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# Introduction

One item of the second objective of the Study on NB-IoT/eMTC support for Non-Terrestrial Network relates to HARQ operation.

*The second objective is, for the above identified scenarios, to Study and recommend necessary changes to support NB-IoT and eMTC over satellite, reusing as much as possible the conclusions of the studies performed for NR NTN in TR38.821. This objective will address the following items:*

*- Aspects related to random access procedure/signals*

*- Mechanisms for time/frequency adjustment including Timing Advance, and UL frequency compensation indication*

*- Timing offset related to scheduling and HARQ-ACK feedback*

*- Aspects related to HARQ operation*

This contribution summarizes companies’ views for enhancements on HARQ.

# Summary of companies’ inputs

The large round trip delay in NTN of hundreds of milliseconds compared to the 1ms delay in terrestrial networks will cause a considerable reduction in throughput due to HARQ stalling before HARQ-ACK feedback is received. Solutions such as increasing the number of HARQ processes and disabling the HARQ feedback for NTN operation are considered in NR NTN to minimize the throughput loss. In this meeting, contributions in NTN IoT AI discuss such solutions, along with other enhancements.

Regarding enhancements for HARQ operation in NTN IoT, many companies note that for NB-IoT and eMTC, throughput and latency are not the main requirements and the benefits of introducing enhancements on HARQ targeting higher throughput and low latency should be assessed considering UE complexity and power consumption which are the main characteristics of these IoT devices.

Observations and proposals from companies are listed in Annex A. Agreements on HARQ enhancements in AI 8.4.3 for NR NTN are listed in Annex B.

## Issue 1 (increasing the number of HARQ processes)

Increasing the number of HARQ processes is one of the solutions considered in NR NTN. More HARQ processes can be used for data transmission to mitigate the impact of HARQ stalling although it may not be entirely removed for large delay cases, e.g. GEO with RTT above 500ms. This solution has an impact on UE cost and complexity as the UE needs to support more HARQ processes, hence larger buffer and additional HARQ feedback. Companies’ inputs on increasing the number of HARQ processes for NB-IoT and eMTC in NTN are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1 Summary: issue 1

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 1 | Consider increasing the number of HARQ processes | * **Yes:** Sierra Wireless (for NB-IoT)
* **No:** Oppo, Huawei (for NB-IoT), ZTE, CATT, Vivo, MediaTek, Intel, Lenovo, Spreadtrum (for NB-IoT), Xiaomi, Samsung, Sierra Wireless (for eMTC), Apple, Interdigital
* **Further discuss (** Ericsson, Nokia, Sierra Wireless)
 |
| Reasons to support |  |
| Reasons not to support | * Target is high throughput/low latency, not a priority for NB-IoT/eMTC (Oppo, Vivo, MediaTek, Intel, Lenovo, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Apple)
* UE complexity (Oppo, Huawei, CATT, Vivo, Intel, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, Nokia, Xiaomi, Samsung, Apple, Interdigital)
* Not needed for NB-IoT, existing mechanism for aggregating resources can be used (Huawei, Spreadtrum, Nokia)
 |
| Solutions | Observation 7: In NB-IoT, consider increasing the number of HARQs only in the UL since UE complexity is not a factor. (Sierra Wireless) |

Proposal 1: Increasing the maximum number of HARQ processes for NB-IoT and eMTC in NTN is not supported in Rel-17.

Table 2 Additional inputs: issue 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| ZTE | Agree with proposal 1. But also fine to further discussion since the key issue is justify the required throughput. If no additional needs are considered, keeping current design is 1st choice.  |
| Apple | Agree with the proposal. |
| Huawei | Agree with proposal 1. |
| Ericsson  | In principle we agree that increasing the number of HARQ processes is likely not needed for IoT NTN but since this is a study item, it would seem proper to have a thorough investigation before concluding this topic. |
| Sierra Wireless | Although we feel NB-IOT speeds and battery life could be improved by increasing UL HARQs to 4 without increasing UE complexity, we can go with majority view here. However, we still feel there is unacceptable scheduling overhead for LTE-M because when >=4 repeats are scheduled only one TB per HARQ cycle can be scheduled. This issue should be studied. |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Support proposal 1 |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support this proposal |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | It is a bit premature to make this agreement in this meeting. There may be benefits (which could be studied) of having, for example, additional HARQ process(es) without feedback, to enhance throughput in NTNs. |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| SONY | This needs further study. We share the view with Sierra Wireless that increasing the number of HARQ processes in the UL does not impact UE complexity.We think that HARQ can be stalled in the GEO case, but are not so sure in the LEO case. Whether HARQ is stalled or not depends on the number of repetitions required (if the HARQ transmissions take a longer time to transmit than the RTT, there may not be stalling). We think that there needs to be study on the link budget in order to determine the number of repetitions required. Once this is determined, we will have a better idea of whether there is a stalling problem. |

## Issue 2 (disabling HARQ feedback)

Disabling of HARQ feedback has been agreed in NR NTN: *Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be at least configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signalling*. With this solution, no explicit UL feedback for DL transmission acknowledges a successful transmission and the HARQ process does not need to wait for the feedback before a new data transmission. This can avoid HARQ stalling and consequently throughput degradation. Correspondingly, retransmission at RLC layer (i.e. RLC ARQ) may be required to meet reliability requirements. Typically, ARQ re-transmissions in RLC can have high latency, which might be acceptable as IoT services are generally delay tolerant.

Table 3 Summary: issue 2

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Issue** | **Companies’ views** |
| 2 | Consider disabling HARQ feedback | * **Yes:** CATT (for eMTC CEModeA), Vivo, Intel, Spreadtrum, Samsung, Apple
* **No:** Oppo, Huawei (for NB-IoT), ZTE, CATT (for NB-IoT, eMTC CEModeB), MediaTek, Lenovo (at least for NB-IoT), Xiaomi, Interdigital
* **Further discuss (**Ericsson, Nokia)
 |
| Reasons to support | * Throughput requirement for eMTC CEModeA is higher (CATT)
* Disabling HARQ feedback benefits UE power consumption (Vivo, Spreadtrum, Samsung)
* It can be done by implementation, but it needs to be configurable on a per UE and per HARQ process basis via RRC signalling (Intel)
* Allows the prompt release of HARQ soft buffer to facilitate the reception of new data (Apple)
 |
| Reasons not to support | * Target is high throughput/low latency, not a priority for NB-IoT/eMTC (Oppo, MediaTek, Ericsson, Xiaomi)
* UE complexity (Oppo)
* Not necessary - due to the higher number of repetitions, and low number of HARQ processes in NB-IoT (Huawei, ZTE, CATT, MediaTek, Lenovo, Spreadtrum)
* It can be done by implementation (MediaTek)
* It may not be helpful to save the time for HARQ feedback as the main issue is the time resource occupied by repetitions (Nokia)
* It can’t be applied to NB-IoT with 1 HARQ process (Nokia)
 |

Companies’ views are not aligned and valid reasons for either supporting or not supporting this feature are provided. Since NTN IoT is in study phase, it is suggested to further study disabling HARQ feedback for NB-IoT and eMTC in NTN. Whether to support it or not will be the outcome of further discussions.

Proposal 2: Further study disabling HARQ feedback for NB-IoT and eMTC in NTN.

Table 4 Additional inputs: issue 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| ZTE | Support |
| Apple | Support |
| Huawei  | In principle agree with proposal 2, but possibly we can consider the necessity separately for NB-IoT and eMTC because company comments also depend on which one is in question |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Sierra Wireless | Support |
| Lenovo, MotoM | Support the proposal. For NBIoT, we are OK not to support the HARQ disabling, but for eMTC, especially for CE mode A, we are still open to identify the penitential benefit of throughput and transmission delay with HARQ disabling. |
| vivo | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Although we don’t see the benefit to support HARQ disabling, we are OK to study it. |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support (we also support this in our contribution; our position on supporting at least HARQ process without feedback is missing from the table) |
| CATT | Support the proposal. |
| SONY | Support. Whether there is a need to disable HARQ will partly depend on whether there is otherwise a stalling problem, which depends on the link budget. Further progress on this topic can be made once we have made progress on the link budget. |

## Other issues

Table 5 is a summary of other proposals on HARQ enhancements. An initial categorization of issues based on companies’ proposals and observations is provided.

Table 5 Summary: issues 3 to 10

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **#** | Issue |
| 3 | **HARQ feedback*** Companies’ proposals

Proposal 3: RAN1 should study alternative feedback for HARQ maximizing the performance of the link, incl for UEs with 1 or 2 HARQ processes. (Nokia)Proposal 2: RAN1 to study support for at least one feedback-disabled HARQ process for NB-IoT over NTN. (Qualcomm)Proposal 2: RAN1 to consider disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmissions, which is configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling (Apple)Proposal 2: HARQ feedback can be enabled/disabled per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling as NR (Samsung)* Moderator’s note

Pending agreement of the moderator’s Proposal 2, issue 3 would include the discussion of disabling HARQ feedback, along with other proposals on HARQ feedback.  |
| 4 | **PDCCH monitoring*** Companies’ proposals:

NPDCCHProposal 1: UE shall skip NPDCCH monitoring for the same HARQ process within a given RTT (Asia Pacific Telecom, FGI)NPDCCHProposal 1: RAN1 to study enabling PDCCH monitoring in “waiting periods”—for example, between receiving NPDSCH and transmitting HARQ ACK in NB-IoT—to mitigate suboptimal throughput. (Qualcomm)MPDCCHProposal 1: In order to reduce power consumption, when a UE is scheduled PUSCH in the UL, it does not need to monitor MPDCCH until the RTT time has elapsed from the end of the PUSCH. (Sony)* Moderator’s note

This discussion would be to study mechanisms to reduce PDCCH monitoring related to the HARQ operation. Based on companies’ proposals, the scope would be to reduce UE power consumption.  |
| 5  | **Coverage enhancements*** Companies’ proposals

Proposal 2: Enhancement on data transmission should be considered if scenarios with too large coupling loss and too low CNR are supported. (ZTE)Proposal 4: Study performance improvement of repetition transmission for satellite NB-IoT in the presence of synchronization error (CATT)Proposal 1: it should be evaluated whether current LTE NB-IoT/eMTC HARQ and repetition number can support the max coupling loss as requirement and agreed data rate, in NTN scenarios with different satellite obit. (Nokia)* Moderator’s note

Analysis/evaluation in AI 8.15.1 would assess the performance of the existing transmission schemes (including number of repetitions, HARQ parameters) in NTN. The need for further improvements can be discussed based on the findings in AI 8.15.1, and solutions related to HARQ aspects can be studied in this AI.  |
| 6 | **Uplink transmission gaps with multiple HARQ processes for NB-IoT** (Asia Pacific)Observation 1: If an NB-IoT UE detects a DCI ending in subframe n, the UE may not expect to receive another DCI before subframe n+k-2 for which the corresponding NPUSCH transmission ends later than subframe n+k+255.Proposal 2: Enhancement on two consecutive NPUSCH transmissions might be needed, regarding the existing scheduling restriction on scheduling offset. * Moderator’s note

It can be first discussed the necessity of addressing this issue. The enhanced timing relationships considered in AI 8.15.2 would need to be taken into account.  |
| 7 | **UE assistance** (Samsung)Proposal 4: UE assistance information for HARQ can be supported. * Moderator’s note

It can be also discussed how gNB would use the UE assistance information. |
| 8 | **Serving cell change** (Nokia)Proposal 4: repetition continuation for HARQ process should be studied and repetition from coverage of two cells should be able to be combined, especially for LEO with high speed satellite movement.* Moderator’s note

It can be first discussed the necessity/scenario for maintaining the continuity for the HARQ process when changing cell in NTN.  |
| 9 | **Multiple Transport Blocks per HARQ Cycle (MTBHC)** (Sierra Wireless)eMTCObservation 5: Scheduling multiple TBs per HARQ cycle increases UL speeds by 28% for LEO600.Proposal 2: Study how the variable PDSCH to ACK mechanism for ACK-Bundling can be adjusted to support scheduling more than one TBs per HARQ cycle.Observation 6: To support multiple TBs scheduled in one HARQ cycle for UL, a variable delay between the UL grant and PUSCH would need to be specified.Proposal 3: Specify a variable UL grant to PUSCH delay to support scheduling more than one TBs per HARQ cycle.NB-IoTObservation 10: Scheduling multiple TBs per HARQ cycle increases UL speeds by 31.4% for LEO600.Proposal 4: To support scheduling multiple TBs per HARQ cycle, increase the number of HARQs to 4 in the uplink for NB-IoT.* Moderator’s note

The need/benefit of enhancing timing relationships should consider the time offsets discussed in AI 8.15.2. Pending agreement of the moderator’s Proposal 1, increasing of HARQ processes for NB-IoT may not be considered.  |
| 10 | **TP for TR** (Sony)The IoT-NTN TR captures observations on:• The fraction of the HARQ cycle that is occupied by active PUSCH / PDSCH transmissions• The number of HARQ processes that are supportable in IoT-NTN * Moderator’s note

It can be revisited in a later meeting. |

It is encouraged to provide inputs on the issues listed in Table 5 in order to decide the categorization of the issues and whether or not an issue has to be further discussed.

Table 6 Additional inputs: Issues 3 to 10

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Input** |
| ZTE | Issue 3: Agree with FL’s note. it can be postponed and up to decision of issue 2Issue 4: For this part, the power saving related discussion can be organized together.Issue 5~6: Agree with FL’s notesIssue 7: This is also related to issue 2 since the corresponding assistance information is considered to optimize the scheduling with enabled/disabled feedback as discussed in NR.Issue 8: Agree. This is valid issue, can be treated with higher priorityIssue 9: Agree with FL’s notesIssue 10: Will be handled later once any agreement is achieved |
| Apple | Issue 3: Agree with FL’s note.Issue 4: Power saving is not in the scope of SID.Issue 5: Agree with FL’s note that it can be discussed in AI 8.15.1Issue 6: Uplink transmission gap is discussed in NR NTN HARQ enhancement. We may wait for the outcome from NR NTN. Issue 7: Similar discussion is in NR NTN HARQ enhancement. We may wait for the outcome from NR NTN. Issue 8: Agree with FL’s note.Issue 9: Agree with FL’s note.Issue 10: Agree with FL’s note. |
| Huawei | Issue 3: Agree with FL that this issue can wait until the outcome of issue 2.Issue 4: We don’t see a great urgency for this topicIssue 5: We agree with moderator’s note that the AI8.15.1 has to be addressed first with its link budget analysis. This would indicate the need (if any) for any coverage enhancement.Issue 6: It is best to first conclude on the timing relationship discussion in 8.15.3.Issue 7: Since this is related to the outcome of issue 2, further discussion can wait.Issue 8: We agree with moderator’s note on first evaluating the necessity of maintaining HARQ process continuityIssue 9: it is too early to consider adding HARQ processes particularly in light of the majority of company positions in Issue 1. Bit rate increase is not a key design target for NB-IoT.Issue 10: Agree with FL’s note |
| Ericsson | Issue 3: The need for disabling HARQ feedback for IoT NTN is not clear and needs to be studied before related proposals are considered.Issue 4: The necessity of these proposals is not clear. It should be first justified there is an issue.Issue 5: Agree with the FL’s note.Issue 6: Agree with the FL’s note.Issue 7: This discussion can wait until issue 2 is concluded. The necessity of this is questionable. This has been discussed under NR NTN WI without consensus. Suggest following the progress in the NR NTN WI.Issue 8: Agree with the FL’s note. Issue 9: Agree with the FL’s note.Issue 10: Agree with the FL’s note. |
| Sierra Wireless | Issue 3: Agree with FLIssue 4: Given the large specification impact of PDCCH monitoring changes and the brevity of this work item, PDCCH monitoring changes should not be considered. Issue 5: Desired number of repeats for different SNRs must be studies. This drives the discussion on #HARQ and HARQ feedback and timing aspectsIssue 6: HARQ-ACK timing must be studied, not only for NPUSCH but also for PDSCH and PUSCH in LTE-MIssue 7: Wait for NR NTNIssue 8: Agree with FLIssue 9: Agree with FL. Since LTE-M only allows 1 TB per HARQ cycle when repeats are scheduled, Grant-PUSCH and PDSCH-ACK timing aspects should be studied for LTE-M. Issue 10: Agree with FL |
| Lenovo, MotoM | For issue 3, we agree with moderatorFor issue 4, PDCCH monitoring issue is identified by many companies, so we should get some guideline on which sub-agenda to discuss this issueFor issue 5, enhancement on data transmission needs further study, especially for some scenarios, e.g, cube satellite with limited Tx power and large coverage range for IoT NTN.For issue 6, agree with moderatorFor issue 7, the issue is related to issue 2, and we can trace the progress of NR NTN if necessaryFor issue 8, agree with moderatorFor issue 9. We can consider the multiple TB transmission with single DCI to reduce the delay, but don’t need to increase the HARQ process number, which is not supported in R.16 NBIoT |
| vivo | Considering the large RTT in NTN, we agree to further study the PDCCH monitoring to reduce UE power and increase throughput performance. |
| Xiaomi | For issue 3, we agree with the noteFor issue 4, we don’t see this have strong relevance to HARQ operation.For issue 5, we are supportive to study enhancement on data transmission.For issue 6, agree with moderator.For issue 7, we share similar view with other companies, no need to discuss it at this stage.For issue 8, agree with the note |
| CMCC | Issue 3: Agree with FL that this issue can wait until the outcome of issue 2.Issue 4: Power saving is a key feature for NB-IoT/eMTC application. It needs further study. We agree with ZTE that the power saving related discussion can be organized together.Issue 5: Agree with the FL’s note.Issue 6: Agree with the FL’s note.Issue 7: Wait for NR NTN.Issue 8: Agree with FL’s note.Issue 9: Agree with FL’s notesIssue 10: Agree with FL’s note. |
| Qualcomm | The issue we raised with regards to enabling PDCCH monitoring in waiting periods seems to be “misinterpreted” by some as being some sort of “power saving” proposal. It is not. Our proposal (listed under Issue 4) is about “maintaining throughput”.We actually propose to “enable” NPDCCH monitoring during potentially large “waiting periods”—e.g., when a cell-specific Koffset is configured (according to the worst-case RTT) in a GEO cell, and a UE with a small RTT has to wait a long time between receiving an NPDSCH and transmitting its corresponding HARQ ACK. The large “waiting period” could be “filled” by allowing the network to schedule other DL transmission in that period (e.g., an NPDCCH scheduling a feedback-less HARQ process).We request to kindly capture this proposal under a separate item such as “Throughput considerations for NB-IoT over NTN”. We believe this is an important issue, since in the absence of this, the system throughput can suffer significantly. |
| CATT | Issue 3: Agree with FL proposal.Issue 4: not sure what is the real benefit? Issue 5: agree FL proposal. This issue is important for study, but actually it is not related to coverage enhancement, which should be evaluated in normal case to check the repletion gain can be obtained in IoT NTN.Issue 6: It can be discussed in other AI.Issue 7: Not sure what is detailed solution? Issue 8: agree FL proposal, firstly we need to evaluate the necessity of maintaining HARQ process continuityIssue 9: HARQ process enhancement is not justified in this moment. Issue 10: Agree with FL’s note  |
| SONY | Issue 3: agree with FLIssue 4: scope is to reduce power consumption, which we see as an important KPI for eMTC / NB-IoT. We would be OK to group power consumption issues togetherIssue 5: it is important to determine the amount of coverage enhancement that is required for the studied scenarios. This determination will feed into the other issues discussed under this AI and other AIs. We are not sure that further coverage enhancement (relative to Rel-16) is required.Issue 6: some clarification of this issue is neededIssue 7: not a priority. We can wait for NR NTNIssue 8: agree with FLIssue 9: This could be considered under AI 8.15.3 (is “8.15.2” a typo in the moderator’s note?). The need for MTBHC depends on the link budget and required number of repetitions, as previously suggested in our responses.Issue 10: agree with FL note |
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# Annex A – Companies’ proposals and observations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R1-2100163Oppo | Observation 1: HARQ enhancements in NR-NTN target for achieving higher throughput. Observation 2: K\_offset is introduced to enhance the timing relationship for HARQ-ACK transmission. Proposal 1: HARQ disabling and increased HARQ process number should NOT be supported for NB-IoT/eMTC over NTN. Proposal 2: K\_offset is introduced to enhance the timing relationship for HARQ-ACK transmission for NB-IoT/eMTC over NTN. |
| R1-2100236Huawei | Observation 1: NB-IoT supports aggregation of transport blocks to cover long RTT delays.Proposal 1: There is no need to extend HARQ process number in IoT-NTN.Proposal 2: Disabling HARQ processes is not necessary in IoT-NTN. |
| R1-2100251ZTE | Observation 1: Disable/enable HARQ-ACK feedback may not needed for IoT-NTN.Observation 2: HARQ process number for NB-IoT/eMTC in terrestrial network can be reused for IoT-NTNProposal 1: HARQ enhancement for IoT-NTN may not be needed unless high requirement on the throughput is defined. Proposal 2: Enhancement on data transmission should be considered if scenarios with too large coupling loss and too low CNR are supported. |
| R1-2100368CATT | Observation 1: Increasing the number of processes will cause additional UE cost, which is critical for NB-IoT case.Observation 2: Disabling HARQ feedback doesn’t show clear benefit to NB-IoT use case. Proposal 1: No enhancement is needed for HARQ in NB-IoT over satellite. Proposal 2: Reuse disabling HARQ feedback mechansim of NR NTN for CEmodeA in eMTC NTN, and no need to increase the HARQ process number for CEmodeA UE.Proposal 3: There is no need for the enhancement on HARQ in CEmodeB of eMTC NTN.Proposal 4: Study performance improvement of repetition transmission for satellite NB-IoT in the presence of synchronization error. |
| R1-2100483vivo | Observation 1: The required HARQ process number can be much less than the subframe number in the RTT latency due to the larger repetition factor of IoT transmission.Proposal 1: The HARQ process number can be maintained the same as the NB-IoT/eMTC for TN, the extension of maximal HARQ process number is not supported in NB-IoT/eMTC NTN.Proposal 2: The disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission can be applied to the NB-IoT/eMTC NTN. |
| R1-2100603MediaTeK |  Observation 1: NB-IoT and eMTC data rates in LEO and GEO are sufficient to meet typical data rates for IoT applications.Observation 2: For typical IoT applications, the need to disable HARQ is not high. Observation 3: It is up to eNB implementation if UL HARQ feedback is not disabled for Message 3 during initial access.Observation 4: Doubling the number of HARQ processes from 2 to 4 in NB-IoT is not a priority as it approximately provides a 50% increase in data rates compare to Rel-14 NB-IoT device due to internal scheduling delays and would have high impact on the specifications. By comparison, a Rel-17 NB-IoT device will provide double the data rates compare to rel-14 NB-IoT device. Observation 5: For GEO, the eNB can disable UL HARQ feedback and rely on RLC ARQ to avoid HARQ stalling. It is also up to the eNB implementation to disable UL HARQ feedback in LEO.Observation 6: NB-IoT supports large number of transmissions on the DL and UL (i.e. up to 2048 repetitions and 128 repetitions respectively). This is sufficient to ensure reliability of the first transmission when HARQ is disabled. |
| R1-2100685Intel | Proposal 1: • For NTN the network could disable HARQ feedback for DL transmission for eMTC and NB-IoT with 2 HARQ processeso The enabling/disabling of HARQ should be configurable on a per UE and per HARQ process basis via RRC signallingProposal 2: • Increased number of HARQ processes is not considered in NB-IoT/eMTC NTN SI |
| R1-2100765Lenovo | Proposal 1: The HARQ process number can be maintained the same as legacy for both eMTC and NBIoT.Proposal 2: At least for NBIoT NTN, disabling HARQ is not supported. |
| R1-2100812Spreadtrum | Proposal 1: Number of HARQ process should be kept in IOT NTN.Proposal 2: Disabling/enabling HARQ feedback should be considered for IOT NTN. |
| R1-2100877Sony | Observation 1. Significant amounts of coverage enhancement are required to operate eMTC and NB-IoT in IoT-NTN constellations.Observation 2. The eMTC UL needs to operate in CE Mode B in order to support NTN.Observation 3. A 500 bit transport block is transmitted in approximately 320ms in the UL for either eMTC or NB-IoT.Observation 4: For GEO, 63% (512ms out of 806ms) of the HARQ cycle time is occupied by active PUSCH transmissions when 2 HARQ processes are active.Observation 5: For LEO constellations, the UE processing pipeline can be fully loaded with active PUSCH transmissions when 2 HARQ processes are active.Proposal 1: In order to reduce power consumption, when a UE is scheduled PUSCH in the UL, it does not need to monitor MPDCCH until the RTT time has elapsed from the end of the PUSCH.It is further proposed that the IoT-NTN study item technical report records the types of observation that have been made in this document.Proposal 2: The IoT-NTN TR captures observations on:• The fraction of the HARQ cycle that is occupied by active PUSCH / PDSCH transmissions• The number of HARQ processes that are supportable in IoT-NTN |
| R1-2100933Ericsson | Observation 1 The main motivation for introducing HARQ enhancements for NR NTN is to address throughput stalling due to the large HARQ RTT.Observation 2 The IoT NTN targets delay tolerant applications with low data rates. Therefore, the rationale for enhancing HARQ operation for NR NTN is not applicable to IoT NTN.Observation 3 If delay tolerant, small and infrequent data transmissions continue to be the focused use cases for IoT NTN, HARQ enhancements are not foreseen to be needed.Proposal 1 RAN1 to analyze the necessity of HARQ enhancements for IoT NTN. |
| R1-2100978Asia Pacific | Observation 1 If an NB-IoT UE detects a DCI ending in subframe n, the UE may not expect to receive another DCI before subframe n+k-2 for which the corresponding NPUSCH transmission ends later than subframe n+k+255.Proposal 1 UE shall skip NPDCCH monitoring for the same HARQ process within a given RTT.Proposal 2 Enhancement on two consecutive NPUSCH transmissions might be needed, regarding the existing scheduling restriction on scheduling offset. |
| R1-2101030Nokia | Observation 1: repetition for IoT UE will mitigate the impact of HARQ stalling because of long propagation delay in NTN scenario.Observation 2: based on current LTE NB-IoT/eMTC design for HARQ and repetition, the max MCL cannot be guaranteed with TN link budget results.Observation 3: more HARQ process with more cost/complexity may not help when repetition number is too large.Observation 4: HARQ feedback disabling is not helpful in some of IoT NTN scenarios. Proposal 1: it should be evaluated whether current LTE NB-IoT/eMTC HARQ and repetition number can support the max coupling loss as requirement and agreed data rate, in NTN scenarios with different satellite obit.Proposal 2: reducing repetition number and real requested repetition number should be studied for the requirement of data rate in IoT NTN scenarios.Proposal 3: RAN1 should study alternative feedback for HARQ maximizing the performance of the link, incl for UEs with 1 or 2 HARQ processes.Proposal 4: repetition continuation for HARQ process should be studied and repetition from coverage of two cells should be able to be combined, especially for LEO with high speed satellite movement. |
| R1-2101107Xiaomi | Proposal 1: The number of the supported HARQ process should not be increased for IoT NTN.Proposal 2: HARQ disabling is not supported for IoT NTN. |
| R1-2101245Samsung | Proposal 1: Disabling of HARQ feedback should be supported as NR NTN.Proposal 2: HARQ feedback can be enabled/disabled per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling as NR NTN.Proposal 3: Number of HARQ processes should be kept considering increasing HARQ process number will cause additional UE cost. Proposal 4: UE assistance information for HARQ can be supported. |
| R1-2101323Sierra W |  LTE-M:Observation 2: A higher TBS increase number of repeats but results in faster speeds, increased spectral efficiency, and lower number of required HARQs.Observation 3: With TBS = 504, no additional HARQs are needed for LEO and 1 additional HARQs is needed for GEO to fill gaps for LTE-M.Proposal 1: Do not increase the number of HARQs for LTE-M.Observation 4: Sending grants before the UE has completed PDSCH or PUSCH can double the data rates for LOE600 LTE-M. Note - this does not require any standard changes.Observation 5: Scheduling multiple TBs per HARQ cycle increases UL speeds by 28% for LEO600.Proposal 2: Study how the variable PDSCH to ACK mechanism for ACK-Bundling can be adjusted to support scheduling more than one TBs per HARQ cycle.Observation 6: To support multiple TBs scheduled in one HARQ cycle for UL, a variable delay between the UL grant and PUSCH would need to be specified.Proposal 3: Specify a variable UL grant to PUSCH delay to support scheduling more than one TBs per HARQ cycle.NB-IOT:Observation 7: In NB-IoT, consider increasing the number of HARQs only in the UL since UE complexity is not a factor.Observation 8: A higher TBS increases required transmission time but results in faster speed, increased spectral efficiency, and lower number of required HARQs.Observation 9: With TBS = 504, no additional HARQs are needed for LEO but additional HARQs are needed for GEO to fill gaps for NB-IoT.Observation 10: Scheduling multiple TBs per HARQ cycle increases UL speeds by 31.4% for LEO600.Proposal 4: To support scheduling multiple TBs per HARQ cycle, increase the number of HARQs to 4 in the uplink for NB-IoT. |
| R1-2101371Apple | Proposal 1: The number of HARQ processes is not increased in IoT over NTN.Proposal 2: RAN1 to consider disabling HARQ feedback for downlink transmissions, which is configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signaling. |
| R1-2101404IDC | Proposal 1: Maximum HARQ process number is not increased for NTN NB-IoT/eMTC devices.Proposal 2: Discussion on enhancements to reduce HARQ stalling is deprioritized in NB-IoT/eMTC.Proposal 3: No discussion on the HARQ enhancement issues for IoT NTN until a sufficient progress is made for that in NTN. |
| R1-2101515Qualcomm | Proposal 1: RAN1 to study enabling PDCCH monitoring in “waiting periods”—for example, between receiving NPDSCH and transmitting HARQ ACK in NB-IoT—to mitigate suboptimal throughput.Proposal 2: RAN1 to study support for at least one feedback-disabled HARQ process for NB-IoT over NTN. |

# Annex B - Agreements in NTN 8.4.3

RAN1#102e:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:Enabling/disabling on HARQ feedback for downlink transmission should be at least configurable per HARQ process via UE specific RRC signalingAgreement:The extension of maximal HARQ process number can be considered with following assumptions:* The maximal supported HARQ process number is up to 32.
* FFS: Support on the maximal HARQ process number is up to UE capability
* Minimizing the impacts on specification and scheduling
 |

RAN1#103e:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:For a DL HARQ process with disabled HARQ feedback, the UE is not expected to receive another PDSCH or set of slot-aggregated PDSCH scheduled for the given HARQ process that starts until [X] after the end of the reception of the last PDSCH or slot-aggregated PDSCH for that HARQ process.* FFS: value of X and units in which it is defined.
* FFS: Whether TB of the two PDSCHs needs to be different

**Decision:** As per email decision posted on Nov.13th,Agreement:* Enhanced HARQ process ID indication is supported for DCI 0-2/1-2 and DCI 0-1/1-1 by at least one of following:
	+ Option 1: Slot index as the MSB
	+ Option 1-a:Slot index as the LSB
	+ Option 2: Reusing one bit from other bit field
	+ Option 3: Extending the HARQ process ID field up to 5 bits
* FFS: DCI 0-0/1-0
* Note: 32 is taken as maximal supported HARQ processes number for both UL and DL

Agreement:HARQ codebook enhancement is supported as:* For Type-2 HARQ codebook:
	+ Option-1: Reduce codebook size with:
		- HARQ-ACK codebook only includes HARQ-ACK of PDSCH with feedback-enabled HARQ processes
			* FFS: the details of C-DAI and T-DAI counting for DCI of PDSCH with feedback-enable/disabled HARQ processes
		- FFS: at least DCI for SPS release/SPS PDSCH
	+ Option-2: No enhancement
	+ Other options are not precluded.
* For Type-1 HARQ codebook, further discuss is needed with down selection among following options:
	+ Option-1: No enhancement;
	+ Option-2: Report NACK on disabled process
	+ Option-3: Reduce codebook size with criteria
* FFS: Enhancements for Type-3 HARQ codebook
 |