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# Introduction

In RAN1 104e, SA2 sent to RAN1 and RAN2 a LS on the QoS requirements when satellite access is used. The LS include two questions about AN-PDB and PER related to 5QI Table 5.7.4-1 in TS 23.501. A reply LS was prepared by Thales in R1-2100832.

As guided by the Chairman, in this document the summary of the discussions and outcomes of the email discussion will be provided.

[104-e-NR-NTN-05] Email discussion/approval of the reply LS to R1-2100014 until Feb-01 – Xiaofeng (Qualcomm)

# Discussions

The first question from SA2 is about AN-PDB:

***Question 1: SA2 would like to ask RAN1, and RAN2 to indicate what is the expected “lower” and “higher” AN-PDB values when the different RAT types for satellite access is used?***

The question is about packet delay from the UE to the UPF that terminates the N6 interface and better to be answered by RAN2. From RAN1 point of view, the maximal RTD of different RAT types for satellite access can be provided.

Based on the above, the proposed reply from RAN1 is

*The round-trip delay (RTD) between the UE and the NTN gateway can be up to [600] ms for GEO satellites and [20 to 30] ms for LEO satellites. The RTD for HAPS is similar to that in TN.*

**Question 1: Is the above proposed reply to Question 1 acceptable? If not, please provide comment.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| QC | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

The second question is on the upper bound of PER:

 ***Question 2: SA2 would like to ask RAN1, and RAN2 to indicate what is the expected upper bound of PER when the different RAT types for satellite access is used?***

On this question, one version of the reply is proposed in R1-2100832:

*RAN1 assumes that the current upper bound of PER defined as 10-2 also applies for NTN.*

**Question 2: Is the above proposed reply to Question 2 acceptable? If not, please provide comment.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| QC | No | The 10-2 upper bound mentioned in the LS is defined for upper-layer packet (e.g., IP packet). It’s preferred to provide RAN1’s view on physical layer as below:*RAN1 is not expected to consider higher PER for NTN.* |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |