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# Introduction

**CB: # 2004\_NTN\_Feeder\_Link**

**- Is any need for XnAP enhancements to support feeder link switch over?**

**- Alternatively/additionally, is there a need for NGAP enhancements?**

**- Should the assumption be that feeder link switchover coordination is a matter of implementation?**

**- If no enhancements to XnAP/NGAP are foreseen, is there any left over issue on this topic? can the topic be closed?**

(CMCC - moderator)
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# For the Chairman’s Notes

TBD

# Discussion

## Enhancement for feeder link switch-over via Xn

Based on the reference paper provided in this meeting, all companies agree that the enhancement for feeder link switch-over via Xn is not needed in Rel-17.

**Question 1: Do you agree that the enhancement for feeder link switch-over via Xn is not needed in Rel-17?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Ericsson | Agree |
| CATT | Agree |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| Nokia | Agree |
| Thales | Agree |
| China Telecom | Agree |
| Samsung | Agree |
| ZTE | Agree |

## New procedure via Xn for feeder link switch-over

Based on the reference paper [1][3][4], companies agree that the new procedure via Xn for feeder link switch-over captured in TR 38.821 is not needed in Rel-17.

**Question 2: Do you agree that the new procedure via Xn for feeder link switch-over captured in TR 38.821 is not needed in Rel-17?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Ericsson | Agree |
| CATT | Agree |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| Nokia | Agree |
| Thales | Agree |
| China Telecom | Agree |
| Samsung | Agree |
| ZTE | Agree |

## Enhancement for feeder link switch-over via NG

Based on reference paper the reference paper [2], it proposes that the enhancement for feeder link switch-over via NG is not needed in Rel-17.

**Question 3:** **Do you agree that the enhancement for feeder link switch-over via NG is not needed in Rel-17?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Ericsson | Agree |
| CATT | Agree |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| Nokia | Agree |
| Thales | Agree |
| China Telecom | Agree |
| Samsung | Agree |
| ZTE | Agree |

## Leftover issues

If no enhancements to XnAP/NGAP are foreseen, is there any leftover issue on this topic? If no issues, can we close this topic?

**Question 4: Companies are invited to provide the leftover issues to be discussed**. **If no issues, can we close this topic.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Ericsson | This has been on the table for several meetings and up to now no agreement could be found on any potential enhancements. We agree that this topic can be closed. More in general, this seems to be the case in a number of sub-topics for the NTN WI. |
| CATT | In Rel-17, we only concentrated on the centralized coordination for feeder link switch, where all necessary information for feeder link switch is configured via OAM.  Maybe we could further discuss the signalling based solution to support the de-centralized coordination for feeder link switch in Rel-18. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with Ericsson |
| Nokia | No leftover issues for Rel-17. |
| Thales | Agree with CATT |
| China Telecom | Agree with CATT |
| Samsung | Enhancement can be discussed in Rel-18. |
| ZTE | Agree with above, this topic could be closed, any enhancement should be left to Rel-18. |

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]

If needed
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