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# 1 Introduction

This paper summarizes the following email discussion:

**CB: # NRIIOR1\_PDC**

**- The time synchronization assistance parameters (a time distribution indication and a Uu time synchronization error budget) are introduced over NG, Xn and F1 interfaces?**

**- During the handover, what kinds of time synchronization assistance information should the source gNB notify the target gNB, e.g., ReferenceTimeInfo (periodicity, clock source, and Timestamp of last RTI); TSN reference information (Uncertainty, Time Information Type, TSN distribution, Periodicity) …?**

**- the gNB-DU estimates and provides the compensated time reference value to the gNB-CU?**

**- Capture agreements and open issues**

**- TPs if agreeable**

(Nok - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-215885](Inbox%5C%5CR3-215885.zip)

# 2 For the Chair’s Notes

[TBD]

# 3 Discussion (Phase 1)

Please provide your Phase 1 views (8 questions) by **11:00 UTC Wednesday November 3rd**, so that they may be taken into account during the online session.

## 3.1 Time synchronisation information (NGAP)

Related papers from ZTE [1][2], Nokia [3], Qualcomm [5], Samsung [7], CATT [8], and Huawei [9].

SA2 has agreed that the TSCTSF can provide a **time distribution indication** and a **Uu time synchronisation error budget** to the NG-RAN via the PCF/AMF. The following proposals seem to represent a common denominator for almost all companies:

Proposal 1: Introduce a *Time Synchronisation Assistance Information* IE that includes a *Time Distribution Indication* IE and *Uu Time Synchronisation Error Budget* IE.

Proposal 2: The *Time Synchronisation Assistance Information* IE is a UE-level parameter that can be optionally included over NGAP in the following messages: INITIAL CONTEXT SETUP REQUEST, UE CONTEXT MODIFICATION REQUEST, HANDOVER REQUEST, and PATH SWITCH REQUEST ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.

Proposal 3: The *Time Distribution Indication* IE is encoded as ENUMERATED type having two codepoints (enabled, disabled).

Proposal 4: The *Uu Time Synchronisation Error Budget* IE is encoded as INTEGER type.

Note: The range and granularity of the *Uu Time Synchronisation Error Budget* IE is addressed separately.

**Question 1: Can proposals 1-4 be agreed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Agree |
| Nokia | Yes. |
| ZTE | Yes. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Moderator Summary: TBD |

Regarding the range and granularity of the *Uu Time Synchronisation Error Budget* IE, companies provided the following proposals:

a) range 250ns to 1ms with 50ns granularity [3]

b) range 0 to 1023ns with 1ns granularity [5]

c) range 10 to 900ns with 10ns granularity [7]

d) range 0 to 1000ns with 1ns granularity [9]

For the granularity, most companies prefer a value of 1ns or 10ns.

**Question 2: For the granularity of the *Uu Time Synchronisation Error Budget* IE, please indicate your preference between 1ns, 10ns, either (i.e. no strong preference), or other (please specify)?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | No strong view. But slightly prefer 1ns granularity considering that the maximum value is not so big.  |
| Nokia | 10ns granularity seems sufficient (preferable), but 1ns can also be agreeable. |
| ZTE | We think either 1ns or 10ns is fine. Or wait for the conclusion of SA2. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Moderator Summary: TBD |

For the maximum value, most companies propose values motivated by TS 22.204 Table 5.6.2-1 for the control-to-control (900ns) and smart grid (1000ns) use cases. One company suggests a larger maximum value taking into account other use cases in TS 22.204 Table 5.6.2-1 such as telesurgery (50us) and Rel-18 use cases in TS 22.261 Table 7.8-2 such as trading (1ms) to be more futureproof.

**Question 3: For the maximum value of the *Uu Time Synchronisation Error Budget* IE, please indicate your preference between 1000ns, 1ms, either (i.e. no strong preference), or other (please specify)?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | In general we agree for future proof reason, the maximum value could be set larger than 1000ns. But 50us/1ms value seems not needed. Note that for R16, the error budget maximum value over Uu is around 550 ns (evaluated by RAN1). Lager value seems not needed. So 1000 ns is preferred.  |
| Nokia | Maximum value of 1ms is preferred, since it can already be foreseen that 1000ns is too small for several use cases. |
| ZTE | For vertical application and future proof, we prefer maximum value with 1ms. Or wait for the conclusion of SA2. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Moderator Summary: TBD |

For the minimum value, it is the moderator’s view that a 0 value does not make sense. One option is to choose the minimum value to be the same as the granularity (i.e. minimum value 1ns if granularity is 1ns, or minimum value 10ns if granularity is 10ns, etc.).

**Question 4: For the minimum value of the *Uu Time Synchronisation Error Budget* IE, can the same value as the granularity be agreed? If not, please propose an alternative.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Agree |
| Nokia | Yes. |
| ZTE | Yes. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Moderator Summary: TBD |

## 3.2 Time synchronisation information (F1AP)

Related papers from ZTE [1] and Samsung [7].

Regarding potential F1AP impacts, it is proposed in [1] and [7] that the Uu Time Synchronisation Error Budget must be known by the gNB-DU to decide the reference time distribution to the UEs, e.g. determine the periodicity of SIB9 and/or provide appropriate reference time accuracy. Therefore, the *Time Synchronisation Assistance Information* IE needs to be delivered over the F1 interface.

**Question 5: Should the *Time Synchronisation Assistance Information* IE be provided to the gNB-DU over F1 interface?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Two parameters are included in the assistance information. Not sure whether the *Time Distribution Indication IE* is needed by the DU, since the CU will generate the time reference SIB9 which will be updated by DU accordingly. So it seems no strong need for the DU to be aware of the  *Time Distribution Indication IE.* But we agree the error budget parameter is needed so that the DU can determine the synchronization enhancement configurations (being discussed in RAN1/RAN2).  |
| Nokia | Agree that the *Uu Time Synchronisation Error Budget* IE could be useful to signal over F1 to the DU. The *Time Distribution Indication* IE may also be useful to signal over F1, depending on the signalling design, since it can be used to disable the accurate reference time distribution. |
| ZTE | Yes.In the case of accurate time synchronization by unicast, gNB-CU needs to inform gNB-DU of the Uu time synchronization error budget by the *REFERENCE TIME INFORMATION REPORTING CONTROL* message, so that gNB-DU can provide appropriate reference time accuracy.And in the In the case of accurate time synchronization by broadcast, gNB-CU also needs to inform gNB-DU of the Uu time synchronization error budget (FFS how to design the signalling), so that gNB-DU can re-encode the SIB9 with appropriate reference time accuracy. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Moderator Summary: TBD |

## 3.3 Time synchronisation information (XnAP)

Related papers from ZTE [1], Nokia [4], Qualcomm [5], Samsung [7], CATT [8], Huawei [9][10], and Ericsson [11][12][13].

It seems that all companies that propose to include the **time distribution indication** and a **Uu time synchronisation error budget** (i.e. *Time Synchronisation Assistance Information* IE) over NGAP also propose that the same information be passed over XnAP.

Proposal 5: Introduce the *Time Synchronisation Assistance Information* IE (same as NGAP) as an optional UE-level parameter in the following XnAP messages: HANDOVER REQUEST and RETRIEVE UE CONTEXT RESPONSE.

**Question 6: Can proposal 5 be agreed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Agree |
| Nokia | Yes. |
| ZTE | Yes. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Moderator Summary: TBD |

Then, there are companies proposing that some additional information about the *ReferenceTimeInfo* (RTI) configuration at the source gNB can be passed to the target gNB over XnAP:

1) Periodicity of RTI delivery [9][11]

2) Time Information Type (i.e. *timeInfoType* field of the RTI) [4][11]

3) Uncertainty (i.e. *uncertainty* field of the RTI) [11]

4) TSN distribution (i.e. broadcast or unicast) [11]

**Question 7: Please provide feedback on why the above parameters should or should not be passed from source gNB to target gNB over XnAP.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | One of Proponents of periodicity value. The source node configures the periodicity based on the multiple rounds of the UE assistance information. While during handover, the target gNB has no idea of the Reference Time Information configuration at the source node (e.g., the synchronisation time period broadcast/unicast mode). We consider these configuration in source gNB is useful for the synchronisation time configuration reference by the target RAN. i.e., it can help the target gNB to determine the suitable time sync deliver mode, and deliver period after the handover completion.We are also fine with 4).  |
| Nokia | For (1), in our understanding the gNB determines the periodicity of RTI delivery on its own based on the *Time Synchronisation Assistance Information* IE (received from the CN over NGAP or the source/old gNB over XnAP) and the holdover capability of the UE.For (3) and (4), it is not clear what relevance this information has at the target gNB, i.e. how it would influence the target gNB’s decision on the RTI delivery configuration.For (2), it may be useful if the target gNB uses a different clock type than the source gNB so we are fine to signal Time Information Type. |
| ZTE | There is no need to provide additional parameters (1,2,3, and 4). Based on the RAN2 specification, only *referenceTimeInfoPreference* is provided from UE to gNB, only the *referenceTimeInfoPreference* should be delivered to target gNB during HO, it can already be delivered to target gNB by RRC Container.And for the above assistance information(1,2,3, and 4), they are producedby the source gNB based on the *referenceTimeInfoPreference* and/or *Time Synchronisation Assistance Information*. For the target gNB, it can make an appropriate decision according to the reference time preference of the UE (*referenceTimeInfoPreference*) and/or *Time Synchronisation Assistance Information* from AMF. So, we think it is enough to deliver the reference time preference of the UE (*referenceTimeInfoPreference*) and/or *Time Synchronisation Assistance Information* to the target gNB during HO. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Moderator Summary: TBD |

## 3.4 gNB-based PDC

Related papers from Samsung [6] and Huawei [9].

Two companies propose that RAN3 initiate discussion on gNB-based propagation delay compensation (PDC), citing further progress in RAN2 based on the following agreement at RAN2#115-e:

1. RAN2 assumes that gNB can perform pre-compensation. RAN2 agrees to introduce signalling to enable/disable UE-side PDC.
2. The gNB can enable/disable UE-side PDC via unicast-RRC signalling for Rel-17
3. RAN2 shall wait for RAN1 to decide the measurement framework for RTT based PDC method and does not preclude UE-side PDC or gNB based pre-compensation at this point. RAN2 is expecting guidance from RAN1 on what is needed.

RAN3 briefly discussed gNB-based PDC at the beginning of Rel-17, and an LS was sent to RAN1 and RAN2 which stated that RAN3 will not further discuss gNB-based PDC unless support for the functionality is first confirmed by RAN1/RAN2 [14]. The following agreement was captured in the RAN3#111-e Chair’s Minutes:

**Wait for reply LS from RAN1 and RAN2, before further discussing gNB-based PDC.**

Therefore, it should first be confirmed that companies are willing to reopen RAN3 discussion on gNB-based PDC to perform a RAN3 impact analysis (but still with the understanding that support for gNB-based PDC is up to RAN1 and RAN2 decisions [14]).

Proposal 6: Further discuss the RAN3 impacts of gNB-based PDC, with the understanding (as agreed by RAN3 in [14]) that support for gNB-based PDC is up to RAN1 and RAN2 decisions.

**Question 8: Can proposal 6 be agreed?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei | Agree. Meanwhile we in-principle agree with the proposal in R3-215081. Maybe it can be discussed here. * *The gNB-CU decides whether to use the UE-based PDC or the gNB-based PDC, and the gNB-DU estimates and provides the compensated time reference value to the gNB-CU. So the new UE-associated F1AP procedure and messages are introduced to support gNB-based PDC*
 |
| Nokia | Yes.  |
| ZTE | Yes. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| Moderator Summary: TBD |

# 4 Discussion (Phase 2, if needed)

*Moderator Note: Phase 2 topics (if any) to be decided during online session, e.g. possible TPs for baseline CRs, additional topics for discussion, etc.*

# 5 Conclusions, Recommendations

Capture the following in the Chair’s Notes: [TBD]
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