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# Introduction

In the RAN#94 plenary meeting, an enhancement work item for Rel.18 IoT NTN was approved. One of the objectives is to specify the following HARQ enhancements to IoT NTN.

*This work considers Rel-17 IoT-NTN as baseline as well as Rel-17 NR-NTN outcome and the further IoT-NTN performance enhancements objectives are listed below:*

*-* ***Disabling of HARQ feedback to mitigate impact of HARQ stalling on UE data rates [RAN1,RAN2]***

*- Study and specify, if needed, improved GNSS operations for a new position fix for UE pre-compensation during long connection times and for reduced power consumption [RAN1]*

This document provides the proposals and summary of discussions on following aspects with detailed proposals from each company listed in appendix according to the inputs [3-22].

* Necessity of disabling HARQ feedback in IoT NTN
* Scenarios/cases to support disabling HARQ feedback
* Indication/configuration of disabling HARQ feedback in IoT NTN
* SPS PDSCH
* (N)PDSCH/(N)PDCCH scheduling restriction
* Performance enhancement for disabling HARQ feedback
* Others

Companies are encouraged to provide the inputs on Issue-1/2/3/4/5/6 in the discussion.

[109-e-R18-NTN-02] Email discussion on disabling of HARQ feedback for IoT NTN by May 20 – Zhi (Lenovo)

* Check points: May 16, May 20

# [CLOSED] Issue-1 Necessity of disabling HARQ feedback in IoT NTN

## Background

IoT NTN disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission was discussed in Rel.17 study item phase[1]. The observation was captured in TR36.763. The main motivation of disabling HARQ feedback in Rel.18 WI is to solve the problem of mitigating impact of HARQ stalling on UE data rates.

In this meeting, most companies mention that the benefits can be achieved for IoT NTN by disabling HARQ feedback. As mentioned by [Huawei, ZTE, Spreadtrum, MTK, Sony, CATT, Xiaomi, Nokia, Samsung, Apple, CMCC, Lenovo, Sharp], disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission can mitigate HARQ stalling and improve the downlink throughput, while as highlighted by [Huawei, Spreadtrum, MTK, CATT, Xiaomi, Nokia, Samsung, Lenovo, Sharp], disabling HARQ feedback for a DL transmission can benefit UE power consumption/latency.

However, some companies have concern on supporting disabling HARQ feedback for some cases/scenarios. As mentioned by [Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, Nokia, Apple, CMCC, Lenovo], disabling HARQ feedback can degrade the L1 reliability of the downlink transmission and impact link adaptation due to the lack of feedback information.

Additionally, [Huawei, ZTE] mention that for IoT repetition scenario especially for NBIoT with worst cases, due to the long duration of NPDCCH and NPDSCH transmission, the performance improvement by disabling HARQ feedback is small. [Ericsson] considers not disabling HARQ feedback at least for LEO satellites since non-negligible data rates are achievable. [Mavenir] has negative view on supporting of disabling HARQ feedback since transmitting PDSCH with NDI toggling can be regarded as “standard transparent” HARQ disabling and allows the network to achieve reasonable DL throughput.

Moreover, [Sony] mentions that RAN1 does not need to consider disabling UL HARQ feedback in IoT-NTN.

## Company views

According to the above summary, majority of companies are supportive to disable HARQ feedback for downlink transmission in Rel.18 NTN IoT as in WID, and the detail supported cases/scenarios need further study.

**[Conclusion 1-1a]: Disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is supported, and the detail supported cases/scenarios need further study.**

Please provide your views and justifications.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Ericsson | There is a variety of possible IoT NTN scenarios when we consider that there are different satellites with different orbit altitudes, different coverage levels, etc. Thus, we think IoT NTN should not adopt disabling HARQ feedback as a general unique approach, since there are use-cases where HARQ feedback can be kept enabled without incurring into the so called “stalling” issue. Having said that, a conclusion that better reflects the different scenarios/use-cases that will be faced by IoT NTN deployments is as follows:  **[Conclusion 1-1a]: For IoT NTN, enabling and disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmissions is supported.**  The part about “**and the detail supported cases/scenarios need further study**” seems to be covered by other sections of this FLS. |
| Ligado | We agree with Sony & Mavenir that HARQ feedback can effectively be disabled using an in-standard solution via NDI bit. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal in general.  “the detail supported cases/scenarios need further study” could be the sub-bullet of the conclusion. |
| Qualcomm | Agree (in fact, nothing to agree; this is restating the WID, as the chairman mentioned today). |
| CATT | We support Ericsson’s proposal. |
| Nordic | We are ok with the proposal |
| MediaTek | We are fine with Ericsson’s version. |
| Mavenir | Before proceeding further, we would like to have common understanding on what is possible based on the current specification.  Based on our understanding, even based on the current spec, we can effectively disable HARQ-ACK in eNB perspective by always toggling NDI and sending initial transmission PDSCH. Between two consecutive such PDSCHs eNB needs to allow the UE decoding time of k0 msec only. Hence, we do not clearly see the HARQ stalling issue here, and the network can achieve reasonable throughput even without any spec enhancement. It is up to the network implementation whether and how frequently to use HARQ-ACK. For this implementation based HARQ disabling, the network can use HARQ-ACK only for link adaptation purpose.  Hence, for the network throughput perspective, we do not see a specification need of HARQ disabling.  Now, we are trying to understand the UE perspective. We understand that UE needs to maintain re-transmission buffer until UE receives the next PDCCH for the same HARQ process with NDI toggled. According to the standards transparent HARQ disabling, UE will receive PDCCH with NDI toggled for the same HARQ process only after k0 msec and the UE can clear the HARQ buffer. We do not see issues here either.  In summary, we would like to understand the exact use case and benefits of HARQ disabling, before proceeding further. Once clear understanding is there, RAN1 should be able to steer a proper solution towards that. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lockheed | We support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal |
| CMCC | We are OK with the proposal. |
| NEC | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| Samsung | The conclusion is fine. Removing the last part is OK too. |
| Nokia, NSB | HARQ feedback disabling should be supported for IoT NTN and need further study, for motivation of HARQ stalling avoidance/throughput improvement/power saving in NTN scenario. In Rel18, IoT NTN special characteristics should be considered in the related study. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. The WID has actually already captured to support HARQ feedback disabling. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t have problem on the conclusion here. However, we don’t need to agree this explicitly considering WID scope clearly indicate that HARQ disabling is specified for IoT NTN.  If companies have different views, it would be better to propose it in RAN plenary. |
| SONY | We don’t need to discuss whether there is any point in disabling HARQ feedback or not. The WID states that we shall work on disabling HARQ feedback:  *Disabling of HARQ feedback to mitigate impact of HARQ stalling on UE data rates* [RAN1,RAN2]  We just need to allow a mechanism to disable HARQ feedback. We note that disabling HARQ feedback is a different issue to disabling HARQ. HARQ is enabled whether the HARQ feedback is disabled or not.  HARQ feedback will be disabled under the control of the eNB. If the eNB has concerns about reliability (or some other metric), the eNB would not disable HARQ feedback. The eNB implementation can determine the cases and scenarios in which HARQ feedback is disabled. RAN1 doesn’t need to consider the cases or scenarios. |

## Summary of 1st round discussions

In the last round email discussion, the following proposal(s) was discussed:

**[Conclusion 1-1a]: Disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is supported, and the detail supported cases/scenarios need further study.**

W.r.t the **Conclusion 1-1a** in section 1.2, in the 1st round discussion, [20] companies are provided views:

* Up to 13 companies (OPPO, Apple, Qualcomm, Nordic, Spreadtrum, Lockheed, Xiaomi, CMCC, NEC, Sharp, Samsung, Nokia, ZTE) are fine with the proposal
* Up to 4 companies (Ericsson, CATT, MTK, Huawei) are partially fine with the proposal.
* Up to 3 companies (Ligado, Mavenir, SONY) have concerns on it.

Obviously, majority of companies are supportive to enable/disable HARQ feedback for downlink transmission in Rel.18 NTN IoT as in WID. Consider the scope of the WID[2] and guideline/comments from chairman in the last GTW, only detailed scenarios/cases on whether/how to support the enabling/disabling HARQ feedback need further study. So, the issue is moved to Section 2 for further discussion.

The section is CLOSED in this meeting.

# [ACTIVE] Issue-2 Scenarios/cases to support disabling HARQ feedback

## Background

In this meeting, some companies have concerns on support disabling HARQ feedback for IoT NTN considering the drawback of the features for some certain cases. So, from moderator’s perspective, scenarios/cases applied with the disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission in IoT NTN should be further discussed.

**LEO and GEO scenarios**

The main reason for considering disabling HARQ feedback for IoT NTN is due to the large roundtrip delay between the UE and the eNB. Obviously, RTD for LEO and GEO are different (e.g., the maximal RTD on the radio interface between the eNB and UE is 541.46ms for GEO and 25.77ms for LEO-600 respectively as analyzed in [1]).

Regarding the HARQ stalling issue for GEO and LEO scenarios, some companies evaluate and analyze the impact on peak data rate and latency.

[QC] observes that for GEO Set 1 deployments, lack of feedback disabled HARQ process(es) results in a throughput/latency penalty of > 11x for UEs with one HARQ process and > 5.5x for UEs with two HARQ processes. As analyzed by [Huawei, MTK], as least for NB-IoT with small repetition number,HARQ stalling reduces data rates by approximately [95%] and [49%] for GEO and LEO respectively without disabling of HARQ feedback. As highlighted by [Nokia] that the throughput gain in GEO scenarios is mainly due to elimination of HARQ stalling, while in LEO 600 km scenarios the gain is from more scheduling uplink opportunities due to the omitted ACK/NACK transmission. [Lenovo] mentions that although LEO scenarios with smaller RTT will mitigate the impact of HARQ stalling, the HARQ stalling issue can’t be solved essentially especially for the case with small repetition number.

However, some companies have concerns on support HARQ disabling on all types of NTN scenarios, especially for LEO. As highlighted by [Lockheed Martin], the disablement of HARQ feedback is mainly beneficial for GEO scenarios. [Ericsson] considers not disabling the HARQ feedback at least for LEO satellites, since non-negligible data rates are achievable by new features introduced in Rel.17 NBIoT/eMTC.

**eMTC/NBIoT disabling of all HARQ feedback**

Disabling of HARQ feedback for all HARQ feedback was discussed in R17 NR NTN WI. For ensuring the efficiency and reliability of transmission carrying some critical signaling, e.g., RRC configuration, at least one HARQ process with feedback enabled should be kept for NR NTN. However, till the discussion of RAN1-108 NR NTN, there is no consensus on the HARQ enabling/disabling configuration restriction regarding whether supporting disabling of all HARQ feedback or not, and it can be up to eNB configuration or implementation.

Similarly, highlighted by [Lockheed Martin], semi-static disablement of HARQ feedback through RRC signaling should be supported for at least a single process for IoT NTN (NB-IoT and eMTC). As highlighted by [Sony], regarding whether to support disabling all HARQ feedback, it is necessary to check whether there are any Rel-17 eMTC or NB-IoT MAC CEs that rely on HARQ feedback for activation, for example a TAC MAC CE or indication of UE-specific K\_offset.

**NBIoT disabling of HARQ feedback in case of single HARQ process**

Similar to the issue on disabling of all HARQ feedback, w.r.t NBIoT with single HARQ process, as highlighted by [Sony, CATT, Samsung, OPPO], whether to support NBIoT disabling of HARQ feedback in case of single HARQ process needs further study. The reason is that at least MAC CE relies on HARQ feedback for activation. Disabling HARQ process for these “important” PDSCH will impact the system operation based on the current specification.

However, as mentioned/illustrated by [MTK, Xiaomi, QC], HARQ stalling issue is obvious and severe even for UE configured with only single HARQ process, [Xiaomi] further proposes that the HARQ disabling can be supported at least for the IoT UE that is only configured/capable of single HARQ process.

**eMTC/NBIoT with large repetition number and small repetition number**

As highlighted by [Huawei], for NBIoT repetition scenario, due to the long duration of NPDCCH and NPDSCH transmission, the performance improvement by HARQ feedback disabling is small. Similarly, ZTE observes that the HARQ stalling will not happen if more than one HARQ process are applied, and repetition number is very large. Hence, whether to disable HARQ feedback can be determined by repetition number.

## Company views

According to the above summary, the following proposals are listed as majority views:

**[Proposal 2-1a]:**

Disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission in IoT NTN is supported for GEO scenarios.

* FFS: NGEO scenarios

**[Conclusion 2-2a]:**

For eMTC NTN, whether to support disabling all HARQ process feedbacks for downlink transmission can wait for NR NTN conclusion if any.

For NBIoT NTN with 2 HARQ process, whether to support disabling all HARQ process feedbacks for downlink transmission can wait for NR NTN conclusion if any.

**[Proposal 2-3a]:**

For NBIoT NTN with single HARQ process, disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is supported.

**[Conclusion 2-4a]:**

Further study on support of disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission for large repetition number.

Please provide your views and comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Ericsson | At this point it seems that we are not ready to agree on “**[Proposal 2-1a], [Conclusion 2-2a], [Proposal 2-3a], [Conclusion 2-4a]**”  For example, on “**[Conclusion 2-2a]**” we think that before re-using whatever was agreed for NR, we should discuss NB-IoT/LTE-MTC specific frameworks which may make the NR agreements not equally applicable.  For the other proposals and conclusion, we need to have a common basis/framework to analyze/evaluate its feasibility, implications (drawbacks) and what it will provide as benefit (e.g., data rate).  Thus, at this point it is probably better to list fundamental aspects to be considered when analyzing scenarios with HARQ feedback enabled and disabled, for example:   * LEO satellites and GEO satellites. * No repetitions and use of repetitions. * Use of one or more HARQ processes. * LTE-MTC framework up to the date as per Rel-17. * NB-IoT framework up to the date as per Rel-17. |
| OPPO | Proposal 2-1a: support  Conclusion 2-2a: as far as our understanding, there is no clear plan for further discussion on NR-NTN for restriction on the HARQ disabling for all HARQ process. Thus, this conclusion might lag the WI progress.  Proposal 2-3a: we have a different opinion. We think that single HARQ process case in NB-IoT is not a data-rate harvest case. Thus the throughput enhancement is not as important as two HARQ process case.  Conclusion 2-4a: in our opinion, when the transmission duration is smaller than the RTT, the HARQ stalling issue occurs. Thus, the HARQ disabling feature can be applied in this situation. |
| Apple | For Proposal 2-1a, we suggest adding “at least for GEO scenarios” in the proposal.  For conclusion 2-2a, we do not expect any conclusion in NR NTN is going to be made as there is no longer such discussion in Rel-17 NR NTN maintenance phase. Without a conclusion, we think it is up to network implementation to disable all HARQ feedback.  We think more discussions are needed for Proposal 2-3a and Conclusion 2-4a. |
| Qualcomm | 2-1a: Support.  2-2a: Do not support such vague agreements, since eMTC/NB-IoT do not have anything to do with NR (not quite sure what is meant here)  2-3a: Hesitant to agree, since people will try to exclude other options later  2-4a: Always open to further studies; not sure what this agreement conveys. |
| CATT | Proposal 2-1a can be supported.  For Proposal 2-2a, it is not needed, we don’t expect NR NTN will have the conclusion.  Proposal 2-3a and Proposal 2-4a are fine to us. |
| Nordic | Agree with CATT |
| MediaTek | We have similar views with Ericsson on “**[Proposal 2-1a], [Conclusion 2-2a], [Proposal 2-3a], [Conclusion 2-4a]**”.  For Proposal 2-1a, more discussions on whether disabling of HARQ feedback should only be supported for GEO and why is needed. The data rate reduction due to HARQ stalling in LEO is still very significant when no large repetition is used. With large repetitions, it can be discussed further whether HARQ disabling for LEO provides any gain in peak data rates.  On Conclusion 2-2a, RAN1 can discuss whether there are IoT NTN specific aspects for IoT NTN. In particular single HARQ process and large repetition numbers as mentioned in proposal 2-3a and Conclusion 2-4a |
| Mavenir | As we mentioned for Section 1-2, we propose to have better understanding on what problems we need to solve before agreeing on these details. |
| Spreadtrum | 2-1a: Support.  2-2a: Agree with CATT  2-3a: It's too early to draw a conclusion now.  2-4a: Support |
| Lockheed | Agree with the [Proposal 2-1a], and [Proposal 2-3a]. We believe these address the majority of the issues for GEO. As noted in reference [5] of our contribution we believe there is the potential for significant loss without supporting the disabling of HARQ feedback. |
| Xiaomi | For proposal 2-1, this is highly dependent on the target data rate that is required. It is early to say HARQ disabling is supported for GEO  For conclusion 2-2, not support. There is nothing to do with NR-NTN.  For proposal 2-3a, support.  For conclusion 2-4a, don’t know what’s the intention. This shouldn’t be a conclusion |
| CMCC | Proposal 2-1a: OK  Conclusion 2-2a: RAN1 can discuss the issue from the eMTC/NB IoT NTN specific aspects.  Proposal 2-3a and conclusion 2-4a: We are open to the further discussion. |
| NEC | **Proposal 2-1a**: support.  **Conclusion 2-2a**: it is more likely the R17 NR NTN will not have relevant discussions. Considering the different traffic characteristics of IoT, we should focus on IoT scenarios.  **Proposal 2-3a**: we think further discussion is needed. This proposal should be based on the HARQ feedback configuration mechanism that to be deployed to IoT NTN.  **Conclusion 2-4a**: support. |
| Sharp | **Proposal 2-1a**: support.  **Conclusion 2-2a**: not support. It is not needed.  **Proposal 2-3a**: support.  **Conclusion 2-4a**: support. |
| Samsung | **[**Proposal 2-1a]: OK  [Conclusion 2-2a]: whether to disable any/some/all HARQ processes for NB-IoT and for eMTC should be discussed in this AI.  [Proposal 2-3a] and [Conclusion 2-4a]: OK to further discuss. |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 2-1a: Agree. More gain can be achieved for GEO when disabling HARQ feedback than in NGEO considering the larger RTT. FFS for NGEO cases.  Conclusion 2=2a: For disabling HARQ feedback, we think it should be network implementation and per HARQ process, especially for IoT UE with reduced number of HARQ process.  Proposal 2-3a: We agree it should be further studied, but too early to make decision. For one HARQ process UE, if not enabled feedback, it will have limited throughput, but if disabled, then RRC/MAC signaling will be impacted. Further study is needed.  Conclusion 2-4a: Agree. Actually whether large repetition number depends on UE’s pathloss to satellite, it should also be network implementation. |
| ZTE | For 2-1a: Support.  For 2-2a: In NR-NTN, there is no such discussion in the maintenance phase. Whether all HARQ processes are disabled depends on the network configuration. Therefore, this conclusion is not needed.  For 2-3a: When HARQ feedback disabling is supported for UE with single HARQ process, disabling all HARQ processes is implicitly supported, in which case the reliability of system needs to be considered. Hence, we do not think it can be agreed now.  For 2-4a: support. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | **[Proposal 2-1a]:** we prefer add also “at least” before “for the GEO case.”.  As we commented online, we are not sure what additional standard effort/impact shall be paid to support LEO case compared with the work for GEO. It seems this can be always left to configuration/implementation to leave the eNB to decide whether configuring HARQ disabling. The specification may not necessarily restrict the cases if no difference or little difference on the standard impact.  **[Conclusion 2-2a]:** we are fine with it.  **[Proposal 2-3a**]: Needs further study as MAC CE should be carried by HARQ process with HARQ enabling.  **[Conclusion 2-4a]**: we are fine with it and we are also happy to see more companies to provide inputs/evaluations under large repetition level. |
| SONY | **[Proposal 2-1a]:**  HARQ feedback disabling should be supported for all orbital scenarios. If, on the contrary, some scenarios allowed HARQ disabling and other didn’t, would we have different RRC and / or DCI signalling for the different GEO / LEO scenarios?  **[Conclusion 2-2a]:**  Agree with Qualcomm: what has this got to do with NR?  **[Proposal 2-3a]:**  Given that HARQ feedback disabling should be supported for all scenarios, it should be supported in this scenario?  **[Conclusion 2-4a]:**  It is unclear how this is meant to work. We should avoid optimisations for cases like this. If HARQ stalling is not a problem for “large numbers of repetitions”, presumably a good eNB implementation would leave HARQ feedback enabled. Is the goal of this proposal to save one bit in a “HARQ enabled / disabled” field in a DCI? |

## Summary of 1st round discussions

In the last round email discussion, the following proposals were discussed:

**[Proposal 2-1a]:**

Disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission in IoT NTN is supported for GEO scenarios.

* FFS: NGEO scenarios

W.r.t the **Proposal 2-1a** in section 2.2, in the 1st round discussion, [19] companies are provided views:

* Up to 14 companies (OPPO, Apple, Qualcomm, CATT, Nordic, Spreadtrum, Lockheed, CMCC, NEC, Sharp, Samsung, Nokia, ZTE, Huawei) are fine with the proposal
* Up to 5 companies (Ericsson, MTK, Mavenir, Xiaomi, SONY) have concerns on it.

Majority companies support disabling HARQ feedback at least for GEO, even for all orbital scenarios. However, some companies have concerns on support HARQ disabling on all orbital scenarios, especially for LEO. From moderator’s perspective, whether disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission in IoT NTN is beneficial for all orbital scenarios, whether enabling/disabling HARQ feedback for all orbital scenarios can be up to eNB implementation or has any spec impact needs further study.

**[Conclusion 2-2a]:**

For eMTC NTN, whether to support disabling all HARQ process feedbacks for downlink transmission can wait for NR NTN conclusion if any.

For NBIoT NTN with 2 HARQ process, whether to support disabling all HARQ process feedbacks for downlink transmission can wait for NR NTN conclusion if any.

W.r.t the **Conclusion 2-2a** in section 2.2, in the 1st round discussion, majority of companies have concerns on it.

From moderator’s perspective, whether to support disabling all HARQ process feedbacks has been discussed for several meetings in NR. Till now, no consensus has been achieved (e.g., implicitly up to gNR implementation). However, whether there are new issues for support disabling all HARQ process feedback for IoT NTN needs further study.

**[Proposal 2-3a]:**

For NBIoT NTN with single HARQ process, disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is supported.

W.r.t the **Proposal 2-3a** in section 2.2, in the 1st round discussion, [19] companies are provided views:

* Up to 8 companies (Qualcomm, CATT, Nordic, Xiaomi, Sharp, Samsung, Nokia, Sony) are fine with the proposal
* Up to 11 companies (Ericsson, OPPO, Apple, MTK, Mavenir, Spreadtrum, Lockheed, CMCC, NEC, ZTE, Huawei) have concerns on it.

According to the inputs, it seems that whether to support disabling of HARQ feedback in case of single HARQ process hasn’t achieved consensus. The issue needs further study.

**[Conclusion 2-4a]:**

Further study on support of disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission for large repetition number.

W.r.t the **Conclusion 2-4a** in section 2.2, in the 1st round discussion, [18] companies are provided views:

* Up to 13 companies (OPPO, Apple, Qualcomm, CATT, Nordic, Spreadtrum, CMCC, NEC, Sharp, Samsung, Nokia, ZTE, Huawei) are fine with the proposal
* Up to 5 companies (Ericsson, MTK, Mavenir, Xiaomi, Sony) have concerns on it.

According to the inputs, it seems that slightly majority of companies are supportive to study the support of disabling HARQ feedback for large repetition number and small repetition number separately. As commented by some companies, whether enabling/disabling HARQ feedback for large repetition number and no/small repetition number can be up to eNB implementation or has any spec impact needs further study.

Based on the discussion, it seems that the views on scenarios/cases of support enabling/disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission are still diverged. From moderator’s perspective, further study is needed in the next meeting. The following updated proposal is recommended:

**Proposal 2-5a**

For IoT NTN, whether/how to support enabling and disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmissions in the following scenarios/cases needs further study:

* NGEO and GEO scenarios
* Disabling all HARQ process feedback
* Disabling HARQ feedback for NBIoT with single HARQ process
* Disabling HARQ feedback for large repetition number and no/small repetition number
* Other scenarios/cases are not excluded

Please provide your views and comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Ericsson | At this point we can be ok with the proposal (i.e., for study/analysis purposes). One comment is that we should avoid ending-up “hardcoding” one-by-one which scenarios support disabling, since we should rather have the possibility of enabling/disabling the HARQ feedback “on-demand” as to give operators the flexibility of adapting to scenarios/deployments on a per-need basis. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Our understanding on this proposal is to further study the scenarios to support the HARQ disabling. The second sub-bullet seems to be more like a design aspect rather than the scenarios. Suggest to remove the second sub-bullet. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| NEC | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine for further study in this early stage. Issues and benefits for all these should be studied before any decision. |
| MediaTek | Partly support. Maybe bullet 3 a special case for bullet 2? We think bullet 3 should be sub-bullet of bullet 2. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal to further study the identified issues. And we agree with MediaTek that the case of disabling HARQ feedback for single HARQ process belongs to the case of disabling all HARQ process feedback. |
| Qualcomm | This is a rather tragic outcome, that is being entertained. We should NOT be discussing “whether” to support feedback disabling. That is the “objective” of the WID.  Companies—specifically Ericsson—that did not object to the WID in plenary, are providing random arguments such as “sufficient” peak data rate can be achieved (with no benchmark for “sufficient”) and “questioning” the HARQ stalling issue—something that was proven in Rel17 analysis, and re-iterated by both Qualcomm and Huawei in their current contributions.  In our opinion, the feature lead should not entertain such devious tactics—such as “sufficient” peak data rates, or “disabling can be agnostic to UE, and the UE can always send feedback”. The whole objective of the WID was to put an end to these discussions, that had stalled the progress of supporting feedback disabling in Release 17! |
| Ericsson v110 | To Qualcomm:  We did not object to the WID at the RAN plenary because we did not have a reason to do that. Certainly, there are scenarios where disabling HARQ feedback can be beneficial, but there is a variety of scenarios in IoT NTN and in some cases keeping enabled HARQ feedback is possible without incurring into the “stalling” issue.  I would be surprised if companies want to adopt disabling HARQ feedback as a unique approach for the IoT NTN technology, which would imply losing flexibility, reliability when no-necessary, and the possibility of acting on demand according with the conditions of a given scenario.  Now I will briefly comment on other things you said:   * About your comments on “no benchmark” and the comment over emphasizing the word “sufficient”, indeed I have also concretely said and proven that there are scenarios where non-negligible data rates in the order of hundreds of kbps are achievable (comparing several scenarios and showing numbers). * About your comment where you mentioned that the HARQ stalling issue “was proven in Rel17 analysis”, I think your analysis is either incomplete or outdated because it overlooked all what was proven in our contribution.   Rather than strongly insisting on pursuing disabling as a unique approach, I think is important to realize that the discussions we have had are beneficial for the feature *per-se* as to know e.g., what we already have available, and what we need. Overall, I believe we all want to end up with a feature that is well equipped and capable to face the challenging real-life scenarios that are out there.  Having said, perhaps to address your concern we can go one step further through removing the word “whether” in the proposal below:  **Proposal 2-5a**  For IoT NTN, ~~whether/~~how to support enabling and disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmissions in the following scenarios/cases needs further study: |

# [ACTIVE] Issue-3 Indication/configuration of disabling HARQ feedback

## Background

In NR NTN, disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is semi-static configured by RRC signaling. The configuration is indicated per HARQ process index by a bitmap manner, e.g., 32bit bitmap if the configured HARQ process number is 32.

Regarding indication/configuration of disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission for IoT NTN, [ZTE, Spreadtrum, Lockheed, MTK, Nordic, Nokia, Samsung, OPPO, Apple, CMCC, Lenovo, Sharp] mention to reuse the HARQ feedback enabling/disabling configuration agreed in NR-NTN for Rel.18 IoT NTN, i.e., enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling.

However, some companies have different views considering the IoT coverage enhancement requirement and supported HARQ process number. [ZTE] mentions the enabling/disabling HARQ feedback in IoT-NTN can be based on repetition number for each transmission. [Sony, Xiaomi, Nokia, NEC] propose that DL HARQ feedback could be enabled / disabled either semi-statically or dynamically since dynamic enabling/disabling would provide more scheduling flexibility by the Enb. [NEC] further proposes to use one new bit field or existing fields (e.g., TPC command or HARQ-ACK resource offset field) in DCI to indicate HARQ feedback enabling/disabling if additional signal enabled.

## Company views

In summary, from moderator’s perspective, NR NTN disabling HARQ feedback configuration can be a starting point for IoT NTN, especially for Emtc with more than one HARQ processes, which is also the majority companies’ view. For NBIoT with single HARQ process, if disabling HARQ feedback for single HARQ process is supported in section 2 and it is disabled by RRC configuration, the issue related to any impact on the MAC Ces activation and overhead of RRC configuration/reconfiguration back-and-forth needs further study.

Based on that, potential solutions are listed for further study based on IoT specific feature (e.g., NBIoT support single HARQ process case, Emtc/NBIoT with large repetition number).

Note: NBIoT with single HARQ process, NBIoT with more than one HARQ process and Emtc HARQ feedback enabling/disabling indication/configuration are separately discussed although unified solution is encouraged if necessary/possible.

**[Proposal 3-1a]:**

For Emtc, enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is at least configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling.

* FFS: [if additional signal enabled,] explicitly/implicitly indicated by DCI.

**[Proposal 3-2a]:**

For NBIoT with more than one HARQ process, enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is indicated/configured by [one of] following option(s):

* Option 1: per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling
* Option 2: explicitly indicated by DCI (e.g., new field or reusing existing field)
* Option 3: implicitly determined by existing configured/indicated parameter(s) (e.g., repetition number)

**[Proposal 3-3a]:**

For NBIoT with single HARQ process, enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is indicated/configured by [one of] following option(s):

* Option 1: per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling
* Option 2: explicitly indicated by DCI (e.g., new field or reusing existing field)
* Option 3: implicitly determined by existing configured/indicated parameter(s) (e.g., repetition number)

Please provide your views and comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Ericsson | Similarly, at this point it does not seem to be possible to agree on detailed proposals such as “**[Proposal 3-1a], [Proposal 3-2a], [Proposal 3-3a]**”.  Perhaps we can list a set of alternatives to be studied, for example:  For the indication of enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink transmission in IoT NTN, the following alternatives are considered for further study:   * Using semi-static or dynamic signaling:   + - UE specific RRC signaling     - Indication via DCI * The enabling/disabling indication applies:   + - Per HARQ process     - To more than one HARQ process     - To all HARQ processes |
| OPPO | Support |
| Apple | We are fine with Proposal 3-1a due to its similarity to NR NTN.  For Proposals 3-2a and 3-3a, we are open for more discussions. We may modify the proposals to “further study the following options”. |
| Qualcomm | OK |
| CATT | We need firstly reach the consensus on the proposal 2-1a/2a/3a/4a, in this stage, it is too early to discuss these details. |
| Nordic | Support |
| MediaTek | [Proposal 3-2a]: Support, and we think Option 1 can be the baseline, because it is the NR NTN solution.  [Proposal 3-3a]: Support, and we think Option 1 can be the baseline, because it is the NR NTN solution. |
| Mavenir | As we mentioned for Section 1-2, we propose to have better understanding on what problems we need to solve before agreeing on these details. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| Lockheed | We support the proposal with a preference for Option 1 but the other options are acceptable as well. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposals. |
| NEC | Support |
| Sharp | We are OK with all the proposals. |
| Samsung | For both [Proposal 3-1a] and [Proposal 3-2a], enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling is fine.  Additional signaling for multiple/single configured HARQ process(es) needs to be further discussed/justified. No need to agreeing to options for additional signaling before further discussion.. |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 3-1a: Agree.  Proposal 3-2a: Further study/comparison in Rel18 WI phase.  Proposal 3-3a: Further study/comparison in Rel18 WI phase. Also the impact on signaling should be considered. |
| ZTE | We are fine for proposal 3-1a and 3-2a.  For 3-3a, whether single HARQ process can be disabled may need further discussion. It’s too early to consider the details. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **[Proposal 3-1a]:** we are fine with it.  **[Proposal 3-2a]:**   * We think as the first meeting, at least other options or combinations are not precluded should be added. * Option 1 can be at least the baseline. * For option 3, maybe TBS can be also added in the example, considering the transmission duration may also depend on the TB size.   Therefore, we prefer the following revision:  For NBIoT with more than one HARQ process, enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is indicated/configured by [one of] following option(s):   * Option 1: per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling * Option 2: explicitly indicated by DCI (e.g., new field or reusing existing field) * Option 3: implicitly determined by existing configured/indicated parameter(s) (e.g., repetition number and/or TBS) * Other options or combinations are not precluded.   **[Proposal 3-3a]:** similar comments as above for more than one HARQ case. Also we think it is not agreed to support single HARQ disabling. Therefore, it is better to add “if supported” for the time being.  For NBIoT with single HARQ process, enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission, if supported, is indicated/configured by [one of] following option(s):   * Option 1: per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling * Option 2: explicitly indicated by DCI (e.g., new field or reusing existing field) * Option 3: implicitly determined by existing configured/indicated parameter(s) (e.g., repetition number and/or TBS) * Other options or combinations are not precluded.) |
| SONY | Agree with Ericsson, but should also consider the alternative that HARQ feedback enabling / disabling is performed at a cell level, via SIB signalling. Hence we would propose:  For the indication of enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink transmission in IoT NTN, the following alternatives are considered for further study:   * Using semi-static or dynamic signaling:   + - UE specific RRC signaling     - SIB signalling     - Indication via DCI * The enabling/disabling indication applies:   + - Per HARQ process     - To more than one HARQ process     - To all HARQ processes |

## Summary of 1st round discussions

In the last round email discussion, the following proposals were discussed:

**[Proposal 3-1a]:**

For Emtc, enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is at least configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling.

* FFS: [if additional signal enabled,] explicitly/implicitly indicated by DCI.

**[Proposal 3-2a]:**

For NBIoT with more than one HARQ process, enabling/disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is indicated/configured by [one of] following option(s):

* Option 1: per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling
* Option 2: explicitly indicated by DCI (e.g., new field or reusing existing field)
* Option 3: implicitly determined by existing configured/indicated parameter(s) (e.g., repetition number)

**[Proposal 3-3a]:**

For NBIoT with single HARQ process, enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is indicated/configured by [one of] following option(s):

* Option 1: per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling
* Option 2: explicitly indicated by DCI (e.g., new field or reusing existing field)
* Option 3: implicitly determined by existing configured/indicated parameter(s) (e.g., repetition number)

W.r.t the **Proposal 3-1a**, **Proposal 3-2a**, **Proposal 3-3a**, in section 3.2, in the 1st round discussion, [19] companies are provided views:

* Up to 15 companies (OPPO, Apple, Qualcomm, Nordic, MTK, Spreadtrum, Lockheed, Xiaomi, CMCC, NEC, Sharp, Samsung, Nokia, ZTE, Huawei) are [partially] fine with the proposal
* Up to 4 companies (Ericsson, CATT, Mavenir, Sony) have concerns on it.

Based on the discussion, it seems that how to configure and indicate enabling/disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission are still diverged. In the contributions and comments from the first-round email discussion, some configuration/indication solutions are proposed. From moderator’s perspective, we can take these solutions as starting point, and further study in the next meeting. The following updated proposal is recommended:

**[Proposal 3-4a]:**

For IoT NTN, to configure/indicate enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission, the following options can be considered:

* Option 1: per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling
* Option 2: per HARQ process via SIB signaling
* Option 3: explicitly indicated by DCI (e.g., new field or reusing existing field)
* Option 4: implicitly determined by existing configured/indicated parameter(s) (e.g., repetition number, TBS)
* Other options or combinations are not excluded

Note: Option(s) for Emtc and NBIoT can be separately discussed.

Please provide your views and comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Ericsson | We are ok with the proposal (i.e., at this point all those possibilities can be studied). |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| Nokia, NSB | Generally we are ok for further study on this with no preclusion. But all these are for further study before come into candidate solution. We suggest it is updated to  “the following options can be considered for further study” |
| MediaTek | Support |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal |
| Qualcomm | OK. |

# [CLOSED] Issue-4 SPS PDSCH

## Background

In NR NTN, it was agreed that for HARQ feedback of each PDSCH, UE follows the per-process HARQ feedback enabled/disabled configuration for the associated HARQ process except for the first SPS PDSCH after activation if additionally enabled, where ACK/NACK is always reported by UE for the first SPS PDSCH.

For IoT NTN, As highlighted by [ZTE, Sony, Apple, Lenovo] that the same mechanism for NR NTN could be applied to IoT NTN. UE follows the per-process HARQ feedback enabled/disabled configuration for the associated HARQ process except for the first SPS PDSCH after activation. For SPS PDSCH, ACK/NACK is reported by UE for the first SPS PDSCH regardless of network configuration of enabled/disabled for this HARQ process if additional signal indicated. As highlighted by [Apple, Lenovo], for DCI indicating SPS PDSCH release, HARQ-ACK report is performed as legacy.

## Company views

From moderator’s perspective, if the indication/configuration of disabling HARQ feedback in Emtc follows that of NR NTN in section 3, the NR configuration of HARQ feedback enabling/disabling for SPS PDSCH can be the starting point for Emtc NTN.

According to the above summary, the following proposals are listed as majority views:

**[Proposal 4-1a]:**

For HARQ feedback for Emtc SPS PDSCH, UE follows the per-process HARQ feedback enabled/disabled configuration for the associated HARQ process, except for the first SPS PDSCH after activation if HARQ feedback for SPS activation is additionally enabled.

* If HARQ feedback for SPS activation is additionally enabled., ACK/NACK is reported by UE for the first SPS PDSCH after activation regardless of network configuration of enabled/disabled for this HARQ process.

**[Proposal 4-2a]:**

For DCI indicating SPS PDSCH release, HARQ-ACK report is performed as legacy in Emtc.

Please provide your views and comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Ericsson | Before moving to have agreements touching upon specific features such as SPS as in “[**Proposal 4-1a], [Proposal 4-1b]**”, we need to reach agreements on more fundamental aspects addressed in previous sections of the FLS. |
| Apple | We support the proposals. |
| Qualcomm | Probably too soon to agree on this (we may need to revisit this ourselves) |
| CATT | SPS configuration can be discussed later. In our view, this issue is not so important to enhance it. |
| Nordic | Agree with Ericsson |
| Mavenir | As we mentioned for Section 1-2, we propose to have better understanding on what problems we need to solve before agreeing on these details. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with Ericsson and QC. |
| Lockheed | Agree |
| Xiaomi | Share Ericsson’s view. |
| CMCC | Agree with Ericsson. |
| NEC | Agree with Ericsson, focusing on the initial baseline solutions for general cases for the time being. The discussions on SPS and other features could be opened afterwards. |
| Sharp | Agree with Ericsson. |
| Samsung | Agree to postpone this discussion. |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 4-1a: It can be one assumption to reuse from NR NTN as starting point. Then check further for IoT special issue.  Proposal 4-2a: Agree if no issue found. |
| ZTE | Support to reuse NR-NTN schemes for SPS. Also fine to postpone the discussion until addressing the fundamental issues. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We should not exclude NB IoT in the proposal. And we support the proposals if NB IoT can be included. |

## Summary of 1st round discussions

W.r.t the **Proposal 4-1a** and **Proposal 4-2a**, in section 4.2, in the 1st round discussion, majority of companies propose that the issue needs further study after fundamental issues in section 1-3 are stable. So the issue is moved to Section 7 Others.

Then, this section is CLOSED in this meeting.

# [CLOSED] Issue-5 (N)PDSCH/(N)PDCCH scheduling restriction

## Background

In NR NTN, additional gap is considered to avoid the continuous reception of PDSCH with same HARQ process at UE side as specified in TS38.214.

As highlighted by [Huawei, ZTE, QC, Nordic, Lenovo] that Enb can schedule new TB after [12ms or UE reported value] from the ending of NPDSCH transmission to improve the throughput for NBIoT and after [2, 4] millisecond from the end of PDSCH transmission for Emtc over the same feedback disabled HARQ process.

However, as highlighted by [MTK] when HARQ feedback for the HARQ process ID is disabled, if a NB-IoT UE receives a NPDSCH transmission ending in subframe n, the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in any subframe starting from subframe n+1 to subframe n+12. [Lenovo] mentions similar PDCCH scheduling restriction behavior for UE with single HARQ process.

Another issue related to the monitoring of a PDCCH which indicates the ACK/NACK after transmission of a PDSCH is raised up by companies. As highlighted by [ZTE, Spreadtrum], when HARQ feedback for a HARQ process is enabled, the UE is not expected to receive another NPDCCH/MPDCCH carrying a DCI scheduling a NPDSCH/PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until round trip propagation delay after the end of the transmit of HARQ-ACK. From the moderator’s view, the issue is the enhancement/reduction of PDCCH/NPDCCH monitoring for HARQ feedback enabling case, not related to the HARQ disabling and corresponding standard impact, so it is preferred to move to Al.9.12.4 Others for further discussion

## Company views

According to the above summary, reusing NR PDSCH scheduling restriction can be a starting point at least for Emtc. For NBIoT, considering the UE complexity and power saving, whether new UE behavior (different from NR NTN UE behavior) will be introduced needs further discussion. The following proposals are listed as majority views:

**[Proposal 5-1a]:**

For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback in Emtc, UE is not expected to receive another PDCCH carrying a DCI scheduling a PDSCH for a given HARQ process or to receive another PDSCH without corresponding PDCCH for the given HARQ process that starts until X (ms) after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH for that HARQ process.

* FFS: X =2, 4.

**[Proposal 5-2a]:**

For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback in NBIoT, [one of] the following UE behavior(s) can be supported:

* Option 1: UE is not expected to receive another NPDCCH carrying a DCI scheduling a NPDSCH for a given HARQ process that starts until X(ms) after the end of the reception of the last NPDSCH for that HARQ process.
  + FFS: X =12 or X is determined by UE reported capability.
* Option 2: UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in a period of Y(ms) from the end of reception of the last NPDSCH
  + FFS: Y=12 or Y is determined by UE reported capability.

**[Conclusion 5-3a]:**

Discussion on issues related to restriction of PDCCH monitoring for a PDSCH with enabled HARQ feedback is moved to AI 9.12.4.

Please provide your views and comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Ericsson | Similar comment, it seems that before treating detailed proposals as in “**[Proposal 5-1a], [Proposal 5-2a], [Conclusion 5-3a]**”, we need to have agreements on more fundamental aspects. Without having a common framework on which the disabling of HARQ feedback will apply, it is not possible to know the suitability of the numbers in the above cited proposals/conclusion. |
| OPPO | we think the value of X should be properly defined, which avoid to be too large or too short. From our understanding, the X value should involve the K\_mac delay which might not be a deterministic value but rather a configurable value provided by the network. |
| Apple | We are generally fine with Proposal 5-1a.  For Proposal 5-2a, we are not sure if Option 2 only applies to the case of a single HARQ process. Some clarification is needed here.  We are not sure if conclusion 5-3a is really needed. |
| Qualcomm | Agree on 5-1a for MTC.  For 5-2a for NB-IoT, current specifications already specify (presumably in the context of SC-PTM) the following, which we think is sufficient:  **Section 16.6, TS 36.213:**  *“If a NB-IoT UE receives a NPDSCH transmission ending in subframe n, and if the UE is not required to transmit a corresponding NPUSCH format 2, the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in any subframe starting from subframe n+1 to subframe n+12.”* |
| CATT | Support Ericsson’s view. Need more discussion before making concrete decision. |
| Nordic | We support all proposals by FL |
| MediaTek | [Proposal 5-2a]: Option 1 is preferable because it has minimum impact on the specification. X should be 12 subframes to allow for internal processing delay.  [Conclusion 5-3a]: Agree. PDCCH monitoring restriction can be de-prioritized. |
| Mavenir | As we mentioned for Section 1-2, we propose to have better understanding on what problems we need to solve before agreeing on these details. |
| Spreadtrum | We shared the similar views with Ericsson. |
| Lockheed | We believe this requires further study. |
| Xiaomi | Share Ericsson’s view |
| NEC | We have similar views to Proposal 4-2a, and support Ericsson’s comments. This issue should be discussed on top of the baseline HARQ disabling mechanism. |
| Sharp | Agree with Ericsson. |
| Samsung | Although proposals 5-1a and 2-a/option1 can be fine in principle, prefer to discuss such proposals after basic agreements on HARQ disabling. |
| Nokia, NSB | Generally, we also think further study is needed before making any decision.  Proposal 5-1a: Agree legacy processing as baseline, then FFS.  Proposal 5-2a: Agree legacy processing as baseline, then FFS. Better to reuse more from legacy spec/implementation, unless new special issue for IoT NTN.  Conclusion 5-3a: Agree. |
| ZTE | For 5-1a, support.  For 5-2a, we generally support. And we support option-1, which reuse the mechanism of NR-NTN.  For 5-3a, this issue is also related to HARQ procedure and we think it can be discussed in this AI. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [Proposal 5-2a]: Option 2 is more preferred. However, we are kind of agree with Ericsson that it is too early to agree something is supported at this time state before some fundamental aspect is not very clear. Therefore, we prefer the following change:  For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback in NBIoT, ~~[one of]~~ at least the following UE behavior(s) can be considered ~~supported~~:   * Option 1: UE is not expected to receive another NPDCCH carrying a DCI scheduling a NPDSCH for a given HARQ process that starts until X(ms) after the end of the reception of the last NPDSCH for that HARQ process.   + FFS: X =12 or X is determined by UE reported capability. * Option 2: UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in a period of Y(ms) from the end of reception of the last NPDSCH   + FFS: Y=12 or Y is determined by UE reported capability.   [Conclusion 5-3a]: We prefer to keep the discussion in this agenda, further study is needed. |
| SONY | We would prefer to consider the basic issues before considering this sort of issue. |

## Summary of 1st round discussions

W.r.t the **Proposal 5-1a, Proposal 5-2a** and **Conclusion 5-3a**, in section 5.2, in the 1st round discussion, majority of companies propose that the issue needs further study after fundamental issues in section 1-3 are stable. So the issue is moved to Section 7 Others.

Then, this section is CLOSED in this meeting.

# [CLOSED] Issue-6 Performance enhancement for disabling HARQ feedback

## Background

For enhancing transmission performance, different solutions including potential parameter configurations are proposed by companies. Following aspects are categorized according to the views from each company:

* Enhancements on transmission repetition
  + [CMCC] proposes that different configurations on aggregation factor for HARQ processes with/without feedback. However, [Spreadtrum] mentions that the existing repeated transmission mechanism can ensure the reliability of downlink transmission
* Blind retransmission
  + [Nokia] proposes to consider blind PDSCH (re)transmission of the same packet by MAC scheduling without waiting for the transmission of the HARQ feedback.
* Enhancements on CQI/MCS table with new BLER
  + [CMCC] mentions that the block error rate target only depends on network implementation without specification impact, and one MCS table may be sufficient, since network can schedule proper MCS value via DCI for HARQ process with/without feedback
* UCI/UE assistant information
  + As highlighted in [Nokia, Samsung, Nordic], in case of scheduling with disabled HARQ feedback, additional new UCI feedback can be considered to improve the scheduling configuration from Enb side. E.g., to report the decoding statistic or reporting DL transmission disruption and/or requesting DL scheduling changes [Nokia], a new CSI reporting method or a one-bit feedback to suggest an increase or decrease in MCS or repetition value of NPDSCH[Nordic], reporting buffer status for HARQ operation, explicit indication to request enabling/disabling HARQ feedback [Samsung].

## Company views

According to the above summary, the following proposals are listed as majority views:

**[Proposal 6-1a]:**

Further study the following performance enhancement schemes for disabled HARQ feedback:

* Enhancements on transmission repetition
* Blind retransmission
* Enhancements on CQI/MCS table with new BLER
* UCI/UE assistant information

Please provide your views and comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Ericsson | What has been listed under “**[Proposal 6-1a]:**” refers to what can be considered as potential optimizations on the disabling scheme. As mentioned earlier, there are more fundamental aspects to be discussed first.  The proposal requires knowing how the disabling of HARQ feedback will look like on the LTE-MTC and NB-IoT frameworks, as to know first what is achievable from it (e.g., in terms of achievable data rate). Once we know that, we can try to conclude whether some additional enhancements for the disabling HARQ feedback are needed or not, pondering what are the implications in terms of complexity and spec impacts. |
| OPPO | These aspects are not the high priority at this stage |
| Apple | Given the limited scope, we prefer to deprioritize the discussion of this proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Second priority |
| CATT | No need to have these enhancements. |
| Nordic | These are important topics to discuss but second priority though |
| MediaTek | It can be de-prioritized |
| Mavenir | As we mentioned for Section 1-2, we propose to have better understanding on what problems we need to solve before agreeing on these details. |
| Spreadtrum | Low priority. |
| Lockheed | This issue requires further study. |
| CMCC | The above issue can be deprioritized. |
| NEC | Second priority. |
| Sharp | Second priority. |
| Samsung | Consider after basic agreements are achieved. |
| Nokia, NSB | Generally we agree to further study these points as in this early stage.  Especially, it should be studied: when HARQ feedback is disabled, how to keep efficiency of link adaptation. |
| ZTE | These optimizations are not essential and can be low priority at this stage. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are open for further discussion. But we don’t think an agreement is needed at this stage. |
| SONY | We don’t need an agreement on this at this stage. We would rather agree on the basic operation of HARQ feedback disabling before considering these optimisations.  Can we use the term “assistance” rather than “assistant”? We think this is a typo. TS36.331 discusses assistance information rather than assistant information. |

## Summary of 1st round discussions

W.r.t the **Proposal 6-1a**, in section 6.2, in the 1st round discussion, majority of companies propose that the issue needs further study as low priority after fundamental issues in section 1-3 are stable. So the issue is moved to Section 7 Others.

Then, this section is CLOSED in this meeting.

# [ACTIVE] Others

## Background

NOTE: The issues in this section identified by companies are related to HARQ disabling and corresponding standard impact/enhancement. Since the views from companies are still diverged and the necessity for corresponding enhancement is not fully justified. Then, from moderator’s perspective, it is better to discuss these issues more. Companies are encouraged to give comments on these issues and show views in this meeting and even next meeting contributions.

**Disabling HARQ feedback impact on HARQ bundling for Emtc H-FDD**

Emtc H-FDD HARQ bundling is introduced in Rel.14 and enhanced in Rel.17. [Sony, Apple] mention the design of disablement of HARQ feedback should handle the case where HARQ feedback is bundled, and HARQ feedback is enabled for some HARQ processes and is disabled for others. [Apple] further proposes that ACK is assumed for a feedback-disabled HARQ process in the logical AND operation.

**Disabling HARQ feedback impact on HARQ feedback for scheduling multiple TB**

Similar as issue of HARQ bundling, as highlighted by [Qualcomm], solutions should be designed for the case of transmitting HARQ feedback for a multi-TB block where some TBs (or TB bundles) have feedback enabled, while some others have feedback disabled.

**Disabling HARQ feedback impact on NPRACH capacity**

With the support of disabling HARQ feedback, NPRACH capacity issue is raised up by [Nokia] that if HARQ feedback is disabled, NB-IoT UE will need to transmit the SR on NPRACH, while if HARQ feedback is always enabled in legacy, NB-IoT UE can transmit the SR piggyback with HARQ feedback. The impact of NB-IoT scheduling request when HARQ feedback is disabled needs further study.

**Disabling HARQ feedback impact on HARQ codebook generation**

Similar as the discussion of NR NTN HARQ codebook enhancement, as highlighted by [Apple, CMCC], for HARQ-ACK codebook construction for PUCCH format 3, 4 or 5, the HARQ codebook does not include the ACK/NACK bits from feedback-disabled HARQ processes and UE ignores the DAI field in the DCI scheduling feedback-disabled HARQ process. [CMCC] further propose that UE can consistently report NACK-only for the feedback-disabled HARQ process regardless of decoding results of corresponding PDSCH.

However, from moderator’s perspective, PUCCH format 3, 4 or 5 is not supported in Emtc FDD, and Emtc TDD is not in the scope of IoT NTN, the issue related to HARQ codebook generation with disabled HARQ feedback needs further study.

**Serving cell change during data transfer**

Due to the large number of repetitions, an UL/DL transmission in IoT can be longer than the time interval needed by the UE for cell reselection or handover. [Nokia] proposes to address the issue of repetition continuation for a HARQ process between two NTN cells. From the moderator’s view, the issue is related to combining between two NTN cells and not related to the HARQ disabling and corresponding enhancement. And if necessary, the issue is moved to Al.9.12.4 Others for further discussion

## Company views

According to the above summary, the following proposals are listed as majority views:

**[Proposal 7-1a]:**

Study and justify the issue of disabling HARQ feedback impact on HARQ bundling for Emtc H-FDD.

**[Proposal 7-2a]:**

Study and justify the issue of disabling HARQ feedback impact on HARQ feedback for scheduling multiple TB.

**[Proposal 7-3a]:**

Study and justify the issue of disabling HARQ feedback impact on NPRACH capacity.

**[Proposal 7-4a]:**

Study and justify the issue of disabling HARQ feedback impact on HARQ codebook generation.

**[Conclusion 7-5a]:**

Move the discussion of benefits and impact on Serving cell change during data transfer to Al.9.12.4

Please provide your views and comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Ericsson | Similarly, what has been listed under “**[Proposal 7-1a]:**” are part of the frameworks that can be studied. In section 4, “SPS” has been categorized separately but it might as well have been listed here. At this point, all features are equally important until they have been analyzed, being perhaps “single TB scheduling with one or more HARQ processes” the most fundamental framework that can be used as starting point. |
| OPPO | Suggest to focus on issue 1-5 first. |
| Apple | We support to discuss all these issues. |
| Qualcomm | **7-1a** (for single TB scheduling) is not an issue, since the UE with feedback disabled will simply ignore the corresponding RRC and DCI fields w.r.t bundling, due to the following clause in the specs:  *“For FDD, a BL/CE UE shall upon detection of a PDSCH intended for the UE and for which an HARQ-ACK shall be provided, transmit the HARQ-ACK response using the same  derived according to Subclause 10.1.2.1 in subframe(s) n+ki with i =0,1, …, N-1, where*  *- subframe n-k is the last subframe in which the PDSCH is transmitted, where*  *if the UE is in half-duplex FDD operation and is configured with CEModeA and higher layer parameter* *ce-HARQ-AckBundling and the ‘HARQ-ACK bundling flag’ in the corresponding DCI is set to 1, or if the UE is configured with higher layer parameter ce-SchedulingEnhancement*  *- is given by the ‘HARQ-ACK delay’ field in the corresponding DCI, and the HARQ-ACK delay value is determined based on the higher layer parameters according to Table 7.3.1-2;*  *”*  **7-2a** will **need to be addressed at some stage**; we are fine to defer it to later meetings but encourage companies to look at it (since currently, multi-TB assumed all processes are feedback-enabled).  **7-4a** is probably some port-over from NR: there is **no “codebook” for FDD** Emtc/NB-IoT. |
| CATT | We need to focus on the fundamental issues 1-5. |
| Nordic | Agree with Qualcomm |
| MediaTek | 7-2a can be further discussed.  7-3a and 7-4a can be de-prioritized. |
| Mavenir | As we mentioned for Section 1-2, we propose to have better understanding on what problems we need to solve before agreeing on these details. |
| Spreadtrum | We are open to study all these issues. |
| Lockheed | We agree with [Proposal 7-1a]. |
| Xiaomi | Fine to discuss all the open issues. |
| CMCC | We are fine to further discuss these issues. |
| NEC | Fine to discuss. |
| Sharp | Fine to discuss. |
| Samsung | OK to discuss. We don’t associate the order of the listed topics with the priority for discussion. |
| Nokia, NSB | Proposal 1-a & Proposal 2-a: NR NTN also have similar discussion on the bundling of HARQ-ACK, which can be a starting point for Emtc study, then to check whether special issue for Emtc.  Proposal 3-a: Agree for further study.  Proposal 4-a: NR NTN discussion as starting point, then further study whether special issue for IoT NTN.  Conclusion 5-a: This is related to long connection of IoT NTN as main focus in Rel18, which should be discussed in AI 9.12.3 and 9.12.2 (for HARQ enhancement for long connection). |
| ZTE | For 7-1a, we think it can be discussed together with 7-4a since it is also related to the feedback of disabled HARQ process. To achieve a unified design, we can consider that UE will always report ACK for disabled HARQ process if needed.  For 7-2a, similar comment as for 7-1a.  For 7-3a, in our view, unless all HARQ processes are disabled, there will be HARQ feedback to piggyback SR. However, whether all HARQ processes can be disabled is still under discussion. Hence, this issue can be deprioritized at this stage.  For 7-4a, we are fine to further discuss.  For 7-5a, fine. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | [Proposal 7-4a]: Not needed, as there is no HARQ codebook for IoT.  We are fine to study other issues, but feel that no need to agree these proposals explicitly. |
| SONY | Issues related to [7-1a], [7-2a] and [7-3a] need to be considered when disabling HARQ feedback.  [7-4a]. There is no HARQ codebook in IoT-NTN. We don’t need to consider this issue. |

## Summary of 1st round discussions

In the last round email discussion, the following proposals were discussed:

**[Proposal 7-1a]:**

Study and justify the issue of disabling HARQ feedback impact on HARQ bundling for Emtc H-FDD.

**[Proposal 7-2a]:**

Study and justify the issue of disabling HARQ feedback impact on HARQ feedback for scheduling multiple TB.

**[Proposal 7-3a]:**

Study and justify the issue of disabling HARQ feedback impact on NPRACH capacity.

**[Proposal 7-4a]:**

Study and justify the issue of disabling HARQ feedback impact on HARQ codebook generation.

**[Conclusion 7-5a]:**

Move the discussion of benefits and impact on Serving cell change during data transfer to Al.9.12.4

W.r.t the **Proposal 7-1a, Proposal 7-2a, Proposal 7-3a, Proposal 7-4a** and **Conclusion 7-5a**, in section 7.2, in the 1st round discussion, majority of companies propose that the issues need further study.

From moderator’s perspective, in this round email discussion, in parallel with discussion for fundamental issue in section 1-3, we also list the potential issues due to enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback, which can be the guideline for the next meeting and even future meeting discussion. In the contributions and comments from the first-round email discussion, some potential issues are proposed. We can take these issues as starting point for 2nd round email discussion. Companies are encouraged to comment the issues (e.g., issue valid or not, high priority/low priority and other comments). The following updated proposal is recommended:

**Proposal 7-6a**

For IoT NTN, further study the following issues due to enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission

* Issue A: SPS PDSCH
* Issue B: (N)PDSCH/(N)PDCCH scheduling restriction
* Issue C: Performance enhancement (e.g., enhancements on transmission repetition)
* Issue D: HARQ bundling for Emtc H-FDD
* Issue E: HARQ feedback for scheduling multiple TB
* Issue F: NPRACH capacity
* Issue G: HARQ codebook generation
* Other issues are not excluded

Please provide your views and comments.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and Views** |
| Ericsson | In my understanding “(N)PDSCH/(N)PDCCH scheduling restriction” came from a discussion that some companies had for NB-IoT on clause 16.6 of TS 36.213. On this matter, “Issue B” has been described using (N) as to encompass both NB-IoT and LTE-MTC, but at this point I’m not sure the issue (if any) holds (i.e., at least in the same way) for LTE-MTC and NB-IoT.  Thus, I think it would be good to add a “Note” in a similar way you did for “Proposal 3-4a”, in this case the note can be:  Note: The “Issues” in common for Emtc and NB-IoT are separately discussed.  On the other hand, there is a missing “D” in “Issue D”, it should say “HD-FDD”. |
| Apple | Agree with the proposal.  Editorial change: “H-FDD” -> “HD-FDD”. |
| Xiaomi | Open to study. |
| Spreadtrum | Support. |
| NEC | OK with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support all these should be further studied.  For Serving cell change during data transfer, it is related as no HARQ feedback in current serving cell, which is similar issue for HARQ feedback disabling. We suggest it should also be added in the list in proposal 7-6a. |
| MediaTek | OK with Ericsson’s Note. |
| ZTE | Generally fine with the proposal to further study identified issues. But for priority, we have following concerns:  For Issue C, the further optimization may be second priority before finishing the study on basic operations.  For Issue F, as we commented in first round, unless all HARQ processes are disabled, there will be HARQ feedback to piggyback SR. Since whether all HARQ processes can be disabled is still under discussion, this issue may be second priority at this stage. |
| Qualcomm | As we commented before:   * + - 1. Issue D is not an issue, due to the way the current specs are worded.       2. Issue G is irrelevant, since there is no “HARQ ACK codebook” for eMTC/NB-IoT in FDD (and NTN is restricted to FDD)       3. Issue C is not a necessary enhancement—should be down-prioritized.   Other issues need to be studied. |

# Proposals for discussion at GTW sessions
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# Appendix

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Contribution | Observation/Proposals |
| R1-2203160  Huawei, HiSilicon | Observation 1: For IoT NTN with disabling HARQ mechanism, the peak rate for different scenarios can be greatly increased, and the data rate of LEOs is comparable with that of TN.  Observation 2: When repetition is taken into consideration, the stalling issues may not exist when UE is configured with 2 HARQ processes and each HARQ process schedules one TB as the NPDSCH scheduling by the second HARQ process can fill the stalling of the NPDSCH scheduling by the first HARQ process.  Observation 3: In IoT NTN, the maximum data rate can be greatly impacted in the case when large number of repetitions is used for link budget improvement.  Observation 4: For repetition scenario, due to the long duration of NPDCCH and NPDSCH transmission, the performance improvement by HARQ disabling is small.  Observation 5: For the cases that can meet service requirement, power consumption can be saved due to disabling of feedback.  Observation 6: For the cases that cannot meet service requirement, with disabling HARQ mechanism, eNB can schedule new TB after 12ms from the ending of PDSCH transmission to improve the throughput. |
| R1-2203241  ZTE | Proposal 1: Consider to reuse the HARQ feedback disabling solution agreed in Rel-17 NR-NTN, i.e., enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling. The enhancement on PDCCH monitoring and SPS activation may also be reused with minor necessary modification.  Proposal 2: The enabling/disabling HARQ feedback in IoT-NTN based on repetition number for each transmission can also be supported.  Proposal 3: When HARQ feedback for a HARQ process is enabled, the UE is not expected to receive another NPDCCH/MPDCCH carrying a DCI scheduling a NPDSCH/PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until round trip propagation delay after the end of the transmit of HARQ-ACK. |
| R1-2203351  Spreadtrum | Proposal 1: Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling for IOT NTN.  Proposal 2: For an NTN UE configured with one HARQ process, when HARQ feedback is enabled, the UE does not monitor PDCCH until the RTT time has elapsed from the end of the PUSCH.  Proposal 3: For the number of configured HARQ processes is 2 (for NB-IoT in NTN) or larger than 1 (for eMTC in NTN), if HARQ processes is full before the RTT time has elapsed from the end of the PUSCH, UE does not monitor PDCCH until the RTT time has elapsed from the end of the PUSCH. |
| R1-2203390  MTK | Observation 1: for IoT NTN, disabling of HARQ feedback is supported in Rel-18 IoT NTN WID.  Observation 2: for NB-IoT, HARQ stalling reduces data rates by approximately 95% and 49% for GEO and LEO respectively without disabling of HARQ feedback.  Observation 3: for NB-IoT, the maximum latency with 2 HARQ processes with up to 4 HARQ transmissions is 2264 ms.  Observation 4: for NB-IoT, disabling of HARQ feedback avoids the issue of HARQ stalling and allows data rates consistent with cellular NB-IoT / eMTC.  Observation 5: In case of disabling of HARQ feedback, it seems natural if eNB transmitter does not wait for ACK/NACK of current DL packet transmission before scheduling a new/retransmission since the UE does not anyway send ACK/NACK for the current NPDSCH/PDSCH for the corresponding HARQ process.  Observation 6: High reliability can be ensured by RLC ARQ re-transmission.  Observation 7: Impact on resource utilisation with lower BLER target for first transmission with HARQ feedback disabling can be further studied.  Proposal 1: Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signalling in IoT NTN.  Proposal 2: When HARQ feedback for the HARQ process ID is disabled, if a NB-IoT UE receives a NPDSCH transmission ending in subframe n, the UE is not required to monitor NPDCCH in any subframe starting from subframe n+1 to subframe n+12.  Proposal 3: RAN2 can discuss fast RRC configuration for RLC ARQ for IoT NTN. |
| R1-2203392  Lockheed Martin | Proposal 1:  Semi-Static disablement of HARQ feedback through RRC signaling should be supported for at least a single process for IoT NTN (NB-IoT and eMTC).  Proposal 2:  Whether the indication of disablement of HARQ feedback for IoT NTN (NB-IoT and eMTC) should be supported may be FFS. |
| R1-2203747  Sony | Observation 1: RAN1 does not need to consider disabling UL HARQ feedback in IoT-NTN.  Proposal 1:  In the design of HARQ feedback disabling, RAN1 considers the following issues:   * Whether HARQ feedback can be disabled for all HARQ processes * Whether DL HARQ feedback is disabled per-cell, per-UE or per-HARQ process * The protocol layer at which DL HARQ feedback is disabled (RRC, MAC or PHY) * Whether DL HARQ feedback is disabled semi-statically or dynamically * HARQ bundling when HARQ feedback is disabled for some HARQ processes but not for others |
| R1-2203755  Nordic | Proposal 1: At least for eMTC, enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signalling  Proposal 2: In eMTC, for a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until 1ms after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH for that HARQ process.  Proposal 3: In NB-IoT single HARQ case, the gap from the end of the last subframe of NPDSCH to the beginning of NPDCCH is configurable by the UE-specific RRC-signalling and its value could be based on capability indicated by the UE.  Proposal 4: In NB-IoT two HARQ case, the gap from the end of the last subframe of NPDSCH carrying the TB of the second HARQ process to the beginning of NPDCCH is fixed in specification.  Observation 1: A new CSI reporting method or a one-bit feedback channel for UE to suggest an increase or decrease in MCS or repetition value of NPDSCH would be beneficial. |
| R1-2203758  CATT | Proposal 1: Rel-17 IoT functionality on HARQ is recommended as the baseline for HARQ enhancement of IoT NTN.  Proposal 2: Reuse disabling HARQ feedback mechansim of NR NTN for IoT NTN.  Proposal 3: Further study on if HARQ disabling is needed for IoT UE that supports only one HARQ process. |
| R1-2203805  Xiaomi | Observation 1: The main benefit to support HARQ disabling is to resolve the HARQ stalling issue.  Observation 2: HARQ stalling issue happens when the IoT UEs are configured with only one HARQ process.  Observation 3: Further check if HARQ stalling issue happens when the IoT UEs are configured with more than one HARQ process.  Proposal 1: The HARQ disabling can be supported for at least for the IoT UE that is only configured/capable of single HARQ process.  Proposal 2: Dynamic HARQ disabling can be supported at least for the IoT UE configured/capable of one HARQ process. |
| R1-2203840  Nokia | Observation 1: Disabling HARQ feedback for DL transmission can improve the downlink throughput.  Observation 2: Disabling HARQ feedback for DL transmission has some drawbacks, which include 1) network not getting acknowledgement of MAC CE or RRC signal, 2) more resource and higher latency with RLC retransmission, 3) network has no feedback for link adaptation.  Observation 3: When HARQ feedback is disabled, scheduling request from NB-IoT UE may impact NPRACH capacity.  Observation 4: When HARQ feedback is disabled for eMTC/NB-IoT DL transmission, more repetitions are required, which results in higher UE power consumption and higher latency.  Observation 5: Disabling HARQ feedback may adversely impact the link adaptation operation for NB-IoT and eMTC.  Proposal 1: RAN1 studies the impacts of HARQ feedback disabling in eMTC and NB-IoT over NTN, taking into consideration the characteristics of of IoT devices.  Proposal 2: RRC configuration of HARQ feedback per HARQ process for DL transmission is used as a baseline for IoT NTN.  Proposal 3: RAN1 studies switching of HARQ feedback enabling/disabling for IoT NTN.  Proposal 4: RAN1 studies the impact of NB-IoT scheduling request when HARQ feedback is disabled.  Proposal 5: RAN1 studies blind retransmission for UE power saving, spectral efficiency, or latency improvement when HARQ feedback is disabled.  Proposal 6: When HARQ feedback is disabled, alternative long-term feedback can be considered to facilitate link adaptation for NB-IoT/eMTC in NTN.  Proposal 7: RAN1 to discuss the issue of repetition continuation for a HARQ process between two NTN cells. |
| R1-203930  Samsung | Proposal 1: For IoT NTN, enabling/disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be at least configurable per HARQ process via UE-specific RRC signalling.  Proposal 2: Further discuss whether to allow disabling of HARQ feedback for NB-IoT with a single HARQ process, and whether to allow disabling HARQ feedback for all HARQ processes when multiple HARQ processes are configured.  Proposal 3: Further discuss the reporting of additional information by the UE. |
| R1-2203937  NEC | Proposal 1 HARQ feedback could be configured via DCI for IoT devices.  Proposal 2 HARQ feedback configuration mechanism in NR NTN could be applied as a baseline solution in IoT NTN.  Proposal 3 RRC signalling indicates the function that whether the DCI will indicate the HARQ feedback configuration.  Proposal 4 One or multiple HARQ process group can be triggered for HARQ feedback disabled by DCI.  Proposal 5 A criteria for NW configuration enabled and disabled HARQ-ACK feedback switching could be specified. |
| R1-2204012  OPPO | Proposal 1: RAN1 should firstly discuss whether to introduce disabling HARQ feedback for the UE configured with one HARQ process.  Proposal 2: For the UE with two (or more) HARQ process, disabling HARQ feedback can be configurable per HARQ process. |
| R1-2204080  Ericsson | Proposal 1 For LTE-MTC NTN, RAN1 should discuss and consider not disabling the HARQ feedback at least for LEO satellites, since non-negligible data rates in the order of hundreds of kbps are achievable using “ce-PDSCH-14HARQ-Config-r17” and “ce-PDSCH-maxTBS”.  Proposal 2 For NB-IoT NTN, RAN1 should discuss and consider not disabling the HARQ feedback at least for LEO satellites, since non-negligible data rates in the order of hundreds of kbps are achievable using “npdsch-16QAM-Config-r17”. |
| R1-2204268  Apple | Proposal 1: The disabling of HARQ feedback for downlink transmission is configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling.  Proposal 2: In HARQ-ACK codebook construction for PUCCH format 3, 4 or 5, the HARQ codebook does not include the ACK/NACK bits from feedback-disabled HARQ processes.   * UE ignores the DAI field in the DCI scheduling feedback-disabled HARQ process.   Proposal 3: In HARQ-ACK bundling with logical AND operation, ACK is assumed for a feedback-disabled HARQ process.  Proposal 4: For HARQ feedback of each SPS PDSCH, UE follows the per-process configuration of HARQ feedback enabled/disabled for the associated HARQ process.   * The HARQ codebook does not include the ACK/NACK bits from feedback-disabled HARQ processes.   Proposal 5: For DCI indicating SPS PDSCH release, HARQ-ACK feedback is always enabled.  Proposal 6: With additional RRC configuration of HARQ feedback for SPS PDSCH activation, UE reports ACK/NACK for the first SPS PDSCH after activation. Without additional RRC configuration of HARQ feedback for SPS PDSCH activation, UE follows the feedback configuration of the HARQ process for the first SPS PDSCH after activation. |
| R1-2204329  CMCC | Observation 1: Disabling HARQ feedback is beneficial to throughput improvement and latency reduction with the cost of reduced reliability or increased power consumption.  Proposal 1. The disabling of HARQ feedback should be supported for IoT NTN.  Proposal 2. The impact of disabling HARQ feedback on power consumption, as well as whether reliability reduction is acceptable in IoT NTN, needs further study.  Proposal 3. Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback can be configured per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling for IoT NTN.  Proposal 4. Support different configuration on aggregation factor for HARQ process with/without feedback.  Proposal 5. For HARQ codebook in NB-IoT over NTN, the UE can consistently report NACK-only for the feedback-disabled HARQ process regardless of decoding results of corresponding PDSCH.  Proposal 6. For semi-persistent HARQ codebook in eMTC over NTN, the UE can consistently report NACK-only for the feedback-disabled HARQ process regardless of decoding results of corresponding PDSCH.  Proposal 7. For HARQ codebook depending on the DAI for eMTC over NTN, the C-DAI and T-DAI are the count of feedback-enabled processes. |
| R1-2204516  Lenovo | Proposal 1: Disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be supported in Rel.18 NTN IoT as in WID.  Proposal 2: Scenarios/cases applied with the disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmission in IoT NTN should be further discussed.  Proposal 3：Disabling HARQ feedback is configured by RRC signaling, and NR NTN configuration is the baseline solution.  Proposal 4: For IoT NTN DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, (N)PDCCH/(N)PDSCH scheduling restriction should be imposed to allow enough time for UE decoding processing.  Proposal 5: Configuration of HARQ enabling/disabling per HARQ process also applies to SPS PDSCH.  Proposal 6: For SPS PDSCH, ACK/NACK is reported by UE for the first SPS PDSCH regardless of network configuration of enabled/disabled for this HARQ process if additional signal indicated. |
| R1-2204646  Sharp | Proposal 1:  Disabling HARQ feedback for IoT NTN is supported in Rel-18.  Proposal 2:  In IoT NTN, HARQ feedback disabling/enabling is configured per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signalling. |
| R1-2204935  Mavenir | Observations:   * Subsequently transmitting PDSCH after k0 msec with NDI toggling can be regarded as “standard transparent” HARQ disabling, and allows the network to achieve reasonable DL throughput.   + Although HARQ feedback is not used for determining HARQ retransmission decision, the ACK/NACK is still useful for network’s link adaptation. * Further studies are needed if any extra specification is necessary for HARQ disabling. |
| R1-2205059  Qualcomm | Observation 1: For GEO Set 1 deployments, lack of feedback disabled HARQ process(es) results in a throughput/latency penalty of > 11x for UEs with one HARQ process and > 5.5x for UEs with two HARQ processes.  Proposal 1: Specify feedback-disabled HARQ processes for eMTC and NB-IoT over NTN  Proposal 2: RAN1 to support two additional feedback-disabled HARQ process for NB-IoT over NTN, resulting in a total of up to four HARQ processes.   * At most two out of these four HARQ processes will have HARQ feedback enabled, and the soft-buffer storage requirements for NB-IoT UEs will not be impacted.   Proposal 3: For eMTC over NTN, introduce a 4-millisecond gap between successive PDSCH transmissions over the same feedback disabled HARQ process.  Proposal 4: RAN1 to discuss the impact of introducing feedback-less HARQ processes on multi-TB scheduling for eMTC and NB-IoT. |
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