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# Introduction

A study item on solutions for NR to support non-terrestrial networks (NTN) was completed in Rel-16 [1]. The Rel-17 work item on solutions for NR to support NTN was approved at RAN#86 and the work item description is updated in [2]. One objective is to specify timing relationship enhancements for NTN. The last feature summary from RAN1#103-e on this topic can be found in [3].

In this contribution, we summarize the related issues and proposals based on the contributions submitted to RAN1#104-e under agenda item 8.4.1 [4] – [29].

# 1 Issue #1: Beam-specific K\_offset in initial access

## 1.1 Background

At RAN1#103-e, a cell specific K\_offset configuration was agreed, while beam specific K\_offset was left FFS.

**RAN1#103-e:**

Agreement:

* For K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access, at least a cell specific K\_offset configuration, which is used in all beams of a cell, should be supported.
* FFS: Beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access.

At RAN1#104-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic. There are polarized views on whether to support beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access.

Proposals that support / do not support introducing beam specific Koffset are summarized below, respectively.

**Proposals that support introducing beam specific Koffset**

**[ZTE]:**

Proposal 1: Beam specific K\_offset configured in system information should be supported for UE in and after initial access procedure.

**[CAICT]:**

Proposal 4: gNB has the flexibility of configuring cell-specific or beam specific value of .

**[Zhejiang Lab]:**

Proposal 2: Per beam K\_offset configuration should be supported and for the case of implicit configuration derived from per cell common TA, the difference between the per cell K\_offset and the per beam K\_offset can be signaled in the system information to reduce the signaling overhead.

**[Intel]:**

Proposal 1: Support beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access

**[LGE]:**

Proposal 2: Support beam (group)-specific K\_offset signaling in addition to cell-specific K\_offset.

**[Spreadtrum]:**

Proposal 2: Beam-specific values of K\_offset configuration for initial access should be supported.

**[Interdigital]:**

Proposal-4: beam-specific K-offset indication is also supported optionally

**[CMCC]:**

Proposal 3: For K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access, beam specific system information based beam specific K\_offset configuration, where different beam specific system information may carry different beam specific K\_offset value, can be supported.

**[Xiaomi]:**

Proposal 1: K\_offset configured on a per beam basis should be supported.

**Proposals that do no support introducing beam specific Koffset**

**[Samsung]:**

Proposal 1: Support cell specific Koffset value only.

**[CATT]:**

Proposal 2: Beam specific K\_offset configuration in system information is not supported.

**[Panasonic]:**

Proposal 1: Beam specific Koffset is not necessary.

**[Nokia]:**

Proposal 1: Do not support beam specific K\_offset in system information and used in initial access.

**[Asia Pacific Telecom/FGI/III/ITRI]:**

Proposal 1 Support of beam specific K\_offset in initial access in Rel-17 should be justified with reasonable gain.

**[DCM]:**

Proposal 2: in initial access is a cell-specific parameter. Beam-specific is not supported.

## 1.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 1.2 (Moderator):**

Discuss whether to support beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | We would like to not support beam specific K\_offset configuration in the initial access.  There are three fundamental reasons for deprioritizing this optimization.   1. Following R15 framework, no beam specific SIB and one initial BWP is visible for the UE. For beam specific K-offset, it should clarify how to multiplex beam transmission in one cell. The use case of beam specific K-offset is unclear. 2. In the initial access stage, no strong motivation to optimize the access latency. For NTN, latency is not critical issue. 3. Beam specific SIB design will complicate system design. If inserting multiple K-offset values in each beam, it will increase the overhead. If indicating different K-offset for different beam, then it will introduce beam specific SIB. Either way is not preferred. |
| Thales | Having beam-specific K\_offset and thus multiple Koffset values to be broadcasted will cause quite an increase in signaling overhead and will have specification impact.  Beam-specific K\_offset (via RRC configuration) may be relevant after initial access to mitigate the latency introduced by the cell specific configured for initial access.  We propose to support Cell-specific K\_offset for initial access as per RAN1#103-e agreement and to use Beam-specific K\_offset after the initial access. |
| ZTE | As illustrated in the figure below, for avoiding the frequent updates of K\_offset, the calculation will be based on the worst case, e.g., beam edge assumption, during the service period for each satellite/cell, especially for the fixed beam case. Then, in case of support for multiple beams per cell, larger K\_offset is expected, which will lead to the significant latency for accessing and scheduling. And the performance of initial access will be degraded.    So, additional supports for beam specific K\_offset is beneficial for all cases to allow the high flexibility on the satellite deployment along with other benefits for signaling and efficiency/latency. |
| Intel | In our view the argument that beam-specific parameter in SIB is not supported in Rel. 15 is not a big issue. For beam-specific K\_offset, value for all the beams can be indicated in all beams. Hence, SIB is cell-specific in this case. In our view it is more constructive to discuss the tradeoff between the signaling overhead and initial access latency.  From our perspective we can support beam-specific K\_offset with little additional overhead, for example difference of K\_offset can be indicated counting from beam with minimum K\_offset. Also, granularity of beam-specific K\_offset can be large (e.g. 8 slots), thus large range can be covered with low number of bits per beam (e.g. 2 bits). Thus, our preference is to support beam-specific K\_offset. |
| CMCC | Beam specific K\_offset is beneficial for finer granularity.  Compared to repeat a list of K\_offset values across beams, beam specific SIB, which is only applicable for NTN, can be further considered to reduce signaling overhead. As discussed in our company’s contribution (R1-2101042), the specification impact to support beam specific SIB seems minimal. |
| Panasonic | We are not supportive to introduce beam specific Koffset. Beam-specific Koffset can reduce the delay to some extent in operation with multiple beam per cell compared to cell-specific Koffset. But, considering Koffset value is UE specifically updated after initial access as discussed in section 1.3 below, the delay reduction effect of beam-specific K\_offset is only limited to during initial access. Beam specific offset can be realized by UE specific Koffset indication if needed. |
| Huawei | We acknowledge the benefit of reduced delay for initial access if beam-specific K\_offset values are supported. However, carrying multiple beam-specific K\_offset values in system information would incur a large signaling overhead. Even though there may be ways to optimize the overhead, this solution does not seems to be scalable in general considering that the number of beams per cell may vary a lot in different deployment.  Therefore, we prefer a more scalable solution where the beam specific K\_offset value is carried by Msg2.  Regarding the scheduling delay issue raised by ZTE, we think the K\_offset can anyway be updated either in beam-specific or UE-specific manner after initial access as discussed in Issue #2. The scheduling latency should not be a problem at least for UEs after initial access. |
| MediaTek | For a satellite with multiple beams, the cell-specific Koffset may reduce gNB UL scheduler complexity. Beam-specific Koffset is not essential during initial cell access as the impact on resource utilization to schedule Msg 3 is not likely to be very significant. In connected mode, beam-specific K offset configuration could be beneficial and can be discussed in Section 2. |
| Apple | We do not support beam specific Koffset for the following reasons:   1. Large signaling overhead: multiple Koffset values need to be broadcast so that a UE can select the proper one in the initial access. 2. Acceptable delay of initial access: With a cell specific Koffset which is designed for farthest UE in the coverage, a UE is able to initial access the network with some level of delay. Such delay is only in initial access procedure and can be tolerant. |
| OPPO | We support beam specific K offset for realizing more appropriate K offset values for different beams, in which the differential delay becomes smaller. |
| Qualcomm | There is a tradeoff between the benefit of beam specific Koffset and signaling overhead. Decisioncan be made when comprehensive signaling of system information is considered. |
| Sony | In the initial access phase, cell-specific K\_offset is enough. |
| Spreadtrum | We support beam specific K offset in initial access. Since a cell in the NTN scenario may contain multiple beams and the coverage area of the cell is relatively large, the cell-specific value of K\_offset configuration will bring more serious end-to-end latency. |
| Zhejiang Lab | We support beam specific K\_offset due to the fact that the cell size could be extremely large and using the same K\_offset for the whole cell could introduce unnecessary latency. |
| Xiaomi | We are supportive to beam specific K\_offset due to the observed large differential delay. The signaling details can be discussed latter if signaling overhead is a concern. |
| LG | Support beam specific K\_offset. If signaling overhead is a problem, we could further consider overhead reduction signaling, e.g, beam-group specific K\_offset signaling. |
| Ericsson | Do not support beam specific K\_offset, as the system works fine with cell specific K\_offset in initial access. |
| InterDigital | Support beam specific K\_offset. As it will be supported optionally on top of the cell-specific K\_offset, signaling overhead shouldn’t be a problem. Network could choose either option based on the trade-off between signaling overhead vs initial access latency. |
| vivo | Support beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access.  The beam-specific K\_offset could be broadcast in each beam or broadcast all of K\_offset on a wider beam, which determined by the association between SSB, BWP and beam. |
| Samsung | We think cell specific K\_offset is enough. The residual difference can be managed by gNB with UE-specific offsets. |
| ChinaTelecom | We think the cell specific K\_offset should be the fundamental configuration and whether to apply beam specific K\_offset can be up to gNB. |
| Lenovo/MM | Considering the large NTN cell size, we prefer that beam-specific k-offset is supported in initial access. To reduce signaling overhead, differential k-offset can be used. |
| CAICT | Since there is a tradeoff between system information payload and the access latency, we think it is beneficial gNB has the flexibility whether to support beam-specific K\_offset. |
| Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI | We second Panasonic’s views on this issue. The improvement in reducing the delay for initial access by using beam specific K\_offset is clear. However, the latency improvement for initial access is not critical. Instead, introducing beam specific K\_offset increases the signaling overhead as pointed out by several companies. |
| APT | Do not support beam specific K\_offset.  There would be less than 2ms scheduling gain and only beneficial to Msg3. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support K\_offset configured in system information and require the UE to use it in initial access.  Support K\_offset configuration at cell level only (that is, not on beam level). |
| NTT Docomo | Given our proposal that Koffset is signaled in SIB1 or in SIB following SIB1, we do not support beam-specific Koffset. At least SIB1 is cell-specific in current NR because if SIB1 is beam-specific, UE has to reread SIB1 every time the UE moves the SSB beam, which becomes a problem in the initial access. It is unclear if there is any merit in changing the definition of NR cell. In addition, the system works fine with cell-specific Koffset in initial access and can be updated to UE-specific after initial access. |

## 1.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 27 companies provided views:

* 12 companies support beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access
  + [ZTE, Intel, CMCC, OPPO, Spreadtrum, Zhejiang Lab, Xiaomi, LG, InterDigital, vivo, Lenovo/MM, CAICT]
* 13 companies do not support beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access
  + [CATT, Thales, Panasonic, Huawei, MediaTek, Apple, Sony, Ericsson, Samsung, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, APT, Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell, NTT Docomo]
* Some companies’ positions are not crystal clear from the comments
  + [ChinaTelecom]
  + [Qualcomm] think the decision can be deferred until when the comprehensive signaling of system information is considered.

Given the views expressed so far, the following observations can be made:

* The pros and cons of supporting beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access are clear to the group – same comments have been made by both sides over the meetings.
* It can be seen that there are a large number of companies who do not support beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access. If the proponents cannot convince this large number of non-supportive companies, the discussion would go nowhere.

Considering (1) this issue has been discussed at the last 2 meetings and debated at the first GTW session and email discussion of this meeting and (2) the large number of companies who still do not support, in Moderator’s view, continuing discussion over emails and/or GTW would not help much to change the status. Instead, it is recommended that the proponents to offline discuss with other non-supportive companies to make progress and let Moderator know if there is a possibility for potential consensus. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss issue #1 further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #1:**

On the need of beam-specific Koffset in initial access, proponents are encouraged to have offline discussions with other companies.

# 2 Issue #2: K\_offset update after initial access

## 2.1 Background

At RAN1#104-e, many companies provide views on K\_offset update after initial access.

**[OPPO]:**

Proposal 2: UE-triggered and gNB-controlled K\_offset updating can be considered.

Proposal 3: K\_offset can be updated via RRC configuration or group-common DCI after initial access procedure.

**[Huawei/HiSilicon]:**

Proposal 3: Support updating beam-specific K\_offset via RRC configuration.

Proposal 4: Support updating UE-specific K\_offset via MAC CE.

Proposal 5: Signaling reduction methods should be introduced to relieve the reporting overhead of UE-specific K\_offset.

**[ZTE]:**

Proposal 2: In case of signalling of cell-specific K\_offset for initial access, the updates should be supported in beam-specific way.

**[CAICT]:**

Proposal 5: The value corresponds to UE-specific TA could be used as the updated . UE reports its autonomous TA to the gNB when the corresponding value of is to be changed at the UE side.

Proposal 6: Use cell-specific for the timing relationships related to fallback DCI formats and use updated UE-specific for the timing relationships related to non-fallback DCI formats.

**[VIVO]:**

Proposal 1: After initial access procedure, support updating K\_offset from cell-specific to beam-specific.

Proposal 2: In NTN, cell-specific K\_offset should also be supported even after the initial access procedure.

Proposal 3: The update of K\_offset should be triggered by gNB.

**[MediaTek]:**

Proposal 1: The value of K\_offset can be re-configured after RRC connection setup based on UE-specific autonomous TA report.

Proposal 2: The UE needs to at least report its autonomous TA to the gNB in Message 3 during initial cell access.

Proposal 3: After initial access, the UE-specific TA can be maintained in two ways:

* gNB triggers an autonomous TA report from the UE
* UE initiates report autonomous TA report

**[Intel]:**

Proposal 3: At least for cell-specific and beam-specific K\_offset, update by the gNB after initial access via higher layer signaling (RRC or MAC CE) is supported

* It is not clear if UE-specific K\_offset is necessary

**[LGE]:**

Proposal 3: Support UE autonomous K\_offset updates based on satellite ephemeris.

**[Lenovo]:**

Proposal 1: Support beam specific K\_offset indication by RRC, MAC CE or group common DCI.

**[Spreadtrum]:**

Proposal 3: UE updates the value of K\_offset based on predefined rules should be considered.

**[China Telecom]:**

Proposal 1: the UE updates K\_offset based on predefined rules and the gNB indicates the updating frequency.

Proposal 2: RRC configuration should be supported with a higher authority to calibrate or overwrite the K\_offset estimated by UE.

**[Ericsson]:**

Proposal 2 The value of can be reconfigured after RRC connection setup to be UE specific by RRC reconfiguration.

**[Asia Pacific Telecom/FGI/III/ITRI]:**

Proposal 2 If K\_offset update is supported, updating in a UE-specific manner provides more scheduling gain.

Proposal 3 If K\_offset update is supported, it is signaled to the UE via RRC in a semi-static manner.

**[Interdigital]:**

Proposal-5: support to update the K-offset to a UE-specific delay after initial access and it is up to the network to use UE-specific K-offset

Proposal-6: the UE-specific K-offset value is configured/indicated by gNB after initial access

**[Panasonic]:**

Proposal 2: UE-specifically update Koffset after initial access.

Proposal 3: Support dedicated RRC signalling and indication of relative Koffset value via MAC CE or group common DCI.

Proposal 4: In order to determine UE specific Koffset, UE location report should be utilized if available. If it is not available, UE report of a coarse RTT value should be specified.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 4: Update K\_offset after initial access under network control can be supported.

Proposal 5: Compared to detailed network indication signaling design for K\_offset updating, the study on UE

reporting TA related information for facilitating network updating K\_offset after initial access needs to be prioritized.

**[Xiaomi]:**

Proposal 2: It is preferred to have common signaling to update the K\_offset.

**[Samsung]:**

Proposal 2: More than one of above Koffset configurations can be supported, and using which one is dependent on gNB configuration.

**[Nokia]:**

Proposal 2: Support UE-specific K\_offset for UEs in connected mode

Proposal 3: The UL-DL timing relationships adjustments should be dynamic to follow the propagation variation over time.

Proposal 4: RAN 1 to discuss methods to update K\_offset for all users in the cell.

Proposal 5: RAN1 to discuss signaling alternatives for providing UE-specific K\_offset after Random Access procedure.

**[Apple]:**

Proposal 1: A UE specific is used after initial access.

Proposal 2: Consider the triggering of update is initiated by UE.

Proposal 3: The update is signaled via RRC configuration or MAC CE.

**[Qualcomm]:**

Proposal 2: Support UE specific Koffset based on UE report(s) of UE specific TA.

* Exact mechanisms for UE TA report and associated signalling of Koffset are FFS.

**[DCM]:**

Proposal 5: After RRC connection setup, RAN1 to support either updating in UE-specific manner or introducing negative values to K1/K2 candidate set via RRC configuration.

**[Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI]:**

Proposal 5: The value of should be updated/reconfigure after RRC connection in UE specific manner.

Proposal 6: For UE specific update of , NTN UE should report its acquired TA to gNB.

Proposal 7: NTN UE should report its first TA report as part of MSG3.

Proposal 8: RAN1 to further study the details of NTN UE TA report.

Several observations can be made from the above extensive list of proposals:

* The interest in this topic is high – 23 sources provide input in this regard.
* There is universal support for updating K\_offset after initial access.
* There are diverse views on how to update K\_offset after initial access, including the signaling designs, applicable scenarios, supporting mechanisms, etc.

Consider that (1) this issue has been discussed at RAN1#102-e and RAN1#103-e and (2) universal consensus on the necessity of updating K\_offset after initial access, in Moderator’s view, it is time for the group to move forward to at least agree on the support of updating K\_offset after initial access, which will form the basis for further discussion on how to update K\_offset.

## 2.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 2.2 (Moderator):**

K\_offset can be updated after initial access.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | In general, we are fine to this proposal. But on how to update this parameter, it should have careful consideration. We think two requirements should be followed: 1) gNB can’t frequently update the K-offset; 2) UE assistant information should be minimized. Any complicated signal design should be avoided. |
| Thales | We support the Initial proposal 2.2  How to update K\_offset after initial access can be left FFS.  The UE can be configured with Beam-specific K\_offset to be used after msg3. Of course depending on the beam size this Beam-specific K\_offset will not be optimal for all UEs within the beam coverage.  Alternatively, K\_offset can be equal to UE TA (UE specific TA + Common TA) but the UE needs to report its TA. |
| ZTE | The main intention for updating the K\_offset after initial access is to reduce the latency for scheduling, especially if once the cell specific value is configured before initial access. For the case with beam-specific configuration, single value can be reused in and before. Meanwhile, w.r.t the details for updating, group/beam specific update is preferred to reduce the signalling overhead. We are also open to discuss it later.  So, the following proposal with updates can be considered:  **Updated initial proposal 2.2:**  Updates of K\_offset after initial access is supported if only cell-specific K\_offset is configured before initial access. |
| Intel | Support the proposal. Update of K\_offset should be supported at least for cell-specific and beam-specific K\_offset. |
| CMCC | We are fine to this proposal. How to update K\_offset after initial access can be left FFS. |
| Panasonic | Support proposal 2.2. |
| Huawei | We are fine with proposal to make an agreement that K\_offset can indeed be updated. This is the first step that needs to be nailed down.  However, the details following this agreement are more critical, e.g. whether both beam specific and UE specific are supported, the signaling methods for beam specific and UE specific update (e.g. RRC, MAC-CE, DCI), the necessity and detailed mechanism of UE TA reporting (if required), etc. |
| MediaTek | Support proposal 2.2. |
| Apple | We support the proposal.  Due to large cell size, the propagation delay of UEs in an NTN cell can have large variation. The cell specific time offset used in initial access is not accurate for each individual UE. Hence, we think a UE specific should be used after initial access. |
| OPPO | OK with the FL proposal |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Sony | We suport the proposal. K\_offset can be update in UE-specific fashion. |
| Spreadtrum | We support the Initial proposal 2.2 |
| Xiaomi | Support. We prefer to have common signaling to update the K\_offset to save the signaling cost |
| LG | Support this proposal. |
| Ericsson | Support. |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| vivo | Agree.  When a satellite is deployed, the trajectory of the satellite is basically unchanged. Therefore, the change of K\_offset caused by the satellite movement is predictable for gNB. Hence, the update of K\_offset should be controlled by gNB. |
| Samsung | Support |
| ChinaTelecom | Support the proposal. K\_offset updating can be initiated be UE and gNB controls the updating frequency or calibration. |
| Lenovo/MM | Support the proposal.  K-offset can be updated to beam-specific or UE specific. UE reporting can be adopted to assist gNB configuration of k-offset. And we prefer the k-offset is configured by gNB rather than determined by the UE itself for consistent understanding between gNB and UE. |
| CAICT | Support the Initial proposal 2.2  The details about how to update K\_offset could be FFS. To our opinion, UE-specific K\_offset could correspond to UE-specific TA. In addition, despite UE-specific K\_offset is supported, Cell-specific K\_offset could still be applied in the transition period of RRC reconfiguration, during handover procedure, and etc. |
| Fraunhofer IIS,  Fraunhofer HHI | Support proposal 2.2. How to update K\_offset after initial access can be FFS. Also, we do not see any benefit in restricting the update to only cell-specific K\_offset in the initial access. Potentially, both cell specific and beam specific initial K\_offset update should be supported. |
| Apt | Support **Initial proposal 2.2** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support enabling updates to k\_offset after initial access |
| NTT Docomo | In general, we are fine to this proposal. However, on the other hand, the same benefit can be expected by extending K1/K2 candidate set. After RRC connection setup, RAN1 to support either updating Koffset in UE-specific manner or introducing negative values to K1/K2 candidate set via RRC configuration. |

## 2.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 26 companies provided views on this proposal.

* All support or are fine with this proposal.
* ZTE made a suggestion that the K\_offset update is supported if only cell-specific K\_offset is configured before initial access.
  + Moderator: such restriction on the functionality is not necessary. The proposal does not say K\_offset must be updated. Whether to use the functionality is up to deployment choice. So the current proposal is fine as is.

The following agreement was made at the GTW session on 01/29/2021:

Agreement:

Update of K\_offset after initial access is supported

# 3 Issue #3: Configuration of K\_offset

## 3.1 Background

At RAN1#104-e, many companies provide views on K\_offset configuration.

**[OPPO]:**

Proposal 1: Support explicit configuration of beam-specific K\_offset in system information.

**[Huawei/HiSilicon]:**

Proposal 1: For cell-specific K\_offset used in initial access, down-select from one of the following solutions:

* Solution 1: Derive K\_offset from ra-ResponseWindow and RAR window offset
* Solution 2: Derive K\_offset from common TA and an extra parameter △K

K\_mac can be decided later once the down-selection is done for K\_offset.

Proposal 2: If beam specific K\_offset in initial access is supported, derive the beam specific initial K\_offset from common TA and a differential value carried by Msg2.

**[ZTE]:**

Proposal 3: Proper setting of the unit of K\_offset should be considered to further reduce signaling overhead.

**[CATT]:**

Proposal 1: It is needed to clarify the K\_offset is associated with the RTT between the UE and reference point, and K\_mac is associated with the RTT between the reference point and gNB.

**[Zhejinag Lab]:**

Proposal 1: Implicit signaling of K\_offset value(s) should be supported and the K\_offset value(s) should depend on numerology.

**[Intel]:**

Proposal 2:

* Common timing advance (TA) value can used to determine common slot offset (K\_offset)
* Koffset value should be common for all applicable physical layer procedures

**[LGE]:**

Proposal 1: Support explicit signaling of K\_offset.

**[Spreadtrum]:**

Proposal 1: Explicit signaling of K\_offset used in initial access in system information should be considered.

**[Sony]:**

Proposal 1: When the common timing offset is broadcasted by gNB, the Koffset values should be implicitly defined by calculation at the UE from the common timing offset.

Proposal 2: When the common timing offset is not broadcast by gNB in transparent payload case, the network should signal additional information such as gNB position or distance from the satellite to the UE.

**[Ericsson]:**

Proposal 1 The value of used in initial access is signaled explicitly in system information. How to properly encode with the consideration of other potential NTN related parameters can be discussed at a later stage.

**[Interdigital]:**

Proposal-3: K-offset value is independently determined/indicated from common TA in the system information (Alt-1)

**[CMCC]:**

Proposal 1: Explicit signaling of K\_offset in system information should at least be supported.

Proposal 2: If Common TA based TA determining solution can be further studied, implicit signaling of K\_offset in system information can be further considered to avoid potential signaling redundancy.

**[Xiaomi]:**

Proposal 3: The K\_offset is configured with a unit of millisecond.

**[Qualcomm]:**

Proposal 1:

* The following two offset are carried in system information:
  + Offset\_s
  + Offset\_f
* The scheduling offset for the following timing relationships is calculated as K\_offset=Offset\_s+Offset\_f
  + The transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH (including CSI on PUSCH).
  + The transmission timing of RAR grant scheduled PUSCH.
  + The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH.
  + The CSI reference resource timing.
  + The transmission timing of aperiodic SRS.
* The scheduling offset for the application of MAC-CE commands with DL configuration is calculated as K\_offset=Offset\_f.
* Offset\_f is the common offset used in the calculation of TA of PRACH transmission.
* FFS Beam specific and UE specific Offset\_s.

**[DCM]:**

Proposal 1: is signaled in SIB1 or in SIB following SIB1.

Proposal 3: Support the value of in initial access which corresponds to the largest delay in the cell.

**[Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI]:**

Proposal 1: It must be left to gNB/network to select a value of greater than or equal to the maximum RTD of cell or beam depending on cell specific or beam specific signaling.

Proposal 2: RAN1 to adopt millisecond as the unit of the .

Proposal 3: NTN UE should derive the initial value of from the broadcast system information, e.g., ra-ContentionResolutionTimer and an offset to the start of ra-ContentionResolutionTimer or common/minimum delay.

Proposal 4: NTN UE should derive the initial value of from the broadcast system information, e.g., RRC timers T300, T301, T319, and T310.

Similar to the status at RAN1#103-e, the main discussion point is still about explicit and/or implicit signaling of Koffset, as summarized in the table below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Explicit signaling of Koffset | Implicit signaling of Koffset |
| Pros | * Flexible for gNB to configure * Clean and more forward compatible * Not coupled with other parameters, e.g. unified signaling framework to support both full TA and partial TA | * Save signaling by deriving from e.g.   + Common TA   + Random access related parameters |
| Cons | * Potential signaling redundancy as dependency of different system parameters are not yet clear | * The parameter used to derive Koffset is mandatorily present * Coupling of parameters   + E.g. for common TA, problematic when common TA < RTT   + E.g. if Koffset is beam specific, the parameter used to derive it needs to be beam specific as well |
| Support | [OPPO, LGE, Spreadtrum, Ericsson, Interdigital, CMCC, Qualcomm] | [Huawei/HiSilicon, Zhejiang Lab, Intel, Sony, Fraunhofer] |

In Moderator’s view, based on the current status, it is unlikely that the situation would change much at RAN1#104-e. Further, the discussion on implicit signaling would depend on progress on other topics. Thus, it appears sensible that we leave this discussion FFS until more design aspects of NTN become clearer. For example, it would be helpful if the TA discussion in A.I. 8.4.2 progresses further.

## 3.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 3.2 (Moderator):**

Implicit and/or explicit signaling of K\_offset in system information can be left as FFS until more design aspects of NTN become clearer.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | We prefer explicit signaling for K-offset indication in system information due to clear benefit. If no consensus reached, we are also fine to leave it in next meeting. |
| Thales | We can wait until more design aspects of NTN become clearer  Our preference is for an explicit signalling. |
| ZTE | Agree with FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | Agree to delay the discussion |
| CMCC | Agree with FL’s proposal. |
| Panasonic | Support proposal 3.2. We support explicit signaling because of the features listed as pros. |
| Huawei | Agree with the FL proposal. We continue to support implicit signaling from the signaling overhead perspective. |
|  | Support Proposal 3.2 |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal to design the signaling of Koffset in a later stage. |
| OPPO | In AI 8.4.2, it was already agreed that common TA is explicitly signaled in the system information. It is not very clear what additional information from AI 8.4.2 can further help to reach agreement for K offset signaling here. |
| Qualcomm | It’s clear that two parametrs, one related to service link RTD and one to feeder link RTD, need to be signaled. These two can be called simply offset\_a and offset\_b. Other parameters used in the spec including Koffset are derived from these two including the form parameter\_a=offset\_a. Hence the discussion of implicit vs explicit is not clear to us. We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| Sony | We prefer implicit signaling, but we can support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Proposal 3.2. We prefer explicit signaling of K\_offset used in initial access in system information. |
| Zhejiang Lab | We are in favor of implicit signaling, however, FL’s proposal is reasonable. |
| Xiaomi | Support, we prefer to have explicit signaling in SI to inform UE of the K\_offset |
| LG | Agree with FL’s proposal. We prefer an explicit signaling. |
| Ericsson | Agree with FL’s proposal. |
| InterDigital | Ok with FL’s proposal although our preference is on explicit signaling |
| vivo | Agree |
| Samsung | Fine with proposal. |
| ChinaTelecom | Support Proposal 3.2 |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with the proposal. |
| CAICT | Support the Initial proposal 3.2 |
| Fraunhofer IIS,  Fraunhofer HHI | Agree with FL’s proposal. |
| APT | Support **Initial proposal 3.2**. Prefer explicit signaling of Koffset. We have a concern about dependency, e.g., RAN2 has proposals to use Koffset as an NTN cell indicator to differentiate NTN and TN cells. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support investigation of implicit signaling and more succinct ways to convey K\_offset. |
| NTT Docomo | Fine with the proposal. |

## 3.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 27 companies provided views.

* There is no objection to the Moderator’s proposal.

So, the following Moderator recommendation is suggested. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss this issue further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #3:**

Implicit and/or explicit signaling of K\_offset in system information can be left as FFS until more design aspects of NTN become clearer.

# 4 Issue #4: MAC CE timing relationships

## 4.1 Background

At RAN1#104-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[LGE]:**

Proposal 4: Discuss on whether or not to support the case where DL/UL frame timing at gNB is not aligned.

**[Interdigital]:**

Proposal-1: the scenario where DL and UL frame timings are not aligned at gNB has to be supported in Rel-17

Proposal-2: support K\_mac for DL MAC-CE action time

**[Panasonic]:**

Proposal 5: For DL related MAC CE action timing, K\_mac should be introduced.

**[Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell]:**

Proposal 6: RAN1 to assume long TA as baseline solution and no K\_mac to be introduced in the system.

**[Apple]:**

Proposal 4: The scheduling offset is derived from feeder link RTT and .

Proposal 5: The MAC CE for downlink configuration is activated at UE at the first downlink slot that is after uplink slot where n is the uplink slot when UE sends HARQ-ACK for the PDSCH providing the activation command, is the sub-carrier spacing configured for uplink.

**[CATT]:**

Proposal 3: For the MAC CE action timing, the timing offset between the slot of UE received PDSCH and real effective slot can be configured as .

**[MediaTek]:**

Proposal 4: In the case where the downlink and uplink frame timing are assumed to be aligned at the satellite, on receiving a MAC CE command on PDSCH in DL slot n to indicate an action in the DL or an assumption on the downlink configuration, the UE assumes the command is activated in the DL slot (at UE side) which is the first DL slot after the UL slot , where

* TA is assumed to be zero and the UL slot indexed by is the UL slot where UE transmits HARQ-ACK corresponding to the received PDSCH carrying the MAC CE command.
* kmac is the feeder link RTD between gNB UL slot and corresponding gNB DL slot.

This issue has been extensively discussed in the last two RAN1 meetings, leading to the following agreement. According to this agreement, the relevance of the K\_mac parameter relies on the need to specify the system for the situation where DL and UL are not aligned at the gNB, for example, in the case DL and UL are aligned at the satellite.

**RAN1#103-e:**

Agreement:

Denote by K\_mac a scheduling offset other than K\_offset:

* If downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB:
  + For UE action and assumption on downlink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac is not needed.
  + For UE action and assumption on uplink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac is not needed.
* If downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB:
  + For UE action and assumption on downlink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac **is needed**.
  + For UE action and assumption on uplink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac is not needed.
* Note: This does not preclude identifying exceptional MAC CE timing relationship(s) that may or may not require K\_mac.

Therefore, as suggested by [LGE, Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell], before discussing details of K\_mac, it would be necessary to first discuss whether to support systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB.

Whether or not to support systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB has more impact on gNB vendors. [Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] provide a detailed analysis, leading to the following observations.

**[Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell]:**

Observation 3: If the reference of the system is placed on the satellite, the gNB will need to constantly adjust its transmitting time in DL as well as the UL, introducing a DL-UL timing offset variation 2 times as high as the variation observed in the feeder link delay.

Observation 4: The variation on the UL-DL offset in the gNB is 2 times the variation of the feeder link delay when the reference point is at the satellite.

Observation 5: Aligning UL and DL at the satellite would entail new specification effort in other RAN groups to specify how the timing adjustment must be performed by the gNB, the accuracy levels expected for this operation and testing procedures for product validation. Such modifications are not in line with the commitment with minimal specification changes for NTN working group.

Observation 6: The K\_mac specification is only required when the UL and DL are not aligned in the gNB, therefore K\_mac can be avoided by aligning UL and DL at the gNB.

## 4.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 4.2 (Moderator):**

Discuss whether to support systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | We are not sure what is the intention to have this proposal. In last meeting, we have agreed the time reference point can be configured flexibly. If reference point is set in satellite, the timing misalignment of DL and UL should be supported. From our perspective, supporting the scenario of DL and UL with a time offset is definite. |
| Thales | We agree with the proposal.  We think that we need to support systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB.  When reference point for time synchronization is at the gNB there will be a large timing offset between the DL and UL frame timing at the UE side. We may need to discuss if this is a valid issue to be considered. To mitigate such large Full TA, we might need to consider a static offset between the DL and UL at the gNB. So that the gNB compensates a static RTD (RP-gNB RTD).  Also, please note that in existing specs, when is used the DL and UL are misaligned at gNB as depicted in the figure below (a small shift e.g.  **=** 13.02 µs, in FR1FDD) |
| ZTE | In existing specification, the DL and UL alignment is assumed. Then, it should be taken as the baseline assumption with higher priority. If there is strong preference to enable other deployment with misaligned configuration at gNB, we are open to discuss it if time is available. |
| Intel | We are open to discuss the proposal. In our view both aligned and misaligned timing at the gNB can be supported. |
| CMCC | We agree with the proposal. DL and UL aligned at the gNB can be prioritized. |
| Panasonic | We are open to discuss it. Both DL-UL aligned and misaligned at the gNB can be supported in our view. For GEO, DL-UL timing alignment at gNB would be possible. On the other hand, for LEO, DL-UL timing alignment at gNB might be difficult due to fluctuation of the feeder link delay. The specification should allow both of operations with DL-UL timing alignment and DL-UL timing misalignment. |
| Huawei | At least the case where DL and UL frame timing are aligned at the gNB should be supported. For the case where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB, we would like to understand whether the misalignment between UL and DL will be changing over time. If so, we have a strong concern on the impact the gNB implementation for both reception and scheduling. If the misalignment is fixed, we can support this case with the understanding that this would still bring in some additional scheduler complexity at the gNB side. |
| MediaTek | Whether to support systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB can be de-prioritized. Alignment of DL and UL subframes at gNB or satellite is under discussion in AI 8.4.2. |
| Apple | We think the DL and UL misaligned at the gNB should be supported.  It depends on the timing reference point design in AI 8.4.2. If the timing reference point is not at gNB, then DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB. |
| OPPO | This was extensively discussed in AI 8.4.2. There was no agreement to fix the reference point on gNB or on satellite. Thus, to our understanding, DL and UL misalignment on gNB side is allowed, leading to the reference point on somewhere other than gNB. |
| Qualcomm | Misaligned DL and UL timing at gNB should be supported. Otherwise, we need to define clearly how much offset is allowed to be considered as aligned and if such a definition is feasible. In the meantime, mechanisms that enables tight alignment at gNB can be considered. |
| Sony | We think this issue was resolved in RAN1#103e |
| Spreadtrum | DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB should be supported. |
| Xiaomi | We are open to discuss it. We support to have both cases depending on gNB’s configuration. |
| LG | We agree with the proposal. Prioritizing DL and UL alignment at the gNB is preferred. If the majority companies want to support misalignment, we are open for further discussion. |
| Ericsson | Similar to other major network vendors, we have strong concerns of supporting the case where DL and UL timing are misaligned at gNB, for reasons as elaborated in Nokia’s contribution. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. We need clear guidance whether the scenario where DL and UL misaligned at the gNB should be supported in this WI. In our view, the misaligned DL and UL timing at gNB should be supported. |
| vivo | Support.  If the reference of the system is placed on the satellite, the common timing offset broadcasted by the network can be avoided. Moreover, the variation observed in the feeder link delay include feeder link switch will not affect the UE. Hence, DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB should be supported. |
| Samsung | Fine to discuss. We think that misalignment can be managed by gNB implementation. |
| ChinaTelecom | We think the DL and UL timing misaligned at gNB should be support to enable the RP flexibility. |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with the proposal. And we think that the case when DL and UL are misaligned at gNB side should be supported as the common timing offset is configurable and under control of the network. |
| CAICT | Support the Initial proposal 4.2 |
| Fraunhofer IIS,  Fraunhofer HHI | We are open to discuss. We believe, potentially, both options, i.e., systems with aligned and misaligned DL and UL, can be supported, but aligned DL and UL should be taken as the baseline assumption with high priority. |
| APT | Do not support systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB.   1. This misalignment will change with time at a gNB and it will make a hard time for the gNB to guarantee UE’s processing time, e.g., 3ms, to determine any time overlap between PUCCH and PUSCH, to synchronize UE’s paging timing, or to control UE’s DRX cycles. 2. UE needs to maintain UE-gNB RTT at least for the RACH procedure. This may happen for RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE. This misalignment at the gNB still needs to signal to UEs from time to time.   Setting a reference point (for both UL timing and UL frequency) may have a limit to support ATG and HIBS scenarios. Also, it is somehow against the principle that a serving satellite is transparent to a UE. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Do not support systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB  In special, we oppose the adoption of a system where the DL-UL timing reference in the gNB varies dynamically, as it introduces unnecessary burden to the central node of the RAN. |

## 4.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 25 companies provided views:

* [CATT, Sony] think that RAN1 has consensus already to support systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB.
* All the other companies [Thales, ZTE, Intel, CMCC, Panasonic, Huawei, MediaTek, Apple, OPPO, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, LG, Ericsson, InterDigital, vivo, Samsung, ChinaTelecom, Lenovo/MM, CAICT, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, APT, Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] agree with / support / are fine with the proposal to discuss whether to support systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB.
  + [Thales, Intel, Panasonic, Apple, OPPO, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, Xiaomi, InterDigital, vivo, Samsung, ChinaTelecom, Lenovo/MM, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI] hold the view that systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB can be supported.
  + [ZTE, Huawei, Ericsson, APT, Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] have concerns on supporting systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB, especially if the misalignment is time varying.
  + [ZTE, CMCC, Huawei, MediaTek, LG, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI] hold the view that systems where DL and UL are aligned at the gNB should be prioritized.

Based on the above, several observations can be made:

* It is clear that currently there is no RAN1 consensus to support systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB.
* Many companies think both systems (aligned and misaligned) can be supported. However, there are concerns from other companies, including several major network vendors.
* Several companies propose to prioritize supporting systems where DL and UL are aligned at the gNB.

In Moderator’s view, the success of the NTN feature depends on the joint effort of the whole ecosystem. In this case, if all major network vendors have concerns on the feasibility of supporting systems where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB, it is questionable whether the systems would be eventually implemented in practice, even if they are supported on paper.

By examining companies’ comments, it appears that no one objects that systems where DL and UL are aligned at the gNB should be supported. In fact, several companies propose to prioritize discussing the support of systems where DL and UL are aligned at the gNB.

Based on the above discussion, an updated proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on this updated proposal.

**Proposal 4.3 (Based on the 1st round of discussion):**

Discuss whether to prioritize NTN designs that support systems where DL and UL are aligned at the gNB.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | Agree to prioritize support systems where DL and UL are aligned at the gNB. |
| Huawei | Our view is that we should at least have a system design that no one is doubt of its feasibility. As pointed out by the FL, clearly no one is questioning a system with aligned DL and UL at the gNB would not work. Hence we would be fine to prioritize this case.  As a step further, if there is a semi-static offset between the DL and UL at the gNB, e.g. larger than the N\_TA,offset as it is now, the system can still work even though there may be some additional complexity for both gNB and UE to handle. The MAC-CE timing discussed in issue#5 is an example |
| Xiaomi | In our understanding, it should be up to the gNB’s configuration on whether the DL and UL are aligned at the gNB or not. In this sense, the NTN design should support both cases. Clarification on the “prioritize” is needed. |
| ZTE | We share same views as moderator’s analysis, prioritize the NTN designs with aligned DL and UL at gNB side is one promising way for progress. |
| APT | Support **Proposal 4.3**  We appreciate the intention to enhance the UL timing mechanism by considering the RP at the satellite in Rel-17. However, we believe the RP will eventually move to the satellite in the following releases, e.g., Rel-18, to support inter-satellite link (ISL) for NTN, which will need a regenerative payload at a satellite and as a result, the RP would move to the satellite naturally. Setting the RP at gNB at Rel-17 can easily support the ISL in future releases and that is also one reason we still believe it is a better option. |
| Apple | We do not see the reason why the prioritization should be put on the case where DL and UL are aligned at gNB. The case of DL and UL unaligned at gNB depends on the common TA value broadcast by gNB.  In our view, both cases (i.e., aligned or not aligned at gNB) should be considered with the same priority. |
| CATT | We disagree this proposal.  Whether DL and UL are aligned depends on time reference point configuration. This issue has been resolved in AI 8.4.2.  When the time reference point is configured at satellite, UE will only maintain the timing change of the service link. It will simplify UE behaviors and timing maintenance performance can be guaranteed based on GNSS information and ephemeris information.  When the time reference point is configured at the gNB, the drawback is clear.  Firstly gNB needs to frequently broadcast feeder link timing information to help UE to maintain the timing of feeder link timing. It increases the system overhead.  Secondly it will require UE to maintain both service link TA and feeder link TA. So it will complicate UE implementation. Due to unknow gNB position information, the timing maintenance of feeder link is questionable.  For forward compatibility, if one UE connects one transparent satellite and one regenerative satellite both, the reference point configured at the gNB would make system much complicated. In this case, the optimal reference point is located in satellite.  Actually in existing deployed satellite network, based on our knowledge, we didn’t see the deployment example where UE should maintain the TA change of feeder link for transparent payload scenario.  Hence, from technical point of view, we don’t see the difficulty in case that the time reference point is configured at the satellite, on the contrary, for the reference point configured at the gNB in transparent payload case, we worry about its the feasibility and final performance.  As the network vendor, we are confused that the FL said some “major networks vendors” concerned the feasibility of DL and UL misalignment. Though it will increase network complexity, however, we can guarantee the performance of TA maintenance of the feeder link and simplify UE efforts. When the reference point is configurable, network vendor can choose its favored implementation.  Overall, we think both the time alignment and misalignment of DL and UL can be supported in NTN, if need to set the rank list, we think the misalignment of DL and UL at the gNB should be prioritized. |
| Spreadtrum | In our view, both cases (i.e., aligned or not aligned at gNB) should be supported with the same priority. |
| vivo | We agree with the proposal. The DL and UL are aligned at the gNB can be taken as the baseline assumption with higher priority. |
| Samsung | With having K\_offset, whether to align DL/UL timing at the gNB or not can be managed by the gNB. In this regards, we don’t see the necessity of this prioritization. But we would like to further discuss specification impact according to whether to align DL/UL at the gNB. |
| Intel | In our view both scenarios should have the same priority. However, considering that most of the base station equipment vendors prefer to prioritize the scenario with aligned DL and UL, we can accept the proposal as a compromise. |
| CMCC | We share same views as moderator’s analysis, prioritize the NTN designs with aligned DL and UL at gNB side is one promising way for progress.  Furthermore, it is hard to conclude which option requires more signaling overhead. For example,  When DL and UL are aligned at the gNB, the specific signaling includes common TA.  When DL and UL are not aligned at the gNB, the specific signaling include: K\_mac, RAR window offset indication, etc. |
| Panasonic | Related to the discussion in 8.4.2, feasibility of DL-UL alignment is not clear to us in LEO scenarios where feeder link delay varies and is invisible to UE. This may cause another difficulty or complexity on the system, e.g. precise prediction of the timing fluctuation due to the LEO movement. Therefore, we think DL-UL misalignment case should also be supported and handled with the same priority. |
| Lenovo/MM | From our perspective, we think whether DL and UL are aligned at gNB should be under control of gNB, and there is no necessity to prioritize the case with aligned DL and UL. |
| LG | As a baseline, we prefer prioritizing the case where DL and UL aligned at gNB. |
| Sony | We support the proposal. |
| Thales | We are supportive of the updated proposal 4.3  We have 2 remarks:   * In current specs the UL and DL are not 100% aligned at gNB. We might have an offset ofbetween DL and UL at gNB (Such offset was introduced for TDD Base station, but applies also to FDD to ensure that UL time transmissions are time synchronized when using FDD/TDD Carrier Aggregation.)   Maybe this should be captured in the proposal   * Also, it might be beneficial that the gNB performs some pre/post-compensation of a static RTT (corresponding for example to GW-gNB when gNB and GW are not co-located). **BUT** this could be envisaged in later stage as optimization of the design. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We agreee with Moderator’s view on this topic.  In order to enable further progress on timing and correlated discussions, we support to prioritize NTN designs which supports DL and UL aligned at the gNB.  Alternative designs must be compliant with other NTN and legacy specifications and not require significant specification changes. |
| Fraunhofer IIS,  Fraunhofer HHI | We support the FL’s proposal and analysis. Indeed, support of systems with UL and DL aligned at gNB should be prioritized. |
| OPPO | We share the same view as Xiaomi, CATT, Intel, Apple, Spreadtrum, Panasonic, Lenovo. Both alignment and misalignment cases should be supported. |
| Ericsson | We support Moderator’s view. |

# 5 Issue #5: Exceptional MAC CE timing relationships

## 5.1 Background

[CAICT] propose to consider exceptional MAC CE timing relationships including activation/deactivation of elements in configured CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList and configured SRS resource set.

**[CAICT]:**

(2) Corresponding UL transmission is based on gNB scheduling, such as the activation/deactivation of elements in configured CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList, configured SRS resource set and etc.

For this case, UL scheduling according to the updated MAC CE command is only feasible after this MAC CE command is valid at the gNB side. The scheduling information would reach UE side after one-trip propagation delay. Before UE receives the scheduling information, UL transmission based on scheduling which relates to MAC-CE command should take previous assumed.

**Proposal 8: For a MAC CE command received in DL slot n, where the command is used to indicate to the UE about an action in the UL or an assumption on the uplink configuration, if UL transmission depends on gNB instantaneous UL scheduling, the UE assumes the command is activated in the UL slot (at UE side) , where corresponds to the minimum propagation delay which the instantaneous UL scheduling is needed from gNB to UE.**

In Moderator’s view, making an agreement using the term “if UL transmission depends on gNB instantaneous UL scheduling” will be ambiguous.

Instead, for each exceptional timing relationship, we need to examine the corresponding specification text to make a corresponding analysis and propose a corresponding update of the specification text.

## 5.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 5.2 (Moderator):**

Discuss whether to consider the following MAC CE timing relationships as exceptional:

* activation/deactivation of elements in configured CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList
* activation/deactivation of elements in configured SRS resource set

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | Based on our understanding, these two cases are relevant to MAC processing time, not related to gNB behaviors. So these two cases are not exceptional. |
| ZTE | More discussion is needed and at clarification on the basic assumption (e.g., aligned DL/UL at gNB or not) for such exceptional for MAC CE timing is needed |
| Intel | In our view these cases are not exceptional |
| Panasonic | We see the need to examine the corresponding specification text for each MAC CE in specification updating phase as commented by Moderator.  For these particular cases, we don’t see the need of handling as exceptional cases. gNB may want to reflect the CSI-RS or SRS resource earlier instead of waiting for around 1.5 RTT considering the long propagation delay. It would be up to gNB implementation whether to trigger the UL transmission according to the updated MAC CE command before or after the HARQ-ACK reception at gNB. If gNB triggers the UL transmission before HARQ-ACK reception, robust MCS would be used for the PDSCH containing the MAC CE. |
| Huawei | At least for the case where DL and UL are aligned at gNB, our understanding is as follows:   * For the first case, the action timing should be start from the HARQ-ACK timing. Given there is already K\_offset between the HARQ-ACK and the PDSCH containing the activation/deactivation. We think there is no need to consider additional delay. * The second case is the actiona timing for a UL configuration, we think there is no need to introduce an offset.   The MAC-CE action timing for the case where DL and UL are not aligned can be discussed further. |
| MediaTek | We do not see a need to consider these MAC CE timing relationships as exceptional as long as the UE behavior on DL.UL alignment is clear. |
| OPPO | We think it is still ok for the UE to assume an activation time without k\_mac. The gNB will send a DL scheduling after having received HARQ-ACK. But before that, the UE will not transmit the uplink according to the updated MAC CE. It can be fully controlled by the network. Moreover, in any case, the gNB will first receive the MAC-CE HARQ-ACK feedback before receiving the triggered CSI or SRS. Therefore, the gNB can determine whether or not the MAC-CE command is applied based on the HARQ-ACK information. There is no ambiguity of understanding between UE and gNB. |
| Qualcomm | The potential ambiguity in timing for the above two cases can be readily handled by gNB as indicated by Oppo. Hence additional treatment is considered as unnecessary. Depending on the spec text, it is also possible to consider the introduction of k\_mac. |
| LG | We also think these two cases are not exceptional. |
| Ericsson | Need further discussion as the issue is not clear. |
| Samsung | Need further discussion. |
| Lenovo/MM | From our perspective, these two UL related MAC CE command is not exceptional. We can differentiate the occasion of activation/deactivation of the MAC CE command and the occasion for actual UL RS transmission. The activation/deactivation can be same as other UL related MAC CE command, and whether UL transmission will occur can depends on DCI for scheduling the UL RS. There may be an k-offset between the DCI triggering the UL RS and the UL RS transmission. |
| CAICT | We can discuss this issue based on the assumption that DL/UL is aligned at gNB before Initial proposal 4.2 is decided.  Take “CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList” as an example, According to 38.214, section 5.2.1.5.1:  - When the number of configured CSI triggering states in *CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList* is greater than , where  is the number of bits in the DCI *CSI request* field, the UE receives a subselection indication, as described in clause 6.1.3.13 of [10, TS 38.321], used to map up to  trigger states to the codepoints of the *CSI request* field in DCI.  is configured by the higher layer parameter *reportTriggerSize* where . When the UE would transmit a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information in slot *n* corresponding to the PDSCH carrying the subselection indication, the corresponding action in [10, TS 38.321] and UE assumption on the mapping of the selected CSI trigger state(s) to the codepoint(s) of DCI CSI request field shall be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot where ** is the SCS configuration for the PUCCH.  It is observed in the current spec, MAC indication about A-CSI trigger state subselection is to be valid after corresponding HARQ-ACK is transmitted and processing time is provided. As shown in the following figure, we suppose the MAC CE is to be valid at t3, both by gNB and by UE. After the MAC CE be valid at gNB side, the earliest DCI with A-CSI triggering could reach UE at t4.  C:\Users\yanzy\AppData\Local\Temp\1611728747(1).png  If the UE receives A-CSI triggering DCI during t3 and t4, the DCI was transmitted before t3. UE illustrates the “CSI request” field according to the updated MAC CE and performs corresponding A-CSI report. For gNB, however, it is assumed “CSI request” field corresponds to the previous MAC CE and expects other triggered A-CSI reports.  gNB may ignore the A-CSI reports during these ambiguous periods. However, it is noticed MAC CE related timing relationships are always resolved by specification as MAC CE related UE actions are defined at certain slots. Then, we think it is necessary to specify the UE actions when A-CSI triggering DCI is received during t3 and t4.  Similar situation is for the “SRS resource set” configuration. |
| APT | In the RAN1#102/103 agreements, we do not have any agreements on general MAC CE timing relationships that were given only in Rel-16 NTN SI. Before talking about the exceptional cases, we need an agreement for MAC CE timing to associate Koffset rather than Kmac. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Need further discussion as the issue is not fully clear. |

## 5.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 15 companies provided views:

* It appears that the majority either feel that the issue is not clear or hold the view that it is not necessary to consider activation/deactivation of elements in configured CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList / SRS resource set as exceptional MAC CE timing.
* The proponent [CAICT] provide an explanation describing there might be an ambiguity period about the configuration if the transmission is triggered during the period.
* However, several companies [Panasonic, OPPO, Qualcomm] point out that it can be up to gNB to handle the ambiguity period.

Given the status, it appears sensible that companies examine the comments provided in the first round of discussion and see if there are updated views.

Based on the above discussion, an updated proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on this updated proposal.

**Proposal 5.3 (Based on the 1st round of discussion):**

Regarding whether to consider the following MAC CE timing relationships as exceptional:

* activation/deactivation of elements in configured CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList
* activation/deactivation of elements in configured SRS resource set

companies are encouraged to provide views on these questions:

* Is the issue of ambiguity period described by the proponent [CAICT] a valid issue?
* If the answer to the first question is yes, can the issue of ambiguity period be adequately handled by gNB?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | In systems where DL and UL are aligned at the gNB and corresponding RAN1#103e agreement that k\_mac is not needed, we think there is no need to consider MAC CE timing relationships as exceptional.  The gNB can determine whether the MAC CE for activation/de-activation of CSI or SRS is applied based on the MAC-CE HARQ-ACK feedback. There is no ambiguity between of understanding between UE and gNB.  The case where DL and UL are misaligned at the gNB could be further discussed depending on conclusion in Issue#4 in Section 4.3. |
| Huawei | Q1: Yes. The ambiguity period does exist same as in TN system. Once the gNB sent out the PDSCH carrying the MAC-CE activation, the gNB has no idea when the activation has been applied at the UE unless an HARQ-ACK corresponding to the PDSCH carrying the MAC-CE activation.  Q2: Our understanding is that the gNB is aware of this ambiguity period. Hence this be handled by proper gNB implementation, e.g. avoid CSI and SRS transmission during the ambiguity period or some of the CSI triggering state or SRS resource set are kept unchanged and used for the ambiguity period. |
| ZTE | From our perspective, both issues are not valid since for the MAC CE carrying CSI-AperiodicTriggerStateList, same mechanism on timing of activation/deactivation of MAC CE is assumed with after the HARQ-ACK transmission. For the UL part, follow the same agreement that no enhancement in case of aligned DL and UL at gNB side is needed and no needed to take it as “special” case. |
| APT | Q1: Yes.  Q2: Yes. Up to NW implementation. if a gNB has UE-gNB RTT, the gNB shall be aware of this ambiguity period and prevent UE receives A-CSI triggering DCI during t3 and t4. |
| CATT | Before gNB gets the HARQ-ACK of the PDSCH carrying the MAC CE, gNB would have one ambiguity period.  Based on this observation, we think it is needed to define an additional timing offset to ensure UE and gNB have same understanding. |
| Spreadtrum | Q1: Yes.  Q2: The issue of ambiguity period be adequately handled by gNB implementation. |
| Samsung | Since the TA will be managed by the gNB, then gNB will be aware of when the MAC CE is activated/deactivated. So, we are not sure that we need to make those cases as exceptional. |
| Intel | We don’t see the issue of ambiguity period if full RTT is compensated via TA at least for the case when UL and DL frames are aligned at the gNB as it is shown in the figure below. |
| CMCC | Q1: Yes. The ambiguity period does exist same as in TN system.  Q2: Yes. This issue can be handled by proper gNB implementation. |
| Panasonic | Because “slot *n*” in the specification text is based on DL slot, there would be no ambiguity period.  “UE assumption on the mapping of the selected CSI trigger state(s) to the codepoint(s) of DCI CSI request field shall be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot ”  Therefore, the same principle as agreed in RAN1#103e can be applied in our view, i.e. kmac is needed for DL-UL misalignment case while kmac is not needed for DL-UL alignment case. |
| CAICT | The issue is valid due to ambiguity period about the configuration assumption.  It is not about when to transmit triggered A-CSI and When to transmit A-SRS which offset could be included by DCI->PUSCH and DCI-> A-SRS timing relationship. It is about which A-CSI report/A-SRS is triggered.  In TN system, the only misalignment between gNB and UE is when UL grant is transmitted by gNB before MAC CE is valid while the corresponding UL transmission (PUSCH for A-CSI/A-SRS) is after the MAC CE is valid. The time difference could be controlled by K1 for DCI-> PUSCH or slot offset for A-SRS triggering.  In NTN, we are resolving timing relationship issues caused by propagation delay. The spec always has clean specification solutions for MAC CE related UE actions for a certain slot. For this, was specified in the MAC procedures. So we think specification solutions are needed for this issue. |
| Lenovo/MM | We think the ambiguity period can be avoid by gNB configuration. |
| LG | Our understanding is same with other companies. Two issues can be resolved by NW implementation and therefore no need to take these as exceptional cases. |
| Sony | The issue of ambiguity period is valid for the same reason as the extra offset is needed in **Proposal 6.3 (Based on the 1st round of discussion).**  It can be handled by the gNB but not transparently. If an offset were specified to the MAC CE activation time, the resolution would be transparent to the gNB. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | At the current stage:  - there is no agreeements about the necessity to introduce K\_mac for MAC CE commands or how it should be interpreted  - There is ongoing discussion about prioritizing UL/DL alignment at the gNB.  Hence, we believe we should first decide on the main cases before discussing exceptions to the general rule. Especially since the problem is not clear for some companies yet, as the first round of discussions show. |
| OPPO | We don’t see it as an issue. |
| Ericsson | It seems the issue can be handled by gNB implementation. |

# 6 Issue #6: Timing relationship of TA command

## 6.1 Background

At RAN1#104-e, a few companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[Asia Pacific Telecom/FGI/III/ITRI]:**

Proposal 4 For a timing advance command received on uplink slot n, the corresponding adjustment of the uplink transmission timing applies from the beginning of uplink slot n + k + K\_TAC + 1, where K\_TAC may be the same or different values as K\_offset.

**[Apple]:**

Proposal 6: The TA command MAC CE is activated at uplink slot n+k+1, where n is the uplink slot when PDSCH carrying TA command MAC CE is received, and k is UE’s PDSCH processing time.

As some more background information, the adjustment of the uplink transmission timing corresponding to a timing advance command MAC CE is as follows:

Section 4.2, TS 38.213:

For a timing advance command received on uplink slot  and for a transmission other than a PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL grant as described in Subclause 8.3, the corresponding adjustment of the uplink transmission timing applies from the beginning of uplink slot  where ,…

Hence, for a timing advance MAC CE command received on uplink slot , the corresponding adjustment of the uplink transmission timing applies from the beginning of uplink slot . The timing is defined solely from UL timing perspective. So, it seems that the timing is not impacted by the large offset in the UE's DL and UL frame timing and thus enhancement appears not needed.

Given the 2 views on this topic are polarized, it will be beneficial to collect more views from companies in order to make progress.

## 6.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 6.2 (Moderator):**

Discuss whether the timing relationship of timing advance MAC CE command need additional timing offset or not.

* Option 1: Needed
  + Note: please elaborate why you think it’s needed to help the group understand.
* Option 2: Not needed
  + Note: please elaborate why you think it’s not needed to help the group understand.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | Option 2 is supported.  As mentioned by the moderator, the timing is not impacted by the large offset in the UE's DL and UL frame timing and thus enhancement appears not needed. |
| Thales | Our view timing advance MAC CE command does not need additional timing offset.  We do not see the need to add such offset (K\_TAC) which add a delay to the adjustment of the uplink transmission timing.  Only UE’s PDSCH processing time should be taken into account. |
| ZTE | Option 2 is preferred. Since for the TA MAC CE action, it seems that no ACK feedback is required, the application of this value, e.g., k, is already defined with consideration on the processing time and potential value for TA adjustment |
| Intel | We support Option 2. In our understanding additional slot offset is needed only for DL action (e.g. CSI-RS transmission) but not for UL transmission. |
| CMCC | Option 2 is supported. |
| Panasonic | Support Option 2. Additional timing offset would not be necessary because the reflection timing is specified based on uplink slot as described in 38.213 section 4.2(cited above) and it is not impacted by the propagation delay. On the other hand, “timing advance command received on uplink slot n” may cause an ambiguity because DL reception slot and UL transmission slot at UE may not be aligned due to the long propagation delay. A clarification on uplink slot n would be necessary, e.g. uplink slot n is the slot which start no earlier than the end of downlink reception slot of PDSCH containing the MAC CE. |
| Huawei | Option 2. The application of TAC is only related to a processing timing and has nothing to do with the frame timing difference between UL and DL |
| MediaTek | Option 2. On receiving timing advance MAC CE, the UE may apply it right away. |
| Apple | We support Option 2.  In terrestrial network, the TA command MAC CE is activated from the beginning of uplink slot , where is the uplink slot when PDSCH carrying TA command MAC CE is received, and is UE’s PSDCH processing time. Since the TA command MAC CE activating time is defined in the uplink timing only, there is no downlink to uplink transmit involved. Hence, the similar definition could be applied to NTN.  Basically, we think the TA command MAC CE is activated at uplink slot n+k+1, where n is the uplink slot when PDSCH carrying TA command MAC CE is received, and k is UE’s PDSCH processing time. |
| OPPO | What needs to be clarified is that the explanation from FL on the spec text is to say that the UE receives a MAC-CE in uplink slot n, which in our understanding means that the downlink slot n-TA. Thus, as shown in figure below, if the UE should apply updated TA after uplink slot n+k+1, where k should cover at least UE-specific TA. In this case, the current specific does not seem to cover this. Our proposal is to change the definition of NTA,max to according to AI 8.4.2. |
| Qualcomm | Support Option 2. |
| Sony | Support option 2. Timing is not impacted by the large offset. |
| LG | Support Option 2. |
| Ericsson | Option 2, as elaborated in the moderator’s summary. |
| vivo | Option 2  We agree that the timing is defined solely from UL timing perspective, and is not impacted by the large offset in the UE's DL and UL frame timing. |
| Samsung | Option 2.  Since the slot n is corresponding to UL slot index, the additional offset is not needed. |
| ChinaTelecom | Support option 2 |
| Lenovo/MM | Support Option 2. As the MAC command reception and the activation are all UL slot, so there is no impact from the large propagation delay. |
| CAICT | Support option2. |
| APT | Option 1: Needed (by assuming UE-calculated TA in RRC\_CONNECTED)  Reason:  One intention of using k is to prevent time overlap between two UL transmissions, where one uses an old TA value and the other one uses a new TA value. This concern is included in given in the specs. is the maximum timing advance value provided by a TA command field of 12 bits, which is 2ms in the current specs.  To prevent time overlap, Option 1 would be needed if UE requires to update its TA value that is larger than 2ms, coming from UE-calculated TA in RRC\_CONNECTED. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | The new offset may be needed. The value of k includes the N\_ta, which implies the timing advance is included in the formula to avoid errors of such nature. However, there is a “prior” TA or pre-compensated TA on top of this one in NTN, according to current RAN1 agreements. Therefore, the already existing must also be included in the formula for NTN. |

## 6.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 21 companies provided views:

* [CATT, Thales, ZTE, Intel, CMCC, Panasonic, Huawei, MediaTek, Apple, Qualcomm, Sony, LG, Ericsson, vivo, Samsung, ChinaTelecom, Lenovo/MM, CAICT] support Option 2, with the reason being that the TA application timing is defined purely from UL perspective and thus additional timing offset is not needed.
* [Panasonic] proposes to clarify that in this context, uplink slot n is the slot which start no earlier than the end of downlink reception slot of PDSCH containing the MAC CE.
* [OPPO] ask for clarification on the meaning of receiving a MAC-CE in uplink slot n.
* [APT] comment that the spec text would be impacted for UE autonomous update with UE-calculated TA in RRC\_CONNECTED.
* [Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] comment that a new offset may be needed because the value of k includes the N\_ta.

Regarding the meaning of “receiving a MAC-CE in uplink slot n”, Moderator further checked the specification text and notice the following clarification exists in the specification text:

Section 4.2, TS 38.213:

For a timing advance command received on uplink slot  and for a transmission other than a PUSCH scheduled by a RAR UL grant as described in Subclause 8.3, the corresponding adjustment of the uplink transmission timing applies from the beginning of uplink slot  where ,…

The uplink slot  is the last slot among uplink slot(s) overlapping with the slot(s) of PDSCH reception assuming , where the PDSCH provides the timing advance command and  is defined in [4, TS 38.211].

Hence, in this context, the transmission timing is described from logical timing perspective assuming TA = 0. Therefore, it appears necessary to introduce K\_offset in this regard, as illustrated in the figure below.



Based on the above discussion, an updated proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on this updated proposal.

**Proposal 6.3 (Based on the 1st round of discussion):**

Introduce K\_offset to enhance the adjustment of uplink transmission timing upon the reception of a corresponding timing advance command.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | We still think support for Option 2 (timing relationship of timing advance MAC CE command need additional timing offset is not needed). On receiving timing advance MAC CE, the UE may apply it right away.  We think there is confusion between TTA for UL synchronization and TTA=0 assumption for DL / UL subframe timing as highlighted by the moderator The uplink slot  is the last slot among uplink slot(s) overlapping with the slot(s) of PDSCH reception assuming  To our understanding, in legacy NR, the UE already has a valid NTA from the network and has applied the TA before transmitting on UL. For the slot n at the UE there is always misalignment between DL and UL subframes with overlapping being defined with assumption TTA = 0. The overlapping with this assumption will correspond to  .  In legacy NR NTN, the UE already has a valid (autonomous) TA (i.e. this is the NTA in NR NTN) and a valid (configured) K\_offset and has applied the valid (autonomous) TA before transmitting on UL. For the slot n at the UE there is always misalignment between DL and UL subframes with overlapping being defined with assumption TTA = 0. The overlapping with this assumption will also correspond to  . The difference with legacy NR NTN is the value of the valid (autonomous) TA which effectively already include the satellite delay. |
| Huawei | We tend to agree that K\_offset should be introduced to enhance the adjustment of UL transmission timing. The value of k used in the MAC-CE TAC action timing at least includes PDSCH processing time. Even the TAC can be applied immediately for UL, there will at least a PUSCH preparation time and the PUSCH should be advanced by a TA. Hence, TA should be part of k. |
| ZTE | Not supportive for this proposal.  From our perspective, this issue is up to the definition of slot n in existing specification as cited below:  The uplink slot  is the last slot among uplink slot(s) overlapping with the slot(s) of PDSCH reception assuming , where the PDSCH provides the timing advance command and  is defined in [4, TS 38.211].  It can be found that in this case, the determination of UL slot n is coupled with the corresponding PDSCH, and the latest one is selected as slot n without assumption on the TA adjustment. So, the definition is illustrated as figure shown below:  gNB DL  UE DL  Received MAC CE at slot n  UE UL  Uplink slot n  In this way, no additional enhancement is needed. |
| APT | Support **Proposal 6.3**  Our understanding of the current specs is given below. |
| Apple | If the uplink slot n is defined in the assumption of TTA=0, then we are fine to introduce Koffset in determining the activation time of TA command MAC CE. |
| CATT | The effective time of TA can be starting from the UL slot corresponding to DL slot receiving the TA command. In this sense, we think TN and NTN don’t show big difference. Even in legacy TN case, TA shouldn’t assume 0. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Option 2. There is no need to enhance the adjustment of uplink transmission timing upon the reception of a corresponding timing advance command. |
| vivo | We agree with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Option 2. There is no need to enhance the adjustment of uplink transmission timing upon the reception of a corresponding timing advance command. |
| Intel | Considering the corresponding spec text we support proposal 6.3. |
| CMCC | Based on the definition of uplink slot n in the current specs, introduce K\_offset seems reasonable.  Nevertheless, as debated in the first round of email discussion, UE can automatically determine when to apply TA update.  Therefore, for a compromise, how to determine K\_offset for TA update can be FFS.  Option 1: K\_offset is indicated by network.  Option 2: K\_offset can be automatically determined by UE. |
| Panasonic | Support proposal 6.3. |
| Lenovo/MM | We support moderator’s updated proposal 6.3 |
| LG | If Rel-17 NTN assumes TA=0 for defining uplink slot n, K\_offset is needed. If not, more discussion is needed. |
| Sony | We support the proposal. |
| Thales | We do not support the proposal.  Maybe this issue is up to the definition of slot n in existing specification and some adaptation would be needed for NTN.  We think that the timing advance MAC CE command does not need additional timing offset:   * First, when the TAC is received it is already outdated by considering the timing drift. If K\_TAC is added before the execution of the Command we simply add extra delay to this already-outdated TAC. Nothing justify such extra delay. * If we agree to combine both open-loop and close-loop for TA updated/maintenance (although how such combination work is still FFS), with the open loop the UE will autonomously update its TA, the received TAC via MAC CE will be used to adjust this always-running open loop TA update. We do not see the need to add such offset (K\_TAC) which add a delay to this adjustment. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Based on a 2nd read of the contributions and the commentaries of other companies, we agree that the K\_offset is NOT NEEDED.  The reason is two-fold:  1) The clarification brought by the moderator, shows that “n” corresponds to the UL slot overlapping with the PDSCH reception.  2) N\_ta\_max is part of the calculation of the k.  Therefore, there’s no situation where n+k+1 is insuficcient to guarantee causality of the system, I.e., it will never happen that an order falls in the past of the UL timing. |
| OPPO | Support moderator proposal 6.3 |
| Ericsson | We agree with Moderator’s analysis. |

# 7 Issue #7: On K1/K2 range extension

## 7.1 Background

At RAN1#104-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[ZTE]:**

Proposal 5: Extension of value range of K1 should be supported when the HARQ process number is larger than X. e.g. X=16.

**[CAICT]:**

Proposal 7: To enhance K1/K2 indication with explicit or implicit way in TDD system which is with more contiguous DL slots.

**[Vivo]:**

Proposal 4: Support to extend the range of K1 value.

**[MediaTek]:**

Proposal 5: In case of TDD, K1 range is increased to 32 with indication of INTEGER (0..31) in dl-DataToUL-ACK field in PUCCH-Config.

**[Lenovo]:**

Proposal 2: Support extension of K1 and K2 range, and whether to increase the number of bits in scheduling DCI can be further discussed.

**[China Telecom]:**

Proposal 3: The range of K1 and K2 shall be slightly extended and implicitly indicated.

**[CMCC]:**

Proposal 6: Extend the value range of K1 from (0..15) to (0..31), while keep the bit size of PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI unchanged.

**[Xiaomi]:**

Proposal 4: Extension of K1/K2 should be supported.

**[DCM]:**

Proposal 4: Keep the existing K1/K2 range in initial access.

Proposal 5: After RRC connection setup, RAN1 to support either updating in UE-specific manner or introducing negative values to K1/K2 candidate set via RRC configuration.

At RAN1#102-e and RAN1#103-e, K1/K2 range extension was discussed. At RAN1#103-e, Moderator recommended proponents to have offline discussions with other companies. The following status is reported to RAN1#104-e by CMCC.

**[CMCC]:**

Based on the offline discussion, up to 10 companies (CMCC, MediaTek, ZTE, CAICT, Thales, VIVO, Eutelsat, Ericsson, Xiaomi, Spreadtrum) supported extending K1 range, and 11 companies (InterDigital, Qualcomm, Huawei, Samsung, Lenovo/MM, ETRI, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI, Intel, Panasonic, LG, OPPO) were open to the enhancements.

## 7.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 7.2 (Moderator):**

Extend the value range of K1 from (0..15) to (0..31)

* FFS impact on PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | We are fine to this proposal, but the DCI change should be avoided. |
| Thales | We are fine with the proposal |
| ZTE | Supportive on the FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | OK with the proposal |
| CMCC | Support the proposal.  As discussed in our company’s contribution (R1-2101042), the benefits of K1 range extension were identified as following:   * Extending K1 value range is beneficial to guarantee all 32 HARQ processes’ feedback can be multiplexed in a HARQ-ACK codebook, at least for TDD or half-duplex FDD, which is important for ATG and HAPS. * Even if UE-specific K\_offset updating via high level signaling is supported, slightly extending K1/K2 value range (e.g., K1 value extend to 0..31) is also beneficial to significantly reduce the potential high level signaling overhead for frequently updating K\_offset to capture rapidly changed RTT in LEO scenario. * Not only updating K\_offset but also extending K1/K2 are possible options to improve scheduling efficiency, latency performance, and HARQ process management. * If K\_offset is updated via common signaling, extension of the K1/K2 values is valuable to migrate the close/near UE problem. |
| Panasonic | We are ok with the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Support proposal 7.2 |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal if impact on DCI is avoided. Hence we propose to add the statement that “***without impact on the number bits in DCI***” |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine to this proposal |
| Xiaomi | Support this proposal |
| Ericsson | Support |
| vivo | Agree |
| Samsung | Support |
| ChinaTelecom | Support this proposal and prefer implicit indication. |
| Lenovo/MM | Support the proposal. And we prefer that the size of PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI is not changed. |
| CAICT | We think if UE-specific K\_offset updating is supported, the need of extending K1 range would be marginal in FDD. In TDD, K1 range extension could be considered to support more contiguous DL slots. For the extension, we prefer DCI bit field is not extended. |
| APT | Open but prefer not to support **Initial proposal 7.2.**  Regarding ZTE’s Proposal 5: Extension of the value range of K1 should be supported when the HARQ process number is larger than X. e.g. X=16, we wonder why K1 is related to a HARQ process number.  Even we extend the value range of K1, NW still needs to use two DCIs to schedule two HARQ processes. Why not simply let NW perform better scheduling timing rather than enlarging the scheduling range of each DCI. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | It is unclear the relevance of extending k1. TDD was not part of the initial scope of NTN, and it is yet to be deemed relevant the case where the number of HARQ processes is doubled to 32, as that depends on new SFI.  Given that the NTN system may already be pressed by the long RTD, we see no reasons to extend the possibility to further delay the HARQ-ACK transmission. |
| NTT Docomo | Support this proposal considering that the number of HARQ processes will increase from 16, but the DCI change should be avoided. |

## 7.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 19 companies provided views on this proposal.

* [Qualcomm, Lenovo/MM, CAICT, NTT Docomo] support / are fine with the proposal, conditioning on avoiding the impact on number of bits in DCI.
* [APT, Nokia/NSB] do not support the proposal.
* All the other companies support / are fine with the proposal.

The following agreement was made at the GTW session on 01/29/2021:

Agreement:

For unpaired spectrum, extend the value range of K1 from (0..15) to (0..31)

FFS: Whether there is an impact on the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI.

# 8 Issue #8: Configured grant type 1 timing relationship

## 8.1 Background

At RAN1#104-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**Koffset is needed:**

**[China Telecom]:**

Proposal 4: K\_offset shall be added to the timing relationship for configured grant type 1.

**[Asia Pacific Telecom/FGI/III/ITRI]:**

Proposal 5 For Type 1 PUSCH transmission, a new scheduling offset or clarification is needed for adapting to the long propagation delay.

**[Apple]:**

Proposal 7: Introduce to the timing relationship for type 1 configured grant.

**Koffset is not needed:**

**[Vivo]:**

Proposal 5: For Configured Grant Type 1, the maintenance of timing relationship should be left to network implementation.

**[MediaTek]:**

Proposal 6: The network configures timeReferenceSFN-r16 to sfn512 in ConfiguredGrantConfig IE for Configured Grant Type 1in NR NTN.

**[Samsung]:**

Proposal 3: The timing relationship for Configured Grant Type 1 should be left to Network implementation.

Based on the submitted contributions at RAN1#104-e, it appears that the views on this topic are polarized.

* 3 out of the 6 companies do not see the need of introducing K\_offset for configured grant type 1, while the other 3 support.

Given the polarized views, it will be beneficial to collect more views from companies in order to make progress.

## 8.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 8.2 (Moderator):**

Discuss whether K\_offset is needed for Configured Grant Type 1.

* Option 1: Needed
  + Note: please elaborate why you think it’s needed to help the group understand.
* Option 2: Not needed
  + Note: please elaborate why you think it’s not needed to help the group understand.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | Share similar view with MTK, if configuring timeReferenceSFN-r16 to sfn512, the problem will be resolved. So we prefer option 2. |
| ZTE | Option 2. The existing configured scheduling offset can scale to a very large range that can handle the impact of the RTT/large TA. |
| CMCC | Option 2 is supported. |
| Panasonic | Support Option 2. Koffset is used to indicate the target slot for PUSCH/PUCCH transmission. The target slot for configured grant type 1 is clearly specified in the existing spec. Therefore, Koffset is not needed in our understanding. |
| Huawei | We prefer Option 2. The application of TAC is only related to a processing timing and has nothing to do with the frame timing difference between UL and DL |
| MediaTek | Option 2 is supported. Koffset seems not needed with adequate configuration of Rel-16 RRC parameter to indicate SFN used for determination of the offset. |
| Apple | Option 1:  Considering the downlink-uplink timing interaction, we think should be introduced to the timing relationship for type 1 configured grant for NTN. Specifically, we have the following modifications if is in the unit of slots.  [(SFN × *numberOfSlotsPerFrame* × *numberOfSymbolsPerSlot*) + (slot number in the frame × *numberOfSymbolsPerSlot*) + symbol number in the slot] =  (*timeReferenceSFN* × *numberOfSlotsPerFrame* × *numberOfSymbolsPerSlot + timeDomainOffset* × *numberOfSymbolsPerSlot* + ***Koffset × numberOfSymbolsPerSlot*** + *S* + N × *periodicity*) modulo (1024 × *numberOfSlotsPerFrame* × *numberOfSymbolsPerSlot*).  Diagram  Description automatically generated  If Option 2 is applied (i.e., left to network implementation), then the value of is implicitly included in the parameter *timeReferenceSFN*. However, the granularity of *timeReferenceSFN* is in system frames, which is not matched with the granularity of .  Hence, we prefer to explicitly introduce to the formula. This reduces the specification impact, as no need of adjusting the existing granularity of *timeReferenceSFN*, but also provides a unified design for type 1 configured grant and type 2 configured grant. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Option 2. |
| LG | Option 2 |
| Ericsson | Option 2: It can be left to network implementation. |
| vivo | Option 2.  The value of K\_offset can be included in the parameters configured by gNB. e.g., *timeReferenceSFN-r16*, *timeDomainOffset*. In this way, we can reuse the same mechanisms of NR CG type 1 as Rel-15/16 and support to left the maintenance of timing relationship to network implementation. |
| Samsung | Option 2.  As we already explained, it can be done by gNB. It can decide when the transmission/reception is activated/deactivated. |
| Lenovo/MM | Support Option 2. As configured grant type 1 is only configured by RRC signaling. It is actual the RRC application delay. We didn’t introduce k-offset for other RRC signaling, and we believe that this can be left to gNB configuration. |
| CAICT | Support Option2. |
| APT | Option 1: needed (to build consensus between UE and gNB)  Reason:  CG transmission shall start by a UE after a gNB receives RRCSetupComplete.  For example, UE may start the first Type 1 PUSCH transmission in a slot n + K\_offset, where n is a slot that the RRC IE configuredGrantConfig is applied by UE after sending RRCSetupComplete, or RRCReconfigurationComplete. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | K\_offset may be needed in extreme cases (for instance at GEO). Since there’s a relevant case that would require such change, it is ok to discuss an efficient implementation for this offset for the general NTN case. |

## 8.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 16 companies provided views:

* 13 companies support Option 2.
  + [CATT, ZTE, CMCC, Panasonic, Huawei, MediaTek, Spreadtrum, LG, Ericsson, vivo, Samsung, Lenovo/MM, CAICT]
* [Apple] support Option 1 with the argument that Koffset may provide a finer granularity than *timeReferenceSFN*.
* [APT] support Option 1 with the argument on RRC procedure.
  + Moderator: If the concern is about RRC procedure, similar to issue #14, it is recommended that the proponent bring up the proposal in RAN2.
* [Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] point out it is ok to discuss to address extreme cases.

Given the current status, an updated proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on this updated proposal.

**Proposal 8.3 (Based on the 1st round of discussion):**

Pick one way forward:

* Option 1: Take the following as a working assumption
  + K\_offset is not needed for Configured Grant Type 1
* Option 2: On the need of Koffset in SFI timing relationship, proponents are encouraged to have offline discussions with other companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | Option 1.  For Configured Grant Type 1, in Release 16, timeReferenceSFN-r16 with value sfn512 is included in *ConfiguredGrantConfig IE*. This RRC parameter indicates SFN used for determination of the offset of a resource in time domain. The UE uses the closest SFN with the indicated number preceding the reception of the configured grant configuration as described in TS 38.321, clause 5.8.2.  The value 512 SFN is sufficiently large to absorb the K\_offset, even in case of GEO where the largest RTDs are observed. |
| Huawei | There seems a typo for option 2.  Regarding the time relationship for CG type 1, we agree that current specification might not be sufficient for some cases. One such example is when UE receive CG type 1 configuration just before SFN 0 or SFN512 (They are used for determination of the offset of a CG resource in time domain). In this case, it is not possible to configure a large *timeDomainOffset* to accommodate a large TA. On the othe hand, this can also be avoided by proper gNB scheduling. Therefore, we would like to support option 2 to have more time to look into this issue. |
| ZTE | We are supportive for Option-1 without additional enhancement. |
| APT | Option 1. Agree Moderator’s note. |
| Apple | Maybe we could consider an extreme case of GEO. The maximum RTT between UE and gNB is about 541 ms, which is 4328 slots in case of SCS=120 kHz. Note that Koffset should be no less than this RTT if the timing reference point is at gNB. In this case, Koffset could be up to 4328 slots.  If Koffset is not introduced for configured grant type 1, then it is likely to use “timeDomainOffset” to absorb this large Koffset. In the current spec, “timeDomainOffset” has upper bound of 5119 slots. If it uses 4328 slots to compensate Koffset, then the remaining range of “timeDomainOffset” (up to 791 slots) is very limited. This leads to limited network scheduling flexibility.  Hence, we prefer Option 2. By the way, the option 2 in the proposal should be modified to “On the need of Koffset **in configured grant type 1**,……” |
| CATT | We prefer option 2.  If configuring the SFN equal to snf512, It seems the issue can be resolved. However, if always configuring such larger value needs more discussion. There is a trade-off between latency and efficiency. |
| Spreadtrum | We support option 1. |
| vivo | Support option 1. |
| Samsung | Support Option 1. |
| CMCC | We prefer option 1. |
| Panasonic | Support option 1.  (p.s. “Koffset in SFI timing relationship” seems typo of “Koffset for Configured Grant Type1”) |
| CAICT | We tend to support option2 to have more time to look into this issue. |
| Lenovo/MM | Support Option 1. |
| LG | Option 1 |
| Sony | Option 2: adding Koffset will have the least specification impact and maintain the flexibility derived from using the large range of *timeReferenceSFN.* |
| Thales | We support the WS: K\_offset is not needed for Configured Grant Type 1 |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support Option 1. K\_offset is not needed in CG Type 1.  As other companies have explained, using proper configuration one can reach virtually any offset for CG type 1, on the order of several hundred SFNs. |
| OPPO | Support option 1 |
| Ericsson | We are fine if proponents would like to have more offline discussion. |

# 9 Issue #9: Configured grant type 2 timing relationship

## 9.1 Background

At RAN1#104-e, [CMCC, ZTE, CAICT, MediaTek, Samsung] propose to confirm the working assumption made at RAN1#103-e about configured grant type 2 timing relationship.

**RAN1#103-e:**

Working Assumption:

K\_offset can be applied to indicate the first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2 in the same way as K\_offset is applied to the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH.

Based on the proposals submitted to RAN1#104-e, there is no objection to confirm the working assumption.

## 9.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 9.2 (Moderator):**

Confirm the following working assumption

Working Assumption:

K\_offset can be applied to indicate the first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2 in the same way as K\_offset is applied to the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | Support it. |
| Thales | Working Assumption is still valid  In configured grant Type 2, periodicity configured via RRC, but the time-domain resource allocation is done using PDCCH DCI, so K\_offset is needed to indicate the first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in the same way as K\_offset is applied to the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH. |
| ZTE | Support. |
| Intel | Support the proposal |
| CMCC | Support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Support the proposal. |
| Huawei | Agree with Proposal 9.2 |
| MediaTek | Support proposal 9.2 |
| Apple | Fine to confirm the working assumption. |
| Qualcomm | Support. |
| Sony | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Support this proposal |
| LG | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Agree to confirm |
| ChinaTelecom | Support |
| Lenovo/MM | Support the proposal. |
| CAICT | Support |
| APT | Support **Initial proposal 9.2** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support the working assumption. |

## 9.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 22 companies provided views on this proposal.

* All support or are fine with this proposal.

The following agreement was made at the GTW session on 01/29/2021:

Agreement:

Confirm the following working assumption:

K\_offset can be applied to indicate the first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2 in the same way as K\_offset is applied to the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH.

# 10 Issue #10: Start of RAR window

## 10.1 Background

At RAN1#104-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[Huawei/HiSilicon]:**

Proposal 6: RAN1 to clarify that Msg2/MsgB RAR window starts according to the actual up timing of PRACH transmission.

**[ZTE]:**

Proposal 4: For NTN cases, PRACH/MsgA is transmitted in the actual timing with consideration of time pre-compensation, and an offset should be added to the start of Msg2/MsgB RAR window.

**[CATT]:**

Proposal 4: An additional parameter must be introduced which should be broadcasted by network to UE to obtain the time of monitoring RAR.

**[VIVO]:**

Proposal 6: A timing offset is applied to the start of ra-ResponseWindow in NTN.

Proposal 7: The value of the timing offset that applied to the start of ra-ResponseWindow is determined by UE.

**[Lenovo/Motorola Mobility]:**

Proposal 3: If TA is pre-compensated for Msg1/MsgA transmission, NO additional offset between Msg1/MsgA and RAR is necessary if the RAR reception is based on DL reception timing at UE side.

**[Asia Pacific Telecom/FGI/III/ITRI]:**

Proposal 6 In response to a PRACH transmission and/or MSGA transmission, a UE attempts to detect a DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by a corresponding RA-RNTI during a window controlled by NW. The window starts at the first symbol of the earliest CORESET the UE is configured to receive PDCCH for Type1-PDCCH CSS set, that is at least one symbol, after the DL symbol corresponding to the last UL symbol (with the same slot number for DL and UL)

**[CMCC]:**

Proposal 8: When downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB, indication of RAR\_window\_offset is not needed.

Proposal 9: When downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB, indication of RAR\_window\_offset is needed.

**[Apple]:**

Proposal 8: In NTN, TA is considered in determining the starting time of RAR window.

Based on the submitted contributions at RAN1#104-e, it appears that there is general consensus that an offset need to be added to the start of RAR window, which is in line with RAN2 agreement.

The difference lies in how the added offset would be reflected.

Further, [CMCC] points out that it is necessary to separate the discussion the case where downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB from the case where downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB. Similar to our discussion at RAN1#103-e about MAC CE, to facilitate the discussion, it is recommended to start with the simpler case, where downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB. When consensus is achieved for this case, we could move on to discuss the more complicated case, where downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB.

The following figure provides an illustration.



For PRACH transmission in the slot indicated in yellow:

* From logical timing perspective (TA is assumed to be zero), the RAR window should start at PDCCH monitoring occasion 2.
* When considering actual timing with a large TA
  + If the offset is equal to the minimum RTT of the cell, the RAR window starts at PDCCH monitoring occasion 1. In this case, UE starts the RAR window too early while its PRACH transmission has not reached the gNB. In general, this would lead to a waste of UE power as the UE would monitor a subset of the PDCCH monitoring occasions in vein. Further, the maximum differential RTT can be up to 20.6 ms for GEO and 6.4 ms for LEO within a cell, respectively, while the RAR window length is 10 ms. As a result, part of the RAR window is wasted because UE starts monitoring too early.
    - In the LEO case with up to 6.4 ms differential RTT, the effective RAR window is reduced to 3.6 ms for UEs close to cell edge, which much reduces the gNB’s scheduling flexibility in transmitting RAR.
    - In the GEO case with up to 20.6 ms differential RTT, the RAR window of 10 ms is not sufficient, which would call for extending the RAR window. The extension of RAR window in turn makes UEs close to cell center monitor more PDCCH monitoring occasions in vein and thus waste even more UE power.
  + If the offset is equal to the maximum RTT of the cell, the RAR window starts at PDCCH monitoring occasion 3. In this case, UE starts the RAR window late and gNB cannot respond to the PRACH transmission in PDCCH monitoring occasion 2, since UE has not started its RAR window. This adds unnecessary delay.
  + If the offset is equal to UE specific RTT, the RAR window starts at PDCCH monitoring occasion 2. In this case, UE starts the RAR window at the right time, which is also consistent with the expected monitoring time from a logical timing perspective.

Therefore, it appears sensible that the offset of RAR window should be equal to UE specific RTT.

[Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Asia Pacific Telecom/FGI/III/ITRI, CMCC] further point out that the start of the RAR window can be based on the DL timing, which can equivalently achieve the effect of UE specific RTT.

## 10.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 10.2 (Moderator):**

Discuss the expected value of the offset of RAR window

* Option 1: minimum RTT of a cell
* Option 2: maximum RTT of a cell
* Option 3: UE specific RTT

Note: Basing the start of RAR window on the DL timing can equivalently achieve the effect of using UE specific RTT as the offset of RAR window.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | Option 3 is supported.  In order to obtain UE specific RTT, UE should be indicated with a feeder link RTT. Based on current reference point configuration, UE can’t get UE specific RTT, only UE specific TA available, so feeder link RTT indication is necessary. |
| Thales | We prefer Option 3 |
| ZTE | Firstly the offset needed to be introduced. W.r.t the exact value, it can be FFS, a maximum value as used in msg3 scheduling is safe and preferable. And for option 3, the problem is that the BS and UE cannot get the value of UE specific RTT before msg3 transmission. |
| Intel | It seems that Option 3 should be supported for the case where feeder link delay and service link delay are considered in TA. |
| CMCC | We prefer Option 3.  Regarding indication of RAR\_window\_offset, as discussed in our company’s contribution [R1-2101042],   * When downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB, indication of RAR\_window\_offset is not needed. * When downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB, indication of RAR\_window\_offset is needed. |
| Panasonic | We support option 3. |
| Huawei | We prefer Option 1. Option 2 may not work for UEs close to the satellite. Option 3 is based on the assumption that UE has the knowledge of feeder link RTD. On the other hand, this discussion is related to the timing synchronization in 8.4.2. Maybe down-selection between Option 1 and Option 3 can be decided later and remove Option 2 now. |
| MediaTek | RAN2#111e agreed that “From RAN2 perspective, an offset is applied to the start of ra-ResponseWindow in NTN for both LEO and GEO scenarios”.  Option 1 will require UE to monitor RAR for potentially a long time if its UE specific TA is larger than maximum RTD which has impact on UE power consumption.  Option 2: will unnecessarily increase UE latency to transmit Msg3.  We have preference for Option 3 assuming full TA is used for the offset or the RAR window (this can be supported with reference point at gNB with broadcast of common timing offset over the feeder link). |
| Apple | Option 3.  The large TA value in NTN needs to be considered in determining the RAR window starting time. Due to the large propagation delay in NTN, a UE does not expect to receive RAR immediately after it transmits PRACH and/or MsgA PUSCH. Hence, the TA should be considered to determine the RAR window starting time. |
| OPPO | Option 3 should be supported.  For option 1: the drawback is that for the UE at the beam/cell edge, it has much larger RTT than the minimum RTT of a cell. The consequence is that the UE has to start the RAR monitoring much earlier, resulting in a waste of power consumption. Moreover, the gNB has to configure a wider RAR window in order not to miss any cell/beam edge UEs.  For option 2: the drawback is that for the UE located in the beam/cell center, when it uses maximum RTT of a cell to offset the start RAR window, it may miss the RAR message. |
| Qualcomm | Option 3 is supported. |
| LG | Option 3 |
| Ericsson | Option 3. |
| vivo | Option 3.  For downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB, UE calculates its UE specific RTT based on the UE specific TA and the common timing offset value which is broadcasted by the network.  For downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB, the common TA offset at the gNB should be also broadcasted by the network. |
| Samsung | Similar view with ZTE. We can first agree to introduce the offset. |
| ChinaTelecom | Option 3 |
| Lenovo/MM | Support Option 3. And we agree with CMCC that when DL and UL are not aligned, an additional offset is necessary even when the RAR reception is based on DL timing. |
| CAICT | Option3 |
| Fraunhofer IIS,  Fraunhofer HHI | RAN2#111e also agreed to introduce an offset to the start of ra-ResponseWindow. RAN1 solution should be inline with RAN2 agreement. Support option 3. We acknowledge the problem raised by ZTE. |
| APT | Option 3: UE specific RTT |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Among the options provided, we think Option 1 seems the most reasonable one to ensure a proper functioning of the RAR window for all users in the cell since the UE performing the RACH procedure would need to be guarantee that the UE starts listening for the Msg2/MsgB at the right time. There are 2 caveats to be considered:  If/when the minimum RTT is used, the cell must ensure that even for very large coverages, the difference between Max\_RTT and Min\_RTT should be smaller than the duration of the RAR window. Such operation may potentially require that the maximum value of the RAR window is increased.  In an optimal configuration, if DL and UL are aligned in the gNB, the value of Koffset may also be used to postpone the RAR window. |

## 10.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 21 companies provided views:

* 15 companies including [CATT, Thales, Intel, Panasonic, MediaTek, Apple, OPPO, Qualcomm, LG, Ericsson, vivo, ChinaTelecom, Lenovo/MM, CAICT, APT] support Option 3 – UE specific RTT.
* [Huawei] prefer Option 1 (min RTT), propose to down select Option 1 (min RTT) and Option 3 (UE specific RTT) later, and remove Option 2.
* [Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] think Option 1 seems the most reasonable but there are caveats such as the need of extension of RAR window.
* [ZTE] make a comment that BS/UE cannot get UE specific RTT before Msg3. [Samsung, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI] have a similar view as ZTE.

Based on the comments, several observations can be made:

* There is clear majority support of Option 3, as it achieves the desired effect with best performance.
* There is a concern on how to know UE specific RTT.
* There are some supports of Option 1 (min RTT), which has some disadvantages/caveats such as UE starts monitoring too early and thus in vein, need of extending RAR window, etc.

To facilitate progress and ease of exchange views to understand each other better, let us continue to first focus on the simpler case, where downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB. When consensus is achieved for this case, we could move on to discuss the more complicated case, where downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB.

Regarding the need of knowing UE specific RTT, is such information truly needed from system operation perspective? The answer appears no. Taking the following figure for example.

* Similar to several other timing relationships, if we look at the configuration from logical timing perspective, there is no ambiguity that PDCCH monitoring occasion 2 is the right occasion for the UE to start monitor after the UE transmits a PRACH in the yellow highlighted PRACH occasion.
* Now if we look at the configuration from actual timing perspective, there is no ambiguity as well.
  + If network receives a PRACH in the yellow highlighted PRACH occasion, the network knows that it can respond to the UE starting from PDCCH occasion 2.
  + If UE transmits a PRACH in the yellow highlighted PRACH occasion, the UE knows that it is supposed to start monitoring from PDCCH occasion 2.



From the above discussion, it seems there is no ambiguity issue, even if the UE specific RTT is not known, when downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB. In other words, UE specific RTT has been implicitly added as an offset for the UE to start RAR window.

The above observation has been pointed out by several companies:

* [CMCC]: When downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB, indication of RAR\_window\_offset is not needed.
* [Asia Pacific Telecom/FGI/III/ITRI]: The window starts at the first symbol of the earliest CORESET the UE is configured to receive PDCCH for Type1-PDCCH CSS set, that is at least one symbol, after the DL symbol corresponding to the last UL symbol (with the same slot number for DL and UL)

In line of these observations, in the second round of discussion, it will be beneficial to check companies’ views on the following question.

**Proposal 10.3 (Based on the 1st round of discussion):**

If downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB, do companies agree with the following observation?

* Based on DL-UL timing relationship, there is no ambiguity in determining the start of PDCCH monitoring to achieve the effect of delaying RAR window by a UE specific RTT, regardless of the knowledge about UE specific RTT.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | Agree with proposal. There is no ambiguity If downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB. This way is optimum for UE power consumption. The UE determines autonomous TA (i.e. UE-specific RTT) and delay RAR window monitoring accordingly. |
| Huawei | Our views is that both UE specific RTT and min RTT are feasible. The difference would be that when the UE shall start to monitor the RAR and length of the RAR window. Given the transmission timing of MSG1 is still under discussion in 8.4.2, it is not clear whether UE-specific RTT can be acquired by the UE or not, it is suggested to decide the starting timing for RAR window later. |
| ZTE | Agree with this proposal to minimize impacts on scheduling latency. |
| APT | Agree **Proposal 10.3**. This will align with a RAN2’s agreement given below.  **Agreements** via email - offline 103 in RAN2#112-e  If the start of the ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow is accurately compensated by UE-gNB RTT, ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow are not extended in LEO/GEO. |
| Apple | By RAN2 working assumption, UE specific RTT is known to UE before its PRACH transmission. Hence, we are not sure if we want to mention “regardless of the knowledge about UE specific RTT” in the proposal. |
| CATT | Firstly we can’t have ONLY one assumption that DL and UL timing are aligned. For the DL and UL timing misaligned case, we still should resolve the RAR window configuration.  Moreover, for RAR window configuration we need to consider UE has the knowledge of UE specific RTT and no knowledge of UE specific RTT two cases.  UE is only able to obtain its UE specific TA between UE and satellite. If need to acquire the UE specific RTT, gNB should indicate one feeder link RTT. However, depending on the reference point configuration, gNB can indicate one minimum RTT or feeder RTT to UE to help timing configuration of RAR window. |
| vivo | We agree with the observation. |
| Samsung | Agree with FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | Agree |
| CMCC | Agree with the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Agree |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with the proposal. |
| LG | Agree with proposal |
| Sony | No – there is no ambiguity. For us the issue is not strictly one of ambiguity. It may also be one of UE power saving. The UE should only expect the PDCCH after at least its RTT + Delta where Delta represents the time between receiving the PRACH and transmitting the PDCCH at the gNB. Knowing its RTT, the UE can calculate the minimum duration of the offset. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We agree with the observation made by the moderator. |
| Fraunhofer IIS,  Fraunhofer HHU | Agree |
| OPPO | 1. We’d like to ask what is the actual meaning of DL-UL timing relationship? Is it K offset? We are a bit confused by the terminology now. If it is K offset, then it is not UE-specific so how it can achieve delaying UE-specific RTT. 2. We are talking about the spec change on UE side, the UE normally does not have knowledge of whether or not gNB DL/UL is aligned or not. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Moderator’s analysis. |

# 11 Issue #11: PDCCH ordered PRACH

## 11.1 Background

At RAN1#104-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**New timing offset is needed:**

**[CAICT]:**

Proposal 2: When a RACH procedure is trigged by PDCCH order, UE shall select the next available RO after a timing offset according to the indication of PDCCH order, where the timing offset can use the explicitly indicated by gNB or implicitly related to the TA reported by UE.

**[MediaTek]:**

Proposal 8: On receiving PDCCH order in slot n, the UE selects the next RACH Opportunity after

* K\_offset as broadcast by the gNB.
* UE autonomous TA

**[LGE]:**

Proposal 5: For RACH procedure triggered by PDCCH order in Rel-17 NTN, define timing offset in addition to minimum gap, .

**[Asia Pacific Telecom/FGI/III/ITRI]:**

Proposal 7 For a PDCCH order, introduce new parameters to prolong the processing time for UE.

**New timing offset is not needed**

**[Huawei/HiSi]:**

Proposal 7: There is no need to introduce a timing offset when determining the RO for PDCCH ordered PRACH.

**[ZTE]:**

Proposal 9: No need to introduce the K\_offset for PDCCH order PRACH.

**[Lenovo/Motorola Mobility]:**

Proposal 4: There is no necessity to add an additional offset between PDCCH order and corresponding PRACH.

Based on the submitted contributions at RAN1#104-e, it appears that the views on this topic are polarized.

* 3 out of the 7 companies do not see the need of introducing a new timing offset for PDCCH ordered PRACH, while the other 4 support.

Given the polarized views, it will be beneficial to collect more views from companies in order to make progress.

## 11.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows. Companies are encouraged to provide views on the proposal.

**Initial proposal 11.2 (Moderator):**

Discuss whether a new timing offset is needed for PDCCH ordered PRACH

* Option 1: Needed
  + Note: please elaborate why you think it’s needed to help the group understand.
* Option 2: Not needed
  + Note: please elaborate why you think it’s not needed to help the group understand.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CATT | Option 2 is supported.  Current specification has not clear timing limitation for PDCCH order PRACH resource. So UE can select next available resource for PRACH transmission based on autonomous TA estimation. |
| ZTE | Option 2 is preferred. The impacts on the TA issue will be considered in the determination of available association ROs. |
| Panasonic | Support Option 2. New timing offset would not be necessary for PDCCH order PRACH because current specification (38.321 section 5.1.2) define the transmission timing as “the next available PRACH occasion” and UE can select RO with taking TA value into account without additional timing offset. |
| Huawei | We prefer Option 2. Based on the current specification, the UE can determine which RO is the “next available” RO from a set of periodic ROs. If the timing-gap between one RO timing and the received PDCCH timing is smaller than the UE’s TA, this RO is not valid and will not be selected by the UE.  As the specification does not restrict the timing-gap between the received PDCCH timing (DL timing) and the selected RO timing (UL timing). A new timing offset is not needed for PDCCH ordered PRACH |
| MediaTek | Option 2. Either the existing Koffset can be used, or UE-autonomous TA (i.e. UE-specific TA) can be used |
| OPPO | Option 1: support adding timing offset for PDCCH ordered PRACH.  In NR spec, it is clearly defined a time position for the UE to determine the earliest RO. This is not different from issue #9 where the earliest CG is defined taking into account K offset, but the UE may select the earliest RO/CG or may select later RO/CG. Thus, if K offset is introduced for type 2 CG, there is no reason that K offset is omitted for PDCCH ordered PRACH. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2. “next available PRACH occasion” is sufficient. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Option 2. |
| LG | Option 1. In current NR specification, initial TA value is assumed as 0 when PRACH transmission. Thus, in the UE perspective, the first symbol of the PRACH transmission and the first symbol of RO selected by UE may be the same, so there is no ambiguity with current specification. However, in NTN, the initial TA for PRACH transmission can be determined based on UE specific TA (estimated by UE) + common TA (if provided). Thus, the actual PRACH transmission timing can be before the PDCCH order reception timing. Thus, we think adopting new offset can be a safer option. |
| Ericsson | Need further discussion as the issue is not clear. |
| Vivo | Support Option 2.  The RACH occasions are periodic, and the valid RACH occasion can be determined by UE. |
| Samsung | Option 2.  The current specification explains based on the UL slot index, so we don’t think the additional delay is needed. |
| Lenovo/MM | Support Option 2 if gNB and UE has common understanding of the propagation delay between them. In this case, the available RO is already after the RTT, and as gNB knows the RTT, so gNB can perform PRACH reception accordingly. |
| CAICT | Support Option1.  For PDCCH ordered PRACH, the selected RO for preamble transmission at UE side and preamble detection at gNB side should be aligned. In current specification, UE transmits preamble with TA=0 and thus gNB and UE have same understanding on which RO is ”the first next available RO after PDCCH order”, and the RO index among the ROs associated to the indicated SSB is indicated by the PRACH mask ID in the PDCCH order.  However, in NTN, UE transmits preamble with TA≠0. gNB will be confused about which RO that the UE will use for preamble transmission and then it will take a lot blind preamble detections, which is certain not the original purpose of PDCCH ordered PRACH.  Therefore, “the first next available RO after PDCCH order” is not sufficient for NTN network. An offset is necessary to be introduced here, not only to ensure sufficient gap between PDCCH order and the selected RO for preamble transmission before applying TA pre-compensation, but also to align the understanding of gNB and UE on which RO to carry preamble indicated by the PDCCH order. |
| Fraunhofer IIS,  Fraunhofer HHI | Option 2. UE can determine the next available RO. |
| APT | Option 1: Needed (to make UE implementation easy)  Reason:   1. RO validity can be up to UE implementation, i.e., UE determines whether a RO is valid based on a calculated TA. However, in NR, clear rules to determine the RO validity have been made for TDD. We believe the same guideline, e.g., a new scheduling offset, would be beneficial for UE implementation.   UE may need additional time to prepare UE-calculated TA, which is not considered in the current specs. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | One of the reasons for the PDCCH ordered PRACH is the assumption, by the gNB, that the UE in connected mode is out-of-sync. Therefore, such procedure should not rely on assumptions made about the timing used by the UE. That said, this implies this procedure must be as protected by k\_offset as any of the other processes. Therefore:  K\_offset is needed for PDCCH ordered PRACH |

## 11.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 17 companies provided views:

* [CATT, ZTE, Panasonic, Huawei, MediaTek, Qualcomm, Spreadtrum, VIVO, Samsung, Fraunhofer IIS/Fraunhofer HHI] support Option 2, with the main reason being that selecting “the next available PRACH occasion” is clear to determine the transmission timing.
* [OPPO] support Option 1, with the reason being that Koffset is supported for type 2 CG and thus should be applicable for PDCCH ordered PRACH as well.
  + Moderator: These two issues are separate and are described with different specification texts. It’s not valid to mix the two issues.
* [LG] support Option 1, with the reason being that PRACH transmission timing can be before PDCCH order.
  + Moderator: This is not valid, because as pointed out by supporters of Option 2, UE will determine “the next available PRACH occasion” upon receiving a PDCCH order. So, there is no causality issue.
* [Ericsson] think the issue requires some further clarification.
* [CAICT] make an observation that though UE can always select “the next available PRACH occasion”, it is not clear if network would know which PRACH occasion would be selected by the UE so that the network can receive accordingly.
  + Moderator: This is a valid comment and good observation that clarifies the issue.
* [Lenovo/MM] make a similar observation, though supporting Option 2 with the assumption that gNB and UE have common understanding of the RTT.
* [APT] support Option 1 to make UE implementation easy.
  + Moderator: The argument is not clear to me.
* [Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] support Option 1 to better support out-of-sync UE.
  + Moderator: Perhaps this is along similar line of the observations made by [CAICT, Lenovo/MM]

Given the views expressed so far, it seems valid to ask the questions:

* For a PDCCH ordered PRACH, UE selects its “the next available PRACH occasion.” Would the network always know which PRACH occasion was selected by the UE so that the network can receive accordingly?
* If the network does not know which PRACH occasion was selected by the UE, is it acceptable for network to perform blind detections?

In Moderator’s view, the answers to these questions will help the group to move forward on this topic. So, it is recommended that companies provide views on these questions for the second round of discussion.

**Proposal 11.3 (Based on the 1st round of discussion):**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the following questions:

* For a PDCCH ordered PRACH, UE selects its “the next available PRACH occasion.” Would the network always know which PRACH occasion was selected by the UE so that the network can receive accordingly?
* If the network does not know which PRACH occasion was selected by the UE, is it acceptable for network to perform blind detections?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| MediaTek | There could be ambiguity for a PDCCH ordered PRACH, if UE selects “the next available PRACH occasion based on its autonomously acquired TA (i.e. UE-specific RTT). This ambiguity can be avoided if the UE report its autonomous TA before PDCCH ordered PRACH.  Blind detection is not desirable as would potentially lead to increased contention on RACH. This could become significant in case the UE selects “the next available PRACH occasion based on K\_offset set to a large maximum RTD as in GEO |
| Huawei | Q1: In our understanding, the network may not know the exact RACH occasion selected by the UE.  Q2: Our understanding is that the gNB can have an estimate, e.g. based on the signaled K\_offset value, on when the RO starts to become valid for a UE hence it is acceptable for network to perform blind detections for the possible candidates. |
| ZTE | It seems an implementation issue.  W.r.t the 1st question, from specification perspective, there is no additional indication for gNB to determine the corresponding PRACH occasion.  W.r.t the 2nd question, our understanding is similar as HW, the gNB will try to decode the PRACH in corresponding occasion with “estimation”, since normally, and the deviation for synchronization is not larger for triggering the PDCCH ordered PRACH. |
| APT | Q1: NW may not know. The intention to trigger a PDCCH ordered PRACH is used for rebuilding UL timing synchronization as mentioned by Nokia.  Q2: not sure how to prevent blind detection. In this case, NW may have lost UE-gNB RTT, and as a result, if blind detection needs to be avoided, then a new offset of UE-gNB RTT may be needed for “the next available PRACH occasion.” |
| Apple | Q1: Network does not always know which PRACH occasion is selected by UE.  Q2: We are neutral whether network performs blind detections on possible PRACH occasions for the UE. |
| CATT | Based on our knowledge, even in TN case, gNB has no good knowledge in when the PRACH will be coming.  Hence, we think blind detection is feasible. Actually as mentioned by the Huawei, gNB may have some prior knowledge to determine when to perform blind detetion. |
| Spreadtrum | Q1: The network may not know the exact RACH occasion selected by the UE.  Q2: It is acceptable for network to perform blind detections. The network can determine some candidate ROs based on some prior knowledge, e.g. based on the signaled K\_offset value. |
| vivo | According to TS 38.321, a PRACH Mask Index value can corresponds to multiple PRACH occasions of an SSB, e.g., 0, 9 and 10. The MAC entity shall select a PRACH occasion randomly with equal probability amongst the PRACH occasions of an SSB. The network does not always know which PRACH occasion was selected by UE. |
| Samsung | Q1) The gNB may or may not know the exact PRACH occasion depending on configuration.  Q2) This issue seems to be up to gNB implementation. |
| CMCC | Q1: NW may not know.  Q2: It is acceptable for network to perform blind detections. |
| Panasonic | In our understanding, PRACH occasion selected by UE based on “the next available PRACH occasion” depends on the RTT between UE and gNB. Therefore, the network would not always know which PRACH occasion was selected by UE.  On the other hand, blind detection of PRACH occasion by the network might be acceptable because the candidates of blind detection would not be so many. Furthermore, when the differential RTT between UEs within a cell is not larger than the period of the PRACH occasion, gNB can avoid the ambiguity by sending PDCCH ordered PRACH at a timing between max RTT and min RTT before the target RO. |
| CAICT | Q1: According to current description about how to determine the next available RO in case of PDCCH ordered PRACH in 38.213, UE will select the RO indicated by PRACH mask index value for the indicated SSB index in **the first available mapping cycle** in a SSB-RO association period.  In our understanding, gNB and UE have the same understanding on the first available mapping cycle with TA=0, where the gap between the first symbol of RO indicated by the PRACH mask index and the last symbol of PDCCH order reception is larger than or equal to msec. Therefore, gNB actually know which RO indicated by the PRACH mask index the UE will select to execute the contention-free PRACH procedure.  Note that if the PRACH mask index value in the PDCCH order is “**0/9/10**”, which means that UE can select one RO among **all/ odd/even** ROs associated to the indicated SSB with equal possibility, respectively. Accordingly, gNB would detect the preamble blindly on the RO group indicated by the PRACH mask index for the indicated SSB in the known first available mapping cycle. In the rest of cases with the PRACH mask index value is **“0~8”,** gNB can detect the preamble with exact knowledge of which RO will be selected by UE.  Q2: For NTN scenario, if not to introduce an offset for the RO selection in the PDCCH ordered PRACH, gNB has to adopt blind detection to receive the preamble indicated by the PDCCH order since gNB has no idea which is “**the first available mapping cycle** in a SSB-RO association period” after the PDCCH order without knowledge of TA applied to UE. We think this is not the original purpose of PDCCH ordered PRACH.  Besides, in order to ensure the contention-free property of the PDCCH ordered PRACH, when to trigger PRACH for another UE by PDCCH order, gNB has to avoid allocating the PRACH resource that would lead to a preamble transmission conflict in the blind detection period. This will kind of reduce the PRACH resource efficiency. Otherwise, the contention would exist in the PDCCH ordered PRACH procedure, which is also undesirable.  Therefore, we recommend to introduce an offset here to avoid blind RO detections in the PDCCH ordered PRACH as much as possible. The offset can be TA reported by UE or a new offset. We prefer the later since the reported TA is not always reliable. |
| Lenovo/MM | Regarding the first question, the gNB can’t know the selected PRACH occasion by the UE as TA maintenance is out of date. And when there is PDCCH ordered PRACH, it means that there may uplink out of synchronization, so the UE can’t report its autonomous TA as there is no synchronized uplink channel.  The gNB can perform blind decoding based on cell coverage or beam coverage of the satellite, that is, the bind decoding time range is determined by the nearest UE and the farthest UE within the cell/beam coverage. We think this is affordable as it is only related to the differential TA within a cell/beam coverage. |
| LG | Q1: Network may not know the exact RACH occasion selected by the UE.  Q2: We don’t have strong view on whether gNB perform blind detection or not. To avoid blind detection, additional offset can be considered. |
| Sony | If the gNB knows the UE specific RTT, it would derive the right RO.  Blind detection in the worst case would cover all the preambles – not the best idea.  A simpler solution is to add a timing offset such as Koffset after receiving the PDCCH order and then use a RO that occurs after the timing offset. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We agree with CAICT explanation on this topic. As the original TA is not equal to 0, there may be a different understanding between UE and gNB about “next available RO”.  Since the PDCCH ordered PRACH is using contention free resources, and the design of the PDCCH ordered PRACH is such that there are exact instructions as to how the PRACH shall be transmitted, the solution for NTN systems should be designed such that there is absolutely no ambiguity for when the gNB is expected to receive the PRACH that is associated to the PDCCH order.  The blind detections by the gNB should be avoided, as it would cause additional gNB complexity and would also be against the principle of using contention free resources for this purpose. |
| Fraunhofer IIS,  Fraunhofer HHI | Question 1 – Network may not always know.  Question 2 – We are neutral with respect to this question. |
| OPPO | The specification should keep a unified and unbiased logic. Regarding the two questions:   1. the gNB should know from which RO the UE may start to select after receiving the PDCCH order, which is exactly the same as CG type 2 activation. 2. The gNB does not know which RO being selected by the UE, which is exactly the same as CG type 2 case, where the gNB does not know which CG resource being selected by the UE.   The same logic should be applied for both PDCCH ordering and CG type 2 activation cases. |
| Ericsson | We are open to further discussion on how to address this issue. |

# 12 Issue #12: SFI timing relationship

## 12.1 Background

At RAN1#104-e, a few companies provide proposals on this topic:

**Pro**

**[OPPO]:**

Proposal 5: K\_offset should be introduced for SFI interpretation for an uplink BWP.

**[CAICT]:**

Proposal 3: To apply in the DCI 2\_0 scheduled SFI timing relationship.

**Against**

**[Xiaomi]:**

Proposal 5: The enhancement on the SFI timing relationship is not supported

**[ZTE]:**

Proposal 8: No need to introduce the K\_offset for DCI 2\_0 scheduled SFI.

At RAN1#102-e and RAN1#103-e, SFI timing relationship was discussed. Based on the submitted contributions at RAN1#104-e, it appears that the interest in this topic is quite low.

* Only 4 companies provide views.
* 2 out of the 4 companies are not in favor of introducing Koffset for SFI timing relationship, while the other 2 support.

Given (1) the polarized views, (2) low interest in this topic, and (3) discussions happened at the last 2 meetings already, it does not seem helpful to spend online/email effort discussing this topic again.

From Moderator’s perspective, it is not appropriate to propose to introduce Koffset in SFI timing relationship nor to conclude that Koffset is not needed in SFI timing relationship. It is recommended that the proponents to offline discuss with other companies to make progress and let Moderator know if there is a possibility for potential consensus.

## 12.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, a recommendation is made as follows.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #12:**

On the need of Koffset in SFI timing relationship, proponents are encouraged to have offline discussions with other companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Thales | We support Moderator recommendation |
| Huawei | Support the FL recommendation |
| MediaTek | Support moderator recommendation |
| Qualcomm | Support moderator’s recommendation given that we are currently considering FDD only. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the FL recommendation |
| LG | Support the FL recommendation |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Samsung | It needs to further study whether the additional delay is needed. The current specification explains based on the UL slot index, so we don’t think the additional delay is needed. A UE can interpret SFI with TA values the UE is applying. |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with moderator’s view. |
| CAICT | We support the FL recommendation with some comments:  As discussed in our contribution (R1-2100304), SFI could be used to dynamically enable/disable semi-statically configured UL transmission in FDD. If no applied to the DCI 2\_0 scheduled SFI timing relationship in NTN, it means this function of SFI is voted out. |
| APT | Support the FL recommendation |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support the moderator recommendation |

## 12.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 12 companies provided views:

* 11 companies support / agree with the Moderator’s recommendation.
* [Samsung] holds the view that additional delay is not needed and calls for further study.

Given the views expressed so far, it is recommended that the proponents to offline discuss with other companies to make progress. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss issue #12 further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #12:**

On the need of Koffset in SFI timing relationship, proponents are encouraged to have offline discussions with other companies.

# 13 Issue #13: Timing relationship upon feeder link switch

## 13.1 Background

[Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] propose to define timing relationships such that a feeder link switch does not cause a large jump in the common delay value used by the UE.

**[Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell]:**

One item that needs further discussion is the impact of any feeder link switches on the timing relationships for NTN. Related topics have been proposed in [4]. As a guiding principle the reference point used for timing must not change as a consequence of the feeder link switch and as such it should not cause a jump in the common delay.

**Proposal 7: RAN1 to define timing relationships such that a feeder link switch does not cause a large jump in the common delay value used by the UE.**

This issue was discussed at RAN1#103-e already. Based the views expressed at RAN1#103-e, it was deemed reasonable that RAN1 wait for RAN2 progress on feeder link switch before discussing its impact on timing relationship. Note that the same approach is taken in AI 8.4.4 about feeder link switch in general.

## 13.2 Company views

Based on the submitted contributions, only one company [Nokia/Nokia Shanghai Bell] is proposing this again at this RAN1 meeting. In Moderator’s view, the following recommendation still holds.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #13:**

RAN1 to wait for RAN2 progress on feeder link switch before discussing its impact on timing relationship.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Thales | We support Moderator recommendation |
| Huawei | Support the FL recommendation |
| MediaTek | Support Moderator recommendation |
| Sony | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support the FL recommendation |
| LG | Support the FL recommendation |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Samsung | Agree |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with moderator’s view. |
| CAICT | Support |
| APT | Agree. To our best understanding, a large jump may happen for both UL timing and UL frequency. However, it could be up to UE implementation based on some tracking algorithms. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support the moderator recommendation. |

## 13.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 12 companies provided views:

* All the companies including the original proponent support / are fine with the Moderator’s recommendation.

Given the views expressed so far, it is reasonable that RAN1 wait for RAN2 progress on feeder link switch before discussing its impact on timing relationship. Note that the same approach is taken in AI 8.4.4 about feeder link switch in general. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss issue #13 further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #13:**

RAN1 to wait for RAN2 progress on feeder link switch before discussing its impact on timing relationship.

# 14 Issue #14: RRC procedure delay

## 14.1 Background

[OPPO] propose to introduce Koffset to enhance the RRC procedure delay.

**[OPPO]:**

The motivation of introducing K\_offset for MAC-CE activation time is to increase the buffer time for the gNB to receive the HARQ-ACK information from the UE. A similar reason can be considered for the RRC procedure delay. In TN system, the RRC procedure delay is a fixed duration, e.g. for RRC reconfiguration the delay is 10 ms, which is long enough for HARQ-ACK feedback in TN network. But the configured delay value in current spec cannot cover the propagation delay in NTN system such as for GEO. For this reason, the RRC procedure delay should also be revisited, e.g., K\_offset should be introduced to the configuration of RRC procedure delay.

**Proposal 4:** K\_offset should be introduced to enhance the RRC procedure delay.

This issue was discussed at RAN1#103-e already. Based the views expressed at RAN1#103e, it was clear that the majority held the view that the discussion should be taken in RAN2.

## 14.2 Company views

Based on the submitted contributions, only one company [OPPO] is proposing this again at this RAN1 meeting. In Moderator’s view, the following recommendation still holds.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #14:**

It is recommended that the proponent bring up the following proposal in RAN2:

*[OPPO] K\_offset should be introduced to enhance the RRC procedure delay.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Thales | We support Moderator recommendation on Issue #14 |
| Huawei | Support the FL recommendation. Meanwhile, we don’t think there is need for a change since the RRC configuration delay only include the processing latency for PDSCH detection and HARQ-ACK preparation. |
| OPPO | Fine with FL’s proposal |
| Ericsson | Support |
| vivo | We agree this is RAN2 topic. |
| Samsung | Agree |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with moderator’s view. |
| CAICT | Agree |
| APT | Like CG Type-1, to build consensus between UE and gNB, the RRC procedure shall start by a UE after a gNB receives RRCSetupComplete. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We support the moderator recommendation. |

## 14.3 Updated proposal based on company views (1st round of email discussion)

In the first round of email discussion, 10 companies provided views:

* 9 companies including the original proponent support / are fine with the Moderator’s recommendation.
* [APT] made a comment about when RRC procedure should start.
  + In Moderator’s view, this is clearly not in RAN1 scope but belongs to RAN2.

Given the views expressed so far, it is clear that the majority hold the view that the discussion should be taken in RAN2. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss issue #14 further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #14:**

It is recommended that the proponent bring up the following proposal in RAN2:

*[OPPO] K\_offset should be introduced to enhance the RRC procedure delay.*
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# Appendix I: RAN1 agreements on timing relationship

**RAN1#102-e:**

Agreement:

* Introduce K\_offset to enhance the following timing relationships:
  + The transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH (including CSI on PUSCH).
  + The transmission timing of RAR grant scheduled PUSCH.
  + The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH.
  + The CSI reference resource timing.
  + The transmission timing of aperiodic SRS.
* Note: Additional timing relationships that require K\_offset of the same or different values can be further identified.

Agreement:

For K\_offset used in initial access, the information of K\_offset is carried in system information.

* FFS implicit and/or explicit signaling of K\_offset in system information.
* FFS a cell specific K\_offset value used in all beams of a cell and/or each beam in a cell uses a beam-specific K\_offset value.
* FFS whether/how to update K\_offset after initial access.

**RAN1#103-e:**

Agreement:

Introduce K\_offset (may or may not be the same as the K\_offset value in other timing relationships) to enhance the timing relationship of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB.

Agreement:

* For K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access, at least a cell specific K\_offset configuration, which is used in all beams of a cell, should be supported.
* FFS: Beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access.

Working Assumption:

K\_offset can be applied to indicate the first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2 in the same way as K\_offset is applied to the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH.

**Conclusion:**

The agreement made at RAN1#102-e about introducing K\_offset in the transmission timing of RAR grant scheduled PUSCH is also applicable to fallbackRAR scheduled PUSCH.

Agreement:

Denote by K\_mac a scheduling offset other than K\_offset:

* If downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB:
  + For UE action and assumption on downlink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac is not needed.
  + For UE action and assumption on uplink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac is not needed.
* If downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB:
  + For UE action and assumption on downlink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac **is needed**.
  + For UE action and assumption on uplink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, K\_mac is not needed.
* Note: This does not preclude identifying exceptional MAC CE timing relationship(s) that may or may not require K\_mac.

# Appendix II: Summary of proposals

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Tdoc | Source | Proposals |
| [R1-2100156](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100156.zip) | OPPO | Proposal 1: Support explicit configuration of beam-specific K\_offset in system information.  Proposal 2: UE-triggered and gNB-controlled K\_offset updating can be considered.  Proposal 3: K\_offset can be updated via RRC configuration or group-common DCI after initial access procedure.  Proposal 4: K\_offset should be introduced to enhance the RRC procedure delay.  Proposal 5: K\_offset should be introduced for SFI interpretation for an uplink BWP. |
| [R1-2100222](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100222.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | Proposal 1: For cell-specific K\_offset used in initial access, down-select from one of the following solutions:   * Solution 1: Derive K\_offset from ra-ResponseWindow and RAR window offset * Solution 2: Derive K\_offset from common TA and an extra parameter △K   K\_mac can be decided later once the down-selection is done for K\_offset.  Proposal 2: If beam specific K\_offset in initial access is supported, derive the beam specific initial K\_offset from common TA and a differential value carried by Msg2.  Proposal 3: Support updating beam-specific K\_offset via RRC configuration.  Proposal 4: Support updating UE-specific K\_offset via MAC CE.  Proposal 5: Signaling reduction methods should be introduced to relieve the reporting overhead of UE-specific K\_offset.  Proposal 6: RAN1 to clarify that Msg2/MsgB RAR window starts according to the actual up timing of PRACH transmission.  Proposal 7: There is no need to introduce a timing offset when determining the RO for PDCCH ordered PRACH. |
| [R1-2100244](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100244.zip) | ZTE | Proposal 1: Beam specific K\_offset configured in system information should be supported for UE in and after initial access procedure.  Proposal 2: In case of signalling of cell-specific K\_offset for initial access, the updates should be supported in beam-specific way.  Proposal 3: Proper setting of the unit of K\_offset should be considered to further reduce signaling overhead.  Proposal 4: For NTN cases, PRACH/MsgA is transmitted in the actual timing with consideration of time pre-compensation, and an offset should be added to the start of Msg2/MsgB RAR window.  Proposal 5: Extension of value range of K1 should be supported when the HARQ process number is larger than X. e.g. X=16.  Proposal 6: For the MAC CE action timing, the existing value of X, i.e., X = 3, can be reused in NTN.  Proposal 7: Confirming the working assumption to apply the K\_offset for the first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2.  Proposal 8: No need to introduce the K\_offset for DCI 2\_0 scheduled SFI.  Proposal 9: No need to introduce the K\_offset for PDCCH order PRACH. |
| [R1-2100304](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100304.zip) | CAICT | Proposal 1: To confirm the working assumption “K\_offset can be applied to indicate the first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2 in the same way as K\_offset is applied to the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH”.  Proposal 2: When a RACH procedure is trigged by PDCCH order, UE shall select the next available RO after a timing offset according to the indication of PDCCH order, where the timing offset can use the explicitly indicated by gNB or implicitly related to the TA reported by UE.  Proposal 3: To apply in the DCI 2\_0 scheduled SFI timing relationship.  Proposal 4: gNB has the flexibility of configuring cell-specific or beam specific value of .  Proposal 5: The value corresponds to UE-specific TA could be used as the updated . UE reports its autonomous TA to the gNB when the corresponding value of is to be changed at the UE side.  Proposal 6: Use cell-specific for the timing relationships related to fallback DCI formats and use updated UE-specific for the timing relationships related to non-fallback DCI formats.  Proposal 7: To enhance K1/K2 indication with explicit or implicit way in TDD system which is with more contiguous DL slots.  Proposal 8: For a MAC CE command received in DL slot n, where the command is used to indicate to the UE about an action in the UL or an assumption on the uplink configuration, if UL transmission depends on gNB instantaneous UL scheduling, the UE assumes the command is activated in the UL slot (at UE side) , where corresponds to the minimum propagation delay which the instantaneous UL scheduling is needed from gNB to UE. |
| [R1-2100381](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100381.zip) | CATT | Proposal 1: It is needed to clarify the K\_offset is associated with the RTT between the UE and reference point, and K\_mac is associated with the RTT between the reference point and gNB.  Proposal 2: Beam specific K\_offset configuration in system information is not supported.  Proposal 3: For the MAC CE action timing, the timing offset between the slot of UE received PDSCH and real effective slot can be configured as .  Proposal 4: An additional parameter must be introduced which should be broadcasted by network to UE to obtain the time of monitoring RAR. |
| [R1-2100441](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100441.zip) | vivo | Proposal 1: After initial access procedure, support updating K\_offset from cell-specific to beam-specific.  Proposal 2: In NTN, cell-specific K\_offset should also be supported even after the initial access procedure.  Proposal 3: The update of K\_offset should be triggered by gNB.  Proposal 4: Support to extend the range of K1 value.  Proposal 5: For Configured Grant Type 1, the maintenance of timing relationship should be left to network implementation.  Proposal 6: A timing offset is applied to the start of ra-ResponseWindow in NTN.  Proposal 7: The value of the timing offset that applied to the start of ra-ResponseWindow is determined by UE. |
| [R1-2100496](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100496.zip) | Zhejiang Lab | Proposal 1: Implicit signaling of K\_offset value(s) should be supported and the K\_offset value(s) should depend on numerology.  Proposal 2: Per beam K\_offset configuration should be supported and for the case of implicit configuration derived from per cell common TA, the difference between the per cell K\_offset and the per beam K\_offset can be signaled in the system information to reduce the signaling overhead. |
| [R1-2100594](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100594.zip) | MediaTek Inc. | Proposal 1: The value of K\_offset can be re-configured after RRC connection setup based on UE-specific autonomous TA report.  Proposal 2: The UE needs to at least report its autonomous TA to the gNB in Message 3 during initial cell access.  Proposal 3: After initial access, the UE-specific TA can be maintained in two ways:   * gNB triggers an autonomous TA report from the UE * UE initiates report autonomous TA report   Proposal 4: In the case where the downlink and uplink frame timing are assumed to be aligned at the satellite, on receiving a MAC CE command on PDSCH in DL slot n to indicate an action in the DL or an assumption on the downlink configuration, the UE assumes the command is activated in the DL slot (at UE side) which is the first DL slot after the UL slot , where   * TA is assumed to be zero and the UL slot indexed by is the UL slot where UE transmits HARQ-ACK corresponding to the received PDSCH carrying the MAC CE command. * kmac is the feeder link RTD between gNB UL slot and corresponding gNB DL slot.   Proposal 5: In case of TDD, K1 range is increased to 32 with indication of INTEGER (0..31) in dl-DataToUL-ACK field in PUCCH-Config.  Proposal 6: The network configures timeReferenceSFN-r16 to sfn512 in ConfiguredGrantConfig IE for Configured Grant Type 1in NR NTN.  Proposal 7: Confirm the working assumption for Configured Grant Type 2 in RAN1#103e as agreement   * K\_offset can be applied to indicate the first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2 in the same way as K\_offset is applied to the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH.   Proposal 8: On receiving PDCCH order in slot n, the UE selects the next RACH Opportunity after   * K\_offset as broadcast by the gNB. * UE autonomous TA |
| [R1-2100654](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100654.zip) | Intel Corporation | Proposal 1:   * Support beam specific K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access   Proposal 2:   * Common timing advance (TA) value can used to determine common slot offset (K\_offset) * Koffset value should be common for all applicable physical layer procedures   Proposal 3:   * At least for cell-specific and beam-specific K\_offset, update by the gNB after initial access via higher layer signaling (RRC or MAC CE) is supported   + It is not clear if UE-specific K\_offset is necessary |
| [R1-2100703](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100703.zip) | LG Electronics | Proposal 1: Support explicit signaling of K\_offset.  Proposal 2: Support beam (group)-specific K\_offset signaling in addition to cell-specific K\_offset.  Proposal 3: Support UE autonomous K\_offset updates based on satellite ephemeris.  Proposal 4: Discuss on whether or not to support the case where DL/UL frame timing at gNB is not aligned.  Proposal 5: For RACH procedure triggered by PDCCH order in Rel-17 NTN, define timing offset in addition to minimum gap, . |
| [R1-2100757](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100757.zip) | Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Proposal 1: Support beam specific K\_offset indication by RRC, MAC CE or group common DCI.  Proposal 2: Support extension of K1 and K2 range, and whether to increase the number of bits in scheduling DCI can be further discussed.  Proposal 3: If TA is pre-compensated for Msg1/MsgA transmission, NO additional offset between Msg1/MsgA and RAR is necessary if the RAR reception is based on DL reception timing at UE side.  Proposal 4: There is no necessity to add an additional offset between PDCCH order and corresponding PRACH. |
| [R1-2100807](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100807.zip) | Spreadtrum Communications | Proposal 1: Explicit signaling of K\_offset used in initial access in system information should be considered.  Proposal 2: Beam-specific values of K\_offset configuration for initial access should be supported.  Proposal 3: UE updates the value of K\_offset based on predefined rules should be considered. |
| [R1-2100859](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100859.zip) | Sony | Proposal 1: When the common timing offset is broadcasted by gNB, the Koffset values should be implicitly defined by calculation at the UE from the common timing offset.  Proposal 2: When the common timing offset is not broadcast by gNB in transparent payload case, the network should signal additional information such as gNB position or distance from the satellite to the UE. |
| [R1-2100912](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100912.ZIP) | China Telecom | Proposal 1: the UE updates K\_offset based on predefined rules and the gNB indicates the updating frequency.  Proposal 2: RRC configuration should be supported with a higher authority to calibrate or overwrite the K\_offset estimated by UE.  Proposal 3: The range of K1 and K2 shall be slightly extended and implicitly indicated.  Proposal 4: K\_offset shall be added to the timing relationship for configured grant type 1. |
| [R1-2100922](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100922.zip) | Ericsson | Proposal 1 The value of used in initial access is signaled explicitly in system information. How to properly encode with the consideration of other potential NTN related parameters can be discussed at a later stage.  Proposal 2 The value of can be reconfigured after RRC connection setup to be UE specific by RRC reconfiguration. |
| [R1-2100971](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100971.zip) | Asia Pacific Telecom, FGI, III, ITRI | Proposal 1 Support of beam specific K\_offset in initial access in Rel-17 should be justified with reasonable gain.  Proposal 2 If K\_offset update is supported, updating in a UE-specific manner provides more scheduling gain.  Proposal 3 If K\_offset update is supported, it is signaled to the UE via RRC in a semi-static manner.  Proposal 4 For a timing advance command received on uplink slot n, the corresponding adjustment of the uplink transmission timing applies from the beginning of uplink slot n + k + K\_TAC + 1, where K\_TAC may be the same or different values as K\_offset.  Proposal 5 For Type 1 PUSCH transmission, a new scheduling offset or clarification is needed for adapting to the long propagation delay.  Proposal 6 In response to a PRACH transmission and/or MSGA transmission, a UE attempts to detect a DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by a corresponding RA-RNTI during a window controlled by NW. The window starts at the first symbol of the earliest CORESET the UE is configured to receive PDCCH for Type1-PDCCH CSS set, that is at least one symbol, after the DL symbol corresponding to the last UL symbol (with the same slot number for DL and UL)  Proposal 7 For a PDCCH order, introduce new parameters to prolong the processing time for UE. |
| [R1-2100984](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2100984.zip) | InterDigital, Inc. | Proposal-1: the scenario where DL and UL frame timings are not aligned at gNB has to be supported in Rel-17  Proposal-2: support K\_mac for DL MAC-CE action time  Proposal-3: K-offset value is independently determined/indicated from common TA in the system information (Alt-1)  Proposal-4: beam-specific K-offset indication is also supported optionally  Proposal-5: support to update the K-offset to a UE-specific delay after initial access and it is up to the network to use UE-specific K-offset  Proposal-6: the UE-specific K-offset value is configured/indicated by gNB after initial access |
| [R1-2101024](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2101024.zip) | Panasonic Corporation | Proposal 1: Beam specific Koffset is not necessary.  Proposal 2: UE-specifically update Koffset after initial access.  Proposal 3: Support dedicated RRC signalling and indication of relative Koffset value via MAC CE or group common DCI.  Proposal 4: In order to determine UE specific Koffset, UE location report should be utilized if available. If it is not available, UE report of a coarse RTT value should be specified.  Proposal 5: For DL related MAC CE action timing, K\_mac should be introduced.  Proposal 6: Whether to use HARQ-feedback disabled process to transmit a MAC CE is up to network implementation. When HARQ-feedback disabled process is used to transmit the MAC CE, virtual HARQ-ACK timing based on the indicated K1 value should be used to determine the UL related MAC CE action timing. |
| [R1-2101042](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2101042.zip) | CMCC | Proposal 1: Explicit signaling of K\_offset in system information should at least be supported.  Proposal 2: If Common TA based TA determining solution can be further studied, implicit signaling of K\_offset in system information can be further considered to avoid potential signaling redundancy.  Proposal 3: For K\_offset configured in system information and used in initial access, beam specific system information based beam specific K\_offset configuration, where different beam specific system information may carry different beam specific K\_offset value, can be supported.  Proposal 4: Update K\_offset after initial access under network control can be supported.  Proposal 5: Compared to detailed network indication signaling design for K\_offset updating, the study on UE reporting TA related information for facilitating network updating K\_offset after initial access needs to be prioritized.  Proposal 6: Extend the value range of K1 from (0..15) to (0..31), while keep the bit size of PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI unchanged.  Proposal 7: For configured grant type 2, conform the working assumption made in the last RAN1 meeting.   * K\_offset can be applied to indicate the first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2 in the same way as K\_offset is applied to the transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH.   Proposal 8: When downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB, indication of RAR\_window\_offset is not needed.  Proposal 9: When downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB, indication of RAR\_window\_offset is needed. |
| [R1-2101117](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2101117.zip) | Xiaomi | Proposal 1: K\_offset configured on a per beam basis should be supported.  Proposal 2: It is preferred to have common signaling to update the K\_offset.  Proposal 3: The K\_offset is configured with a unit of millisecond.  Proposal 4: Extension of K1/K2 should be supported.  Proposal 5: The enhancement on the SFI timing relationship is not supported |
| [R1-2101206](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2101206.zip) | Samsung | Proposal 1: Support cell specific Koffset value only.  Proposal 2: More than one of above Koffset configurations can be supported, and using which one is dependent on gNB configuration.  Proposal 3: The timing relationship for Configured Grant Type 1 should be left to Network implementation.  Proposal 4: Confirm the Working Assumption made in RAN1#103-e for CG type 2. |
| [R1-2101296](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2101296.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Proposal 1: Do not support beam specific K\_offset in system information and used in initial access.  Proposal 2: Support UE-specific K\_offset for UEs in connected mode  Proposal 3: The UL-DL timing relationships adjustments should be dynamic to follow the propagation variation over time.  Proposal 4: RAN 1 to discuss methods to update K\_offset for all users in the cell.  Proposal 5: RAN1 to discuss signaling alternatives for providing UE-specific K\_offset after Random Access procedure.  Proposal 6: RAN1 to assume long TA as baseline solution and no K\_mac to be introduced in the system.  Proposal 7: RAN1 to define timing relationships such that a feeder link switch does not cause a large jump in the common delay value used by the UE. |
| [R1-2101383](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2101383.zip) | Apple | Proposal 1: A UE specific is used after initial access.  Proposal 2: Consider the triggering of update is initiated by UE.  Proposal 3: The update is signaled via RRC configuration or MAC CE.  Proposal 4: The scheduling offset is derived from feeder link RTT and .  Proposal 5: The MAC CE for downlink configuration is activated at UE at the first downlink slot that is after uplink slot where n is the uplink slot when UE sends HARQ-ACK for the PDSCH providing the activation command, is the sub-carrier spacing configured for uplink.  Proposal 6: The TA command MAC CE is activated at uplink slot n+k+1, where n is the uplink slot when PDSCH carrying TA command MAC CE is received, and k is UE’s PDSCH processing time.  Proposal 7: Introduce to the timing relationship for type 1 configured grant.  Proposal 8: In NTN, TA is considered in determining the starting time of RAR window. |
| [R1-2101464](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2101464.zip) | Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 1:   * The following two offset are carried in system information:   + Offset\_s   + Offset\_f * The scheduling offset for the following timing relationships is calculated as K\_offset=Offset\_s+Offset\_f   + The transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH (including CSI on PUSCH).   + The transmission timing of RAR grant scheduled PUSCH.   + The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH.   + The CSI reference resource timing.   + The transmission timing of aperiodic SRS. * The scheduling offset for the application of MAC-CE commands with DL configuration is calculated as K\_offset=Offset\_f. * Offset\_f is the common offset used in the calculation of TA of PRACH transmission. * FFS Beam specific and UE specific Offset\_s.   Proposal 2: Support UE specific Koffset based on UE report(s) of UE specific TA.   * Exact mechanisms for UE TA report and associated signalling of Koffset are FFS. |
| [R1-2101616](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2101616.zip) | NTT DOCOMO, INC. | Proposal 1: is signaled in SIB1 or in SIB following SIB1.  Proposal 2: in initial access is a cell-specific parameter. Beam-specific is not supported.  Proposal 3: Support the value of in initial access which corresponds to the largest delay in the cell.  Proposal 4: Keep the existing K1/K2 range in initial access.  Proposal 5: After RRC connection setup, RAN1 to support either updating in UE-specific manner or introducing negative values to K1/K2 candidate set via RRC configuration. |
| [R1-2101694](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Docs/R1-2101694.zip) | Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI | Proposal 1: It must be left to gNB/network to select a value of greater than or equal to the maximum RTD of cell or beam depending on cell specific or beam specific signaling.  Proposal 2: RAN1 to adopt millisecond as the unit of the .  Proposal 3: NTN UE should derive the initial value of from the broadcast system information, e.g., ra-ContentionResolutionTimer and an offset to the start of ra-ContentionResolutionTimer or common/minimum delay.  Proposal 4: NTN UE should derive the initial value of from the broadcast system information, e.g., RRC timers T300, T301, T319, and T310.  Proposal 5: The value of should be updated/reconfigure after RRC connection in UE specific manner.  Proposal 6: For UE specific update of , NTN UE should report its acquired TA to gNB.  Proposal 7: NTN UE should report its first TA report as part of MSG3.  Proposal 8: RAN1 to further study the details of NTN UE TA report. |