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1. **Introduction**

This contribution provides discussion on reply LS to R1-2100021 within the thread [104-e-NR-R17-SL-LS-01].

1. **Discussions (Phase 1 until 27th Jan)**

RAN2 sent the following LS body:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|

|  |
| --- |
| Working assumption: SL DRX should take PSCCH monitoring also for sensing (in addition to data reception) into account if SL DRX is used. |

RAN2 has made the following working assumption on sidelink DRX:In addition, RAN2 has made the following agreements related to sidelink DRX:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements on SL DRX: 1: Sidelink DRX needs to support sidelink communications for both in-coverage and out-of-coverage scenarios.2: Support SL DRX for all casting types.3: If a UE is in SL active time, UE should monitor PSCCH. FFS on PSSCH. FFS for sensing impacts.4: As baseline, for Sidelink DRX for SL unicast, it is proposed to inherit and use timers similar to what are used in Uu DRX. FFS for SL broadcast/groupcast. FFS on detailed timers.5: Support of long DRX cycle for SL unicast should be assumed as a baseline. FFS on the need of short DRX cycle.6: Deprioritize SL WUS (Wake-Up Signal) from RAN2 point of view in Rel-17.7： RAN2 will prioritize normal use case without consideration of relay UE use case in Rel-17.8： RAN2 is not going to introduce SL paging and SL PO for SL DRX. |

Note: From RAN2 perspective, the partial coverage case has not been precluded by the first agreement in the above box.To RAN WG1: RAN2 kindly asks RAN1 to provide feedback if there is any concern on the working assumption and take the above information into their future works. |

Therefore, in the following, the interpretation of RAN2’s working assumption, as well as any related details would be discussed in this section.

## Potential interpretation on working assumption

### Round 1 discussion (till 27th, Jan)

In moderator’s understanding, RAN2’s working assumption can be understood through the following two alternatives:

**Alt1**: When UE is configured with sidelink DRX, UE’s configured sidelink DRX cycle will impact the two mentioned actions, i.e., sidelink data reception and (partial) sensing, i.e. UE should decide whether it can perform (partial) sensing and data reception referring to its configured DRX cycle.

**Alt2**: When whichever entity (network or UE’s upper layer) is performing sidelink DRX configuration, it should take (partial) sensing impact and data reception into account.

Tentative consideration for each understanding alternative:

For Alt1: If the working assumption is understood in alternative 1, that means PSCCH monitoring for (partial) sensing should be limited to the active duration of SL DRX. It will cause impact to RAN1’s (partial) sensing principle, i.e. configured (partial) sensing window will be impacted by sidelink DRX configuration, where the design complexity and spec impact should be considered.

For Alt2: If the working assumption is understood in alternative 2, moderator understands that whichever entity(network or UE’s upper layer) is taking the responsibility of setting up sidelink DRX configuration, it should take (partial) sensing related impact into account by acquiring (partial) sensing related parameters, therefore, it can be assumed that sidelink DRX configuration and (partial) sensing configuration is strived to be aligned by the aforementioned entity. Correspondingly, moderator thinks that PHY layer can follow (partial) sensing mechanism irrespective of sidelink DRX configuration in any case that mis-alignment between sidelink DRX cycle and (partial) sensing window happened, i.e. PSCCH monitoring for (partial) sensing cannot be limited to the active duration of SL DRX.

Q1: Please share your views and whether Alt1 or Alt 2 of the above moderator consideration is agreeable.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Alt 1/ Alt 2** | **Comments (if any)** |
| OPPO | Alt1 | For the explanation of the WA from RAN2, we tend to understand it in the way of Alt1. While it does not mean that the sensing is limit within DRX on duration. The WA just say that the SL DRX should take sensing (in addition to data reception) into account. There is no intension to combine sensing and SL DRX on duration. SL DRX is designed for data reception. In our view, the DRX pattern of RX UE should be indicated by the TX UE so that it can well align with the traffic pattern of the TX UE. While sensing is the operation for resource selection for data transmission, it depends on the traffic pattern of the RX UE itself. If the sensing is limit within DRX on duration, that will put much limitation to the sensing operation, and will affect the accuracy of sensing operation, and will degrade PRR performance. Furthermore, if sensing is limit within on duration, that will put limitation for the resource selection range, such as, the UE can only select the resource within on duration so that it can do re-evaluation/pre-emption check(based on sensing) to avoid potential collision . Otherwise, if UE selects resource within OFF duration, it can not do sensing so that it cannot do re-evaluation/pre-emption check. In that case, the traffic pattern of TX UE (which determines the DRX pattern of RX UE), and the traffic pattern of RX UE (which determines the resource selection range), should be well aligned, that is not reasonable |
| Fujitsu | Alt1 with the comments | In general, there are two time windows with different functions. One is defined as DRX On-duration, used for sidelink data reception, and the other is defined as (partial) sensing window, used to deduce the information in terms of periodic/retransmission reservations, resource reselection, and resource preemption, for resource selection. In nature, both should be independently configured/defined. Our interpretation towards Working Assumption is, Tx-UE could monitor PSCCH for sensing (in addition to data reception) in DRX On-duration, and meanwhile, Tx-UE should perform sensing in (partial) sensing window. This is because, performing a sensing in DRX On-duration can acquire more information for resource selection and improve the reliability. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Neither | RAN2 has not asked for our feedback on these two potential alternatives – only whether RAN1 has a concern. The agenda item for power saving is where to discuss issues such as this. |
| vivo | Alt1 with the comments | The question from moderator seems to ask which layer (PHY or MAC) makes the first decision (i.e., partial sensing configuration or DRX configuration), and which layer takes the second action to handle the impact. If DRX is semi-statically (pre-)configured by higher layer, Alt1 seems to be a reasonable interpretation. However, in the current state with all the existing agreement, either way is not precluded from RAN1 perspective. If RAN1 is required to take such decision, further evaluation should be done.  |
| Panasonic  | Neither | Both alternative interpretations could be possible and not precluded in current stage. RAN1 may need further discuss in the SL RA agenda which alternative to be adopted. |
| CATT, GOHIGH | See comments | We tend to understand the working assumption in alt 1, but our understanding is different from moderator’s consideration. Alt 1 doesn’t mean that the sensing operation should limited into the DRX on duration. If sensing operation is limited into the DRX on duration, the DRX cycle configuration should be aligned with the minimum configured resource reservation periods for partial sensing. This operation will have a strict restriction on SL DRX configuration and enlarge the DRX activation duration, and the power saving gain should be doubted comparing with partial sensing operation without limitation of SL-DRX. |
| Samsung | Neither | Our understanding is the same as HW and Panasonic. Both alternatives are possible at this stage and we need to discuss about this in this meeting.  |
| Xiaomi |  | From our point of view, the major issue between the two alternatives is whether sensing should be limited in the on duration of DRX cycle, i.e. no sensing behaviour is expected out of the DRX on duration. RAN1 can make our own decision on this issue, but further discussion would be necessary. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Neither | Agree with HW/Panasonic/Samsung. Current RAN2 WA/agreements do not preclude any direction including alt 1 and alt 2.  |
| Sony | Neither | Agree with HW/Panasonic/Samsung/docomo that both alternatives are possible from the current RAN2 agreements. RAN1 can discuss a relationship between sensing operation and SL-DRX configuration. |
| Ericsson | Neither | RAN2 is only asking to provide a reply in case of any concern regarding the WA. Since RAN1 has not yet decided which alternative to select there is no need to reply with an alternative.In case a reply is sent to RAN2 indicating no concern on their agreements and WA, we can include a clarification regarding the third bullet in RAN2 agreements: RAN1 would like to inform RAN2 that a first stage Sidelink Control Information is transmitted in PSCCH and a second stage Sidelink Control Information is transmitted in PSSCH. |
| Fraunhofer | Neither | Agree with HW, Panasonic and others. Both alternatives are up for discussion in the RAN1 power saving AI, and agreements toward this topic are yet to be made. |
| FUTUREWEI | Neither | It is premature to reply that RAN1 has a concern. |
| ё | See comments | We suggest discussing details of partial sensing operation first, including UE behavior for semi-persistent and dynamic resource reservations. We have not discussed yet any solutions and have not agreed on any interpretations. In addition, there may be other ways to implement SL DRX from the physical layer perspective. Instead of discussing alternatives, it may be better to discuss L1 impacts on DRX and inform RAN2 as well as provide RAN1 feedback on working assumption made by RAN2. |
| InterDigital | Neither | The two alternatives listed are not clear to us at this point. Seems there are two topics are mixed together. The first topic is whether the sensing configuration will affect DRX configuration or DRX configuration will affect sensing configuration; and the second topic is whether sensing is allowed outside active time or not although these two topics are correlated each other.We think RAN1 needs more time to digest the RAN2 agreements and investigate the potential options, and pros and cons of each options. |
| Apple | See comments | Our understanding of the two alternatives represents two-way impact. Alternative 1 discusses the impact of SL DRX on SL data reception/sensing, while alternative 2 discusses the impact of SL data reception/sensing on SL DRX configurations. We think both alternatives are possible at this stage. In alternative 1, SL DRX is configured, then SL sensing and resource selection operations should be adapted. For example, a TX UE does not select a resource which is in RX UE’s DRX off duration. In alternative 2, if partial sensing is configured, then SL DRX should be configured to align with UE’s sensing occasions for power saving purpose.  |
| ZTE | Alt 2 | We would like to avoid too much impact on RAN1 spec after introducing sidelink DRX mechanism. Thus, to apply alt 2, the alignment between partial sensing and sidelink DRX configuration will be handled by upper layer and minimized RAN1 impact will be caused. |
| Convida Wireless | Neither | Neither alternatives are intended by RAN2. Both alternatives may be discussed and possible. RAN1 could discuss these alternatives in more details. |
| Qualcomm | Please see our comments  | In our view, the working assumption made by RAN2 is unclear. It might be intended to mean any or both alternatives listed above. When the DRX configurations are disjoint and both the Tx and Rx UEs are configured with a sidelink DRX, the Tx UE only needs to perform sensing during the Rx UE’s active time; note that performing sensing outside of the DRX active time of the Rx UE is not useful since the Rx UE is not able to receive data outside of its active time. This could, for example, be the case for the P2P/D2D communication. In some other scenarios, e.g., P2V, although a Tx UE (i.e., a pedestrian UE) is configured with a DRX for its reception, it can still perform sensing outside of its DRX active time in case it has an urgent packet with a small PDB (as compared to the gap between two consecutive active time) to transmit. In this case, once a UE receives a packet for transmission, it can perform sensing for the purpose of resource selection or reevaluation.Hence, whether a sidelink UE should perform sensing only during its DRX active time or can perform sensing outside of it too is dependent on each specific scenario and should be left to a UE to decide.  |
| Lenovo/MoTM | Alt1 | UE should monitor PSCCH inside the SL DRX active period. There is no need to configure partial sensing in addition to SL DRX configuration. Within the SL DRX configuration UE shall support data transmission/reception and sensing. If sensing duration inside a SL DRX active period for a UE is not enough then a separate DRX configuration especially for sensing can be configured, where UE only monitors PSCCH and not support data transmission.  |

### Round 2 discussion (till 29th, Jan)

After the 1st round of discussion, it can be found that companies still keep quite divergent view on the understanding of the working assumption, also it is widely mentioned that RAN1 should firstly study further and discuss on different possible understanding alternatives. Thus, moderator suggests on the below conclusion to discuss the relationship between sidelink DRX configuration and partial sensing:

Conclusion: Regarding the relationship between sidelink DRX and (partial) sensing, whether (partial) sensing can be performed in sidelink DRX inactive duration will be further studied in RAN1.

Companies are encouraged to provide comment on the above conclusion. In addition, if possible, companies are further encouraged to provide feedback to the “whether” issue mentioned in the above conclusion, i.e. whether sensing can be performed in sidelink DRX inactive duration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Ericsson | Since the question from RAN2 was to reply in case of any concern with respect to the working agreement and in RAN1 we still more study to provide an answer (as shown in the conclusion), in our view there is no need to send a reply to the LS in this meeting. Once we have a better picture about the DRX and partial sensing relationship we can reply to the LS. |
| **OPPO** | **OK with the conclusion** |
| FUTUREWEI | No conclusion necessary, RAN1 will of course take the RAN2 decision into account. |
| Apple | We do not make conclusion in preparing this reply LS. More relevant discussions can be made in AI 8.11.1.1.  |
| Samsung | No conclusion necessary. |
| ZTE | Agree with the conclusion. This conclusion can be put under AI 8.11.1.1 as the baseline for future discussion if it can be agreed. |
| NTT DOCOMO | No conclusion necessary. |
| vivo | No need of this conclusion – the updated WID already task RAN1 to do this. |
| Panasonic | No need for conclusion.  |
| Nokia, NSB | We don’t see a need for discussing this conclusion here |
| CATT, GOHIGH | we are ok with this conclusion, but we think it doesn’t make much progress. Anyway it will be discussed in 8.11.1.1 |
| LG | Not sure whether such conclusion is necessary. Even without having it, RAN2 can assume that the relevant discussion will be taken in RAN1.  |

## Writing style of the reply LS

### Round 1 discussion (till 27th, Jan)

As mentioned above, the working assumption in RAN2’s LS can be understood in two different alternatives, thus, in moderator’s understanding, when constructing the reply LS, RAN1 also has three solutions:

**Solution 1**: Explain the two understanding alternatives of RAN2’s working assumption in a detailed way, and ask RAN2 to confirm which alternative is RAN2’s original intention.

**Solution 2**: Explain the two understanding alternatives of RAN2’s working assumption, as well as showing RAN1’s consideration and preference for each of the understanding alternative.

**Solution 3**: If the consequence of Q1 is quite convergent to one understanding alternative, RAN1 can reply the LS based on that understanding alternative directly.

Q2: Please share your views and which solution of the above moderator consideration is agreeable for the way to construct the reply LS.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Solution option** | **Comments (if any)** |
| OPPO |  | The WA does not put much limitation to DRX and sensing. RAN1 can discuss the relationship between DRX and sensing firstly. Based on the discussion output, RAN1 can reply to RAN2 about the RAN1’s discussion/agreement. |
| Fujitsu |  | Solution 4: RAN1 understanding towards Working Assumption is as follows. DRX On-duration and (partial)sensing window are (pre)-configured independently. RAN1 will study the Tx-UE behavior, such that Tx-UE should mainly perform sensing in (partial) sensing window, and in addition, Tx-UE could monitor PSCCH for sensing (in addition to data reception) in DRX On-duration, as well. RAN1 will report the relevant RAN1’s agreements to RAN2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | None of the above. | Neither of the potential alternatives, nor any of the solutions derived here from it raise a concern with RAN2’s working assumption. That means we can answer that RAN1 has no such concern on the working assumption so far, but based on RAN1’s further discussions additional receptions may be assumed during DRX (e.g. PSFCH, etc).If companies have the view that some deeper technical discussion is needed under the appropriate WI agenda items, then it may be feasible to take a bit longer to reply (e.g. next meeting), as RAN2 are not on pause waiting for an immediate response. |
| vivo |  | It is beneficial to clarify RAN2’s intention and understanding, but in order to provide RAN1’s consideration or preference, further evaluation is required. Then it seems hard to provide the response in this meeting. |
| Panasonic |  | We have similar view with HW/vivo that to respond it in the next meeting |
| CATT, GOHIGH |  | We also think it is better to discuss the relationship between SL-DRX and sensing operation firstly, and then reply the LS next meeting. |
| Samsung | None of the above | We have similar view with HW/vivo/Panasonic. We do not need to response for RAN2 LS. If RAN1 makes some agreements about sidelink DRX, then we can send LS to RAN2.  |
| Xiaomi |  | We prefer to sending reply to RAN2 after RAN1 has further discussion on partial sensing, to understand the potential impact of partial sensing on DRX. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | Same view as vivo/etc. LS would be unnecessary in this meeting.Alternatively, we can ask RAN2’s intention with alt 1/2 as just example. |
| Sony |  | We also think that a LS reply is not necessary in this meeting. We can discuss a relationship between sensing operation and SL-DRX configuration in RAN1. |
| Ericsson |  | There is no need to reply in this meeting with a solution. |
| Fraunhofer |  | Since the topic is currently under discussion in RAN1, we can either defer it to either the next meeting, or provide an update based on the agreements made in this meeting via LS to RAN2, as stated by Samsung. |
| FUTUREWEI |  | No reply is needed in this meeting |
| Intel |  | We believe the reply is needed to (at least) provide feedback on working assumption and update RAN2 on the latest status of RAN1 discussion with respect to potential L1 impacts on SL DRX if those are discussed and agreed by RAN1 this meeting. |
| InterDigital | None of the above. | RAN1 needs further discussion on the relationship between SL DRX and resource allocation for power saving before sending LS to RAN2.  |
| Apple |  | We think RAN1 could reply this LS in a later meeting, once the relationship between sensing and SL DRX is commonly understood.  |
| ZTE | Solution 2 | We can show our preference on the understanding of WA. But we also feel sympathy on other companies’ comment that first we should discuss this issue clearly and then send the reply LS. |
| Convida Wireless |  | No need to reply in this meeting for solution. If RAN1 would like to reply this LS, we could discuss the relationship between DRX and sensing in more details. RAN1 could reply the LS in next meeting or so. |
| Qualcomm |  | Since RAN2’s working assumption is unclear, it is not possible for RAN1 to respond whether we have a concern or not. The main concern is about the clarity of the working assumption itself. We can first discuss the relation between sensing and DRX configurations, including different scenarios, e.g., the RX UE is not configured with DRX or both TX/RX UEs configured with DRX, in RAN1. Our response, including the potential conclusions and agreements, can inform RAN2 about how we see the interaction of the two features.  |
| Lenovo/MoTM |  | RAN1 should discuss and understand the relationship between SL-DRX and sensing operation firstly before replying to LS. |

### Round 2 discussion (till 29th, Jan)

Moderator understands and agrees to most companies’ concern that so far RAN1 cannot clearly reply the LS before any deeper study and discussion for the relationship between sidelink DRX and partial sensing. But at least RAN1 can show our working status on this issue so that to avoid any potential repetitive work in RAN2. In addition, if there is any possible agreements would be made during this meeting related to sidelink DRX, the agreement can also be informed to RAN2. So moderator suggest to adopt the following text in the reply LS:

Proposed text:

*“RAN1 thanks RAN2 for informing the sidelink DRX related agreements and working assumption. So far RAN1 is still discussing and studying on any possible relationship between sidelink DRX and partial sensing. RAN1 will reply our consideration on the working assumption, as well as related agreements once there is any update.”*

Companies are encouraged to provide feedback on whether the intention of the proposed text can be agreed, editorial modification can be discussed in the draft LS if the intention can be agreed by most companies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Ericsson | Same as for the conclusion. We do not need to send a reply to RAN2 in this meeting. |
| **Qualcomm** | **In our view, there is no need to send a reply at this moment. RAN1 can continue the discussion on (partial) sensing and DRX configurations. Once agreements are made, RAN2 can be notified.**  |
| **OPPO** | **No necessary to send the LS. If the above conclusion is agreed, it can be known by other WGs, e.g. from RAN1’s Chairman’s notes.** |
| FUTUREWEI | No reply necessary |
| Apple | We do not need to send reply LS in this meeting, before any conclusions are made in RAN1.  |
| Samsung | No reply necessary |
| ZTE | We think the LS is OK but we can also follow majority view. |
| NTT DOCOMO | No reply necessary.Agree with QC, after RAN1 reached agreements if any, then RAN1 send an LS to RAN2. |
| vivo | No need to reply this meeting. |
| Panasonic | No need to reply this meeting.  |
| Nokia, NSB | RAN2’s action to RAN1 was “provide feedback if there is any concern on the working assumption” so there is no need for a reply LS unless we find such concerns. So there is no need for a reply LS at this point. |
| Xiaomi | No need to send LS in this meeting. |
| CATT, GOHIGH | At this point, since no relevant progress made in RAN1, no need to send LS to RAN2. |
| Intel | We believe the reply is needed to (at least) provide feedback on working assumption and inform RAN2 that RAN1 is looking into this and will update RAN2 once progress on partial sensing design is made. If it is agreeable, some rewording may be needed. Otherwise, we can accept to postpone reply LS towards future meeting(s) |
| LG | We also think that it is not meaningful to send the reply LS to RAN2 before RAN1 makes agreement on this issue. |

1. **Conclusions (till 1st, Feb)**

According to the email discussion, most companies agreed that RAN1 should further study and discuss on the relationship between sidelink DRX and sensing. The reply LS will be postponed. Thereafter, RAN1 will try to send the reply LS next meeting once there is any related agreement made or any concern found regarding RAN2’s working assumption.
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