**3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #121b-e R2-2304223**

**Online, 17th April– 26th April, 2023**

**Agenda item: 6.10.2**

**Source: ASUSTeK**

**Title: Summary on [AT121bis-e][505][V2X/SL] DRX timer numerology (ASUSTeK)**

**Document for: Discussion & Decision**

Introduction

This is to summarize the result of the following email discussion in RAN2#121bis-e:

* [AT121bis-e][505][V2X/SL] DRX timer numerology (ASUSTek)

**Scope:** Discuss corrections

1. DRX timer numerology, including 3907, 3925, 3926, 3927, 2908, change-3 of 2683

      Identify CRs that can be agreed in principle with or without revision

**Intended outcome:**

1. discussion summary in R2-2304223.
2. If needed, 38.331 CR in R2-2304224
3. If needed, 38.321 CR in R2-2304225

**Deadline: Comeback** at 4/25 CB session

2 Contact Information

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| ASUSTeK | Xinra Kung (Xinra\_Kung@asus.com) |
| Ericsson | Min Wang |
| Apple | Zhibin Wu (zhibin\_wu@apple.com) |
| CATT | [Shijie@catt.cn](mailto:Shijie@catt.cn) |
| Samsung | Hyunjeong Kang (hyunjeong.kang@samsung.com) |
| Lenovo | Jing Han (hanjing8@lenovo.com) |
| Xiaomi | Xing Yang(yangxing1@xiaomi.com) |
| vivo | Jing LIANG: [liangjing@vivo.com](mailto:liangjing@vivo.com) |
| Intel | Ansab Ali (ansab.ali@intel.com) |

# 3 Discussion

In RAN2#121 meeting, there was a discussion regarding an issue where based on current specification, timer length of drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerSL and drx-RetransmissionTimerSL cannot be derived correctly for type-1 CG, and the conclusion was postponed:

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 4: Changes in R2-2301530 are not agreed.   * Postponed |

In the current specification, the value of the length of drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerSL and drx-RetransmissionTimerSL is in number of symbols or slots of the BWP where the PDCCH corresponding to the SL grant was transmitted:

|  |
| --- |
| ***DRX-ConfigSL* field descriptions** |
| ***drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerSL***  Value in number of symbols of the BWP where the PDCCH was transmitted. Value 0 is used in case *sl-PUCCH-Config* is not configured and the corresponding resource pool is not configured with PSFCH. |
| ***drx-RetransmissionTimerSL***  Value in number of slot lengths of the BWP where the PDCCH was transmitted. *sl0* corresponds to 0 slots, *sl1* corresponds to 1 slot, *sl2* corresponds to 2 slots, and so on. |

It is unclear which PDCCH is associated with SL configured grant type-1 and the UE cannot derive the numerology of the timers. Therefore, proposing companies suggest that a change is needed in the spec so that the UE can derive symbol length for the timers corresponding to SL configured grant type-1.

Q1: Do you agree that a spec change is needed for SL UE to derive symbol length for drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerSL and the slot length for drx-RetransmissionTimerSL corresponding to SL configured grant type-1?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree/Disagree** | **Detailed Comments** |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | Disagree | UE can derive the reference BWP on which the PDCCH was transmitted by the gNB for transmtting RRC signaling to the UE. Although the UE may expereince BWP switch, it is can be up to UE implementation to address it. No need to introuce spec change. |
| Apple | Yes | The current spec does not cover the CG type 1 case which is configured by RRC message. |
| CATT | Agree | For SL CG type 1, there is only RRC and no PDCCH. Hence, the spec is unclear. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| Lenovo | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Disagree | Isn’t it NBC change? |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Intel |  | We are fine to support the change but the NBC change as mentioned by OPPO is a valid concern |

**Conclusion 1: TBD**

In this meeting, there are several documents continuing the discussion, and some options are provided regarding how to derive symbol length for drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerSL and the slot length for drx-RetransmissionTimerSL:

* **Option 1**: referring to active DL BWP of the PCell ([1], [2], [3], [4], [5]).
* **Option 2**: referring to the BWP on which the PDCCH transmission scheduling the RRC message, carrying the type-1 CG configuration, was transmitted ([2]).

Q2: If a spec change is agreed, which option(s) would you prefer?

* Option 1: referring to active DL BWP of the Pcell.
* Option 2: referring to the BWP on which the PDCCH transmission scheduling the RRC message, carrying the type-1 CG configuration, was transmitted.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Detailed Comments** |
| ASUSTeK | Option 1 | For Option 2, this would lead to the UE having to store the information of which BWP was used to schedule MAC PDUs and the associations between the MAC PDUs, disassembled RLC PDUs, disassembled PDCP PDUs, and disassembled RRC messages. UE implementation complexity is increased for protocol layers interactions. In addition, different type-1 CG configurations can be provided in different RRC messages, and each RRC message containing the type-1 CG configuration can be segmented into multiple transmissions. If the transmissions encompasses multiple BWP and/or numerologies, it is still unclear for the UE which one to refer to among all the BWPs. While it can be left to UE implementation to select any of the BWPs carrying the RRC messages, it may cause UE DRX active time state to be unsynchronized between the UE and the network, which could cause data loss. While the network implementation may ensure data can be received by the UE for all possible combination/BWP selected, it would be an unnecessary restriction for NW scheduling. |
| Apple | Option 1 |  |
| CATT | Option 1 |  |
| Samsung | Option 1 |  |
| Lenovo | Option 1 |  |
| Xiaomi | Option 1 | Can follow majority |
| vivo | Option 1 |  |
| Intel | Option 1 |  |

**Conclusion 2: TBD**

If Option 1 is selected, there are two ways to adopt the changes:

* **Option a**: apply the change to all SL grants (corresponding change in R2-2303926 [3] and R2-2302683 [5]).

|  |
| --- |
| ***DRX-ConfigSL* field descriptions** |
| ***drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerSL***  Value in number of symbols of the active DL BWP of the PCell. Value 0 is used in case *sl-PUCCH-Config* is not configured and the corresponding resource pool is not configured with PSFCH. |
| ***Drx-RetransmissionTimerSL***  Value in number of slot lengths of the active DL BWP of the PCell. *Sl0* corresponds to 0 slots, *sl1* corresponds to 1 slot, *sl2* corresponds to 2 slots, and so on. |

* **Option b**: apply the change to SL configured grant type-1 only (and the UE derives timer length of other SL grants following the current behaviour)

Option b-1 (R2-2303907 [1]):

|  |
| --- |
| *DRX-ConfigSL* field descriptions |
| ***drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerSL***  For configured type1, value in number of symbols of PDCCH on the activated BWP of PCell. For other cases,value in number of symbols of the BWP where the PDCCH was transmitted. Value 0 is used in case *sl-PUCCH-Config* is not configured and the corresponding resource pool is not configured with PSFCH. |
| *Drx-RetransmissionTimerSL*  For configured type1, value in number of slot of PDCCH on the activated BWP of PCell. For other cases,value in number of slot lengths of the BWP where the PDCCH was transmitted. *Sl0* corresponds to 0 slots, *sl1* corresponds to 1 slot, *sl2* corresponds to 2 slots, and so on. |

Option b-2 (R2-2303927 [4]):

|  |
| --- |
| ***DRX-ConfigSL* field descriptions** |
| ***drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerSL***  Value in number of symbols of the BWP where the PDCCH was transmitted, or the active DL BWP of the Pcell in case of sidelink configured grant Type 1. Value 0 is used in case *sl-PUCCH-Config* is not configured and the corresponding resource pool is not configured with PSFCH. |
| ***Drx-RetransmissionTimerSL***  Value in number of slot lengths of the BWP where the PDCCH was transmitted, or the active DL BWP of the Pcell in case of sidelink configured grant Type 1. *Sl0* corresponds to 0 slots, *sl1* corresponds to 1 slot, *sl2* corresponds to 2 slots, and so on. |

Q3: If Option 1 (referring to active DL BWP of the Pcell) is selected in Q2, which option would you prefer for applying the change?

* Option a: apply the change to all SL grants.
* Option b: apply the change to SL configured grant type-1 only (and the UE derives timer length of other SL grants following the current behaviour)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Detailed Comments** |
| ASUSTeK | Option b |  |
| Apple | Option b-1 |  |
| CATT | Option b |  |
| Samsung | Option b |  |
| Lenovo | Option b |  |
| Xiaomi | b |  |
| vivo | Option b |  |
| Intel | Option b |  |

**Conclusion 3: TBD**

Q4: If Option b (apply the change to SL configured grant type-1 only) is selected in Q3, which wording proposed in the CRs would you prefer?

* Option b-1 (R2-2303907 [1])
* Option b-2 (R2-2303927 [4])

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option** | **Detailed Comments** |
| ASUSTeK | Option b-2 |  |
| Apple | Option b-1 |  |
| CATT | Option b-1 | But the wording should be revised to keep terminology consistent, e.g., “configured type1” should be modified to “sidelink configured grant Type 1”. |
| Samsung | Option b-2 |  |
| Lenovo | Option b-2 |  |
| Xiaomi | b-1 |  |
| vivo | Option b-2 |  |
| Intel | Ok with either option |  |

**Conclusion 4: TBD**

If Option 2 is selected, a text proposal provided in [2] is as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| ***DRX-ConfigSL* field descriptions** |
| ***drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerSL***  Value in number of symbols of the BWP where the PDCCH scheduling the corresponding SL grant or the *RRCReconfiguration* containing the *rrc-ConfiguredSidelinkGrant* for the corresponding SL grant was transmitted. Value 0 is used in case *sl-PUCCH-Config* is not configured and the corresponding resource pool is not configured with PSFCH. |
| ***drx-RetransmissionTimerSL***  Value in number of slot lengths of the BWP where the PDCCH scheduling the corresponding SL grant or the *RRCReconfiguration* containing the *rrc-ConfiguredSidelinkGrant* for the corresponding SL grant was transmitted. *sl0* corresponds to 0 slots, *sl1* corresponds to 1 slot, *sl2* corresponds to 2 slots, and so on. |

Q5: If Option 2 (referring to the BWP on which the PDCCH transmission scheduling the RRC message, carrying the type-1 CG configuration, was transmitted) is selected in Q2, would you agree with the TP proposed in [2]?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree as is/**  **Agree with changes/**  **Disagree** | **Detailed Comments** |
| ASUSTeK | Agree as is |  |
|  |  |  |

**Conclusion 5: TBD**

# Conclusion

**TBD**
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