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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#104bis-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#105-e under agenda item 8.4.1 [4] – [30].

# 1 Issue #1: K\_offset update

## 1.1 Background

At RAN1#105-e, many companies provide views on K\_offset update after initial access.

**[Nokia/NSB]**

Proposal 1: RAN 1 to downselect the type of messages that update K\_offset.

Proposal 2: Updates on individual K\_offset values are provided by MAC-CE.

Proposal 3: A new MAC-CE message to be designed for covering per-UE individual K\_offset updates.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal-2: For 2-step RACH, a refined value of K\_offset can be directly configured for a UE if corresponding TA is conveyed in the Msg-A transmission.

Proposal-3: To enable the updates of K\_offset in UE specific way, the full TA report should be supported by both Msg-A and periodically PUSCH.

Proposal-4: MAC CE is preferable as a quick network indication to update from cell specific K\_offset to UE specific \_offset.

Proposal-5: Update K\_offset via indicating an adjustment value should be supported.

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 2: Support both RRC reconfiguration and MAC CE for the update of Koffset. Relative indication should be used for MAC CE.

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.

**[NTT Docomo]**

Proposal 3: A RRC parameter to configure UE-specific K\_offset.

* If this parameter is provided, the UE uses the parameter as K\_offset.
* Otherwise, the UE uses K\_offset provided in initial access.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 1: Regarding K\_offset update after initial access, both Option 1 (RRC reconfiguration) and Option 2 (MAC CE) can be supported.

Proposal 2: If further down-selection is needed, Option 2 (MAC CE) is preferred for universality.

Proposal 4: RAN1 to further study the details of UE reporting TA related information to facilitate network updating K\_offset after initial access. The following reporting information can be further studied.

* Option 1: UE location.
* Option 2: UE self-estimated TA ($N\_{TA,UE-specific}$).
* Option 3: the difference value (in unit of slot) between K\_offset signaled in system information and a UE specific K\_offset as suggest by UE.

**[Apple]**

Proposal 2: For signaling of updating $K\_{offset}$ after initial access, both RRC reconfiguration and MAC CE are supported.

Proposal 3: Consider the triggering of $K\_{offset}$ update is initiated by UE.

**[CAICT]**

Proposal 1: Updating $K\_{offset}$ with MAC CE after initial access.

**[Zhejiang Lab]**

Proposal 4: Both cell/beam specific and UE specific updating of K\_offset should be supported as follows,

* For cell/beam specific K\_offset updating, K\_offset can be broadcasted in system information;
* For UE specific K\_offset updating, the following cases should be considered,
	+ if UE location is available to the gNB, UE specific K\_offset can be configured by gNB without any reporting from UE;
	+ if UE location is not available to the gNB, UE specific K\_offset can be derived from common TA and UE specific TA, which requires UE specific TA reporting.

Proposal 5: For updating K\_offset after initial access, both RRC reconfiguration and MAC CE should be supported.

**[OPPO]**

Proposal 3: both MAC-CE and RRC reconfiguration can be supported for K offset update.

Proposal 4: UE-specific or beam-specific K offset in the K offset updating can be left for gNB implementation and RAN1 does not need to further discuss this aspect.

Proposal 5: UE-triggered and gNB-controlled K\_offset updating can be supported in RRC connect mode.

**[ITL]**

Proposal 1. It is preferred to adopt RRC reconfiguration for updating K\_offset value after initial access.

Proposal 2. gNB controlled and UE-initiated mechanisms can be supported for update of K\_offset value.

**[LGE]**

Proposal 4: Support MAC-CE based K\_offset update after initial access.

Proposal 5: Apply new K\_offset value X slot after transmission of RRC reconfiguration complete message or acknowledgement for MAC-CE reception.

**[Huawei/HiSi]**

Proposal 3: K\_offset update after initial access is supported via MAC-CE.

Proposal 4: Support reporting UE-specific TA related information in Msg3 or MsgA for updating of K\_offset.

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

Proposal 1: Support MAC CE for updating K\_offset after initial access to prevent UE from being unable to comply with part of the configuration included in the RRCReconfigration message.

Proposal 7 Support UE-specific TA reporting for an update of K\_offset after initial access.

Proposal 8 UE-specific TA reporting shall include a UE-calculated TA value used for the latest UL transmission in a unit of slot numbers.

Proposal 9 Reporting UE location is non-essential for UL scheduling adaptation considering the frequency of UE reporting and user privacy.

Proposal 10 Reporting UE-specific TA drift rate is non-essential for UL scheduling adaptation considering the frequency of UE reporting

Proposal 11 The UE reports the UE-specific TA pre-compensation using a MAC CE.

Proposal 12 To minimize spec impacts, TA reporting using a MAC CE after initial access shall be considered.

**[InterDigital]**

Proposal-3: a UE report UE-specific TA value for K-offset update in RRC connected status if requested by the network

Proposal-4: MAC-CE is used for updating K-offset value after initial access

**[Spreadtrum]**

Proposal 3: The method to avoid frequent K\_offset update with dedicated RRC signaling/MAC CE should be considered.

**[Lenovo/Motorola Mobility]**

Proposal 1: Support MAC CE signaling to update K-offset after initial access.

Proposal 3: Update of K-offset can be indicated by a drift rate or by indication of a coordinate of a position.

**[Intel]**

Proposal 2:

At least RRC-based K\_offset update after initial access shall be supported

* MAC CE-based K\_offset update can be additionally considered for non-GEO scenario

**[Xiaomi]**

Proposal 4: It is preferred to have a group common signaling to update the K\_offset.

**[CATT]**

Proposal 3: RRC signaling to indicate K\_offset can be supported.

Proposal 4: One threshold is used for TA report triggering.

Proposal 5: Coarse TA range reporting with larger granularity can be supported, rather than accurate TA reporting.

**[Ericsson]**

Proposal 1 For updating K\_offset after initial access, support only the RRC reconfiguration option.

Proposal 2 K\_offset is updated by K\_offset+ΔK\_offset, where ΔK\_offset is configured after initial access and is zero if not configured.

**[Qualcomm]**

Proposal 3: Support updating K\_offset after initial access at least by MAC-CE

* FFS: details of signaling

Proposal 4: Support UE specific TA report by MAC-CE

* FFS: details of signaling

Proposal 5: Support configuration of periodic TA report by RRC.

**[Samsung]**

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

Proposal 3: The update of K\_offset value after initial access is done by the combination of RRC configuration and MAC CE. MAC indicates only one of the multiple values configured by the gNB.

**[NEC]**

Proposal 3: Support UE based triggering for K\_offset update after initial access.

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.
* The main discussion point is about using RRC reconfiguration, or MAC CE or both to update K\_offset.
* There are several proposals on TA/location reporting. Note that RAN2 has been discussing this topic as well. It would be preferred to avoid parallel discussions across RAN1 and RAN2.

The table below presents a summary of the proposed design options and the corresponding proponents.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Design option | Proponent(s) |
| RRC reconfiguration | [4] sources: [NTT Docomo, ITL, CATT, Ericsson] |
| MAC CE | [8] sources: [Nokia/NSB, ZTE, CAICT, LGE, Huawei/HiSi, Asia Pacific Telecom/FGI/ITRI/III, InterDigital, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Qualcomm] |
| Both RRC configuration and MAC CE | [7] sources: [Panasonic, CMCC, Apple, Zhejiang Lab, OPPO, Intel, Samsung] |

Given the diverse views, Moderator holds the view that the group would first need to understand the pros and cons, as well as the needs, to make further progress.

**The first question is how often K\_offset would need to be updated.**

* In GEO the change of propagation RTT when the satellite moves is small and there appear to be no need to update the broadcasted Koffset often.
* In LEO with earth moving cells, the gNB knows the maximum propagation RTT in each cell and can broadcast a Koffset that suits the individual cell. This K\_offset will be updated very seldom, if at all.
* In LEO with earth fixed cells, the maximum propagation RTT and the differential delay in the cell will change when the satellite moves. K\_offset update appears more needed in this scenario.

**The second question is how network would schedule UEs with different K\_offset values.**

* It appears non-trivial for network to manage UEs with different K\_offset values.
	+ When grants for UEs with different K\_offset values are sent in the same slot, the corresponding UL transmissions are not received in the same UL slot, that is, the gNB scheduler cannot schedule all UEs that are to be received in the same UL slot at the same occasion.
	+ Alternatively, gNB can send grants at different times so that the corresponding UL transmissions are received in the same UL slot. However, if UEs are scheduled at different points in time, it is difficult to tradeoff QoS among the UEs whose transmissions are received in the same UL slot.
* Despite this is more an implementation issue, the discussion would have implications on what design options are suitable, because in the end a good design option is the one that has the potential of being implemented.

## 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):**

Companies are encouraged to provide views on the following questions:

1. How often does K\_offset need to be updated in GEO NTN?
2. How often does K\_offset need to be updated in LEO NTN with earth moving cells?
3. How often does K\_offset need to be updated in LEO NTN with earth fixed cells?
4. How would network schedule UEs with different K\_offset values?

Further, as asked by RAN2, at least for uplink scheduling adaptation:

1. What is the exact content of UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation?
2. How frequent is the UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | 1. If beam-specific K\_offset in SI is not supported then K\_offset needs to be updated at least once for GEO (from cell-specific to beam specific)
2. Same as 1. Furthermore, depending on beam-specific K\_offset configuration design, it may require update every time beam switching happens.
3. Same as 1. In addition, K\_offset can be updated due to satellite mobility once per several seconds.
4. In our view network can handle different UEs with different K\_offset as it can handle UEs configured with different slot offset values (e.g. K2). However, in our view UE-specific K\_offset is not needed, beam-specific K\_offset is enough. Anyway, if it is difficult for network to handle different K\_offset then network can configure the same K\_offset.
 |
| Samsung | For 1), at most once may be needed.For 2) and 3), it depends on the number of satellites in the constellation. Also, this is related to the subcarrier spacing. For larger subcarrier spacing, more frequent update of K\_offset is needed. For 4), there is other timing parameters including K1 and K2. Therefore, regardless of whether the same or different K\_offset value, the gNB can schelude with adjustment of K1 and K2.  |
| NTT DOCOMO | 1. Larger interval than 3)
2. Larger interval than 3)
3. Per several seconds in the worst case. Nomally more.
4. It would be up to NW implementation. If latency reduction of some UEs is preferred to fairness among UEs, UE specific K\_offset can be used. If fairness i.e. QoS among UEs are prioritized, common K\_offset would be applied.
 |
| Apple | 1). Koffset update rate is low in GEO. It may be updated after the initial access and with UE mobility.2). Koffset update rate could be high in LEO with earth moving cells. The cell specific Koffset may not change in this case. Then the non-cell-specific Koffset needs to be updated frequently for each particular UE (without UE mobility). 3). Koffset update rate could be high in LEO with earth fixed cells. Cell specific Koffset may be updated in this case, but it is not suitable for each particular UE. 4). The difficulty that network schedules UEs with different Koffset values is unclear to us. a). In our understanding, UE reporting of UE specific TA information is mainly for Koffset update purpose. Hence, UE reported information could be an indication of Koffset increase or decrease, or the amount of Koffset increase or decrease. Overall, it could be slot level granularity.b). We propose to have UE report based on event trigger. If UE detects the needs of updating Koffset, then it reports.  |
| APT | It depends on whether to support UE-specific K\_offset, which shall be supported since we have decided not to extend UE-specific K1 and K2. Also, UE-gNB RTT is needed at least for K\_mac and other RAN2 enhancements.The update frequency is based on the granularity of K\_offset, which shall be in a slot to cope with K1 and K2. K\_offset shall be updated if RTT varies by more than one slot. If only **cell/bean-specific K\_offset** is supported, then since a gNB shall know the geolocation of the cell/beam center and the cell/beam size (which shall be needed for DL pre-compensation), then cell/beam-specific K\_offset can be updated in system information for all RRC modes (without TA report). * 1) No update
* 2) No update
* 3) 10.75s for SCS = 15KHz
* 4) Not sure about the issue, but based on SS and Intel, UE-specific K1 and K2 may help.
* a) No report
* b) No report

If **UE-specific K\_offset** is supported, then a UE-specific TA report is needed.* 1) at least one time after TA reporting.
* 2) 10.75s for SCS = 15KHz (not very sure, but assume the UE-specific elevation angle changes like the one for quasi-earth-fixed cells)
* 3) 10.75s for SCS = 15KHz
* 4) not sure about this issue, but UE-specific K1 and K2 may help.
* a) UE location/UE self-estimated TA/adjustment of K\_offset/UE self-estimated TA
* b) 10.75s for SCS = 15KHz
 |
| ZTE | 1 At least UE-specific update from cell specific K\_offset is supported for these three cases. And in connected state, the update frequency will increase from 1) to 3). Specifically, the K\_offset can be updated when the change of RTD exceed a defined granularity e.g. 1ms, 10ms, or a threshold based on value range of K1/K2 etc. 2 For question 4), we share similar view with Intel, It can be handled to schedule UEs with different UE-specific K\_offset values similar as legacy TN system. Anyway, the scheduling and setting of corresponding value will be determined by network, e.g., grouping or pairing UEs with same K\_offset.3 w.r.t the reply LS, as proposed in R1-2105198, From RAN1’s perspective, the full TA value, which will be applied for UL transmission should be reported by UE via following two approaches:* Msg-A in two-step RACH
* Periodically PUSCH

4 W.r.t frequency for updates, it mainly update the scenario, for example, in case of LEO case, shorter period can be considered for report. Comparing to other solution, e.g., UE initialized or BS triggered, since the need for updates (frequency for updates) is determined by network and UE type only, the CG PUSCH based can save overhead for UE-gNB interaction.Moreover, w.r.t the two options for updating K\_offsetFor RRC reconfiguration, the ambiguity processing delay is critical and should be considered. For MAC CE, update K\_offset via indicating an adjustment value should be considered from signaling overhead benefit perspective. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 1. K\_offset if properly set, it will not be updated or it will be updated very seldom (in special the cell specific K\_offset). It is so rare, that even if this feature is not available, it could be done via SIB update and a new RACH (ex: PDCCH ordered RACH for connected users.)
2. The question can be split into 2:
	1. Cell-specific K\_offset won’t require updates.
	2. UE specific K\_offset may use updates, if the cell is large enough (as some of the NTN reference scenarios propose). Update will happen once every few seconds (~10 s for the largest SCS).
3. In this case both, cell specific and UE specific may need to be updated.
	1. Cell-specific update can be done in SIB via SIB update. However, it won’t affect connected users. Assuming a scenario where there is no UE-specific K\_offset, the connected UEs will need to have access to this info. Therefore, there is a need to send this information to all connected users once every few seconds.
	2. UE specific K\_offset may also need update once every 10 seconds or so.
4. In terms of scheduling, an offset of a few slots on the UL grant addressed to different UEs in the same slot is no different from what can be done today, as the gNB has leeway to provide different time allocation in the grant (it is not a constant number). However, it will be more complex in the sense it will require book-keeping of K offsets used by the gNB.

Further, as highlighted at the GTW session, it is also important to further discuss whether we need to ensure that UE and gNB have the same understanding of the UE specific K\_offset all the time, as this may also impact the design of the signaling mechanism. |
| Spreadtrum | 1) In the GEO scenario, the update frequency of K is very low. The update frequency depends on the UE's moving speed.2) In the LEO scenario, due to the rapid movement of the satellite, the RTD changes very quickly. Compared with the GEO scenario, the update frequency of the K\_offset value is much higher.3) In the LEO scenario, due to the rapid movement of the satellite, the RTD changes very quickly. Compared with the GEO scenario, the update frequency of the K\_offset value is much higher.4) It would be up to NW implementation. |
| Panasonic | 1) For GEO, Koffset update would be carried out once after initial access and based on UE mobility. The update rate would be once per a few minutes at shortest considering 0.125ms slot length and 1000km/h UE speed). 2) For LEO earth moving cells, Koffset would be updated mainly according to the satellite movement. Suitable Koffset value depends on individual UE location. The update rate would be once per 1.2 seconds at shortest considering RTT drift rate up to roughly 100us/s. 3) For LEO earth fixed cells, Koffset would be updated mainly according to the satellite movement. Similar update rate as in 2) is expected. 4) it should be NW implmenentation matter. a) we think reporting rough UE location information is more useful than reporting TA pre-compensation value because UE location information can also be used for other purposes, e.g. handover, beam switching. But, if TA pre-compensation is reported for this particular use case of Koffset update, differential value from the cell specific Koffset with coarse granularity like slot length order would be preferable to save signaling overhead.b) Necessary update rate of UE TA pre-compensation reporting would depend on UE mobility status as well as deployment scenarios. UE report based on event trigger would be preferable. |
| LG | 1) K\_offset update rate is quite low in GEO. 2) and 3) Compared to 1), higher K\_offset update rate is required. 4) it is upto NW implementation.a) We think it needs to be firstly determined whether it is explicit signaling or implicit signaling. In our view, implicit signaling is preferred to reduce some overhead. As a candidate, we can consider that the different TA (or the range of TA) can be mapped to different ROs (or RO groups).b) it may depends on whether it is periodic reporting or event-driven reporting. In order to unnecessary reporting overhead, we prefer event-driven reporting. In that case, NW can configure some threshold (e.g., difference btw K\_offset and TA). |
| OPPO | 1. UE-specific K offset needs to be updated after initial access.

For LEO, the K offset updating is more often. But it can be left for gNB implementation, e.g. if gNB wants to maintain a same cell-specific K offset, the gNB can do it by not updating the K offset.  |
| ITL | 1) and 2) Larger interval such as more than several seconds3) It depends on the position of moving UE and the number of satellites. A few number of times per several seconds.4) It would basically be up to scheduler design in NW side, with proper value of K\_offset value.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We assume the discussion focus on update of K\_offset after initial access. How often does K\_offset need to be updated is not only dependent on whether it is GEO or LEO but also the elevation angle as well as the UE speed. For 1) The update of K\_offset can be seldom even for UEs with high speed. For 2) and 3) The update of K\_offset can be quite often consider the movement of satellite.For 4), we are not sure about whether there will be an issue for gNB scheduling considering that K1/K2 can already be different for different UEs.For a) and b), our view is that the main purpose of UE-specific TA reporting is at least be used for UE-specific K\_offset configuration. The detailed content and reporting mechanism can be discussed after we reach an agreement that UE-specific TA reporting is supported.With respect to signaling, as discussed at the first GTW session, RRC and MAC-CE based signalling have different tolerance to frequent updates. MAC-CE based update seems to us more robust choice whether the K\_offset updates would take place only seldom or fairly often depending on 1), 2), 3). |
| Qualcomm | For GEO, Question 1), typically one K\_offset update is needed.For LEOs with moving and fixed cells, Questions 2) and 3), several or more Koffset updates may be needed. For Question 4), UE report of TA is needed. TA report can be under network request or based on configured triggering conditions.In NTN, the uncertainty duration for the application of the old or new configurations at UE can be very large, RTD+processing time. This is particularly an issue. As a result, MAC-CE is preferred. |
| Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI | For 1) GEO the update is not frequent. This also depends on whether UE specific K\_offset update is required or not. For 2) and 3) more frequent update is required. For 4) we believe this may not be an issue as K1 and K2 will be configured for different UEs. Again, if UE specific update of K\_offset is needed, UE TA report can be considered.  |
| Xiaomi | We also agree that the update frequency for GEO is quite low, but for LEO with fixed or moving cells, the update happens frequently.For a), we don’t have a agreement on UE need to report its TA. So we can first have a discussion on that and then decide how to report the TA information.For b), this highly depends on how the TA is reported, e.g, periodical or triggered  |
| Inmarsat | For GEO, we agree the update frequency can be low as a baseline, but update might be required in case of feeder link switch, and in case of beam steering, both of which will affect RTT.For LEO we agree more frequent update may be required. |
| MediaTek | K\_offset is updated at most once when UE moves to connected for GEO, LEO earth moving beams and LEO earth-fixed beams. Assuming a large satellite cell consists of several smaller beamspots, the granularity of the K\_offset can be based on the beamspot diameter. This should be sufficient to improve UL scheduler flexibility.On a) The UE-specific TApre-compensation should be for the UE-satellite RTT. It is not needed to include the common TA part (between gNB and Reference Point for DL-UL subframe timing alignment)On b) The UE reporting of UE-specific TA pre-compensation should be reported to avoid subframe ambiguity when the delay drift is larger than half slot / subframe. If this is allowed to happen, there would be ambiguity on the slot / subframe index between the UE and gNB.  |
| Sony | 1. Infrequent. This is mainly related to UE mobility.
2. Infrequent. This is mainly related to UE mobility.
3. More frequentry compared to 1 & 2. This is mainly related to satellite mobility.
4. This would be up to network implementation. We have the same view as Intel that if it is difficult for network to handle different K\_offset then network can configure the same K\_offset.
 |
| Lenovo/MM | 1. In GEO NTN, update of K-offset is seldom.
2. In earth moving cell, UE-gNB RTT will firstly change within a range due to satellite moving, and then cell/beam will change. So update of K-offset by MAC CE is preferred.
3. In earch fixed cell, UE-gNB RTT will change due to satellite moving with a relative large range than earch moving cell. So update of K-offset by MAC CE is preferred.
4. As gNB and UE have common understanding on the k-offset, gNB is flexible to schedule UE with differnt scheduling methods. That is, the DCI for scheduling can be transmitted simultaneously for Ues with different K-offst values, or the DCI are sent at different occasions, and the reception of uplink signal/RS are at same occastion at gNB side.
5. We prefer a TA value is reported by UE, similarly to the TA command received in TA command.

Periodic reporting of UE specific TA pre-compensation is preferred considering satellite moving. |
| Zhejiang Lab | 1. In GEO, K\_offset deos not need to be updated often. However, it also depends on the movement ompou UE. For example, if UE moves from cell centre ompou cell edge, K\_offset value needs ompo updated.
2. For LEO, K\_offset depends on many issues, such as beam swithing, UE movement and thus it needs ompo updated multiple times.
3. For the last question, if UE specific K\_offset is configured, NW can cope with the scheduling of UE in our understanding.
 |
| CMCC | 1. The update frequency of the K\_offset value is very low.
2. The update frequency is much higher. Due to the rapid movement of the satellite, the RTD in feeder link changes very quickly.
3. The update frequency is even higher than 2). Due to the rapid movement of the satellite, the RTD in both service link and feeder link changes very quickly.
4. It would be up to NW implementation.

 1. It is preferred to report the difference value (in unit of slot) between K\_offset signaled in system information and a UE specific K\_offset as suggest by UE.
2. We propose to have UE report based on event trigger. If UE detects the needs of updating Koffset, then it reports.
 |
| CATT | * 1. In GEO NTN, K\_offset need to be updated with long time, e.g per 10 seconds.
	2. In LEO NTN, K\_offset need to be updated quickly, e.g per second.
	3. In earth fixed cells, it should be more frequent than case 2.
	4. In reality, Network may use fixed K-offset for all UEs, so the K-offset updating would be used seldom.

Regarding the RAN2 questions, 1. UE may report coarse UE specific TA, no need to have very accurate information.
2. Not frequent. UE can trigger the report if the UE specific TA has exceeded one threshold.
 |

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

In the first round of email discussion, 23 companies provided views. For ease of further discussion, K\_offset update and TA reporting for replying RAN2 LS are summarized in Sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.2, respectively.

### 1.3.1 K\_offset update

Companies provided diverse comments on how often K\_offset needs update. Several general observations can be made as follows.

* For GEO, both cell-specific and UE-specific K\_offset updates can be rare.
* For LEO with earth moving cells, cell-specific K\_offset update can be rare, while UE-specific K\_offset update may be carried out, e.g., once every seconds.
* For LEO with earth fixed cells, both cell-specific and UE-specific K\_offset updates may need to be more often. Cell-specific K\_offset update can be done via system information update. UE-specific K\_offset update may be carried out, e.g., once every seconds.

Besides, several companies also pointed out that K\_offset update via MAC CE is preferred.

Based on the above discussion as well as companies’ proposals, the following proposal is made for companies to comment in the second round of discussions.

**Proposal 1.3.1 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

For updating K\_offset after initial access, at least the MAC CE option is supported.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Zhejiang Lab | Agree with the proposal. Suggest to add one FFS point for RRC re-configuration for future discussion. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. Although we think RRC reconfiguration can also be used for delivering UE-specific K\_offset, especially in GEO scenario, we are fine to agree at least the MAC CE option at this stage.  |
| APT | Support. NTN covers many scenarios, GEO, MEO, LEO, HIBS, and ATG, so it might be unrealistic to optimize each of them. For Rel-17, handling the worst-case is reasonable. In this issue, LEO with earth fixed cells shall be considered.  |
| CATT | RRC updating is the baseline. For MAC CE updating, it can be further discussed. |
| LG  | Support. Regarding Zhejiang Lab’s comment on FFS point, we think “at least” in the main bullet already covers it, so it is not needed.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 1.3.2 TA reporting for answering RAN2 LS

Companies provided diverse comments on TA reporting for answering RAN2 LS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Question | Company inputs |
| What is the exact content of UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation? | UE specific TA: [Apple, MediaTek, CATT, Lenovo/MM(?)]Full TA: [ZTE, Lenovo/MM(?)]UE location: [Panasonic]Difference between UE-specific K\_offset and cell-specific K\_offset: [CMCC] |
| How frequent is the UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation? | Event triggered: [Apple, ZTE, Panasonic, LG, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, CMCC, CATT]Network request: [ZTE, Qualcomm]Periodic: [Xiaomi, Lenovo/MM] |

[Huawei/HiSi, Xiaomi] also suggested first discussing whether to support TA reporting before discussing content and reporting mechanisms.

* [Moderator]: Note that RAN2 has been discussing this topic for relatively long already and has made good progress. It would be preferred to let RAN2 to converge further, rather than RAN1 start to duplicate the discussion which might interfere with RAN2 discussion. Therefore, Moderator suggests that we focus on answering RAN2 LS questions.

**Proposal 1.3.2 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

Companies are encouraged to provide further views on the questions asked by RAN2 LS:

1. At least for uplink scheduling adaptation, what is the exact content of UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation?
	1. Option 1: UE specific TA: [Apple, MediaTek, CATT, Lenovo/MM(?)]
	2. Option 2: Full TA: [ZTE, Lenovo/MM(?)]
	3. Option 3: UE location: [Panasonic]
	4. Option 4: Difference between UE-specific K\_offset and cell-specific K\_offset: [CMCC]
	5. Other option(s)?
2. At least for uplink scheduling adaptation, how frequent is the UE reporting of information about the UE specific TA pre-compensation?
	1. Option 1: Event triggered: [Apple, ZTE, Panasonic, LG, Qualcomm, Xiaomi, CMCC, CATT]
	2. Option 2: Network request: [ZTE, Qualcomm]
	3. Option 3: Periodic: [Xiaomi, Lenovo/MM]
	4. Other option(s)?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Zhejiang Lab | For question 1), we support option 1. For question 2), we think both option 1 and 3 should be supported for different scenarios. In addition, it should be clarified that if event triggered or network request mean UE only reports once or UE can still report multiple times in a given time window.  |
| Apple | 1). Probably UE specific TA or full TA make no big difference. UE reporting of UE specific (or full) TA related information is mainly for UE specific Koffset update purpose. Hence, UE reported information could be simply an indication of Koffset increase or decrease, or the amount of Koffset increase or decrease. Overall, it could be slot level granularity. * We have concern with Option 3, since the UE location is private information, which may only be reported to location server. NW usually does not have this information.
* Option 4 may cause some ambiguity during the period when cell-specific K\_offset is updated.

2). We support Option 1. Option 1 has the advantage of signaling overhead savings. Basically, a UE only needs to report when it detects the necessity of updating UE-specific Koffset.* UE specific TA keeps changing and NW does not generally know the UE specific TA. This implies that NW may not always know when to request the reporting information related to UE specific TA. Hence, Option 2 is less preferrable comparing with Option 1.
* Option 3 (periodic reporting) seems to waste the signaling in many cases, especially for static UEs.
 |
| APT | 1. Option 1: UE-specific TA (aligned with R2-2103630, and this is the only information NW lacks)
2. Option 2: Network request (TA reporting is not useful when frequent update of Koffset is not needed, e.g., GEO, LEO with earth-moving-cell, or Koffset is set to be a large number when latency is not the concern).
 |
| CATT | For question 1, we think UE specific TA reporting should control overhead, so we prefer one new option based on option 1Option 5: TA change between current TA and previous TAFor question 2, option 1 and option 3 can be supported both. When TA change is very quick, periodic reporting can be used, but for slow change case, aperiodic reporting is needed.1. Option 1: Event triggered: CATT
2. Option 3: Periodic: CATT
 |
| LG | Q1) As TA reporting contents, we also think there is no big difference btw option 1 and 2, but we slightly prefer option 2 (full TA). Q2) In order to reduce unnecessary reporting overhead in RRC connected mode, we prefer event-triggered (option 1). In this case, NW can configure some threshold (e.g., difference btw K\_offset and TA). In the initial access, implicit TA reporting can be considered where the different TA (or the range of TA) can be mapped to different ROs (or RO groups). |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 2 Issue #2: K\_offset value determination

## 2.1 Background

At RAN1#105-e, many companies provide views on K\_offset configuration.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal-1: Signalling one offset value for K\_offset as option-1 is preferred.

**[NTT Docomo]**

Proposal 4: For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, signal one offset value for K\_offset.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 5: Regarding K\_offset value determination, Option 2 (K\_offset is equal to the sum of the two indicated offset values) should be supported, wherein,

* K\_offset (in unit of slot) = offset\_1 + offset\_2, where offset\_2 is explicitly indicated in system information, and offset\_1 is implicitly determined by common TA ($N\_{TA,common}$) as following.

$$offset\_{1}=\left⌈\frac{N\_{TA,common}∙T\_{c}}{2^{-μ}×10^{-3}}\right⌉$$

**[Apple]**

Proposal 1: Support to signal a single offset value for cell specific $K\_{offset}$.

**[CAICT]**

Proposal 3: For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, signal a first offset value and a second offset value. K\_offset is equal to the sum of the two offset values.

**[Zhejiang Lab]**

Proposal 1: For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, option 2 should be supported and the first offset value should be implicitly signaled.

Proposal 3: The initial value(s) of K\_offset should be chosen considering the worst case, i.e., cell edge UE and the K\_offset value(s) should depend on numerology and satellite type.

**[OPPO]**

Proposal 1: decide whether beam-specific K offset is supported in system information before selecting the K offset indication option 1 vs. option 2.

Proposal 2: decide whether common TA can be used to determine the K offset before selecting the K offset indication option 1 vs. option 2.

**[ITL]**

Proposal 4. Single one offset value for K\_offset can be adopted.

**[LGE]**

Proposal 1: Support explicit signaling of K\_offset.

Proposal 2: For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, support signaling one offset value for K\_offset (option 1).

**[Huawei/HiSi]**

Proposal 1: For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, K\_offset is equal to the sum of two offset values

* The first offset value is equal to common TA signaled in system information
* The second offset is signaled in system information and covers the maximum service link RTD within the cell.

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

Proposal 2: Support signal one offset value for K\_offset for determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information to prevent unnecessary scheduling restriction.

**[InterDigital]**

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

Proposal-2: a single K-offset value is signaled in SIB (Option-1)

**[Sony]**

Proposal 1: Part of K\_offset value should be implicitly derived by calculation at the UE from the .

Proposal 2: RAN1 should support to signal a first offset value and a second offset value for determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information.

**[Spreadtrum]**

Proposal 1: One offset value indicated by system information for K\_offset is cover the RTT of service link plus the RTT between serving satellite and reference point.

**[Lenovo/Motorola Mobility]**

Proposal 2: Support K-offset indication with two values. The first value corresponding to RTT between satellite and reference point and the second value corresponding to RTT of service link.

**[Intel]**

Proposal 3:

* Indication of K\_offset can be divided into two parts, there one part is determined based on common TA
* K\_offset value should be common for all applicable physical layer procedures

**[Xiaomi]**

Proposal 3: It is slightly preferred to signal two separate values to determine the cell-specific K\_offset in system information.

**[MediaTek]**

Proposal 1: Support Option 1: Signal one offset value for K\_offset.

**[Fraunhofer IIS/HHI]**

Proposal 1: NTN UE should derive the initial value of $K\_{offset}$ from the broadcast system information, e.g., RRC timers T300, T301, T319, and T310.

Proposal 2: Common Timing Advance should be used for determination of the first offset value, capturing the RTT of the satellite to RP, in Option-2 to reduce signaling overhead and avoid duplicate signaling.

Proposal 3: NTN UE should derive the initial value of $K\_{offset}$ from the broadcast system information, e.g., “ra-ContentionResolutionTimer” and common TA for option-2.

Proposal 4: RAN1 to down-select Option-2 for determination of the value of initial $K\_{offset}$.

**[Qualcomm]**

Proposal 1: The following two offset values are signalled in system information:

* Offset\_1
* Offset\_2
* K\_mac=offset\_1 and Offset\_1=0 if not signalled.
* K\_offset=Offset\_1+Offset\_2
* For K\_offset update other than in system information, only offset\_2 is updated
* FFS: If $N\_{TA,common}$ is derived from offset\_2
* FFS: Detailed signalling and granularity of offset\_1 and offset\_2.

**[NEC]**

Proposal 2: Support explicit signaling of K\_offset used in initial access in system information.

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

* The interest in this topic is high – 21 sources provide input in this regard.
* The main discussion point is about selection between the two options agreed at RAN1#104bis-e to determine K\_offset value: signal one offset value vs. signal two offset values. The table below presents a summary of the proposed design options and the corresponding proponents. It can be seen the views are polarized and equally split among the companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Design option | Proponent(s) |
| Option 1: Signal one offset value for K\_offset  | [10] sources: [ZTE, NTT Docomo, Apple, ITL, LGE, Asia Pacific Telecom/FGI/ITRI/III, InterDigital, Spreadtrum, MediaTek, NEC] |
| Option 2: Signal a first offset value and a second offset value. K\_offset is equal to the sum of the two offset values | [10] sources: [CMCC, CAICT, Zhejiang Lab, Huawei/HiSi, Sony, Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, Intel, Xiaomi, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Qualcomm] |

Given the diverse views, Moderator holds the view that the group would first need to understand the pros and cons, as well as the needs, to make further progress.

[ZTE] provide a table comparing the two options:

[ZTE] Table 1 Comparison between option 1 and option 2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Complicity | Signaling overhead | Spec impact |
| Option 1 | low | high | low |
| Option 2 | high | low | high |

Companies supporting Option 2 universally cite the argument of signaling overhead saving. It would be valuable to find out how much could be saved in this regard.

[Apple] make an interesting observation:

*On the other hand, the signaling overhead saving from* $K\_{offset}$ *to* $K\_{offset2}$ *may not be significant. It is likely the range of* $K\_{offset}$ *is no more than two times of the range of* $K\_{offset2}$*. This implies the signaling saving is only about 1 bit. Hence, we prefer Option 1 of* $K\_{offset}$ *signaling, i.e., a single offset value of* $K\_{offset}$*.*

## 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):**

Do you agree with the following observation?

*[Apple] It is likely the range of* $K\_{offset}$ *is no more than two times of the range of* $K\_{offset2}$*. This implies the signaling saving is only about 1 bit.*

If you do not agree, please provide your analysis on how much signaling overhead can be saved in Option 2 vs. Option 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | Agree with the above analysis. However, considering that feeder link RTT is anyway indicated separately as common TA or for K\_mac, this 1 bit can be saved for free.  |
| Samsung | Agree.Configuration of K\_offset with two parameters complicates the specifications even with the same functionality. Therefore, we also prefer Option 1: Signal one offset value for K\_offset. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes, and the one bit is not issue since signaling will be higher layer. This means that Option 2 is little benefit and much more complexity and spec impact. |
| Apple | Agree. The signaling overhead gain of Option 2 is low.On the other hand, the signaling of RTT between satellite and timing reference point is still in discussion under AI 8.4.2. Although a common TA broadcast is supported, whether or not to broadcast common TA drift rate and its variation is still open. In case the common TA drift rate and its variation are broadcasted, then $K\_{offset1}$ may be maintained by UE, based on broadcasted common TA drift rate. This is not desirable since it is not guaranteed that the same $K\_{offset1}$ is maintained by all UEs.  |
| APT | Agree.It depends on whether combining TA and scheduling offset is allowed. In SI, most of the companies have assumed scheduling offset and TA shall be decoupled to provide better scheduling flexibility. If this assumption still holds, then signaling saving will be very limited as apple mentioned.  |
| ZTE | Agree with above analysis and single value is more preferred with good tradeoff among different factors. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We agree with Apple Observation. Two offsets introduces more sources of innacuracies, still require a parameter being broadcast and saves only one bit for this parameter.Moreover, it increases the complexity for the UE. The K\_offset may be updated over time, if it is compoud by 2 parameters, the UE will need to actively track the common delay (implicit parameter) and the updates on the second parameter. If the common delay is broadcast in SIB, it will be updated over SIB modification, which is much slower than a MAC CE can produce, and complicates the UE operation compared to tracking just one parameter.We prefer **option 1**  |
| Spreadtrum | We agree with Apple Observation.We prefer option 1. |
| Panasonic | Agree. We prefer simpler approach (i.e. Option 1).  |
| LG | Agree. Since Option 2 has trivial overhead gain at the expense of complexity, we prefer Option 1: Signal one offset value for K\_offset. |
| OPPO | Single value of K offset is fine to us. But we think K mac is a separate offset other than K offset.  |
| ITL | Agree. The one bit is not issue while option 1 can provide more benefits such as low complicity and less specification impact. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Our view is that the 1 bit saving does not cost too much specification complications since it does not make a big difference between whether it is derived from one parameter of the sum of two parameters. The complexity and specification impact are almost identical. |
| Qualcomm | Yes, there is only one bit saving. However, this saving also applies to Koffset update. We don’t see any downside for option 2 and don’t see any complication/complexity. So far, the only argument about increased complexity is that UE may loss track of common offset. In such case, UE connection fails anyhow. We don’t understand Nokia’s comment.  |
| Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI | We second Huawei and QC comments. In addition to that, we believe that signaling overhead reduction also depends on the choice of implicit and explicit signaling of the parameters. In our contribution, we have shown that in addition to common TA, as a first parameter capturing the RTT of feeder link, second parameter, which is supposed to capture the RTT of service link, can be obtained also implicitly, for instance via contention resolution timer. This will reduce the signaling overhead even further.  |
| MediaTek | Agree with analysis. Option 1 with single value Koffset is preferred option for simplicity and smaller specification impact. |
| Sony | Agree with the one bit reduction.However, this is also related to the position of reference point and frequency of K\_offset update. Considering fixed location UE and earth-fixed cell, option 1 should update the K\_offset fairly regularly if the reference point is somewhere on the feeder link. On the other hand, because option 2 can update only part of K\_offset for feeder link from common TA information, K\_offset doesn’t need to be updated regularly in fixed location UE and earth-fixed cell case.  |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree with Intel’s view. |
| Zhejiang Lab | Agree with HW |
| InterDigital | Agree. We prefer Option 1 as it is simpler and requires less specification impact.  |
| CMCC | Agree with the one bit reduction for once transmission.Nevertheless, in some scenario such as LEO with moving beam, the update frequency of K\_offset with Option 2 can be further reduced, since the second offset value which is expected to cover RTT of service link can keep unchanged. |
| CATT | It depends on overall K-offset indication, K-mac and RAR timing indication. Only saying one bit overhead will hide the difference of different parameters indication.We need firstly identify how to signal the service link RTT, feeder link RTT, common TA, and K-Mac. Finally the K-offset could be the sum of two or more from the mentioned parameter list. |

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

In the first round of email discussion, 22 companies provided views. The following observations can be made.

* There is nearly universal common understanding that the signaling overhead saving is only about 1 bit in Option 2 vs. Option 1.
* The 1-bit saving might appear free if the first offset value is derived from e.g. common TA, as pointed out by [Intel, Huawei/HiSi, Qualcomm, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Sony, Lenovo/MM, Zhejiang Lab, CATT]
	+ [Qualcomm, CMCC] mentioned the saving applies to K\_offset update.
		- [Moderator]: it appears this is not true if the K\_offset update is done relatively (i.e., delta update), which would lead to same overhead in both options.
* However, the 1 bit saving comes at the cost of more complexity for UE, more specification impact, more sources of inaccuracies, scheduling restriction, as pointed out by [Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Apple, APT, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, Spreadtrum, Panasonic, LG, OPPO, ITL, MediaTek, InterDigital]
* 1 bit saving in higher layer signaling is negligible, as pointed out by [NTT DOCOMO]
	+ [Moderator]: I agree – 1 bit saving in higher layer signaling is almost nothing. Companies can check with their RAN2 team if they have doubts.

Reading through the comments, Moderator tends to agree that the ~1 bit overhead saving can hardly justify the many disadvantages associated with signaling two offset values, as mentioned by many companies.

Given the status, Moderator would like to encourage companies to rethink about their position and come back to this issue at the next RAN1 meeting. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss issue #2 further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #2:**

Companies are encouraged to rethink about their position and come back to this issue at the next RAN1 meeting, taking the following into account.

* The signaling overhead saving in Option 2 vs. Option 1 is only about 1 bit.
* The ~1-bit saving might appear free, but comes at the cost of many disadvantages (more complexity for UE, more specification impact, more sources of inaccuracies, scheduling restriction, etc.)
* 1 bit saving in higher layer signaling is negligible.

# 3 Issue #3: K\_offset usage

## 3.1 Background

At RAN1#105-e, several companies provide views on K\_offset update after initial access.

**[Nokia/NSB]**

Proposal 6: The cell-specific K\_offset shall be applied in the following procedures:

* HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB/Msg4
* RAR or fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH

Proposal 7: Any UL transmission corresponding to a UL grant DCI scrambled with a RNTI other than the C-RNTI shall use cell-specific K\_offset.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal-6: If there is signaling of K\_offset conveyed in Msg2/msgB, either in RAR or in fallbackRAR, the K\_offset value can be applied in following timing relationships:

* The transmission timing of RAR / fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH

Proposal-7: If there is signaling of K\_offset conveyed in Msg2, the K\_offset value can be applied in following timing relationships:

* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to Msg4

Proposal-8: With updated UE-specific K\_offset based on the TA reporting, this value can be applied in following timing relationships:

* The transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH (including CSI on PUSCH)
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH (except HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB / Msg4)
* The CSI reference resource timing
* The transmission timing of aperiodic SRS
* The first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2
* Adjustment of uplink transmission timing upon the reception of timing advance command

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 3: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 and HARQ-ACK to PDSCH scheduled by DCI 1\_0, cell specific Koffset value should be used.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 3: When UE is provided with K\_offset value other than the one signaled in system information:

* The K\_offset value signaled in system information is used for
	+ The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB / Msg4
	+ The transmission timing of RAR / fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH
* The K\_offset value other than the one signaled in system information is used for
	+ The transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH (including CSI on PUSCH)
	+ The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH (except HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB / Msg4)
	+ The CSI reference resource timing
	+ The transmission timing of aperiodic SRS
	+ The first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in Configured Grant Type 2
* FFS: the transmission timing adjustment upon the reception of timing advance command

**[Apple]**

Proposal 4: When a UE is provided with $K\_{offset}$ value other than the one signaled in system information, this $K\_{offset}$ is used at least for

* The transmission timing of DCI scheduled PUSCH
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH (except HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB / Msg4)
* The CSI reference resource timing
* The transmission timing of aperiodic SRS
* The first transmission opportunity of PUSCH in configured grant type 2
* MAC CE activation timing
* TA command activation timing

**[CAICT]**

Proposal 2: Use cell-specific $K\_{offset}$ for the timing relationships related to fallback DCI formats and use updated $K\_{offset}$ for the timing relationships related to non-fallback DCI formats.

**[ITL]**

Proposal 3. When UE is provided with K\_offset value other than the one signaled in system information,

* for UL transmission related to random access procedure, K\_offset value signaled in system information is used regardless of RRC states while for other purposes, K\_offset value signaled in system information is used until new updated K\_offset value is provided by network.

**[Sony]**

Proposal 3: When enhancing relationships by K\_offset extension, apply the extension before the TA.

**[Intel]**

Proposal 4: Update of K\_offset after initial access is not supported for

* HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB/Msg4
* RAR or fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH

**[Ericsson]**

Proposal 3 To ensure that UE is always reachable, for the transmissions scheduled by fallback DCIs, the K\_offset value signaled in system information is used.

**[Qualcomm]**

Proposal 2: For a UE provided with a K\_offset value other than in the system information

* The Koffset value provided in system information applies to the following UL transmission
	+ Msg3 transmission and retransmissions with scrambling initialized by a TC-RNTI.
	+ HARQ-ACK transmissions in response to a DL transmission scrambled by TC-RNTI or MsgB-RNTI.
* The Koffset value provided not in system information applies to all other timing relationships associated with K\_offset.
* FFS: If the above UL transmissions indicates that the K\_offset value provided not in system information is outdated.

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

* There is a general consensus that for certain timing relationships, the K\_offset value signaled in system information shall be used, regardless of whether the UE is provided with an updated K\_offset value other than the one signaled in system information.
	+ Continuing the discussion from RAN1#104bis-e, such timing relationships include:
		- The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB / Msg4
		- The transmission timing of RAR / fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH
	+ [Qualcomm] point out an additional timing relationship:
		- Msg3 retransmissions with scrambling initialized by a TC-RNTI
* During the update of K\_offset, UE and network may not have the same understanding about the K\_offset value used in timing relationships that do not use the one signaled in system information. To improve robustness of the system, several companies make the following proposals along similar line:
	+ [Nokia/NSB]: Any UL transmission corresponding to a UL grant DCI scrambled with a RNTI other than the C-RNTI shall use cell-specific K\_offset.
	+ [Panasonic]: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 and HARQ-ACK to PDSCH scheduled by DCI 1\_0, cell specific Koffset value should be used.
	+ [CAICT]: Use cell-specific $K\_{offset}$ for the timing relationships related to fallback DCI formats and use updated $K\_{offset}$ for the timing relationships related to non-fallback DCI formats.
	+ [Ericsson]: To ensure that UE is always reachable, for the transmissions scheduled by fallback DCIs, the K\_offset value signaled in system information is used.

## 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):**

Do you agree that cell specific K\_offset shall be used at least in the following timing relationships?

* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB / Msg4
* The transmission timing of RAR / fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH
* The transmission timing of Msg3 retransmissions

What are your views regarding the following proposals?

* *[Nokia/NSB]: Any UL transmission corresponding to a UL grant DCI scrambled with a RNTI other than the C-RNTI shall use cell-specific K\_offset.*
* *[Panasonic]: For PUSCH scheduled by DCI 0\_0 and HARQ-ACK to PDSCH scheduled by DCI 1\_0, cell specific Koffset value should be used.*
* *[CAICT]: Use cell-specific* $K\_{offset}$ *for the timing relationships related to fallback DCI formats and use updated* $K\_{offset}$ *for the timing relationships related to non-fallback DCI formats.*
* *[Ericsson]: To ensure that UE is always reachable, for the transmissions scheduled by fallback DCIs, the K\_offset value signaled in system information is used.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | Agree with Moderator proposal.Regarding the other proposals, using K\_offset from SI for transmissions scheduled by fallback DCI seems reasonable. |
| Samsung | Agree with the basic usage.For other proposals, the proposals from [Nokia/NSB], [Panasonic], [CAICT] seem reasonable. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with Moderator, and exactly it seems that cell specific K\_offset is better for fallback DCI. |
| Apple | Fine with Moderator proposal. For the other proposals, we do not support. Koffset is sent over MAC CE or RRC, which is pretty reliable. We do not see the necessity of using cell-specific Koffset, which has low scheduling efficiency comparing with the updated non-cell specific Koffset.  |
| APT | Support Initial proposal 3.2* For Nokia/NSB, in RRC\_CONNECTED, PDCCH ordered PRACH supports CBRA, which may have an RNTI already.
* For Panasonic, CAICT, Ericsson, this limitation is due to the support of using RRC. No such limit if we support K\_offset update via a MAC CE.

If K\_offset is updated by RRC, one drawback is UE-specific K\_offst cannot be carried by fallback DCI formats due to the ambiguous period of 10ms that RRC messages has no clear action time. |
| ZTE | Q1: Modify the third bullet as follows: the transmission timing of Msg3 retransmissions with scrambling initialized by a TC-RNTI.Q2: It’s fine to set a conservative mechanism that apply initial K\_offset for fallback DCIs scheduling. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We agree with using cell-specific K\_offset for the aforementioned procedures. Regarding the specific phrasing, the resaons behind our choice were: every transmission that is triggered by a grant not directed specifically to a single UE, could be source of ambiguity. If the procedure is triggered by a DCI scrambled with UE-specific ID, there is no ambiguity.  |
| Panasonic  | Generally agree with Moderator proposal. For “ The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB / Msg4“, because “Msg4“ is not clearly defined in the specification in our understanding, clarification would be ignaled. If the intention of “Msg4“ is “PDSCH with UE contention resolution identity“ specified in 38.213 section 8.4 (copied below), this can be simply covered by [Nokia/NSB], [Panasonic], [CAICT], [Ericsson] proposals.

|  |
| --- |
| TS38.213 section 8.4 PDSCH with UE contention resolution identityIn response to a PUSCH transmission scheduled by a RAR UL grant when a UE has not been provided a C-RNTI, the UE attempts to detect a DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by a corresponding TC-RNTI scheduling a PDSCH that includes a UE contention resolution identity [11, TS 38.321]. |

 |
| LG | Agree with moderator’s proposal. For other proposals, using cell specific K\_offset for fallback DCI seems fine. |
| OPPO | Support initial proposal 3.2 |
| ITL | Agree with Moderator proposal. |
| CAICT | Support Initial proposal 3.2Fallback DCI is usually used in the transition period of RRC reconfigurations, during handover procedure, and etc. During these procedures, the UE-specific $K\_{offset}$ may be outdated and could not cover the current UE-gNB RTT. Cell-specific $K\_{offset}$ could be used to keep valid UL transmission before UE specific $K\_{offset}$ is updated. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As we mentioned at the first GTW session, even for above listed timing relationship using cell specific K\_offset, it has dependency on issue 4 on beam specific K\_offset. If that is messaged in msg2 these also could use the same ignaled value. If beam-specific K\_offset is not signaled to the UE, then the cell specific K\_offset can be applied for the above three timing relationships. On the company proposals, maybe it is proper to discuss them after resolving Issue 1 given that some of the proposals seems to implying RRC based reconfiguration for K\_offset. |
| Qualcomm | We agree that in some cases cell specific Koffset has to be used for the three type of UL transmissions listed in some cases. However, there are cases where UE specific Koffset is preferred as commented by Nokia, eg in the case of CFRA. Hence, for the above three type of transmissions, the RNTI of the associated DL transmissions need to be checked.For Q2, we don’t see the motivation of the proposals. We are concerned of two problems:* In GEO or one beam per cell scenario, UE may have only one BWP and fallback DCIs are sufficient. Consequently, the proposal defeats the purpose of Koffset.
* With the proposal, UE will have simultaneously two different Koffset. Out of order scheduling and collision of UL transmission may occur. This creates additional spec impacts.
 |
| Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI | Fine with FL proposal. Other proposals also seem reasonable to us.  |
| Xiaomi | We share Huawei’s view on the beam-specific Koffset. Meanwhile, it is agreed that in last meeting “When UE is not provided with K\_offset value other than the one signaled in system information, the K\_offset value signaled in system information is used for all timing relationships that require K\_offset enhancement.”, it the intention is to say these timing relationship have to be tied with cell-specific K\_offset? |
| MediaTek | Agree with proposal. For fallback DCI 0\_0 / 1\_0 it seems more robust to use cell-specific K\_offset value to ensure the UE is always reachable |
| Sony | Agree with proposal. |
| Lenovo/MM | Agree that cell specific K-offset should be used for the following timing relationships:• The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB / Msg4 • The transmission timing of RAR / fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH• The transmission timing of Msg3 retransmissionsRegarding the K-offset for fallback DCI, we think updated K-offset rather than cell-specific K-offset shall be used. |
| Zhejiang Lab | Agree with initial proposal 3.2. For fallback DCI, we think the latest K\_offset should be used. |
| InterDigital | Agree with proposal. Regarding the fallback DCI, it is proposed to address the ambiguity issue when RRC is used for K\_offset update. We don’t think it is need since there is no ambiguity periode if MAC-CE is used. |
| CMCC | Agree with proposal. |
| CATT | Agree with proposal. |

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

In the first round of email discussion, 23 companies provided views. In summary:

* There is general consensus that this issue needs to be addressed, by (1) listing the timing relationships that need to use cell-specific K\_offset regardless of K\_offset update and/or (2) along the line of using cell-specific K\_offset in fallback DCIs.
	+ The latter approach (2) is more general than the former approach (1). In other words, the former approach (1) can be covered by the latter approach (2).
	+ There are some concerns on the latter approach (2), while there is good consensus on the former approach (1) already since last RAN1 meeting.
	+ Therefore, it is sensible at this stage to agree on the former approach and continue discussion on the latter approach to check if it is necessary to extend the former approach (1) to the latter approach (2).
* Regarding some specific comments:
	+ [ZTE] suggest modifying the third bullet as: *the transmission timing of Msg3 retransmissions with scrambling initialized by a TC-RNTI*.
		- [Moderator]: The CRC of the DCI scheduling Msg3 transmission and retransmissions is always scrambled by TC-RNTI.
	+ [Panasonic] ask for clarification on “Msg4”
		- [Moderator]: “Msg4” can be scheduled by DCI 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI or C-RNTI. An alternative wording for “Msg4” can be “contention resolution PDSCH”.
	+ [Huawei/HiSi] raise the dependency on Issue #4 about beam specific K\_offset
		- [Moderator]: As is clear from Section 4.3, it is unlikely that the issue on beam specific K\_offset will be resolved soon. We cannot let the discussion there prevent us from completing the design.
	+ [Qualcomm] raise the issue on CFRA
		- [Moderator]: It may not be desirable to create different behaviors for CBRA and CFRA.

Based on the above discussion, the following proposal is made for companies to comment in the second round of discussions.

**Proposal 3.3 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

When UE is provided with K\_offset value other than the one signaled in system information, the K\_offset value signaled in system information is still used for

* The transmission timing of RAR / fallbackRAR grant scheduled PUSCH
* The transmission timing of Msg3 retransmission scheduled by DCI format 0\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by TC-RNTI
	+ FFS: The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to contention resolution PDSCH scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI
* The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by MsgB-RNTI
	+ FFS: The transmission timing of HARQ-ACK on PUCCH to MsgB scheduled by DCI format 1\_0 with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI

FFS: how to treat additional transmission timings related to fallback DCI formats

FFS: how to update this formulation with beam-specific K\_offset if beam-specific K\_offset is agreed to be supported

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We agree with the proposal.  |
| APT | Support.Additionally, if UE-specific K\_offset is updated via MAC CE, then there is no ambiguous period. However, for cell-specific K\_offset, it will (shall) update via SIB. We may need to consider an ambiguous period due to the SIB updates.  |
| CATT | Agreed this proposal. |
| LG | Support |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 4 Issue #4: Beam-specific K\_offset in initial access

## 4.1 Background

At RAN1#105-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**Proposals that support introducing beam specific Koffset**

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 6: gNB has the flexibility of configuring cell-specific or beam specific value of K\_offset.

* Beam specific SIB can be supported, i.e., different beam specific SIB may carry different beam specific values (e.g., K\_offset).

**[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, i.e., in the second offset value.

**[LGE]**

Proposal 3: Support beam (group)-specific K\_offset signaling in addition to cell-specific K\_offset in initial access.

**[InterDigital]**

Proposal-5: beam-specific K-offset indication is also supported optionally

**[Spreadtrum]**

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

**[Lenovo/Motorola Mobility]**

Proposal 4: Support indication of beam specific K-offset.

Proposal 5: The beam specific K-offset can be indicated by an associated RS explicitly or implicitly.

**[Intel]**

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

Support indication of K\_offset difference between adjacent beams with up to X bits (e.g. X = 2)

K\_offset for all beams should be indicated in the SI transmitted in every beam

**[Xiaomi]**

Proposal 2: Beam-specific K\_offset configuration during the initial access should be supported.

**[China Telecom]**

Proposal 1: Beam-specific K\_offset is supported in initial access.

Proposal 2: Beam-specific K\_offset value can be carried in Msg2.

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

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 1: Beam specific Koffset is not necessary.

**[NTT Docomo]**

Proposal 1: K\_offset is signaled in SIB1 or in SIB following SIB1.

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

**[ITL]**

Proposal 5. Cell-specific K\_offset is only supported in initial access procedure.

**[Samsung]**

Proposal 1: Support cell specific Koffset value only.

**[NEC]**

Proposal 1: Support cell specific K\_offset value only configured in system information for use in initial access.

**Proposals on how to support beam specific Koffset (if supported)**

**[Nokia/NSB]**

Proposal 4: RAN 1 to consider implicit signalling of differential K\_offset in the time/frequency values of the UL scheduling in the RAR as an alternative to explicit NR-beam level signalling in the SI.

Proposal 5: RAN 1 to consider implicit signalling of differential K\_offset in the temporary C-RNTI in RAR as an alternative to explicit NR-beam level signalling in the SI.

**[Huawei/HiSi]**

Proposal 2: For determination of beam specific K\_offset used in initial access if supported, K\_offset is equal to the sum of two offset values

* The first offset value is equal to common TA signaled in system information
* The second offset is signaled in Msg2 and covers the maximum service link RTD within the beam

This issue has been discussed at 3 RAN1 meetings with several rounds of email discussion and debated at GTW session. 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.

In fact, given the views expressed at RAN1#104-e and RAN1#104bis-e, it was recommended at the last two RAN1 meetings that the proponents to offline discuss with other companies to make progress.

However, the proponents have not brought to the Moderator’s attention whether there has been such offline discussion, and if yes, what the outcome is.

That said, give that 16 companies provide input on this topic to RAN1#105-e, it appears justified to collect another round of views from companies to check if convergence is possible.

## 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):**

On beam-specific K\_offset in initial access:

* Option 1: Beam-specific K\_offset in initial access is supported.
* Option 2: Beam-specific K\_offset in initial access is not supported.
* Option 3: Proponents are encouraged to have offline discussions with other companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | Support option 1. Seems our proposal is missing (captured below). ***Proposal 1*:** * *Support beam specific K\_offset configured in system information for initial access*
	+ *Support indication of K\_offset difference between adjacent beams with up to X bits (e.g. X = 2)*
	+ *K\_offset for all beams should be indicated in the SI transmitted in every beam*
 |
| Samsung | Support Option 2. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support Option 2. This discussion should be deprioritized. |
| Apple | Either Option 2 or Option 3.  |
| APT | Option 2. We cannot configure anything on a satellite beam. Therefore, it is better to clarify beam-specific means SSB-specific or BWP-specific.  |
| ZTE | Option 1 is preferred given the clear benefit of access delay in multiple beams deployment.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We prefer Option 2. Option 1 can be conditionally supported, if the specific K\_offset information is conveyed in Msg 2. We see no advantages in providing a list of beam specific K offsets in SIB. |
| Spreadtrum | Support option 1. |
| Panasonic | Support Option 2 |
| LG | Option 1 is preferred due to its benefit in latency. If the signaling overhead is really matter, we can further consider reduction method (e.g., beam-group specific K\_offset). |
| OPPO | Option 2 |
| ITL | Support Option 2. |
| CAICT  | Option1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer Option 1 as outlined in our contribution. |
| Qualcomm | We see benefit of option 2. However, if Koffset is the only beam specific parameters to be signalled, it’s questionable if the benefit is worth of the signaling overhead/design effort.  |
| Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI | Option 2 |
| Xiaomi | We prefer option 1 |
| Sony | Support option 2. |
| Lenovo/MM | Support option 2. And we think beam specific K-offset should be supprted after initial access. |
| Zhejiang Lab | Support option 1 |
| InterDigital | Support option 1 |
| CMCC | We prefer option 1. |
| CATT | Prefer option 2. In the initial access stage, the latency is not critical. |

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

In the first round of email discussion, 23 companies provided views.

* 10 companies support Option 1, including [Intel, ZTE, Spreadtrum, LG, CAICT, Huawei/HiSi, Xiaomi, Zhejiang Lab, InterDigital, CMCC]
* 13 companies support Option 2, including [Samsung, NTT Docomo, Apple, APT, Nokia/NSB, Panasonic, OPPO, ITL, Qualcomm, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Sony, Lenovo/MM, CATT]

The status does not change much compared to where we have been in over the past several RAN1 meetings.

From Moderator’s perspective, it is not proper to propose either Option 1 or Option 2.

Therefore, Moderator would like to continue to encourage Proponents of Option 1 to offline convince the other camp to make progress. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss issue #4 further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #4:**

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

# 5 Issue #5: MAC CE timing relationships

## 5.1 Background

At RAN1#105-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[ZTE]**

Proposal 9: Additional time-variant K\_mac other than K\_offset can be indicated the value is expected to cover RTT of feeder link.

Proposal 10: The granularity of K\_mac can be same as K\_offset.

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 5: DL related MAC CE action timing is determined by K\_mac independently from HARQ-ACK timing, i.e. K\_mac is defined as an offset from DL reception slot of the MAC CE.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 7: The K\_mac value provided by network can be fixed.

* Note: The K\_mac is used to compensate the fixed unalignment caused by the distance between NTN GW and gNB in Scenario 2-b (RU located at gateway, with gateway and gNB located away from each other).

**[Apple]**

Proposal 5: The scheduling offset $K\_{mac}$, in unit of slots, is carried in system information.

Proposal 6: The MAC CE for downlink configuration is activated at UE at the first downlink slot that is after uplink slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,μ}+K\_{mac}+K\_{offset}, $where n is the uplink slot when UE sends HARQ-ACK for the PDSCH providing the activation command, $μ$ is the sub-carrier spacing configured for uplink.

**[CATT]**

Proposal 2: K\_mac can be derived by the common TA and feeder link RTT.

**[MediaTek]**

Proposal 2: Support K\_mac values for the following NTN architecture options:

* Scenario 2-a: K\_mac=RTD of feeder link
* Scenario 2-b: K\_mac = RTD of feeder link + RTD of Gateway-gNB
* Scenario 3: K\_mac = 0.

**[Nokia/NSB]**

Proposal 8: RAN 1 to consider the scenario where the gNB and the GW are co-located with the RU as the default.

**[OPPO]**

Proposal 6: Prioritize the case that the reference point is located at the satellite in RAN1 discussion.

**[Spreadtrum]**

Proposal 4: Both cases (i.e., aligned or not aligned at gNB) should be supported with the same priority.

Proposal 5: The maximum value of unalignment is equal to the feeder link RTT, where the reference point is configured at the satellite.

Proposal 6: Time-varying value of unalignment should be supported.

**[Xiaomi]**

Proposal 1: The aligned/un-aligned timing at the gNB side should be treated with equal priority.

In summary, companies provide further details to make progress on completing K\_mac design.

Recall that K\_mac is needed for UE action and assumption on downlink configuration indicated by a MAC-CE command in PDSCH, if downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB. In Moderator’s view, to make further progress on K\_mac, the first step would be to discuss how to apply K\_mac.

In existing specification, UE action and assumption on downlink configuration are usually described to be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}$. See e.g. the following example from TS 38.214, Section 5.1.4.2.

**[TS 38.214, Section 5.1.4.2]**

For a UE configured with a list of *ZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSet(s)* provided by higher layer parameter *sp-ZP-CSI-RS-ResourceSetsToAddModList*:

- when the UE would transmit a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information in slot *n* corresponding to the PDSCH carrying the activation command, as described in clause 6.1.3.19 of [10, TS 38.321], for ZP CSI-RS resource(s), the corresponding action in [10, TS 38.321] and the UE assumption on the PDSCH RE mapping corresponding to the activated ZP CSI-RS resource(s) shall be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}$ where µ is the SCS configuration for the PUCCH.

- when the UE would transmit a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information in slot *n* corresponding to the PDSCH carrying the deactivation command, as described in clause 6.1.3.19 of [10, TS 38.321], for activated ZP CSI-RS resource(s), the corresponding action in [10, TS 38.321] and the UE assumption on cessation of the PDSCH RE mapping corresponding to the de-activated ZP CSI-RS resource(s) shall be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}$ where *µ* is the SCS configuration for the PUCCH.

As illustrated in the following figure:

* K\_mac accounts for the magnitude of unalignment between DL and UL frame timing at the gNB side.
* In line with existing specification, the green colored slot n is the slot where the UE would transmit HARQ-ACK.
* Without K\_mac, the DL command is expected to be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}$, i.e., the blue colored slot m.
* With K\_mac, the DL command should be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}+K\_{mac}$, i.e., the blue colored slot m’.



## 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):**

If a UE is provided with a K\_mac value, when the UE would transmit a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information in slot *n* corresponding to a PDSCH carrying a MAC CE command on a downlink configuration, the UE action and assumption on the downlink configuration shall be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}+K\_{mac}$.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | Support the proposal |
| Samsung | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal in general. Maybe, it should be specify the $μ$ in the formula is SCS configuration for PUCCH.  |
| APT | Support  |
| ZTE | Support the proposal |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | If the gNB does not need to change behavior or configuration, the DL configuration on the UE side does not need to be postponed by K\_mac. The UE has received the MAC-CE, and can already apply the DL measurement configuration. The gNB will know the UE has successfully updated the information at a later time upon receiving the ACK-NACK. If the procedure requires a different behaviour form the gNB then the K\_mac does not suffice for the UE to be sure the ACK-NACK has gone through. In this case the offset needs to be the RTT. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal |
| Panasonic | In the proposed approach, DL activation command is delayed by 1.5RTT (e.g. 830ms for GEO). It should be allowed to shorten the delay. Therefore, we propose to determine the DL related MAC CE activation timing based on the MAC CE reception timing rather than HARQ-ACK transmission timing. ProposalIf a UE is provided with a K\_mac value, **when the UE receives a PDSCH carrying a MAC CE command on a downlink configuration in slot n’,** the UE action and assumption on the downlink configuration shall be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot $n'+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}+K\_{mac}$.This proposal gives NW flexibility to set the MAC CE activation timing after HARQ-ACK reception or earlier timing like 3ms after UE reception of the MAC CE.  |
| LG | OK |
| OPPO | We think that the slot n should be clarified. In the proposal, there are 2 slot n, If a UE is provided with a K\_mac value, when the UE would transmit a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information in slot *n* corresponding to a PDSCH carrying a MAC CE command on a downlink configuration, the UE action and assumption on the downlink configuration shall be applied starting from the first slot that is after slot n $+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}+K\_{mac}$To our understanding, these two slot n are different. The former refers to UL slot n and the latter refers to DL slot n.  |
| ITL | Support |
| CAICT | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the initial proposal 5.2. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Fraunhofer IIS,Fraunhofer HHI | Support the proposal |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| Lenovo/MM | Support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Although it was agreed to support K\_mac, we also have the same concern with Nokia, “If the gNB does not need to change behavior or configuration, the DL configuration on the UE side does not need to be postponed by K\_mac. The UE has received the MAC-CE, and can already apply the DL measurement configuration. The gNB will know the UE has successfully updated the information at a later time upon receiving the ACK-NACK.”Nevertheless, to make progress, we can support the Initial proposal 5.2. |
| CATT | Support  |

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

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

* 20 companies support/are fine with the initial proposal 5.2: [Intel, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Apple, APT, ZTE, Spreadtrum, LG, OPPO, ITL, CAICT, Huawei/HiSi, Qualcomm, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Xiaomi, MediaTek, Sony, Lenovo/MM, CMCC, CATT]
	+ [Apple] suggest clarifying that µ is the SCS configuration for the PUCCH.
		- [Moderator]: suggestion adopted.
	+ [OPPO] suggest clarifying DL and UL when referring to slot n.
		- [Moderator]: suggestion adopted.
* [Panasonic] make a different proposal that determines the DL related MAC CE activation timing based on the MAC CE reception timing rather than HARQ-ACK transmission timing.
	+ [Moderator]: given the vast majority support of keeping determining the DL related MAC CE activation timing based on HARQ-ACK transmission timing, as is done in existing specifications, Moderator would appreciate if [Panasonic] can be flexible and accept the majority view.
* [Nokia/NSB] make some general observations.
	+ [Moderator]: it’s not entirely clear what the concerns are. Moderator would encourage [Nokia/NSB] to check the history of the discussions on this topic over the past few meetings.

Based on the views expressed, the following proposal is made and is being discussed in the email reflector:

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

If a UE is provided with a K\_mac value, when the UE would transmit a PUCCH with HARQ-ACK information in uplink slot *n* corresponding to a PDSCH carrying a MAC CE command on a downlink configuration, the UE action and assumption on the downlink configuration shall be applied starting from the first slot that is after downlink slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}+K\_{mac}$, where µ is the SCS configuration for the PUCCH.

# 6 Issue #6: Exceptional MAC CE timing relationships

## 6.1 Background

At RAN1#105-e, a few companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[Nokia/NSB]**

Proposal 9: RAN 1 to consider the MAC CE aperiodic trigger state subselection as a DL procedure (MAC-CE action timing is the request timing).

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 7: The following alternatives for the timing definition of Aperiodic CSI trigger state subselection MAC CE action timing should be discussed.

Alt1: new subselection is applied for the CSI report after the UL related MAC CE action timing

Alt2: new subselection is applied for the CSI request after the DL related MAC CE action timing

Proposal 8: Aperiodic CSI trigger state subselection MAC CE should be reflected for the transmission of the CSI report after the UL related MAC CE action timing, i.e. slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}$.

Proposal 9: AP SRS spatial relation Indication MAC CE should be reflected for the SRS transmission after the MAC CE action timing, i.e. slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}$. No specification modification would be necessary because in the current specification the applied timing is defined as “for SRS transmission”.

**[CAICT]**

Proposal 4: For “Aperiodic CSI Trigger State Subselection MAC CE” and “AP SRS spatial relation Indication MAC CE”:

* If DL and UL is aligned at gNB, timing relationships about UE actions and assumptions should take $K\_{offset-2}$ into consideration,
* If DL and UL is misaligned at gNB, timing relationships about UE actions and assumptions should take $K\_{offset-2}$ and K\_mac into consideration,

 where $K\_{offset-2}$ is the timing relationship between UL grant and the scheduled PUSCH.

**[Huawei/HiSi]**

Proposal 6: There is no need to consider MAC CE timing for both CSI-resource-configuration and SRS-resource-configuration as exceptional.

In summary:

* [Huawei/HiSilicon] hold the view that there is no need to consider MAC CE timing for both CSI-resource-configuration and SRS-resource-configuration as exceptional.
* [CAICT] hold the view that enhancement can be considered to address the ambiguity period of CSI-resource-configuration / SRS-resource-configuration.
* [Panasonic] propose to discuss whether the timing definition of Aperiodic CSI trigger state subselection MAC CE action timing is CSI report timing or CSI request timing.
* [Nokia/NSB] propose to consider the MAC CE aperiodic trigger state subselection as a DL procedure (MAC-CE action timing is the request timing).

At RAN1#104-e and RAN1#104bis-e, this issue was discussed. Based on the submitted contributions at RAN1#105-e, it appears that the interest in this topic is quite low with different views.

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

Given this situation, Moderator would like to recommend the proponents to offline discuss with other companies to make progress and let Moderator know if there is a possibility for potential consensus.

## 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):**

On MAC CE timing for CSI-resource-configuration and SRS-resource-configuration, proponents are encouraged to have offline discussions with other companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Samsung | The same timing for MAC CE can be used. |
| APT | Agree. |
| Panasonic | Fine to de-prioritize the discussion for a moment, but we think clarification of the behavior is necessary at some point of time. Unclear point to us is summarized below. * CSI-resource-configuration

TS38.214 section 5.2.1.5.1“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 $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}$ where ** is the SCS configuration for the PUCCH.”It is not clear whether the updated mapping of the selected CSI trigger state(s) to the codepoint(s) of DCI CSI request field is applied for transmission of CSI report after the specified timing or CSI request reception after the specified timing. One may interpret as the latter (CSI request) but it is not crystal clear. * SRS-resource-configuration

TS38.214 section 6.2.1“the UE assumptions on updating spatial relation for the SRS resource shall be applied for SRS transmission starting from the first slot that is after slot $n+3N\_{slot}^{subframe,µ}. $“It is clear from above specification text that the updated spatial relation for the SRS resource shall be applied for SRS transmission after the specified timing. This would imply that DCI that triggers the SRS transmission may be transmitted in earlier timing than gNB reception of HARQ-ACK. But, some companies seem to have different understanding.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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

Given the current situation, Moderator recommendation stands as is.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #6:**

On MAC CE timing for CSI-resource-configuration and SRS-resource-configuration, proponents are encouraged to have offline discussions with other companies.

# 7 Issue #7: On K1 range extension

## 7.1 Background

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

**[Nokia/NSB]**

Proposal 13: RAN 1 to consider maintaining existing K1 values for HARQ feedback.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal 13: For unpaired spectrum, enhancement on current DCI either via increasing bit size or re-interpreting the bit field PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator should be supported.

**[NTT Docomo]**

Proposal 5: Keep the K1/K2 range for paired spectrum.

Proposal 6: A new RRC parameter (e.g., dl-DataToUL-ACK-r17) is adopted at least for DCI format 1\_1.

Proposal 7: Keep the field size for K1 indication in DCI.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 8: If increased K1 value range in DCI is supported, Option 4 (the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 bits in non-fallback DCI 1\_1/1\_2) is preferred for less spec impact.

**[Apple]**

Proposal 8: The K1 range extension does not change the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field size in DCI.

**[CAICT]**

Proposal 5: Configure two sets of candidate K1 values. The slot index of scheduled PDSCH is used to decide one candidate K1 set.

**[ITL]**

Proposal 6. Followings on K1 range extension issue are proposed:

* It is not supported to extend the K1 range for FDD
* DCI field range related to the K1 range extension should not be increased.

**[LGE]**

Proposal 6: Do not increase the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI.

* For non-fallback DCI, increase the range of dl-DataToUL-ACK in PUCCH-config IE from (0,…,15) to (0,…,31).
* For fallback DCI, consider introducing fixed or configurable offset.

**[Huawei/HiSi]**

Proposal 7: K1 indication can be enhanced without impact on the size of DCI by re-interpreting PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field.

**[Xiaomi]**

Proposal 5: The bit-length of PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in the DCI is kept unchanged.

**[CATT]**

Proposal 6: Extend K1/K2 range without changing the DCI, and dynamically configure the list of K1/K2 values corresponding to the DCI size.

**[China Telecom]**

Proposal 3: The increased K1 value for TDD case is indicated by reinterpret the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI.

**[Ericsson]**

Proposal 4 Increase the maximum number of entries in the higher layer parameter dl-DataToUL-ACK from 8 to 16.

Proposal 5 In non-fallback DCI 1\_1/1\_2, the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 bits, depending on the number of entries in the higher layer parameter dl-DataToUL-ACK (which is proposed to be increased up to 16).

**[Samsung]**

Proposal 5: Do not change the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI.

**[NEC]**

Proposal 4: The size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI is not changed when the range of the K1 value is extended from (0..15) to (0..31).

In summary:

* [Nokia/NSB, NTT Docomo, Apple, ITL, LGE, Xiaomi, CATT, Samsung, NEC] propose not to change the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI.
* [ZTE, CMCC, CAICT, Huawei/HiSi China Telecom, Ericsson] hold the view that enhancement can be considered to accommodate more flexible scheduling.
	+ [ZTE] proposes to support either increasing bit size or re-interpreting the bit field PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator.
	+ [CMCC, Ericsson] consider increasing the max # of RRC configured K1 values from 8 to 16, for which the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 bits in non-fallback DCI 1\_1/1\_2.
		- [Ericsson] points out that increasing the maximum number of K1 values that can be configured to a UE from 8 to 16 will not only benefit NTN but also offer significant deployment flexibility for terrestrial 5G NR networks.
	+ [CAICT] propose to configure two sets of K1 values and use slot index of scheduled PDSCH to signal which K1 set is used.
	+ [Huawei/HiSi, China Telecom] proposes to reinterpret the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI to accommodate the increased K1 value range.

Based on the proposals submitted at this RAN1#105-e, it appears that the group is not converging on this issue. In Moderator’s view, to make further progress in this topic, it would be better we take one step back discussing the motivations before discussing solutions.

## 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):**

Companies are encouraged to provide more detailed views on the motivations why K1 related enhancements are needed / not needed to facilitate the group to understand each other’s needs / reasoning.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Samsung | Since K\_offset value is introduced, the extension of K1 value is not needed. |
| Apple | The RRC configured table for K1 (i.e., dl-DataToUL-ACK) already has up to 8 entries. The motivation of expanding the table is not strong.  |
| APT | When companies agreed to extend the K1 range, not to change the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI was the baseline.  |
| ZTE | As the example shown above, for the scfheduling with larger HARQ process number, since currently the DCI field (3 bits) can only support 8 different K1 candidates, the flexibility of efinedng is quite limited. So, there is need to further enhance it, e.g., extending the value range with 4 bits or other solutions.So the proposal is suggested as follows: Proposal: Enhancement of K1 indication should be supported. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Modifying the DCI is, in a great extent, creating a new DCI format. The reason is that all release 17 Ues need to have the same understanding of DCI formats. If we increase one bit for NTN DCIs, and other Ues are not ready to comply with it, the easiest way is to create a new DCI format. The scenario where K1 needs an expansion seems an extreme case whose advantages are uncertain. Moreover it can be dealt simply with an updated RRC parameter, |
| LG | We are supportive for increasing scheduling flexibility w/o increasing DCI field size.In case of fallback DCI, the candidate K1 values are fixed to {1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8}. If we increase the flexibility for fall back DCI, we can further consider introducing configurable/fixed offset. |
| OPPO | No enhancement is needed.  |
| ITL | It is not clear the motivation to chage DCI size related to K1 range extension. |
| CAICT | K1 related enhancements are needed.Currently, K1 includes 8 values from [0,15]. For the trial ATG network stated in R1-2101042 which K1 range extension was justified needed, the 8 values of K1 should cover different segments within [0,31] to guarantee DL scheduling if the number of candidate K1 values is not increased. Obviously, scheduling flexibility would be impacted It is not preferred to extend the bit width of DCI. Configuring two sets of candidate K1 values could keep scheduling flexibility comparable as before and maginal specification impacts. For the trial ATG network in R1-2101042, for PDSCH in DL slot 0~16 , K1 is in the range of [16,31]. For PDSCH in DL slots 17~30, K1 is in the range of [1,15]. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The main motivation to introduce K1 related enhancement is to increase the scheduling flexibility but it should be first be proven that there is a serious restriction with current 3 bits field. |
| Xiaomi | Not sure about the question here. We already agree to increase the K1 range for at least TDD in some specific configuration, what we need to do to specify the details to support it. |
| Lenovo/MM | We don’t think one step back is necessary as there is already agreement to support K1 range extension. We think we should to discuss how to realize the K1 range extension, e.g. by adding new bits or reinterpreatting existing bits. |
| CMCC | In our view, at least for ATG scenario, the network can be workable even if the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field in DCI does not change.Nevertheless, increase K1 value range in DCI is beneficial to allow higher scheduling flexibility. Regarding the candidate solutions, Option 4 (the size of the PDSCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field is 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 bits in non-fallback DCI 1\_1/1\_2) is preferred for less spec impact. |
| CATT | Not sure what is the motivation to increase the DCI size. Additional enhancement should be justified.  |

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

In the first round of email discussion, 14 companies provided views:

* 10 companies question the need of further enhancement (besides the already agreed extension of K1 range from 0-15 to 0-31 for TDD), including [Samsung, Apple, APT, Nokia/NSB, OPPO, ITL, Huawei/HiSi, Xiaomi, Lenovo/MM, CATT]
* 3 companies jump to advocate the enhancements they favor, including [LG, CAICT, CMCC]
	+ [Moderator]: As can be seen from the large number of companies questioning the need of further enhancements, directly discussing the specific enhancements would not fly. It is better that the proponents can focus on justifying the need first to convince the other camp.
* [ZTE] elaborate why configuring more than 8 K1 values is needed.
	+ [Moderator]: This type of elaboration is constructive for facilitating discussion.

Given the current status, it is sensible to check if the group feels the scenario [ZTE] described is valid or not. However, Moderator doubts that the other camp would immediately agree that this is valid. Given the status, it is recommended that we revisit this issue at the next RAN1 meeting. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss issue #7 further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Proposal 7.3 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

Companies are encouraged provide input to the next RAN1 meeting on whether it is necessary to address the following scenario.

*[ZTE]:*



*As the example shown above, for the scheduling with larger HARQ process number, since currently the DCI field (3 bits) can only support 8 different K1 candidates, the flexibility of scheduling is quite limited. So, there is need to further enhance it, e.g., extending the value range with 4 bits or other solutions.*

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

## 8.1 Background

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

**Koffset is needed:**

[Nokia/NSB]

Proposal 14: RAN 1 to apply K\_offset for Configured Grant type 1.

[China Telecom]

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

**Koffset is not needed:**

[Panasonic]

Proposal 10: Koffset is not necessary for type 1 configured grant.

[OPPO]

Proposal 7: K\_offset is not needed for CG Type 1 configuration.

[Huawei/HiSi]

Proposal 5: By extending the range of timeReferenceSFN-r16, there can be sufficient scheduling flexibility to fulfil the timing relationship for configured grant type 1.

[Samsung]

Proposal 4: The timing relationship for Configured Grant Type 1 should be left to Network implementation.

Based on the submitted contributions at RAN1#105-e, it appears that the views on this topic are polarized.

* 4 out of the 6 companies do not see the need of introducing K\_offset for configured grant type 1, while the other 2 support.

Given the discussions happened at the last 4 meetings already, it does not seem helpful to spend online/email effort discussing this topic again.

In fact, given the views expressed at RAN1#104bis-e, it was recommended that the proponents to offline discuss with other companies to make progress.

However, the proponents have not brought to the Moderator’s attention whether there has been such offline discussion, and if yes, what the outcome is.

Given this situation, Moderator would like to continue to recommend the proponents to offline discuss with other companies to make progress and let Moderator know if there is a possibility for potential consensus.

## 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.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #8:**

On the need of Koffset in Configured Grant Type 1 timing relationship, proponents are encouraged to have offline discussions with other companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Samsung | The timing relationship for Configured Grant Type 1 should be left to Network.  |
| APT | Agree  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We believe the CG Type 1 can be set without the need of K\_offset. But we don’t believe it can be updated without the need oft he same. If other companies demonstrate this is not a problem or that this can be dealt with by implementation, we are willing to compromise on this one.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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

Given the current situation, Moderator recommendation stands as is.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #8:**

On the need of Koffset in Configured Grant Type 1 timing relationship, proponents are encouraged to have offline discussions with other companies.

# 9 Issue #9: Start of RAR window

## 9.1 Background

At RAN1#105-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**[Nokia/NSB]**

Proposal 10: UE could only start ra-ResponseWindow at earliest physical realistic instance of DL reception.

Proposal 11: In the scenarios where the UE pre-compensates for the time advance, in relation to the gNB, before the random access attempt, the same pre-compensation value can be used to postpone the start of the ra-ResponseWindow.

Proposal 12: In other scenarios, where the UE compensates the delay to the satellite, the UE must postpone the start of the window by at least the value corresponding to the common delay plus the delay to the satellite. As this value may have some variation from the actual RTT, the gNB must ensure the response arrive within the ra-responseWindow.

**[ZTE]**

Proposal 11: Determining start of Msg2/MsgB RAR window considering following options:

* Option 1: Introducing an offset of UE specific RTT
* Option 2: Introducing an offset of Minimum RTT

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 11: For both DL-UL alignment and non-alignment cases, offset for RAR window start timing should be UE specific RTT which is calculated by UE based on location based UE autonomous TA value and common TA offset.

**[CMCC]**

Proposal 9: The start of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow are compensated by UE-gNB RTT.

* If downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB, no additional signal is needed.
* If downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB, an additional K\_RAR\_offset is needed, wherein,

K\_RAR\_offset = UE-gNB RTT - $T\_{TA}$

The start of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow = K\_RAR\_offset + $T\_{TA}$

where, $T\_{TA}$ is the timing advance applied by an NR NTN UE.

* In scenario 2-b (RU located at gateway, with gateway and gNB located away from each other), K\_RAR\_offset = 2 \* the propagation delay between NTN GW and gNB
* In scenario 3 (RU located at satellite) if supported, K\_RAR\_offset = feeder link RTT

**[Apple]**

Proposal 7: In NTN, a UE specific RTT to gNB is used as the offset of RAR window.

**[OPPO]**

Proposal 8: For start of RAR window

* The start of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow are compensated by UE-gNB RTT.
* UE-gNB RTT is derived from Msg1/A TA and an additional RTT.
* The additional RTT is signaled by the gNB to UE.
* If gNB does not signal the additional RTT, the additional RTT is assumed to be zero.

**[ITL]**

Proposal 7. The RAR window starting time is determined based on UE-specific RTT. Also, consider how the K\_offset is used for deriving the UE-specific RTT.

**[Lenovo/Motorola Mobility]**

Proposal 6: If DL TX and UL RX are aligned at gNB side, NO additional offset between Msg1/MsgA and RAR is necessary; otherwise, an additional offset corresponding to RTT between reference point and gNB is necessary.

**[CATT]**

Proposal 1: Indicating the feeder link RTT to help UE to derive the RAR reception timing is supported.

**[MediaTek]**

Proposal 3: Start of RAR window can be discussed in AI 8.4.2

Recall the observations made at the RAN1#104-e:

* *There is good consensus on this topic that UE specific RTT can be used to determine the start of PDCCH monitoring for RAR window, which can be equivalently achieved if the determination of the start of RAR window is based on DL timing.*
* *Network does not need to know UE specific RTT to determine the start of PDCCH monitoring for RAR window simply based on the DL timing.*
* *To help UE obtain UE specific RTT, feeder link RTT needs to be signaled to UE if the downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB.*

At RAN1#104bis-e, Moderator encouraged companies to propose a refined formulation on how to offset the start of RAR window using the below formulation as a starting point:

* *The start of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow are compensated by UE-gNB RTT.*
* *If downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB, feeder link RTT is signaled to UE.*
	+ *FFS signaling details*
* *Note: If downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB, there is no need to signal feeder link RTT. Instead, UE can determine the start of RAR window based on downlink timing.*

Based on the proposals submitted at this RAN1#105-e, it appears that the group is converging on this issue.

* There is a common theme that UE specific RTT is used to determine the start of RAR window.
* The follow-up question is how UE can determine the start of RAR window with a UE specific RTT offset. Based on the companies’ proposals, the following observations can be made.
	+ If downlink and uplink frame timing are not aligned at gNB, UE’s TA only covers the RTT of UE-reference point. In this case, a RTT of gNB-reference point needs to be signaled to the UE.
	+ If downlink and uplink frame timing are aligned at gNB, there is no need to signal the RTT of gNB-reference point. Instead, UE can determine the start of RAR window based on DL timing.

## 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):**

* The starts of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow are compensated by UE-gNB RTT.
* The UE-gNB RTT is equal to the sum of UE’s TA and an offset, where the offset value is provided by the gNB. When the UE is not provided by the gNB with the offset value, UE assumes the offset value is zero.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | We agree with the proposal. It can be further clarified that offset is equal to common TA. |
| Samsung | We don’t need to use UE-gNB RTT. We can reuse K\_offset value here. |
| Apple | We agree with the proposal. The offset value seems to be equal to Kmac (i.e., the RTT between timing reference point to gNB). Hence, we propose to further check the relationship between this offset value and Kmac. |
| APT | Support Initial proposal 9.2 (Moderator)To be clear, we understand **UE’s TA** and **an offset** as follows: **UE’s TA** means $T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA,UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$**An offset** means additional information, e.g., the feeder link delay, for UE to calculate UE-gNB RTT. |
| ZTE | We are fine with the 1st sub-bullet and the wording can be efined asThe starts of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow are delayed ~~compensated~~ by UE-gNB RTT.W.r.t the 2nd bullet, the definition of offset should be clarified and this value will be common TA.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Agree with the proposal.In addition, in our preference we would have a proposal or conclusion that it is essential that the monitoring window starts at the correct time (that is, not too early and not too late), as there would otherwise be a risk that UE either misses the RAR/MsgB or receives RAR/MsgB intended for another UE.  |
| Spreadtrum | We agree with the proposal. The offset value is equal to the RTT between RP and gNB. |
| Panasonic | Agree.  |
| LG | May be we need to first clarify the question 2) in RAN2 LS, which is how the UE determines UE-gNB RTT. For the second subbullet, the definition of offset should be clarified.  |
| OPPO | We agree with APT’s clarification.  |
| ITL | We need to clarify how/whether K\_offset value can be reused for deriving UE-gNB RTT. |
| CAICT  | Share the same view with APT. the UE’s TA and an offset need a further clarification. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support initial proposal 9.2. |
| Qualcomm | Clarification is needed on how the compensation time is measured. We believe the intention is to adopt RAN2 approach, i.e., the start of RAR window is relative to UE PRACH transmission time. If so, we support the proposal. |
| Fraunhofer IIS,Fraunhofer HHI | We support the proposal. However, the definition of the offset should be clear. Given that in UE’s TA there is a component capturing common TA, which is from the satellite to the RP, here the offset should be from the RP to the gNB. We would like to know if this understanding is correct. |
| Lockheed Martin | Agree with the proposal |
| MediaTek | Support moderator proposal and suggest additions for follow up highlighted in blue**Initial proposal 9.2 (Moderator):*** The starts of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow are compensated by UE-gNB RTT.
* The UE-gNB RTT is equal to the sum of UE’s TA and an offset, where the offset value is provided by the gNB. When the UE is not provided by the gNB with the offset value, UE assumes the offset value is zero.
	+ In case of DL-UL subframe timing aligned at the gNB, the offset is not provided.
	+ In case of DL-UL subframe timing not aligned at the gNB, an offset equal to gNB-reference point is provided.

NOTE: The UE’s TA is based on RAN1#104bis-e agreement on Timing Advance applied by an NR NTN UE in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE and RRC\_CONNECTED given by  $T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA,UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$ |
| Sony | We agree with the proposal |
| Lenovo/MM | We are generally fine with the proposal. We want to mention that the offset corresponding to RTT between gNB and reference point can be determiend based on K\_mac. |
| InterDigital | Agree with the proposal with clarification that the offset indicated by gNB is RTT between RP and gNB. |
| CATT | UE-gNB RTT is the sum of UE specific TA and feeder link RTT, so we prefer directly to support feeder link RTT indication. The proposed offset is unclear. We tend to change the proposal as:* The starts of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow are compensated by UE-gNB RTT.
* The UE-gNB RTT is equal to the sum of UE specific TA and feeder link RTT. UE specific TA is equal to the TA between the UE and satellite. Feed link RTT can be indicated by the gNB.
 |

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

In the first round of email discussion, 20 companies provided views:

* 17 companies support/are fine with the initial proposal 9.2: [Intel, Apple, APT, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, Spreadtrum, Panasonic, OPPO, CAICT, Huawei/HiSi, Qualcomm, Fraunhofer IIS/HHI, Lockheed Martin, MediaTek, Sony, Lenovo/MM, InterDigital]
	+ Many companies suggest clarifying the meaning of the offset value and/or of the UE’s TA.
		- [Moderator]: suggestion adopted.
	+ [ZTE] suggest changing “compensated” to “delayed”.
		- [Moderator]: “compensated” is used in RAN2 agreement. For consistency, it’s better to stick to “compensated”.
* [Samsung] make a different proposal on using K\_offset instead of UE-gNB RTT.
	+ [Moderator]: the suggestion is not in line with RAN2 agreement. Besides, given the vast majority support of using UE-gNB RTT in RAN1, Moderator would appreciate if [Samsung] can be flexible and accept the majority view.

Based on the views expressed, the following proposal is made and is being discussed in the email reflector:

**Proposal 9.3 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

* The starts of ra-ResponseWindow and msgB-ResponseWindow are compensated by UE-gNB RTT.
* The UE-gNB RTT is equal to the sum of UE’s TA and an offset, where the offset value is provided by the gNB. When the UE is not provided by the gNB with the offset value, UE assumes the offset value is zero.

Note 1: The UE’s TA is based on the RAN1#104bis-e agreement on Timing Advance applied by an NR NTN UE given by  $T\_{TA}=\left(N\_{TA}+N\_{TA,UE-specific}+N\_{TA,common}+N\_{TA,offset}\right)×T\_{c}$.

Note 2: The offset, for example, can correspond to the RTT between gNB and timing reference point. Its relationship with K\_mac can be further discussed.

# 10 Issue #10: PDCCH ordered PRACH

## 10.1 Background

At RAN1#105-e, several companies provide proposals on this topic:

**New timing offset is needed:**

**[Nokia/NSB]**

Proposal 15: The common K\_offset value must be considered also for the PDCCH ordered RACH.

**[Panasonic]**

Proposal 6: Cell specific Koffset should be used to determine RO for PDCCH order RACH.

**[CAICT]**

Proposal 6: Apply cell-specific $K\_{offset}$ explicitly or reported TA implicitly to align the understanding of “next available mapping cycle in a SSB-RO association period after the PDCCH order” for gNB and UE.

**[LGE]**

Proposal 7: For RACH procedure triggered by PDCCH order in Rel-17 NTN, define timing offset in addition to minimum gap, $N\_{T,2}+ ∆\_{BWPSwitching}+∆\_{Delay}+T\_{switch}$.

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

Proposal 3: To ensure NW and UE have a common understanding of the selected PRACH occasion triggered by a PDCCH order, how to define a valid UE-specific TA and a valid TA report shall be considered.

Proposal 4 To minimize RAN1 and RAN2 spec impacts, reusing the existing TA timer to determine whether UE-specific TA or TA reporting is valid shall be considered.

Proposal 5 Do not support any new validity timer for UE-specific TA, considering UE may not update UE-specific TA for a PRACH transmission triggered by a PDCCH due to the timer restriction.

Proposal 6 To reduce blind detection at the gNB side, introducing an offset between the last symbol of the PDCCH order reception and the first symbol of the PRACH transmission shall be considered.

**[InterDigital]**

Proposal-6: introduce K-offset for PDCCH ordered PRACH

**[Intel]**

Proposal 5: PDCCH ordered PRACH should be supported for NTN without blind detection at the gNB

* Alt. 1: PRACH occasion is determined at the gNB based on UE-specific TA reported by the UE
* Alt. 2: UE selects PRACH occasion based on slot offset K\_offset

**[NEC]**

Proposal 5: An additional timing offset for PDCCH ordered PRACH is supported.

**New timing offset is not needed**

**[Lenovo/Motorola Mobility]**

Proposal 7: There is no necessity to add an additional offset between PDCCH order and corresponding PRACH.

**[MediaTek]**

Proposal 4: Blind detection of PDCCH ordered RACH is supported without new enhancements.

**[China Telecom]**

Proposal 5: The blind detection burden on PDCCH ordered PRACH is left to network implementation.

**Clarification suggestion:**

**[ZTE]**

Proposal 12: For PDCCH ordered PRACH, clarification on the assumption for RO determination in legacy system is needed to down-select one of following solutions:

* Introduction on the K\_offset
* Re-interpretation of determination of RO can be considered

**[NTT Docomo]**

Proposal 8: For the discussion of PDCCH ordered PRACH, RAN1 should clarify what scenarios to assume regarding the size of the residual TA error.

Proposal 9: If there is less/no scheduling timing to prevent the ambiguity for the RO selection, K\_offset is used to determine the next available RO for PDCCH ordered PRACH.

Based on the submitted contributions at RAN1#105-e, it appears that the views on this topic have converged a bit further.

* The main debating point is whether the issue can be left to network implementation following the discussion at RAN1#104-e.
	+ 8 companies hold the view that Koffset should be introduced to reduce unnecessary network’s blind detection, while 3 companies hold the view that there is no such need.
* [ZTE] suggest down selecting between introducing K\_offset and re-interpretation of RO determination.
* [NTT Docomo] ask for clarification about the size of the residual TA error.
	+ [Moderator]: This would be a discussion mainly under A.I. 8.4.2.

At RAN1#103-e, RAN1#104-e, and RAN1#104bis-e, PDCCH ordered PRACH was discussed.

In fact, given the views expressed at RAN1#104bis-e, it was recommended that the proponents to offline discuss with other companies to make progress. However, the proponents have not brought to the Moderator’s attention whether there has been such offline discussion, and if yes, what the outcome is.

That said, give that 13 companies provide input on this topic to RAN1#105-e, it appears justified to collect another round of views from companies in order to make progress.

## 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):**

On the timing relationship of PDCCH ordered PRACH:

* Option 1: Introduce K\_offset to enhance the timing relationship of PDCCH ordered PRACH.
* Option 2: Conclude that enhancing timing relationship of PDCCH ordered PRACH is not needed.
* Option 3: Proponents of enhancement are encouraged to have offline discussions with other companies that are negative to the enhancement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | We are OK with Option 1 and Option 2 if for option 2 it is assumed that reporting of autonomous TA applied by the UE shall be supported. |
| Samsung | K\_offset value can be used. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think that which option should be taken is dependent on actual situations. For example, if the typical situation is that TA error compensated by PDCCH ordered PRACH is not so large, then there are many scheduling occasions where the raised issue does not happen. To conclude this issue, considered situation should be identified at first. |
| APT | Option 1. Considering UE may re-calculate UE-specific TA when UL is unsynchronized, NW cannot know which RO UE will select (the previous TA report shall be invalid). Introducing K\_offset can prevent blind decoding for a gNB and also relaxing the processing time (in case UE needs to update TA) for a UE after receiving a PDCCH order.  |
| ZTE | Enhancing timing relationship of this case is needed based on current specification, .Option-2 is preferred and also option-1 is acceptable if majority prefer it.  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We prefer Option 1.  |
| Spreadtrum | Considering that K\_offset has been introduced to enhance the timing relationships involve DL-UL timing interaction, K\_offset value also can be used to enhance the timing relationship of PDCCH ordered PRACH. |
| Panasonic | Option 1. Cell specific Koffset should be used because UE timing status would not be known to gNB. (if UE timing is known to gNB, Koffset would not be needed) |
| LG | Option 1.  |
| OPPO | Option 2 |
| CAICT | Option1.We should notice that PDCCH ordered PRACH is usually triggered when gNB has DL data for UE and the UL is unsynchronized. The purpose of PDCCH ordered RACH is to achieve UL synchronization so that the HARQ feedback associated with the DL data can work properly. In such case, the UE reported TA is not reliable since the UL is under the state of synchronization. Therefore, in order to align the understanding of RO resource selection at both UE and gNB for PDCCH ordered RACH and to reduce the blind detection at gNB side, we prefer Option1.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We tend to prefer Option 1 but further discussion to clarify the arguments on both sides would be welcome. |
| MediaTek | Option-2 is preferred, Option-1 is also acceptable. |
| Sony | We support Option 1. PRACH in NTN is not transmitted with an assumption of TA = 0 as in TN. Option 2 is only workable if a PDCCH ordered PRACH is transmitted with an assumption of TA = 0. But this would then be different to the assumption used for initial access PRACH transmission wherein there is TA precompensation of the UL. |
| Lenovo/MM | We support Option 2. |
| InterDigital | Support Option 1 |
| CMCC | Option 1. |
| CATT | Option 1 is better. The benefit is to reduce the blind detection efforts for gNB. |

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

In the first round of email discussion, 18 companies provided views.

* 15 companies support / can accept Option 1: [Intel, Samsung, APT, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, Spreadtrum, Panasonic, LG, CAICT, Huawei/HiSi, MediaTek, Sony, InterDigital, CMCC, CATT]
* 3 companies support Option 2: [NTT Docomo, OPPO, Lenovo/MM]

It has also been brought to Moderator’s attention that [CAICT] has been kindly coordinating the offline discussion, which results in this more converging status.

Moderator also encouraged [CAICT] to further coordinate with [NTT Docomo, OPPO, Lenovo/MM] to converge further.

Given this status, Moderator will wait for [CAICT] to report back the offline discussion outcome and then make a proposal

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #10:**

Moderator will wait for [CAICT] to report back the offline discussion outcome and then make a proposal.

# 11 Issue #11: SFI timing relationship

## 11.1 Background

At RAN1#105-e, there is only one proposal on this topic:

**[Xiaomi]:**

Proposal 6: The enhancement on the SFI timing relationship is not supported

At RAN1#102-e, RAN1#103-e, and RAN1#104-e, SFI timing relationship was discussed. At RAN1#104-e, Moderator recommended that the proponents to offline discuss with other companies to make progress. At RAN1#104bis-e, the proponents did not bring to the Moderator’s attention whether there had been such offline discussion.

Therefore, at RAN1#104bis-e, Moderator continued to recommend the proponents to offline discuss with other companies to make progress and let Moderator know if there is a possibility for potential consensus.

At RAN1#105-e, no company proposes to enhance SFI timing relationship, while one company proposes not to enhance SFI timing relationship. Given this, it would be good to check with the group if a conclusion could be made for this topic.

## 11.2 Company views

Based on the above discussion, an initial proposal is made as follows.

**Initial proposal 11.2 (Moderator):**

Make a conclusion on the following proposal:

*[Xiaomi] The enhancement on the SFI timing relationship is not supported*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| APT | Support Xiaomi’s proposal. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We agree with the proposal |
| Panasonic  | Agree.  |
| CAICT | Not support.In the previous discussions, there was some concern that SFI timing relationship is not critical currently. We think the issue #11 could be revisited if time is available when the major issues in NTN are concluded.  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

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

In the first round of email discussion, 4 companies provided views. 3 companies support, while 1 company do not support.

For companies who do not provide views, Moderator assumes that those companies are fine with [Xiaomi]’s proposal as well.

Given the status and the issue has been discussed over many meetings already, it is reasonable to conclude this issue so that the group’s time can be better spent on other more important topics.

**Proposal 12.3 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

Conclusion:

SFI timing relationship does not need enhancement for NR NTN.

# 12 Issue #12: Timing of preamble retransmission

## 12.1 Background

 [OPPO] propose timing relaxation for preamble retransmission.

**[OPPO]:**

In last RAN1 meeting, some companies raised an issue on the preamble retransmission timing relaxation. In the current specification, it says that:

 ‘the UE is expected to transmit a PRACH no later than NT,1+0.75 msec after the last symbol of the window, or the last symbol of the PDSCH reception.’

According to the FL’s analysis in the last meeting, it seems the network will continue detecting the preamble without knowing when the UE will retransmit the PRACH. But in this case, why in the spec there is a restriction that the UE is expected to perform the retransmission latest by NT,1+0.75 msec after the last symbol of the window, or the last symbol of the PDSCH reception? If this is a requirement for the UE, then we think in NTN system, this delay may be relaxed or increased.

**Proposal 7: Introduce timing relaxation for preamble retransmission.**

In Moderator’s view:

* The NT,1+0.75 msec is the minimum time that the UE should be *ready* for preamble transmission. It is not the time that the UE should transmit preamble within NT,1+0.75 msec. The actual retransmission would occur at a configured PRACH occasion. There is no clear motivation why this time should be relaxed for NTN.

That said, it would be good to hear more views from the group.

## 12.2 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 12.2 (Moderator):**

Discuss the necessity of the following proposal:

*[OPPO]* *Introduce timing relaxation for preamble retransmission.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | Agree with the Moderator view |
| Samsung | It seems no need for relaxation. Since there are other UEs, the gNB anyway needs to perform preamble detection. |
| APT | Agree with the moderator’s view. This is the minimum time for UE to be ready. |
| ZTE | Agree with moderator’s analysis. No need to relax the timing for NTN. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | This is not a problem of DL-UL timing, as there is no slot index indication. The specification is clear that the metric used for retransmission is purely elapsed absolute time. However, the phrasing on the chedulingon sounds indeed odd, and suggests, in our comprehension, the opposite of moderator’s view. In this case, the retransmissions of PRACH are subjected to a very strict requirement that in many scenarios won’t be possible to comply with due to the lack of RACH opportunities. This seems a problem to be corrected outside the scope of NTN as it may affect all Ues |
| Panasonic | We tend to agree with Moderator’s view, but we are open to discuss.  |
| OPPO | We respect the majority view.  |
| CAICT  | Agree with the Moderator view. The problem in the timing relationship of preamble retransmission needs a further clarification.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree with the moderator’s view. |
| MediaTek | Agree with moderator’s view |
| Sony | Support relaxing the time. The timing of PRACH transmission in NTN was previously agreed to be precompensated with the TA. If NT,1+0.75 msec is less than the current TA, then the time need to be relaxed to allow TA precompensation. |
| Lenovo/MM | We agree with OPPO that a value should be introduced for preamble retransmission. E.g. the UE is expected to transmit a PRACH no later than NT,1 + 0.75ms+K\_value after the last symbol chedu window, or the last symbol chedu PDSCH reception. And we think K\_value is same as K\_offset. The reason chedul the last symbol chedu window or for PDSCH reception is a DL symbol, and preamble transmission is a UL symbol. We understand moderator’s view that anyway PRACH transmission is associated with a RACH occasion. However, necessary restrictions can avoid UE to perform unnecessary RACH transmission at least from power saving perspective. |
| CATT | The original wording from specication is “not later than‘‘, but the moderator said it is the minimum time to be ready. We are confused with moderator explaination. |

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

In the first round of email discussion, 13 companies provided views. The majority support Moderator’s analysis, despite some companies raise the spec text is confusing.

As pointed out by the majority, the “NT,1+0.75 msec” here is a minimum UE processing requirement for UE to be ready for PRACH retransmission.

To further confirm this understanding, Moderator checked the version history of TS 38.213.

In v15.1.0, it is clear:

|  |
| --- |
| If a UE detects the PDCCH with the corresponding RA-RNTI and a corresponding PDSCH that includes a DL-SCH transport block within the window, the UE passes the transport block to higher layers. The higher layers parse the transport block for a random access preamble identity (RAPID) associated with the PRACH transmission. If the higher layers identify the RAPID in RAR message(s) of the DL-SCH transport block, the higher layers indicate an uplink grant to the physical layer. This is referred to as random access response (RAR) UL grant in the physical layer. If the higher layers do not identify the RAPID associated with the PRACH transmission, the higher layers can indicate to the physical layer to transmit a PRACH. A minimum time between the last symbol of the PDSCH reception and the first symbol of the PRACH transmission is equal to  msec where  is a time duration of  symbols corresponding to a PDSCH reception time for PDSCH processing capability 1 when additional PDSCH DM-RS is configured and . |

The wording was changed in v15.2.0 of 38.213, and this is reflected in the CR **R1-1807957**, where it says “the UE shall be ready to transmit” which is still clear enough.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Then in version v15.3.0, the following editorial changes was made in CR **R1-1810020**, where “the UE shall be ready to transmit” was changed to “the UE is expected to transmit”, which does cause confusion.

|  |
| --- |
|  |

Therefore, we can conclude the following:

* The intention of the spec text is clear. The NT,1+0.75 msec is the minimum time that the UE should be *ready* for preamble transmission. It is not the time that the UE should transmit preamble within NT,1+0.75 msec. The actual retransmission would occur at a configured PRACH occasion.
* That said, the latest specification text is a bit confusing, and the wording is not the best, despite it should be obvious from the specification as a whole that PRACH transmissions only take place in PRACH occasions.
	+ If companies are interested in improving the spec text, it is recommended that companies provide input to Rel-15 maintenance agenda item, as the potential refinement of the specification text is a general issue outside the scope of NTN WI.

Given the above analysis and majority view, Moderator would like to propose the following conclusion.

**Proposal 12.3 (Based on 1st round of email discussion):**

Conclusion:

Timing relaxation for preamble retransmission is not needed for NR NTN.

# 13 Issue #13: Beam failure recovery timing relationship

## 13.1 Background

[Apple] propose to study whether timing relationship enhancement is needed for beam failure recovery.

**[Apple]:**

It is not crystal clear whether the “slot $n$” or “slot $n+4$” in the specifications refers to uplink slot or downlink slot. Different interpretations may result in large difference on the beam failure recovery request window starting time, due to the large TA in NTN.

Furthermore, in NR terrestrial network, when a UE receives a first PDCCH in the dedicated search space set configured for beam failure recovery, it resets its PUCCH transmission beam based on the newly identified beam after 28 symbols after the last symbol of the PDCCH. This also implies the time from which gNB adjusts its reception beam for the PUCCH. In NTN, due to the large propagation delay, the time from which gNB adjusts its reception beam for the PUCCH (with new beam) needs to be clarified. Hence, it is worth to examine whether this 28-symbol gap needs to be enhanced in NTN.

***Proposal 9:*** *RAN1 to study whether timing relationship enhancement is needed for beam failure recovery.*

Since this issue is brought up for the first time, it would be good to hear more views from the group.

## 13.2 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 13.2 (Moderator):**

Discuss the necessity of the following proposal:

*[Apple] RAN1 to study whether timing relationship enhancement is needed for beam failure recovery.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | Ok to study |
| Samsung | Ok to study |
| Apple | Support to study.  |
| APT | Agree. However, support BFR may be challenging, e.g., frequency reuse = 1 may not be good for NTN, i.e., every satellite beam shall have a different frequency to prevent strong interference due to light-of-sight transmission. |
| ZTE | For this topic, as pointed by Apple, there are following two points for discussion:1. As defined in current spec, “For PRACH transmission in slot C:\Users\10184108.ZTE\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml7788\wps1.png and according to antenna port quasi co-location parameters associated with periodic CSI-RS resource configuration or with SS/PBCH block associated with index C:\Users\10184108.ZTE\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml7788\wps2.png provided by higher layers [11, TS 38.321], the UE monitors PDCCH in a search space set provided by *recoverySearchSpaceId* for detection of a DCI format with CRC scrambled by C-RNTI or MCS-C-RNTI starting from slot C:\Users\10184108.ZTE\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml7788\wps3.png within a window configured by *BeamFailureRecoveryConfig*.”

The definition of time-relationsip is similar the as preamble transmission + RAR window cheduling as initial access stage. Then, similar approach can be considered. But since the window length is up to 200ms as defined below beamFailureRecoveryTimer ENUMERATED {ms10, ms20, ms40, ms60, ms80, ms100, ms150, ms200} which is enough for LEO cases and maybe only needed to be enhanced with larger value for GEO.1. W.r.t the PUCCH transmission after 28 symbols, according to eixsitng speci, this value is defined to enforce the usage of new QCL relationship after BFR, and whether/when the PUCCH will be transmitted is still up to the cheduling. In this way, with the consideration on the impacts of TA, the transmission of PUCCH can be scheduled later after BFR. In this way, it seems that there is no need to enlarge the value.

In general, for NTN case, since the beam footprint is larger for either Tx or Rx beam at gNB side. The overall benefits of BFR to select the one beam is marginal. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We are ok in further investigation this problem. At a first view, it seems a problem poised for the solution with a K\_offset (cell specific) delay. |
| Panasonic | We are open to study.  |
| LG | Ok to study. |
| ITL | We are ok to further study. |
| CAICT  | OK to study |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Okay to study this further. |
| Qualcomm | OK to study. |
| Fraunhofer IIS,Fraunhofer HHI | Fine to study further. |
| Sony | Support to study |
| Lenovo/MM | We are fine to study. And we think K\_mac should be introduced to enhance n+4. Regarding 28-symbol gap, we think K-offset is necesary. |
| Zhejiang Lab | OK |
| InterDigital | Ok to study but we don’t see an issue for BFR at this point for NTN since BFR may be required when there is a possibility that a frequent beam change for PDCCH is needed. |
| CATT | OK |

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

In the first round of email discussion, 17 companies provided views. The majority are fine to study this issue further, despite some companies point out that BFR might not be essential for NTN.

Given the status, in Moderator’s view, it is reasonable to study the issue further. Since this issue is brought up the first time at this meeting, companies may need more time to analyze it. So, it is recommended that we revisit this issue at the next RAN1 meeting. With this way forward, it is not necessary to discuss issue #13 further at this RAN1 meeting.

**Moderator recommendation on Issue #13:**

Companies are encouraged to provide input on whether timing relationship enhancement is needed for beam failure recovery at the next RAN1 meeting.
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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.

**RAN1#104-e:**

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.

Agreement:

Update of K\_offset after initial access is supported

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.

Working assumption:

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

**RAN1#104bis-e:**

Agreement:

For updating K\_offset after initial access, at least one of the following options is supported:

* Option 1: RRC reconfiguration
* Option 2: MAC CE

FFS: Other options

Agreement:

* For determination of cell-specific K\_offset in system information, down-select one option from below:
	+ Option 1: Signal one offset value for K\_offset
		- Note: For example, the value is expected to cover the RTT of service link plus the RTT between serving satellite and reference point
	+ Option 2: Signal a first offset value and a second offset value. K\_offset is equal to the sum of the two offset values
		- Note: For example, the first offset value is expected to cover the RTT between serving satellite and reference point or is determined by common TA, and the second offset value is expected to cover RTT of service link

Agreement:

Confirm the following working assumption:

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

Agreement:

When UE is not provided with K\_offset value other than the one signaled in system information, the K\_offset value signaled in system information is used for all timing relationships that require K\_offset enhancement.

Agreement:

UE can be provided by network with a K\_mac value.

* When UE is not provided by network with a K\_mac value, UE assumes K\_mac = 0.