relationship, proceed to assess what enhancement is needed for IoT-NTN as the Koffset solution of NTN may not be suitable in all cases.

Timing advance (TA) is used in terrestrial NB-IoT or eMTC for UL synchronization. The use of a perfect TA results in UL and DL frames being aligned at the eNB with respect to a given UE. The TA reflects the RTT between the particular UE and the eNB. It is therefore expected that the long RTT in LEO / GEO NTN would require a large TA as has been seen in NR NTN for UL synchronization. In NR NTN, the Koffset solution has been used to solve the following problem that is best explained by an example.

When a UE receives a dynamic UL grant via DCI ending in slot n, the UE is expected to transmit NPUSCH starting at some UL subframe n+k0. The UE generally advances all UL transmissions by its specific TA. So, if because of an excessive RTT the UE specific TA is larger than k0, the UE would then be faced with the dilemma of having to transmit an NPUSCH scheduled by an NPDCCH DCI that it has not yet received. The Koffset solution in NR NTN would allow the UE to transmit the NPUSCH instead at UL subframe n+k0+Koffset. As long as (k0 + Koffset) is larger than the TA, the UE would avoid the scheduling dilemma outlined above.

Table 1: NB-IoT timing relationship offsets

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Timing relationship description | Value of time offset (FDD)  (ms) | Value of time offset (TDD)  (ms or subframe) |
| Timing offset for reporting ACK/NACK on NPUSCH | SCS = 3.75kHz  {12, 20} | (k + 12) subframes, where k = {0, 8} |
| SCS = 15kHz {12,14,16,17} | (k + 12) subframes, where  k = {0,2,4,5} |
| Timing offset for DCI scheduled NPUSCH | 8,16,32,64 | (k + 8) subframes, where  k = { 0,8,16,32} |
| Timing offset for RAR grant scheduled NPUSCH  (Also can be configured with additional Scheduling delay field () in RAR) | 12,16,32,64 | (k + 8) subframes, where  k = {4,8,16,32} |
| start of Msg2 RAR window | 4,41 | 4 |
| PDCCH order PRACH | the value is k ≥ 8 |  |
| Applying time of timing advance command | 12 |  |
| start of monitoring PUR response window | 4 |  |

Table 2: eMTC timing relationship offsets

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Timing relationship description | Value of time offset (FDD)  (ms) |
| Timing offset for reporting ACK/NACK on MPUCCH | 4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,15,17 |
| Timing offset for DCI scheduled PUSCH | 4 |
| Timing offset for RAR grant scheduled PUSCH  (Also can be configured with UL delay in RAR grant) | For CEmodeA,  PUSCH is transmitted in next available UL subframe after n+k1+Δ, if UL delay field is set to 1,  The value is k1, if UL delay field is set to 0,  DL-SCH transport block reception ending in subframe n, and Δ is the number of Msg3 PUSCH repetitions, e.g. 2. k1≥6. |
| start of Msg2 RAR window | 3 |
| PDCCH order PRACH | the value is k2 ≥ 6 |
| Applying time of timing advance command | 6 |
| start of monitoring PUR response window | 4 |

Table 3: RTD in NTN satellite scenarios under consideration

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Scenarios | GEO based non-terrestrial access network (Scenario A and B) | LEO based non-terrestrial access network (Scenario C & D) |
| Max Round Trip Delay (propagation delay only) | Scenario A: 541.46 ms (service and feeder links)  Scenario B: 270.73 ms (service link only) | Scenario C: (transparent payload: service and feeder links)  25.77 ms (600km)  41.77 ms (1200km)  Scenario D: (regenerative payload: service link only)  12.89 ms (600km)  20.89 ms (1200km) |

In NB-IoT and eMTC however, the parameter k0 is configurable and in some cases, to a very large number of subframes. Table 1 and Table 2 taken from R1-2100250 summarises the values of k0 for NB-IoT and eMTC, respectively. In NB-IoT for example, it can be seen that k0 could be as high as 64ms in some cases. The range of RTDs for the NTN scenarios under consideration in this SI are shown in Table 3 taken from [2] for comparison. Clearly, for LEOs, the RTD is less than 64ms.

It is therefore reasonable to consider each timing relationship separately for the different NTN scenarios and to assess whether it needs enhancement. If it needs enhancement, what exact offsets to use can be decided during the normative phase.

FL Proposal 1.1-2:

For NB-IoT, at least the following timing relationships need to be studied individually for enhancement:

* NPDCCH to NPUSCH format 1
* RAR grant to NPUSCH format 1
* NPDSCH to HARQ-ACK on NPUSCH format 2
* NPDCCH order to NPRACH

FSS: Other NB-IoT timing relationships

Companies are invited to provide their views on this proposal 1.1-2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson | Agree with modification | Revise the wording (change in red):  … need to be studied individually for checking if enhancement is needed or not |
| Samsung | Agree | Prefer rewording as above |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| APT | Agree | Wonder whether TDD is still within the SI scope |
| ZTE | Agree with modification | Supportive with modification, including:   * take the FFS as a sub-bullet. * Update the main purpose by deleting “individually for enhancement”;   For NB-IoT, at least the following timing relationships need to be studied ~~individually for enhancement~~ |
| Huawei | Agree with the bullets as areas for study | As commented by the FL, the LEO case and GEO case may have different requirement.  Also, we do not want to make hasty conclusions in agreements that make it look like we already find a need for enhancements. This would be an outcome AFTER the study.  Thus, for proposal 1.1-2 we recommend editing the first line as:  For NB-IoT, at least the following timing relationships need to be studied individually for identifying a need (if any) for enhancement |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree | Further study on each case |
| CMCC | Agree | Prefer rewording as Ericsson, ZTE or Huawei’s suggestion. |
| SONY | Agree | Prefer rewording from Ericsson or Huawei |
| Apple | Agree | Prefer rewording as some companies proposed. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree | Prefer the modification of ZTE |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |

FL Proposal 1.2-2:

For Emtc, at least the following timing relationships can be studied individually for enhancement:

* MPDCCH to PUSCH
* RAR grant to PUSCH
* PDCCH order to PRACH
* MPDCCH to scheduled uplink SPS
* PUSCH to HARQ-ACK on PUCCH
* CSI reference resource timing
* MPDCCH to aperiodic SRS

FSS: Other Emtc timing relationships

Companies are invited to provide their views on this proposal 1.2-2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson | Agree with modification | Revise the wording (change in red):  … need to be studied individually for checking if enhancement is needed or not |
| Samsung | Agree | Prefer rewording as above |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree with modification | Supportive with modification, including:   * take the FFS as a sub-bullet. * Update the main purpose by deleting “individually for enhancement”;   For NB-IoT, at least the following timing relationships need to be studied ~~individually for enhancement~~ |
| Huawei | Agree with the bullets as areas for study | As commented to Proposal 1.1-2, we do not want to make hasty conclusions in agreements that make it look like we already find a need for enhancements. This would be an outcome AFTER the study.  Thus, for proposal 1.2-2 we recommend editing the first line as:  For NB-IoT, at least the following timing relationships need to be studied individually for identifying a need (if any) for enhancement |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree | Further study on each case |
| CMCC | Agree | Prefer rewording as Ericsson, ZTE or Huawei’s suggestion. |
| MediaTek | Agree with modification. Enhancements should be considered if needed and beneficial. | Revise the wording (change in red):  need to be studied individually for identifying whether enhancement is needed and beneficial  … |
| SONY | Agree | Revised wordings from Ericsson, Huawei or Mediatek are preferred. |
| Apple | Agree | Prefer rewording as some companies proposed. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |

### THIRD ROUND: Timing relationships

FL Proposals 1.1-2 and 1.2-2 in this round 2 email discussion have each attracted agreement from all 13 respondents. Some respondents while agreeing, nonetheless proposed changes to some of the wording and I have reflected the proposed changes in the following modified proposals.

Modified FL Proposal 1.1-2:

For NB-IoT, at least the following timing relationships need to be studied individually for checking whether enhancement is necessary and beneficial:

* NPDCCH to NPUSCH format 1
* RAR grant to NPUSCH format 1
* NPDSCH to HARQ-ACK on NPUSCH format 2
* NPDCCH order to NPRACH
* Timing advance command activation
* FSS: Other NB-IoT timing relationships

Modified FL Proposal 1.2-2:

For eMTC, at least the following timing relationships can be studied individually for checking whether enhancement is necessary and beneficial:

* MPDCCH to PUSCH
* RAR grant to PUSCH
* PDCCH order to PRACH
* MPDCCH to scheduled uplink SPS
* PUSCH to HARQ-ACK on PUCCH
* CSI reference resource timing
* MPDCCH to aperiodic SRS
* Timing advance command activation
* FSS: Other eMTC timing relationships

## Koffset Configuration

The Koffset value that is introduced in NR NTN can be used for various aspects of IoT-NTN functionality.

There are expected to be fewer satellite beams for IoT-NTN than for NR NTN. Should there be beam-specific Koffset values signaled in SIB? A counter-argument is that IoT traffic is not delay sensitive and hence there is no point trying to optimize the Koffset value and a cell-specific value may be acceptable.

It was agreed in NR NTN that a single Koffset value for initial access will be signaled in the SI per cell. Companies have raised similar issues here.

How many values of Koffset should there be?

* Cell specific Koffset for initial access
* UE-specific Koffset during connected mode
* Beam specific Koffset values

How are Koffset values determined by the UE?

* Cell specific signaling (e.g. SIB)
  + Per cell
  + Per beam
* UE-specific signaling
* Implicitly determined

The Koffset value, at least for initial access, should be capable of supporting the RTT to the furthest UE in the NTN cell/beam coverage. It seems like this does not need to be specified and that a reasonable eNodeB implementation may choose the Koffset value appropriately.

### Issue Discussion

#### Cell specific vrs beam specific Koffset for initial access

RAN1#103-e agreement for NR NTN

Agreement:

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

The FSS part for NR NTN is also under discussion at this meeting.

**Company views**

Cell specific Koffset should be supported in initial access. Spreadtrum, Samsung, Apple, Len-MM, Samsung, NOK-NSB

Beam-specific Koffset values supported. MTK-Eutelsat, Spreadtrum

There is no beam processing in LTE. NOK-NSB

FL Question 2.1: Should the Koffset for initial access be cell-specific or beam-specific?

#### Koffset for initial access should be explicitly signaled in SI

RAN1#103e agreement in NR NTN implies explicit configuration in SI.

Agreement:

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

**Company views**

Koffset should be carried in system information. Zhejiang, IDC

Koffset should be derived implicitly based on other parameters, such as common TA. Zhejiang, SONY

FL Question 2.2: Should Koffset for initial access be explicitly configured in SI or implicitly signaled?

#### UE-specific Koffset during connected mode

**Company views**

UE-specific Koffset value can avoid collisions in HD-FDD and avoid unused DL subframes. MTK-Eutelsat

UE-specific timing offsets can be applied after initial access in order to account for the large variation in TA between UEs in a cell. Samsung

For NB-IoT, the latency is not critical and the latency saving from UE-specific offset does not justify the signaling overhead to a potentially large number of UEs Apple

Koffset value applied depends on the configured Koffset and the TA difference between first TX and last TX of a set of repetitions. NOK-NSB

FL Question 2.3: Should IoT-NTN support a UE-specific Koffset in connected mode?

### Related proposals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tdoc#** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: Reuse the Koffset introduced in NR NTN to enhance the timing relationships in IoT NTN. |
| Zhejiang Lab | Proposal 1: K\_offset can be introduced and carried in system information to support NB-IoT/eMTC and in which procedure (s) should K\_offset be introduced can be further discussed.  Proposal 2: Implicit signaling of K\_offset value(s) should be supported. |
| MediaTek Inc. | Observation 1: Configuration of a beam-specific K\_offset requires beam-specific K\_offset to be broadcast on SIB increases system information overhead in a satellite cell with moderate number of beams and may be acceptable trade-off between UL scheduler flexibility in initial access and SIB overhead.  Proposal 2: The value of K\_offset can be re-configured after RRC connection setup based on UE-specific autonomous TA report. |
| Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 1: The K\_offset introduced in NR NTN can be reused in IoT NTN.  Proposal 2: Cell specific K\_offset configuration should be supported and used in initial access.  Proposal 3: Updating of the Koffset from cell-specific to beam-specific after initial access for IOT NTN should be supported. |
| Sony | Proposal 1: The timing relationship between certain physical channels is extended by *Koffset* subframes in order to enable operation in IoT-NTN cells with large propagation delays.  Proposal 2: RAN1 selects between the following options for determining *Koffset*:   * *Koffset* is explicitly signaled to the UE * UE implicitly determines *Koffset* value based on other cell parameters, such as a common timing offset if broadcasted by the eNB |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 1: configured K\_offset and timing distance difference between the first transmission and the repetiton could be used to generate the new K\_offset for the repetition.  Observation 1: Large complexity for IoT UE and large standard effort are needed for IoT UE in NTN to support beam specific processing.  Proposal 2: beam specific processing is not introduced into LTE IoT NTN and Cell-specific K\_offset could be used for time relation in IoT NTN.  Observation 2: there are ways to cover multiple beams, to guarantee both beamforming gain and timing relationship.  Proposal 3: multiple deployments for timing relationship with satellite beams should be studied and compared, considering complexity and standard effort. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2: Cell specific timing offset is transmitted in SIB with a single value for adjusting the transmission timings of DCI scheduled PUSCH, RAR grant scheduled PUSCH and HARQ-ACK on PUCCH.  Proposal 3: Discuss whether to allow reconfiguration to a UE-specific timing offset after initial access.  Proposal 4: Discuss the existing timing relationships of NB-IoT and eMTC for NTN. |
| Apple | Proposal 1: IoT over NTN reuses the principle of the timing relationship enhancement in NR over NTN.  Proposal 2: A cell specific is configured as system information and is used in initial access.  Proposal 4: A cell specific is used after initial access at least for NB-IoT devices.  Proposal 6: RAN1 to study how to align the scheduling timing between UE and network. |
| InterDigital, Inc. | Proposal 1: A Koffset value carried in system information is used to adapt timing relationship enhancements in NB-IoT/eMTC to an NTN environment. |

### Koffset Configuration Issues for email discussion

On the 3 different issues related to the number, configuration and UE-specific Koffset, some companies have expressed views that lie on both sides of each issue. As only a few companies have expressed a view on each of these issues, in the email discussion, we would like to get the views of more companies.

FL Question 2.1: Should the Koffset for initial access be cell-specific or beam-specific?

Companies are kindly asked to indicate the view (Cell-specific/Beam-specific) in the relevant column and provide a comment.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Cell or beam-specific Koffset? | Comment |
| Ericsson | Cell specific | Follow progress in NR NTN WI |
| ZTE | Beam-specific is prioritized | For the IoT case, impact of different satellite parameter along with beam layout should be considered. |
| Zhejiang Lab | both | Cell-specific as baseline and beam-specific can be further supported to optimize the latency when needed. |
| Huawei | Cell specific | According to NR NTN, at least cell-specific Koffset should be supported. |
| CMCC | Cell specific | IoT NTN is delay tolerant. |
| Apple | Cell specific | Like NR NTN, at least cell specific Koffset is supported. |
| Xiaomi | At least cell specific | At least cell-specific Koffset can be supported following NTN outcome. FFS the support of beam specific Koffset |
| Spreadtrum | Cell specific | Considering that NB-IOT is not very sensitive to delay, cell specific Koffset is enough to meet the requirements in initial access. |
| Samsung | Cell specific | As in NR NTN |
| CATT | Cell specific | For IoT NTN, the delay is not critical. |
| vivo | Cell-specific | Same as NR-NTN, at least cell specific Koffset is supported. |
| MediaTek | Cell specific | As in NR NTN, beam specific Koffset could be FFS |
| SONY | Depends on definition of beam and cell | The choice depends to an extent on what a “beam” is. An IoT-NTN beam seems to have different characteristics to an NR NTN beam. Our preference is for cell-specific |
| Nokia, NSB | Cell specific | Cell specific K\_offset will have much less UE complexity and standard effort and LTE does not support beam related processing. |

FL Question 2.2: Should Koffset(s) for initial access be explicitly configured in SI or implicitly signaled?

Companies are kindly asked to indicate their view (Explicit /Implicit) in the relevant column and provide a comment if necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Explicit or Implicit Configuration | Comment |
| Ericsson | Too early | Too early to decide, especially this is a SI. Follow progress in NR NTN WI |
| ZTE |  | Be open to study, basically the structure of issues on the indication can follow NR-NTN, e.g. include initial value, and update. |
| Zhejiang Lav | Implicit | Reduce signaling overhead |
| Huawei | Implicit | Same view as NR NTN, implicit indication can save the signaling overhead |
| CMCC | Need further study | Follow NR-NTN. |
| Apple | Explicit | We could wait for the detailed design of Koffset before making a decision. |
| Xiaomi | Too early | Share Ericsson’s view |
| Spreadtrum | Need further study |  |
| Samsung |  | This can be discussed in the WI phase. |
| vivo | Further study | Follow NR-NTN. |
| MediaTek |  | This issue is under discussion in NR NTN, we can wait for progress in NR NTN. |
| SONY | Follow NR NTN | Both explicit and implicit can be considered at this stage. We can follow progress in NR NTN.  If Koffset can be calculated from other parameters in SIB, then Koffset can be calculated implicitly and there is no need for separate Koffset signaling. |
| Nokia, NSB | Further study | Too early to decide. Further study needed for IoT NTN cases. |

FL Question 2.3: Should IoT-NTN support a UE-specific Koffset in connected mode?

Companies are kindly asked to indicate the view (Yes/No) in the relevant column and provide a comment if necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | UE-specific Koffset in connected mode? | Comment |
| Ericsson | No | IoT NTN is delay tolerant. |
| ZTE | Up to the whole structure of design | If the beam specific offset can be introduced starting from initial access, no much need to optimized the K\_offset for scheduling.  But if only the cell specific offset K\_offset is supported, optimization to introduce a parameter is needed. Otherwise, the overall UE will suffered from the latency for scheduling and even in some case, the beam switching will occur during the reception of scheduling and corresponding data transmission due to large K\_offset for LEO. |
| Huawei | No | It is not evident that for IoT NTN UE-specific offset is of benefit in connected mode. The UE would have to report its TA for UE-specific Koffset which will increase the power consumption of UE |
| CMCC | Need further study | It may be relative to HD-FDD operation. |
| Apple | No | In IoT over NTN, the motivation of using a UE specific time offset is not strong. The latency is not the critical KPI for IoT devices. For example, the latency requirement is up to 15 ms for eMTC devices and up to 10 seconds for NB-IoT devices. The maximum differential delay in an NTN cell is acceptable in network scheduling, comparing with the latency requirements of NB IoT devices. On the other hand, using a cell specific for all UEs in an NTN cell after initial access could save the signaling related to calculating UE specific . This signaling saving is significant in case the number of IoT devices in an NTN cell is large. |
| Xiaomi | Too early | At least UE-specific update of the Koffset should be avoided. |
| Spreadtrum | No | NB-IOT is not very sensitive to delay. Furthermore, supporting UE-specific Koffset will increase the power consumption of UE. |
| Samsung |  | We think this can be studied. A UE specific Koffset can be helpful in large cells. |
| vivo | No | The UE-specific K\_offset needs to be updated frequently due to the fast movement of satellite. It’s very unfriendly to the repetition transmission in the IoT. |
| Mediatek | Yes | The motivation is HD FDD operations in NB-IoT / eMTC NTN. There are two issues with using the K\_offset value configured to a smaller value than the maximum differential TA in case of FDD-Half-Duplex Systems:  - Collision of DL and UL subframes, where DL and UL scheduling by the BS collide at the UE  - Interrupted DL subframes when the eNB schedules an UL subframe to one or several UEs, but cannot schedule DL transmissions for the other UEs within the maximum differential TA. |
| SONY | Can be studied | The main use case for a UE-specific Koffset would be to potentially handle HD-FDD collisions.  Given that the RTT is already large, applying a UE-specific Koffset to minimize the effect of any differential RTT seems to be an unnecessary optimization. |
| Nokia, NSB | Too early | Too early to decide. Further study needed for different cases. |

### SECOND ROUND: Koffset Configuration

FL Question 2.1: Should the Koffset for initial access be cell-specific or beam-specific?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Response | Number |
| Cell-specific | 11 |
| Beam-specific | 1 |
| Both cell- & beam-specific | 2 |
| Total respondents | 14 |

The vast majority of respondents (11) support cell-specific. If include the supporters of both alternatives, then cell-specific is supported by 13 companies, compared to 1 for beam-sepcific.

**FL Proposal 2.1-2:** Study cell-specific configuration of specific offsets for enhancing each timing relationships.

* FFS: beam-specific configuration

Companies are invited to provide their views on this proposal 2.1-2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson | Too early | This second level of detail is not important at this moment. It is more important to address the issues in 2.1.4 before addressing this. |
| Zhejiang Lab | Disagree | Considering we are in SI stage, we should study more options to see their feasibility. Anyway, “study cell-specific” and “FFS beam-specific” are both study. We should simply study pros and cons of both options. |
| Samsung | OK to study | After the timing relationships are studied. |
| CATT | Agree | FFS is also study, so in general, two cases are both for study. |
| APT | Agree | If our goal is to leverage the most results from Rel-17 NTN WI, then it is a good start. |
| Huawei |  | Even though we are fine with the proposal, this proposal seems like a WI discussion. |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree for study on Cell-specific | We object to include any beam specific configuration as it will introduce too much IoT UE cost/complexity. Considering LTE does not support beam related processing, it will also cause large standard effort for beam related processing for each procedure. |
| CMCC | Too early | It is too early to determine cell/beam specific offsets for each timing relationships before any inverstigation. |
| SONY | Too early | We should study the issues in 2.1.4 first. As part of the study, we can study the pros and cons of cell-specific vs beam-specific. If there are significant problems with beam-specific (as indicated by Nokia-NSB), then these issues would get listed in the TR and we would expect the WI to then choose cell-specific configuration.  Our preference is for cell-sepcific. |
| Apple | Agree | The similar schemes from NR NTN could be used for IoT NTN. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine to study on Koffset. | In principle, similar timing relationship enhancement in NR NTN can be considered. |
| Xiaomi | OK to study | At this stage, both cell-specific and beam-specific should be equally treated. |

FL Question 2.2: Should Koffset(s) for initial access be explicitly configured in SI or implicitly signaled?

The vast majority of companies think it is premature to decide on this issue given the deferral of Issues 2.1 to 2.3. Accordingly, we await contributions at the next meeting on these studies.

FL proposal 2.2-2: Companies are encouraged to further study means of configuration of any timing offset enhancements that follow from issues 2.1.

FL Question 2.3: Should IoT-NTN support a UE-specific Koffset in connected mode?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Response | # Respondents |
| Yes | 1 |
| No | 5 |
| Need Further study | 5 |
| Total respondents | 11 |

Responses are a mixed bag! But given the need to identify which timing relationships need enhancement and how to enhance, I think it is premature to decide on this question without further study.

FL Proposal 2.3-2: Study the need for UE-specific timing offset enhancements in RRC-connected mode for each timing relationship.

Companies are invited to provide their views on this proposal 2.3-2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson | Too early | This third level of detail is not important at this moment. It is more important to address the issues in 2.1.4 before addressing this. |
| Samsung | OK to study |  |
| ZTE | Postponed | We need start with proposal in section 2.1 |
| Huawei |  | We are wondering whether this is needed given that IoT service are delay tolerant. |
| vivo | OK to study the need, not detail |  |
| Nokia, NSB | OK for study | After study in section 2.1, further study should be considered for each case mentioned above for timing relationship, for both NB-IoT and eMTC. |
| CMCC | OK to study the need. |  |
| MediaTek | Too early | We have same comment as for 2.2.3. It is not clear what needs to be discussed compare to NR NTN which has made agreement on “Update of K\_offset after initial access is supported”. We can first discuss issue in 2.1.4 |
| SONY | Agree | The need for a UE-specific timing offset should at least be studied. We are OK if this study happens later. |
| Apple | Ok for study | We are also fine to discuss this proposal after FL Proposal 2.1-2 |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine to study on UE-specific timing offset enhancements. | But, in our view, considering that NB-IOT/eMTC is not sensitive to delay, there is no need to introduce UE-specific timing offset enhancements in RRC-connected mode. |
| Xiaomi | Agree | OK to study |

### THIRD ROUND: Koffset Configuration

Majority of responding companies agree with FL Proposal 2.1-2 **(9 vrs 4),** and 2.3-2 **(9 vrs 3). Some of t**he companies not agreeing express the view that it is probably too early to agree on specifics. However, ‘too early’ in an SI suggests that the item needs further study. Perhaps we should unify these proposals into one.

**FL Proposal 2.4:** For each timing relationship for which enhancement is necessary and beneficial, study the following aspects of the potential enhancements:

* Cell-specific and/or beam-specific configuration for initial access
* Explicit or implicit configuration for initial access
* How to treat the enhancement in RRC-connected mode

## MAC-CE activation timing.

The NR NTN work item has agreed that an offset, K\_mac, to the MAC CE in PDSCH is needed for the case that:

* DL and UL frame timing are not aligned at the eNB
* For UE action on a downlink configuration indicated in MAC CE command.

The same principle can be applied in IoT-NTN.

In NR-NTN WI, the MAC-CE activation time was discussed extensively and in RAN1#103e meeting, there was a consensus that according to whether the gNB has aligned DL and UL timing, the DL MAC-CE activation time may or may not need an additional offset.

The RAN1#103-e agreement on NR NTN regarding this issue is as follows:

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

### Company views

NR NTN MAC CE activation time principle to be applied in IoT-NTN. OPPO.

### Related proposals

Proposal 5: For NB-IoT-NTN, adopt the same MAC-CE activation time principle as NR-NTN. OPPO.

### MAC-CE Activation Timing Issues for email discussion

Only one company expresses a view on this issue. It is not clear what configurations are activated/deactivated via MAC CE. In the email discussion we wish to collate the views of more companies.

**FL Question 3.1:** Which IoT-NTN configurations need to be activated / deactivated via MAC-CE?

Companies are kindly asked to list examples of IoT/MTC MAC-CE activated / deactivated configurations.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | MAC-CE affected configurations | Comment |
| Ericsson |  | MAC CE timing relationship is complicated. It requires case by case analysis. |
| ZTE |  | Include this case in issue 2.1 with clarification. |
| Huawei |  | This needs more careful analysis before making a conclusion. |
| CMCC |  | Same comment as above. |
| Apple |  | More studies are needed. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Need further study |
| Samsung |  | It needs to be studied. |
| CATT |  | Need more study. |
| vivo |  | Need further study, and it can be merged into issue 2.1. |
| MediaTek |  | It can be further studied |
| SONY |  | Time at which TA command applies.  An initial task would be to determine which configurations are applicable to IoT-NTN. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Further study needed |

**FL Proposal 3.2:** For IoT-NTN, adopt the NR-NTN MAC-CE activation time solution as baseline.

If there are MAC-CE activated / deactivated configurations, companies are kindly asked to indicate their view (Yes/No) in the relevant column and provide a comment if necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Adopt FL Proposal 3.2? | Comment |
| Ericsson | Too early | MAC CE timing relationship is complicated. It requires case by case analysis. Further, there may be differences between IoT NTN and NR NTN. So, study is needed first. |
| ZTE | No | Comment as above for **FL Question 3.1.** |
| Huawei | Needs further study | As NR NTN is still discussing this topic, it is too early to draw conclusions regarding proposal 3.2. We also have not analyzed the differences between NR-NTN and NB-IoT/eMTC with respect to MAC CE timing. |
| CMCC | Needs further study | Same comment as above. |
| Apple | No | Depending on the discussion of FL proposal 3.1. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Need further study |
| Samsung |  | It needs to be studied. |
| CATT |  | Need further study |
| vivo | Too early | Need further study. |
| MediaTek |  | It can be further studied |
| SONY | No | Once RAN1 has agreed on a list of configurations that need activation / deactivation via MAC-CE, RAN1 can consider how the activation time is handled on a case-by-case basis. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | Further study needed |

### SECOND ROUND: MAC-CE Activation

**FL Question 3.1:** Which IoT-NTN configurations need to be activated / deactivated via MAC-CE?

**FL Proposal 3.2:** For IoT-NTN, adopt the NR-NTN MAC-CE activation time solution as baseline.

Companies have not listed any IoT-NTN configuration needing activation/de-activation via MAC CE. But all respondents think this issue should be further studied.

FL Proposal 3.1-2: Identify IoT-NTN configurations needing activation/de-activation via MAC CE and their timing relationships.

Companies are invited to provide their views on this proposal 3.1-2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| APT | Agree | Only 6-bit timing advance command (TAC) MAC CE may need some attention |
| ZTE | Agree | We can start to check corresponding configurations |
| Huawei | Agree | One thing related to the discussion in 8.4.1 is whether the case with unaligned UL and DL should also be studied in this SI. |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Nokia, NSB | To identify whether it is needed | Further study should be done to identify whether there is issue on activation/deactivation via MAC CE before any agreement. |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| SONY | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |

### THIRD ROUND: MAC-CE Activation

All respondent companies agree to FL Proposal 3.1-2.

FL Proposal 3.1-2: Identify IoT-NTN configurations needing activation/de-activation via MAC CE and their timing relationships.

## HD-FDD operation

IoT/MTC devices can support both HD-FDD and FD-FDD operation, as well as TDD operation.

IoT-NTN cell sizes can be large which can lead to a large differential delay (up to 10.3ms from TR38.821). These large differential delay values may lead to collisions of simultaneous UL and DL transmissions for a half-duplex UE needing solutions to avoid or mitigate such collisions. Before RAN1 engages in the search for such solutions, it is probably useful to first decide on the kinds of duplex that an IoT-NTN device is expected to support.

### Company views

Support HD-FDD operation. OPPO, Xiaomi, IDC

The large TA and large differential TA in a cell may introduce collisions of simultaneous UL transmission and DL reception for a half-duplex UE. HW/HiSi, Xiaomi, IDC.

Consider ways to either (1) avoid or (2) handle UL/DL conflicts in HD-FDD operation. IDC

Subframes where UE is not expected to monitor NPDCCH due to potential DL/UL collision need to take account of the extended timing advance in IoT-NTN. Qualcomm

UE may monitor for NPDCCH during “waiting periods” (e.g. between NPDSCH and transmitting HARQ ACK/NACK), especially when Koffset is cell-specific and cells are large. Qualcomm.

### Related proposals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Proposals** |
| Oppo | Proposal 2: UE is expected to operate in half-duplex mode for FDD. |
| HW/HiSi. | Proposal 2: Study solutions for the possible collision between UL transmission and DL reception for half- duplex UE caused by large TA and large differential TA. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 2: The impact on the timing relationship caused by half duplex operation need to be studied. |
| IinterDigital Communications | Proposal 2: Study solutions to address the potential conflict between DL and UL for HD-FDD UEs when Koffset is used. |
| Qualcomm | Observation 1: For half-duplex UEs (including NB-IoT and HD eMTC UEs), the interrupted downlink subframes due to an uplink transmission are UE-specific and related to the UE-specific TA.  Proposal 2: RAN1 to study the definition of downlink interrupted subframes (e.g., those before and after a PUSCH, PRACH, PUCCH, and half-duplex guard periods) where a half-duplex UE is not expected to monitor PDCCH, in the light of large TAs in NTN.  Proposal 3: RAN1 to study enabling PDCCH monitoring in “waiting periods”—for example, between receiving NPDSCH and transmitting HARQ ACK in NB-IoT—to mitigate suboptimal throughput. |

### HD-FDD Operation Issues for Email Discussion

The issue of DL/UL conflict or overlap in HD-FDD has been raised by companies saying this will require a study and solutions. Such solutions could look at whether the eNB-based scheduler can resolve such collisions for HD-FDD UEs and what additional information would the eNB need to be able to avoid DL / UL collisions?

**FL Questions 4.1:** Should solutions to support HD-FDD operation be studied?

Companies are kindly asked to give their view (Yes/No) on whether such overlap in DL/UL requires study and in the comments, indicate what aspects need studying.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Study Required | Comments on what aspects to study |
| Ericsson | Need study first | Concrete problem statements should be formulated to align understanding before delving into solutions. |
| ZTE | Yes | HD-FDD is key feature to reduce the cost of IoT device. And corresponding issue along with solutions should be studied. And timing related issues can be listed in this agenda. E.g. a basic issue for HD-FDD UE mentioned in section 2.9 should be moved to this section. |
| Huawei | Yes | Our understanding is that there will be collision between UL and DL of HD-FDD when large TA is applied, so the study is needed. |
| CMCC | Yes | HD-FDD is the most typical IoT device type. Thus HD-FDD operation should be supported. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | The DL and UL collision as well as possible UL transmissions collision issues need to be studied |
| Spreadtrum | Need further study |  |
| Samsung | Yes | This needs to be studied. It can be done later in the study. |
| CATT | YES | HD-FDD is one important case, so we need to study related timing, especially for the gap configuration in long UL transmission. Current gap is only defined with 40ms, not enough for DL signal reception if long RTT exists. |
| vivo | Yes | HD-FDD is a typical feature of IoT, and the collision between UL and DL may be cause by the fast movement of satellite. |
| MediaTek | Yes | First identify the issues with HD-FDD operations. |
| SONY | Yes | HD-FDD operation is a key aspect of both NB-IoT and eMTC operation. Agree that it would be good to list potential issues arising from HD-FDD operation. These include:   * UL / DL collisions * UE-applied timing advance (the eNB may not have full knowledge of the UL/DL timing offset at the UE)   When does UE need to monitor PDCCH? |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes | It should be studied as HD-FDD is used by most of NB-IoT and eMTC UE. |

### SECOND ROUND - HD-FDD Operation

As HD-FDD is key feature to reduce the cost of IoT device, all responding companies agree with the need for further studies on HD-FDD operation.

FL proposal 4.1-2: Study the impact of timing relationships on HD-FDD operation and possible enhancements.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson | Agree with modification | Revise the wording (change in red):  … on HD-FDD operation and checking if possible enhancements are needed or not |
| Samsung | Agree | Prefer rewording as above |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Modify | As we have outlined before (and Ericsson also mentioned in their TDoc), some issues for HD-FDD arise *on account of the large TA* (which is due to the large RTT, and is different from a “TA command” mentioned in Section 2.7)—e.g., the uplink/downlink timelines for half-duplex UEs may need to be revisited.  “*Study the impact of HD-FDD operation as well as large TA (on account of large RTTs) on uplink-downlink timing relationships and study related potential enhancements.”* |
| APT | Agree | We did not see any issue yet but support FFS. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Huawei | Agree |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree with modification | Revise the wording (change in red):  Study whether there is impact of timing relationships on HD-FDD operation and whether potential ~~possible~~ enhancements are needed and beneficial. |
| SONY | Agree | Agree with the point from QC.  In any case, the proposal should be updated with the standard “needed and beneficial” text. |
| Apple | Agree | Prefer the wording from Ericsson or MediaTek. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |

### THIRD ROUND - HD-FDD Operation

All responding companies (14) agree with FL proposal 4.1-2 but with 3 companies suggesting some modifications. This modified proposal tries to incorporate the sense of the modifications.

**FL Proposal 4.1-3:** Study the impact of large RTD on HD-FDD UL-DL timing relationships and check whether enhancement is necessary and beneficial.

## PDCCH monitoring timing after PRACH

Due to the large propagation delay in NTN, UE may not receive the RAR grant in response window if the propagation delay is much larger than the length of response window. Therefore, a timing offset may need to be applied to the start of ra-ResponseWindow in IoT NTN relative to the end of the PRACH transmission.

Companies further express the view that after PRACH transmission, the RAR window start is shifted to cover the UE-specific RTT and the UE can go into sleep mode to save power.

How is the RAR window location defined, taking into account the R16 offset between PRACH and RAR window and any Koffset-type delay introduced for IoT-NTN? Is this a RAN2 issue?

**The issue of ra-ResponseWindow offset in NR NTN was discussed in RAN2#112-e and is pending resolution.**

### Company views

After PRACH transmission, the UE can go to sleep mode to save power and the RAR window start is shifted to cover the UE-specific RTT. OPPO.

How does the existing offset between PRACH and RAR window relate to the new IoT-NTN delayed RAR window location? APT

### Related proposals

Proposal 1: introduce a K offset to delay the RAR window start. OPPO

Observation 5: A timing offset need be applied to the start of ra-ResponseWindow in IoT NTN. Vivo

Proposal 2: If an offset used to adjust the start of ra-ResponseWindow will be introduced, how to cope with the existing offset X in the legacy NB-IoT shall be considered. APT

### PDCCH monitoring timing after PRACH Issues for Email Discussion

There are effectively two issues here.

**FL Proposal 5.1:** NR NTN solution to RAR window timing is baseline for IoT-NTN.

Companies are kindly asked to indicate their view (Yes/No) on FL Proposal 5.1 and comment as necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Support FL Proposal 5.1? | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes | Follow progress in NR NTN WI |
| ZTE | Yes | Follow the NR and offset for RAR window monitoring can be considered. |
| Huawei | Yes | Follow the principle adopted in NR NTN. |
| CMCC | Yes | Follow NR NTN. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Follow the principle adopted in NR NTN. |
| Samsung |  | We agree to follow NR NTN progress. As discussion is still ongoing in NR NTN, this agreement can be done later. |
| CATT | Yes | Follow NR NTN |
| vivo | Yes | Follow NR NTN. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Follow progress in NR NTN WI |
| SONY | Yes | Given that this issues was discussed in RAN2#112e for NR NTN, this is likely to be discussed in RAN2 for IoT-NTN too. RAN1 could agree that this issue is considered in RAN2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes | Follow NR NTN |

**FL Proposal 5.2:** Should IoT-NTN UE go to sleep mode to save power whilst waiting for the RAR window start?

Companies are kindly asked to indicate their view (Yes/No) on FL Proposal 5.2 and comment as necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Power saving? | Comments |
| Ericsson | Need discussion | Which mode UE can go to should be discussed, possibly with coordination with RAN2. |
| ZTE | Need discussion | Open to discuss. Re-organize this issue together with other aspect related to power saving in agenda 8.15.5 is preferred. |
| Huawei | Need further study | What a UE does in the time it waits for RAR is up to the UE. There is no need for RAN1 to agree anything here. |
| CMCC | Need discussion | Same view as ZTE. |
| Apple |  | Open to discussion |
| Spreadtrum | Need further study |  |
| Samsung |  | This can be studied. |
| CATT |  | Need further study |
| vivo |  | Need further study |
| MediaTek | Up to UE implementation | RAN2#111e made agreement “1. From RAN2 perspective, an offset is applied to the start of ra-ResponseWindow in NTN for both LEO and GEO scenarios.”. After transmitting Msg1 in RACH procedure, the UE can go to sleep during the duration of time corresponding to the offset applied to start of ra-ResponseWindow to save power consumption. This is highly preferable in GEO where the RTT can be up to half a second. It is up to the UE implementation. |
| SONY | Yes | We are open for further discussion on this issue.  Power consumption is an important KPI for NB-IoT and eMTC. We share ZTE’s view and would like to see issues related to power consumption in AI 8.15.5 considered as part of the study. |
| Nokia, NSB | Further study | Further study in IoT NTN |

### SECOND ROUND – PDCCH Monitoring time after PRACH

**FL Proposal 5.1:** NR NTN solution to RAR window timing is baseline for IoT-NTN.

All respondents (12) agree with the proposal.

FL Proposed Conclusion 5.1-2: NR NTN solution to RAR window timing is baseline for IoT-NTN.

**FL Proposal 5.2:** Should IoT-NTN UE go to sleep mode to save power whilst waiting for the RAR window start?

Majority of respondents (6 out of 8) think it needs further study possibly in coordination with RAN2.

**FL Proposal 5.2.2:** Power consumption should be considered in the study all the timing relationships.

Companies are invited to provide their views on this proposal 5.2-2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson |  | It is unclear what value this proposal would provide. |
| Samsung |  | We support that UE power consumption is taken into account in the timing relationships (when applicable). |
| CATT | Agree with the modification | The proposal can be changed as :  Power consumption should be considered in the study of necessary timing relationship enhancements. |
| Qualcomm | Too general and too early | Proposals like “going to sleep mode before RAR window”, etc., are second-level details that can be worked out in the WI phase.  As such, this statement in the proposal seems too general. |
| APT | Agree, but | Current UE behavior is to skip NPDCCH monitoring, but not sure what is “sleep mode” |
| ZTE |  | The power related issue is not coupled with timing and can be discussed in dedicated agenda. |
| Huawei | Agree with the principle but do not see the need of the proposal | At least for NB-IoT low power consumption is one of the key design features so we don’t see the necessity for a specific agreement on considering it. |
| Nokia, NSB | Too general | Agree to study for each ease mentioned above. |
| CMCC | Agree with the priciple |  |
| MediaTek | Disagree | The SID does not have an objective for UE power consumption optimization. This would require RAN Plenary discussion as the scope of SI would very significantly increase.  In 8.15.2, the motivation was to check the impact of GNSS and SIB reading on UE power consumption was reasonable to enable UL synchronization. |
| SONY | Agree | Power consumption is a key KPI for NB-IoT and eMTC devices and the study should consider the power consumption implications of any potential enhancement. |
| Apple |  | This proposal is too broad. Probably we need to clarify which particular areas the power consumption is considering, e.g., go to sleep mode while waiting for RAR window starting. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Power consumption issues are not limited to the timing relationships. We think that it can be discussed in dedicated agenda. |
| Xiaomi |  | The proposal itself don’t provide any information to step forward, more clarification is needed |

## Scheduling delay

The scheduling delay needs to provide sufficient time for NPDCCH / MPDCCH decoding as well as to account for the large RTT-related timing advance.

The scheduling delay needs to account for the UE-specific TA, especially the different delay aspect.

### Company views

Scheduling delay: to take into account the half duplex constraint and long timing advance. OPPO, Qualcomm

### Related proposals

Proposal 3: The scheduling delay for NPUSCH needs to cover a UE-specific TA. OPPO.

Proposal 1: RAN1 to study mechanisms for UE reporting of UE-specific TA for half-duplex UEs over NTN, including mechanisms for updating the TA when it changes. Qualcomm

### Scheduling delay Issues for Email Discussion

The FL considers that this issue will be covered by issues 2.1 and 2.2.

**FL Proposal 6.1 : This issue will be resolved through Issues 2.1 and 2.2.**

Companies are invited to agree/disagree and comment as necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree? | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes | This can be treated as part of 2.1 and 2.2. |
| ZTE | Yes | Scheduling delay for NPUSCH can be moved to 2.1.  UE reporting UE-specific TA can be either discussed together with 2.4 or AI 8.1.5.2 for synchronization. |
| Huawei | Yes | Agree with FL conclusion |
| CMCC | Yes | Agree with FL conclusion |
| Apple | Yes | This can be addressed together with issues 2.1 and 2.2. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Samsung |  | We agree with the FL’s conclusion. |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with FL conclusion |
| vivo | Agree | Agree with FL conclusion. |
| MediaTek | Yes | UE-specific TA report can be discussed in question 2.3 in Section 2.2.3 |
| SONY | Yes | Scheduling delay is part of the timing relationships discussion in section 2.1 |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes | To be discussed in 2.1 and 2.2 |

### SECOND ROUND: Scheduling delay Issues for Email Discussion

All respondents agree. This issue should be tackled as part of 2.1 and 2.2

## Timing advance.

Clarification of legacy functionality

Several companies suggested that there should be clarification / a common understanding on the operation of Rel-16 NB-IoT / eMTC timing advance. This clarification could possibly be made with reference to the figure below.



Full TA vs partial TA

Full TA: the timing advance is fully compensated such that the UL and DL frame timings are aligned.

Partial TA: A common timing offset in the eNB’s frame timing exists. The UE then compensates for the differential delay only.

UE-specific timing advance indication

The eNB needs to know the UE-specific timing advance so that it can properly account for this in its scheduling delay. This avoids collisions between UL and DL in HD-FDD UEs and avoids wasted subframes (unused subframes if the eNB always assumes maximum differential TA). This signaling is in contrast to terrestrial NB-IoT / eMTC, where the timing advance is controlled by the eNB.

UL timing advance overlap

If UL timing advance is changed by more than a single subframe, then how is UL transmission overlap handled?

### Company views

eNB needs to know UE-specific TA for properly handing the scheduling delay. OPPO, MTK-Eutelsat, Intel, Qualcomm

Discuss whether full TA or partial TA is used. vivo.

Need a common understanding of how terrestrial timing advance operates for eMTC, NB-IoT. Ericsson, APT.

Timing advance maintenance needs to consider impact of UL transmission overlap that extends beyond a single subframe. APT

Timing advance value may change during a along set of repetitions. NOK-NSB

### Related proposals

Proposal 4: the gNB needs to know the UE-specific TA for properly handling the scheduling delay. OPPO.

Proposal 1: Whether full TA or partial TA is used in IoT NTN should be discussed. vivo.

Observation 2: For half-duplex UEs (including NB-IoT and HD eMTC), configuring K\_offset value to maximum differential TA may cause collision of DL and UL subframes. MTK-Eutelsat

Observation 3: For half-duplex UEs (including NB-IoT and HD eMTC), configuring K\_offset value to maximum differential TA may cause interruption of DL subframes. MTK-Eutelsat

Observation 4: For connected half-duplex UEs (including NB-IoT and HD eMTC), updating the K\_offset value based on UE autonomous TA report can avoid collision issue between DL and UL subframes and interrupted DL subframe issue. MTK-Eutelsat

Observation 5: It is sufficient if the UE autonomously acquired TA report is sent by UE about every 20 seconds (=500 µs / 25.33 µs) to avoid DL-UL subframe collision issue in LEO. MTK-Eutelsat

Proposal 2: The value of K\_offset can be re-configured after RRC connection setup based on UE-specific autonomous TA report. MTK-Eutelsat

Proposal 3: The UE can report at least report its autonomous TA to the gNB in Message 3 during initial cell access. MTK-Eutelsat

Proposal 4: RAN1 to study UE reporting of UE-specific TA for half-duplex UE in NTN where MTK-Eutelsat

* gNB triggers an autonomous TA report from the UE
* UE initiates report autonomous TA report

Proposal 2: Reporting of additional TA applied by the UE to compensate service link delay calculated based on GNSS information and satellite ephemeris should be supported. Intel

Observation 1: It is not clear whether the various timing relationships in eMTC and NB-IoT take into account timing advance (TA). Ericsson.

Proposal 1: RAN1 to first discuss existing eMTC and NB-IoT timing relationships to reach a common understanding, before discussing any potential required adjustment(s) within the context of NTN. Ericsson.

Proposal 6: Enhancement on TA maintenance shall consider any impact on UL transmission overlap. APT

[area of proposal 7] Does the spec describe “actual timing” of “logical timing” for TA? APT

[section 2.2] Timing advance may change during a long set of repetitions for LEO. NOK-NSB

Proposal 1: RAN1 to study mechanisms for UE reporting of UE-specific TA for half-duplex UEs over NTN, including mechanisms for updating the TA when it changes. Qualcomm

### Timing Advance Issues discussion

**FL Conclusion 7.1:** This issue is best handled in AI 8.15.2?

Companies are kindly requested to express their view (Yes/No on FL conclusion 7.1 and comment as necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree? | Comments |
| Ericsson | No | Common understanding is needed before e.g. discussing applicability of Koffset to IoT NTN. |
| ZTE | Yes | It’s fine to handle it in AI8.15.2 similar as issue above. But clear understanding on the whole timing definition/assumption or IoT should be clarified firstly. |
| Huawei | Yes | We can follow the similar discussion as NR NTN, but some definition can be clarified in this AI |
| CMCC | Yes | Agree with FL conclusion |
| Apple |  | Timing advance itself can be handled in AI 8.15.2. The Koffset related topics (e.g., how to obtain Koffset) can be handled in AI 8.15.3. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Samsung |  | It needs further study. It can handled either here or in 8.15.2. |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with FL conclusion |
| vivo |  | The timing definition should be clarified firstly, common understanding is needed before the timing enhancement. |
| MediaTek |  | Timing advance is used for UL synchronization. The full TA and common timing offset for UL synchronization are discussed in NR NTN. We can wait for progress in NR NTN first.  We repeat below the comment in Proposal 1.1 in Section 2.1 on TA understanding for timing relationships:  We are fine with Ericsson suggestion to further discuss the TA understanding with long RTT. The TA is used in cellular NB-IoT or eMTC for UL synchronization. To our understanding, longer RTT in LEO / GEO would still require use of TA similarly to NR NTN for UL synchronization. The Koffset is a solution used for the timing relationships. This is needed even with assumption that UE is perfectly synchronized on UL as was discussed in NR NTN.  In eNB, there is no overlapping of UL and DL subframes in FDD assuming UE are synchronized on UL. It is up to the eNB to schedule UL transmissions taken into account the long RTT. The Koffset is needed to avoid scenario where for example UE receives UL grant on DCI in slot n, but would need to advance the transmission by several hundreds of ms due to long RTT before transmitting NPUSCH Format 1 in UL subframes n+k0. This would not be possible without the Koffset for the same reasons as in NR NTN for corresponding case. We see no difference for this case. |
| SONY | No | UE specific timing advance indication has implications on HD-FDD operation. If HD-FDD operation is considered in this AI, then so should UE specific timing advance indication issues.  UL timing advance overlap should be handled in this AI. |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes | It could be. But TA and K\_offset should be discussed as a complete solution. |

### SECOND ROUND - Timing Advance

8 out of 11 respondents think the timing advance issue should be handled in AI 8.5.2.Some respondents make the point that some timing advance issues can be clarified under this AI as UE specific TA indication may have implications for HD-FDD operation.

There is a timing advance related timing relationship issue that may be relevant for study under this AI. The time after the UE received a timing advance command from the eNB that the eNB can assume that the UE has applied the command. This is: 16 subframes (NB-IoT) and 8 subframes (eMTC). In IoT-MTN, given the RTD from eNB to UE and considering any operational mode in which the UL and DL frames are not aligned at the eNB, there are likely enhancement issues to study for this particular relationship.

**FL Proposal 7.1-2:** Study timing relationship issues arising from timing advance command.

Companies are invited to provide their views on this proposal 7.1-2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comments |
| Ericsson | Agree | Typo “form” -> “from” |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Intent unclear / inter-related with (proposed, modified) HD-FDD proposal. | We are still unclear what exactly this is targeting.  There is one issue regarding “large TA” for HD-FDD UEs, which we have proposed to cover adequately in Section 2.4.  As part of the solution to the problem above, the base station may need knowledge of the UE’s internal TA (which is due to the large RTT between the UE and satellite and is largely autonomously determined by the UE) for collision-free scheduling.  To us, the issue of “UE communicating its TA to the base station” should be studied under the modified text for Section 2.4.  What else is being targeted here is unclear. |
| APT | Agree | Agree with Ericsson’s change. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| Huawei |  | Okay to study this further but we are not sure whether this proposal can be combined with proposal 1.1-2 and 1.2-2. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| SONY | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |

### THIRD ROUND - Timing Advance

12 out of 13 responding companies support FL Proposal 7.1-2. Qualcomm expresses the view that the intent (outside of HD-FDD and UE sending its TA to eNB) is unclear. The issue of HD-FDD is discussed in section 2.4 here. The issue of sending UE TA to eNB is covered in AI 8.15.2. The issue here is about when the eNB can be sure that the UE has taken account of the commanded TA in its UL transmissions. Huawei suggests that this issue can be tackled in proposals 1.1-2 and 1.2-2. This FL agrees with this point and so have included TA activation time in the list of timing relationships to be studied.

## MAC contention resolution timer

General comments

Contention resolution timers are a RAN2 issue.

### Company views

Unit in which contention resolution timer needs to be counted needs to be decided. APT.

### Related proposals

Proposal 4: If an offset used to adjust the start of mac-ContentionResolutionTimer will be introduced, whether to reuse an NPDCCH period as a unit shall be FFS. APT

### MAC contention resolution timer Issues for Discussion

**FL Conclusion 14.1:** MAC contention resolution timer is discussed in RAN2.

Companies are kindly requested to indicate whether or not they agree with this FL conclusion and comment as necessary.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree? | Comment |
| Ericsson | Agree | Up to RAN2 |
| ZTE | Agree | Up to RAN2 |
| Huawei | Agree | Up to RAN2 |
| CMCC | Agree | Up to RAN2 |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree | Up to RAN2 |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| CATT | Agree | Up to RAN2 |
| vivo | Yes | Up to RAN2. |
| SONY | Agree | RAN2 |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes | Up to RAN2 |

### SECOND ROUND: MAC contention resolution timer

All respondents agree that this issue is for RAN2.

**FL Conclusion 14.1-2:** MAC contention resolution timer is discussed in RAN2.

## NPDCCH / MPDCCH monitoring restrictions

General comments

Having time periods in which the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH / MPDCCH would have the following benefits:

* Avoid UL / DL collisions in HD-FDD.
* Power saving.
* Allows time for UE to decode NPDCCH / MPDCCH (this is a reason in the legacy terrestrial NB-IoT functionality).

### Company views

In terrestrial NB-IoT, there is a time between NPDCCH reception and NPUSCH transmission where the UE does not need to monitor for NPDCCH. This helps to avoid UL / DL collision. [FL: it also helps the UE to be able to complete NPDCCH processing before transmitting NPUSCH when there are limited CPU resources in the UE]. Consider changing the time in which the UE is not required to monitor for NPDCCH. ZTE.

### Related proposals

Proposal 2: Limitation on NPDCCH monitoring in the spec should be modified accordingly if the K\_offset is introduced in the time relationship. ZTE

### NPDCCH / MPDCCH monitoring restrictions Issues for discussion

**FL issues**

What are the reasons for applying NPDCCH / MPDCCH monitoring restrictions:

* Avoid UL / DL collisions in HD-FDD.
* Power saving.
* Allows time for UE to decode NPDCCH / MPDCCH (this is a reason in the legacy terrestrial NB-IoT functionality).
* Other (please specify)

## UE time / frequency tuning time

General comments

There is an UL compensation gap inserted in NB\_IoT and Emtc UL transmissions to allow an HD-FDD UE to correct its time-frequency synchronization. It should be studied whether changes to the UL compensation gap are required to account for the large RTT in IoT-NTN

A guard period can be applied around the start / end of an UL transmission to allow RF re-tuning / symbol alignment. This is necessary when the Enb does not know the UE-specific TA.

### Company views

Resolve collision issues in the presence of UL compensation gap in PUSCH. CATT.

Resolve collision issues in the presence of UL compensation gap in PRACH. CATT.

Allow guard periods around UL transmissions to allow for frequency / time adjustment by UE. MTK-Eutelsat.

### Related proposals

Proposal 3: Study the solutions to resolve the collision issues in the presence of transmission gap for IoT NTN in HD-FDD. CATT

Proposal 4: Add a guard period before the start of transmission gap to solve transmission collision for uplink transmission of IoT NTN in HD-FDD. CATT

Proposal 5: Guard Period Around the start / end of UL transmission is configured. MTK-Eutelsat.

### UE time / frequency tuning time Issues for discussions

**FL considerations**

Do UL compensation gaps for PUSCH and PRACH need to be extended to account for RTT?

Do we need to allow guard periods around UL transmissions to allow the UE to update time / frequency synchronization?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| ZTE | Open to discuss UL compensation gap, that involves HD-FDD, and also time frequency synchronization in another agenda. |
| Huawei | The UP gap extension may not needed to be extend based on RTT but should take the updating period of system information into consideration. To compensate the timing and frequency drift of long UL transmitting during, guard period is needed. |
| Spreadtrum | We shared the similar views with ZTE. |
| CATT | Current gap is only 40 ms used for DL synchronization tracking, but the long RTT will make timing misalignment between UE and gNB. For UE side, from TX to RX, it need wait for a period to get DL signal to re-turn the time and frequency, where the period may include DL signal transmission, Base station signal switching and UE re-calculating the TA. So one guard period should be reserved. |
| MediaTek | UL compensation gap is discussed in AI 8.15.2. We do not see a need to discuss it in AI 8.15.3 |
| SONY | UL compensation gaps need to be discussed in this study. We are open to consider this issue in AI8.15.2, since requirements on the length of UCG and time between UCG depend on timing accuracy and frequency accuracy, where these accuracies are considered in AI8.15.2 |
| Nokia, NSB | Perhaps revisit this question after working on the koffset and the HD-FDD issues |

### SECOND ROUND: UE time / frequency tuning time

Varied company views. More than one company mention that UL compensation gaps are more suited to AI 8.15.2 especially as long transmissions are prone to time and frequency synchronization drift.

**FL Conclusion 10.1-2:** Leave the core issue for AI 8.15.2. Consider the impact of timing offset enhancements on the tuning times and related gaps when more progress is made.

## GNSS measurement

General comments

If the UE does not have a valid GNSS measurement, timing relationships may need to be extended to allow the UE to transmit in the uplink following downlink reception.

### Company views

UE can extend timing between PDSCH and PUCCH in order to make a GNSS measurement if it doesn’t previously have a valid TA. SONY.

### Related proposals

Proposal 7: When the UE is scheduled PDSCH and does not have a valid GNSS measurement, the timing relationship between PDSCH and PUCCH is extended by a time that is sufficient to perform a GNSS measurement. SONY

### GNSS measurement Issues for discussions

**FL considerations**

The UE needs to have accurate timing and frequency compensation before UL transmission. How do the IoT-NTN timing relationships allow the UE to perform measurements for such compensation (e.g. through GNSS measurement)?

## Power saving

General comments

There are various proposals covering different issues that impact power saving:

* From the timing point of view, can the UE sleep at certain times to save power, e.g. partial coverage NTN
* Sleep between PRACH and start of RAR window
* UE only needs to make a GNSS measurement if it does not have valid TA and needs to transmit in the UL

### Company views

Consider power saving from timing point of view: NOK-NSB

UE can extend timing between PDSCH and PUCCH in order to make a GNSS measurement if it doesn’t previously have a valid TA in order to save power. SONY

### Related proposals

Proposal 4: it could be studied from timing PoV on power saving in NTN scenario, with e.g. partial coverage of NTN network. NOK-NSB

Proposal 7: When the UE is scheduled PDSCH and does not have a valid GNSS measurement, the timing relationship between PDSCH and PUCCH is extended by a time that is sufficient to perform a GNSS measurement. SONY

After PRACH transmission, the UE can go to sleep mode to save power and the RAR window start is shifted to cover the UE-specific RTT. OPPO.

### Power saving Issues for Discussions

**FL considerations**

Is there an impact of timing relationships on power consumption?

## PUR and EDT

General comments

PUR requires the UE to have valid TA before transmission. In NTN, the TA may change rapidly. Do there need to be updated procedures for PUR?

Do procedures for EDT need updating, given that in EDT, TA is validated in the Msg1 / Msg2 exchange.

In general, what set of R16 Emtc and NB-IoT features need to be supported in IoT-NTN?

### Company views

Discuss timing offsets for PUR and EDT in NTN-IoT. Samsung

### Related proposals

Proposal 5: Discuss timing offsets for transmission of preconfigured uplink resources and EDT in NTN-IoT. Samsung

### PUR and EDT Issues for discussions

**FL considerations**

Which set of R16 features need to be supported by IoT-NTN?

Is the study going to only consider baseline functionality?

Should there be some prioritization of what is supported?

Should the study seek to support PUR and EDT features in Rel17 IoT-NTN?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| ZTE | As baseline, we need to discuss the potential impact for all relevant feature in case of NTN**.** |
| Huawei | It is perhaps too early to consider R16 NB-IoT and Emtc features at this stage. |
| Spreadtrum | It is too early to consider R16 NB-IoT and Emtc features at this stage. |
| CATT | It is too early to consider R16 NB-IoT and Emtc features at this stage. |
| MediaTek | Can be de-prioritized. |
| SONY | While it would be desirable to consider all R16 features in the study, RAN1 needs to prioritise the features studied, given the timeplan for the IoT-NTN study item. |

### SECOND ROUND: PUR and EDT Issues

5 respondents out of 6 advocate for at least de-prioritisation of PUR and EDT for this study.

**FL Conclusion 13.1-2:** Need guidance from Chairman regarding scope.

## (N)PRACH before SIB1

General comments

SIB1-NB can update the PRACH configuration. A large timing advance might mean the (N)PRACH is transmitted with an out of date (N)PRACH configuration.

### Company views

NPRACH may be transmitted with an out of date configuration with respect to SIB1-NB. APT.

### Related proposals

Proposal 1: Whether consider the initial TA to determine a valid NPRACH occasion shall be FFS. APT

### (N)PRACH before SIB1 Issues for Discussions

**FL Considerations**

Does RAN1 need to consider changes in PRACH configuration signaled in system information? If PRACH configuration is not changed frequently, the network might be able to tolerate some inadvertent PRACH transmission due to an out of date configuration in system information.

## Terrestrial eMTC / NB-IoT timing relationships

General comments

Legacy timing relationships for NB-IoT and eMTC are provided by ZTE, CATT

The tables below are taken from the ZTE Tdoc:

Table Timing relationships in NB-IoT

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Row  index | Timing relationship description | Value of time offset (FDD)  (ms) | Value of time offset (TDD)  (ms or subframe) |
| 1 | Timing offset for reporting ACK/NACK on NPUSCH | 12,20 if SCS is 3.75kHz, 12,14,16,17 if SCS is 15kHz | The value is k on the top of 12 subframe, and  k is 0,8 UL subframe for SCS=3.75kHz,  k is 0,2,4,5 UL subframe for SCS=15kHz |
| 2 | Timing offset for DCI scheduled NPUSCH | 8,16,32,64 | The value is k on the top of 8 subframe, and  k is 0,8,16,32 UL subframe |
| 3 | Timing offset for RAR grant scheduled NPUSCH  (Also can be configured with additional Scheduling delay field () in RAR) | 12,16,32,64 | The value is k on the top of 8 subframe, and  k is 4,8,16,32 UL subframe |
| 4 | start of Msg2 RAR window | 4,41 | 4 |
| 5 | PDCCH order PRACH | the value is k ≥ 8 |  |
| 6 | Applying time of timing advance command | 12 |  |
| 7 | start of monitoring PUR response window | 4 |  |

Table Timing relationships in eMTC

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Row  index | Timing relationship description | Value of time offset (FDD)  (ms) |
| 1 | Timing offset for reporting ACK/NACK on MPUCCH | 4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,15,17 |
| 2 | Timing offset for DCI scheduled PUSCH | 4 |
| 3 | Timing offset for RAR grant scheduled PUSCH  (Also can be configured with UL delay in RAR grant) | For CEmodeA,  PUSCH is transmitted in next available UL subframe after n+k1+Δ, if UL delay field is set to 1,  The value is k1, if UL delay field is set to 0,  DL-SCH transport block reception ending in subframe n, and Δ is the number of Msg3 PUSCH repetitions, e.g. 2. k1≥6. |
| 4 | start of Msg2 RAR window | 3 |
| 5 | PDCCH order PRACH | the value is k2 ≥ 6 |
| 6 | Applying time of timing advance command | 6 |
| 7 | start of monitoring PUR response window | 4 |

# Outstanding and Concluding Discussions

## Timing relationships requiring enhancement

The following agreements were made on timing relationships to study that may need enhancement

Agreement:

For NB-IoT over NTN, at least the following timing relationships need to be studied individually for checking whether enhancement is necessary and beneficial:

* NPDCCH to NPUSCH format 1
* RAR grant to NPUSCH format 1
* NPDSCH to HARQ-ACK on NPUSCH format 2
* NPDCCH order to NPRACH
* Timing advance command activation
* FFS: Other NB-IoT timing relationships

Agreement:

For eMTC over NTN, at least the following timing relationships can be studied individually for checking whether enhancement is necessary and beneficial:

* MPDCCH to PUSCH
* RAR grant to PUSCH
* PDCCH order to PRACH
* MPDCCH to scheduled uplink SPS
* PUSCH to HARQ-ACK on PUCCH
* CSI reference resource timing
* MPDCCH to aperiodic SRS
* Timing advance command activation
* FFS: Other eMTC timing relationships

Companies are invited to contribute to the next meeting their studies on these timing relationships.

## Koffset Configuration

**FL Proposal 2.4:** For each timing relationship for which enhancement is necessary and beneficial, study the following aspects of the potential enhancements:

* Cell-specific and/or beam-specific configuration for initial access
* Explicit or implicit configuration for initial access
* How to treat the enhancement in RRC-connected mode

FL Proposal 2.4 was discussed in the GTW on Tuesday and the general view from objecting companies was that this represented a particular solution that is dependent on a study yet to be carried out.

**FL concluding recommendation**: Postpone this issue until the timing relationships needing enhancement are identified.

## MAC-CE activation timing.

The following agreement was made on MAC CE activation timing.

Agreement:

Identify IoT-NTN configurations needing activation/de-activation via MAC CE and their timing relationships.

Companies are invited to contribute to the next meeting their identified configurations needing activation/de-activation via MAC CE and their timing relationships.

## HD-FDD operation

The following agreement was made on HD-FDD operation

Agreement:

Study the impact of large RTD (which impacts TA) on HD-FDD UL-DL timing relationships and check whether enhancement is necessary and beneficial.

Companies are invited to contribute to the next meeting their study of the impact of large RTD on HD-FDD operation.

## PDCCH monitoring timing after PRACH

FL Proposed Conclusion 5.1-2: NR NTN solution to RAR window timing is baseline for IoT-NTN.

Despite wide company support, this conclusion was not agreed because RAR window timing is still under discussion in NR NTN.

**FL Proposal 5.2.2:** Power consumption should be considered in the study all the timing relationships.

A critical number of companies had the view that this proposal was too general. Some companies make the point that power consumption is a critical element for IoT-NT. If a general statement about power consumption is required, maybe this could be made in AI8.15.1 on scenarios (as AI8.15.1 considers other aspects of simulation assumptions).

**FL Recommendation:** Companies interested in the power consumption aspects of timing relationships can analyse the power consumption impacts in their contributions to RAN1#104bis\_e. General proposals on the need for power consumption consideration could be submitted to AI8.15.1 at the next meeting.

## NPDCCH / MPDCCH monitoring restrictions

The proposal from the contributing is as follows:

Proposal 2: Limitation on NPDCCH monitoring in the spec should be modified accordingly if the K\_offset is introduced in the time relationship. ZTE

This presupposes the use of K\_Offset to enhance the timing relationships concerned. Since it is too early to adopt timing offset enhancements for any timing relationship enhancements, this proposal can also be said to be premature. Further, NPDCCH / MPDCCH monitoring restrictions also have a bearing on power consumption, an issue whose importance companies currently do not agree on.

**FL Recommendation:** Study NPDCCH / MPDCCH monitoring restrictions for any timing offset enhancements and contribute to future meetings.

## UE time / frequency tuning time

**FL Conclusion 10.1-2:** Leave the core issue for AI 8.15.2. Consider the impact of timing offset enhancements on the tuning times and related gaps when more progress is made.

The above FL conclusion was discussed during the GTW session and the chairman directed that the FL for AI 8.15.2 should pick up on the core issue. The secondary issue of the impact of any timing offset enhancements on tuning times is pending more progress on the study of timing relationships and the necessity and benefit of enhancements to these.

## GNSS measurement

The UE needs to have accurate timing and frequency compensation before UL transmissions. How do the IoT-NTN timing relationships impact the UE performing measurements for such compensation (e.g. through GNSS measurement)?

In NR NTN, there have been agreements to allow a combination open and closed loop timing and frequency offset compensation. As the same issues arise for IoT-NTN, it is reasonable to consider the NR NTN agreements as a baseline and consider whether enhancements are necessary and beneficial for IoT-NTN.

**FL Proposal 8.1-3**: Consider GNSS measurements, time and frequency synchronisation in NR NTN as a baseline and study whether enhancements are necessary and beneficial for IoT-NTN.

Companies are invited to provide their views on FL Proposal 8.1-3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This discussion would rather fit in 8.15.2. The proposal has no relation to timing relationship. |
| MediaTek | It can be discussed in AI 8.15.2 |
| Samsung | It seems appropriate to discuss this in AI 8.15.2. |
|  |  |

## PUR and EDT

PUR requires the UE to have valid TA before transmission. In NTN, the TA may change rapidly. Do there need to be updated procedures for PUR?

Do procedures for EDT need updating, given that in EDT, TA is validated in the Msg1 / Msg2 exchange?

In the first round, discussions focused on whether PUR and EDT should be supported in this SI. In this discussion, 5 respondents out of 6 advocated for at least de-prioritisation of PUR and EDT for this study. However, RAN2 has subsequently made the following agreement in RAN2#112e:

‘**From RAN2 point of view,** **assume that all IoT features up to R16 are supported, and can consider differently case by case when/if problems are found.’**

This implies, from RAN2 point of view that both EDT and PUR are supported unless there is a problem. RAN1 can of course have a different view. So, given the above RAN2 agreement, it would be useful to find out whether RAN1 is of the same opinion.

**FL Question 3.9-3**: From RAN1 point of view, assume that all NB-IoT and eMTC features up to R16 are supported for IoT-NTN?

Companies are invited to express their views on **FL Question 3.9-3**.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | View |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We would not want to rule out any features up to and including R16 out of hand, and we expect that at the end of the SI we should have an answer to this question. |
| MediaTek | Support of features in IoT NTN in normative phase is RAN Plenary discussion. |
| Samsung | Consider all features up to Rel-16 in this study to understand whether there is any issue for supporting them. The decision whether to support all/which features or not will happen in/after WI phase. |
|  |  |
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