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# 1 Scope of the offline discussion

This is the offline email discussion “[AT112-e][404][eMTC R16] Correction to the DRX cycle on RRC\_INACTIVE for eMTC”, as indicated below:

[R2-2009738](http://ftp.3gpp.org/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_112-e/Docs/R2-2009738.zip) Correction to the DRX cycle on RRC\_INACTIVE for eMTC Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 36.331 16.2.1 4483 - F LTE\_eMTC5-Core

* [AT112-e][404][eMTC R16] Correction to the DRX cycle on RRC\_INACTIVE for eMTC (Huawei)

 Scope: Check for feedback and update the CR accordingly, if needed.

 Intended outcome: Agreed 36.331 CR in R2-2010817

 Deadline: Tuesday 2020-11-10 14:00 UTC

# 2 Offline discussion

Companies are requested to provide comments in the table below (one row for each new comment to better keep track of the discussion – please don’t edit the previous comments).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Do you agree with the intent of the change?** | **Detailed comments** |
| ZTE | Yes, but | We agree the change is needed.But the agreement has already been captured in TS 36.304, which can be followed by idle mode UE. The UE can already benefit from the power consumption saving introduced by the extended RAN paging cycle. So the “Consequences if not approved” is suggested to change from “UE cannot benefit from the power consumption saving introduced by the extended RAN paging cycle.” to “The description in TS 36.304 and TS 36.331 are not consistent and the UE behavior may be confused”. |
| Qualcomm | **Agree with the intent.** | But we think TS 36.304 clearly defines how actual DRX cycle is selected based on UE capability, NAS and RAN configurations. Therefore, don’t see the need for only some of the rules to be duplicate din TS 36.331. For this reason we propose simplification of text in TS 36.331 to avoid duplication and potentially missunderstanding. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **yes but** | We agree with the comments from ZTE and Qualcomm that there seems to be duplication with TS 36.304 and we also agree with Qualcomm that the current text is not completely correct as it does not mention eDRX. we would be fine to replace the existing text with a reference to TS 36.304.we would propose something similar to TS 38.3311> apply the *defaultPagingCycle* included in the *radioResourceConfigCommon* to derive ‘T’ in TS 36.304 [4], clause 7.1.If we were going this way, we should apply the same simplification to NB-IoT (and update the cover sheet accordingly)Also as this would affect also LTE, the CR would need to be discussed in the LTE legacy room. |
| Ericsson | **Yes, but** | Similar comments as above from other companies – the intent is fine to clarify that the agreements are captured correctly. However, if we refer to parameters from *radioResourceConfigCommon* to derive T (HW suggestion), wouldn’t we also need to mention then somewhere that T derivation depends also on *ran-PagingCycle* (if configured)? Otherwise, the only location where we mention “to derive T” is in context of receiving SIB2 where RAN paging would be configured in *RRCConnectionRelease,* which, if configured, should also be taken into account when deriving T so this part would be somewhat incomplete unless something similar is captured elsewhere as well. Thus prefer QC version where the parameters are just applied in context if SIB2 reception without mentioning further details (also when receiving possible inactive config it is just applied as whole in 5.3.8.7 for possible RAN paging). |

Conclusion:

# 3 Conclusion

# 4 Participants

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **e-mail address** |
| Qualcomm | **Mungal Dhanda** | mdhanda@qti.qualcomm.com |
|  |  |  |