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**Attachments:**

# 1 Overall description

RAN2 thanks SA2 for their reply LS on Tx Profile in R2-2204525/S2-2203595.

Regarding the questions from SA2, RAN2 would like to provide the following answers.

**SA2 Question 1**: Would this behaviour be compliant with RAN2's assumption for V2X, or would AS layer always expect a NR Tx Profile from V2X layer?

* the upper layer does not provide NR Tx Profile to the AS layer when there is no NR Tx Profile mapped for the relevant service. In this case, the AS layer can consider that SL DRX is not supported. How the AS layer operates in this case is up to RAN2.

**[RAN2 answer]** RAN2 discussed the issue and has made the following agreement:

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2 #118e Agreement:  When the upper layer does not provide NR Tx Profile associated with an L2 ID to the AS layer, no SL DRX is applied for the L2 ID. |

**SA2 Question 2**: Would the use of "default SL DRX configuration" also require the NR Tx Profile?

**[RAN2 answer]** RAN2 discussed the issue and has made the following agreement:

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2 #118e Agreement:  For default SL DRX operation, SL DRX needs to be supported in the TX profile associated with service type/L2 id which the UE is interested to receive. No need of special TX profile only for a default SL DRX operation. |

In addition to SA2’s questions, RAN2 also made the following agreements related to TX profile.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. RAN2 agree to revert the following working assumptions:   * *“No additional RAN2 work if SA2 confirms it’s feasible for Rel-17 SL DRX operation, L2 id is only associated with either DRX-based TX profile(s) or non-DRX based TX profile(s)”.* * *“For GC, we will check with SA2 whether the mapping from L2 id to TX profile is feasible in the gNB (like what we did in LTE). Working assumption: no additional RAN2 work if SA2 confirms it’s feasible.”*   2. RAN2 assumption: For a given L2 id, all TX and RX UEs should be configured with the same set of TX profile(s) (including DRX on/off). We need to check with SA2.  3.For GC, UE reports L2 id and SL DRX on/off indication to the gNB.  4. In case multiple TX profiles (*w/ SL DRX and/or w/o SL DRX*)areassociated withan L2 ID, SL DRX is supported only when all TX profiles support SL DRX. |

In addition to the above, RAN2 would like to seek feedback from SA2 regarding the following questions:

**RAN2 Question 1**: For an L2 destination ID, is it possible that at least one of the service types doesn’t have Tx Profile passed to AS layer yet all other service types are mapping with Tx Profiles with “SL DRX” delivered to AS layer?

# 2. Actions:

**To SA2**

**ACTION:** RAN2 kindly asks SA2 to take the above agreements/assumption into account for further work and to provide feedbacks if any concern(especially on the RAN2 assumption), and provide feedbacks on the Question-1 listed above.

# 3. Dates of Next RAN2 Meetings:

3GPP RAN2#119e August 22 – 26, 2022 [Electronic] Meeting