**3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #110e R2-200xxxx**

**Online, 1st – 12th June 2020**

**Agenda item: 6.11.3**

**Source: MediaTek Inc,**

**Title: [AT110-e][504][PowSav] CP Open and ASN.1 Issues (Mediatek)**

**Document for: Discussion and decision**







# 5 For further discussion (including documents submitted to section 6.11.3)

## O803: Do we need to clarify that max MIMO layer preference applies to each BWP that the UE operates on?

| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ERI | Yes | We think that the current wording “*the UE prefers to reduce the number of maximum MIMO layers of each serving cell*” is clear that the UE prefers a max MIMO for each BWP the UE operates on. But it is not clear if this is achieved via RRC reconfiguration (the maxMIMO on all BWPs is reconfigured below the preferred max) or BWP switching (e.g. UE is switched to a BWP with maxMIMO below the preferred maxMIMO). We think the latter aspect could be clarified by “*the UE prefers to reduce the number of maximum MIMO layers of each BWP, if configured, of each serving cell*”. |
| Huawei | Yes |  |
| CATT | No | We don’t see a need to have a different wording than the overheating wording. Our understanding is that this preference is “for each serving cell” and therefore acts at the same level as the per-cell configured DL Max MIMO layer value (*maxMIMO-Layers* in *PDSCH-ServingCellConfig*). And regarding the DL MIMO layer RRC configuration, it was agreed that the configured per-BWP DL max MIMO layer value (*maxMIMO-Layers-r16* in *PDSCH-Config*) is expected to be less than or equal to the per-cell configured DL Max MIMO layer value (if configured). Thus, it is clear enough max MIMO layer preference applies to each serving cell. It is then left to network implementation how to configure maximum number of DL MIMO layers per BWP, after receving the max MIMO layer preference of each serving cell. |
| vivo |  | We think the preferred reduced maximum number of MIMO layers of each serving cell should be applied to all BWPs that UE operates on. (Any other understanding?) From the network side, either reconfiguring maxMIMO layer for all BWPs below the preferred maximum number, or switching to a BWP with maxMIMO layer lower than the preferred maximum number, should be supported. It is up to network to implement. Thus, from our side, there is no difference to clarify this explicitly or not. |
| MediaTek |  | Agree with vivo that the preference should be applied to all BWPs that the UE operates on. How this is achieved (RRC reconfiguration vs BWP switch) is for NW implementation. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## V210/R2-2004643: This paper discusses the note on the implicit SCG release indication of indicating max CC = 0 or max BW = 0.

This paper suggests that the if zero value of maxCC (or max BW) should override a previous signalled non-zero value of max BW (or max CC), to avoid any misinterpretations in case a zero value is provided for one parameter and a non-zero value for the other parameter. During the discussion, it was pointed out that the problem can be avoided by changing the note to say that max CC *and* max BW should be set to 0 to indicate an implicit SCG release. The rapporteur suggests a change as below to address the problem:

NOTE 3: The UE can implicitly indicate a preference for NR SCG release by reporting the maximum aggregated bandwidth preference for power saving of the cell group, if configured, as zero for both FR1 and FR2, and by reporting the maximum number of secondary component carriers for power saving of the cell group, if configured, as zero for both uplink and downlink.

Companies are asked to provide their view on the suggested clarification

| **Company** | **Clarification needed (yes/no)** | **Agree with suggested change (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ERI | Yes | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | Yes | From our side, we would like to confirm that companies have same understanding on the UE behavior to indicate the preferred SCG release.  The above suggestion is OK for us, or we can consider the the note suggested in our contribution. |
| MediaTek | Yes | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

## R2-2004558: On the impact of secondary DRX group on DRX preference UAI – **moved to email discussion 37**

This paper discusses the interpretation of the preferred DRX inactivity timer when two DRX groups are configured for a cell group. The following options are outlined in the document:

* *Option 1：The DRX-Preference is applied to primary DRX group by default even if secondary DRX group is configured, i.e., no DRX preference for secondary DRX.*
* *Option 2: When the UE provides its preference on DRX parameters, the UE explicitly indicates whether this reported DRX-Preference is corresponding to the secondary DRX group or not.*
* *Option 3: It’s up to network configuration whether DRX-Preference is for secondary DRX or not if secondary DRX group is configured.*
* *Option 4: Secondary DRX group specific DRX-Preference for power saving can be configured by the network, UE can report DRX-Preference for both primary DRX and secondary DRX.*

Companies are asked to provide their views on the issue raised in this document.

| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Huawei |  | We are ok to discuss it under the email discussion on secondary DRX (#037) |
| CATT |  | Also fine to discuss it as part of email discussion [037] |
| vivo |  | We are also fine to discuss this issue in TEI on secondary DRX group. |
| MediaTek |  | Moved to email discussion 37 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## R2-2005145: On a new UAI parameter for time gap between WUS and onDuration

This paper suggests that a new UAI is needed to indicate the UE preference on the time gap between DCI2\_6 and DRX on duration. It points out that there is UE capability signalling in place for this time gap, but a UE assistance can bring additional benefits., and therefore proposes:

*The UE may signal UE assistance information including a preferred value of Minimum Time Gap in addition to signaling its Minimum Time Gap capability.*

Companies are asked to provide their views on this proposal.

| **Company** | **Support (yes/no)** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ERI | No | This topioc has been discussed in RAN1, and any preference signalling should be discussed there.  Furthermore the UE indicates a minimum time gap that the UE supports via UE capability. Thus the UE already has the possibility to omit some time gaps that it does not prefer via UE capability. |
| Huawei | No | The benefit (power saving gain?) can be introduced is not clear, the gap capability is sufficient. |
| CATT | No | We see no strong motivation to introduce a new preference for power saving at this later stage, given a capability is already supported and seems sufficient for us. |
| vivo | No | We also think this should be discussed in RAN1 first.  In RAN1, they agreed this time gap is the UE capability. We are not sure about the benefit to report the UE preference, which should be first approved in RAN1, as the time gap may impact the signaling design for DCP. |
| MediaTek | No | We see no strong motivation for this. UE capability reporting is sufficient to achieve the necessary power savings |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## O804: Optionality of the maxCC-Preferences for UL and DL

For overheating the UL and DL preferences are mandatory present in all the overheating IEs. This is also the case for power saving, except for the maxCC-Preferences IE:

**OverheatingAssistance** ::= SEQUENCE {

reducedMaxCCs SEQUENCE {

reducedCCsDL INTEGER (0..31),

reducedCCsUL INTEGER (0..31)

} OPTIONAL,

reducedMaxBW-FR1 SEQUENCE {

reducedBW-FR1-DL ReducedAggregatedBandwid,

reducedBW-FR1-UL ReducedAggregatedBandwid

} OPTIONAL,

reducedMaxBW-FR2 SEQUENCE {

reducedBW-FR2-DL ReducedAggregatedBandwh,

reducedBW-FR2-UL ReducedAggregatedBandwih

} OPTIONAL,

reducedMaxMIMO-LayersFR1 SEQUENCE {

reducedMIMO-LayersFR1-DL MIMO-LayersDL,

reducedMIMO-LayersFR1-UL MIMO-LayersUL

} OPTIONAL,

reducedMaxMIMO-LayersFR2 SEQUENCE {

reducedMIMO-LayersFR2-DL MIMO-LayersDL,

reducedMIMO-LayersFR2-UL MIMO-LayersUL

} OPTIONAL

}

**Power Saving:**

MaxBW-Preference-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

reducedMaxBW-FR1-r16 SEQUENCE {

reducedBW-FR1-DL-r16 ReducedAggregatedBandw,

reducedBW-FR1-UL-r16 ReducedAggregatedBand

} OPTIONAL,

reducedMaxBW-FR2-r16 SEQUENCE {

reducedBW-FR2-DL-r16 ReducedAggregatedBandw,

reducedBW-FR2-UL-r16 ReducedAggregatedBandw

} OPTIONAL

}

MaxCC-Preference-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

reducedCCsDL-r16 INTEGER (0..31) OPTIONAL,

reducedCCsUL-r16 INTEGER (0..31) OPTIONAL

}

MaxMIMO-LayerPreference-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

reducedMaxMIMO-LayersFR1-r16 SEQUENCE {

reducedMIMO-LayersFR1-DL-r16 INTEGER (1..8),

reducedMIMO-LayersFR1-UL-r16 INTEGER (1..4)

} OPTIONAL,

reducedMaxMIMO-LayersFR2-r16 SEQUENCE {

reducedMIMO-LayersFR2-DL-r16 INTEGER (1..8),

reducedMIMO-LayersFR2-UL-r16 INTEGER (1..4)

} OPTIONAL

}

It is proposed to align with the overheating IEs:

MaxCC-Preference-r16 ::=  SEQUENCE {

    reducedCCs             SEQUENCE {

       reducedCCsDL-r16      INTEGER (0..31),

        reducedCCsUL-r16      INTEGER (0..31)

    }

} OPTIONAL

What do companies prefer?:

1. Keep MaxCC IE as is
2. Change MaxCC IE such that UL and DL are mandatory present, similar as all the other IEs for power saving and overheating

| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ERI | 2 | Alignment with overheating has been used as an argument to decide on the power saving structures. We can follow the same principle here. |
| Huawei | 1 or 2 | We don’t have a strong view, either way works. As we decide to use delta-signalling reporting, it should be supported that UE includes MaxCC-Preference-r16 with all the sub-fields absent. |
| CATT | 2 | No strong view but OK to align with overheating. |
| vivo | 1 | We prefer to keep the current maxCCs as optional. In this way, we can report an empty IE to indicate ‘no preference’. |
| MediaTek | 1 or 2 (with changes) | For option 2 to be compatible with our earlier agreements to allow ‘no preference’ signaling, *reducedCCs* field must be OPTIONAL. With this change to option 2, we are ok with both design choices. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Other documents

Documents R2-2005405 and R2-2004860 are not listed here as they are addressed in section 2. Document R2-2004758 is not discussed here as it was discussed at the last meeting.