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# Introduction

*Briefly introduce background, the scope of this email discussion (e.g. list of treated agenda items) and provide some guidelines for email discussion if necessary*

*The WI starts with allocated TUs in RAN4#99. However, RAN4 discussion started already in last RAN4#98bis meeting triggered by an LS from RAN1. RAN4 reached prial agreement in the questions in the Ls in RAN4#98bis, while one aspect was left open related to the RAN1 LS.*

*During this meeting RAN4 is to discuss two separate parts related to the WI:*

1. *Work plan for the WI, and*
2. *Continue the ongoing discussion related to LS and the definition of the reference point.*

Company contributions submitted and handled in this email discussion:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R4-2110850 | Discussion on the reference point for the UE transmit timing error | MediaTek Inc. | discussion |
| R4-2109223 | Discussion on IIoT and URLLC enhancement in RRM | Intel Corporation | discussion |
| R4-2109495 | Discussion on reference point of UE transmit timing error | CMCC | discussion |
| R4-2109895 | Discussion for reply LS of UE transmit timing error | NEC |  |
| R4-2110415 | Propagation Delay Compensation Enhancements for Time Synchronization | Ericsson | discussion |
| R4-2110915 | Initial discussion on Rel-17 URLLC RRM | Huawei, HiSilicon | discussion |
| R4-2110916 | LS on the definition of Reference point for Te requirements | Huawei, HiSilicon | LS out |
| R4-2111153 | Work Plan for Enhanced IIOT and URLLC support | Nokia | Work Plan |
| R4-2111316 | LS response on UE transmit timing error | Ericsson, Nokia, Intel | LS out |

Related CR which are submitted under AI 4.1.7 which technical discussion and TP will be covered in this email discussion:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| R4-2110927**Note: Only change #5 of the CR is to be discussed in this email discussion** | CR on Rel-15 SCell activation, SMTC determination and UL timing 38133 | Huawei, HiSilicon | CR |
| R4-2111313 | Correction to reference point defintion for UE timing in TS 38.133 | Ericsson, Nokia, Intel | CR |

*List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round*

* 1st round:
	+ Initial work plan discussion
		- outcome goal: input to work plan.
	+ Continue discussion related to ‘reference point’
		- outcome goal:
			* agreement on the reference point

Companies are invited to provide their views on the two aspects in Topic #1 and Topic #2 during the 1st round. Topic #2 is split into smaller specific parts in order to reach consensus on the basic foundation of the discussion.

Based on the input from the companies in 1st round, a work plan can be made drafted and potential agreement related to the reference point and Reply LS can be initiated in the 2nd round.

* 2nd round:
	+ Work plan agreement
	+ LS agreement
	+ CR agreement

# Topic #1: Work Plan

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2110415 | Ericsson | Tdoc Title: Propagation Delay Compensation Enhancements for Time SynchronizationProposal 1: RAN4 to pursue one set of Rel-17 enhancement to satisfy the accuracy requirement of propagation delay compensation for all use cases. Observation 1: Work in Rel 17 should also be flexible and allow methods that can scale and target future requirements that may be more strict. Observation 2: None of the TA-based options can satisfy the accuracy requirement range for the control-to-control use case when agreed values for the error components are used.Observation 3: Reducing T\_e from 391ns to a substantially smaller value for the TA-based method is expected to require the UE to make use of a specialized downlink Reference Signal for clock synchronization (e.g. PRS)Observation 4: Reducing Err\_TAG from 260ns to a substantially smaller value for the TA-based method is expected to require the gNB to make use of a specialized uplink Reference Signal (e.g. a wideband SRS).Observation 5: The introduction of specialized reference signals for determining PD values with a substantially reduced uncertainty effectively calls for a new procedure and new signalling, to exchange information, that is distinct from the TA-based propagation delay method for determining PD. Observation 6: None of the TA-based options can satisfy the high end of the accuracy requirement range for the control-to-control use case even if values for the two largest error components are aggressively reduced from their current values.Observation 7: The introduction of reference signals needed to determine PD values with acceptable uncertainty within the context of a TA-based method effectively calls for a procedure, and new signalling, that is new and distinct from existing TA-based methods. Proposal 2: RAN1 does not adopt the current TA-based method for determining propagation delay compensation since even a 75% reduction of the two largest uncertainty components (i.e. T\_e = 391 ns and Err\_TAG = 260 ns for 15 kHz SCS) does not result in a total uncertainty ±275ns or less for a single Uu interface. Observation 8: A pessimistic estimate using worst case PRS bandwidth (24 PRB) and coarsest granularity (16 ns) show that RTT based method is better than an optimized budget for the TA based approach and certainly much better than the baseline estimate, assuming no optimizations. Observation 9: RTT-based propagation delay estimation can satisfy the tighter Uu interface budget of ±145ns to ±275ns for control-to-control use case. Observation 10: The RTT based approach to Propagation Delay Compensation is accurate, flexible, more readily available, hence the RTT based approach can be tuned and adapted flexible dependent actual needs and flexible to meet stricter future requirements. Proposal 3: The WI adopts an RTT-based procedure for propagation delay compensation in Rel-17. |
| R4-2110915 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Tdoc Title: Initial discussion on Rel-17 URLLC RRMProposal 1: RAN4 does not need to define any requirement for PDC based on existing Rel-15/Rel-16 TA procedure and associated granularity.Proposal 2: RAN4 to wait for RAN1 conclusions on enhanced PDC, and can consider to define requirements for the new measurements if they are introduced by RAN1. |
| R4-2111153 | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Tdoc Title: Work Plan for Enhanced IIOT and URLLC supportObservation 1: RAN4 may need to discuss if new minimum BS demodulation performance requirements are needed for PUCCH sub-slot repetition considering all PUCCH formats and for PUCCH multi-slot repetition for the short formats (formats 0 and 2) if it is agreed from RAN1. Observation 2: RAN4 will need to discuss the impacts on UE behavior, including possible new reporting quantities, new test cases and the corresponding UE demodulation performance requirements for the CSI feedback enhancement Case 2 and Case 1 (if bullet 1 or 2 is agreed from RAN1).Observation 3: The TU allocation for NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Perf at [3] does not reflect that the completion date has been postponed for three RAN plenary meetings and therefore, the TU allocation for NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh-Perf should be updated and the start date can be April 2022 RAN4 #102bis.Observation 4: RAN4 may need to investigate carrier switching delay, and any UE requirements of switching carrier for HARQ-ACK transmission. |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

*In the contributions several questions have been discussed. Based on these a number of observations and proposals have been made.*

*To reduce the RAN4 discussion time it is proposed to focus on proposals which are within the RAN4 scope. Hence following proposals will not be discussed (R4-2110415):*

* *Proposal 2: RAN1 does not adopt the current TA-based method for determining propagation delay compensation since even a 75% reduction of the two largest uncertainty components (i.e. T\_e = 391 ns and Err\_TAG = 260 ns for 15 kHz SCS) does not result in a total uncertainty ±275ns or less for a single Uu interface*
* *Proposal 3: The WI adopts an RTT-based procedure for propagation delay compensation in Rel-17.*

*The proposals are seen to be targeted the RAN1 part of the WI.*

*Following 3 proposals will be discussed:*

* *Proposal 1: RAN4 to pursue one set of Rel-17 enhancement to satisfy the accuracy requirement of propagation delay compensation for all use cases.*
* *Proposal 1: RAN4 does not need to define any requirement for PDC based on existing Rel-15/Rel-16 TA procedure and associated granularity.*
* *Proposal 2: RAN4 to wait for RAN1 conclusions on enhanced PDC, and can consider to define requirements for the new measurements if they are introduced by RAN1.*

*No draft Work Plan proposal has been submitted.*

### Sub-topic 1-1

*Sub-topic description: Scope of the RAN4 work.*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

*One company propose that* *RAN4 only pursue one set of Rel-17 enhancements to satisfy the accuracy requirements of PDC for all use cases.*

*It is unclear for the moderator if this is RAN1 or RAN4 related proposal. The proposal seems to address ‘one set of Rel-17 enhancements’ while the RAN4 work would more be related to defining requirements for the chosen enhancements.*

*One company propose that* *RAN4 will not define requirements for propagation delay compensation based on existing Rel-15 or Rel-16 TA procedure and granularity.*

*It is proposed that* *RAN4 wait for further RAN1 progress and agreements related to enhanced propagation delay compensation before considering defining any PDC related requirements for new measurements if such are agreed in RAN1.*

*Moderator encourage the rapporteur to provide a draft work plan for commenting and possible agreement in 2nd round.*

**Issue 1-1: RAN4 should only pursue one set of Rel-17 enhancements to satisfy the accuracy requirements of PDC for all use cases.**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: This is RAN1 decision.
	+ Option 2: Yes.
	+ Option 3: No.
	+ Option 4: Other.
* Recommended WF
	+ More discussion needed.

**Issue 1-2: RAN4 will not define requirements for propagation delay compensation based on existing Rel-15 or Rel-16 TA procedure and granularity.**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: This is RAN1 decision.
	+ Option 2: Yes.
	+ Option 3: No.
	+ Option 4: Other.
* Recommended WF
	+ More discussion needed.

**Issue 1-3: RAN4 wait for further RAN1 progress and agreements related to enhanced propagation delay compensation before considering defining any PDC related requirements for new measurements if such are agreed in RAN1.**

* Proposals
	+ Option 2: Yes.
	+ Option 3: No.
	+ Option 4: Other.
* Recommended WF
	+ More discussion needed.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Sub topic 1-1, Issue 1-1: RAN4 should only pursue one set of Rel-17 enhancements to satisfy the accuracy requirements of PDC for all use cases.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | Option 1.We understand it is up to RAN1 to define possible enhancements to the PDC mechanism.  |
| Intel | Option 1. |
| Nokia | Option 1.The Control-to-control and the Smart Grid scenarios are derived by RAN2 from LS R2-2010837 that RAN2 asks RAN1 to study which PDC methods can be used to satisfy the Uu interface time synchronization budget. We do not see any need for RAN4 to attempt to influence the study in RAN1. |
| Ericsson | Option 2. |
| Qualcomm | Option 4. There are four RAN WGs participating in the PDC enhancements objective. RAN4 may provide inputs but it may not make this decision unilateraly. |
| Apple | Option 1. |

Sub topic 1-1, Issue 1-2: RAN4 will not define requirements for propagation delay compensation based on existing Rel-15 or Rel-16 TA procedure and granularity.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | Option 2.There is no new measurement or procedure, so we see no need for RAN4 to define any requirement.  |
| Intel | No need to draw conclusion. Subject to RAN1 conclusion. |
| Nokia | Option 1.Similar comment as to issue 1-1. This is not up to RAN4 to influence the ongoing study in RAN1 and its possible outcome. |
| Ericsson | Option 2. |
| Qualcomm | RAN4 should wait for further progress in RAN1 before reaching a conclusion. |
| Apple | Similar with QC. It depends on RAN1 progress. |

Sub topic 1-1, Issue 1-3: RAN4 wait for further RAN1 progress and agreements related to enhanced propagation delay compensation before considering defining any PDC related requirements for new measurements if such are agreed in RAN1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | Option 2. |
| Intel | Option 2. |
| Nokia | Option 2 |
| Ericsson | “RAN4 wait for further RAN1 progress and agreements”. Which agreements, in particular, are we waiting for? |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. |
| Apple | Option 2. |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic #1-1, Issue 1-1** | Sub topic 1-1, Issue 1-1: RAN4 should only pursue one set of Rel-17 enhancements to satisfy the accuracy requirements of PDC for all use cases. *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| **Sub-topic #1-1, Issue 1-2** | Sub topic 1-1, Issue 1-2: RAN4 will not define requirements for propagation delay compensation based on existing Rel-15 or Rel-16 TA procedure and granularity. *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| **Sub-topic #1-1, Issue 1-3** | Sub topic 1-1, Issue 1-3: RAN4 wait for further RAN1 progress and agreements related to enhanced propagation delay compensation before considering defining any PDC related requirements for new measurements if such are agreed in RAN1.*Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

# Topic #2: Reference Point discussion

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| R4-2110850 | MediaTek Inc. | Tdoc Title: Discussion on the reference point for the UE transmit timing errorObservation 1: Using the first detected path as reference point results in downlink frame timing detection error being not included in UE transmit timing error (i.e. Te). This contradicts the RAN4 common understanding, which is the downlink frame timing detection error is already included in UE transmit timing error.Observation 2: Using the true arrival time at UE as the reference point for UE transmit timing error (i.e. Te) results in the DL frame timing detection error being included in the Te, which aligns with RAN4 common understating.Observation 3: The UE is only capable of detecting the true arrival time for sufficiently high SINR, and hence the UE should follow the Te requirement for the SINR above that threshold only.Proposal 1: Support studying and modifying the definition of the reference point in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133 to reflect that the downlink frame timing detection error is already included in UE transmit timing error (i.e. Te). Proposal 2: Support using the true arrival time at UE as the reference point for UE transmit timing error (i.e. Te).Proposal 3: Support re-writing the second paragraph in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133 as:The UE shall meet the Te requirement for an initial transmission provided that at least one SSB is available at the UE during the last 160 ms. The reference point for the UE initial transmit timing control requirement shall be the downlink timing of the reference cell minus time (N\_TA+N\_TAoffset)×T\_c. The downlink timing is defined as the true arrival time at UE of the corresponding downlink frame is received from the reference cell. NTA for PRACH is defined as 0.Proposal 4: Support creating a side condition section in Annex B in TS 38.133 for timing requirements to clarify when the UE can detect the true arrival time. The condition is:SSB\_RP and SSB Ês/Iot according to Annex B.x.y for a corresponding Band. |
| R4-2109223 | Intel Corporation | Tdoc Title: Discussion on IIoT and URLLC enhancement in RRMObservation 1: Since there is no way for a UE to know the DL frame timing detection error, it has no choice but to simply use the perceived timing.Observation 2: Test equipment verify the UE transmit timing by comparing the received timing against the transmitted DL signal timing.Observation 3: Although there is no clear requirement specified for DL timing detection error, the UE needs to be good enough to cover detection error in Te to pass the tests.Proposal: Further reply to RAN1 about the correct interpretation for them to take:* Correct interpretation is that the UE takes the first detectable DL path as the reference point to apply (NTA + NTA\_offset) ×Tc
* Since there is no way for the UE to know the ‘true arrival timing’, RAN4 spec specifies the correct UE behaviour
 |
| R4-2109495 | CMCC | Tdoc Title: Discussion on reference point of UE transmit timing errorProposal 1: The interpretation of “the reference point” defined in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133 for UE transmission timing is ahead of the first path (in time) of the corresponding downlink frame is received from the reference cell at the UE antenna. |
| R4-2109895 | NEC | Tdoc Title: Discussion for reply LS of UE transmit timing errorProposal 1: “the reference point” defined in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133 is  ahead of “first detected path (in time) of the corresponding downlink frame”. |
| R4-2110916 | Huawei, HiSilicon | Tdoc Title: LS on the definition of Reference point for Te requirementsObservation 1: The “reference point” in clause 7.1.2 of 38.133 is for “ideal UL timing” instead of “actual UL timing”. If the “reference point” is defined based on “detected path”, then the DL timing detection error is not included in Te.Observation 2: For testing, the “ideal UL timing” is derived based on transmit timing of TE, which is effectively the arrival time of the first path. Observation 3: The current wording for the definition of the “reference point” in 38.133 is confusing. Proposal 1: Update the definition of the “reference point” in clause 7.1.2 of 38.133 from Rel-15:“The downlink timing is defined as the time when the first detectable path (in time) of the corresponding downlink frame from the reference cell arrives at the UE antenna.”Proposal 2: Send LS to inform RAN1 about the updated definition of the “reference point”. |
| R4-2111316 | Ericsson, Nokia, Intel | TDoc Title: LS response on UE transmit timing error* Observation 1: The term first “detected path” (in time) in the definition of the reference point for timing error control requirement in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133 is subject to misinterpretation and confusion. The power of the SSB’s first detected path in time is measured at the UE antenna.
* Observation 2: The UE timing error requirement in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133 is generic and are met for serving cell which has reasonably higher SINR e.g. ≥ -3 dB.
* Proposal #1: Preferred reference point definition for timing error control requirement is as follows:
	+ *The interpretation of “the reference point” defined in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133 for UE transmission timing is (NTA + NTA offset)\*Tc ahead of the time of arrival of the first detectable path at the UE antenna*. ​
* Proposal #2: If proposal # 1 is not acceptable then compromise proposal of reference point definition is:
	+ *The interpretation of “the reference point” defined in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133 for UE transmission timing is   (NTA + NTA offset)\*Tc ahead of the time when the first path (in time) is received from the reference cell at the UE antenna*.
 |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

*The discussion is related to the RAN1 LS received and discussed in RAN4#98bis. In the RAN4#98bis meeting RAN4 agreed on part of the question from RAN1:*

* *Is the downlink frame timing detection error included in UE transmit timing error (i.e. Te)?*

*RAN4 reached agreement on the issue and replied to RAN1:*

*RAN4 has the common understanding that downlink frame timing detection error is already included in UE transmit timing error (i.e. Te defined in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133).*

*Meanwhile, it was also agreed that RAN4 will further discuss the reference point definition in the future to clarify the term. This topic is addressing the definition of the ‘reference point’ which is used currently used in 38.133, section 7.2:*

*The UE initial transmission timing error shall be less than or equal to ±Te where the timing error limit value Te is specified in Table 7.1.2-1. This requirement applies:*

*- when it is the first transmission in a DRX cycle for PUCCH, PUSCH and SRS, or it is the PRACH transmission, or it is the msgA transmission..*

*The UE shall meet the Te requirement for an initial transmission provided that at least one SSB is available at the UE during the last 160 ms. The reference point for the UE initial transmit timing control requirement shall be the downlink timing of the reference cell minus . The downlink timing is defined as the time when the first detected path (in time) of the corresponding downlink frame is received from the reference cell. NTA for PRACH is defined as 0.*

*Based on the input from the different companies there are following options proposed:*

* *use ‘true arrival time’ and define an additional condition when the UE shall be able to detect the true arrival time (MTK)*
* *use ‘first detectable DL path’ (Intel)*
* *add to current condition ‘at the UE antenna’ (CMCC)*
* *define ‘the reference point’ as ‘ ahead of “first detected path (in time) of the corresponding downlink frame”’ (NEC)*
* *use ‘The downlink timing is defined as the time when the first detectable path (in time) of the corresponding downlink frame from the reference cell arrives at the UE antenna.’ (Huawei)*
* *use: (Ericsson, Nokia, Intel)*
	+ *option 1: “the reference point” defined in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133 for UE transmission timing is (NTA + NTA offset)\*Tc ahead of the time of arrival of the first detectable path at the UE antenna.*
	+ *option 2: The interpretation of “the reference point” defined in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133 for UE transmission timing is   (NTA + NTA offset)\*Tc ahead of the time when the first path (in time) is received from the reference cell at the UE antenna.*

*From the proposals there are at least two aspect to discuss:*

1. *Which condition to use and the understanding of the condition used for the reference point/downlink timing:*
	1. *True arrival (with side conditions) at UE*
	2. *detectable by UE*
	3. *detected path by UE*
2. *Whether to additionally include the condition ‘at the UE antenna’*

*From the discussion in last meeting and from the company contributions in this meeting moderator propose to initially get an understanding that RAN4 is discussing the reception/arrival of the signal initial path at the UE, discuss the conditions when a signal can be understood as received/arrived at the UE and then (if these are agreeable) define the conditions.*

*Secondly it then needs to be discussed if the signal is received at the UE antenna connector.*

*Next sub-topics addresses each of these aspects.*

### Sub-topic 2-1

*Sub-topic description: First path arrival at the UE*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

*From all company proposals it seems clear that there is common understanding that RAN4 is* *discussing the reference point/downlink timing of the first path. How to define the first path will be discussed in next Sub-topic 1-2, but initially moderator propose to get common understanding that RAN4 is discussing the ‘first path’.*

**Issue 2-1:** **The reference point/downlink timing refer of the first path at the UE.**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: The reference point/downlink timing refer of the first path at the UE.
	+ Option 2: Other.
* Recommended WF
	+ More discussion needed.

### Sub-topic 2-2

*Sub-topic description: Define conditions and of the conditions for the reference point/downlink timing (first path)*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

*Based on the background and summary in section 2.2 there seem to be many companies which do prefer having a defined understanding of when the signal used as the reference point is received at the UE side. Companies use phrases ‘detected’, ‘detectable’ and ‘true arrival’ while it is not clear or agreed* *when the signal is understood to be ‘detectable’ or ‘detected’ by the UE or ‘truly arrived’ at the UE.*

*One proposed option is to use* *SSB\_RP and SSB Ês/Iot.*

**Issue 2-2: Define the conditions when is the signal is ‘detectable’ or ‘detected’ or ‘truly arrived’ at the UE.**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes.
	+ Option 2: No.
* Recommended WF
	+ More discussion needed.

**Issue 2-3:** **The conditions when the signal is ‘detectable’ or ‘detected’ or ‘truly arrived’ at the UE.**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: When SSB\_RP and SSB Ês/Iot is better than [x]dB.
	+ Option 2: Other.
* Recommended WF
	+ More discussion needed.

### Sub-topic 2-3

*Sub-topic description: Signal is received/arrived at the UE antenna connector*

*Open issues and candidate options before e-meeting:*

A number of companies propose to clarify the reference point/downlink timing is defined as when the signal of the first path is received/arrives at the UE antenna.

**Issue 2-4: It should be clarified that the reference point/downlink timing refer to the signal of the first path being received/arrives at the UE antenna.**

* Proposals
	+ Option 1: Yes.
	+ Option 2: No.
* Recommended WF
	+ More discussion needed.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

Sub topic 2-1, Issue 2-1: The reference point/downlink timing refer of the first path at the UE.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | Option 1. |
| Intel | Option 1. |
| Nokia | Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |
| Qualcomm | Option 1. Choice of ‘first path’ as the reference is consistent with the current wording. RAN4 should only consider changing this aspect of the definition if there is a strong reason to do so. The choice of first path is appealing for ranging applications. From the perspective of supporting the communication function, we think it is adequate although it may not be the only choice.  |
| vivo | If the ‘first path’ means the first path detected by UE, then it is consistent with current specification. We cannot just say first path, which is unknown to both UE and gNB. |
| CMCC | Option 1 |
| NEC | Option 1. We share same view as Vivo. |
| Apple | Option 1 is OK. However, it doesn’t say anything whether the reference point if ideal timing or actual timing. RAN4 has common understanding that Te requirements include DL timing estimiation error. However, seems not everyone has same understanding what reference point is. In our view, reference point is the ideal timing rather than the acutal timing. Reference point doesn’t include DL estimation error. When checking Te requirements in the test, TE compares the UE actual timing with the reference point to see if the timing difference between these two point is within Te or not. UE DL timing estimation error contributes to this timing difference.Therefore, if we want to clarify sth in our spec, we prefer to make it clear that reference point refers to ideal timing, rather than actual timing. |
| MediaTek | We are fine with Option 1: The reference point/downlink timing refer of the first path at the UE. This is because the first path at the UE is the typical indication of the DL frame being received at the UE. |

Sub topic 2-2, Issue 2-2: Define the conditions when is the signal is ‘detectable’ or ‘detected’ or ‘truly arrived’ at the UE.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | Option 2.We prefer to not define the exact condition in the core requirements. In the test, it should be clear when the first path is ‘detectable’ or ‘truly arrived’ at the UE based on the channel profile used for the testing. It is also noted that the visible path depends on the resolution of the timing estimation, which further depends on the RS BW (Te requirements are defined based on SSB).  |
| Intel | Option 2.No condition should be defined otherwise there is no requirement if the condition is not met. The outcome of this discussion is either the condition is too low making no sense or it is too high that no requirement applies for most of the cases. |
| Nokia | Option 2. We don’t think such side condition should be defined for UE transmit timing control.  |
| Ericsson | Option 2. But these three terms should have been different options. There is big difference between detected and detected. We support “detectable”. Truly arrived may cause some confusion. |
| Qualcomm | If RAN4 decides not to define any conditions for detectability then we should expect more questions like the ones asked by RAN1 in the recent LS. Referring to a test case for a very specific test condition is not really an answer.More discussion is needed on this issue but saying nothing is probably not the best course of action.“Truly arrived” is different from detected, in our view. Detected means determined to be present. The term “truly arrived” implies to us that the arrival time is known with certainty (without error). It is different from determining that a signal is present. |
| vivo | Option 2.We don’t think it is feasible to define side conditions for the ‘detected’ or ‘detectable’. It is not only dependent on SINR side conditions, but also on the channel characteristics.‘Truly arrived’ is ambiguous. All the ‘detectable’ or ‘detected’ path will arrive at UE antenna truly. |
| CMCC | Option 2. |
| NEC | Option 2 |
| Apple | Option 2. |
| MediaTek | Option 1: Yes.We need to define conditions for the first path, otherwise the UE will not be able to identify what is the first path at the UE. Besides, the condition will allow us to indicate that the DL frame timing error is included in the UE timing error. |

Sub topic 2-2, Issue 2-3: The conditions when the signal is ‘detectable’ or ‘detected’ or ‘truly arrived’ at the UE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Do not define this kind of condition. |
| Nokia | Option 2 – no need to introduce such side condition. |
| Ericsson | Do not define any side conditions. This is general requirements.  |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 could be a starting point. Here we would need to clarify that we’re concerned with detectability of a signal path. The condition should address multipath fading (unless the core requirement is not applicable in such cases). |
| vivo | We don’t think it is feasible to define the side condition. As commented to Issue 2-2, It is not only dependent on SINR side conditions, but also on the channel characteristics. We may define based on certain channel model, e.g., TDL-C, however it doesn’t mean too much in practice. |
| CMCC | Option 2. |
| NEC | We think these conditions are not required. |
| Apple | We prefer not to have such conditions. We don’t have such condition in early release even in LTE. No problem has been raised. |
| MediaTek | We are fine with Option 1: When SSB\_RP and SSB Ês/Iot is better than [x]dB. In addition, in order to save the time doing research and testing to define the values of [x], we propose that the values of [x] are equal to the SSB Ês/Iot values that are used for the test measurements defined in Annex A.6.4.1.1. |

Sub topic 2-3, Issue 2-4: It should be clarified that the reference point/downlink timing refer to the signal of the first path being received/arrives at the UE antenna

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX |  |
| Huawei | Option 1. We are fine to have the clarification regarding “at the UE antenna”.In addition, to avoid any possible ambiguity, we prefer to use “time when the first path arrives” or “arrival time of the first path” to define the reference point for the Te requirements. “Time when the first path is received” could be mis-interpreted as time of the first detected path. |
| Intel | Option 2.There is no way for the UE to know the timing of arrival. We would like to still try for first detectable path wording in the group in this meeting. ‘first path’ is also a proper approach in our understanding. Test cases are carried out anyway in its way since long ago and nothing has changed. |
| Nokia | Option 1. |
| Ericsson | Our preference is to use ‘detectable’. But we can also compromise on option 1. We have proposed following compromise proposal if detectable is not acceptable.* + *The interpretation of “the reference point” defined in section 7.1.2 in TS 38.133 for UE transmission timing is   (NTA + NTA offset)\*Tc ahead of the time when the first path (in time) is received from the reference cell at the UE antenna*.
 |
| Qualcomm | Option1. In our understanding, the question here is whether a physical reference point should be specified. If we are talking about time of arrival of a signal path then a physical reference point is needed. Otherwise, the time of arrival would be ambiguous. |
| vivo | We support option 2. The current spec itself is clear enough.If company thinks clarification is really needed, the wording is suggested as follows.The reference point/downlink timing refer to the signal of the first path detected by UE being received/arrives at the UE antenna.With adding ‘at the UE antenna’ to the reference timing, it would clarify that there is detection error due to downlink sampling resolution and RF calibration error in the initial uplink transmit timing error. |
| CMCC | Option 1.“received from the reference cell arrives at the UE antenna” or “arrival time of the first path at the UE antenna” will avoid including processing time into Te, which is more clear. |
| NEC | Option 2. We think current spec is clear enough. If majority of compnies think clarification is required we can agree to something on the lines specified by Vivo. |
| Apple | Similar with issue 2-1. If we really want to clarify sth in our spec, we prefer to make it clear that reference point refers to ideal timing, rather than actual timing. |
| MediaTek | We prefer Option 2: No.It is not clear for us what is the difference between with and without mentioning UE antenna? |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize WIs and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| R4-2110927 | CR Title: CR on Rel-15 SCell activation, SMTC determination and UL timing 38133**NOTE: Only comments for Change #5** |
| Huawei: Pending on outcome of open issues |
| Nokia: Support |
| Ericsson: We not agree with change #3. No reason to change anything but SCell measurement cycle to measCycleSCell; Do not agree with any change # regarding "If measObjectNRs configured by MN and SN have different SMTC configurations, Trs is the SMTC with the larger SMTC periodicity." Should be the shorter of the two, in our view. |
| vivo：we do not agree to change ‘detected’ to ‘detecable’. But other changes are fine with us. |
| R4-2111313 | CR Title: Correction to reference point defintion for UE timing in TS 38.133 (Rel-15) |
| Huawei: Pending on outcome of open issues |
| Nokia: This CR is more or less the same as change #5 in R4-2110927, we can support it. |
| vivo：we do not agree to change ‘detected’ to ‘detecable’. But other changes are fine with us. |
| NEC: In our view, detectable causes more confusion than detected. We prefer keeping it detected. Other change is fine with us. |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Status summary**  |
| **Sub-topic #2-1, Issue 2-1** | Sub topic 2-1, Issue 2-1: The reference point/downlink timing refer of the first path at the UE. *Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| **Sub-topic #2-2, Issue 2-2** | Sub topic 2-2, Issue 2-2: Define the conditions when is the signal is ‘detectable’ or ‘detected’ or ‘truly arrived’ at the UE.*Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| **Sub-topic #2-2, Issue 2-3** | Sub topic 2-2, Issue 2-3: The conditions when the signal is ‘detectable’ or ‘detected’ or ‘truly arrived’ at the UE*Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |
| **Sub-topic #2-3, Issue 2-4** | Sub topic 2-3, Issue 2-4: It should be clarified that the reference point/downlink timing refer to the signal of the first path being received/arrives at the UE antenna*Tentative agreements:**Candidate options:**Recommendations for 2nd round:* |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

***Moderator comment****: Note that both CRs are submitted under agenda item 4.1.7. However, in accordance with agreement with moderator of 201 it was agreed to keep the technical discussion and TP related to this work in this email discussion (239).*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation**  |
| R4-2110927 (Only change #5) | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |
| R4-2111313 |  |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

# Recommendations for Tdocs

## 1st round

**New tdocs**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Title** | **Source** | **Comments** |
| Work plan for NR\_IIOT\_URLLC\_enh\_RRM | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | draft workplan for discussion during 2nd round. |
|  |  |  |

**Existing tdocs**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation**  | **Comments** |
| R4-2110927 (only change #5) | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-2111313 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics incl. existing and new tdocs.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
	1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
	2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. For new LS documents, please include information on To/Cc WGs in the comments column
4. Do not include hyper-links in the documents

## 2nd round

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Tdoc number** | **Title** | **Source** | **Recommendation**  | **Comments** |
| R4-210xxxx | CR on … | XXX | Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued |  |
| R4-210xxxx | WF on … | YYY | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
| R4-210xxxx | LS on … | ZZZ | Agreeable, Revised, Noted |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Please include the summary of recommendations for all tdocs across all sub-topics.
2. For the Recommendation column please include one of the following:
	1. CRs/TPs: Agreeable, Revised, Merged, Postponed, Not Pursued
	2. Other documents: Agreeable, Revised, Noted
3. Do not include hyper-links in the documents