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# Introduction

This document is the email discussion summary for UE Power Saving Enhancements (AI 8.9), including the following topics covered

* Topic 1: General and work plan (AI 8.9.1)
* Topic 2: UE measurements relaxation for RLM and/or BFD (AI 8.9.2)

List of candidate target of email discussion for 1st round and 2nd round

* 1st round: Decide on the scope, priority, options and tentative agreement to be discussed in the 2nd round. Conclude issues with strict consensus, if any.
* 2nd round: Conclude the issues identified in the 1st round.

# Topic #1: General and work plan (AI 8.9.1)

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2107082**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107082.zip) | vivo | *Moderator: Some content can be discussed one by one in Topic 2.* |

## Open issues summary

*Before e-Meeting, moderators shall summarize list of open issues, candidate options and possible WF (if applicable) based on companies’ contributions.*

### Sub-topic 1-1 General

**Issue 1-1: Issues to be further discussed in the work phase**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: In the work phase, RAN4 should continue to work on the following (R4-2107082, vivo)
    - Applicable DRX cycles for relaxation
    - The threshold value and/or margins based on further evaluations
    - Relaxation factor determination
    - Relaxation of BM when not all serving cells in intra-band CA/DC meets relaxation criteria
    - Other options, if RAN4 spec impacts are identified, are not precluded.
* Recommended WF
  + Companies to discuss the proposal.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

**Sub-topic 1-1 General**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Issue 1-1: Issues to be further discussed in the work phase  The list of issue is based the status report for the last RAN plenary.  Based on this list of issues, work split between RAN2 and RAN4 is further recommended.  Therefore, in issue 2-2-8, companies can further discuss whether LS to RAN2 is needed in this meeting. |
| Apple | Agree with the list to be further discussed. All open issues in 2.2 should be included in the list. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 1-1: Agree Option 1. |
| CMCC | Issue 1-1: We agree all the bullets above. Besides, we think the revert criteria should be captured as a candidate. |
| Ericsson | Could the proponent clarify what is meant by “Relaxation of BM when not all serving cells in intra-band CA/DC meets relaxation criteria”? This issue currently being discussed already. |
| Nokia | Issue 1-1: Issues to be further discussed in the work phase  This depends on the progress in this meeting and the outcome of the study phase. There still seems to be quite many details related to simulations that companies understand differently (e.g. how to treat RRM measurements, approach to compute delta SINR), so RAN4 should aim to clarify these issues first before agreeing on how to continue from study phase to work phase. |
| MTK | Agree with Option 1.  To Nokia: Follow the RAN plenary guidance, our understanding is that we don’t need to discuss RRM measurement because there is no spec impact for RRM. Besides, delta SINR was already agreed and specified in R4-2104066 Updated evaluation assumptions for R17 RLM/BFD relaxation:   |  | | --- | | * *ΔSINR = MAX (ABS [(estimated SINR at Rel-17– estimated SINR at Rel-15) CDF=X ] ), ABS [(estimated SINR at Rel-17 – estimated SINR at REl-15) CDF=Y ]) [dB]*   + *(X,Y) =(5%, 95%) or (1%, 99%)*   + *Note: Other options to (X,Y) are not precluded. Companies are encouraged to bring CDF curves of ΔSINR in the next meeting.* |   Hope our explanation can resolve your concern. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*For close-to-finalize WIs and maintenance work, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For ongoing WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round, list all the identified open issues and tentative agreements or candidate options and suggestion for 2nd round i.e. WF assignment.*

**Sub-topic 1-1 General**

**Issue 1-1: Issues to be further discussed in the work phase**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  5 companies support option 1.  1 company asks a clarification question on one sub-bullet.  1 company suggests to clarify simulation details, including how to treat RRM measurements and the approach to compute delta SINR    **Moderator's comment:**     * The bullet regarding intra-band CA/DC should depend on Issue 2-5, so it is removed.      * @ Nokia: regarding the clarification questions on the comment "approach to compute delta SINR", in my understanding, the Delta SINR comparison between R15 an R17 has been clarified and agreed in the previous simulation assumption R4-2104066      * the CDF curves of Delta SINR comparison between R15 an R17.   + *ΔSINR = MAX (ABS [(estimated SINR at Rel-17– estimated SINR at Rel-15) CDF=X ] ), ABS [(estimated SINR at Rel-17 – estimated SINR at REl-15) CDF=Y ]) [dB]*     Please comment if it addresses you concern.    **Recommended WF:** Work on WF directly, to see if it is agreeable to be captured in WF as below.   * RAN4 should continue to work on the open issues in the work phase, including   + Applicable DRX cycles for relaxation   + The threshold value and/or margins based on further evaluations   + Relaxation factor determination   + Other open issues are not precluded. |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provides recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update*

*Note: The tdoc decisions shall be provided in Section 3 and this table is optional in case moderators would like to provide additional information.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

**Issue 1-1: Issues to be further discussed in the work phase**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Moderator's comment:**   * The bullet regarding intra-band CA/DC should depend on Issue 2-5-1~3, so it is removed.      * @ Nokia: regarding the clarification questions on the comment "approach to compute delta SINR", in my understanding, the Delta SINR comparison between R15 an R17 has been clarified and agreed in the previous simulation assumption R4-2104066      * the CDF curves of Delta SINR comparison between R15 an R17.   + *ΔSINR = MAX (ABS [(estimated SINR at Rel-17– estimated SINR at Rel-15) CDF=X ] ), ABS [(estimated SINR at Rel-17 – estimated SINR at REl-15) CDF=Y ]) [dB]*     Please comment if it addresses you concern.    **Recommended WF:** Work on WF directly, to see if it is agreeable to be captured in WF as below.   * RAN4 should continue to work on the open issues in the work phase, including   + Applicable DRX cycles for relaxation   + The threshold value and/or margins based on further evaluations   + Relaxation factor determination   + Other open issues are not precluded. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| MTK | Agree with the recommended WF |
| Company B |  |

# Topic #2: UE measurements relaxation for RLM and/or BFD (AI 8.9.2)

*Main technical topic overview. The structure can be done based on sub-agenda basis.*

## Companies’ contributions summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **T-doc number** | **Company** | **Proposals / Observations** |
| [**R4-2104605**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104605.zip) | CMCC | ***Proposal 1: Take serving cell’s quality variation into account as a part of relaxation criteria. It can be included in low mobility rule.***  ***Proposal 2: If SINR drift rate is under a threshold during a certain estimation period, then the UE can be considered to fulfill the serving cell’s quality variation rule.***  ***Proposal 3: Consider the serving cell’s quality based on SINR.***  ***Proposal 4: R16 low-mobility criterion should not be directly reused in R17 SINR-based criterion for RLM/BFD relaxation. The SINR (value and variation) can be used for low-mobility criterion.***  ***Proposal 5: We support the configurable relaxation criteria, the configurable parameters include the parameters in low mobility rule and serving cell’s quality rule, and the relaxation factor.***  ***Proposal 6: UE determine whether the relaxation criteria can be fulfilled or not.***  ***Proposal 7: the determination of scaling factor should consider:***   * ***RLM/BFD performance after relaxation*** * ***The evaluation period after relaxation, which should be smaller or equal to a threshold***   ***Proposal 8: Different relaxation factors should be allowed for FR1 and FR2 at least when the RLM/BFD-RS is SSB.***  ***Proposal 9:***   * ***Alt1: Revert after several consecutive out-of-sync indications, the specific value is configured by network, a*** ***new Counter may be needed in order to give more flexibility to network.*** * ***Alt2: Revert when T310 is running, i.e. after X out-of-sync indication, the X can be a new Counter and configured by network in order to avoid frequent counter(N310) reconfiguration.***   ***Proposal 10:***  ***If UE revert to normal RLM operation, and the T310 is not starting. UE can go back to relaxation mode after receiving several in-sync indications. The number of in-sync indications can be configured by network, such as configure a new counter.***  ***Proposal 11:***  ***If UE stop the T310 because receiving N311 in-sync indication, UE couldn’t go into relaxation mode again during a certain period, such as when a new timer is active. UE can decide whether go into relaxation mode by relaxation criteria after the timer expires. The timer is configured by network.***  ***Proposal 12:***   * ***Alt1: Revert after BFI\_COUNTER add to the value of a new counter or a new parameter, the new counter or the new parameter is configured by network.*** * ***Alt2: Revert when UE trigger the RLF, i.e. after BFI\_COUNTER add to a new parameter, the new parameter which is used in relaxation mode is configured by network.***   ***Proposal 13:***  ***If ALT1 is used in proposal 12, then after the beamFailureDetetionTimerT310 expires, UE could not go back to relaxation mode before the punish time ends, the punish time can be a timer by network configuration.***  ***Proposal 14:***  ***If ALT2 is used in proposal 12, then when UE trigger the RLF, UE could not go back to relaxation mode before the new timer expires. The new timer is configured by network, and this timer start right after UE perform revert.***  ***Proposal 15: For intra-band CA case, the UE should relax only on serving cells where the relaxed criteria is fulfilled.***  ***Proposal 16: The relaxation criteria and K factor should be configurable. SpCells and SCells can use different RLM/BFD measurement relaxation criteria.*** |
| [**R4-2104693**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104693.zip) | Xiaomi | **Proposal 1: The evaluation of serving cell quality based on BLER of hypothetical PDCCH can be considered as the RLM/BFD measurement relaxation criteria.**  **Proposal 2: Rel-16 RRM relaxation criterion can be used as baseline for RLM/BFD relaxation for low mobility scenario.**  **Proposal 3: The relaxation criteria should be predefined by the NW and it could be determined by UE whether the relaxation criteria is fulfilled or not.**  **Proposal 4: The evaluation period should be extended based on the legacy RLM/BFD requirements by considering the scaling factors, e.g. N factor, P factor, RS type, FR1 or FR2.**  **Proposal 5:** **UE is expected to revert to normal RLM operation during T310 is running.**  **Proposal 6: There is no need to configure conditions for UE reverting to normal BFD operation.**  **Observation 1:** **The measurement results of CCs in intra-band CA/DC would be quite similar.**  **Proposal 7: For intra-band CA/DC, if UE fulfils the relaxed criterion for RLM/BFD in one serving cell, it is expected that the relaxation operations are applied to the other serving cell(s).**  **Proposal 8:** **For intra-band CA/DC, if UE meets the conditions of reverting to the normal RLM/BFD in one serving cell, it is expected the reversion operations are applied to other serving cell(s).** |
| [**R4-2104756**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104756.zip) | CATT | **Proposal 1: SSB-based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1 and FR2 for low mobility and high/medium SINR UE.**  **Proposal 2: It is feasible to do the relaxation for both DRX=20ms or DRX=40ms RLM/BFD measurement.**  **Proposal 3: Consider serving cell’s quality as relaxation criteria when radio link quality > Qout + X (dB) for RLM and Qout,LR + Y (dB) for BFD relaxation.**  **Proposal 4: UE need to fulfil the low mobility and radio link quality is good than a threshold to make sure the link quality is good enough to do the relaxation.**  **Proposal 5: The similar definition of RLM/BFD evaluation period in Rel-15 can be reused as Max(T, Ceil([Y] × P ×N) × Max(TDRX,TSSB))**  **Proposal 6: For intra-band CA/DC, UE shouldn’t relax RLM for the cells which UE hasn’t fulfilled the relaxation condition.**  **Proposal 7: Revert to normal RLM/BFD operation when the relaxation criterion is not met.** |
| [**R4-2104757**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104757.zip) | CATT | *Simulation results are provided* |
| [**R4-2104850**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104850.zip) | Apple | **Observation 1: With R16 UE baseline, with 160ms DRX cycle, up to 7.42% UE power saving gain is observed with 4x RLM/BFD relaxation. With 40ms DRX cycle, up to 19.34% UE power saving gain is observed with 8x RLM/BFD relaxation.**    **Observation 2: With R17 DCI based adaptation for UE power saving, with 160ms DRX cycle, up to 10.32% UE power saving gain is observed with 4x RLM/BFD relaxation. With 40ms DRX cycle, up to 21.47% UE power saving gain is observed with 8x RLM/BFD relaxation.**  **Proposal 1: RLM/BFD relaxation through scaling on DRX cycle is supported.**    **Proposal 2: Relaxation factor depends on various factor including DRX cycle configuration, RLM-RS configuration, mobility and channel conditions etc.**  **Proposal 3: RLM/BFD relaxation criterion include both mobility criterion and serving cell quality criterion. Relaxation criterion can be configured by the network and determined by the UE whether relaxation criterion is fulfilled.**  **Proposal 4: UE revert back to normal operation when criterion is not met, or when N310 start to count.** |
| [**R4-2104908**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2104908.zip) | Qualcomm, Inc. | **Proposal 1: Prioritize SSB-based RLM/BFD in FR1 scenario for power saving RLM/BFD measurement relaxation study.**  **Proposal 2: Relaxation for longer DRx cycle measurement requirement should be considered to maintain the monotonicity of measurement/evaluation time w.r.t. DRx cycle length.**  **Observation 1: When serving SINR is above 6dB, the neighboring cell is not detectable.**  **Observation 2: The UEs with a better performance lose power saving opportunities if we force UEs to take the same number of samples as specified in RAN4 spec in the evaluation assumptions.**  **Proposal 3: Do not to set assumptions on other RRM measurement procedures when evaluating the power saving gain from RLM/BFD measurement relaxation.**  **Proposal 4: R16 low mobility condition applies to RLM/BFD relaxation when configured together with serving cell quality condition.**  **Proposal 5: Set different cell quality conditions for entering and exiting power saving mode.**  **Proposal 6: Serving cell quality evaluation uses RLM/BFD SINR measurement.**  **Proposal 7: UE enters power saving mode when RLM SNR is larger than Qout/Qin + margin.**  **Observation 3: Low mobility condition is violated in the system level simulation submitted in the previous meetings. Therefore, these simulations are not appropriate for deriving SINR margin.**  **Proposal 8: If R16 low mobility condition is adapted, RAN4 derives SINR distribution for margin derivation from link level simulation without mobility and with small scale fading.**  **Proposal 9: If power saving conditions are satisfied, allow TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB for the first OOS indication and the original TEvaluate\_out\_SSB doesn’t apply. After the first OOS indication, the original TEvaluate\_out\_SSB applies to UE.**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Configuration** | **TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB (ms)** | | no DRX | Max(200, Ceil(10 × P) × TSSB) | | DRX cycle≤80ms | Max(200, Ceil(30 × P) × Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | 80ms<DRX cycle≤320ms | Max(200, Ceil(20 × P) × Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | DRX cycle>320ms | Ceil(10 × P) × TDRX | | NOTE: TSSB is the periodicity of the SSB configured for RLM. TDRX is the DRX cycle length. | | |
| [**R4-2106461**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106461.zip) | Intel Corporation | **Observation 1: Estimated SINR value varies with time, if a fixed SINR threshold is used as relaxation criteria, estimated SINR value may be up or below the threshold frequently.**  **Proposal 1: Since SINR value varies with time, a more robust criteria based on SINR is expected to be discussed.**  **Observation 2: SINR fluctuation will be reduced with more averaged samples.**  **Proposal 2: SINR will be evaluated during a time window to check if it satisfies the criteria of relaxation or not. The exact window length and how to process SINR value during the window for relaxing RLM/BFD can be further studied.**  **Proposal 3: SINR threshold for start relaxing RLM needs to consider SINR fluctuation.**  **Observation 3: If high SINR is used as the relaxation threshold, there will some problems if out-of-sync is used as the reverting back criteria.**  **Proposal 4: Relaxation criteria and reverting back criteria should be designed jointly.**  **Proposal 5: SINR threshold for reverting back needs to consider SINR fluctuation or simply use Qin as threshold.**  **Observation 4: The low mobility criteria of Rel-16 reflects the low fluctuation of filtered RSRP and is not directly relevant to the RLM/BFD performance.**  **Proposal 6: R16 low-mobility relaxation criterion is not suitable to be re-used in Rel-17.**  **Proposal 7: For Rel-17, it’s better to consider the “low fluctuation of SINR”, which is more relevant to RLM/BFD performance. How to define “low fluctuation of SINR” can be further discussed.**  **Observation 5: For RLM, In-Sync means that SINR is higher than Qin threshold. Different from RLM, the criteria for CBD in BM satisfied that the measured L1-RSRP is equal to or better than the threshold Qin\_LR, which is indicated by higher layer parameter *rsrp-ThresholdSSB*.**  **Proposal 8: BFD should be relaxed at least better than CBD condition. Whether RSRP is also needed to be considered for relaxation criteria of BFD needs further discussion.**  **Proposal 9: Relaxation and reverting back criteria for RLM and BFD are different.** |
| [**R4-2106539**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106539.zip) | OPPO | **Proposal 1: It is up to UE implementation to use less L1 samples for RRM measurements if RRM measurement procedure and performance requirements were satisfied for UE.**  **Proposal 2: Reuse “Low mobility” as relaxation criteria which is determined and configured to UE by the network.**  **Proposal 3: Define SINR threshold or range as relaxation criteria for RLM/BFD based on evaluation of the scenario serving cell’s SINR is larger than Qout.**  **Proposal 4: Some margin of SINR should be considered for relaxation criteria due to different UE implementation.**  **Proposal 5: Suggest scaling factor can be different for different SINR range, for FR1 and FR2, and UE speed level.**  **Proposal 6: For intra-band CA/DC with collocated deployment,**  **if UE has fulfilled the criterion for operating RLM/BFD relaxation in any serving cell, the same relaxation is allowed in all other serving cells of the intra-band pair.**  **Otherwise, if UE has failed to fulfil the criterion for operating RLM/BFD relaxation in all serving cells, then it shall revert to normal RLM/BFD operation without relaxation.** |
| [**R4-2106540**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106540.zip) | OPPO | **Observation 1: Average SINR as relaxation criteria should be at least higher than Qout to ensure RLF will not be triggered.**  **Observation 2: From simulation results, if delta SINR of max（95%, 5%）can be tolerated within ±2.0dB, the scaling factors for RLM/BFD relaxation could be**   * **DRX cycle 20ms: K=4,** * **DRX cycle 40ms: K=2**     **Observation 3: At least other parameters (e.g., DRX cycle, FR1/FR2) can be considered for defining different relaxation factor.** |
| [**R4-2106581**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106581.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | *Simulation results are provided* |
| [**R4-2106582**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106582.zip) | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | 1. Remove Option 2 (How many L1 samples UE applies for RRM measurements is up to UE implementation) from the list of scenarios to be studied for the UE power saving enhancements WI. 2. There are multiple ways to calculate delta SINR, and the simulation results depend on the chosen scenario. 3. The time the UE spends in outage increases significantly when the relaxation factor for RLM and BFD measurements increases due to the late detection of failure and initiating the recovery procedure. 4. Negative system level impact due to RLM/BFD relaxation should be minimized e.g. by studying the time of outage with different relaxation factors. 5. Based on our simulations, there is no power saving gain in FR1 when only RLM and BFD measurements are relaxed by extending the evaluation period. 6. In FR2, power saving gain of less than 3 % can be achieved by relaxing RLM and BFD measurements by extending the evaluation period in our simulations. 7. Use SINR as the quality measure for serving cell quality. FFS the exact metric. 8. If UE is under coverage of a specific cell or beam for certain amount of time or certain observed conditions do not change for a predefined time, the UE could be considered to be in stationary/low mobility state. 9. Consider time associated with a given condition when determining UE mobility state. 10. Robust, UE autonomous mechanism, is needed to determine when UE should change back to normal measurement activity if UE has adapted its activity based on e.g. ‘mobility’ state. 11. When operating in relaxed RLM/BFD mode, there could be alternate values for related parameters such has values for N310/N311. 12. Observed link quality degradation should cause the UE to revert back to normal measurement operation. |
| [**R4-2106851**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106851.zip) | Ericsson | *Simulation results are provided* |
| [**R4-2106852**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106852.zip) | Ericsson | * **Observation #1:** No specification impact to RRM measurement procedure requirements and performance due to RRM measurement relaxation. * **Observation #2:** In release 17 UE power saving, it is possible to treat each UE separately by setting the relaxation criteria separately for each UE. * **Observation #3:** Assuming high SINR threshold for entering the relaxed mode, no significant impact on latency for triggering RLF. * **Proposal #1:** After RAN1 has agreed on the PDCCH relaxation methods, RAN4 shall assess the interaction between PDCCH relaxation and RLM/BM relaxation from power consumption perspective. * **Proposal #2:** Allow RLM/BFD relaxation for DRX cycle lengths ≤ 80 ms when serving cell SNR > K, where K=FFS. * **Proposal #3:** Low mobility scenario under which the UE is allowed to apply the RLM/BM requirements is determined and configured to UE by the network, and it is up to the UE whether to apply relaxed RLM/BM requirements when configured. * **Proposal #4:** The relaxation criteria includes the serving cell quality expressed as follows:   + radio link quality > Qout + X (dB) for RLM,   + Qout,LR + Y (dB) for BFD relaxation,   + X and Y are FFS. * **Proposal #5:** Scaling factor defining the relaxed RLM/BFD evaluation period is defined based onmax(TDRX, TSSB). * **Proposal #6:** RAN4 to discuss whether certain number of out-of-indications upon which UE shall revert back to normal mode can be expressed using N310 or whether it shall be predefined. * **Proposal #7:** The UE while performing relaxed BM upon beam failure detection (e.g. 1st indication) reverts to the normal BFD operation (i.e. without relaxation). * **Proposal #8:** The legacy requirement on UE performing BFD on all PCell, PSCell and all configured SCells apply for BFD relaxation. * **Proposal #9:** For intra-band CA/DC scenario, if UE has fulfilled the criterion for operating BFD in relaxed mode in one serving cell (SpCell), then it is allowed to operate BFD in relaxed mode in all other serving cells (e.g. SCells). * **Proposal #10:** For intra-band CA/DC scenario, if UE has failed to fulfil the criterion for operating BFD in relaxed mode in one serving cell (SpCell), then it shall revert to normal BFD operation (i.e. without relaxation) in all other serving cells (SCells). * **Proposal #11:** For intra-band CA case, RAN4 to use the same RLM/BFD measurement relaxation criteria for the serving cells. * **Proposal #12:**   + Up to 3 km/h and at high SINR (in-sync), relaxation by factor 4 can be allowed for FR1.   + Up to 3 km/h at low SINR (out-of-sync), relaxation if allowed should be smaller than factor 2 for FR1. * **Proposal #13:**   + Up to 30 km/h and at high SINR (e.g. in-sync), relaxation if allowed should be smaller than factor 2 FR1.   + Up to 30 km/h at low SINR (e.g. out-of-sync), no relaxation shall be allowed for FR1. * **Proposal #14:**    + Up to 3 km/h at higher SINR (e.g. in-sync), relaxation if allowed should be smaller than factor 2 for FR2.   + Up to 30 km/h, no relaxation should be allowed for FR2. * **Proposal #15:** Relaxation factors used are different for FR1 and FR2, for the different SINR levels. * **Proposal #16:** Low mobility state for allowing RLM/BM relaxation corresponds to 3 km/h. * **Proposal #17:** Relaxation factors are different for FR1 and FR2. * **Proposal #18:** RAN4 shall discuss whether to apply different relaxation factors for SSB and CSI-RS based evaluations in FR2. * **Proposal #19:** RAN4 to discuss applying different relaxation factor for the different SINR regions. |
| [**R4-2106915**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106915.zip) | ZTE Corporation | **Observation 1:** The mobility status of the UE is known to both the network and the UE in CONNECTED mode.  **Proposal 1: The relaxation criteria shall be configured by the network to the UE. If the threshold (criteria) is not configured, it means the UE cannot go into relaxation mode.**  **Proposal 2: The UE can determine alone if the criteria (configured by the network) is met and enter the low mobility mode to use a relaxed requirements for RLM and RLF if there will be test cases defined to test the UE behaviors.**  **Proposal 3: The UE while performing relaxed RLM shall revert to the normal RLM operation (i.e. without relaxation) if the relaxation criterion is not met or N310 starts to count (1 out-of-sync indication).**  **Proposal 4: The UE shall revert to the normal BFD operation upon detect 1 beam failure instance indication.**  **Proposal 5: For intra-band CA case, the UE should relax only on serving cells where the relaxed criteria is fulfilled.**  **Proposal 6: Take UE mobility as the major factor into the criteria.** |
| [**R4-2106942**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106942.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | ***Observation 1: If the assumed measurement sample number in R15 was reduced in R17, the system and the measurement performance could not be guaranteed to be same as in R15.***  ***Proposal 1: In relaxing RLM/BFD evaluation, the measurement sample numbers for both RLM/BFD measurements and RRM measurements need to be kept as same as Rel-15 assumptions.***  ***Proposal 2: In relaxing RLM/BFD evaluation, the measurement sample number and measurement interval for RRM measurements need to be kept as same as Rel-15 assumptions.***  ***Observation 2: For SSB based RLM/BFD in FR1, there is no power saving benefit due to relaxed RLM/BFD measurements.***  ***Proposal 3: It is suggested not to perform SSB based RLM/BFD relaxation in FR1.***  ***Proposal 4: It is suggested not to perform CSI-RS based RLM/BFD relaxation in FR1 when CSI-RS resource configured for RLM/BFD is within SMTC window.***  ***Observation 3: For CSI-RS based RLM/BFD in FR1, the power saving benefit due to relaxed RLM/BFD measurements is quite limited when CSI-RS is within DRX onDuration time and WUS is not used.***  ***Observation 4: For CSI-RS based RLM/BFD in FR1, the power saving benefit due to relaxed RLM/BFD measurements is observed (4%~7%) for a UE with light traffic when CSI-RS is outside DRX onDuration time or WUS is used.***  ***Proposal 5: It is suggested not to perform CSI-RS based RLM/BFD relaxation in FR1 when the CSI-RS resource configured for RLM/BFD is within DRX onDuration time and WUS is used.***  ***Proposal 6: RAN4 needs to study whether the beneficial scenario is a reasonable case for network configuration.***  ***Proposal 7: It is suggested not to perform RLM/BFD relaxation in FR1 when the RS resource for RLM/BFD is also configured for L1-RSRP measurements.***  ***Proposal 8: Due to UE beam sweeping, it is suggested not to perform SSB based RLM/BFD relaxation in FR2.***  ***Proposal 9: The RLM/BFD relaxation criteria needs to combine both serving cell quality and UE mobility state.***   * ***Entering conditions: both good serving cell quality and low UE mobility are satisfied.*** * ***Leaving conditions: either good serving cell quality or low UE mobility is not satisfied***   ***Observation 5: The UE is not required to perform SSB/CSI-RS based RLM measurements on more than one serving cells in the same bands.***  ***Observation 6: The UE is not required to perform SSB/CSI-RS based BFD measurements on more than one serving cells in the same bands.*** |
| [**R4-2106943**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2106943.zip) | Huawei, HiSilicon | *Simulation results are provided* |
| [**R4-2107083**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107083.zip) | vivo | **Observation 0 According to current spec, the UE is required to perform RLM/BFD at least twice per 3 DRX cycles when DRX cycle length is less than or equal to 320ms, no matter what mobility state UE is in and whether UE is in the high/medium SINR.**  **Observation 1 If a UE is only allowed to relax RLM when SINR is above a proper SINR threshold, and falls back to normal measurement when SINR is below such threshold, then the impact to increased RLF triggering latency with 99%-tile probability can be less than (K-1) × DRX\_cycle, while K is the relaxation factor.**  **Observation 2 If 40ms DRX cycle is considered and a UE is only allowed to relax RLM when SINR is above a proper SINR threshold, the RLF latency increases no more than only 2.5% when K=2, 7.5% when K=4 and 17.5% when K=8, with 99%-tile probability.**  **Observation 3 The SINR threshold for relaxation can be set by leaving enough margin to accommodate low mobility scenarios.**  **Observation 4 For FR1 SSB based RLM, if proper threshold for RLM/BFD relaxation is considered, the delta SINR can be less than 3.6dB for K=8 when UE speed is less than 30km/h with 95% probability.**  **Observation 5 For FR1 SSB based RLM, if proper threshold for RLM/BFD relaxation is considered, the delta SINR can be less than 7.5dB for K=8 when UE speed is less than 30km/h with 99% probability.**  **Observation 6 For FR2, compared to UE movement, UE rotation plays more important role in mobility impact analysis.**  **Observation 7 For FR2 UE rotation, elevation plane rotation would have more impact to mobility than horizontal rotation.**  **Observation 8 For FR2 CSI-RS based RLM, if proper threshold for RLM/BFD relaxation is considered, the delta SINR can be less than 4.9dB for K=2 when UE rotation is less than 5r/min with 95% probability.**  **Observation 9 To optimise the case where data packet arrives with interval of around 100ms to 200ms, and 40 ms DRX cycle is considered, relaxation of RLM/BFD may further achieve power saving gain on top of R16 power saving techniques. If PDCCH WUS is configured and relaxing RLM-RS measurements 2x/4x/8x, 15~ 26% additional gain can be achieved.**  **Observation 10 For intensive eMBB or VoIP traffic, relaxing RLM measurements 2x/4x/8x, can also achieve 10% to 17% power saving gain.**  **Observation 11 The DRX on-duration offset to the SSB may have impact on power saving gain.**  **Observation 12 The packet delay is highly related to the DRX cycle length, and RLM and BFD relaxation will not impact the packet delay.**  **Observation 13 The one-shot SINR estimation error is less than 1.2dB with 95% probability when the actual SINR is above 8dB.**  **Proposal 1 In the study phase of this WI, RAN4 conclude the feasibility of R17 power saving, i.e. exact mobility impact and the exact power saving gain if RLM/BFD are relaxed in low mobility and/or high/medium SINR region.**  **Proposal 2 In the study phase of this WI, RAN4 conclude the potential spec impact of R17 power saving.**  **Proposal 3 RAN4 conclude the increased latency as observation 2, if number of measured samples are reduced (K=8) when SINR is above a proper threshold in the study phase of WI.**  **Proposal 4 RAN4 conclude the delta SINR for FR1 as observation 4 and 5, if number of measured samples are reduced (K=8) when SINR is above a proper threshold in the study phase of WI.**  **Proposal 5 Further update the evaluation assumptions to encourage companies to consider UE rotation in FR2.**  **Proposal 6 RAN4 conclude the delta SINR for FR2 CSI-RS based RLM as observation 8 and 9, if number of measured samples are reduced (K=2) when SINR is above a proper threshold in the study phase of WI.**  **Proposal 7 The conclusions to RLM measurement relaxation, if achieved, should also be applicable to BFD in FR1.**  **Proposal 8 RAN4 conclude the power saving gain and capture observation 6 and 7 in the study phase of the WI.**  **Proposal 9 For R17 RLM and BFD relaxation, measurement accuracy for RLM, BFD and RRM reuses R15 requirements.**  **Proposal 10 For R17 RLM BFD relaxation, the range of applicable DRX cycles is <= Xms, and X=80 is preferred.**  **Proposal 11 Low mobility cell can be configured by network in RRC without any thresholds, e.g. for indoor cells.**  **Proposal 12 Define network-configured thresholds reflecting different SINR regions for RLM and BFD relaxation. Such threshold is the same for RLM and BFD.**  **Proposal 13 Two SINR thresholds, i.e. Thenter and Thquit, should be defined for R17 RLM and BFD relaxation.**  **Proposal 14 RAN4 further discuss and agree on the link level evaluation assumptions to collect results on the SINR estimation error based on Y samples, while Y=1 is the baseline.**  **Proposal 15 UE falls back to normal mode if either the averaged SINR based on reduced number of samples is below Thquit, or the one-shot SINR is below Qout.**  **Proposal 16 Different relaxation factor and different thresholds for relaxation can be considered for SSB based RLM/BFD and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD.**  **Proposal 17 UE relaxation behaviour for BFD should be the same in all cells in a CG in the same band.**  **Proposal 18 The PDCCH monitoring relaxation is in RAN1 scope, and should be further studied in RAN1.**  **Proposal 19 Send LS to RAN2 in this meeting, in order to inform RAN2 on the progress that RAN4 has made.** |
| [**R4-2107084**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107084.zip) | vivo | **Observation 1 If a UE is only allowed to relax RLM when SINR is above a proper SINR threshold, and falls back to normal measurement when SINR is below such threshold, then the impact to increased RLF triggering latency with 99%-tile probability can be less than (K-1) × DRX\_cycle, while K is the relaxation factor.**  **Observation 2 If 40ms DRX cycle is considered and a UE is only allowed to relax RLM when SINR is above a proper SINR threshold, the RLF latency increases no more than only 2.5% when K=2, 7.5% when K=4 and 17.5% when K=8, with 99%-tile probability.**  **Observation 3 The SINR threshold for relaxation can be set by leaving enough margin to accommodate low mobility scenarios.**  **Observation 4 For FR1 SSB based RLM, if proper threshold for RLM/BFD relaxation is considered, the delta SINR can be less than 3.6dB for K=8 when UE speed is less than 30km/h with 95% probability.**  **Observation 5 For FR1 SSB based RLM, if proper threshold for RLM/BFD relaxation is considered, the delta SINR can be less than 7.5dB for K=8 when UE speed is less than 30km/h with 99% probability.**  **Observation 6 For FR2, compared to UE movement, UE rotation plays more important role in mobility impact analysis.**  **Observation 7 For FR2 UE rotation, elevation plane rotation would have more impact to mobility than horizontal rotation.**  **Observation 8 For FR2 CSI-RS based RLM, if proper threshold for RLM/BFD relaxation is considered, the delta SINR can be less than 4.9dB for K=2 when UE rotation is less than 5r/min with 95% probability.**  **Observation 9 To optimise the case where data packet arrives with interval of around 100ms to 200ms, and 40 ms DRX cycle is considered, relaxation of RLM/BFD may further achieve power saving gain on top of R16 power saving techniques. If PDCCH WUS is configured and relaxing RLM-RS measurements 2x/4x/8x, 15~ 26% additional gain can be achieved.**  **Observation 10 For intensive eMBB or VoIP traffic, relaxing RLM measurements 2x/4x/8x, can also achieve 10% to 17% power saving gain.**  **Observation 11 The DRX on-duration offset to the SSB may have impact on power saving gain.**  **Observation 12 The packet delay is highly related to the DRX cycle length, and RLM and BFD relaxation will not impact the packet delay.**  **Observation 13 The one-shot SINR estimation error is less than 1.2dB with 95% probability when the actual SINR is above 8dB.** |
| [**R4-2107085**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107085.zip) | vivo | Updated evaluation assumptions |
| [**R4-2107124**](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG4_Radio/TSGR4_98bis_e/Docs/R4-2107124.zip) | MediaTek inc. | ***Observation 1: UE can meet RRM measurement procedure requirements and measurement performance requirements when UE speed is lower than 30km/hr and SNR is higher than 0dB.***  ***Observation 2: Probability of RLF triggering and the corresponding averaged increased latency when UE performs RLM/BFD measurement relaxation can be well controlled by setting a sufficient high SINR criterion.***  ***Observation 3: Ranged from 8.62% to 20.34% UE power saving gain can be obtained for scenarios SSB-based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement in FR1***  ***Observation 4: Ranged from 14.55% to 28.63% UE power saving gain can be obtained for scenario CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement in FR2***  ***Observation 5: In FR1, evaluation period for SSB based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement can be extended at least by 4 times when SINR ≥ 4dB and UE speed ≤ 30km/hr***  ***Observation 6: In FR2, evaluation period for CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement can be extended at least by 2 times when SINR ≥ 8dB and UE speed ≤ 30km/hr***  And we propose  ***Proposal 1: RAN4 to confirm that from UE power saving gain perspective, it is beneficial to relax SSB-based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement in FR1, and it is beneficial to relax CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement in FR2***  ***Proposal 2: RAN4 to confirm that from system impact perspective, SSB based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1 and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2 are feasible for low mobility and high SINR UE.***  ***Proposal 3: RAN4 to specify that requirement of Rel-17 connected mode power saving at least for the following scenarios: 1) SSB based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1, and 2) CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2***  ***Proposal 4: RAN4 to specify BLER (or SINR) threshold for UE to enter the relaxation mode***  ***Proposal 5: RAN4 to specify BLER (or SINR) threshold for UE to exit the relaxation mode***  ***Proposal 6: For future study whether to specify 2 different threshold values for UE to enter and exit the relaxation mode***  ***Proposal 7: RAN4 to study the necessity of mobility criterion for Rel-17 power saving*** |

## Open issues summary

### Sub-topic 2-1 Evaluation assumption

**Issue 2-1-1: Evaluation assumption update**

* Background:
  + Evaluation assumption update is proposed in R4-2107085 (vivo) and discussed in R4-2107083 (vivo).
* Proposals:
  + Option 1 (vivo):
    - Further update the evaluation assumptions to encourage companies to consider UE rotation in FR2.
    - RAN4 further discuss and agree on the link level evaluation assumptions to collect results on the SINR estimation error based on Y samples, while Y=1 is the baseline.
* Recommended WF:
  + Companies are encouraged to provide views in the 1st round.
  + Responsible company may provide revision in the 2nd round.

**Issue 2-1-2: assumption on other RRM measurement**

* Background:
  + Further evaluate UE power saving gains for the following UE implementations:
    - UE meets Rel-15 RRM measurement period and accuracy requirements
    - Option 1:
      * UE uses all L1 samples for RRM measurements based on Rel-15 assumptions
    - Option 2:
      * How many L1 samples UE applies for RRM measurements is up to UE implementation (e.g. UE can use lower number of measurement samples for RRM measurements)
      * Further discuss how many samples to use for evaluations
      * Companies shall evaluate RRM measurements accuracy for the proposed number of samples.
    - FFS whether Option 2 can be considered for requirements definition
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: (Nokia, Huawei, Ericsson)
    - UE uses all L1 samples for RRM measurements based on Rel-15 assumptions.
  + Option 2: (Oppo, Qualcomm)
    - How many L1 samples UE applies for RRM measurements is up to UE implementation. (e.g. UE can use lower number of measurement samples for RRM measurements)
* Recommended WF:
  + Companies are encouraged to provide views in the 1st round.

**Issue 2-1-3: Impact on PDCCH monitoring**

* Background: Further assess impact on PDCCH monitoring due to relax UE measurements for RLM/BFD
* Proposals:
  + Option 1: (Ericsson)
    - After RAN1 has agreed on the PDCCH relaxation methods, RAN4 shall assess the interaction between PDCCH relaxation and RLM/BM relaxation from power consumption perspective.
  + Option 2: (vivo)
    - The PDCCH monitoring relaxation is in RAN1 scope, and should be further studied in RAN1.
* Recommended WF:
  + Do not discuss this issue until RAN1’s conclusion.

### Sub-topic 2-2 Feasible scenarios for relaxation

**Issue 2-2-1: Observations on the simulation results of power saving gain**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: (vivo)
  + In the study phase of this WI, RAN4 conclude the feasibility of R17 power saving, i.e. exact mobility impact and the exact power saving gain if RLM/BFD are relaxed in low mobility and/or high/medium SINR region.
  + RAN4 conclude the power saving gain and capture observation 6 and 7 in the study phase of the WI.
* Recommended WF:
  + The observation should be made based on the simulation result.
  + Encourage companies to update on the simulation result in the 1st round.
  + The observations of the simulation result will be captured in the 2nd round.

**Issue 2-2-2: Observations on the simulation results of delta SINR**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: (vivo)
  + RAN4 conclude the delta SINR for FR1 as observation 4 and 5, if number of measured samples are reduced (K=8) when SINR is above a proper threshold in the study phase of WI.
  + RAN4 conclude the delta SINR for FR2 CSI-RS based RLM as observation 8 and 9, if number of measured samples are reduced (K=2) when SINR is above a proper threshold in the study phase of WI.
* Recommended WF:
  + The observation should be made based on the simulation result.
  + Encourage companies to update on the simulation result in the 1st round.
  + The observations of the simulation result will be captured in the 2nd round.

**Issue 2-2-3: Observations on the simulation results of increased latency**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: (vivo)
    - RAN4 conclude the increased latency as observation 2, if number of measured samples are reduced (K=8) when SINR is above a proper threshold in the study phase of WI.
* Recommended WF:
  + The observation should be made based on the simulation result.
  + Encourage companies to update on the simulation result in the 1st round.
  + The observations of the simulation result will be captured in the 2nd round.

**Issue 2-2-4: Feasible Scenarios from both power Saving gain and system impact**

* Background: FFS the feasibility of following scenarios from system level perspective:
  + SSB-based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1 for low mobility and high/medium SINR UE.
  + CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2 for low mobility and high/medium SINR UE
  + SSB-based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2 for stationary and high/medium SINR UE
* Proposals: feasible relaxation scenarios:
  + Case 1: SSB based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1
    - Option 1: Yes (MTK, CATT, Qualcomm, vivo, Ericsson)
    - Option 2: No (Huawei)
  + Case 2: CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1
    - Option 1: Yes (MTK, CATT, Qualcomm, vivo)
    - Option 2: No with the conditions when (Huawei)
      * The CSI-RS resource configured for RLM/BFD is within SMTC window
      * The CSI-RS resource configured for RLM/BFD is within DRX onDuration time and WUS is used
      * The RS resource for RLM/BFD is also configured for L1-RSRP measurements.
  + Case 3: CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2
    - Option 1: Yes (MTK, CATT, vivo)
  + Case 4: SSB based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2
    - Option 1: Yes (CATTEricsson)
    - Option 2: No (Huawei)

Recommended WF:

* + Focus on the observations in issue 2-1-1, 2-1-2, and 2-1-3.
  + Companies are still encouraged to provide comments in the first round.
  + Target to capture the feasible relaxation scenarios in the 2nd round.

**Issue 2-2-5: Considerations on the feasibility study**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Negative system level impact due to RLM/BFD relaxation should be minimized e.g. by studying the time of outage with different relaxation factors. (Nokia)
  + Option 2: RAN4 needs to study whether the beneficial scenario is a reasonable case for network configuration. (Huawei)
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals

**Issue 2-2-6: DRX cycle applicability**

* Background:
  + The applicability of DRX cycles for RLM/BFD relaxation should be studied and decided based on the ongoing simulation study.
    - FFS DRX cycle length <= 80 ms
* Proposals
  + Option 1: relaxation is applicable for DRX=20ms or DRX=40ms. (CATT)
  + Option 2: relaxation is applicable for DRX <= 80 ms. (Ericsson, vivo)
    - Option 2a: relaxation is applicable for DRX <= 80 ms, but adjustment to other DRx cycles is needed to keep the monotonicity of DRx cycles w.r.t. evaluation time (QC)
* Recommended WF
  + Is Option 2 agreeable? Note that the relaxation criteria should be also satisfied to enable the relaxation.

**Issue 2-2-7: Potential spec impact**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: In the study phase of this WI, RAN4 conclude the potential spec impact of R17 power saving. (vivo)
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals

**Issue 2-2-8: LS to RAN2 on the study phase conclusion**

* Proposals:
  + Option 1: Send LS to RAN2 in this meeting, in order to inform RAN2 on the progress that RAN4 has made. (vivo)
  + Option 2: LS is not needed.
* Recommended WF
  + Companies are encouraged to provide views on whether to send the LS.

### Sub-topic 2-3 Relaxation criteria

* Background: the relaxation criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation has been discussed in the last meeting as follows.
  + At least take UE mobility into account as the relaxation criteria.
  + also take serving cell’s quality into account
  + FFS whether and how to take other aspects into account

**Issue 2-3-1: Criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation - General**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: The RLM/BFD relaxation criteria needs to combine both serving cell quality and UE mobility state. (Huawei, Apple, CATT, Qualcomm, Intel)
    - Entering conditions: both good serving cell quality and low UE mobility are satisfied.
  + Option 2: Take UE mobility as the major factor into the criteria. (ZTE)
  + Option 3: RAN4 to study the necessity of mobility criterion for Rel-17 power saving. (MTK,vivo)
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals

**Issue 2-3-2: Good serving cell quality criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: radio link quality is better than a threshold. (CATT, Qualcomm, Ericsson, Oppo, MTK)
    - radio link quality > Qout + X (dB) for RLM
    - radio link quality > Qout,LR + Y (dB) for BFD relaxation.
    - FFS X, Y
  + Option 1a: Define network-configured thresholds reflecting SINR regions for RLM and BFD relaxation. Such threshold is the same for RLM and BFD. (vivo)
* Recommended WF: Is Option 1 (i.e. radio link quality is better than a threshold) agreeable?

**Issue 2-3-3: what is the radio link quality in Issue 2-3-2**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: based on SINR. (CMCC, Qualcomm, Intel, Nokia, Oppo, MTK)
    - Option 1a: (Intel)
      * Since SINR value varies with time, a more robust criteria based on SINR is expected to be discussed.
      * SINR will be evaluated during a time window to check if it satisfies the criteria of relaxation or not. The exact window length and how to process SINR value during the window for relaxing RLM/BFD can be further studied.
  + Option 2: based on BLER of hypothetical PDCCH. (Xiaomi, MTK)
  + Option 3: BFD should be relaxed at least better than CBD condition. Whether RSRP is also needed to be considered for relaxation criteria of BFD needs further discussion. (Intel)
* Recommended WF: Is Option 1 agreeable for RLM?

**Issue 2-3-4: different threshold for SSB based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: different threshold for SSB based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD is allowed (vivo)
* Recommended WF: Is Option 1 agreeable?

**Issue 2-3-5: Low mobility criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: R16 low mobility condition applies to RLM/BFD relaxation. (Qualcomm)
    - If R16 low mobility condition is adapted, RAN4 derives SINR distribution for margin derivation from link level simulation without mobility and with small scale fading.
  + Option 2: R16 RRM relaxation criterion can NOT be directly used. (CMCC, Intel)
    - Option 2a (CMCC):
      * The SINR (value and variation) of serving cell can be used for low-mobility criterion.
      * If SINR drift rate is under a threshold during a certain estimation period, then the UE can be considered to fulfill the serving cell’s quality variation rule.
  + Option 3: RAN4 to study the necessity of mobility criterion for Rel-17 power saving. (MTK,vivo)
  + Option 4: Consider time associated with a given condition when determining UE mobility state. (Nokia)
  + Option 5: Low mobility scenario under which the UE is allowed to apply the RLM/BM requirements is determined and configured to UE by the network, and it is up to the UE whether to apply relaxed RLM/BM requirements when configured. (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals.

**Issue 2-3-6: Exiting criteria of RLM relaxation**

* Background:
  + The UE while performing relaxed RLM upon detecting certain number of out-of-sync indications or upon triggering T310 or upon observed link quality degradation or mobility state change reverts to the normal RLM operation (i.e. without relaxation).
* Proposals
  + Option 1: exit relaxation mode when any relaxation criterion is not met (CATT, Apple, ZTE, Huawei)
  + Option 2: exit relaxation mode when the radio link quality is worse than a certain threshold.
    - Option 2a: set different radio link quality threshold for entering and exiting the relaxation (CMCC, Vivo, MTK, Intel, Oppo)
    - Option 2b: UE falls back to normal mode if either the averaged SINR based on reduced number of samples is below Thquit, or the one-shot SINR is below Qout. (vivo)
  + Option 3: exit relaxation mode based on out-of-sync indication. (Apple, , ZTE, Xiaomi, CMCC, Nokia)
    - Option 3a: exit when N310 starts to count, i.e. 1 out-of-sync indication. (Apple, , ZTE)
    - Option 3b: exit when T310 is running (Xiaomi, CMCC)
    - Option 3c: exit when certain number of out-of-indications (Ericsson)
    - Option 3d: exit when certain consecutive out-of-sync indications (CMCC)
  + Option 4 (QC) : Additional time is allowed for UE to evaluate first OOS indication when UE is in power saving mode. UE is in normal mode after first OOS indication. The additional delay for RLF declaration is guaranteed to be within OOS evaluation time (TEvaluate\_out\_SSB) in normal mode. Relaxation factor and exit SINR threshold (for good cell quality condition) is up to UE implementation, but the “first OOS indication” requirement has to be satisfied.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Configuration | TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB (ms) |
| no DRX | Max(200, Ceil(10 × P) × TSSB) |
| DRX cycle≤80ms | Max(200, Ceil(30 × P) × Max(TDRX,TSSB)) |
| 80ms<DRX cycle≤320ms | Max(200, Ceil(20 × P) × Max(TDRX,TSSB)) |
| DRX cycle>320ms | Ceil(10 × P) × TDRX |
| NOTE: TSSB is the periodicity of the SSB configured for RLM. TDRX is the DRX cycle length. | |

* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals. Target to down-select or merge proposals.

**Issue 2-3-7: Exiting criteria of BFD relaxation**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: exit relaxation mode when any relaxation criterion is not met (CATT, Apple, Huawei)
  + Option 2: exit relaxation mode when the radio link quality is worse than a certain threshold.
    - Option 2a: set different radio link quality threshold for entering and exiting the relaxation (CMCC, vivo, MTK, Intel, Oppo)
    - Option 2b: UE falls back to normal mode if either the averaged SINR based on reduced number of samples is below Thquit, or the one-shot SINR is below Qout. (vivo)
  + Option 3: exit relaxation mode upon detect 1 beam failure instance indication. (Ericsson, ZTE)
  + Option 4: exit relaxation mode after BFI\_COUNTER add to the value of a new counter or a new parameter, the new counter or the new parameter is configured by network. (CMCC)
  + Option 5: exit relaxation modeupon RLF (CMCC)
  + Option 6: no need for the exiting criteria for BFD relaxation. (Xiaomi)
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals. Target to down-select or merge proposals.

**Issue 2-3-8: Alternative N310/N311 values in relaxation mode**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: When operating in relaxed RLM/BFD mode, there could be alternate values for related parameters such has values for N310/N311. (Nokia, CMCC)
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals

**Issue 2-3-9: Re-entry to the RLM relaxation mode**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (CMCC):
    - If UE revert to normal RLM operation, and the T310 is not starting. UE can go back to relaxation mode after receiving several in-sync indications. The number of in-sync indications can be configured by network, such as configure a new counter.
    - If UE stop the T310 because receiving N311 in-sync indication, UE couldn’t go into relaxation mode again during a certain period, such as when a new timer is active. UE can decide whether go into relaxation mode by relaxation criteria after the timer expires. The timer is configured by network.
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals

**Issue 2-3-10: Re-entry to the BFD relaxation mode**

* Proposals
  + Option 1 (CMCC):
    - If Option 4 in Issue 2-3-7 is agreed, then after the beamFailureDetetionTimerT310 expires, UE could not go back to relaxation mode before the punish time ends, the punish time can be a timer by network configuration.
    - If Option 5 in Issue 2-3-7 is agreed, then when UE trigger the RLF, UE could not go back to relaxation mode before the new timer expires. The new timer is configured by network, and this timer start right after UE perform revert.
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals

### Sub-topic 2-4 Relaxation scheme

**Issue 2-4-1: Relaxed evaluation period of RLM/BFD**

* Background
  + Use of a scaling factor to extend the RLM/BFD evaluation period.
* Proposals
  + Option 1: Scaling factor defining the relaxed RLM/BFD evaluation period is defined based on max(TDRX, TSSB). (Ericsson, Apple, CATT, Qualcomm)
    - Option 1a:The similar definition of RLM/BFD evaluation period in Rel-15 can be reused as Max(T, Ceil([Y] x P x N) x Max(TDRX,TSSB))
    - Option 1b: If power saving conditions are satisfied, allow TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB for the first OOS indication and the original TEvaluate\_out\_SSB doesn’t apply. (Qualcomm)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Configuration | TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB (ms) |
| no DRX | Max(200, Ceil(10 × P) × TSSB) |
| DRX cycle≤80ms | Max(200, Ceil(30 × P) × Max(TDRX,TSSB)) |
| 80ms<DRX cycle≤320ms | Max(200, Ceil(20 × P) × Max(TDRX,TSSB)) |
| DRX cycle>320ms | Ceil(10 × P) × TDRX |
| NOTE: TSSB is the periodicity of the SSB configured for RLM. TDRX is the DRX cycle length. | |

* Recommended WF: Is Option 1 agreeable?

**Issue 2-4-2: Are the parameters of relaxation criteria predefined or configurable**

* Background
* Network to enable and disable this feature.
  + FFS Should the relaxation criteria be predefined or configurable?
  + FFS Should it be network or UE to determine the relaxation criteria is fulfilled or not?
* Proposals
  + Option 1: The parameters of relaxation criteria should be predefined. (Xiaomi)
  + Option 2: The parameters of relaxation criteria can be configured by the network. (Apple, ZTE, Oppo, CMCC, vivo, Ericsson)
  + Option 3: No parameter for low mobility criteria
    - Option 3a: Low mobility cell can be configured by network in RRC without any thresholds, e.g. for indoor cells. (vivo)
    - Option 3b: Low mobility scenario under which the UE is allowed to apply the RLM/BM requirements is determined and configured to UE by the network, and it is up to the UE whether to apply relaxed RLM/BM requirements when configured.(Ericsson)
  + Option 4 (QC): The parameters of relaxation criterion of low mobility and entering condition of good cell quality can be configured by the network. Exit condition of good cell quality is up to UE implementation, as long as the additional delay for RLF declaration is guaranteed to be within OOS evaluation time (TEvaluate\_out\_SSB) in normal mode
* Recommended WF: Is Option 2 agreeable?

**Issue 2-4-3: network or UE to determine the relaxation criteria is fulfilled or not**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: UE determines whether the relaxation criteria can be fulfilled or not. (CMCC, Xiaomi, Apple, QC)
  + Option 1a: The UE can determine alone if the criteria (configured by the network) is met and enter the low mobility mode to use a relaxed requirements for RLM and RLF if there will be test cases defined to test the UE behaviors. (ZTE)
* Recommended WF: Is Option 1 agreeable?

**Issue 2-4-4a: Different Relaxation factors between FR1 and FR2**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Different Relaxation factors are allowed for FR1 and FR2. (Oppo, CMCC, Xiaomi, Ericsson)
  + Option 2: Relaxation factor and exit SINR threshold (for good cell quality condition) is up to UE implementation, but the “additional delay for first OOS indication” requirement has to be satisfied (QC).
* Recommended WF: Is Option 1 agreeable?

**Issue 2-4-4b: Different Relaxation factors for different SINR range**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Different Relaxation factors are allowed for different SINR range (oppo, Ericsson, Apple)
  + Option 2: Relaxation factor and exit SINR threshold (for good cell quality condition) is up to UE implementation, but the “additional delay for first OOS indication” requirement has to be satisfied (QC).
* Recommended WF: Is Option 1 agreeable?

**Issue 2-4-4c: Different Relaxation factors for different UE speed**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Different Relaxation factors are allowed for different UE speed (oppo)
  + Option 2: Relaxation factor and exit SINR threshold (for good cell quality condition) is up to UE implementation, but the “additional delay for first OOS indication” requirement has to be satisfied (QC).
* Recommended WF: Is Option 1 agreeable?

**Issue 2-4-4d: Different Relaxation factors for SSB and CSI-RS**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: different relaxation factors are allowed for SSB and CSI-RS (vivo, Xiaomi, Apple)
  + Option 2: FFS whether different relaxation factors are allowed for SSB and CSI-RS in FR2 (Ericsson)
  + Option 3: Relaxation factor and exit SINR threshold (for good cell quality condition) is up to UE implementation, but the “additional delay for first OOS indication” requirement has to be satisfied (QC).
* Recommended WF: Is Option 1 agreeable?

**Issue 2-4-4e: Different Relaxation factors for different DRX cycle**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: Different Relaxation factors are allowed for different DRX cycle (apple)
  + Option 2: Different “additional delay for first OOS indication” requirement for different DRx cycles (QC)
* Recommended WF: Is Option 1 agreeable?

**Issue 2-4-4f: Other consideration on Relaxation factors**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: The evaluation period should be extended based on the legacy RLM/BFD requirements by considering the scaling factors, e.g. N factor, P factor (Xiaomi)
  + Option 2: Relaxation for longer DRx cycle measurement requirement should be considered to maintain the monotonicity of measurement/evaluation time w.r.t. DRx cycle length (Qualcomm)
  + Option 3 (CMCC):
    - RLM/BFD performance after relaxation
    - The evaluation period after relaxation, which should be smaller or equal to a threshold
  + Option 4 (Ericsson):
    - Up to 3 km/h and at high SINR (in-sync), relaxation by factor 4 can be allowed for FR1.
    - Up to 3 km/h at low SINR (out-of-sync), relaxation if allowed should be smaller than factor 2 for FR1.
    - Up to 30 km/h and at high SINR (e.g. in-sync), relaxation if allowed should be smaller than factor 2 FR1.
    - Up to 30 km/h at low SINR (e.g. out-of-sync), no relaxation shall be allowed for FR1.
    - Up to 3 km/h at higher SINR (e.g. in-sync), relaxation if allowed should be smaller than factor 2 for FR2.
    - Up to 30 km/h, no relaxation should be allowed for FR2.
* Recommended WF: Suggest to discuss the principle first in Issue 2-4-4a~e.

**Issue 2-4-5: Measurement accuracy**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For R17 RLM and BFD relaxation, measurement accuracy for RLM, BFD and RRM reuses R15 requirements. (vivo)
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals

### Sub-topic 2-5 Others

**Issue 2-5-1: Entering relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For intra-band CA/DC, the UE should relax only on serving cells where the relaxed criteria is fulfilled. (CMCC, CATT, ZTE)
  + Option 2: For intra-band CA/DC, if UE has fulfilled the criterion for operating BFD in relaxed mode in one serving cell, then it is allowed to operate BFD in relaxed mode in all other serving cells (Oppo, Ericsson, Xiaomi)
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals

**Issue 2-5-2: Exiting relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For intra-band CA/DC, if UE meets the conditions of reverting to the normal RLM/BFD in one serving cell, it is expected the reversion operations are applied to other serving cell(s). (Xiaomi, Ericsson)
  + Option 2: For intra-band CA/DC, if UE has failed to fulfil the criterion for operating RLM/BFD relaxation in all serving cells, then it shall revert to normal RLM/BFD operation without relaxation. (Oppo)
* Recommended WF: Is option 1 agreeable?

**Issue 2-5-3: Relaxation criteria in intra-band CA/DC**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: For intra-band CA case, RAN4 to use the same RLM/BFD measurement relaxation criteria for the serving cells. (Ericsson, vivo)
    - Option 1a: UE relaxation behaviour for BFD should be the same in all cells in a CG in the same band (vivo)
  + Option 2: The relaxation criteria and K factor should be configurable. SpCells and SCells can use different RLM/BFD measurement relaxation criteria.
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals

**Issue 2-5-4: Applicability for BFD relaxation requirement**

* Proposals
  + Option 1: As the legacy BFD requirement, the BFD relaxation requirement is applicable for PCell, PSCell and all configured SCells. (Ericsson)
* Recommended WF: Discuss the proposals.

## Companies views’ collection for 1st round

### Open issues

**Sub-topic 2-1 Evaluation assumption**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Issue 2-1-1: **Evaluation assumption update**  As discussed in RAN plenary, the number of samples for RLM/BFD/RRM measurements is up to UE implementation, as long as UE can meet the accuracy requirements.  As agreed in last RAN4 meeting, the relaxation for RLM and BFD is only conducted in low mobility and good cell quality condition, it is important to identify the UE measurement performance based on reduced number of samples, when the actual SINR is not as bad as the side condition.  This is also important for the purposed of identifying the necessary margin and potential configuration options for the details of the cell quality condition.  Issue 2-1-2: **assumption on other RRM measurement**  This issue is already discussed in the RAN Plenary and the conclusion from RAN P is  “*For Rel-17 WI of UE power saving enhancements for NR, no specification impact to RRM measurement procedure requirements and measurement performance requirements is expected.*”  Based on above conclusion, the FFS bullet under option 2 for last meeting can be removed or can be revised to “FFS whether Option 2 can be considered for RLM/BFD requirements definition” to avoid any collision or confusion.  Moreover, the above RAN Plenary guidance implies that the number of samples UE used is up to UE implementation, as the wording “sample number” was not included in the plenary guidance.  Therefore, we are fine to list option 1 as one option for evaluation, if option 2 in last meeting is not removed.  We also prefer option 2 and we think it is better to agree and capture option 2 in this meeting, as proposed in our contribution R4-2107082.Issue 2-1-3: **Impact on PDCCH monitoring**  We support the moderator’s recommended WF.  Impact on/from PDCCH monitoring is not precluded, and can be further discussed after RAN1 have conclusions. |
| QC | Issue 2-1-2 assumption on other RRM measurement:  Support option 2. As we pointed out in our contribution, under good serving cell quality condition, the side condition for neighboring cell measurement is mostly violated and the neighboring cell measurement requirement is not relevant. Therefore, we don’t have to consider other RRM measurement, leaving to UE implementation for power saving gain evaluation. Note that this doesn’t change the requirement, since the requirement doesn’t apply when side condition is violated. |
| Apple | Issue 2-1-2: Option 2. The number of L1 samples used for measurement is up to UE implementation as long as requirement is met.  Issue 2-1-3: RAN1 R17 PDCCH monitoring adaptation can reduce UE power used for PDCCH monitoring. In this case, UE spend a larger portion of power for RLM/BFD. RLM/BFD relaxation on top of R17 PDCCH based adaption scheme provides higher UE power saving gain, as shown in our simulation results. |
| CMCC | Issue 2-1-2: assumption on other RRM measurement  For power saving gain evaluation, we think Option1 and Option2 are both OK. If we use Option2 as a starting point, we should further down-select a specific value for aligned simulation assumption.  In real network, how to do the RRM measurements is up to UE implementation as long as UE fulfill the related requirements.  Issue 2-1-3: Impact on PDCCH monitoring  We support the recommended WF. |
| Nokia | Issue 2-1-1: Could the motivation behind these new simulations compared to the earlier agreed ones be clarified a bit more? What kind of rotation model is proposed to be used, and what is the motivation behind adding a new model based on UE rotation? Related to SINR estimation error: it is unclear to us whether this is the same as the agreed delta SINR metric or not and what is meant with one-shot here? What do the 5 samples as proposed mean?  Issue 2-1-2: We support Option 1, which we think is correct regarding the WID and also corresponds to the RAN plenary guidance. If the UE could autonomously decide how many samples it applies for RRM measurements, why could the UE not do the same for RLM and BFD measurements? The exact number of samples the UE uses is not defined in the requirements for any of these measurement types. The L1 indications from physical layer to higher layer (e.g. to indicate IS (in-sync) or OOS (out-of-sync)) are in our understanding only defined so that we can align the expected behavior in terms of counters/timers between the UE and NW.  Issue 2-1-3: We think this issue should be RAN1 initiated, so we support the recommended WF. |
| OPPO | Issue 2-1-2: Support option 2. The number of L1 samples used for RRM measurement is up to UE implementation as long as requirement is met. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 2-1-1: Evaluation assumption update**  In our understanding UE rotation is not considered in the legacy assumptions. Thus we do not need this take it into account the power saving assumption. The Rel-17 power saving assumptions should be align to the Rel-15 assumptions correctly study the power saving gain. Thus option 1 is not agreeable to us.  **Issue 2-1-3: Impact on PDCCH monitoring**  We agree to postpone the discussions on this topic until RAN1 has reached more progress. It is important to analyse how both features (PDCCH relaxation as currently being discussed in RAN1) and RLM/BFD relaxation interact with respect to UE power consumption. It can be captured in a WF that the combination of the feature shall be discussed in RAN4 when there are more progress in RAN1. |
| CATT | Issue 2-1-1: Don’t understand about the new link level simulation. It is collection the results of 5 samples (In) for SS-SINR but not delta SINR.  Issue 2-1-3: support recommended WF. |
| MTK | **Issue 2-1-1: Evaluation assumption update**  We share the same view with Ericsson. RAN4 did not reach consensus on the UE rotation model even in Rel-15, we don’t think RAN4 has time to cover this issue in this WID.  **Issue 2-1-2: assumption on other RRM measurement**  Support option 2. According to the RAN plenary guidance, UE should have flexibility to decide which sample is applied to perform the RRM measurement, as long as the Rel-15 measurement requirement can still be fulfilled.   |  | | --- | | Based on this RP-210329 is noted, and the following conclusion is noted in the Minutes:  *“RAN Plenary guidance to RAN4: For Rel-17 WI of UE power saving enhancements for NR, no specification impact to RRM measurement procedure requirements and measurement performance requirements is expected.”* |   **Issue 2-1-3: Impact on PDCCH monitoring**  Agree the WF |
| Vivo2 | Issue 2-1-1:  [Replying comments from companies]  On rotation model we agree that RAN4 has never considered such model before but it is related to the UE RLM/BFD performance in FR2. Therefore, we only proposed to encourage companies to consider rotation, but no specific model is provided.  On one-shot SINR measurements, maybe it is also related issue 2-1-2. We see some companies have brought results on the measurement accuracy in this meeting.  Issue 2-1-3: support recommended WF. |

**Sub-topic 2-2 Feasible scenarios for relaxation**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Issue 2-2-1: **Observations on the simulation results of power saving gain**  Suggest to come back to this issue after the results are collected, since it is mainly about the wording. It is further discussed in the WF.Issue 2-2-2: **Observations on the simulation results of delta SINR**  Suggest to come back to this issue after the results are collected, since it is mainly about the wording.. It is further discussed in the WF.  Moreover, it is proposed to not to capture the results from some company, in case the results are deviated from all other companies.  Issue 2-2-3: **Observations on the simulation results of increased latency**  Suggest to come back to this issue after the results are collected, since it is mainly about the wording.. It is further discussed in the WF.  Issue 2-2-4: **Feasible Scenarios from both power Saving gain and system impact**  Based on the contributions from companies, we identify that the companies having concerns on the feasible scenarios are mainly on whether number of samples for RRM can be reduced, in case the RRM requirements are not impacted. As is discussed for many times, this should be up to UE implementation.  Therefore, we suggest to agree on option 1 for at least case 1, 2 and 3.  Issue 2-2-5: **Considerations on the feasibility study**  For proposal 2, we understand the motivation, but the baseline assumption for such negative system impact needs to be considered. As agreed in evaluation assumptions, the T310 value is stated as 1000ms. This is copied from the in-sync test case, and we think it is an reasonable value for realistic deployment. Considering this value, the UE would be maintained in out-of-sync condition for at least 1000ms before RLF triggers. Only after RLF triggers, UE can start reestablishment, or other recovery procedure.  For proposal 3, we are fine to have further discussion. For example,  L1-RSRP reporting is not a typical configuration for FR1, at least in our understanding. Even if it is configured, as agreed in TR 38.840, it should not be more frequent than once per 160ms.  For the MO configuration, based on our understanding, the only thing matters would be the intra-frequency measurement for the PCC frequency layer, which is defined to have CSSF=1 if CSI-RS layer is not configured. Therefore, it is reasonable to reduce the sample for serving cell and not to measure the neighbor cells if the serving cell SNR is high enough.  Issue 2-2-6: **DRX cycle applicability**  We support option 2.  Option 2a can be further discussed. This is related to what is defined for the relaxed requirement.  Issue 2-2-7: **Potential spec impact**  At least the restriction for UE to perform RLM once per indication period can be removed in TS 38.214.  The indication period specified in clause 38.133 can be extended when UE meets the relaxation criteria.  Moreover, the evaluation for the oos evaluation period can be extended based on reasonable UE behavior assumption.  Issue 2-2-8: **LS to RAN2 on the study phase conclusion**  We prefer option 1.  As listed in the status report, the remaining open issues for this topic are quite many. In our view it is reasonable to trigger RAN2 discussion earlier than the work plan stated. For example, the criteria are normally captured in RAN2 spec.  In our view, the following topics are better discussed in RAN2.   * + Criteria which the UE is allowed to relax the RLM/BM requirements, including both serving cell quality and/or UE mobility criteria   + Criteria/mechanism which UE falls back to normal RLM/BM operation   + Network or UE to determine if the criteria for relaxation is fulfilled   + RRC signaling design   We are open to hear other views. |
| QC | **Issue 2-2-4: Feasible Scenarios from both power Saving gain and system impact**  We suggest prioritizing SSB-based based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1 for low mobility and high/medium SINR UE. In this scenario, largest gain is observed in most of evaluation results. Our option toward different cases:  Case 1: prioritized  Case 2: open to discuss  Case 3/4: can evaluate after RAN4 is done with specifying FR1 power saving  **Issue 2-2-6: DRX cycle applicability**  We support option 2a, because the monotonicity of DRx cycles w.r.t. evaluation time should be kept.  **Issue 2-2-8: LS to RAN2 on the study phase conclusion**  It is preferred to send LS when RAN4 reaches concrete conclusion. |
| Apple | Issue 2-2-1: Agree with WF. UE power saving gain highly related to the two options in 2-1-2.  Issue 2-2-4: For feasible relaxation scenarios, we also favor option 1 of case 1 and case 2.  Issue 2-2-6: Option 2b. Maximum relaxation factor should be related to DRX cycle.  Example 1: max relaxation factor is 8 for 40ms DRX cycle, 4 for 80ms DRX cycle, 2 for 160ms DRX cycle.  Example 2: max relaxation factor is 4 for 40ms DRX cycle, 2 for 80ms DRX cycle, no relaxation for 160ms DRX cycle.  Issue 2-2-7: Spec impact should be discussed in phase II.  Issue 2-2-8: Option 2. Do not see the need to send LS on study phase conclusion. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 2-2-1: Observations on the simulation results of power saving gain**  We are also OK to come back on this issue after the results are collected and analysed.  **Issue 2-2-2: Observations on the simulation results of delta SINR**  We are also OK to come back on this issue after the results are collected and analysed.  **Issue 2-2-3: Observations on the simulation results of increased latency**  We are also OK to come back on this issue after the results are collected and analysed.  **Issue 2-2-4: Feasible Scenarios from both power Saving gain and system impact**  For case 1: we support option 1. For case 4, we support option 1.  **Issue 2-2-6: DRX cycle applicability**  We can agree to option 2.  **Issue 2-2-7: Potential spec impact**  What does this proposal mean really? Specifying the relaxed RLM/BFD requirements will have specification (at least 38.133) impact.  **Issue 2-2-8: LS to RAN2 on the study phase conclusion**  LS to RAN2 containing the RAN4 agreements might be useful when there are more concrete agreements. Thus it depends on the progress in this meeting. |
| Nokia | Issue 2-2-1, 2-2-2, 2-2-3, 2-2-4: For all these four issues, we think the observations should be collected based on the results from all companies. It also needs to be made sure that the results are comparable.  Issue 2-2-5: In our simulations we have observed that when the relaxation factor K increases, the time the UE spends in outage increases significantly. RAN4 should keep such measurements along in the simulation study to make sure that harmful system level impact can be minimized.  Issue 2-2-6: Short DRX cycles are preferred, but we would like the exact agreement to be made based on the observations that are done based on the simulation results.  Issue 2-2-7: This can be done in a WF, but first RAN4 needs to conclude what are the relaxation scenarios to be included.  Issue 2-2-8: We think an LS should only be sent if RAN4 has some action points for RAN2. We do not see the benefit of just informing about RAN4 agreements if they have no RAN2 impact. |
| Huawei | Issue 2-2-4:  The feasible scenario at least should be the scenario where UE can obtain power saving gain. However, from the simulation results, it can be observed that the power saving gains vary considerably for different UE implementations. Companies would have different views on the feasible scenarios. For example, SSB based RLM/BFD relaxation for power saving purpose may not be feasible for all the UE implementations.  So, it is suggested that whether to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements can be up to UE implementation, i.e., the UE is allowed but not mandatory to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements when the relaxation criteria is met.  Issue 2-2-6:  Agree with option 2.  Issue 2-2-7:  It is too early to conclude the potential specification impacts. It depends on how to define the RLM/BFD relaxation criteria and how to capture the relaxed RLM/BFD measurement requirements.  Issue 2-2-8:  RAN4 can send an LS to RAN2 when RAN4 has achieved the agreements to introduce necessary signaling used for RLM/BFD relaxation criteria. |
| OPPO | Issue 2-2-1: Agree with WF.  Issue 2-2-4: Prefer option 1 of case 1 and case 2.  Issue 2-2-6: Option 2 is fine.  Issue 2-2-8: Do not see the urgency to send LS. |
| CATT | Issue 2-2-4: Support Case 1/2/34. Agree it depends on simulation collection and observation.  Issue 2-2-6: From simulation, DRX 20 and 40ms is feasible to relax. We don’t simulate for larger DRX cycle. Open to the upper limit of DRX for simulation.  Issue 2-2-8: no need to send LS now. |
| MTK | **Issue 2-2-1: Observations on the simulation results of power saving gain**  Agreed with WF  **Issue 2-2-2: Observations on the simulation results of delta SINR**  Agreed with WF  **Issue 2-2-3: Observations on the simulation results of increased latency**  Agreed with WF  **Issue 2-2-4: Feasible Scenarios from both power Saving gain and system impact**  Support option 1 for all of the cases.  **Issue 2-2-5: Considerations on the feasibility study**  Disagree with option 1 and option 2. RAN4 has done a lot of evaluation to check the system impact. At least from our point of view, delta SINR and RLF latency should be enough. If further evaluation is needed, then exact performance metric should be agreed first. Besides, RAN4 already agreed to follow the simulation assumptions specified in TR38.840, discussion on any new evaluation settings should go back to RAN1. The agreed model in RAN1 was actually determined from the traffic data provided by Network vendors. Our understanding is that whether the cases are reasonable had already been concluded in RAN1.  **Issue 2-2-6: DRX cycle applicability**  Both option 1 and option 2 are fine.  **Issue 2-2-7: Potential spec impact**  Discuss in next stage  **Issue 2-2-8: LS to RAN2 on the study phase conclusion**  We prefer to send LS only after RAN4 has clear definition on criteria for power saving scheme. |

**Sub-topic 2-3 Relaxation criteria**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Issue 2-3-1: **Criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation – General**  We support both option 1 and option 3. These two options are compatible.  As discussed in issue 2-4-2, our view is that such low mobility condition does not necessarily need to be configured as some thresholds. If network indicates that UE can relax when it meets the cell quality threshold, then UE can relax when it actually meets such threshold. Network only configure the cell quality threshold when UE’s mobility is limited, e.g. indoor cell. If no thresholds are configured, it means such cell is some high mobility cell.  Issue 2-3-2: **Good serving cell quality criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**  Option 1 is fine. We also prefer option 1a because if UE only relax RLM but not BFD, while both are configured, then the power saving gain would be lost.  Issue 2-3-3: **what is the radio link quality in Issue 2-3-2**  We support both option 1 and option 2. Down-selection between option 1 and option 2 can be FFS. In our view this is the issue for signaling design and can be further discussed in WI phase.  Regarding option 3, we do not see the necessity to link relaxation of BFD with CBD. If UE exits from BFD relaxation, it does not necessarily mean BF happens. However, we are fine to have further study on option 3.  Issue 2-3-4: **different threshold for SSB based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD**  We think option 1 is reasonable because different resources are considered. Issue 2-3-5: **Low mobility criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**  We prefer option option 2, 3, and 5. These options are compatible. However, for option 1, we also see it can be re-used in some scenarios.  As discussed in issue 2-4-2, our view is that such low mobility condition does not necessarily need to be configured as some thresholds. If network indicates that UE can relax when it meets the cell quality threshold, then UE can relax when it actually meets such threshold. Network only configure the cell quality threshold when UE’s mobility is limited, e.g. indoor cell. If no thresholds are configured, it means such cell is some high mobility cell.  Such details can be further discussed. In our view, RAN2 can be a better place.  Issue 2-3-6: **Exiting criteria of RLM relaxation**  We support option 2, 2a, 2b. We think at least option 2 and 2a can be agreeable.  Option 1,3 can be regarded as special cases for option 2.  Option 4 can be regarded as details for option 2, which is not precluded and can be further discussed.  Option 2b is to ensure timely fall back when the SINR gets a sharp fall.  Issue 2-3-7: **Exiting criteria of BFD relaxation**  We support option 2, 2a, 2b. We think at least option 2 and 2a can be agreeable.  Option 1,3,4,5 can be regarded as special cases for option 2.  Option 2b is to ensure timely fall back when the SINR gets a sharp fall.  Issue 2-3-8: **Alternative N310/N311 values in relaxation mode**  This can be further discussed in WI phase, after we have conclusion in 2-3-6.  Issue 2-3-9: **Re-entry to the RLM relaxation mode**  FFS  Issue 2-3-10: **Re-entry to the BFD relaxation mode**  FFS |
| QC | **Issue 2-3-1: Criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation – General**  Support option 1  **Issue 2-3-2: Good serving cell quality criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**  Support option 1  **Issue 2-3-3: what is the radio link quality in Issue 2-3-2**  Support option 1, with the condition that SINR is the one derived for RLM/BFD evaluation.  **Issue 2-3-4: different threshold for SSB based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD**  OK with option 1, but in our opinion, SSB based should be prioritized for discussion  **Issue 2-3-5: Low mobility criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**  We support option 1.  For option 2, the SINR from RLM/BFD is heavily filtered, which can not reflect the mobility status accurately and timely. Therefore, RSRP with less filtering is preferred.  For option 3, we consider mobility condition as necessary, since it has been there for eMTC/NB-IOT and R16 idle mode relaxation. We don’t see significant difference in mobility condition between idle and connected mode.  For option 4 and 5, since the threshold is configured by gNB, gNB can take whatever the condition it would like to consider to determine the threshold. Therefore, we believe option 4 and 5 can be combined with option 1.  **Issue 2-3-6: Exiting criteria of RLM relaxation**  For option 1, we believe that when low mobility condition is added to option 4, option 1 is included in option 4. We agree that low mobility condition should be added to option 4.  For option 2, the problem is that a fixed threshold is given to UE. How to define this threshold becomes an issue, we prefer to have a more flexible approach as option 4.  For option 3, the increase in additional delay on RLF declaration becomes a function of relaxation factor K. Option 3a has an additional delay of (K-1)\* Tevaluation. Option 3b,c,d has an additional delay of a\*(K-1)\*Tevaluation, where a is the number of OOS indicators sent under power saving mode.  Option 4 is better from both UE implementation and system performance guarantee perspective:  From UE implementation perspective, UE can determine the exit threshold and relaxation factor based on its measurement accuracy and different conditions, e.g., SINR, mobility etc. In fact, for an optimized system design, relaxation factor and measurement accuracy are the function of SINR. However, it is too complicated for RAN4 to specify different relaxation factors/exit threshold for different SINR conditions, leaving this to UE implementation can lead to best power saving for all Ues. The only concern is how can we guarantee system performance when we leave this to UE implementation.  Option 4 addressed this concern for system performance by directly specifying the additional delay in the RAN4 spec as Tevaluation. While option 2 and 3 provide no guarantee or longer additional delay, option 4 guarantee the additional delay within Tevaluation, which better protect system performance.  To Vivo: option 4 doesn’t specify the SINR threshold. If option 2 can leave SINR threshold and relaxation factor up to UE implementation, we can support option 2 and propose option 4 under option 2.  **Issue 2-3-8: Alternative N310/N311 values in relaxation mode**  If option 4 in issue 2-3-6 is agreed, UE is guaranteed to be in normal mode once UE starts to count N310/N311  **Issue 2-3-9: Re-entry to the RLM relaxation mode**  We are open to discuss adding a timer for blocking power saving mode after OOS is indicated. But for the proposed scheme, we have the following concern: (1) In practice, gNB has no idea whether UE revert to normal or is always in normal mode. Therefore, if we want to add a timer to block power saving mode, it should apply to all circumstances after OOS indication, regardless of UE is in power saving mode or not before OOS indication. (2) We don’t understand why the condition is specified as counting in-sync indication instead of timer. A timer makes more sense. |
| Apple | Issue 2-3-1: Option 1 is preferred. Both serving cell quality and UE mobility criterion is needed.  Issue 2-3-2: OK with option 1.  Issue 2-3-3: Option is OK.  Issue 2-3-4: Do not see the need to define different threshold for SSB versus CSI-RS based RLM/BFD  Issue 2-3-5: Option 1, option 4 and option 5 are preferred.  Issue 2-3-6: Option 1 and option 3 are preferred. Do not see the need to specify another set of thresholds.  Issue 2-3-7: Both option 1 and option 3 are OK. Similar to 2-3-6, we do not see the need to define another set of thresholds.  Issue 2-3-8: This depends on existing criterion discussed in 2-3-6.  Issue 2-3-9: Re-entry and entry RLM relaxation mode can be the same. |
| ZTE | **Issue 2-3-1: Criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation – General**  Support option 1  **Issue 2-3-6: Exiting criteria of RLM relaxation**  Prefer Option 1. Having separated threshold seems not necessary and moreover, if there is a threshold for the UE to exit relaxation mode and the threshold is a different criterion other than the ones used for the UE to enter relaxation mode, ping-pong effect may arise. Option 1 is enough and quite clear.  2-3-7: Option 3. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 2-3-1: Prefer Option 1.  Issue 2-3-2: Option 1 is fine to us.  Issue 2-3-3: Prefer Option 2. From the point of ensuring consistent behavior between different UEs, we think it is more appropriate to use BLER of hypothetical PDCCH as metric for the serving cell quality criteria.  For Option 1, as the mapping between the SINR and BLER is determined by what receiver the UE implemented, if we use the SINR to evaluate, the SINR threshold value would have to be designed considering different UE implementation. We can further discuss.  For Option 3, in our understanding, the BFD and CBD are separate procedure and there may be no strong connection between them.  Issue 2-3-4: Prefer to come back to this issue after we have conclusion on issue 2-3-3.  Issue 2-3-5: Prefer Option 1, Option 4 and Option 5.  Issue 2-3-6: Prefer Option 2 and Option 3.  Issue 2-3-7: Prefer Option 6, Option 2 is also fine to us.  Issue 2-3-8: Wait for the conclusion from issue 2-3-6  Issue 2-3-9: We don’t see the necessity to set re-entry condition. |
| Intel | **Issue 2-3-1:** Support Option 1.  **Issue 2-3-2:** Generally fine with option 1 to choose a threshold. However, how to design the threshold, it’s FFS. For example, it can also be based on Qin+Margin or some other value.  **Issue 2-3-3:** Support option 1 and option 3.  For option 3, To vivo, it’s not linked to CBD. It only use the CBD condition to make sure that current beam is in good state to relax the BFD. CBD can be assumed as the In-sync condition of beam management. From our understanding, both RLM and BFD should be relaxed at least better than In-Sync condition. In-sync condition is different from RLM and BFD. For RLM, In-Sync means that SINR is higher than Qin threshold. Different from RLM, the criteria for good beam condition in BM satisfied that the measured L1-RSRP is equal to or better than the threshold Qin\_LR, which is indicated by higher layer parameter rsrp-ThresholdSSB.  **Issue 2-3-5:** Support option 2.  **Issue 2-3-6:** Support option 2a. Different radio link quality threshold for entering and exiting the relaxation is needed. Otherwise, UE will frequently enter and exit the relaxation. A margin between the thresholds can avoid ping-pong issue.  **Issue 2-3-7:** Support option 2a. |
| CMCC | Issue 2-3-1: Criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation – General  We support Option1. In RRC-CONNECTED relaxation (RLF/BFD), the SINR should be the major factor into the criteria. We should both consider the SINR value and SINR variation.  Issue 2-3-2: Good serving cell quality criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation  Basically, we support Option1 that radio link quality is better than a threshold. The threshold can be configured by network, if there is no configuration, then use a default value. Whether the threshold is same or different for RLM and BFD should be further studied.  Issue 2-3-3: what is the radio link quality in Issue 2-3-2  We support Option1 since SINR is the main factor in RLM/BFD. We also support Option 1a that the SINR variation during a time window should be considered. we capture this into low-mobility rule in our contribution, we are also OK to consider it in the radio link quality rule.  Issue 2-3-5: Low mobility criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation  We support Option2 and Option2a. As the comments for Issue 2-3-3, we think the SINR variation during a time window should be considered, and we are both OK to capture this in low-mobility rule or capture this in serving cell’s quality rule.  Issue 2-3-6: Exiting criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation  We support Option 3d and Option 3b.   * In Option 3d, the number of consecutive out-of-sync indications should be configured by network, we propose to configure a new counter to UE * The Option3b should combine with the precondition that new N310 value or new counter is configured to UE.   For Option1, if UE exit relaxation mode when any relaxation criterion is not met, then severe Ping-Pong affection will be caused since the channel quality degradation is common in real network.  For Option2a, we think it can be used together with Option3d and/or Option3b. Option2a is suitable for the case that SINR drops slowly, Option3d and/or Option3b is suitable for the case that SINR drops quickly.  For Option2b, the logic is similar to Option2a+ Option3d and/or Option3b. However, we concern about the accuracy of one-shot SNIR result.  For Option 4, the RLF triggering latency can be guaranteed in an evaluation period. However, proper test case should be designed carefully, because the exiting threshold and the number of samples in the first evaluation period are all up to UE implementation.  Issue 2-3-7: Exiting criteria of BFD relaxation  First, we want to clarify that Option 5 is not our proposal, it is a typo in our contribution, sorry for the misleading. To avoid the confusion, we are OK to remove Option5.  We support Option 4; UE should revert to normal BFD measurement after several BFI. We propose that network configure the number of “several BFI” by a new parameter or a new counter.  Issue 2-3-8: Alternative N310/N311 values in relaxation mode  We support Option1 if Option3b in issue 2-3-6 is agreed.  Issue 2-3-9: Re-entry to the RLM relaxation mode  We propose Option1 in our contribution, and we give more clarification here.  We think after UE triggering the reverting, there should be a period of punish time to prevent UE to perform relaxation again. As we known, the relaxation should be performed under strict entering criteria, if reverting happens in this condition, it means channel quality is unstable which corresponds to two case. The first case is the channel quality is low and the variation is slow, in this case, the channel quality will not raise to entering threshold suddenly, the punish period can prevent extra relaxation evaluation. The second case is channel variation is fast, in this case, the punish period can avoid frequent “go into relaxation” and “fall back”.  Issue 2-3-10: Re-entry to the BFD relaxation mode  We propose Option1 in our discussion paper, and the reason of Option1 is same with the comments in Issue 2-3-9. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 2-3-1: Criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation – General**  What is meant by “combining” both serving cell quality and UE mobility? Can we rephrase it as follows: whether relaxed RLM/BFD requirements can be applied depends on the serving cell quality and UE mobility state”?  **Issue 2-3-2: Good serving cell quality criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**  Option 1 is agreeable.  **Issue 2-3-3: what is the radio link quality in Issue 2-3-2**  Option 1 is agreeable. But why does it apply only to RLM? Is the idea to have different radio link quality definition for applying relaxed BFD?  **Issue 2-3-4: different threshold for SSB based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD**  Can be decided based on the simulation performance.  **Issue 2-3-5: Low mobility criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**  What does option 3 mean? The relaxed requirements apply in low mobility state and then there is a need for such criteria.  We support option 5. But it shall be noted that option 5 can be combined with the UE decision, i.e. the UE is evaluating whether it has fulfilled the relaxation criteria. The UE can be allowed to apply relaxation when NW has configured the UE that it is in low mobility condition and when estimated radio link quality is above a threshold, this is performed in the UE.  **Issue 2-3-6: Exiting criteria of RLM relaxation**  We would like to understand the intention of the proposals here given that following was already agreed [**R4-2103670**]:  “*The UE while performing relaxed RLM upon detecting certain number of out-of-sync indications or upon triggering T310 or upon observed link quality degradation or mobility state change reverts to the normal RLM operation (i.e. without relaxation).”*  Given these agreements, we see that many of the options are already covered by these agreements.  It is important that the UE is not in relaxed mode when out of sync/RLF is detected.  The options 1 and 2 are not concrete enough to guarantee that UE exits relaxed RLM when out of syc is detected.  We therefore support option 3. We prefer option 3c but any of options 3a-3d are acceptable.  **Issue 2-3-7: Exiting criteria of BFD relaxation**  We also support option 3. Option 1 does not define concrete criterion for exiting.  **Issue 2-3-8: Alternative N310/N311 values in relaxation mode**  This needs more discussions in RAN4 and we also agree that it can be discussed further in the WI phase, i.e. whether it is possible to reuse existing counters, or predefine some value or introduce new counters.  **Issue 2-3-9: Re-entry to the RLM relaxation mode**  UE can evaluate the relaxation criteria again and if criteria are fulfilled then it can enter the relaxed mode again. We don’t see need to define new criteria for re-entry into RLM relaxed mode.  **Issue 2-3-10: Re-entry to the BFD relaxation mode**  UE can evaluate the relaxation criteria again and if criteria are fulfilled then it can enter the relaxed mode again. We don’t see need to define new criteria for re-entry into BFD relaxed mode. |
| Nokia | Issue 2-3-1: We support Option 1, but with the remark that since these are connected mode measurements, it needs to be made very sure that both criteria can be used in a robust manner.  Issue 2-3-2: We agree that radio link quality should be better than a threshold, but we would prefer to see concrete proposals for X and Y to be able to evaluate the proposal better. Could the Qout values be clarified related to Option 1? We understand this is a BLER value, not SINR. Qout values are agnostic to receiver design, while the dB values are not, so the formula needs some clarification.  Issue 2-3-3: As we proposed in our contribution, we support Option 1. However, it needs to be clearly defined what the actual SINR metric is before making a final agreement to use SINR as the metric. A clear mapping between SINR and radio performance does not exist at the moment. Hence, it needs to be discussed how the entry criteria can be defined in a receiver agnostic manner.  Issue 2-3-4: We would like to base such agreements on the simulation study. Also need to know first what the threshold is.  Issue 2-3-5: We support Option 4 as the proponent company, and Option 5 is also ok for us. Regarding the proposals against using the mobility criteria: if it is possible to use the UE mobility criteria for idle mode as in Rel-16, then why not for connected mode?  Issue 2-3-6: We support Option 3, but not alone. Option 1 is also important, but it needs to first be defined what the relaxation criteria is. It has to be made sure that the mechanism is robust and the UE will return back to normal measurements early enough to prevent degradation of the system performance.  Issue 2-3-7: Option 1 and 3 sound reasonable to us, but similar as for the previous issue, we think the relaxation criteria needs to be agreed first. At the end there may be many criteria under which the UE exits the relaxation mode, and the combination of these should guarantee robust system level performance.  Issue 2-3-8: We support Option 1.  Issue 2-3-9 and 2-3-10: For both of these issues, we would suggest postponing such detailed discussion until RAN4 has agreed on higher level details e.g. what is the relaxation entry/exit criteria and the feasible/beneficial relaxation scenarios. |
| Huawei | Issue 2-3-1:  Support option 1.  RLM/BFD relaxation need to be allowed in which mobility performance should not be impacted. For medium/high UE mobility, the delta-SINR error between legacy RLM/BFD and relaxed RLM/BFD would still be very large. Hence, the relaxation criteria shall consider link quality and UE mobility state together.  Issue 2-3-2:  Support option 1.  The values of X and Y can be derived based on the simulation results of delta-SINR in considering of different UE implementation.  Issue 2-3-3:  Support option 1.  Issue 2-3-4:  Suggest to postpone this issue.  RAN4 needs firstly to discuss on the methodology of defining the threshold, then to decide whether to use different thresholds for different cases.  Issue 2-3-6:  Support option 1.  Relaxed RLM is allowed if radio link quality is better than (Qout + XdB), UE would fallback to legacy RLM if radio link quality is worse than (Qout + XdB). Therefore, UE would fallback to legacy RLM before N310 starts to count and T310 starts running.  Issue 2-3-7:  Support option 1.  Relaxed BFD is allowed if radio link quality is better than (Qout,LR + YdB), UE would fallback to legacy BFD if radio link quality is worse than (Qout,LR + YdB). Therefore, UE would fallback to legacy BFD before UE detects BFI indication.  Issue 2-3-8:  The UE is assumed to perform relaxed RLM/BFD with good serving cell quality. UE would detect OOS/BFI indication when link quality get worse. However, UE would fallback to legacy RLM/BFD before link quality starts to get worse. So, there is no need to introduce alternate parameters for relaxed RLM/BFD. |
| OPPO | Issue 2-3-1: Option 1 is preferred.  Issue 2-3-2: Option 1 is OK.  Issue 2-3-3: Option 1 is OK.  Issue 2-3-4: FFS  Issue 2-3-5: Option 1& 5 are preferred.  Issue 2-3-6: For SINR as relaxation criterion, option 2a are fine. Option 1 is generally ok.  Issue 2-3-7: The similar comments as issue 2-3-6.  Issue 2-3-8: This depends on existing criterion discussed in 2-3-6. |
| CATT | Issue 2-3-1:  Support Option 1.  Issue 2-3-2:  Support Option 1.  But how to define X and Y. related to Issue 2-3-3  Issue 2-3-3:  Option 1 is fine. But how to define SINR here exactly need be FFS.  Issue 2-3-4: What is the threshold here?  Issue 2-3-5: Prefer Option 1 and 5.  Issue 2-3-6 Issue 2-3-7: Support Option 1. |
| MTK | **Issue 2-3-1: Criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation – General**  Support option 3. Option 1 might also be fine as long as RAN4 can find the precise metric for mobility. SINR might be impacted a lot by interference, and that variation does not indicate the true UE speed. Our understanding is SINR threshold should be enough.  **Issue 2-3-2: Good serving cell quality criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**  Support option 1  **Issue 2-3-3: what is the radio link quality in Issue 2-3-2**  Support option 1, 2, and 3  **Issue 2-3-4: different threshold for SSB based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD**  Agree with option 1.  **Issue 2-3-5: Low mobility criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**  Support option 2 and 3  Rel-16 criteria should not be reused. RSRP is actually the L3 measurement results, which might not be able to reflect the serving beam quality well. For example, when UE moves around the serving cell, the RSRP might not be variated a lot but the SINR for serving beam is actually changed (might be from beam 1 to beam2).  **Issue 2-3-6: Exiting criteria of RLM relaxation**  Support Option 2 and option 3a.  For option1, if same thresholds are applied for UE to enter and exit the power saving mode. Then UE will suffer the ping-pong issue.  For option 4, Network will not be able to predict the UE measurement behavior if RAN4 spec dose not specify any relaxation factor.  **Issue 2-3-7: Exiting criteria of BFD relaxation**  Support option 2.  **Issue 2-3-8: Alternative N310/N311 values in relaxation mode**  Depending on the conclusions of 2-3-6 and 2-3-7  **Issue 2-3-9: Re-entry to the RLM relaxation mode Issue 2-3-10: Re-entry to the BFD relaxation mode**  Prefer to postpone 2-3-9 and 2-3-10 until RAN4 has consensus on other issues. |

**Sub-topic 2-4 Relaxation scheme**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 2-4-1: **Relaxed evaluation period of RLM/BFD**  We do not think it is necessary to scale the out-of-sync evaluation period K times, while K = 2,3,…, if limited system level impact needs to be considered.  The extended evaluation period agreed in last meeting, in our understanding, is the interval between measurement samples for UE deriving RLM/BFD measurement results.  Therefore, we further propose another option:  Option 1c (or Option 2): If power saving conditions are satisfied, allow TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB for the first OOS indication and the original TEvaluate\_out\_SSB doesn’t apply.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Configuration | TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB (ms) | | no DRX | Max(200, Ceil(10 × P) × TSSB) | | DRX cycle≤80ms | Max(200, Ceil(15 × P) × Max(TDRX,TSSB) + (K-1) × Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | 80ms<DRX cycle≤320ms | Max(200, Ceil(15 × P) × Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | DRX cycle>320ms | Ceil(10 × P) × TDRX | | NOTE: TSSB is the periodicity of the SSB configured for RLM. TDRX is the DRX cycle length, K is the relaxation factor. | |   Issue 2-4-2: **Are the parameters of relaxation criteria predefined or configurable**  We support option 2, 3a, and 3b.  Option 4 is also acceptable, but we slightly not prefer it because scaling evaluation period 2 times is considered. In this case the impact to system is slightly higher. But we are open to further discussion.  Issue 2-4-3: **network or UE to determine the relaxation criteria is fulfilled or not**  We support option 1. Regarding option 1a, test cases are necessary.  Issue 2-4-4a: **Different Relaxation factors between FR1 and FR2**  Suggest to focus on 2-4-1 first. FFS.  Issue 2-4-4b: **Different Relaxation factors for different SINR range**  Suggest to focus on 2-4-1 first. FFS.  Issue 2-4-4c: **Different Relaxation factors for different UE speed**  Suggest to focus on 2-4-1 first. FFS.Issue 2-4-4e: **Different Relaxation factors for SSB and CSI-RS**  Suggest to focus on 2-4-1 first. FFS.Issue 2-4-4f: **Different Relaxation factors for different DRX cycle**  FFS  Issue 2-4-5:  For RRM, it is already agreed in RAN plenary and last RAN4.  For RLM and BFD, we don’t think measurement accuracy requirements needs to be impacted. Such accuracy requirement is to ensure the UE performance at cell-edge condition, which is important to UE experience and network performance. However, how UE relax RLM and BFD in higher SINR should not have any impact to such requirements. |
| QC | **Issue 2-4-1: Relaxed evaluation period of RLM/BFD**  We support option 1b. As we explained in issue 2-3-6, specifying the allowed additional delay in first OOS indication is beneficial to UE and system performance.  Vivo’s proposal option 1c/2 is fine for us if DRx 80~320ms is updated to satisfy the DRx cycle monotonicity w.r.t. evaluation time. We think RAN4 spec can directly use K = 2, but we are open to discuss K>2. Note that even with K = 2, UE can implement relaxation of taking one observation per x DRx cycles, x is up to 10, but need to adjust its implementation of exit condition accordingly to satisfy the requirement.  **Issue 2-4-2: Are the parameters of relaxation criteria predefined or configurable**  For low mobility condition, we can agree with option 2. For the good cell/link quality condition to enter power saving mode, we also can agree with option 2. But for exiting condition, we support option 4.  **Issue 2-4-3: network or UE to determine the relaxation criteria is fulfilled or not**  Support option 1  **Issue 2-4-4a: Different Relaxation factors between FR1 and FR2**  **Issue 2-4-4b: Different Relaxation factors for different SINR range**  **Issue 2-4-4c: Different Relaxation factors for different UE speed**  **Issue 2-4-4d: Different Relaxation factors for SSB and CSI-RS**  **Issue 2-4-4e: Different Relaxation factors for different DRX cycle**  Support the option of “Relaxation factor and exit SINR threshold (for good cell quality condition) is up to UE implementation, but the “additional delay for first OOS indication” requirement has to be satisfied” for the above 5 issues  **Issue 2-4-5: Measurement accuracy**  Under our proposal, no measurement accuracy should be defined |
| Apple | Issue 2-4-1: Option 1 is agreeble.  Issue 2-4-2: Option 2. Network configure the criterion.  Issue 2-4-3: Option 1.  Issue 2-4-4a: Option 1. Different factors for FR1 and FR2  Issue 2-4-4b: Agree with WF.  Issue 2-4-4c: FFS after mobility criterion is defined.  Issue 2-4-4d: Agree with WF  Issue 2-4-4e: Agree with WF. |
| ZTE | 2-4-2:  We actually want to suggest a new Option with a slightly different wording than Option 2. The original wording in our paper is “The relaxation criteria shall be configured by the network to the UE. If the threshold (criteria) is not configured, it means the UE cannot go into relaxation mode.”  This means that there is no pre-defined threshold. The threshold must be configured by the network. If no threshold is configured, the UE cannot enter relaxation mode.  Issue 2-4-3: **network or UE to determine the relaxation criteria is fulfilled or not**  We support option 1a. The threshold must be configured by the network. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 2-4-1: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-4-2: Option 2 is fine to us. Also agree with ZTE’s view.  Issue 2-4-3: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-4-4a: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-4-4b: Wait the conclusion from other open issues  Issue 2-4-4c: Wait the conclusion from other open issues  Issue 2-4-4d: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-4-4e: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-4-4f: Wait the conclusion from other open issues |
| Intel | **Issue 2-4-2:** Option 2. Network configure the criterion.  **Issue 2-4-3:** Option 1. |
| CMCC | Issue 2-4-1: Relaxed evaluation period of RLM/BFD  We think the definition of scaling factor should consider two factors below:   RLM/BFD performance after relaxation   The evaluation period after relaxation, which should be smaller or equal to a threshold  Issue 2-4-2: Are the parameters of relaxation criteria predefined or configurable  We support Option2.  Issue 2-4-3: network or UE to determine the relaxation criteria is fulfilled or not  Support the Option1.  Issue 2-4-4a: Different Relaxation factors between FR1 and FR2  Basically, we think relaxation factors can be configured by network according to some rules that:   RLM/BFD performance after relaxation   The evaluation period after relaxation, which should be smaller or equal to a threshold  So different relaxation factors can be applied.  Issue 2-4-4b:  Same views with the comments in Issue 2-4-4a  Issue 2-4-4c:  Same views with the comments in Issue 2-4-4a  Issue 2-4-4e:  Same views with the comments in Issue 2-4-4a  Issue 2-4-4f: Other consideration on Relaxation factors  We support Option3 here. Option3 is a rule for relaxation factor configuration, relaxation factor can configure to any value as long as the rule is fulfilled. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 2-4-1: Relaxed evaluation period of RLM/BFD**  Option 1 is agreeable. In our view, the scaling factor should be based on maximum of SSB periodicity and DRX cycle since the UE samples at max(TDRX, TSSB). If SSB based measurements are used for RLM/BFD evaluations then how often UE measures depends on the periodicity of SSB which can vary from 5 ms to 160 ms.  **Issue 2-4-2: Are the parameters of relaxation criteria predefined or configurable**  We support option 2.  **Issue 2-4-3: network or UE to determine the relaxation criteria is fulfilled or not**  Option 1 is agreeable. Criteria can be configured by the network but UE can evaluates and determines whether it has fulfilled the criteria when NW has configured the UE that it is in low mobility condition and when estimated radio link quality is above a threshold.  **Issue 2-4-4a: Different Relaxation factors between FR1 and FR2**  We support option 1. The simulation results show different performance between FR1 and FR2 which is the motivation for allowing different relaxation factor s for FR1 and FR2.  **Issue 2-4-4b: Different Relaxation factors for different SINR range**  We support option 1. The simulation results show different performance depending on the SINR region. Thus it is reasonable to assume different level of relaxation depending on the SINR range.  **Issue 2-4-4c: Different Relaxation factors for different UE speed**  We have observed different performance at 3km/h and 30km/h. It will be very difficult to differentiate between these two speeds at the node which is going to determine the UE mobility state. This will also increase the complexity of the feature. We should try to keep it simple. Therefore our preference is to define one relaxation factor regardless of the UE speed. We also prefer to define that relaxation factor based on UE mobility of 3 km/h. Therefore we support option 1. Option 2 is not clear. The relaxation factor should be known, and it should not be up to the UE. The UE, on the other hand, can decide not to apply that relaxation factor even if relaxation criteria is met. But the factor itself should be known.  **Issue 2-4-4d: Different Relaxation factors for SSB and CSI-RS**  If the performance are different between SSB and CSI-RS, then we are open to applying different relaxation factors.  **Issue 2-4-4e: Different Relaxation factors for different DRX cycle**  We have observed different performance depending on how frequent UE measures. For example, our results show that relaxation might be possible for shorter DRX cycles in FR2 with SSB compared to longer DRX cycles (still below 80 ms). Thus we support option 1.  **Issue 2-4-4f: Other consideration on Relaxation factors**  We have observed different performance at 3km/h and 30km/h. It will be very difficult to differentiate between these two speeds at the node which is going to determine the UE mobility state. This will also increase the complexity of the feature. We should try to keep it simple. Therefore our preference is to define one relaxation factor regardless of the UE speed. We also prefer to define that relaxation factor based on UE mobility of 3 km/h. Therefore we support option 1. Option 2 is not clear. The relaxation factor should be known, and it should not be up to the UE. The UE, on the other hand, can decide not to apply that relaxation factor even if relaxation criteria is met. But the factor itself should be known.  **Issue 2-4-5: Measurement accuracy**  The existing measurement accuracy requirements shall be applied also during relaxation, no specification impact to the measurement accuracy |
| Nokia | Issue 2-4-1: Could it be clarified what Option 1 means regarding the formula for Qout, and which part of Option 1 does the recommended WF suggests to agree on?  Issue 2-4-2: Option 2: The parameters should be network configurable.  Issue 2-4-3: Option 1 is ok for us assuming that network configures the criteria.  Issue 2-4-4a, 2-4-4b, 2-4-4c, 2-4-4e, 2-4-4f: All these issues go into details, and we think higher level discussion related to issues such as feasible relaxation scenarios and relaxation criteria should be completed first. These proposals are also directly related to the simulation study and seeing the whole picture of the simulation analysis would be helpful before making such agreements.  Issue 2-4-5: It was already agreed in the plenary that RRM is not in the scope of the WI, so Option 1 is ok otherwise, but RRM does not need to be included. |
| Huawei | Issue 2-4-1:  Support option 1a. FFS the value of Y used for relaxed RLM/BFD evaluation period.  Issue 2-4-2:  RAN4 needs to discuss on what parameters will be used in RLM/BFD relaxation criteria. Then, RAN4 decides which parameters need to be predefined or network-configured.  The parameters related to link quality judgement are up to UE implementation and can be predefined.  Issue 2-4-3:  Support option 1.  Relaxed RLM/BFD is allowed for a UE with good serving cell quality in low mobility state. However, the serving cell quality and mobility state for a UE may change over time, and it is difficult for network to predict the serving cell quality and mobility state of a UE. UE could determine whether the relaxation criteria is met based on the measured quantities.  Issue 2-4-4a/b/c/d/e/f:  RAN4 can specify a fix evaluation period for relaxed RLM/BFD. The sample number and sampling interval used for relaxed RLM/BFD measurement are up to UE implementation.  For example, if the evaluation period for relaxed RLM is defined as 20\*max(TRLM-RS, TDRX), then the UE can implement based on 10 samples and 2\*max(TRLM-RS, TDRX) sampling interval (relaxation factor X=2), or implement based on 5 samples and 4\*max(TRLM-RS, TDRX) sampling interval (relaxation factor X=4).  Issue 2-4-5:  The measurement accuracy requirements for RLM/BFD have not been implicitly defined in RRM performance part. But the measurement accuracy for RLM/BFD can be considered on how to define test cases. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 2-4-1: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-4-2: Option 2 is fine.  Issue 2-4-3: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-4-4a: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-4-4b: FFS  Issue 2-4-4c: FFS  Issue 2-4-4d: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-4-4e: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-4-4f: FFS |
| CATT | Issue 2-4-1: Support Option 1. For the K value and DRX affection, It is related to outcomes of other open issues. So we propose to use [Y]. Y is FFS for different configuration.  Issue 2-4-2: Support option 2.  Issue 2-4-3: In our understanding, the criteria is configured by network but UE determines whether it is fulfilled or not.  Issue 2-4-4a Issue 2-4-4b Issue 2-4-4c Issue 2-4-4d Issue 2-4-4e Issue 2-4-4f: Need further evidence. Prefer to FFS. |
| MTK | **Issue 2-4-1: Relaxed evaluation period of RLM/BFD**  Support option 1a.  **Issue 2-4-2: Are the parameters of relaxation criteria predefined or configurable**  Option 1, 2 and 3 are fine.  **Issue 2-4-3: network or UE to determine the relaxation criteria is fulfilled or not**  Support option 1  **Issue 2-4-4a: Different Relaxation factors between FR1 and FR2**  Support option 1  **Issue 2-4-4b: Different Relaxation factors for different SINR range**  Support option 1  **Issue 2-4-4c: Different Relaxation factors for different UE speed**  We prefer not to set mobility criterion Support option 1 if low mobility criterion is agreed.  **Issue 2-4-4d: Different Relaxation factors for SSB and CSI-RS**  Support option 1  **Issue 2-4-4e: Different Relaxation factors for different DRX cycle**  Support option 1  **Issue 2-4-4f: Other consideration on Relaxation factors**  FFS  **Issue 2-4-5: Measurement accuracy**  Support option 1 |

**Sub-topic 2-5 Others**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| XXX | Issue 2-5-1: **Entering relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**  We support option 2 because UE measures only one CC as agreed in R16. This can be FFS.  Issue 2-5-2: **Exiting relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**  FFS.  Issue 2-5-3: **Relaxation criteria in intra-band CA/DC**  We support option 1 and 1a because UE measures only one CC as agreed in R16. FFS  Issue 2-5-4: **Applicability for BFD relaxation requirement**  Option 1 is fine. |
| Apple | Issue 2-5-1: Option 2. Relax for all other serving cells for UE power benefit.  Issue 2-5-2: Agree with WF  Issue 2-5-3: Option 1.  Issue 2-5-4: Agree with option 1 |
| ZTE | **Issue 2-5-1:** Support Option 1. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 2-5-1: Support Option 2.  Issue 2-5-2: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-5-3: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-5-4: Support Option 1. |
| Intel | **Issue 2-5-3:** Support Option 1. |
| CMCC | Issue 2-5-1: Entering relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC  For this issue, we support Option1. The UE behavior under Option1 is same with the UE behavior under Option2 in most cases, since the measurement results for intra-band cells is same based on our common understanding. However, when the conner case happens that the measurement results for intra-band cells have large gap, or when the relaxation criteria for sPCell and Scell is different, Option1 can guarantee the network performance.  Issue 2-5-2: Exiting relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC  For this issue, we want to add a new proposal:  For intra-band CA/DC, if UE meets the conditions of reverting to the normal RLM/BFD in the serving cell(s), it is expected the reversion operations are applied to the serving cell(s).  We are Ok with Option1.  Issue 2-5-3: Relaxation criteria in intra-band CA/DC  We support Option2 that if relaxation criteria can be configured by network, theoretically, SpCells and SCells can be configured with different RLM/BFD measurement relaxation criteria.  Issue 2-5-4: Applicability for BFD relaxation requirement  In our view, the BFD relaxation requirement is applicable for the serving cells which perform measurement relaxation. |
| Ericsson | **Issue 2-5-1: Entering relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**  We support option 2. Option 2 is also improve the UE power consumption. In intra-band CA/DC operating scenarios, multiple serving cells may belong to the same frequency band and the RF front end is typically shared for between those cells (e.g. SpCell and SCells). If UE evaluates whether it fulfills the low criterion based on a measurement, then there would be very little difference between those in the different serving cells because they operate in the same band. In such scenarios, the UE does not have to evaluate the relaxation criterion separately for every serving cell. Why to evaluate the criteria for every cell separately? Treating all together simplifies the evaluation in the criteria when in intra-band CA, and also good from UE power consumption perspective.  **Issue 2-5-2: Exiting relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**  We agree to the recommended WF. Support option 1.s  **Issue 2-5-3: Relaxation criteria in intra-band CA/DC**  For the reasons explain in issue 2-5-1, we support option 1.  **Issue 2-5-4: Applicability for BFD relaxation requirement**  Option 1 is fine. |
| Nokia | Issue 2-5-1: We support Option 1. To guarantee system level performance, we think that in general the UE should only perform relaxed measurements if the cell itself fulfils the relaxation criteria.  Issue 2-5-2: We think this should be cell specific.  Issue 2-5-3: We think the criteria may be the same, but the decision about whether to relax the measurements on a certain cell should be cell specific.  Issue 2-5-4: Does this mean that relaxation can in general be done on all these cells or is the proposal related to the previous issues on how to relax in CA? |
| Huawei | Issues 2-5-1/2/3/4:  These issues are discussed based on the assumption that UE needs to perform RLM/BFD measurements on multiple serving cells in the same band. However, the existing RLM/BFD measurement requirements are not applicable when UE needs to perform RLM/BFD measurements on more than one serving cells in the same band.  In TS 38.133, the following conditions are defined for RLM and BFD:   |  | | --- | | 8.1.1 Introduction The requirements in clause 8.1 apply for radio link monitoring on:  - PCell in SA NR, NR-DC and NE-DC operation mode,  - PSCell in NR-DC and EN-DC operation mode. 8.5.2.1 Introduction The requirements in this clause apply for each SSB resource in the set  configured for a serving cell, provided that the SSB configured for beam failure detection is actually transmitted within the UE active DL BWP during the entire evaluation period specified in clause 8.5.2.2. The requirements in this clause could not be applicable if UE is required to perform beam failure detection on more than 1 serving cell per band. 8.5.3.1 Introduction The requirements in this clause apply for each CSI-RS resource in the set  of resource configurations for a serving cell, provided that the CSI-RS resource(s) in set for beam failure detection are actually transmitted within the UE active DL BWP during the entire evaluation period specified in clause 8.5.3.2. UE is not expected to perform beam failure detection measurements on the CSI-RS configured for BFD if the CSI-RS is not QCL-ed, with QCL-TypeD when applicable, with the RS in the active TCI state of any CORESET configured in the UE active BWP. The requirements in this clause could not be applicable if UE is required to perform beam failure detection on more than 1 serving cell per band or on more than one band among a set of bands that it can receive with a common beam. |   According to TS38.133, the followings can be obtained:  For RLM, UE will only perform RLM measurements on PCell or PSCell.  For BFD, UE is only required to perform BFD measurements on one serving cell per band.  Within a band, only three cases would occur:  Case 1: PCell is in the band, and UE is only required to perform RLM and BFD measurements on PCell.  Case 2: PSCell is in the band, and UE is only required to perform RLM and BFD measurements on PSCell.  Case 3: SpCell is not in the band, and UE is only required to perform BFD measurements on one activated SCell.  Since intra-band NR-DC has not been introduced, PCell and PSCell could not be in the same band.  Hence, it will not occur that UE needs to perform RLM/BFD measurements on multiple serving cells in the same band. |
| Xiaomi | Issue 2-5-1: Support Option 2.  Issue 2-5-2: Support Option 2. For option 1, it seems contradictory with option 2 in issue 2-5-1.  If UE meets the conditions of reverting to the normal RLM/BFD in one serving cell, but still existing at least one serving cell in which UE fulfilled the criterion for relaxed mode, it is allowed to operate BFD in relaxed mode in all other serving cells,  Issue 2-5-3: Support Option 1.  Issue 2-5-4: Support Option 1. |
| CATT | Issue 2-5-1: Support Option 1  Issue 2-5-2: We would like to leave it open.  Issue 2-5-3: It depends on the outcomes of other issues in 2-3. Need more discussion.  Issue 2-5-4: Support Option 1 |
| MTK | **Issue 2-5-1: Entering relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**  We support option 2.  **Issue 2-5-2: Exiting relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**  Support option 1.  **Issue 2-5-3: Relaxation criteria in intra-band CA/DC**  Support option 1.  **Issue 2-5-4: Applicability for BFD relaxation requirement**  Support option 1. |

### CRs/TPs comments collection

*Major close to finalize WIs and Rel-15 maintenance, comments collections can be arranged for TPs and CRs. For Rel-16 on-going WIs, suggest to focus on open issues discussion on 1st round.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **Comments collection** |
| XXX | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |
| YYY | Company A |
| Company B |
|  |

## Summary for 1st round

### Open issues

**Sub-topic 2-1 Evaluation assumption**

**Issue 2-1-1: Evaluation assumption update**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.**  1 company proposes Option 1 to update simulation assumption .  2 companies disagree with Option 1.  2 company asks clarification about the motivation and the updated model/SINR estimation error.    **Recommended WF**: Further discuss in the 2nd round. Please check proponent's response in the 1st round. |

**Issue 2-1-2: assumption on other RRM measurement**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.**  4 companies are fine with option 2.  1 company has concern on option 2.  2 companies are fine with option 1.    **Options:**   * Further evaluate UE power saving gains for the following UE implementations:   + Option 1: (**Nokia**, **CMCC**)     - UE uses all L1 samples for RRM measurements based on Rel-15 assumptions.   + Option 2: (**Qualcomm**, **vivo, Apple, CMCC, MTK**)     - How many L1 samples UE applies for RRM measurements is up to UE implementation. (e.g. UE can use lower number of measurement samples for RRM measurements)   **Moderator's comment:**  This issue was discussed in the RAN Plenary and the guidance is  *“For Rel-17 WI of UE power saving enhancements for NR, no specification impact to RRM measurement procedure requirements and measurement performance requirements is expected."*  No clear consensus is observed and repeated discussion will lead to the same conclusion as the RAN Plenary's guidance that no spec impact on RRM measurement procedure requirements and measurement performance requirements is expected.    **Recommended WF**:  Further discuss this issue in the 2nd round. Companies please elaborate and clarify the concerns. Note that it should follow RANP’s guidance. |

**Issue 2-1-3: Impact on PDCCH monitoring**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **Clear consensus that** all companies agree on not to discuss this issue until RAN1 has reached more progress.  1 company suggested the wording to be captured in WF.    **Recommended WF**:  Work on WF directly, to conclude the exact wording to be captured in WF. The draft WF is provided:  *RAN4 shall assess the interaction between PDCCH relaxation (as being discussed in RAN1) and RLM/BM relaxation (as being discussed in RAN4) from power consumption perspective once there is more progress in RAN1 on PDCCH relaxation.* |

**Sub-topic 2-2 Feasible scenarios for relaxation**

**Issue 2-2-1: Observations on the simulation results of power saving gain**

**Issue 2-2-2: Observations on the simulation results of delta SINR**

**Issue 2-2-3: Observations on the simulation results of increased latency**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status of Issue 2-2-1, 2-2-2, 2-2-3:**  All companies agree on the observation should be made based on the collected simulation results.    **Recommended WF:**   * Work on WF directly, to capture the observations of the simulation result in the 2nd round. |

**Issue 2-2-4: Feasible Scenarios from both power Saving gain and system impact**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  Companies expresses views on the feasible scenarios.  Majority agree on Option 1, while one company suggest whether to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements can be up to UE implementation.    **Options:**   * Case 1: SSB based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1   + Option 1: Yes (**MTK,** **CATT,** **Qualcomm (prioritized)**, **vivo,** **Apple,** **Ericsson, oppo**)   + Option 2: whether to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements can be up to UE implementation. (Huawei) * Case 2: CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1   + Option 1: Yes (**MTK,** **CATT,** **Qualcomm (open to discuss)**, **vivo, Apple, oppo**)   + Option 2: whether to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements can be up to UE implementation. (Huawei) * Case 3: CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2   + Option 1: Yes (**MTK,** **CATT,** **vivo**)   + Option 2: whether to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements can be up to UE implementation. (Huawei) * Case 4: SSB based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2   + Option 1: Yes (**MTK,** **CATT,** **Ericsson**)   + Option 2: whether to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements can be up to UE implementation. (Huawei)     **Moderator's comment:**  My understanding on this issues is to identify the feasible scenarios and the corresponding requirement would be defined in the work phase. Becase case 1 is supported by the most of companies, so the draft WF is provided with case 1 as the starting point.    **Recommended WF:** Work on WF directly, and the draft WF is provided:  *RAN4 conclude the feasible scenario and will define the RLM/BFD requirements for R17 UE measurements relaxation for RLM and/or BFD in work phase for the following cases,*   * *Case 1: SSB based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1* * *FFS Case 2: CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1* * *FFS Case 3: CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2* * *FFS Case 4: SSB based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2* |

**Issue 2-2-5: Considerations on the feasibility study**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.**  2 companies provides comments on Option 1.  1 company provides comments on Option 2.  1 company disagrees with Option 1 and Option 2.    **Proposals:**   * Option 1: Negative system level impact due to RLM/BFD relaxation should be minimized e.g. by studying the time of outage with different relaxation factors. (Nokia) * Option 2: RAN4 needs to study whether the beneficial scenario is a reasonable case for network configuration. (Huawei)   **Recommended WF**:  Further discuss the proposals regarding the comments provided. |

**Issue 2-2-6: DRX cycle applicability**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  5 companies are fine with Option 2.  2 companies are fine with Option 1.  1 company commented it should be based on the simulation result.  **Options**   * Option 1: relaxation is applicable for DRX=20ms or DRX=40ms. (**CATT,** **MTK**) * Option 2: relaxation is applicable for DRX <= 80 ms. (**Ericsson**, **vivo, Huawei, Oppo, MTK**)   + Option 2a: relaxation is applicable for DRX <= 80 ms, but adjustment to other DRx cycles is needed to keep the monotonicity of DRx cycles w.r.t. evaluation time (**QC**)   + Option 2b. Maximum relaxation factor should be related to DRX cycle. (Apple)   **Moderator's comment:**   * Simulation results for DRX of 80 ms is provided in R4-2106851. Companies are encouraged to check the simulation results.   **Recommended WF:** Work on WF directly, and the draft WF is provided:   * Relaxation is applicable for DRX<=40ms.   + FFS DRX of 80 ms   + FFS adjustment to other DRx cycles is needed to keep the monotonicity of DRx cycles w.r.t. evaluation time   + FFS Maximum relaxation factor should be related to DRX cycle. |

**Issue 2-2-7: Potential spec impact**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  4 companies suggest to discuss it in the work phase. (HW, MTK, Nokia, Apple)  **Proposals**   * Option 1: In the study phase of this WI, RAN4 conclude the potential spec impact of R17 power saving. (vivo)   **Recommended WF**:  The spec impact of R17 power saving will be discussed in the work phase. |

**Issue 2-2-8: LS to RAN2 on the study phase conclusion**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.**  Most of companies commented it is too early to send the LS before more progress are made.  **Proposals**   * Option 1: Send LS to RAN2 in this meeting, in order to inform RAN2 on the progress that RAN4 has made. (vivo)   **Recommended WF**   * Companies in support of the LS to RAN1 should clarify the intention and proposed content of the LS, otherwise defer sending the LS |

**Sub-topic 2-3 Relaxation criteria**

**Issue 2-3-1: Criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation – General**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  Most of companies are fine with Option 1.  3 companies provides further comments on Option 1.  **Proposals**   * Option 1: The RLM/BFD relaxation criteria needs to combine both serving cell quality and UE mobility state. (**Huawei,** **Apple, CATT**, **Qualcomm**, **Intel,** **vivo, ZTE, Xiaomi, Nokia, oppo, CMCC**)   + Entering conditions: both good serving cell quality and low UE mobility are satisfied. * Option 2: Take UE mobility as the major factor into the criteria. * Option 3: RAN4 to study the necessity of mobility criterion for Rel-17 power saving. (**MTK,** **vivo**)   **Moderator's comment**  Majority supports Option 1.  @MTK: Is it ok to compromise with Option 1?  **Recommended WF**:  Based on the comment on Option 1, the draft WF is suggested below:  whether relaxed RLM/BFD requirements can be applied depends on the serving cell quality and UE mobility state   * FFS the precise and robust metric for serving cell quality and UE mobility state |

**Issue 2-3-2: Good serving cell quality criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status**  **Clear consensus on Option 1.**  **Proposals**   * Option 1: radio link quality is better than a threshold. (**CATT,** **Qualcomm**, **Ericsson,** **Oppo,** **MTK,** **vivo, Huawei, Apple, Xiaomi, intel, CMCC, Nokia**)   + radio link quality > Qout + X (dB) for RLM   + radio link quality > Qout,LR + Y (dB) for BFD relaxation.   + FFS X, Y * Option 1a: Define network-configured thresholds reflecting SINR regions for RLM and BFD relaxation. Such threshold is the same for RLM and BFD. (**vivo**)   **Moderator's comment**  All companies are fine with Option 1.  Whether BLER or SINR should be considered as the radio link quality can be considered in the Issue 2-3-3.  How to define the threshold, e.g. the same threshold, can be further discussed as in the value of X, Y.  **Tentative agreement**  Good serving cell quality criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation is defined as the radio link quality is better than a threshold.   * FFS radio link quality > Qout + X (dB) for RLM * FFS radio link quality > Qout,LR + Y (dB) for BFD relaxation. * FFS X, Y   **Recommended WF**: Further discuss the sub-bullets in the 2nd round. |

**Issue 2-3-3: what is the radio link quality in Issue 2-3-2**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status**  No objection on Option 1.  **Proposals**   * Option 1: based on SINR. (**CMCC**, **Qualcomm**, **Intel**, **Nokia,** **Oppo,** **MTK, vivo, Ericsson, Huawei, CATT**)   + Option 1a: (**Intel, CMCC**)     - Since SINR value varies with time, a more robust criteria based on SINR is expected to be discussed.     - SINR will be evaluated during a time window to check if it satisfies the criteria of relaxation or not. The exact window length and how to process SINR value during the window for relaxing RLM/BFD can be further studied. * Option 2: based on BLER of hypothetical PDCCH. (**Xiaomi**, **MTK, vivo**) * Option 3: **BFD** should be relaxed at least better than CBD condition. Whether **RSRP** is also needed to be considered for relaxation criteria of BFD needs further discussion. (**Intel, MTK**)   **Moderator's comment**  No objection on Option 1.  @ Xiaomi: please check if it is ok to go with Option 1  **Recommended WF**: Work on WF directly. The draft WF is suggested below:  The radio link quality in good serving cell quality criteria for R17 RLM/BFD relaxation is based on SINR   * FFS how to define the metric of SINR * FFS whether RSRP is also needed for BFD as additional condition |

**Issue 2-3-4: different threshold for SSB based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.** Companies suggested to postpone the discussion.  **Recommended WF**: Proponent may still clarify the proposal regarding companies questions |

**Issue 2-3-5: Low mobility criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status**  **No clear consensus.**  **Proposals**   * Option 1: R16 low mobility condition applies to RLM/BFD relaxation. (**Qualcomm, apple, Xiaomi, oppo, CATT**)   + If R16 low mobility condition is adapted, RAN4 derives SINR distribution for margin derivation from link level simulation without mobility and with small scale fading. * Option 2: R16 RRM relaxation criterion can NOT be directly used. (**CMCC**, **Intel**, **vivo**)   + Option 2a (**CMCC**):     - The SINR (value and variation) of serving cell can be used for low-mobility criterion.     - If SINR drift rate is under a threshold during a certain estimation period, then the UE can be considered to fulfil the serving cell’s quality variation rule. * Option 3: RAN4 to study the necessity of mobility criterion for Rel-17 power saving. (**MTK**, **vivo**) * Option 4: Consider time associated with a given condition when determining UE mobility state. (**Nokia,** **apple, Xiaomi, MTK**) * Option 5: Low mobility scenario under which the UE is allowed to apply the RLM/BM requirements is determined and configured to UE by the network, and it is up to the UE whether to apply relaxed RLM/BM requirements when configured. (**Ericsson,** **vivo, apple, Xiaomi, Nokia, oppo, CATT**)   **Recommended WF**: Proposing company should elaborate and answer questions. |

**Issue 2-3-6: Exiting criteria of RLM relaxation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status**  **No clear consensus.**  **Proposals**   * Option 1: exit relaxation mode when any relaxation criterion is not met (**CATT,** **Apple**, **ZTE**, **Huawei**, **Nokia, Oppo**) * Option 2: exit relaxation mode when the radio link quality is worse than a certain threshold. (**vivo, Xiaomi, MTK**)   + Option 2a: set different radio link quality threshold for entering and exiting the relaxation (**CMCC,** **Vivo**, **Intel**, **Oppo**)   + Option 2b: UE falls back to normal mode if either the averaged SINR based on reduced number of samples is below Thquit, or the one-shot SINR is below Qout. (**vivo**) * Option 3: exit relaxation mode based on out-of-sync indication. (**Apple,** **Xiaomi**, **CMCC**, **Nokia,** **Ericsson**)   + Option 3a: exit when N310 starts to count, i.e. 1 out-of-sync indication. (**MTK**)   + Option 3b: exit when T310 is running (**CMCC**)   + Option 3c: exit when certain number of out-of-indications (**Ericsson**)   + Option 3d: exit when certain consecutive out-of-sync indications (**CMCC**) * Option 4 (**QC**) : Additional time is allowed for UE to evaluate first OOS indication when UE is in power saving mode. UE is in normal mode after first OOS indication. The additional delay for RLF declaration is guaranteed to be within OOS evaluation time (TEvaluate\_out\_SSB) in normal mode. Relaxation factor and exit SINR threshold (for good cell quality condition) is up to UE implementation, but the “first OOS indication” requirement has to be satisfied.      |  |  | | --- | --- | | Configuration | TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB (ms) | | no DRX | Max(200, Ceil(10  P)  TSSB) | | DRX cycle≤80ms | Max(200, Ceil(30  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | 80ms<DRX cycle≤320ms | Max(200, Ceil(20  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | DRX cycle>320ms | Ceil(10  P)  TDRX | | NOTE: TSSB is the periodicity of the SSB configured for RLM. TDRX is the DRX cycle length. | |     **Recommended WF**: Proposing company should elaborate and answer questions. |

**Issue 2-3-7: Exiting criteria of BFD relaxation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **No clear consensus.**   * Proposals   + Option 1: exit relaxation mode when any relaxation criterion is not met (**CATT,** **Apple**, **Huawei, Nokiax, Oppo**)   + Option 2: exit relaxation mode when the radio link quality is worse than a certain threshold. (**Xiaomi, vivo, MTK)**     - Option 2a: set different radio link quality threshold for entering and exiting the relaxation (**vivo**, **Intel,** **Oppo**)     - Option 2b: UE falls back to normal mode if either the averaged SINR based on reduced number of samples is below Thquit, or the one-shot SINR is below Qout. (**vivo**)   + Option 3: exit relaxation mode upon detect 1 beam failure instance indication. (**Ericsson,** **ZTE**, **Apple, Nokia**)   + Option 4: exit relaxation mode after BFI\_COUNTER add to the value of a new counter or a new parameter, the new counter or the new parameter is configured by network. (**CMCC**)   + ~~Option 5: exit relaxation mode~~~~upon RLF (CMCC)~~   + Option 6: no need for the exiting criteria for BFD relaxation. (**Xiaomi**)     **Recommended WF**: Proposing company should elaborate and answer questions. |

**Issue 2-3-8: Alternative N310/N311 values in relaxation mode**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.** Companies think more discussion needed.  **Recommended WF**: Postpone the discussion in the work phase, since it depends on other open issue. |

**Issue 2-3-9: Re-entry to the RLM relaxation mode**

**Issue 2-3-10: Re-entry to the BFD relaxation mode**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status of Issue 2-3-9, 2-3-10:**  **No clear consensus.** Companies suggested to postpone the discussion.  **Recommended WF**: Postpone the discussion until relaxation criteria is clearer. |

**Sub-topic 2-4 Relaxation scheme**

**Issue 2-4-1: Relaxed evaluation period of RLM/BFD**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.**    **Proposals**   * Option 1: Scaling factor defining the relaxed RLM/BFD evaluation period is defined based on max(TDRX, TSSB). (**Ericsson,** **Apple**, **CATT,** **Qualcomm**, **Xiaomi**)   + Option 1a:The similar definition of RLM/BFD evaluation period in Rel-15 can be reused as Max(T, Ceil([Y] x P x N) x Max(TDRX,TSSB)) (**Huawei, MTK**)     - FFS the value of Y used for relaxed RLM/BFD evaluation period.   + Option 1b: If power saving conditions are satisfied, allow TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB for the first OOS indication and the original TEvaluate\_out\_SSB doesn’t apply. (**Qualcomm**)      |  |  | | --- | --- | | Configuration | TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB (ms) | | no DRX | Max(200, Ceil(10  P)  TSSB) | | DRX cycle≤80ms | Max(200, Ceil(30  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | 80ms<DRX cycle≤320ms | Max(200, Ceil(20  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | DRX cycle>320ms | Ceil(10  P)  TDRX | | NOTE: TSSB is the periodicity of the SSB configured for RLM. TDRX is the DRX cycle length. | |      * Option 1c: If power saving conditions are satisfied, allow TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB for the first OOS indication and the original TEvaluate\_out\_SSB doesn’t apply. (**vivo**)  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Configuration | TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB (ms) | | no DRX | Max(200, Ceil(10  P)  TSSB) | | DRX cycle≤80ms | Max(200, Ceil(15  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB) + (K-1)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | 80ms<DRX cycle≤320ms | Max(200, Ceil(15  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | DRX cycle>320ms | Ceil(10  P)  TDRX | | NOTE: TSSB is the periodicity of the SSB configured for RLM. TDRX is the DRX cycle length, K is the relaxation factor. | |      * **Recommended WF**: Is the main bullet of Option 1 agreeable, and FFS on option 1a~1c? |

**Issue 2-4-2: Are the parameters of relaxation criteria predefined or configurable**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.**   * Most of companies are fine with Option 2. * One company can agree Option 2 except for exiting criteria. * One company suggest to agree on the parameters first, then discuss whether it is configured or predefined.     **Proposals**   * Option 1: The parameters of relaxation criteria should be predefined. (**MTK**) * Option 2: The parameters of relaxation criteria can be configured by the network. (**Apple,** **vivo**, **Ericsson,** **QC, Xiaomi, Intel, CMCC, Nokia, CATT, MTK**) * Option 2a: The relaxation criteria shall be configured by the network to the UE. If the threshold (criteria) is not configured, it means the UE cannot go into relaxation mode.” (**ZTE, Xiaomi**) * Option 3: No parameter for low mobility criteria (**MTK**)   + Option 3a: Low mobility cell can be configured by network in RRC without any thresholds, e.g. for indoor cells. (**vivo**)   + Option 3b: Low mobility scenario under which the UE is allowed to apply the RLM/BM requirements is determined and configured to UE by the network, and it is up to the UE whether to apply relaxed RLM/BM requirements when configured.(**vivo**) * Option 4 (**QC**): The parameters of relaxation criterion of low mobility and entering condition of good cell quality can be configured by the network. Exit condition of good cell quality is up to UE implementation, as long as the additional delay for RLF declaration is guaranteed to be within OOS evaluation time (TEvaluate\_out\_SSB) in normal mode   **Recommended WF**: Proponent of option2 should clarify which parameters in the relaxation criteria can be configured by the network. |

**Issue 2-4-3: network or UE to determine the relaxation criteria is fulfilled or not**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**   * Most of companies are fine with Option 1. * One company proposes Option 1a.   **Proposals**   * Option 1: UE determines whether the relaxation criteria can be fulfilled or not. (**CMCC,** **Xiaomi,** **Intel,** **Apple, QC,** **vivo, Ericsson, Nokia, Huawei, CATT, MTK**) * Option 1a: The UE can determine alone if the criteria (configured by the network) is met and enter the low mobility mode to use a relaxed requirements for RLM and RLF if there will be test cases defined to test the UE behaviors. (**ZTE**)   **Recommended WF**: Opponent of Option 1 should clarify and elaborate their concerns. Option 1 is suggested as draft WF. |

**Issue 2-4-4a: Different Relaxation factors between FR1 and FR2**

**Issue 2-4-4b: Different Relaxation factors for different SINR range**

**Issue 2-4-4c: Different Relaxation factors for different UE speed**

**Issue 2-4-4d: Different Relaxation factors for SSB and CSI-RS**

**Issue 2-4-4e: Different Relaxation factors for different DRX cycle**

**Issue 2-4-4f: Other consideration on Relaxation factors**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status of Issue 2-4-4a~f:**  **No clear consensus on Issue 2-4-4a~f.**  **Recommended WF**: No clear consensus on all options. The relaxation factors depend on other open issues, e.g. feasible scenarios, the approach of the relaxed evaluation period. It is suggested to come back this issue next meeting. |

**Issue 2-4-5: Measurement accuracy**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.** One company commented the proposal would be not needed.  **Proposals**   * Option 1: For R17 RLM and BFD relaxation, measurement accuracy for RLM, BFD ~~and RRM~~ reuses R15 requirements. (vivo)   **Recommended WF:** Measurement accuracy for RRM is not needed to be discussed. Continue the discussion on the rest part of the proposal. |

**Sub-topic 2-5 Others**

**Issue 2-5-1: Entering relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**

**Issue 2-5-2: Exiting relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**

**Issue 2-5-3: Relaxation criteria in intra-band CA/DC**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status of Issue 2-5-1, 2-5-2, 2-5-3**:  No clear consensus.  **Moderator's comment:**  On the Issue 2-5-1~3, please check Huawei's comment as follows:  *For RLM, UE will only perform RLM measurements on PCell or PSCell.*  *For BFD, UE is only required to perform BFD measurements on one serving cell per band.*  *Since intra-band NR-DC has not been introduced, PCell and PSCell could not be in the same band.*  Based on this comment, it seems no need to further discuss the Issue 2-5-1~3, because there is no case that multiple serving cells will be required to perform RLM/BFD on one band.  **Recommended WF:** Before continue the discussion, please take Huawei's' comment into account. Companies provide views whether this discussion is still needed or not. |

**Issue 2-5-4: Applicability for BFD relaxation requirement**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status**  No objection on Option 1. One further comment is provided.  **Proposals**   * Option 1: As the legacy BFD requirement, the BFD relaxation requirement is applicable for PCell, PSCell and all configured SCells. (Ericsson)   **Recommended WF:** Work on WF directly, the draft WF is provided below  As the legacy BFD requirement, the BFD relaxation requirement is applicable for PCell, PSCell and all configured SCells.   * Note: the BFD relaxation requirement is applicable for the serving cells which perform measurement relaxation. |

### CRs/TPs

*Moderator tries to summarize discussion status for 1st round and provided recommendation on CRs/TPs Status update suggestion*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CR/TP number** | **CRs/TPs Status update recommendation** |
| XXX | *Based on 1st round of comments collection, moderator can recommend the next steps such as “agreeable”, “to be revised”* |

## Discussion on 2nd round (if applicable)

*Moderator can provide summary of 2nd round here. Note that recommended decisions on tdocs should be provided in the section titled ”Recommendations for Tdocs”.*

**Issue 2-1-1: Evaluation assumption update**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Proposals:**   * Option 1 (vivo):   + Further update the evaluation assumptions to encourage companies to consider UE rotation in FR2.   + RAN4 further discuss and agree on the link level evaluation assumptions to collect results on the SINR estimation error based on Y samples, while Y=1 is the baseline   **Recommended WF**: Further discuss in the 2nd round. Please check proponent's response in the 1st round. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ericsson | As we have commented in the 1st round, we do not see any need for assuming UE rotation in FR2. The simulation assumptions of FR2 should be similar to the one used in Rel-15 FR2. Since UE rotation was not considered in release 15, there is no need to consider it in Rel-17 power saving. Companies have been bringing simulation results for last 3 meetings which should be used as basis for deriving conclusions. We don’t support option1. |
| Company B |  |

**Issue 2-1-2: assumption on other RRM measurement**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Options:**   * Further evaluate UE power saving gains for the following UE implementations:   + Option 1: (**Nokia**, **CMCC**)     - UE uses all L1 samples for RRM measurements based on Rel-15 assumptions.   + Option 2: (**Qualcomm**, **vivo, Apple, CMCC, MTK**)     - How many L1 samples UE applies for RRM measurements is up to UE implementation. (e.g. UE can use lower number of measurement samples for RRM measurements)   **Moderator's comment:**  This issue was discussed in the RAN Plenary and the guidance is  *“For Rel-17 WI of UE power saving enhancements for NR, no specification impact to RRM measurement procedure requirements and measurement performance requirements is expected."*  No clear consensus is observed and repeated discussion will lead to the same conclusion as the RAN Plenary's guidance that no spec impact on RRM measurement procedure requirements and measurement performance requirements is expected.  **Recommended WF**:  Further discuss this issue in the 2nd round. Note that it should follow RANP’s guidance.  Encourage to address the concern raised by Nokia “*why the UE can choose the number of samples for RRM but not for RLM and BFD*” |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| -vivo | As discussed in our paper, in RAN1 spec UE is restricted to assess link quality once per 1.5 DRX cycle. It cannot be interpreted as ‘aligning the expected behaviour in terms of counters/timers between the UE and NW’. Based on the assumption of ‘assessing link quality once per 1.5 DRX cycle’ the requirement to RLM and/or BFD is in its current form since R15.  One important difference between RLM/BFD and RRM is that RLM/BFD is for ‘monitoring’, while RRM is for ‘measuring and reporting’. In RLM/BFD, UE is measuring SINR of the serving cell/beam only, while in RRM, in most cases, UE focuses on RSRP of both the serving and neighbour cells. Therefore, UE cannot skip monitoring occasions if it wants to keep tracking the SINR and identify the low SINR scenario accurately, based on R15 requirements, as provided by the analysis in our paper. If it skips some measurement occasions, it may fail the RLM test defined in R15. However, for RRM, since RSRP and SINR can be decoupled, it is possible for UE to autonomously skip some occasions purely based on UE implementation, without affecting any of the RRM requirements. |
| MTK | Our understanding is that UE can choose to skip some samples for both RRM and RLM/BFD when serving cell quality is good. If RAN4 can reach consensus that no extended evaluation period is needed for RLM/BFD, we can compromise to this option. However, considering that RLM/BFD are tested in the low SINR region, the SINR margin needs to be modified due to the fact that the number of samples that UE collects within 1 evaluation period has been reduced. |
| Huawei | To MTK: UE is allowed to perform RLM/BFD relaxation in good serving link quality. So, UE shall fall back to legacy RLM/BFD in the low SINR region, then the number of samples within 1 evaluation period shall not be reduced in the low SINR region. |
| Ericsson | On this issue, our view is that the existing RRM measurement requirements shall remain unchanged (no specification impact as agreed in RAN plenary), i.e. the release 15 RRM measurement requirements shall apply also when UE is performing relaxed RLM/BFD. Since release 15 requirements do not specify the exact number of subframes to be used for RRM measurements, it is already possible for UE to use fewer samples and fulfil the corresponding measurement requirements. However, for RLM/BFD, the exact number of samples to be used in the evaluations are predefined and it should be kept that way also in relaxed mode. |

**Issue 2-1-3: Impact on PDCCH monitoring**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **Clear consensus that** all companies agree on not to discuss this issue until RAN1 has reached more progress.  1 company suggested the wording to be captured in WF.  **Recommended WF**:  Work on WF directly, to conclude the exact wording to be captured in WF. The draft WF is provided:  *RAN4 shall assess the interaction between PDCCH relaxation (as being discussed in RAN1) and RLM/BM relaxation (as being discussed in RAN4) from power consumption perspective once there is more progress in RAN1 on PDCCH relaxation.* |

**Sub-topic 2-2 Feasible scenarios for relaxation**

**Issue 2-2-1: Observations on the simulation results of power saving gain**

**Issue 2-2-2: Observations on the simulation results of delta SINR**

**Issue 2-2-3: Observations on the simulation results of increased latency**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status of Issue 2-2-1, 2-2-2, 2-2-3:**  All companies agree on the observation should be made based on the collected simulation results.  **Recommended WF:**   * Work on WF directly, to capture the observations of the simulation result in the 2nd round. |

**Issue 2-2-4: Feasible Scenarios from both power Saving gain and system impact**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Options:**   * Case 1: SSB based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1   + Option 1: Yes (**MTK,** **CATT,** **Qualcomm (prioritized)**, **vivo,** **Apple,** **Ericsson, oppo**)   + Option 2: whether to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements can be up to UE implementation. (Huawei) * Case 2: CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1   + Option 1: Yes (**MTK,** **CATT,** **Qualcomm (open to discuss)**, **vivo, Apple, oppo**)   + Option 2: whether to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements can be up to UE implementation. (Huawei) * Case 3: CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2   + Option 1: Yes (**MTK,** **CATT,** **vivo**)   + Option 2: whether to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements can be up to UE implementation. (Huawei) * Case 4: SSB based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2   + Option 1: Yes (**MTK,** **CATT,** **Ericsson**)   + Option 2: whether to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements can be up to UE implementation. (Huawei)   **Moderator's comment:**  My understanding on this issues is to identify the feasible scenarios and the corresponding requirement would be defined in the work phase. Because case 1 is supported by the most of companies, so the draft WF is provided with case 1 as the starting point.    **Recommended WF:** Work on WF directly, and the draft WF is provided:  *RAN4 conclude the feasible scenario and will define the RLM/BFD requirements for R17 UE measurements relaxation for RLM and/or BFD in work phase for the following cases,*   * *Case 1: SSB based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1* * *FFS Case 2: CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR1* * *FFS Case 3: CSI-RS based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2* * *FFS Case 4: SSB based RLM/BFD measurement relaxation in FR2* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| vivo | We do not see any reason to postpone the decision on Case 2, given it is already the majority view and evaluation results can support this.  We also support to at least case 3 for FR2.  Regarding Nokia’s comments on how the results can be comparable, in our understanding, different company may of course have different understanding and corresponding UE behaviour behind the conformance requirements. That is one of the reason why evaluation needs to be done. RAN4 only needs to see the range of the variation between UEs. |
| Huawei | For SSB based RLM/BFD, companies provided simulation results based option 1 or option 2. The simulation results based option 1 (all RRM meas. samples in R15 assumption, no extended RRM meas. interval) show no power saving gain for RLM/BFD relaxation. The simulation results based option 2 (less RRM meas. Samples, extended RRM meas. interval) show some power saving gain for RLM/BFD relaxation. So, whether SSB based RLM/BFD relaxation is feasible depends on whether UE to use less RRM meas. samples for extending L1 meas. interval. At least SSB based RLM/BFD relaxation for power saving purpose is not feasible for all UE implementations. Hence, UE shall not be mandatory to perform RLM/BFD relaxation in this case. |
| Ericsson | We would like to include also case 4 included in the work phase. Ericsson presented FR2 SSB results at 98e-meting and it was agreed at 98e-meeting that companies were encouraged to study and present the results for FR2 case. In this meeting at least two companies have presented FR2 results (delta PDCCH SINR) based on SSB have been presented by at least two companies. It is observed from these results that RLM/BFD relaxation is feasible for certain DRX configurations in FR2 SSB case. Therefore we would like to include case 4 in the work phase.  Regarding option 2 from Huawei on all cases, our understanding is that whether to perform relaxed RLM/BFD measurements is still up to UE implementation. The UE may perform relaxed RLM/BFD when the associated relaxation criterion are met, but it may also choose to not perform relaxation and stay in the normal RLM/BFD mode. |

**Issue 2-2-5: Considerations on the feasibility study**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Proposals:**   * Option 1: Negative system level impact due to RLM/BFD relaxation should be minimized e.g. by studying the time of outage with different relaxation factors. (Nokia) * Option 1a: RAN4 should consider the maximum additional delay of RLF declaration within a confidence level due to power saving, i.e., the probability of maximum additional delay within x is larger than y, for power saving evaluation on different schemes. (QC) * Option 2: RAN4 needs to study whether the beneficial scenario is a reasonable case for network configuration. (Huawei)   **Recommended WF**:  Further discuss the proposals regarding the comments provided. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| QC | Option 1 is a reasonable concern as a side effect that should be evaluated in feasibility study: how much negative system impact induced by achieving the power saving gain? However, the language is a little bit vague: what is the “time of outage”? In our opinion, the negative system impact can be characterized by the maximum additional delay of RLF declaration within a confidence level due to power saving, i.e., the probability of maximum additional delay within *x* is larger than *y*. Therefore, we want to propose the following option:  Option 1a: RAN4 should consider the maximum additional delay of RLF declaration within a confidence level due to power saving, i.e., the probability of maximum additional delay within *x* is larger than *y*, for power saving evaluation on different schemes. |
| -vivo | Agree with Qualcomm’s comment. Option 1a is preferred. |
| Ericsson | If RAN4 decides to do further feasibility study, then the conclusion on the feasibility scenario in 2-2-4 could defer? Otherwise , we don’t see the intention of this feasibility study? Conclusions on feasibility scenarios are already being discussed in issue 2-2-4. It is not clear to us how RAN4 is supposed to use the outcome of the feasibility study proposed in this issue 2-2-5? Also if RAN4 decides to agree on such feasibility study as proposed in option 1 and 1a , the evaluation assumptions should be very concrete and clear to make results from companies comparable. |
| vivo | Replying Ericsson’s comment:  We think this is not related to continuing feasibility study. Our understanding is that this should be the considerations on the conclusions of feasibility study. Maybe moderator can further clarify this. |

**Issue 2-2-6: DRX cycle applicability**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Options**   * Option 1: relaxation is applicable for DRX=20ms or DRX=40ms. (**CATT,** **MTK**) * Option 2: relaxation is applicable for DRX <= 80 ms. (**Ericsson**, **vivo, Huawei, Oppo, MTK**)   + Option 2a: relaxation is applicable for DRX <= 80 ms, but adjustment to other DRx cycles is needed to keep the monotonicity of DRx cycles w.r.t. evaluation time (**QC**)   + Option 2b. Maximum relaxation factor should be related to DRX cycle. (Apple)   **Moderator's comment:**   * Simulation results for DRX of 80 ms is provided in R4-2106851. Companies are encouraged to check the simulation results.   **Recommended WF:** Work on WF directly, and the draft WF is provided:   * Relaxation is applicable for DRX<=40ms.   + FFS DRX of 80 ms   + FFS adjustment to other DRx cycles is needed to keep the monotonicity of DRx cycles w.r.t. evaluation time   + FFS Maximum relaxation factor should be related to DRX cycle. |

**Issue 2-2-7: Potential spec impact**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Proposals**   * Option 1: In the study phase of this WI, RAN4 conclude the potential spec impact of R17 power saving. (vivo)   **Recommended WF**: Work on WF directly, and the draft WF is provided:  The spec impact of R17 power saving will be discussed in the work phase. |

**Issue 2-2-8: LS to RAN2 on the study phase conclusion**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.**  Most of companies commented it is too early to send the LS before more progress are made.  **Proposals**   * Option 1: Send LS to RAN2 in this meeting, in order to inform RAN2 on the progress that RAN4 has made. (vivo)   **Recommended WF**   * Companies in support of the LS to RAN1 should clarify the intention and proposed content of the LS, otherwise defer sending the LS |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ZTE | Agree with recommended WF. Not sure why there is a need to send LS now. |
| vivo | We have provided our preference on the contents of the LS in our 1st round comments, but not sure whether some companies have checked it or not.    However, regarding Huawei and Mediatek’s comments, we see the arguments behind these proposals, and would like to provide a compromised proposal as follows.  The majority view in the first round is to consider RLM and/or BFD relaxation only when both low mobility and cell quality criteria are fulfilled. Regarding the low mobility criterion, in R16, it was discussed and agreed in RAN2, and it is not RAN4 expertise to discuss such criterion. Therefore, as one compromised proposal, we suggest to send the LS to trigger further discussion on the low mobility criterion in RAN2.  For other option issues, including cell quality criterion, fall back mechanisms and who determines the criteria is fulfilled or not, they can be discussed in RAN4.  A draft LS is provided in the draft folder for this issue and encourages companies to further check. |
| Apple | Agree with the WF. However there is a typo, should be RAN2 instead of RAN1. |
| Ericsson | We don’t agree with option 1. The compromise proposal from Vivo does not reflect the RAN4 discussions so the criteria. In fact, RAN4 has discussed the mobility criterion for several meetings, i.e. whether it determined by NW or UE etc. In our view, based on these discussions, RAN4 has discussed determination of low mobility state for several meetings and have not concluded on this issue. Only when there is more progress on this issue, an LS is relevant. |
| vivo2 | Replying Ericssion’s comment:  Yes RAN4 has discussed the mobility criterion for several meetings, but based on current status of issue 2-3-5 we see quite diverged opinions from companies.  In our view, low mobility criterion includes many RAN2 spec details and it is RAN2 expertise to have further discussion on this issue. If it is studied in RAN4 then companies may fall into long discussion on how to interpret RAN2 spec and how to judge whether the motivations behind new proposals are reasonable or not, which in our view is not an efficient way to move forward.  Maybe it is also fine to include the current status of low mobility criterion, i.e. the options RAN4 identified, and probably including the supporting companies of the options, in the LS to RAN2, so that RAN2 discussion can be based on the current status of RAN4 discussion.  Note that in the WI it is stated that:   * 1. Study the feasibility and performance impact of relaxing UE measurements for RLM and/or BFD, particularly for low mobility UE with short DRX periodicity/cycle, and specify, if agreed, relaxation in the corresponding requirements [RAN4] * NOTE: Supplementary RAN2 work, if needed, can be triggered by RAN4 LS |

**Sub-topic 2-3 Relaxation criteria**

**Issue 2-3-1: Criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation – General**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  Most of companies are fine with Option 1. companies provides further comments on Option 1. **Proposals**   * Option 1: The RLM/BFD relaxation criteria needs to combine both serving cell quality and UE mobility state. (**Huawei,** **Apple, CATT**, **Qualcomm**, **Intel,** **vivo, ZTE, Xiaomi, Nokia, oppo, CMCC**)   + Entering conditions: both good serving cell quality and low UE mobility are satisfied. * Option 2: Take UE mobility as the major factor into the criteria. * Option 3: RAN4 to study the necessity of mobility criterion for Rel-17 power saving. (**MTK,** **vivo**)   **Moderator’s comment**  Majority supports Option 1.  @MTK: Is it ok to compromise with Option 1?  **Recommended WF**:  Based on the comment on Option 1, the draft WF is suggested below:  whether relaxed RLM/BFD requirements can be applied depends on the serving cell quality and UE mobility state   * FFS the precise and robust metric for serving cell quality and UE mobility state |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ZTE | Support Option 1. Can support the WF. |
| Vivo | We think adding a word ‘both’ is more clear.  ‘Whether relaxed RLM/BFD requirements can be applied depends on both the serving cell quality and UE mobility state’ |
| MTK | We are also fine with option 1. |
| Ericsson | It is not clear what “combine” means in option 1. Combining both serving cell quality and UE mobility state may have different interpretations. Therefore option 1 can be clarified as follows:  “UE is allowed to relax the RLM/BFD requirements when the low mobility criteria, conditions on serving cell quality SINR and conditions on short DRX cycles are fulfilled.” |

**Issue 2-3-2: Good serving cell quality criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Proposals**   * Option 1: radio link quality is better than a threshold. (**CATT,** **Qualcomm**, **Ericsson,** **Oppo,** **MTK,** **vivo, Huawei, Apple, Xiaomi, intel, CMCC, Nokia**)   + radio link quality > Qout + X (dB) for RLM   + radio link quality > Qout,LR + Y (dB) for BFD relaxation.   + FFS X, Y * Option 1a: Define network-configured thresholds reflecting SINR regions for RLM and BFD relaxation. Such threshold is the same for RLM and BFD. (**vivo**)   **Moderator’s comment**  All companies are fine with Option 1.  Whether BLER or SINR should be considered as the radio link quality can be considered in the Issue 2-3-3.  How to define the threshold, e.g. the same threshold, can be further discussed as in the value of X, Y.  **Tentative agreement**  Good serving cell quality criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation is defined as the radio link quality is better than a threshold.   * FFS radio link quality > Qout + X (dB) for RLM * FFS radio link quality > Qout,LR + Y (dB) for BFD relaxation. * FFS X, Y   **Recommended WF**: Further discuss the sub-bullets in the 2nd round. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ZTE | Propose to specify that such a threshold is configured by the network. |
| Intel | Generally fine with option 1 to choose a threshold. However, I don’t think that only Qout can be used as the basis by plus some margin. It’s possible that reverting back criteria is higher than Qout. Then the basis will be Qout plus some value. Then based on that, extra margin is considered. |
| Vivo | Agree with the tentative agreements. The details of the thresholds can be further discussed. |
| MTK | Agree with the WF |
| Huawei | Agree with the WF. How to derive the values of X and Y need to be further studied in RAN4. |
| Ericsson | Given that there is a clear majority support for option 1 and only one company supports 1a, our view is that option 1 can be made into agreement and RAN4 can further discuss the value of X and Y at next meeting. |

**Issue 2-3-3: what is the radio link quality in Issue 2-3-2**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status**  No objection on Option 1.  **Proposals**   * Option 1: based on SINR. (**CMCC**, **Qualcomm**, **Intel**, **Nokia,** **Oppo,** **MTK, vivo, Ericsson, Huawei, CATT**)   + Option 1a: (**Intel, CMCC**)     - Since SINR value varies with time, a more robust criteria based on SINR is expected to be discussed.     - SINR will be evaluated during a time window to check if it satisfies the criteria of relaxation or not. The exact window length and how to process SINR value during the window for relaxing RLM/BFD can be further studied. * Option 2: based on BLER of hypothetical PDCCH. (**Xiaomi**, **MTK, vivo**) * Option 3: **BFD** should be relaxed at least better than CBD condition. Whether **RSRP** is also needed to be considered for relaxation criteria of BFD needs further discussion. (**Intel, MTK**)   **Moderator’s comment**  No objection on Option 1.  @ Xiaomi: please check if it is ok to go with Option 1  **Recommended WF**: Work on WF directly. The draft WF is suggested below:  The radio link quality in good serving cell quality criteria for R17 RLM/BFD relaxation is based on SINR   * FFS how to define the metric of SINR * FFS whether RSRP is also needed for BFD as additional condition |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xiaomi | From our perspective, applying the metric of BLER would be more straightforward considering different UE receiver performance, but for the sake of progress we can go with Option 1. The recommended WF is fine to us. |
| ZTE | Propose to specify that such a threshold is configured by the network. |
| Intel | for RLM, we are fine with option 1. For BFD, we also support option 3. |
| Vivo | Same issue as 2-3-2  Option 3 can be FFS. |
| Huawei | For RLM/BFD, the threshold of Qout/Qout,LR is used for defining worse serving cell quality and corresponds to the level of 10% BLER under the hypothetical PDCCH transmission parameters. The corresponding SINR level of Qout/Qout,LR is up to UE implementation. The threshold used in good serving cell quality criteria shall also be up to UE implementation. RAN4 can further study how to derive the corresponding SINR level of the threshold used in good serving cell quality criteria. |
| Ericsson | We support option 1. We also have similar view as ZTE that the threshold can be configured by the NW. In our view, it can be agreed on option 1 and the details of SINR can be further discussed in the work phase. |

**Issue 2-3-4: different threshold for SSB based and CSI-RS based RLM/BFD**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.** Companies suggested to postpone the discussion.  **Recommended WF**: Proponent may still clarify the proposal regarding companies questions |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company A |  |
| Ericsson | It should be decided based on the similar results. If results show different performance, then it is reasonable to use different thresholds. |
| vivo | The motivation behind this proposal is whether different RRC signalling is needed for the thresholds of relaxation for SSB and CSI-RS, respecitively.  It is fine to FFS for this issue. |

**Issue 2-3-5: Low mobility criteria of RLM/BFD relaxation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status**  **No clear consensus.**  **Proposals**   * Option 1: R16 low mobility condition applies to RLM/BFD relaxation. (**Qualcomm, apple, Xiaomi, oppo, CATT**)   + If R16 low mobility condition is adapted, RAN4 derives SINR distribution for margin derivation from link level simulation without mobility and with small scale fading. * Option 2: R16 RRM relaxation criterion can NOT be directly used. (**CMCC**, **Intel**, **vivo**)   + Option 2a (**CMCC**):     - The SINR (value and variation) of serving cell can be used for low-mobility criterion.     - If SINR drift rate is under a threshold during a certain estimation period, then the UE can be considered to fulfil the serving cell’s quality variation rule. * Option 3: RAN4 to study the necessity of mobility criterion for Rel-17 power saving. (**MTK**, **vivo**) * Option 4: Consider time associated with a given condition when determining UE mobility state. (**Nokia,** **apple, Xiaomi, MTK**) * Option 5: Low mobility scenario under which the UE is allowed to apply the RLM/BM requirements is determined and configured to UE by the network, and it is up to the UE whether to apply relaxed RLM/BM requirements when configured. (**Ericsson,** **vivo, apple, Xiaomi, Nokia, oppo, CATT**)   **Recommended WF**:  Further discuss in the 2nd round.  Based on the discussion in the 1st round, it would be good to have some principle discussion. The options are re-arranged based on my understanding as the following aspects:   * Option A: UE will need to keep verifying whether the condition is fulfilled   + Option A1: RSRP variation (option 1, option 3)   + Option A2: SINR variation (option 2, option 3) * Option B: UE will **not** need to keep verifying whether the condition is fulfilled   + Option B1: No mobility criteria (option 4)   + Option B2: Network configured (option 5) * Option C: The low mobility criterion can be left for RAN2 to decide. Send LS to RAN2 to trigger RAN2 discussion.   Proposing company may indicate what option (Option A or Option B) does your proposal belong to.  And also clarify the proposals regarding the comments received in the 1st round.  The conclusion will be captured in WF. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xiaomi | Prefer Option B2. |
| ZTE | Support Option 5. |
| Intel | Support option A2. |
| Vivo | As discussed in issue 2-2-8, we don’t think low mobility is within RAN4 scope. It was discussed in RAN2 in previous releases and we don’t see why it has to be discussed in RAN4 for this R17 power saving.  Therefore, another option C is added for discussion. |
| CMCC | Support Option A2 |
| MTK | We have 1 question to be clarified. What is the difference between option B1 and B2? Our understanding is for B2 there still exist a mobility indication; however, for B1 Network can disable/enable UE power saving mode by the indicator of this feature, no extra indicator is needed. I would like to check whether companies have similar understanding for these 2 options.  We can support A2 and B1 |
| Huawei | We can agree with option A2 or option B1. |
| Ericsson | We support option 5 which has the majority support. Also it is noted that RAN4 has discussed this issue since for start of the WI and should conclude on this issue based on majority view. |
| vivo2 | In our understanding RAN4 discussion so far are only for study phase and did not touch too many details for the low mobility criterion, it is slightly early to go with the majority view at this stage. |

**Issue 2-3-6: Exiting criteria of RLM relaxation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status**  **No clear consensus.**  **Proposals**   * Option 1: exit relaxation mode when any relaxation criterion is not met (**CATT,** **Apple**, **ZTE**, **Huawei**, **Nokia, Oppo**) * Option 2: exit relaxation mode when the radio link quality is worse than a certain threshold. (**vivo, Xiaomi, MTK**)   + Option 2a: set different radio link quality threshold for entering and exiting the relaxation (**CMCC,** **Vivo**, **Intel**, **Oppo**)   + Option 2b: UE falls back to normal mode if either the averaged SINR based on reduced number of samples is below Thquit, or the one-shot SINR is below Qout. (**vivo**) * Option 3: exit relaxation mode based on out-of-sync indication. (**Apple,** **Xiaomi**, **CMCC**, **Nokia,** **Ericsson**)   + Option 3a: exit when N310 starts to count, i.e. 1 out-of-sync indication. (**MTK**)   + Option 3b: exit when T310 is running (**CMCC**)   + Option 3c: exit when certain number of out-of-indications (**Ericsson**)   + Option 3d: exit when certain consecutive out-of-sync indications (**CMCC**) * Option 4 (**QC**) : Additional time is allowed for UE to evaluate first OOS indication when UE is in power saving mode. UE is in normal mode after first OOS indication. The additional delay for RLF declaration is guaranteed to be within OOS evaluation time (TEvaluate\_out\_SSB) in normal mode. Relaxation factor and exit SINR threshold (for good cell quality condition) is up to UE implementation, but the “first OOS indication” requirement has to be satisfied.      |  |  | | --- | --- | | Configuration | TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB (ms) | | no DRX | Max(200, Ceil(10  P)  TSSB) | | DRX cycle≤80ms | Max(200, Ceil(30  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | 80ms<DRX cycle≤320ms | Max(200, Ceil(20  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | DRX cycle>320ms | Ceil(10  P)  TDRX | | NOTE: TSSB is the periodicity of the SSB configured for RLM. TDRX is the DRX cycle length. | |     **Recommended WF**: Proposing company should elaborate and answer questions. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xiaomi | We support Option 3 in principle.  Option 2 is also acceptable. But if RAN4 agree that relaxed RLM/BFD requirements can be applied depending on both the serving cell quality and UE mobility state, then we think it would be more reasonable to consider both UE mobility state and radio link quality for exiting relaxation mode. We can further discuss.  For Option 1, as companies pointed out, it would cause ping-pong effect. |
| ZTE | Support Option 1. Actually, in our view, Option 2 is more likely to cause ping-pong effect. Option 3 can also cause such effect, depending on the channel conditions. |
| Intel | Support option 2a. different criteria can avoid ping-pong effect. |
| Vivo | We support either option 2 or option 4.  For ZTE comments we do not understanding why option 2 will cause ping-ping effect. We see different threshold for Qin and Qout is specified, and no ping-pong effect for this case.  For 1st round comments from Ericsson, we think it is better to clarify in option 2 that the certain thresholds is above the SINR threshold Qout. |
| CMCC | We support Option3 in principle.  Besides, for Option 3b, we would like to clarify that it should be combined with new N310 counter, which is configured with a smaller value than before. Only in this way, the RLF triggering latency will decrease. |
| Huawei | Support option 1.  A predefined hysteresis value (e.g. 3dB) could be used to avoid ping-ping effect. For example,  Relaxation entering condition: Qualitymeasured > Thresh  Relaxation exiting condition: Qualitymeasured + Hys < Thresh |
| Ericsson | Our view is that the agreement [R4-2103670] from previous meeting shown below is already enough and covers many of the options listed here  “*The UE while performing relaxed RLM upon detecting certain number of out-of-sync indications or upon triggering T310 or upon observed link quality degradation or mobility state change reverts to the normal RLM operation (i.e. without relaxation).”*  The options 1 and 2 are not concrete enough to guarantee that UE exits relaxed RLM when out of syc is detected.  We therefore support option 3. We prefer option 3c but any of options 3a-3d are acceptable. |

**Issue 2-3-7: Exiting criteria of BFD relaxation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **No clear consensus.**   * Proposals   + Option 1: exit relaxation mode when any relaxation criterion is not met (**CATT,** **Apple**, **Huawei, Nokiax, Oppo**)   + Option 2: exit relaxation mode when the radio link quality is worse than a certain threshold. (**Xiaomi, vivo, MTK)**     - Option 2a: set different radio link quality threshold for entering and exiting the relaxation (**vivo**, **Intel,** **Oppo**)     - Option 2b: UE falls back to normal mode if either the averaged SINR based on reduced number of samples is below Thquit, or the one-shot SINR is below Qout. (**vivo**)   + Option 3: exit relaxation mode upon detect 1 beam failure instance indication. (**Ericsson,** **ZTE**, **Apple, Nokia**)   + Option 4: exit relaxation mode after BFI\_COUNTER add to the value of a new counter or a new parameter, the new counter or the new parameter is configured by network. (**CMCC**)   + Option 6: no need for the exiting criteria for BFD relaxation. (**Xiaomi**)     **Recommended WF**: Proposing company should elaborate and answer questions. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xiaomi | We can accept Option 3.  For Option 2, similar as issue 2-3-6, RAN4 may need to consider the combination of UE mobility state and radio link quality. |
| ZTE | Support Option 3. If one beam failure instance is already detected, the UE shall enter normal mode. |
| Intel | I think that exiting criteria will be higher than OOS criteria. Otherwise, RLF delay will be expected. |
| Vivo | We support option 2.  For 1st round comments from Ericsson, we think it is better to clarify in option 2 that the certain thresholds is above the SINR threshold Qout. |
| CMCC | We prefer Option4 and also accept Option3. |
| Huawei | Support option 1. Same comments as issue 2-3-6. |
| Ericsson | We support option 3. Option 1 does not define concrete criterion for exiting. After detecting the beam failure, it is important that UE quickly searches for new candidate beams and report them to the NW. Therefore the CBD should be started upon the first detected beam failure instance indication. |

**Issue 2-3-8: Alternative N310/N311 values in relaxation mode**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.** Companies think more discussion needed.  **Recommended WF**: Postpone the discussion in the work phase, since it depends on other open issue. |

**Issue 2-3-9: Re-entry to the RLM relaxation mode**

**Issue 2-3-10: Re-entry to the BFD relaxation mode**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status of Issue 2-3-9, 2-3-10:**  **No clear consensus.** Companies suggested to postpone the discussion.  **Recommended WF**: Postpone the discussion until relaxation criteria is clearer. |

**Sub-topic 2-4 Relaxation scheme**

**Issue 2-4-1: Relaxed evaluation period of RLM/BFD**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.**    **Proposals**   * Option 1: Scaling factor defining the relaxed RLM/BFD evaluation period is defined based on max(TDRX, TSSB). (**Ericsson,** **Apple**, **CATT,** **Qualcomm**, **Xiaomi**)   + Option 1a:The similar definition of RLM/BFD evaluation period in Rel-15 can be reused as Max(T, Ceil([Y] x P x N) x Max(TDRX,TSSB)) (**Huawei, MTK**)     - FFS the value of Y used for relaxed RLM/BFD evaluation period.   + Option 1b: If power saving conditions are satisfied, allow TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB for the first OOS indication and the original TEvaluate\_out\_SSB doesn’t apply. (**Qualcomm**)      |  |  | | --- | --- | | Configuration | TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB (ms) | | no DRX | Max(200, Ceil(10  P)  TSSB) | | DRX cycle≤80ms | Max(200, Ceil(30  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | 80ms<DRX cycle≤320ms | Max(200, Ceil(20  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | DRX cycle>320ms | Ceil(10  P)  TDRX | | NOTE: TSSB is the periodicity of the SSB configured for RLM. TDRX is the DRX cycle length. | |      * Option 1c: If power saving conditions are satisfied, allow TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB for the first OOS indication and the original TEvaluate\_out\_SSB doesn’t apply. (**vivo**)  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Configuration | TEvaluate\_ps\_out\_SSB (ms) | | no DRX | Max(200, Ceil(10  P)  TSSB) | | DRX cycle≤80ms | Max(200, Ceil(15  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB) + (K-1)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | 80ms<DRX cycle≤320ms | Max(200, Ceil(15  P)  Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | DRX cycle>320ms | Ceil(10  P)  TDRX | | NOTE: TSSB is the periodicity of the SSB configured for RLM. TDRX is the DRX cycle length, K is the relaxation factor. | |      * **Recommended WF**: Is the main bullet of Option 1 agreeable, and FFS on option 1a~1c? |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Xiaomi | We prefer Option 1a. |
| vivo | As discussed in issue 2-2-5, it is important to also consider the increased RLF latency.  Therefore, we prefer option 1c. Moreover, clarification to the relaxation factor is needed.  In our understanding this relaxation factor is the scaling factor for the interval between L1 measurements. |
| CMCC | Option 1a can be a baseline. |
| Huawei | Same view as CMCC. Option 1a can be used as a starting point. |
| Ericsson | We support option 1 in which the scaling factor is clear, and also that it depends on max(TDRX, TSSB) is reasonable and aligned with existing requirements. |

**Issue 2-4-2: Are the parameters of relaxation criteria predefined or configurable**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.**   * Most of companies are fine with Option 2. * One company can agree Option 2 except for exiting criteria. * One company suggest to agree on the parameters first, then discuss whether it is configured or predefined.     **Proposals**   * Option 1: The parameters of relaxation criteria should be predefined. (**MTK**) * Option 2: The parameters of relaxation criteria can be configured by the network. (**Apple,** **vivo**, **Ericsson,** **QC, Xiaomi, Intel, CMCC, Nokia, CATT, MTK**) * Option 2a: The relaxation criteria shall be configured by the network to the UE. If the threshold (criteria) is not configured, it means the UE cannot go into relaxation mode.” (**ZTE, Xiaomi**) * Option 2b: The parameters of relaxation criterion of low mobility and entering condition of good cell quality can be configured by the network. Exit condition of good cell quality is FFS. (**QC**) * Option 3: No parameter for low mobility criteria (**MTK**)   + Option 3a: Low mobility cell can be configured by network in RRC without any thresholds, e.g. for indoor cells. (**vivo**)   + Option 3b: Low mobility scenario under which the UE is allowed to apply the RLM/BM requirements is determined and configured to UE by the network, and it is up to the UE whether to apply relaxed RLM/BM requirements when configured.(**vivo**) * ~~Option 4 (~~**~~QC~~**~~): The parameters of relaxation criterion of low mobility and entering condition of good cell quality can be configured by the network. Exit condition of good cell quality is up to UE implementation, as long as the additional delay for RLF declaration is guaranteed to be within OOS evaluation time (T~~~~Evaluate\_out\_SSB~~~~) in normal mode~~   **Recommended WF**: Proponent of option2 should clarify which parameters in the relaxation criteria can be configured by the network. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| QC | We would like to add option 2a:  The parameters of relaxation criterion of low mobility and entering condition of good cell quality can be configured by the network. Exit condition of good cell quality is FFS.  And option 4 can be removed, the exit condition is discussed in 2-3-6. In fact, we want to point out that moderator’s suggestion of “clarify which parameters in the relaxation criteria can be configured by the network” is important, otherwise option 2 can contradict with options in 2-3-6. |
| ZTE | Support Option 2a. There’s a slight difference between Option 2 and 2a and we prefer the precise description given in Option 2a. |
| vivo | We are fine with 2, 2a and 2b and only agree for the cell quality threshold. For mobility criterion, as in issue 2-3-5, we prefer to discuss in RAN2. |
| CMCC | We are OK with Option2a  As for the parameters, the threshold of SINR is one of the parameters, while for others, we can’t confirm since the relaxation criteria has not been agreed yet. Besides, we think the relaxation factor should be configured by network. |
| Apple | We are fine with 2, 2a. Parameters include SINR threshold, mobility threshold and relaxation factor. |
| MTK | Support option 2 and option 3 |
| Huawei | We support that the parameters related to good serving link quality criteria are predefined. FFS other potential parameters. |
| Ericsson | We support option 2. In this option, it is proposed to agree on the principle. Once agreed, RAN4 can discuss the details on exact parameters that are needed and this work can be done in work phase. |

**Issue 2-4-3: network or UE to determine the relaxation criteria is fulfilled or not**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**   * Most of companies are fine with Option 1. * One company proposes Option 1a.   **Proposals**   * Option 1: UE determines whether the relaxation criteria can be fulfilled or not. (**CMCC,** **Xiaomi,** **Intel,** **Apple, QC,** **vivo, Ericsson, Nokia, Huawei, CATT, MTK**) * Option 1a: The UE can determine alone if the criteria (configured by the network) is met and enter the low mobility mode to use a relaxed requirements for RLM and RLF if there will be test cases defined to test the UE behaviors. (**ZTE**)   **Recommended WF**: Opponent of Option 1 should clarify and elaborate their concerns. Option 1 is suggested as draft WF. |
|  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ZTE | Basically we also support Option 1, just want to mention that we need also consider testability and test cases now. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 is agreeable. Important to clarify that the UE determines whether the relaxation criteria are fulfilled based on the criteria fulfilled by the network. |

**Issue 2-4-4a: Different Relaxation factors between FR1 and FR2**

**Issue 2-4-4b: Different Relaxation factors for different SINR range**

**Issue 2-4-4c: Different Relaxation factors for different UE speed**

**Issue 2-4-4d: Different Relaxation factors for SSB and CSI-RS**

**Issue 2-4-4e: Different Relaxation factors for different DRX cycle**

**Issue 2-4-4f: Other consideration on Relaxation factors**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status of Issue 2-4-4a~f:**  **No clear consensus on Issue 2-4-4a~f.**  **Recommended WF**: No clear consensus on all options. The relaxation factors depend on other open issues, e.g. feasible scenarios, the approach of the relaxed evaluation period. It is suggested to come back this issue next meeting. |

**Issue 2-4-5: Measurement accuracy**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status:**  **No clear consensus.** One company commented the proposal would be not needed.  **Proposals**   * Option 1: For R17 RLM and BFD relaxation, measurement accuracy for RLM, BFD ~~and RRM~~ reuses R15 requirements. (vivo)   **Recommended WF:** Measurement accuracy for RRM is not needed to be discussed. Continue the discussion on the rest part of the proposal. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| -vivo | Agree with most companies’ comments. Yes RLM accuracy is not defined as an explicit requirement, but UE needs to guarantee the SINR accuracy at Qout so as to precisely identify the RLF. |
| Ericsson | It is not clear what is meant by SINR accuracy. Our preference is to reuse the SINR approach from existing RLM/BFD requirements. No need to modify or change this part compared to legacy. |
| vivo2 | Replying Ericsson’s comment  We see the thresholds defined in the test cases are related to SINR, therefore there is implicit requirement on the SINR accuracy. Anyway it is actually the same that legacy SINR approach from existing RLM/BFD requirements can be re-used. |

**Sub-topic 2-5 Others**

**Issue 2-5-1: Entering relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**

**Issue 2-5-2: Exiting relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**

**Issue 2-5-3: Relaxation criteria in intra-band CA/DC**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status of Issue 2-5-1, 2-5-2, 2-5-3**:  No clear consensus.  **Moderator's comment:**  On the Issue 2-5-1~3, please check Huawei's comment as follows:  *For RLM, UE will only perform RLM measurements on PCell or PSCell.*  *For BFD, UE is only required to perform BFD measurements on one serving cell per band.*  *Since intra-band NR-DC has not been introduced, PCell and PSCell could not be in the same band.*  Based on this comment, it seems no need to further discuss the Issue 2-5-1~3, because there is no case that multiple serving cells will be required to perform RLM/BFD on one band.  **Recommended WF:** Before continue the discussion, please take Huawei's' comment into account. Companies provide views whether this discussion is still needed or not. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| CMCC | We agree that this issue is invalid for RLM  However, For BFD, the description in TS 38.133 is as follows:  8.5.2 Requirements for SSB based beam failure detection  8.5.2.1 Introduction  The requirements in this clause apply for each SSB resource in the set configured for a serving cell, provided that the SSB configured for beam failure detection is actually transmitted within the UE active DL BWP during the entire evaluation period specified in clause 8.5.2.2. The requirements in this clause could not be applicable if UE is required to perform beam failure detection on more than 1 serving cell per band.  We are not sure what is the UE behavior, is the UE will not perform BFD on all serving cells , or UE can perform BFD on all serving cells while the requirements will not be applicable. We are open to have more discussion. |
| Huawei | To CMCC.  In TS 38.133, the following is specified:  *The RS resource configurations in the set  on PCell or PSCell can be periodic CSI-RS resources and/or SSBs. RS resource configuration in the set  on SCell shall be periodic CSI-RS.*  UE is required to perform SSB based BFD measurements only on PCell or PSCell, which is similar to RLM measurements. |
| Ericsson | We would like to clarify that our proposals in issue 2-5-1 and 2-5-2 apply only to intra-band CA.  We agree that currently there are no band combination for intra-band NR DC. We also agree that currently UE only performs RLM measurements on SpCell (PCell or PSCell) and BFD requirements apply for one serving cell per band. The BFD can be done on SpCell or SCell of the same band. However, as per current specification for intra-band CA, it is a realistic scenario that on the same band the UE does BFD on SCell while RLM is performed on SpCell. In such scenario, it is up to the NW on which serving cell the UE is configured with BFD RS. Therefore, if RLM is relaxed then BFD should also be relaxed or vice versa if the UE is using the same type of RS, i.e. SSB or CSI-RS. NW can configure the same type of RS resources (e.g. SSB) for RLM on SpCell and BFD on SCell in the same band. In such scenarios, we still believe that the originals conditions for entering and exiting the relaxation mode as proposed in issue 2-5-1 and 2-5-2 can be revised as follows:  **Issue 2-5-1: Entering relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**  For intra-band CA~~/DC~~, if UE has fulfilled the criterion for operating RLM/BFD in relaxed mode in one serving cell, then it is allowed to operate RLM/BFD in relaxed mode in all other serving cells if same type of RS are used for RLM/BFD in the serving cell and other serving cells.  **Issue 2-5-2: Exiting relaxation mode in intra-band CA/DC**  Option 1: For intra-band CA~~/DC~~, if UE meets the conditions of reverting to the normal RLM/BFD in one serving cell, it is expected the reversion operations are applied to other serving cell(s) if same type of RS are used for RLM/BFD in the serving cell and other serving cells. |

**Issue 2-5-4: Applicability for BFD relaxation requirement**

|  |
| --- |
| **Status summary** |
| **Status**  No objection on Option 1. One further comment is provided.  **Proposals**   * Option 1: As the legacy BFD requirement, the BFD relaxation requirement is applicable for PCell, PSCell and all configured SCells. (Ericsson)   **Recommended WF:** Work on WF directly, the draft WF is provided below  As the legacy BFD requirement, the BFD relaxation requirement is applicable for PCell, PSCell and all configured SCells.   * Note: the BFD relaxation requirement is applicable for the serving cells which perform measurement relaxation. |
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