Draft_R3-212606 - Version 0.0.2
RAN3

1 Introduction

This is the discussion on:

CB: # 9_IoT_NTNarch

(HW - moderator)

Summary of offline disc R3-212606

The 2nd round of discussion:

Please provide your feedback by **25th Tuesday May 12:00 UTC**

The LS was revised by several companies, last version is in Draft_R3-212806was1629 LS reply NTN_IOT_04_hw

The moderator proposes to have agreement on LS R3-212806

If any objection to proceed on this agreements, please provide **comment in section 3**

The first round of discussion:

Please provide your feedback by **21st Friday May 16h00 UTC (18h00 CEST)**

(based on first round, if no convergence, the discussion will continuing next week)

2 Discussion

In the incoming LS [1] (contact Eutelsat) RAN2 ask: RAN3 and SA2 to confirm our understanding of the core network connections to be supported for IoT-NTN in release 17. SA2 provided a reply in [2].

All discussions paper and draft LS provide consitant response in sense there is no work on-going in RAN3 for IoT-NTN.

It is propose to take the Qualcomm reply as a start LS response R3-211629 [6]. Slight preference from the moderator considering the correction to RAN2 on architecture aspect in the initial LS and the expectation on work. If the group has other preference please comment below. Please check the draft_R3-21xxx-was1629 for agreement, in the draft dedicated folder, Feel free to provide revision if needed.

Should RAN3 agree the Reply LS in R3-211629?

Feedback Form 1: Should RAN3 agree the Reply LS in R3-211629?

1 – Huawei Tech.(UK) Co.. Ltd The principle of the LS is fine, but we should also address RAN with comment that these work is not schedule. The question from RAN2 is on confirmation of the feature support which is a RAN decision.... We would like also to express like SA2 that a minimum and none disruptive work is expected in RAN3 See the revisions in draft folder
2 – Ericsson LM We are fine with sending an LS, but the current version sounds a bit over-optimistic ;-) you will find a ”down-to-earth” version in the inbox.
3 – Qualcomm Technologies Int No issue with whatever LS is used however (1) from our view may still need fine tuning of the latest version which is factually ok but perhaps over-negative (anyway business as usual), and (2) not sure the point regarding RAN needs to be made, the LS already states that the two topics are not planned, therefore it is obvious that any change is RAN business.
4 – ZTE Corporation Agree to send the LS, and an editorial change is added.

3 Round 2: LS convergence

The moderator proposes to have agreement on LS R3-212806 (draft available)

If there is any objection to on this agreement please express your view below:

Feedback Form 2: If any objection against, LS R3-212806, please explain:

4 Reference

[1] R3-211432 LS on IoT-NTN basic architecture (RAN2)

[2] R3-211449 Reply LS on IoT-NTN basic architecture (SA2)

[3] R3-212116 IoT NTN Basic Architecture (Ericsson)

[4] R3-212117 [DRAFT] [Reply] LS on IoT-NTN basic architecture (Ericsson)

[5] R3-212215 Discussion on Reply LS on IoT-NTN basic architecture (Huawei)

[6] R3-211629 [DRAFT] Reply LS on LS on IoT-NTN basic architecture (Qualcomm Incorporated)