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# Introduction

During RAN2#110-e it was agreed to have an email discussion on:

* [AT110e][037][TEI16] Secondary DRX (Ericsson)

Scope: Treat R2-2004325, R2-2004364, R2-2005729 and Aspects that do not overlap with email discussion of: R2-2004856, R2-2004553, R2-2004640, R2-2004786 (proponents are responsible to explain and drive)

Part 1: Identify agreeable changes, and make agreements as far as possible. Deadline: June 4, 0700 UTC. Possibly if needed can be revisited on-line.

Part 2: For agreeable parts, continuation to agree CRs. Deadline: June 10, 0700 UTC

This document describes phase 1 of this email discussion.

# Phase 1

In phase 1 the RAN1 LS ([R2-2004325](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004325.zip)), RAN4 LS ([R2-2004364](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004364.zip)), email report ([R2-2005729](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005729.zip)) and the proposals in the Ericsson contribution ([R2-2004856](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004856.zip)), OPPO contribution ([R2-2004553](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004553.zip)), vivo contribution ([R2-2004640](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004640.zip)) and Xiaomi contribution ([R2-2004786](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004786.zip)) to this meeting should be discussed, unless they were already discussed during the email discussion ([R2-2005729](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005729.zip)):

[R2-2004325](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004325.zip), *LS response on secondary DRX*, LS out, To: RAN2, Cc: RAN4, RAN1#100bis-e

[R2-2004364](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004364.zip), *LS on secondary DRX group for FR1+FR2 CA*, LS out, To: RAN2, RAN4, RAN4#94bis-e

[R2-2005729](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005729.zip), *Email report of [PostAT109bis-e][054][TEI16] Secondary DRX*, Ericsson, RAN2#110-e

[R2-2004856](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004856.zip), *Introduction of secondary DRX group*, Ericsson, DISC, RAN2#110-e

[R2-2004553](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004553.zip), *Further considerations on secondary DRX group*, OPPO, DISC, RAN2#110-e

[R2-2004640](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004640.zip), *Views on NR TEI for secondary DRX group*, vivo, DISC, RAN2#110-e

[R2-2004786](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004786.zip), *Views on introduction of Dual DRX*, Xiaomi, DISC; RAN2#110-e

There was one submission under the Power Saving agenda item that is added to this email discussion:

[R2-2004558](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004558.zip), *Impact of secondary DRX group on UE assistance information*, OPPO, DISC; RAN2#110-e

The following topics were already discussed during email #054 ([R2-2005729](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2005729.zip)) which lead to the following proposals:

1. RAN1 reply LS

**Proposal 1**: Joint configuration of DCP and secondary DRX is not supported in REL-16.

**Proposal 2**: Joint configuration of SCell dormancy during Active Time and secondary DRX is not supported in REL-16.

1. RAN4 reply LS

Many companies think that no further discussion in RAN2 is required based on the RAN4 reply LS. But there are also quite a few companies that think that the UE should support perFRgap with secondary DRX to make use of the power saving gains. Two companies pointed out that more work in RAN4 is needed when RAN2 decides to introduce secondary DRX. From a rapporteur perspective we make the following comments:

* The need to support perFRgap with secondary DRX was extensively discussed in RAN4 meeting, and RAN4 did not agree that the UE is required to support perFRgap with secondary DRX. The need to support perFRgap is a RAN4 topic, and RAN4 is the working group that can best decide if this is required or not. Furthermore the same discussion should not be repeated in RAN2.
* RAN4 indicated that there is impact on RAN4, but that the impact is limited.

1. RRC configuration issues

**Proposal 3**: All serving cells in the secondary DRX group shall belong to one Frequency Range and all serving cells in the legacy DRX group shall belong to another Frequency Range.

**Proposal 4**: The network shall configure a shorter *drx-InactivityTimer* and *drx-onDurationTimer* for the secondary DRX group compared to the default DRX group.

1. Active Time

**Proposal 5**: The *drx-ShortCycleTimer* is handled per DRX group, i.e. (re-)started when *drx-InactivityTimer* of the associated DRX group expires, and when *drx-ShortCycleTimer* expires the associated DRX group goes into Long DRX.

**Proposal 6**: The (Long) DRX Command MAC CE controls the DRX cycle switch of both DRX groups.

**Proposal 7**: While SR on PUCCH is pending both DRX groups are in Active Time.

**Proposal 8**: When RAR using CFRA has been received, and PDCCH indication new transmission has not been received yet, both DRX groups are in Active Time.

1. CSI measurements and reporting

**Proposal 9**: The UE reports periodic and semi-persistent CSI when the DRX group that is configured with PUCCH/PUSCH for CSI reporting is in Active Time.

**Proposal 10**: SRS is transmitted when the DRX group where SRS is transmitted is in Active Time.

The new proposals submitted to RAN2#110-e [4-8] are listed below, and the proposals that have already been discussed in email discussion #054 are stricken though:

[R2-2004856](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004856.zip), *Introduction of secondary DRX group*, Ericsson, DISC, RAN2#110-e

**Proposal 1**: The legacy DRX group remains in Active Time, while the secondary DRX group is in Active Time.

**Proposal 2**: The network is only required to configure the DRX groups in different frequency ranges when the UE supports perRFgap capability.

[R2-2004553](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004553.zip), *Further considerations on secondary DRX group*, OPPO, DISC, RAN2#110-e

**~~Proposal 1~~** ~~If a SR is sent on PUCCH and is pending, UE enters Active Time for either or both of DRX groups based on the LCP restriction for the logical channel which triggers the SR.~~

**~~Proposal 2~~** ~~Upon receiving a RAR in CFRA, UE enters Active Time of a DRX group for the serving cell where preamble is sent.~~

**Proposal 3** For a UE configured with secondary DRX group, the UE enters Active Time of the primary DRX group if ra-*ContentionResolutionTimer* is running.

**~~Proposal 4~~** ~~The expiration of~~ *~~drx-InactivityTimer~~* ~~or~~ *~~drx-ShortCycleTimer~~* ~~for a DRX group triggers the DRX cycle switch for the corresponding DRX group.~~

**~~Proposal 5~~** ~~If a (Long) DRX Command MAC CE is received on a serving cell, UE switches the DRX cycle of a DRX group to which the serving cell belongs.~~

**~~Proposal 6~~** ~~UE reports periodic or semi-persistent CSI for a cell only when this cell is in Active Time, regardless of whether the cell carrying the CSI report is in Active Time or not.~~

**~~Proposal 7~~** ~~Secondary DRX group is not configured simultaneously with DCP or SCell dormancy in Rel-16.~~

[R2-2004640](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004640.zip), *Views on NR TEI for secondary DRX group*, vivo, DISC, RAN2#110-e

**~~Proposal 1:~~** ~~In Rel-16 TEI on secondary DRX group, if it is needed, only consider the case where secondary DRX group is not configured simultaneously with DCP or SCell dormancy for a UE.~~

**~~Proposal 2:~~** ~~The interaction with DCP or SCell dormancy indication for secondary DRX group, if needed, can be further considered in Rel-17, e.g. in the UE power saving enhancement WI.~~

**Proposal 3:** The TEI on secondary DRX group should be configured for UEs with per-FR MG capability in FR1 + FR2 CA.

**Proposal 4:** The capability for secondary DRX group should be defined as per-BC.

[R2-2004786](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004786.zip), *Views on introduction of Dual DRX*, Xiaomi, DISC; RAN2#110-e

**Proposal 1** The introduction of Dual DRX should be postponed to R17 power saving.

[R2-2004558](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004558.zip), *Impact of secondary DRX group on UE assistance information*, OPPO, DISC; RAN2#110-e

**Proposal** : RAN2 discuss how the UE provides its preference on DRX parameters if secondary DRX group is configured.

# Discussion

The new proposals identified in phase 1 are discussed below.

**Active time**

[R2-2004856](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004856.zip), *Introduction of secondary DRX group*, Ericsson, DISC, RAN2#110-e

Even when the *OnDurationTimer* and *drx-InactivityTimer* are configured shorter for the secondary DRX goup, there can be (corner) cases where the primary DRX group goes to sleep while the secondary DRX group is still in Active Time.

**Proposal 1**: The legacy DRX group remains in Active Time, while the secondary DRX group is in Active Time.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Agree | This is perhaps a corner case, but potential problems with CSI reporting from FR2 can be avoided when proposal 1 is agreed, and we think proposal 1 is not complicated, nor increases the UE power consumption significantly. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Given that on duration timer and data inactivity timer for legacy DRX groups are longer, this scenario where legacy DRX group goes to sleep before secondary DRX group does happens only when network schedules traffic exclusively on FR2. That does not seem to be a sensible network implementation to us, i.e. not to fully utilize all available radio resources when there is enough traffic requiring the use of FR2 carriers. On other hand, even if that happens in some network implementation, system is not broken. For example, for CSI reporting, although periodic CSI reports for FR2 carriers have to stop after FR1 carriers enter sleep, network can just use aperiodic CSI to get CSI reports on FR2 carriers.  Therefore, we do not think any forced coupling between active time of two DRX groups is needed. |
| NEC | Disagree | it seems that before having additional agreements, e.g. shorter timers in secondary DRX group or handling of SR/CFRA (Proposals 4,7,8 in post-109bis Email discussion report [3]), this proposal itself may not be so meaningful. However, in any case, there is no need for such restriction. This could happen according to ongoing data activity due to traffic volume or HARQ retransmissions in each DRX group, but nothing will be broken. |
| LG | Disagree | There should be no dependencies between two DRX groups. |
| Intel | Disagree | We share the same view as Qualcomm. |
| HW | Agree | As we pointed in the previous discussions, the misaligned active time for two DRX groups have impact on the RLM and CSI reporting from FR2. We understand the issue comes from the drx-InactivityTimer, and the simplest approach is to exclude drx-InactivityTimer, which would make the discussions easier to conclude. Otherwise, we have strong concers on how to settle down the feature in TEI within the last meeting before ASN.1 frozen. |
| OPPO | Disagree | Firstly, we think FR1 DRX and FR2 DRX Active Time should be independent. Secondly, we have different understanding on the PUCCH CSI reporting, in the case when reported carrier (FR2) is in Active Time and reporting carrier (FR1) is not in Active Time, UE can still report the PUCCH CSI in order to enable data scheduling in FR2. |
| vivo | Disagree | We also think this restriction makes no sense. There is not much time when the legacy DRX group is not in Active Time but the secondary DRX group is in Active Time. Firstly, we would like to understand why network only schedules on FR2 and gives up radio resource on the FR1 when there is enough traffic buffering. Secondly, even if only FR2 is in Active Time, the network can get CSI reports on FR2. Hence the restriction is not needed. |
| Panasonic | Disagree | We agree with Qualcomm |
| MediaTek | Disagree | We share same view with QC. We prefer to decouple active time of the two DRX groups. |
| Nokia | Agree | We should not artificially require NW to schedule over primary DRX group to keep it in Active Time while the secondary DRX group is in Active Time to ensure, e.g., proper CSI reporting from FR2. |
| Apple | Disagree | We share the same view as Qualcomm. |
| ZTE | Agree | Share the same view with HW |
| CATT | Agree | On top of Ericsson’s argument, it also prevents from configuring PUCCH in both groups to address this issue, which we don’t think is a corner case. |
| Verizon | Agree | This helps for exception case handling |
| Futurewei | Agree | There shouldn’t be unnecessary restriction on network’s scheduling operation over FR1 and FR2. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | We agree with Qualcomm |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Frequency Range**

[R2-2004856](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004856.zip), *Introduction of secondary DRX group*, Ericsson, DISC, RAN2#110-e

**Proposal 2**: The network is only required to configure the DRX groups in different frequency ranges when the UE supports perRFgap capability.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Agree | We think that the NW configuration restriction only makes sense when the UE support perFRgap, otherwise it is not needed.  PS: there is a dependency with proposal 4 below, i.e. in case it is agreed that UE shall support perFRgap with secondary DRX. |
| Qualcomm | See comment | We agree that power saving enabled by DRX group would be limited if UE does not support perFRgap capability.  But regardless of whether UE supports perFRgap or not, network always has the full control in whether to configure DRX groups or not. So we are not sure if anything needs to be captured in the specs. And we can just leave it to network configuration.  If companies want to capture a common understanding in the meeting minutes/agreements, the proposal maybe can be reworded to:  “Network is not required to configure DRX groups in different frequency ranges for a UE that does not support perFRgap capability.” |
| NEC | See comment | this is rather UE capability aspect which highly depends on RAN4 work, but not functional aspect. We do not see any urgency to agree or disagree with this network behavior. if necessary, it should be discussed from UE capability point of view. |
| LG | Disagree | Though it is reasonable configuration, it is up to network. There should be no configuration restriction from the specification point of view. |
| Intel | Disagree | We share Qualcomm’s view that the configuration aspect can be left to network implementation. |
| HW | Agree | We think P2 is the intention that we agreed it is the preliminary understanding in the previous discussions, and thus we should stick to the previous agreement. |
| OPPO | Agree | We agree with the intention, it’s up to network configuration and smart network configuration does not configure secondary DRX if UE does not support per FR MG capability. We’re open to add an restriction for network saying that the secondary DRX is configured when UE supports per FR MG capability. |
| vivo | Agree with comments | We think the proposal should be:  The network is required to configure the DRX groups in different frequency ranges only when the UE supports perRFgap capability.  We think this restriction makes sense, which is the main motivation when we agreed to have this secondary DRX group. |
| Panasonic | Disagree | It can be left up to NW configuration. |
| MediaTek | Disagree | We can leave this up to NW configuration, so nothing needs to be captured in spec. |
| Nokia | Disagree | The proposal seems rather confusing and we don’t want the NW to be required to configure the feature regardless of UE support for perRFgap capability. |
| Apple | Disagree | We share Qualcomm’s view that the configuration is up to NW implementation. |
| ZTE | Agree | This is the original intention why we agree with introduction of it |
| CATT | Disagree | Same view as above companies. We see no reason to relax the requirement about the different frequency ranges. This is a RAN2 agreement, we don't need to re-discuss it. |
| Verzion | See comment | Share the same view with QC and many others – it is up to the NW, though the intention is for different frequency range. A lot of the differences of “agree” or “disagree” is just the interpretation of the question and different ways of answering. We don’t see further specifing it is needed (or important). |
| Futurewei | Disagree | Though it is understood that the intention is to use the secondary DRX group when UE is capable of per-FR measurement gap, it shouldn’t be network requirement but rather should be network choice to configure secondary DRX group when it deems secondary DRX group useful. |
| Samsung | See comment | It is preferable to defer to NW implementation rather than introducing any limitation. |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | Leave to gNB implementation. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

***ra-ContentionResolutionTimer***

[R2-2004553](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004553.zip), *Further considerations on secondary DRX group*, OPPO, DISC, RAN2#110-e

**Proposal 3:** For a UE configured with secondary DRX group, the UE enters Active Time of the primary DRX group if ra-*ContentionResolutionTimer* is running.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Disagree | We think this should be handled similar as for SR and RAR i.e. both groups wake up. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | We have the same view as Ericsson. |
| NEC | Disagree | but firstly handling of SR and CFRA should be decided based on Email discussion report [3], then confirm this. |
| LG |  | Same view as NEC. The e-mail discussion on SR and CFRA should be decided first. |
| Intel | Disagree | Agree with Ericsson. |
| HW | Disagree |  |
| OPPO | Agree | Active time is independent between FR1 and FR2, for contention resolution timer, it’s used for UE for monitoring DCI scheduling MSG4. Currently, DCI scheduling MSG4 can only be transmitted in PCell/PSCell which corresponding to one of the DRX groups, so we think UE can only starts the Active Time for that DRX group. It does not make any sense to let UE start Active Time for the other DRX group for which UE can not receive DCI scheduling MSG4. |
| vivo | Disagree | We also think both DRX groups will wake up in this case. |
| Panasonic | Disagree | Agree with Ericsson |
| MediaTek | Disagree | Both DRX group should enter active time. |
| Nokia |  | In principle, the contention resolution is only scheduled through SpCell so in that sense this could be considered. |
| Apple | Disagree |  |
| ZTE | Disagree |  |
| CATT | Disagree | Same understanding as Ericsson. |
| Verizon | Disagree | Agree with Ericsson & others. Both waking up is a cleaner solution with less hidden risk |
| Futurewei | Disagree | Both DRX group should wake up to avoid other subtle issues. |
| Samsung | Disagree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | We have the same view as Ericsson. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Per-FR MG capability**

[R2-2004640](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004640.zip), *Views on NR TEI for secondary DRX group*, vivo, DISC, RAN2#110-e

**Proposal 4:** The TEI on secondary DRX group should be configured for UEs with per-FR MG capability in FR1 + FR2 CA.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Disagree | It is true that the UE obtains the most power saving gain, when the UE supports perFRgap capability with secondary DRX. But RAN4 has discussed whether a UE supporting secondary DRX group shall support perFRgap capability, but RAN4 did not agree on this, and RAN2 should not re-discuss this. RAN4 is the WG that can best asses whether perFRgap is needed. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | See our comment on Proposal 2. |
| NEC | Agree, but see comment | Firstly, as RAN4 confirms, the feature gives the most benefit when the UE supports the per-FR MG. At the same time RAN4 does not say it is not feasible to support by the UE without per-FR MG capability.  What RAN2 should do is to discuss and confirm whether there is technical issue when the UE without per-FR MG capability supports the secondary DRX? This should be discussed from UE point of view, not network configuration point of view, because if the network receives the information that the UE supports the secondary DRX group even though it does not support per-FR MG, there is no stopper to configure the feature to this UE from functional aspect.  Therefore, our view is as follow:  - from network point of view, the secondary DRX **should be** configured to the UE with per-FR MG capability to realize good UE power saving,  - from UE point of view, if the UE/chipset vendors want to support the secondary DRX regardless of per-FR MG capability, it is up to them. If they want, they **can support**. This is because we cannot identify the issue prohibiting from doing as such. |
| LG | Disagree | See our comment on Proposal 2. |
| Intel | Disagree | Agree with Ericsson. |
| HW | Agree | That is just what RAN4 concerns on how to implement this feature. We understand if we really rush for this, we should take RAN4 concerns into account and not expand the discussions. Otherwise, we need a second round LS check with RAN4. |
| OPPO | Disagree | We think this is the correct intention but we don't think there should be any restrictions on the specification. It’s up to network configuration and smart network configuration does not configure secondary DRX if UE does not support per FR MG capability. |
| vivo | Agree | We think this is the intention for RAN4’s reply LS. In RAN4 reply LS [4], it is clearly stated that RAN4 has observed that dual DRXs configured to the UE without per-FR MG capability in FR1 + FR2 CA may not be able to provide same power saving gain.  In our understanding, the reasonable implementation for UE capable of per-FR MG have individual RF chains for FR1 and FR2. On/off control on different RF chain can be performed by dual DRX groups. In this way, power saving gain can be obtained for UEs with per-FR MG capability. For UEs without per-FR MG capability in FR1+FR2 CA, even different DRX on/off state can be achieved by secondary DRX group, but the UE cannot go to sleep due to the implementation. |
| Panasonic | Disagree | Agree with Ericsson |
| MediaTek | Disagree | We understand the intention, but we think it could be up to NW configuration/determination whether to configure secondary DRX for a UE without per-FR MG capability in FR1+FR2 CA. |
| Nokia | Disagree | Up to RAN4. |
| Apple | Disagree | Agree with Ericsson |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree | This is consistent with the primary intention of the feature, the discussion on P2 and earlier RAN2 agreement. |
| Verizon | Disagree | Our understanding is also that RAN4 didn’t say to support this, UE needs to support per-FR MG capability. NW should be able to handle it properly without this added specification. |
| Futurewei | Agree | But there may be no specs impact, as it is up to network implementation. |
| Samsung | Disagree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree | Up to RAN4. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**UE capability**

[R2-2004640](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004640.zip), *Views on NR TEI for secondary DRX group*, vivo, DISC, RAN2#110-e

**Proposal 5:** The capability for secondary DRX group should be defined as per-BC.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Disagree | When the UE indicates support for secondary DRX group, the UE should support it for all the supported band combinations in different FRs. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Our view is that per-UE capability likely is sufficient, as DRX groups are already restricted to per FR in FR1+FR2 CA configuration. |
| NEC | Disagree | Given that the DRX groups are configured in FR1 and FR2 respectively, the per-UE capability should be sufficient. |
| LG | Disagree | This feature is independent of band combination. |
| Intel | Disagree | Agree with Ericsson and Qualcomm. |
| HW | Disagree |  |
| OPPO | Disagree |  |
| vivo | Agree | If we agree to have per-UE capability, we should clearly capture in the specification that secondary DRX group is only applicable in FR1+FR2 CA. |
| Panasonic | Disagree |  |
| MediaTek | Disagree | Per-UE capability should be sufficient, i.e. supported for all band combinations. |
| Nokia | Disagree |  |
| Apple | Disagree |  |
| ZTE | Disagree |  |
| CATT | Disagree | We don’t think such granularity is needed. |
| Verizon | Disagree |  |
| Futurewei | Disagree | Per UE capability should be sufficient. |
| Samsung | Disagree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Disagree |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Postpone to REL-17**

[R2-2004786](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004786.zip), *Views on introduction of Dual DRX*, Xiaomi, DISC; RAN2#110-e

**Proposal 6:** The introduction of Dual DRX should be postponed to R17 power saving.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Disagree | We think that the open issues have been addressed in email discussion #054 and this email discussion. The solution has been scaled down to a simple solution that can be supported in REL-16 with an acceptable impact on other WGs. Furthermore, and most importantly, there is large support for this feature in REL-16. The power consumption in FR2 is a concern for the operators which should be addressed. |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Outcome of the post RAN2#109bis email discussion has shown that there is a strong support for this feature and companies have converged on nearly all open issues. We thus expect good progress can be made in this meeting. Moreover, as Ericsson explained above, power consumption in FR2 is a concern for operators and they do hope this feature can be deployed as soon as possible. |
| NEC | Disagree | Given that some combination of other features with the secondary DRX is to be removed (i.e. not supported), there seems no technical concern additionally for introducing this feature in Rel-16. |
| LG | Agree | RAN1 has not confirmed that the introduction of secondary DRX has zero or very little impact to RAN1 specifications. In addition, RAN4 impacts may not be neglected. Even the RAN2 aspects, there are many issues that need to be resolved. Thus, it is not feasible to introduce Dual DRX in Rel-16. |
| Intel | Disagree | Agree with Ericsson and Qualcomm. |
| HW | Agree | As identified by the contributions on the table, we don't believe it is a good idea to finalize everything within one meeting without any further check with other WGs. Given that we have introduced SCell dormancy and WUS, we truly believe there is no urgent to have another feather, which cannot be combined with existing mechanisms, unless there is convincing proof that sec DRX overwhelms the other two mechanisms. Otherwise, why it was not prioritized at the study phase of PS in R16? We think more analysis is therefore needed and can be postponed to Rel-17. |
| OPPO | Open | We are open to postpone this to Rel-17 given that there are some R16 power saving feature may not be supported if we have secondary DRX. We think it could be better to develop a complete feature instead of split it into different releases. |
| vivo | Open | We share the same view as OPPO. From technique point of view, it is better to consider it with power saving features as a complete design. But we are also OK to first introduce a simple, just a simple solution in Rel-16, after that, we can continue to discuss more design in future release. |
| Panasonic | Disagree | We share Qualcomm and Ericsson view. |
| MediaTek | Disagree | Based on previous agreement, we think we can have simple design for secondary DRX in R16. It may address the concern of FR2 power consumption (although the design may be not so complete and compatible with other features). |
| Apple | Disagree | Agree with Ericsson and Qualcomm. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| CATT | Disagree | No strong view though but this feature seems to have strong support from operators and discussions so far nailed down the issues and keep it simple. We would agree though to complement Rel-17 WID to include improvements related e.g. with joint configuration of DRX groups and DCP. |
| Verizon | Disagree | Being in Rel-16 is where its best value is. We need it now so we can request it immediately and have it up and running much earlier than the WUS. Having 2 loops working on the same things is common, and often good when they differ in time they apply. This is clearly an earlier goer much needed in our NW, which is currently suffering from big UE power consumption problem for FR2. It offers a much needed RAN2 high level approach – a diversity branch in addition to those lower level solutions (which usually take longer time to tune). We support efforts to make it simple (therefore reducing the scope a bit), but postphoning it is really not acceptable, sorry to say that but it would be hard to explain should that happen. |
| Futurewei | Agree | Given that it is the last meeting to finalize R16 functionalities and many open issues are still to be addressed, it’d be better not to rush into a decision that has many gaps to fill and may impact other WGs. |
| Samsung | Disagree | We have strong view to support this feature in Rel-16. It’s really immediate work in market. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree | RAN1 impact is not clear yet, so it is preferable to postpone this to R17. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**UE assistance**

[R2-2004558](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2//TSGR2_110-e/Docs/R2-2004558.zip), *Impact of secondary DRX group on UE assistance information*, OPPO, DISC; RAN2#110-e

**Proposal 7**: RAN2 discuss how the UE provides its preference on DRX parameters if secondary DRX group is configured.

**Option 1**: The *preferredDRX-InactivityTimer* applies to primary DRX group only

**Option 2**: The UE can signal a separate *preferredDRX-InactivityTimer* value for the secondary DRX group (if configured)

**Option 3**: Other

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Option 2 | PS: thanks to OPPO for bringing up this issue, i.e. we overlooked it.  The intention with secondary DRX is to configure a shorter *drx-InactivityTimer* for the secondary DRX group, and therefore we think it makes sense that the UE can also indicate a preference for the *drx-InactivityTimer* of the secondary DRX group. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | We also agree that it makes sense for UE to be able to indicate its preference for DRX inactivity timer for its secondary DRX group. |
| NEC | Option 1 | we do not see strong need to combine two different power saving functions, just like removing the combination with WUS in Rel-16. |
| LG | Option 2 | Two DRX groups are independent. Thus, it is logical that preference signal is provided per DRX group. |
| Intel | Option 2 | We are OK allowing UAI on secondary DRX group under network control (i.e. Option 2). If companies prefer not to allow this in Rel-16, it might be good to clarify that current preference refers to primary DRX group (i.e. as in Option 1).  On the capability part, we do not think that a new UE capability is needed for this new parameter to be defined within UAI assistance. Basically, a UE supporting reporting DRX preference (capability *drx-Preference-r16* as specified in Power Saving WI) and secondary DRX group (capability *secondaryDRX-Group* as in R2-2004857) should be able to send its preference on *drx-InactivityTimer* for the secondary DRX group. No change is forseen on TS 38.306, but for TS 38.331, some change is needed on the procedure text regarding the condition that UE send its UAI preference on *drx-InactivityTimer* for the secondary DRX group.    On the related stage-3 work (i.e. ASN.1 and procedural changes to 38.331) to capture sending UE’s preference on *drx-InactivityTimer* for the secondary DRX group, the changes should better be captured within PWS CR as otherwise both CRs would be drafted in the same meeting and may run into issues keeping them up to date with the latest TP (which could even end up on having overlapping discussions on both threads). |
| HW | Option 3 | As commented to Q1, drx-InactivityTimer should be out. |
| OPPO | Option 2 with clarification | We think the UE should be able to indicate it’s preference on secondary DRX, so we don't support option 1.  Regarding option 2, it would be good to clarify by signalling a separate *preferredDRX-InactivityTimer* value, it means we introduce a separate drx-preference including only *preferredDRX-InactivityTimer*, something like below:  DRX-Preference-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  preferredDRX-InactivityTimer-r16 ENUMERATED {  ms0, ms1, ms2, ms3, ms4, ms5, ms6, ms8, ms10, ms20, ms30, ms40, ms50, ms60, ms80,  ms100, ms200, ms300, ms500, ms750, ms1280, ms1920, ms2560, spare9, spare8,  spare7, spare6, spare5, spare4, spare3, spare2, spare1} OPTIONAL,  preferredDRX-LongCycle-r16 ENUMERATED {  ms10, ms20, ms32, ms40, ms60, ms64, ms70, ms80, ms128, ms160, ms256, ms320, ms512,  ms640, ms1024, ms1280, ms2048, ms2560, ms5120, ms10240, spare12, spare11, spare10,  spare9, spare8, spare7, spare6, spare5, spare4, spare3, spare2, spare1 } OPTIONAL,  preferredDRX-ShortCycle-r16 ENUMERATED {  ms2, ms3, ms4, ms5, ms6, ms7, ms8, ms10, ms14, ms16, ms20, ms30, ms32,  ms35, ms40, ms64, ms80, ms128, ms160, ms256, ms320, ms512, ms640, spare9,  spare8, spare7, spare6, spare5, spare4, spare3, spare2, spare1 } OPTIONAL,  preferredDRX-ShortCycleTimer-r16 INTEGER (1..16) OPTIONAL  }  SecondaryDRX-Preference-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  preferredDRX-InactivityTimer-r16 ENUMERATED {  ms0, ms1, ms2, ms3, ms4, ms5, ms6, ms8, ms10, ms20, ms30, ms40, ms50, ms60, ms80,  ms100, ms200, ms300, ms500, ms750, ms1280, ms1920, ms2560, spare9, spare8,  spare7, spare6, spare5, spare4, spare3, spare2, spare1} OPTIONAL,  }  Then of course network should be able to configure whether UE can report UAI for secondary DRX preference if secondary DRX group is configured, and we need to add corresponding signalling in otherConfig.  We also think it should be included in power saving RRC CR, thus the signalling details can be discussed there. |
| vivo | Option 1 | Option 1 is sufficient in this stage. The effect to report a separate *preferredDRX-InactivityTimer* value for the secondary DRX group is limited. |
| Panasonic | Option 2 | Since these are individual DRX group, preference should be also provided per DRX group |
| MediaTek | Option 2 | Since two DRX groups apply different DRX inactivity timers, we think it makes sense for UE to report preferred DRX inactivity timer for the secondary DRX. |
| Nokia | Option 2 |  |
| Apple | Option 2 | The UE preference should be provided per DRX group. |
| ZTE | Option 3 | Agree with Huawei |
| CATT | Option 1 | Thus there is no difference in interpreting this parameter irrespective of whether the DRX group is configured or not. |
| Verizon | Option 2 | But it is not a critical issue. We are OK to simplify as long as we have the basic functionalities of the 2nd DRX feature in Rel-16. Small issues shouldn’t block the main goal. |
| Futurewei | Option 1 or Option 3 | The intention is to have secondary DRX group go to sleep earlier than the primary DRX group. What is preferred for secondary DRX group can already be deduced from what is indicated for primary DRX group. |
| Samsung | Option 2 |  |
| Spreadtrum | Option3 | Agree with Huawei |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Summary of email discussion

TBD

# Conclusions

TBD
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