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# 1 Introduction

The following email discussion was triggered at RAN2#113[1]:

* [POST113-e][703][V2X/SL] Details of timers (InterDigital)

**Scope:** Discuss details of how to maintain the agreed timers (including exact definition of timers, how to set the timers, when to start/restart/stop the timers, additional consideration due to SL characteristics, considerations of both RX UE and its peer TX UE sides) and FFS parts related to timer operations.

**Intended outcome:** Discussion summary

**Deadline:** Long email discussion

The summary of this email discussion is presented in this document.

# 2 Details of Timers

## 2.1 Parameters Defining the DRX Cycle

In Uu, a number of DRX parameters are used to define the DRX cycle length and starting offset. These are:

- *drx-SlotOffset*: the delay before starting the *drx-onDurationTimer*;

- *drx-LongCycleStartOffset*: the Long DRX cycle and *drx-StartOffset* which defines the subframe where the Long and Short DRX cycle starts;

- *drx-ShortCycle* (optional): the Short DRX cycle;

- *drx-ShortCycleTimer* (optional): the duration the UE shall follow the Short DRX cycle;

In addition, the on-duration timer is used to define the minimum guaranteed on period at the UE for each DRX cycle:

* *drx-onDurationTimer*: the duration at the beginning of a DRX cycle;

For SL, it was agreed at RAN2#113[1] to re-use the timer-based approach of Uu to define SL DRX for all cast types. In addition, it was agreed to not support the short DRX cycle for SL. Based on these agreements, similar parameters to the Uu parameters (without considering the short DRX cycle) can be used to define the DRX cycle and the minimum on duration. These parameters can be configured for all cast types.

**Q1) Do you agree to support the following parameters as part of the SL DRX configuration: sl-drx-StartOffset, sl-drx-Cycle, sl-drx-onDurationTimer, and sl-drx-SlotOffset for all casts type?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (if no, please explain why) |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y | These timers are essential to support DRX functionality. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| LG | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Vivo | Y |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Nokia | Y |  |
| ITL | Y |  |
| ASUSTeK | Y |  |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| ZTE | Y |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

### 2.1.1 RX UE Handling

Assuming the use of similar timers for SL as in Uu in the above question, the behaviour of the RX UE with respect to these timers on SL should likely be similar to that of Uu.

**Q2) Do you agree with similar UE behaviour regarding SL DRX at the RX UE with respect to the timers in Q1 as that of Uu, namely:**

* **The RX UE determines the subframe associated with the start of the DRX cycle using the configured sl-drx-Cycle, sl-drx-StartOffset**
* **The RX UE starts the sl-drx-onDurationTimer after sl-drx-slotOffset from the beginning of the subframe**
* **The RX UE’s active time includes the time in which sl-drx-on-DurationTimer is running**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (if no, please explain why) |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y | Uu behavior should be baseline. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes with comments | We share the basic principle asked by this question.  In addition to that, however, regarding the part “The RX UE determines the subframe”, we would like to point out a possibile difference between the UE hehaviour for SL DRX and that for Uu DRX. Specifically, SL synchronization reference source used by a UE can be GNSS, eNB, gNB or another UE, and thus there may be the case that the TX UE and RX UE respectively use DFN and SFN which can be different at the same time. As a result, if the TX UE and RX UE directly uses DFN and SFN respectively to dertermine the subframe starting thesl-drx-onDurationTimer, there could be the misalignment between the TX UE and the RX UE on SL active time, with the further consequence of SL reception loss.  This is an SL specific issue which cannot be ignored, and thus needs to be further discussed and fully addressed by RAN2, i.e. how to align the TX UE and RX UE understanding on the subframe where the *sl-drx-onDurationTimer* is started in the case of different SL synchronization reference sources applied by each party. If the principle asked by this question is to be proposed, we ask for proposing this issue along with the proposal as well. |
| LG | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | We are fine to follow Uu behavior as baseline |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| vivo | Y |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Nokia | comments | We share the intention to have same principles for SL DRX compared to Uu DRX wrt SL DRX timers. However, this only works if TX-UE and RX-UE have the same global timing reference, i.e. same synchronization source. We think RAN2 needs to study the impact of synchronization-based misalignment between TX-UE and RX-UE. That may happen in several scenarios: TX-UE and RX-UE attached to different networks (not synchronized with each other) may have different Uu synchronization, TX-UE (in-coverage) and RX-UE (out-of-coverage) may use DFN vs. SFN (and sl-offsetDFN hastily introduced by the RAN1 can not resolve all problems), isolated UEs without GNSS support might use internal free-running clock etc. As a result of nonsynchronous operation between TX-UE RX-UE the sl-drx-SlotOffset and sl-drx-StartOffset can be misaligned (when setting to identical values) if the sidelink UEs have different understanding of subframe timing.  RAN2 needs to address this problem and discuss potential solutions right from the beginning of the SL DRX design phase, eventually including RAN1 consultation as the synchronization expertise is in RAN1 (please refer to [R1-1913696 where RAN1](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_99/LS/Outgoing/R1-1913696.zip) admitted it has not really solved all the problems related to multiple synchronization sources. |
| ITL | Y |  |
| ASUSTeK | Y |  |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| ZTE | Y |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

### 2.1.2 TX UE Handling

In order to synchronize transmission at the TX UE with the active periods of the RX UE, it would seem natural that the TX UE maintains similar timers defining the SL DRX cycle as the RX UE does.

**Q3) Do you agree that the TX UE also maintains the sl-drxCycle, sl-drx-StartOffset, and sl-drx-onDurationTimer, and considers the RX UE(s) to be active at least during the time in which the sl-drx-onDurationTimer is running?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (if no, please explain why) |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y | TX UE should be aware of the active time of RX UE to perform appropriate resource selection and logical channel multiplexing.  TX UE should not select logical channels to the inactive Rx UEs. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, with comment | Although the same behaviour as RX side is expected at the TX side for the “transmitter-receiver” consistency, it is however clear whether any specified UE behaiour for the transmitter is needed. That is, whether the word “*maintained*” in the question implies any spec impact or the intended transmitter behaviour is just up to UE implementation. This is in the end the key point that needs to be addressed.  If RAN2 finally agrees to specify DRX related TX UE behaviour, at least the behaviours of the TX UE side should be specifieid to avoid mis-match between transmission and reception or unnecessary UE power consumption. |
| LG | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y | We think specification at the TX UE is preferrable compared to UE implementation to avoid unnecessary resource usage and congestion. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | We assume that as per the agreement made in the last meeting, this synchronization of the timers between the TX and RX UE only pertains to a single direction, i.e. a separate set of timers would be needed for the other direction (when the TX and RX UE are reversed). |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| vivo | Y | Our interpretation is, Tx-UE may need to maintain the same DRX pattern, but its behaviors are different from Rx UE behaviors. Namely, Tx-UE is not necessary to be awake for monitoring SCIs during On Duration but only needs to be aware of the DRX pattern operated by the Rx-UE. This is because Tx UE only needs to realize its potential transmission during On duration. |
| Apple | Yes with Comments | We agree the TX UE need aware of the DRX configuration used by RX UE, but we do not thin it need to “maintain” an identical set of timers. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y | Agree with Xiaomi that Tx UE need to consider the Active Time of the Rx UE for the LCP procedure, i.e. Tx UE considers only those SL LCH(s) for the LCP procedure/destination selection whose corresponding DRX Active Time matches with the allocated SL resources. This should be specified and not left to implementation. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Nokia | Yes, with comments | In principle the high-level answer is yes, the TX-UE need to be synchronized to RX-UE wrt to SL DRX timers of the RX-UE, i.e. there is consistency between TX-UE knowledge of SL DRX timers running at RX-UE. Since there may be multiple PC5 links to the same or different UEs (that may have different RX SL DRX configurations) the “TX-UE shall maintain sl-drx timers of all the L2 connections to the RX-UEs”. |
| ITL | Y |  |
| ASUSTeK | Y | We share the same view with Xiaomi that Tx UE should select logical channels to active Rx UEs.  We think there’s no need to specify how Tx UE maintains the timers of the Rx UEs. |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| ZTE | Y |  |

## 2.2 SL Inactivity Timer for Unicast

### 2.2.1 RX UE Handling

In RAN2#113 [1], inactivity timer was agreed for at least sidelink unicast. However, the details of the inactivity timer for sidelink unicast require further discussion.

In Uu, the inactivity timer is used to extend the active time (beyond the on duration) when the UE continues to receive active scheduling by the network. The UE is configured with an inactivity timer per DRX group (if the secondary DRX group is configured). The active time for the serving cells in a DRX group includes the time while at least the drx-InactivityTimer configured for the DRX group is running.

For unicast sidelink, an RX UE can receive from different unicast links or pair of source/destination L2 IDs, which can each be considered as different transmission sources. Based on agreements in RAN2#113 [1], each pair of source/destination L2 IDs can be associated with a different DRX configuration, which may include the value of the inactivity timer itself. There are therefore at least two different options for how the RX UE maintains the inactivity timer:

Option 1: Separate inactivity timers started/maintained for each pair of source/destination L2 IDs

* The UE maintains a separate inactivity timer for each pair of source/destination L2 ID
* The UE starts/restarts the inactivity timer for that pair of source/destination L2 ID when the UE receives a transmission associated with that specific source/destination L2 ID.

Option 2: Single inactivity timer for all pair of source/destination L2 IDs

* The UE maintains a single inactivity timer regardless of the number of unicast links (pair of source/destination L2 IDs)
* The UE starts/restarts the inactivity timer when the UE receives a transmission associated with any unicast link (pair of source/destination L2 ID).
* The timer could be started with different values depending on the received transmission

In option 1, the UE maintains multiple inactivity timers and so the UE’s active time would include the time in which any of the inactivity timers at the UE is running. In option 2, there is only a single inactivity timer at the UE, however, the UE may need to set the value of that inactivity timer differently depending which source/destination L2 ID the data is associated to.

**Q4) For unicast, which option do you prefer for maintenance of the SL inactivity timer:**

1. **Option 1: RX UE maintains a separate SL inactivity timer for each pair of src/dest L2 ID**
2. **Option 2: RX UE maintains a single SL inactivity timer for all pairs of src/dest L2 ID, but the value of the timer can be set to different values**
3. **Other**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | Option 1 | * It was agreed in RAN2 #113 that “SL DRX configuration can be configured per a pair of source/destination“, which means the value of inactivity timer for each link is different. For Tx-UE: The different inactivity timers are not only maintained by the Rx UE for reception, but also maintained by each Tx UE to determine the time for transmission. For Tx-UE, it can only be maintained in a per-link manner, i.e., option-2 cannot be applied anyway for Tx-UE； * For Rx-UE: for option-2, not sure if „The timer could be started with different values depending on the received transmission“ is valid, e.g., if the inactivity timer is started at t1, with length of T1, even though it receives a new grant at t2 which assocates with a length of T2, it does not have to restart as long as t1+T1 > t2+T2.. So option-2 is just a way to mimic option-1, but would lead to unnecessary complexity for spec design.. |
| Xiaomi | Optin 2 | The rantionle of DRX per group in Uu is that Pcell and Scell operates on different frequency and there is two MAC entities correspondingly, which results in UE monitoring on different frequencies. But on sidelink, only one sidelink BWP and only one MAC entity is supported in NR. There is no difference on UE monitoring triggered by which pair of src/dest L2 ID. We see unnecessary complexity in maintaining seperate inactivity timers, considering the number of src/dest pare could be large.  How to maintain single inactivity timer upon MAC PDU reception could be further discussed. |
| Samsung | Option 1 | We think at least option 1 should be allowed based on our previous agreement that OPPO mentioned in the above. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A, Option 1 | This attributes to the “*multi-point to point*” nature of SL from the reception perspective of a specific UE. |
| LG | Option 1 |  |
| InterDigital | Option 1 | Either option is feasible. Option 1 may be easier to specify and more inline with how timers are used in Uu, since we do not need to consider the possibility of starting a timer with multiple possible valuie |
| CATT | Option 1 | According to the agreement we reached in RAN2#113-e, option 1 is more align with our understanding. |
| Ericsson (Min) | Option 1 | Option 1 is better, easier for spec development. Since different UE pair may employ different services/applications associated with different QoS requirments and different traffic pattern.  In addition, each UE pair is associated with a different DRX configuration. Using option 2, it would mean that UE has to maintain a common timer across multiple DRX configurations, leading to unnecessary complexity. |
| Intel | Option 1 | Since we assume that both TX and RX UE shall maintain the DRX related timers (including inactivity timer) for a given SRC/DST L2 ID pair, option 2 cannot work well considering that it is only the RX UE that can somehow consolidate the inactivity timer (configuration) for multiple SRC/DST pairs. Besides, Option 1 seems simpler and more inline with Uu design and so we prefer to go with Option 1 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| vivo | Option 1 | Option 1 fully reuses the current Uu DRX operations and can work well with synchronization operation between TX UE and RX UE.  For option 2, RX UE maintains a common SL inactivity timer which may be related to multiple TX SL inactivity timers from multiple TX UEs. This is a asymmetric (i.e. 1-to-Multiple) and unproven inactivity timer operation, which may be not good for DRX MAC CE benefits. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Sharp | Option 1 |  |
| Fujitsu | Option 1 | Since the agreement in RAN2#113-e is per pair configuration, option 1 is more aligned with this, i.e., it’s better to maintain this timer in a per pair granularity. |
| Nokia | Option 1 | Keeping separate SL inactivity timers for each pair of source/destination L2 ID (option 1) is straight forward solution with minimal specification impact. For sidelink unicast each PC5 connection (pair of src/dest L2 IDs) is associated with its own SL DRX configuration. |
| ITL | Option 1 | We think it is appropriate to take separate SL inactivity timer for each unicast link. It can be expected that the gNB or Tx UE properly selects the resources |
| ASUSTeK | Option 1 | We also think that option 2 is another version of option 1.  Since for unicast, DRX configuration is configured separately, it is straightforward to mainitain separate inactivity timers for different links. |
| Fraunhofer | Option 1 | We share the same view as majority companies to go with Option 1. |
| Apple | Option 2 | We think the RAN2 agreement cited by OPPO is for configuring the values of inactivityTimer parameters, it does not mean the UE need to have multiple inactivity timers maintained and running at the same time. Anyway, the SL MAC is either active or inacitive. It is meaningless to say the UE is active/inactive per src/dst address. We suggest to follow Uu guideline to configure a single inactivity timer per SL MAC. |
| ZTE | Option1 | We think option2 is not a feasible solution and we do not see too many benefits to adopt option2. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Option 1 |  |
| Lenovo | Option 1 | We understand option 1 is the meaning of RAN2 agreement for per unicast link SL DRX configuration. And comments from Xiaomi is not correct “The rantionle of DRX per group in Uu is that Pcell and Scell operates on different frequency and there is two MAC entities correspondingly” There are no two MAC entities for DRX per group in Uu |
| Qualcomm | Option 1(A) |  |

In Uu, the network configures the SL inactivity timer. Such configuration may take into account the expected DL traffic pattern associated with the QoS flows established at the UE, as well as the scheduling latency at the network. In SL DRX, unlike Uu DRX, the network may be unaware of the active QoS flows between two sidelink UEs (specifically for the IDLE/INACTIVE or OOC cases). However, the traffic pattern and consequently the inactivity timer, may still depend on the associated SL QoS flows at the TX UE.

**Q5) Do you agree that the value of the SL inactivity timer should have some relation to the QoS of the transmissions associated with pair of src/dest L2 IDs?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (if no, please explain why) |
| OPPO | N | we do not forsee the need of spec impact due to this, i.e., it is up to network / UE implementation to reflect the „relation“. |
| Xiaomi | Y | QoS should be considered when the value of inactivity timer is decided. But this could be done by NW or UE implementation without spec impact. |
| Samsung | Y | We think SL inactivity timer may have some relation to QoS and/or pair of src/dest L2 id dependent on the further discussion on how to signal/configure it. We may or may not have specification impact. To our view, for a pair of source/destination L2 id, we think single value will be enough. Then whether to derive this single value based on QoS or not is FFS, which to us, it's not essential consideration but more like for optimization. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, with comment | It is unclear what Spec impact is expected by asking this question. In Uu, how the QoS requirements are considered to set the DRX parameters is up to NW **implementation**.We don’t see this principle needs to be deviated from the Uu prinriple for at least SL Unicast, where a pair of UEs involving in a PC5 RRC connection can exchange the QoS parameters for the traffic they initiated, so that the UE/gNB (depending on who finally decides the SL DRX parameter for SL unicast) can set the SL DRX parameters just based on the PC5 QoS parameters via UE/gNB **implementation**. |
| LG | Y | Traffic pattern is related to QoS, and DRX timer for monitoring SL traffic of Tx UE should be set to a value considering the QoS (e.g., PQI) of SL data. |
| InterDigital | Y | We think there should at least be a way for the NW to configured an association between QoS and inactivity timer, as there is for configuring SLRB parameters based on in Rel16. |
| CATT | N | For Uu, the reason for introducing an inactivity timer is to reduce the impacts caused by data schedule latency. There is no obvious evidence that the relationship for QoS with the value of the inactivity timer is needed. |
| Ericsson (Min) | Y | As for Uu DRX, QoS requirements or traffic pattern can be considered when configuring DRX configurations/parameters including inactivity timer. |
| Intel | Y (see comment) | While QoS for SL traffic should be consdiered for the configuration of inactivity timer (and indeed SL DRX related timers in general), we think this should be up to NW/UE implementation and is related to how the configuration for SL DRX is obtained, e.g. based on coverage scenario, etc. So, it might be too soon to discuss this in detail, but we do think that at least the QoS/priority of incoming transmission should be considered. |
| Sharp | Y | The determination of the value could be NW/UE implemention |
| Fujitsu | N | It is not needed to define such a relationship b/w QoS and Inactivity timer value, it can be up to implementation. |
| Nokia | Y | Q5 just asks if there is a relation between value of sl-drx-InactivityTimer and the QoS, while Q5 does NOT ask if and how this should be specified. Yes, QoS assigned to certain PC5 links (src/dest L2 IDs) [and other parameters like resource utilization (CBR) of the resource pool, number of UEs within a resource pool etc.] may impact the value of the SL inactivity timer. |
| ITL | N | It is up to implementation issue |
| ASUSTeK | N | Share the same view with OPPO. |
| Fraunhofer | Y | The DRX timer should take into consideration the QoS or the traffic pattern. |
| ZTE | N | We do not see the strong relationship between inactivity timer and QoS requirements. From our perspective, the value of inactivity timer should take the power saving requirement of RX UE into consideration, not the QoS requirements, i.e. a lower value can be set to RX UE with strong power saving requirement. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y | It may be beneficial to consider the QoS requirement while RAN2 is considering the value of the SL inactivity time for NR PC5 interface. However, we wonder whether it needs the support from the upper layers and the possible spec impact in RAN2. |
| Lenovo | N | The values of the inactivity timer are stage-3 details, but DRX timer for monitoring SL traffic of Tx UE should be set to a value considering the QoS (e.g., PQI) of SL data. However will be left to NW implementation anyway. |
| Qualcomm | Y | Similar to Uu, QoS and traffic pattern may be considered. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| vivo | Y | In our understanding, SL inactivity timer may be configured per QoS flow/group especially for IDLE/INACTIVE or OOC cases. And UE deduces a per-link Inactivty timer value according to its QoS flow component and configurations. |
| Apple | Y |  |

If such an association is assumed, there can be at least two ways to ensure the inactivity timer takes such association into account.

One way would be for a single value of the inactivity timer to be determined for a pair of source/destination L2 ID. This value could be determined based on the active or expected QoS flows established between the TX and RX UE, or on the established SLRBs. This may require that the value of the inactivity timer for the pair of source/destination L2 IDs be changed each time the established flows or bearers are changed. Another way would be for the RX UE to determine the inactivity timer value to be applied based on the QoS of the transmission that started the timer.

**Q6) Does the RX UE start/restart the SL inactivity timer with:**

1. **a value configured for the pair of source/destination ID**
2. **a value configured for the QoS (e.g. priority) of the transmission that started the timer**
3. **Others**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | A (if the question is not restricted to **Rx** UE set..) | Similar to Uu, a single inactivity timer is sufficient even though there might be multiple QoS flows running. |
| Xiaomi | A | The SL inactivity timer is configured per pair of src/dest ID, which considers overall QoS between source and destination. In Uu, only one inacivity timer is supported even if there are traffic with different QoS for one UE. Furthermore, QoS information is not available in MAC. The LCH priority is not directly related to interval between next data arrival, which is not suitable to decide SL inactivity timer. |
| Samsung | A (with removal of RX) |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A | For SL Unicast, Option A is preferred, because the two UEs in a unicast PC5 RRC connection can exchange the QoS parameters so that a proper value can already be set by taking into account the QoS parameters of all flows running on the connection. As a result, there’s no need to again set the per QoS DRX parameters, which should be more a way applied to Groupcast/Broadcast where the QoS parameter exchange between UEs are not possible. |
| LG | A | RX UE can use the SL inactivity timer with a value configured for the QoS (e.g., PQI) per pair of source/destination ID. |
| InterDigital | A  B can be FFS for groupcast. | There is more granularity possible for configuring the inactivity timer based on the QoS profile (and communicating it to the peer UE in PC5-RRC) than using information in the MAC (e.g. priority, LCH), so A is preferrable for unicast.  Whether it is beneficial to consider B for groupcast can be further discussed. |
| CATT | A |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | A | Generally speaking, it is beneficial to consider QoS parameters or traffic pattern of services when setting DRX configuration, this is rule which is valid in both Uu DRX and SL DRX. However, how to set DRX configuration granularity considering QoS is a different issue. It is sufficient to have a single DRX configuration across different SL RBs, which is suitable to the dominated SL RB/service/flow. In other words, it is sufficient to adapt the DRX configuration to the main service/SL RB with critial QoS requirement. In such a way, it is beneficial to acheve a good balance between QoS satisfacion and reduction of the design complexity. |
| Intel | A | We think that per SRC/DST configuration seems sufficient |
| Sharp | A |  |
| Fujitsu | A |  |
| Nokia | A |  |
| ITL | A |  |
| ASUSTeK | A | For unicast, DRX configuration is configured per src/dst ID. |
| Fraunhofer | A | DRX inactivity timer per source and destination in case of unicast should suffice assuming it already considers the overall QoS. |
| Apple | See comment | If this is only for unicast case, we support A. |
| ZTE | A |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | A | 1. Per SRC/DST configuration should be suppored firstly. 2. The power-saving gain of Per priority configuratrion may need more analysis. |
| Lenovo | A |  |
| Qualcomm | A | For multiple QoS flows, the Rx UE doesn’t know the QoS associated to a packet to be received. So setting Inactivity timer per pair of source/destination ID is sufficient for Rx UE and Tx UE maintaining synchronized behavior. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| vivo | A | SL inactivity timer should be configured per link level, i.e. the pair of source/destination ID. And the value of this timer should be determined based on the combination of established QoS flows, i.e. not the single QoS with highest priority. |

In Uu, the UE starts or restarts the drx-InactivityTimer for a DRX group if the PDCCH indicates a new transmission on a serving cell in this DRX group. In other words, the inactivity timer is associated with new transmissions from the perspective of the UE, whereas retransmissions are handled using the retransmission timer for each HARQ process. Since both transmissions are retransmissions are possible for sidelink, it would be straightforward to model the inactivity timer in a similar way for sidelink and start the inactivity timer only for new transmissions of a TB from the RX UE perspective.

**Q7) Should the RX UE (re)start the SL inactivity timer upon reception of a new SL data transmission from the RX UE perspective (similar to Uu)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response  (Y/N) | Comments (if no, please explain why) |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y | Uu behavior should be baseline. |
| Samsung | Y in principle (see comment) | We think upon reception of PSCCH indicating a new SL data transmission. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | If the per SRC/DST Inactivity timer is agreed, more detailed description should be that the SL inactitity timer of a SRC/DST pair is (re)started when the new transmission for the associated pair is received. |
| LG | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y | Similar to Uu, new transmission should be defined from the RX UE perspective. The RX UE could miss the initial transmission from the TX UE but should still reset the timer when it receives a retransmission. |
| CATT | Y with comments | If we aligh with Uu behavior, it should the RX UE (re)start the SL inactivity timer upon recepiton of stage2 SCI indicates a new SL data transmission. |
| Ericsson (Min) | Yes | Same as in Uu |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Nokia | Y |  |
| ITL | Y |  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | If there are possible subsequent dynamic transmisisons after the new SL data transmission, Rx UE should (re)start the SL inactivity timer. |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| ZTE | Y |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Yes | RX UE (re)starts the SL inactivity timer based on PSCCH monitoring result. |
| Lenovo | Y | One difference is SL configured grant. It should be noted that for SL CG resources the SLdrx-inactivity timer should not be started similar to the Uu interface where Drx-inactivity is not started for SL SPS transmissions. In Uu DRX Drx-inactivityTimer is currently not started for DL SPS(CG) transmission. Instead *drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDL* is started after transmission of DL HARQ feedback, e.g. transmitted on PUCCH. However Rx UE is not aware of whether a SL resource has been allocated by a SL configured grant allocation, e.g. SL CG allocated by gNB (mode 1), or allocated by a dynamic grant. This issue should be addressed. |
| Qualcomm | Y | May start Inactivity timer within its monitoring resource pool. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Vivo | Y |  |

One potential difference with sidelink is that while the HARQ information (e.g. process ID, NDI, etc.) is in the SCI, the L2 ID is contained in the MAC header and requires successful decoding of the TB. If the decision of whether to start and run the inactivity timer is based only on the L1 ID, a UE may start an inactivity timer for transmissions which are associated with a matching L1 ID but non-matching L2 ID. Furthermore, sidelink transmissions may not always contain data transmissions. Specifically, a MAC PDU can contain a SL CSI report MAC CE only, and whether starting/running the inactivity timer at the reception of a SL CSI MAC CE is beneficial needs to be considered. Considering information in the MAC header/MAC PDU would therefore result in a more efficient use of the inactivity timer.

**Q8) What information should the UE consider when handling the SL inactivity timer?**

1. **Information in the SCI only**
2. **Information in both SCI and MAC header**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | B | We share the same view with the rapporteur that if we adopt option A the UE may start inactivity timer unnecessarily, i.e., lead to power waste.  As for option B, before starting inactivity timer, there is a latency due to data channel decoding, i.e., HARQ retransmission and PSSCH decoding plus MAC subheader reading, which brings a further issue, i.e., how to ensure the inactivity timer alignment between Tx and Rx UE discussed considering this HARQ and decoding latency. This issue should also be discussed if going towards option-B. |
| Xiaomi | B | Option A would result in false alarm. |
| Samsung | A | We think option A is baseline and option B is more like for optimization and we need to see further details of option B regarding whether it brings more issues and/or complexities. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A, with comments | For Opt A, there seems to be two ways of reading, i.e. information in 1st-stage SCI only *OR* that in both 1st and 2nd stage SCI. We think, it is the information in Both 1st stage SCI and 2nd stage SCI that should be taken into account, since this can result in better power saving effect than consideirng only 1st stage SCI, due to the consideration on the L1 SRC/DST Ids included in the 2nd stage SCI. We think this aspect should be clarified, if Opt A is finally proposed.  Regareding Opt B, the SL inactivity timer is started only when a new MAC PDU is successfully decoded. If a new MAC PDU is not successfully decoded, the SL inactivity timer is not started, and this will further cause the consequence that the SL active time is not extended by a new SL transmission. Also, this way is different from Uu DRX modeling, because now the (re)start of the timer of SL Inactitiy timer depends the some forms of interaction between the (de-)Mux Entity and the MAC Entity. This does not seem to follow the basic modeling in the MAC. |
| LG | A | In the case of applying B), if the Rx UE fails to decode the PSSCH (MAC header), misalignment of the timer start with the Tx UE may occur. This is because the Tx UE can determine that the Rx UE has started the timer when transmitting the PSCCH. |
| InterDigital | B | Option B avoids unnecessary power consumption at the RX UE which would result from starting the inactivity timer prematurely. The timer can be started at some time after PSCCH reception at both the TX and RX UE to avoid misalignment, for example. |
| Vivo | B | Per SL link DRX operation means matching L2 ID. UE can (re-)start the SL inactivity timer after the end of SCI subframe, which is a fixed time point and no impacts by different processing capabilities of Ues. Later when MAC header is processed and L2 ID is verified or not, inactivity timer can be updated. Details are left to UE implementation. |
| CATT | A | Option B’s proference is better than option A at the cost of complex protocol design. In fact, L2 ID(24bits) may also result in false alarm(power waste). Considering that there are 16bits for L1 destination ID, the probability of false alarm is acceptable. |
| Ericsson (Min) | A | Option A shall be adopted. In order to address the false alarm issue, UE can be allowed to stop inactivity timer if the decoding of the MAC PDU turns out that the PDU is not intended to the UE. While with option B, decoding failure of the MAC PDU would lead to misalignment issue between TX and RX UE, which is difficult to be avoided. |
| Intel | A | We agree with Samsung that as a baseline, only information in SCI should be considered (1st and potentially 2nd stage SCI). Option A also allows for simpler/easier alignement between TX and RX UE inactivity timer compared to Option B |
| Sharp | B | when handling the SL inactivity timer, we think both informations are helpful, e.g.   * SL inactivity timer could be started considering Information in the SCI only * SL inactivity timer could be stopeped considering Information in both SCI and MAC header   So the alignment for between TX and RX UE in inactivity timer could be reliable. |
| Fujitsu | A | Option A should be considered as baseline. |
| Nokia | A | To our understanding SCI means full SCI, i.e. 1st and 2nd stage SCI. The second stage SCI contains 8-bits source identity (ID) and a 16-bits destination ID. |
| ITL | A | As rapporteur noted, we agree that Option A can cause false alarms. However, in the case of Obtion B, since inactivity timer misaligned due to decoding failure may occur, we think Option A is considered as baseline. |
| ASUSTeK | A | We think the inactivity timer should be (re)started after SCI reception.  There’s no need to introduce further enhancement (e.g. stop the inactivity timer) to address the false alarm. |
| Fraunhofer | A | With Option A the misalignment issue between TX and RX may easily be avoided, compared to the failure in decoding of MAC PDU. |
| Apple | A | SCI decoding is sufficient. |
| ZTE | A | We first agree the observation of this mis-match L2 ID issue. Actually, same issue also exits in R16 sidelink unicast link, i.e. whether RX UE should signal HARQ feedback after checking the full L2 ID, the agreements in RAN2109-e meeting is: UE send HARQ feedback without checking MAC header.  The length of L2 and L1 ID in SCI is designed by RAN1, from RAN2’s perspective, this straightforward mis-match issue is already taken into RAN1’s consideration. We do not see the necessary to solve this issue in RAN2. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | A | 1. Option A should be considered as baseline. However, the details still need RAN2 consensus. 2. Option B may cause additional compelxity. |
| Lenovo | A | We are concern for misalignment issue if decoding failure occurs at Rx UE. |
| Qualcomm | A | Similar to Uu based on DCI, SCI decoding is sufficient enough for synchronizing Tx UE and Rx UE’s behavior. |

In Uu, the drx-InactivityTimer is started in the first symbol after the end of the PDCCH reception. If only information in the SCI is considered when handling the inactivity timer, a similar approach to Uu may be used for sidelink, and the inactivity timer may be started in the first slot after the end of the SCI reception. If information in the MAC header is considered for inactivity timer handling, the UE may either start the inactivity timer immediately following reception of SCI, and stop it later, or the UE could instead start the inactivity timer in the first slot after the MAC PDU is decoded, or at some pre-defined slot following SCI reception. Finally, as discussed in section 2.2.2 (Q11), half-duplex, for example, may motivate the use of starting the inactivity timer based on HARQ feedback in some cases.

**Q9) When should the RX UE (re)start the SL inactivity timer?**

1. **In the first slot after the end of SCI reception**
2. **In the first slot after MAC PDU header is decoded**
3. **A configured or pre-defined number of slots after the end of SCI reception**
4. **Following transmission of PSFCH (if the transmission is HARQ enabled)**
5. **Others?**
6. **In the first symbol after the end of the reception of 2nd stage SCI**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | A), D) and E) for different cases | Option A) if “ Information in the SCI only“ is concluded for Q8.   * For the case that “ Information in both SCI and MAC header“ is used, as our comments above, both Tx-UE and Rx-UE have to take into account of additional latency due to HARQ retransmission and PSSCH decoding, therefore: * Option D) if HARQ **enabled**. * For HARQ **disabled** case, even though the time for PSSCH decoding plus MAC subheader reading can be bounded by UE processing capability, the time for HARQ retransmission is environment-dependent, and thus cannot be pre-judged. So either we leave this to UE implementation, or to prevent inactivity timer (re)start for FB disabled case => either 1) up to UE implementation when to (re)start inactivity timer, or 2) not (re)start inactivity timer at all. |
| Xiaomi | A | We prefer a common solution to all scenarioes. Option D is not preferred, since only HARQ enable is supported. Option B may result in miscynchronization between TX and RX UE, since the MAC PDU header decoding time is unknown to TX UE. Option C creats gap between SCI reception and SL inactivity timer running, which may result in data loss during gap. |
| Samsung | A | We think A is the baseline. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | F | Corresponding to our answer to Q8. |
| LG | F |  |
| Interdigital | C or A, depending on outcome of Q8 | We think C can be used if inactivity timer starting depends on information in the MAC. If we decide to use SCI only, then A can be used. |
| vivo | A | B) is not reasonable since different UE has different decoding capability, which may cause mis-alignment about active time between TX UE and RX UE.  C) just means that every Inactivity timer is extended with a configured or pre-defined number of slots. D) is only for HARQ enabled case.  A) is the current Uu solution and fully validated. Hence A) is baseline. |
| CATT | A or F | We think both have the same meaning. |
| Ericsson (Min) | A | As we comments for Q8, in order to address false alarm issue, UE shall be allowed to stop inactivitytimer if the decoding of the MAC PDU turns out that the PDU is not intended to the UE |
| Intel | A | As mentioned before, we think Option A is the simplest to consider. Option C might be considered but raises the question of synchronization between TX and RX UE.  Note that we assume option A somehow includes option F as well and is the next level detail that we can discuss later |
| Sharp | A |  |
| Fujitsu | A | We agree SS and Intel that option A is the simplest one. |
| Nokia | A or D | For option D there seems to be a wrong understanding: the PSFCH resource (1 or 2 symbols) in the configured slot are always present, regardless if HARQ feedback is enabled or not. If HARQ is disabled the PSFCH symbol(s) are wasted, i.e. can not be used for e.g. PSSCH. |
| ITL | A/F |  |
| ASUSTeK | A/F | Inactivity timer should be started for SCI reception indicating new transmission. |
| Fraunhofer | A | As per Q8 we think, Option A is the baseline. |
| Apple | A |  |
| ZTE | A | The SCI implies 1st stage SCI and 2nd stage SCI from RAN2’s perspective. And the granularity of DRX configuration is slot in Uu interface, we prefer a unified solution. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | F |  |
| Lenovo | A | Follow Uu principle as the baseline |
| Qualcomm | A | Simpler for synchronizing Tx UE and Rx UE’s behaviour. |

### 2.2.2 TX UE Handling

Similar to the onDurationTimer, the TX UE should have a means to know when the RX UE is active as a result of the inactivity timer running at the RX UE. One straightforward way is for the TX UE to maintain a similar inactivity timer associated with that RX UE and ensure that transmissions are performed by the TX UE when the RX UE is active.

**Q10) For unicast, do you agree that the TX UE maintains is own timer associated with the RX UE to be able to determine the active time of that RX UE?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response  (Y/N) | Comments (if no, please explain why) |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y | Same as Q3. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, with comment | Same comments as to Q3. |
| LG | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | Same as in Q3, we assume that this maintenance of inactivity timer at the TX UE only pertains to a single direction over the unicast link. |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Nokia | Y | As stated previously, the SL DRX InactivityTimer refers to src/dest L2 IDs i.e. is per PC5 unicast connection. |
| ITL | Y |  |
| ASUSTeK | Y | It is beneficial for Tx UE to keep track of each Rx UE’s active time. |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| Apple | Left to UE implementation | We think the TX UE need track active time of peer UE, but we are reluctant to have 3GPP to specify how TX UE perform this (e.g, using a timer). This can be left to UE implementation. |
| ZTE | Y |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y | The SL DRX InactivityTimer refers to src/dest L2 IDs i.e. is per PC5 unicast connection |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

The TX UE may start the inactivity timer associated to an RX UE upon a new transmission to that RX UE (or at some time after such new transmission). This would align the inactivity timers at the TX and RX UE. One problem is that the RX UE may miss the new transmission from the TX UE for various reasons:

* SCI misdetection
* PSSCH decoding error
* Half-duplex
* Etc.

As a result, the TX UE may (re)start its inactivity timer (with respect to the RX UE) while the RX UE has not (re)started the inactivity timer. This may result in the RX UE not receiving subsequent transmissions of new data sent by the TX UE. RAN2 should discuss whether this issue needs to be handled, and if so, how to handle it. One straightforward way to avoid unsynchronized timers is to rely on HARQ feedback from the RX UE. This can be used for transmissions with HARQ feedback enabled. For transmissions where we cannot rely on HARQ feedback, the TX UE can tailor its transmissions in order to increase the likelihood that the inactivity timer is started at the RX UE. For example, the TX UE may perform multiple retransmissions to avoid that half-duplex plays a role in whether the RX UE restarts the inactivity timer.

**Q11) Which option(s) should RAN2 discuss to reduce the likelihood of having unsynchronized inactivity timers at the TX and RX UEs:**

1. **Use of HARQ feedback**
2. **Rely on retransmissions**
3. **Others**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | A), C) if Q8 is concluded as option-B, otherwise NONE | We assume alignment is needed in Q11 and Q8/9, i.e., if Q8 is concluded to option-B   * A) for HARQ **enabled** case * Either 1) up to UE implementation to (re)start inactivity timer or 2) not (re)start inactivity timer at all for HARQ **disabled** case.   Otherwise, if Q8 is concluded as option-A   * We can rely on TX-UE implementation to solve the DRX un-sync issue, i.e., no spec impact |
| Xiaomi | A, B, C | Option A and B can help reduce the likelihood of unsynchronization. But there is limitation for both options. Option A only works in HARQ enable transmission. Option B could not resolve the problem due to half-duplex. If RX UE performs Uu UL or sidelink transmission in the active time, sidelink retransmission can not be received. In this case, RX UE should extend the active time to provide further reception opportunity. |
| Samsung | A | A is for the case when HARQ is enabled. FFS for the case where HARQ is disabled. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | For HARQ FB enabled case, we think there is no difference between SL unicast and Uu where such error/exceptional case can also happen. Since in Uu, we don’t have special operations for these cases and generally depend on the gNB (TX side) implementation to address such issues, we don’t see strong motivation to introduce extra things for SL unicast and sees no problem to depending on also TX UE implementation.  For HARQ FB disabled case, we may depend on (blind) retransmission to address the issue, but currently we don’t see extra things to be done on top of the current retransmission mechinism when HARQ FB is disabled.  For Half-duplex issue, it has been being dicussed by RAN1 since the birth of 3GPP SL; therefore, it is a RAN1 issue w/o need of touch by RAN2.  To summarize, we currently don’t see specific Spec impacts needed to address the unsync inactivity timer handling from a RAN2 perspective. |
| LG | A | A can be used for the case of HARQ Feedback enabled. |
| InterDigital | At least A | We think the issue should be resolved for SL because it would occur more than Uu, where half-duplex and UL/SL prioritziation cannot occur. HARQ feedback can resolve the issue for HARQ enabled transmissions, and we can further study HARQ disabled transmissions. |
| vivo | C | Up to TX UE implementation. |
| CATT | See comments | For Uu DRX, the UE may also miss the new transmission from the gNB for DCI misdetection. For inactivity timer, it is unnecessary to guarantee 100% synchronization at the cost of complex protocol design. |
| Ericsson (Min) | none | Fully agree with Huawei. The similiar issue is existing for Uu. Since there is no special treatment in Uu, don’t see reason why we need to define special treatment for SL. |
| Intel | See comment | At least option A is applicable for the case when HARQ FB is enabled. Of course, we can further discuss need of potential solutions on how the TX UE can maintain the synchronization of the timer when HARQ FB is not enabled and whether we need to specify anything to handle it. We have some sympathy for Huawei’s comment that it is not clear whether we really need to have special handling compared to Uu case. |
| Sharp | C | It could be left to UE implementation. |
| Fujitsu | none | We agree HW and Ericsson’s proposal that no special treatment should be done for SL. |
| Nokia | none | All options can be discussed in RAN2. Whether none, one or all option(s) should be specified (and if so how) is a different question. In our view we fail to see a need to specify a behavior for the TX-UE. |
| ITL | A | For HARQ FB disabled case, it is up to implemetation no need specification work. |
| ASUSTeK | See comment | Agree with Huawei that no special handling is needed similar to Uu. |
| Fraunhofer | A | At least for the HARQ enabled case Option A can be considered. |
| Apple | None | How TX UE track RX UE DRX active/inactive time shall be left to UE implementation. The spec only need to ensrue the peer UEs share the same DRX configuration. There is no need to specify tracking behavior. |
| ZTE | A | We think inactivity timer can only be used for HARQ enabled TB. For HARQ feedback disabled TB, considering it is hard to avoid unsynchronization issue, the inactivity timer can not be used for TB with HARQ disabled from our view. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | None | We agree with HW. |
| Lenovo | A | Option A can work when HARQ FB is enabled. For HARQ FB disable case, how to handle inactivity timer can be FFS |
| Qualcomm | None | Same for Uu DRX. |

The starting time of the inactivity timer at the TX UE can depend on whether/which option is chosen to avoid the issue of unsynchronized timers. If multiple options are supported, then the TX UE may start its inactivity timer at different times depending on which option is used at a given time.

**Q12) Given the option(s) preferred in Q11, which of the following should be considered as valid time(s) in where the SL inactivity timer at the TX UE (with respect to a specific RX UE) is (re)started?**

1. **At the slot following an SCI (re)transmission to the RX UE**
2. **A (pre)configured/pre-defined number of slots following a (re)transmission to the RX UE**
3. **Following reception of HARQ feedback on PSFCH (e.g. ACK or NACK) for a (re)transmission**
4. **Others**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | A), D) and E) for different cases | Please refer to the comments for Q9. |
| Xiaomi | A | Same as Q9 |
| Samsung | A | We think A is baseline. |
| LG | A |  |
| InterDigital | A, B, C | These are all possible depending on the assumptions for previous questions. Specifically, if HARQ feedback is used for handle inactivity timer synchronization, C can be used at the TX UE. |
| Vivo | A | Same as the above response to Q9. |
| Ericsson (Min) | none | See comments for Q11. |
| Sharp | A |  |
| Fujitsu | A |  |
| Nokia | none | see Q11 |
| ITL | A |  |
| Fraunhofer | A | Same as Q9. |
| Apple | None | See Q11 |
| ZTE | A | A should be the baseline solution. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | None |  |
| Lenovo | A |  |
| Qualcomm | A |  |

## 2.3 Inactivity Timer for Groupcast/Broadcast

The need for inactivity timer for groupcast was discussed in RAN2#113[1] and was left FFS. On the one hand, some companies argued that it should be supported because it allows the transmission opportunities associated with groupcast to be extended beyond the guaranteed-on period (defined by the on duration timer). On the other hand, some companies argued that it should not be supported for groupcast because of the inherently unstable topology of groupcast.

One potential issue with groupcast is how to ensure all RX UE’s have started their inactivity timers. This is similar to the problem of unsynchronized inactivity timers for the unicast case. Specifically, the TX UE may start its inactivity timer and perform further transmissions outside the on duration, but one or more of the RX UEs may not have started their inactivity timer(s). These UEs may miss all subsequent transmissions which occur (until the next on duration) while the TX UE continues to perform transmissions. As in the case of unicast, some possible solutions (e.g. use of HARQ feedback, or adaptation of the transmissions at the TX UE) can be used to solve the problem for the groupcast case.

Another issue is that a UE in a group may join the group (or be able to receive the groupcast transmissions) at a time when the on duration timer is not running but one or more TX UEs are transmitting (due to a running inactivity timer). In this case, these new UEs joining the group may not receive transmissions until the next on duration. If companies feel this is an issue, one way to avoid it is by limiting the usage of the inactivity timer to the case of stable group topology (e.g. group member ID and group size provided by upper layers). Inactivity timer may also be limited to transmissions with some QoS only (e.g. corresponding to best effort or low reliability requirements).

Depending on whether the above issues are considered critical for the functioning of groupcast RAN2 may consider limiting the applicability of inactivity timer for groupcast, or not using it at all.

**Q13a) For groupcast transmissions, inactivity timer is:**

1. **Always supported**
2. **Supported only for some groupcast transmissions**
3. **Not supported**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | C) | Except for the potential issues listed by rapporteur, even for the stable group topology and HARQ enabled case, even though the ACK-NACK feedback provides a tool for Tx-UE to be aware of the connection to all RX-UEs, e.g., by receiving A-N feedback from ALL Rx-UE, Tx-UE can be confident on the reachability and thus to start the inactivity timer, but since there is no tool for one RX-UE to know the status of other RX-UEs, one RX-UE A may start inactivity timer even if there are another RX-UE B does not receive the SCI and thus neither the RX-UE B nor the TX-UE start the inactivity timer, and thus lead to power waste of RX-UE A -it is still infeasible to apply inactivity timer for group-cast. |
| Xiaomi | B | We see benefit to support inactivity timer in certain case, i.e. the group member/topology is stable/fixed. This timer could be optional configured. The granularity should be per group, i.e. destinatio id. |
| Samsung | B | We think if HARQ ACK is supported, it would be pretty much similar to unicast. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | C | We don’t see big motivation to support the inactivity timer in Groupcast, especailly considering the complication when it is maintained along with HARQ RTT Timer (already agreed) and Retransmission timer to be discussed later. To avoid such complication, we don’t support it for Groupcast. |
| LG | A with comment | Inactivity timer can be always supported, and the inactivity timer can be turned on/off by setting the timer value to 0. |
| InterDigital | B | Agree with Xiaomi and Samsung. |
| vivo | A or B | Inactivity timer is used to extend active time (i.e. transmit data timely) upon continuous arrival of data and avoid delaying these data to the next cycle.  With an assumption that there are 19 UEs in the group with good link quality and 1 newest UE or with bad link quality, A) means that the QoS requirements and user experience of 19 UEs have been considered and guaranteed and C) means that the data of the 19 UEs may be delayed to next DRX cycle due to the 1 newest/bad UE, which does not make sense.  Furthermore, there may be some implementation solutions to handle the newest/bad-quality UE issue in groupcast, e.g. TX UE repitition for high-relibility QoS, newest UE continuously monitoring in the first cycle after joining and so on.  Solution B) can be implemented with zero value configured to inactivity timer. |
| CATT | A | For Uu, the reason for introducing an inactivity timer is to reduce the impacts caused by data schedule latency.  For the problem of unsynchronized inactivity timers, we don’t think it is necessary to guarantee 100% synchronization at the cost of complex protocol design. |
| Ericsson (Min) | A | Inactivitytimer shall be supported, since it is beneficial to handle the aperiodic traffic. Meanwhile, the misalignment issue for groupcast is similiar as for unicast. Similiar issue is also existing for Uu. SL can just reuse UU DRX as baseline, i.e., to always support inactivity timer. |
| Intel | B | We think it is too soon to rule out inactivity timer for groupcast case completely. Certainly, there can be some benefit even if the synchronization issue is left to UE implementation to solve. |
| Sharp | B | Agree with Samsung. |
| Fujitsu | B | We think it only applicable for groupcast in the case where group member/topology is stable/fixed. |
| Nokia | A | A unified design of SL DRX for all cast types is preferred. |
| ITL | C | Agree with OPPO. |
| ASUSTeK | A | We think the inactivity timer can be optionally configurable for groupcast. The unsynchronization issue exists both in Uu and SL unicast, and the groupcast can follow same principle. |
| Fraunhofer | A | We think the groupcast transmission, which was initiated during ON duration, can be continued after triggering the inactivity timer. |
| Apple | A | A single Inactive timer can always be maintained per SL MAC. Whether it is (re)started after receiving a groupcsat transmission can be further discussed. |
| ZTE | C | We share the same view with OPPO. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | A or B | The Sidelink Inactivity could be supported on a stable sidelink multi-cast/broadcast group. |
| Lenovo | A |  |
| Qualcomm | A | Inactivity timer is needed for at least blind or HARQ retransmissions. In general, it’s beneficial to support Inactivity timer since it provides flexibility for managing traffic load. |

**Q13b) If the answer to the previous question is B), under which scenarios should groupcast transmissions support inactivity timer:**

1. **Supported for specific groupcast HARQ-enabled transmissions**
2. **Supported for specific group configuration from upper layers (e.g. presence of group size/member ID)**
3. **Supported for certain types of transmissions (e.g. certain QoS/priority)**
4. **Others**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| Xiaomi | D | As replied to last question, the inactivity timer should be supported in the granularity of group, which has stable/fixed group member/topology. If the group member/topology is dynamically changing, there is a risk of data loss for new members. |
| Samsung | A, B | We think if HARQ ACK is supported, it would be pretty much similar to unicast. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | None | We don’t support Inactivity timer for Groupcast. |
| InterDigital | A,B | Considering either A and B, there seems to be no issue with Inactivity timer. |
| vivo | C or D | In our understanding, DRX timer value is essentially determined by QoS and arrival characteristics of services. But for groupcast, the same DRX parameters should be acquired by all of TX and RX UEs. Details are FFS and depend on DRX parameter delivery solution for groupcast. |
| Intel | At least A | As with the unicast case, in case of HARQ FB enabled, inactivity timer can be supported. Other options should not be precluded as well |
| Sharp | A | At least scenario A should support inactivity timer for groupcast transmissions. |
| Fujitsu | A, B | It is better that both A and B are fulfilled. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | At least A. | 1. At least Scenario A) could be supported. 2. Scenario B) & Sceanrio C) may need SA2 support. |

A similar question can be asked for broadcast. Although in the case of broadcast, the specific conditions (if any) where we may/may not want to support inactivity timer may be limited since neither HARQ feedback, nor group information is available from upper layers.

**Q14) For broadcast transmissions, inactivity timer is:**

1. **Always supported**
2. **Supported for certain conditions (please specify)**
3. **Not supported**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | C | Without HARQ feedback, there is no tools for TX-UE to detect reachabity at all. |
| Xiaomi | C | It’s impossible for TX UE and all RX UEs to maintain synchronized inactivity timer in broadcast. |
| Samsung | C |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | C | It is unclear how to support any dynamic-maintained DRX timers for Broadcast where there seems little chance for the transmitter to find the timer status of any peer UEs and even less chance to use any ways to avoid packet missing due to the misaligned timer status among peer UEs. |
| LG | A | Same as groupcast |
| InterDigital | C |  |
| vivo | C | Broadcast is good to use the simplest DRX pattern, i.e. only onDuration timer. |
| CATT | C |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | A | See comments for Q13a |
| Intel | C |  |
| Sharp | C |  |
| Fujitsu | C |  |
| Nokia | A | A unified design of SL DRX for all cast types is preferred. |
| ITL | C |  |
| ASUSTeK | C |  |
| Fraunhofer | A | See Q13a. |
| Apple | A | A single Inactive timer can always be maintained per SL MAC. Whether it is (re)started after receiving a broadcsat transmission can be further discussed. |
| ZTE | C |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | A | Same as sidelink groupcast. |
| Lenovo | C |  |
| Qualcomm | A | Inactivity timer is needed for at least blind retransmissions. In general, it’s beneficial to support Inactivity timer since it provides flexibility for managing traffic load. |

### 2.3.1 RX UE Handling

Similar to the case of unicast, the RX UE may maintain one or multiple inactivity timers associated with groupcast and/or broadcast. If a single inactivity timer is maintained, and we support inactivity timer for both groupcast and broadcast, then each cast may also possibly be associated with its own inactivity timer. If multiple inactivity timers are maintained, then the RX UE may maintain one for each L2 destination ID, or QoS. Alternatively, multiple inactivity timers can be maintained within a groupcast/broadcast transmission, where each inactivity timer is associated to a specific TX UE. In this case, the inactivity timer is maintained per pair of source/destination L2 ID (as in the case of unicast).

**Q15) For groupcast/broadcast, if SL inactivity timer is supported, which of the following is assumed for the RX UE:**

1. **Single inactivity timer for groupcast/broadcast**
2. **Separate inactivity timer for groupcast vs broadcast**
3. **Separate inactivity timer for each L2 destination ID associated with groupcast/broadcast**
4. **Separate inactivity timer for each QoS associated with groupcast/broadcast**
5. **Separate inactivity timer for each pair of source/destination L2 ID**
6. **Other**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | NONE | As reply to Q13a/14, we don’t support inactivity timer for SL groupcast and broadcast. |
| Xiaomi | A | Same as Q4 |
| Samsung | C for groupcast (with comment) | We think DRX operates per L2 destination id for groupcast, so from timer handling point of view, separate timer will operate per L2 destination id. However if we talk about the inactivity timer value itself, we assume common value will be applied e.g. A or D. For broadcast, we don’t think inactivity timer is applied since there is no mean TX UE knows whether RX UE missed SCI or not. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | None | We don’t support inactivity timer for either Groupcast or Broadcast. |
| LG | None | We prefer to start this discussion after the discussion of the granularity of the SL DRX configuration has ended. |
| InterDigital | C | A UE can have a single inactivity timer for each L2 destination ID. Depending on the discussion on configuration, the value can be set based on the QoS. |
| vivo | C | Each groupcast is identified with a specific L2 destination ID. Hence inactivity timer is per L2 destination ID. |
| CATT | See comments | This is an issue is related to the granularity of SL broadcast/groupcast. It’s better to discuss the granularity issue firstly. |
| Ericsson (Min) | C | In Rel-16, there is mapping between V2X services and L2 destination address. the same principle can be used for SL DRX in Rel-17. Therefore, a RX UE may maintain one or multiple DRX configurations for GC/BC, each configuration is associated with a different service. In this case, the inactivitytimer can be configured per DRX configuration. |
| Intel | C with comment | For groupcast, we think similar logic as unicast applies, i.e. in order to have a simple way of synchronizing the inactivity timer between TX and RX UEs, separate timers for each L2 DST ID should be supported.  No timer is needed for broadcast |
| Sharp | C |  |
| Fujitsu | C with comments | In our opionion, SL DRX shall be configured and maintained per destinition ID for groupcast scenario, Inactivity timer should not be supported for broadcast. |
| Nokia | C |  |
| ASUSTeK | C |  |
| Fraunhofer | C | Separate inactivity timers associated to each L2 source/destination ID should be applicable. |
| Apple | A | WE think there is only one inactivity timer needed per SL MAC |
| ZTE | None | We don’t support inactivity timer for SL groupcast and broadcast. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | C |  |
| Lenovo | C or D with comments | This depending on how SL DRX configuration is configured for groupcast. If per-destination configured, then prefer C; if per-PQI configured, then prefer D |
| Qualcomm | C | For a group or service |

Depending on the answer to question Q4 and Q15, the UE may start/maintain multiple inactivity timers for unicast/groupcast/broadcast. Since active time is defined as the time in which the UE monitors SCI1 and SCI2, it would seem that the UE should be active whenever any of its maintained inactivity timers are running.

**Q16) Assuming the RX UE maintains multiple SL inactivity timers for unicast/groupcast/broadcast do you agree that the RX UE should be active whenever any of its SL inactivity timers are running?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (if no, please explain why) |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes for Unicast;  No for Groupcast or Broadcast. | We don’t support inactivity timer for either Groupcast or Broadcast. |
| LG | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Nokia | Y |  |
| ASUSTeK | Y |  |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| ZTE | Y |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

### 2.3.2 TX UE Handling

Similar to the case of unicast, if inactivity timer is supported for groupcast/broadcast, RAN2 should discuss which time/times are applicable for the TX UE to start/(re)start the inactivity timer. In addition to the options associated to unicast, an additional option specific to groupcast/broadcast is to start the inactivity timer when the TX UE receives a transmission (from another UE) associated with the same L2 destination ID or QoS, and therefore tied to the same inactivity timer. In this case, the TX UE may profit from the transmission performed by another UE which results in starting the inactivity timers associated with the other RX UEs associated with the same L2 destination ID, for example.

**Q17) For groupcast/broadcast transmissions, if inactivity timer is supported, what time(s) should the TX UE (re)start its SL inactivity timer with respect to the RX UE(s)**

1. **At the slot following an SCI (re)transmission by the TX UE**
2. **A (pre)configured/pre-defined number of slots following the SCI for a (re)transmission by the TX UE**
3. **Following reception of HARQ feedback on PSFCH (e.g. ACK or NACK) from one or more RX UE(s)**
4. **Following reception (from another UE) of a new transmission that is associated with that inactivity timer (e.g. L2 destination ID, QoS)**
5. **Others**
6. **At the slot following an 2nd stage SCI transmission by the TX UE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | NONE | As reply to Q13a/14, we don’t support inactivity timer for SL groupcast and broadcast. |
| Xiaomi | A | To align with Q9, Tx UE should have the same behavior as RX UE. |
| Samsung | A | We think A is baseline. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | None | We don’t support inactivity timer for either Groupcast or Broadcast. |
| LG | F |  |
| InterDigital | A, B, C | Similar to Q12 for unicast, this will depend on how we handle the inactivity timer synchronization problem. |
| Vivo | A | Similar to Q9 and Q12. |
| CATT | A |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | F | We think it is sufficient to start the inactivity timer at TX/RX UE only when the TX UE sends SCI for initial transmissions. In this way, same rules as in Uu are reused for SL DRX. |
| Intel | A | Similar reasoning as for the case of unicast |
| Sharp | A |  |
| Fujitsu | A |  |
| Nokia | A |  |
| ASUSTeK | A/F | The UE should start the inactivity timer only when the SCI is for new transmission.  More precisely, the SCI should be the 2nd stage SCI since NDI is carried in the 2nd stage SCI. |
| Fraunhofer | A | Same as Q9. |
| Apple | Left to UE implementation | There is no need to specify how to track inactivity timer of a RX UE in TX UE side. |
| ZTE | None | We don’t support inactivity timer for SL groupcast and broadcast. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | A |  |
| Lenovo | A |  |
| Qualcomm | A |  |

## 2.4 HARQ RTT and Retransmission Timer for SL DRX

HARQ RTT timer and retransmission timer in Uu DRX are meant to provide the UE with opportunities to perform DRX in between retransmissions of one or more HARQ process. The timers take into account the minimum delay and uncertainty of NW scheduled assignments/grants for retransmissions of that HARQ process. The UE maintains separate HARQ RTT timers and retransmissions timers for each HARQ process. For DL, the UE starts the drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDL for the corresponding HARQ process in the first symbol after the end of the corresponding transmission carrying the DL HARQ feedback. For UL, the UE starts the drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerUL for the corresponding HARQ process in the first symbol after the end of the first transmission of the corresponding PUSCH. When the timer expires, the UE starts the drx-RetransmissionTimerDL or drx-RetransmissionTimerUL, and actively monitors PDCCH while this timer is running.

In sidelink, an RX UE maintains reception SL HARQ processes associated with transmissions from a TX UE. A SL HARQ RTT and SL retransmission timer can be maintained for a reception SL HARQ process at the RX UE, similar to Uu. These timers, if used/supported, can be maintained on a per reception SL HARQ process basis, as in Uu.

**Q18) Do companies agree that a SL HARQ RTT timer and SL HARQ retransmission timer (if supported) are maintained per SL HARQ process at the RX UE?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (if no, please explain why) |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y | Uu design should be baseline. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, except for Broadcast | HARQ RTT Timer and Retransmisison Timer can be supported for Groupcast and Unicast, and in a per SL HARQ process way at the reception side.  For SL broadcast, we don’t agree to support either HARQ RTT timer or Retransmission Timer. |
| LG | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Y | Except for broadcast. |
| Intel | Y | Ok to follow Uu behavior |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Nokia | Y |  |
| ITL | Y |  |
| ASUSTeK | Y |  |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| ZTE | Y |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | A |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

In Uu DL, the end of the HARQ RTT timer/start of the retransmission timer represents the earliest time in which the NW can schedule the retransmission, and the expiry of the retransmission timer represents the latest time. This accounts for the NW delay associated to scheduling the assignment while ensuring that the UE will be able to receive it (and not be performing DRX). It also provides flexibility to the network for scheduling the retransmission resource.

In SL, the TX UE also exhibits some scheduling delay/flexibility/uncertainty. However, the source of this delay/flexibility/uncertainty can depend on different factors related to SL. Specifically, it would depend if the TX UE uses mode 1 or mode 2. Furthermore, SL SCI can schedule upto 2 retransmission resources. Following a specific (re)transmission by the TX UE, whether the timing of the next retransmission can have some uncertainty will depend on whether retransmission resource is present or not in the SCI for the specific (re)transmission, and whether the TX UE uses mode 1 or mode 2. This is summarized in the table below.

Table 1 – Different Scenarios for timing of the SL Retransmission

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scenario | Mode1/  Mode2 | Retransmission resource present/not present in SCI | How can SL retransmission be scheduled following the SCI | Source of Uncertainty in the timing of the next retransmission following the SCI |
| A | Mode 1 | Not present | NW may schedule a new SL grant for a retransmission | NW delay in scheduling next retransmission resource for the HARQ process and NW choice of the scheduled location of the SCI |
| B | Mode 1 | Present | TX UE uses retransmission resource in the SCI to send the retransmission | No uncertainty – retransmission expected at the next retransmission resource indicated in SCI |
| C | Mode 2 | Not present | TX UE decides to use a new grant for the retransmission | Time location of the retransmission resource determined by resource selection procedure |
| D | Mode 2 | Present | TX UE triggers resource reselection for the retransmission resource due to UL/SL prioritization, CBR, or pre-emption | Time location of the retransmission resource determined by resource selection procedure |

Specifically, in each scenario, a retransmission by the TX UE can be sent due to the following reasons:

* Scenario A: Following SCI sent by the TX UE indicating no retransmission resources, the network may decide to schedule further retransmission resources for the same PDU (e.g. after reception of SL HARQ feedback from the TX UE on PUCCH).
* Scenario B: If the network schedules both transmission and retransmission resources and these are included by the TX UE in the SCI, the retransmission by the TX UE (if performed) will occur in the time location indicated by the SCI
* Scenario C: A TX UE may send SCI with no retransmission resources, and then send the retransmission in a new grant following the SCI
* Scenario D: A TX UE may send SCI with retransmission resources. It may send the retransmission in the announced retransmission resources, or perform resource (re)selection for the retransmission resource (e.g. due to UL/SL prioritization, congestion control, or pre-emption)

### 2.4.1 SL HARQ RTT

Scenarios A and C (i.e. the SCI does not indicate the next retransmission resource) are very similar to Uu. The RX UE can start a HARQ RTT timer following reception of the (re)transmission (in SCI) and the HARQ retransmission timer can be started upon expiry of the HARQ RTT timer if the decoding failed. The value of the HARQ RTT timer in this case can be explicitly configured.

For the case where the retransmission resource is present in the SCI (scenarios B and D), the HARQ RTT time (i.e. the time when the UE does not expect to be scheduled for the HARQ process) can be calculated, for the most part, from the timing of the retransmission resource in the SCI. One possible exception would be when mode 2 is used but pre-emption occurs. RAN2 should confirm whether it is possible, in this case, that the new selected resource occurs prior to the resource initially indicated in SCI. In this case, the HARQ RTT cannot be derived directly from the timing of the retransmission in the SCI.

**Q19) In which cases can SL HARQ RTT (i.e. the period in which the UE does not expect to be scheduled for retransmission of the same HARQ process) be derived directly from the timing of the retransmission resource in the SCI?**

1. **(Scenario B) Mode 1, Retransmission resource present in the SCI**
2. **(Scenario D) Mode 2, Retransmission resource present in the SCI, pre-emption disabled**
3. **(Scenario D) Mode 2, Retransmission resource present in the SCI, pre-emption enabled**
4. **Others?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | Fail to understand this question and scenario-B/D cannot justify disabling RTT either | We do not think this question goes into a correct direction, i.e., this question seems to lead to a result that for specific cases, the RTT timer may or may not be used. The result would be that some indication is needed in order for Rx-UE to be aware of the different cases, which unnecessarily leads to complexity, and more importantly, will introduce RAN1 impact, which is of zero-TU for the DRX bullet in this WI..  Furthermore   * For scenario-B (option-A), if the UE experiences a RLF, the resources will be discarded (due to that the SL grant / pool being abandoned), so the re-tx resource may not always valid. * For sceanrio-D (option-B/C), we fail to understand, since rapporteur arleady described that „TX UE triggers resource reselection for the retransmission resource due to UL/SL prioritization, CBR, or pre-emption“, i.e., the re-tx resource will be discarded/reselected due to the reasons above..   So We support RTT timer for all the cases. |
| Xiaomi | A, B |  |
| Samsung | A, B, C | We think if pre-emption happens, it can be covered by HARQ retransmission timer (e.g. reselected resource due to preemption is placed in the time that the duration HARQ retransmission timer runs), so from RX UE point of view, retransmssion resource in SCI indicates actual HARQ RTT regardless of whether preemption is used or not. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A and B, with comments | We want to point out that for the scenarios of A and B, the UE, on receiving an SCI, can **only** direclty derive the timing of the up to 2 other retransmission resources (if included) in **the same** SCI. For the timing of other retransmisison resources which are not indicated in the **current** SCI the UE receives (e.g. those retx resources dynamic scheduled via SL-RNTI/SL-CSRNTI in mode-1 or selected by the UE in mode-2 , other than the 2 retrx resources binding with the new transmission resource) , the UE is of course unable to derive it via the current SCI received. For those resources, i.e. those unable to be “predicted” from a received SCI, the special handling as to be discussed in Q20 does not apply, and the HARQ RTT Timer and Retransmission Timer till need to be operated as in the legacy Uu manner.  We think this aspect should be properly/clearly clarified, if a proposal is to be made for this question, lest there is any misunderstanding. |
| LG | None with comments | According to the RAN1 agreement, the HARQ RTT Timer of Mode 1 is a fixed value (can be calculated), and the HARQ RTT Timer of Mode 2 is set to UE implementation. That is, the HARQ RTT Timer value of mode 2 is set by the UE implementation as a value less than or equal to (because there is no PUCCH Tx) than the mode 1 HARQ RTT Timer.  In other words, HARQ RTT is not derived from the SCI. |
| InterDigital | A, B, C (with comments) | We think for A and B it is possible to assume the retransmission will never come the next retransmission indicated in SCI.  For C, it may be (currently) possible that pre-emption results in a retransmission before the next indicated retransmission timing. In this case, we see two options for RAN2: 1) Don’t use SCI; 2) Ensure TX UE performs reselection after the next retransmisison resource.  2) may be preferred to align this case to the case of UL/SL prioritization |
| vivo | A,B,C | A unified solution is preferable. Based on SCI information, Rx UE is able to flexibly control HARQ retransmission timer other than monitors single slot reserved by SCI. |
| CATT | See comments | We share the same view as LG. |
| Ericsson (Min) | A, B, C | We support Samsung’s views. |
| Intel | None  (See comment) | We tend to share the view wtih OPPO that we do not need to go into the details of when the RX UE can determine the duration of HARQ RTT timer since the RX UE may not be aware of which scenario is applicable all the time. Indeed, it seems much simpler and straightforward to assume that the timer is applicable and configured, regardless of which scenario is applicable. |
| Sharp | None | We share the view with OPPO. |
| Fujitsu | A and B, C with comments | We think the Rx UE anyway needs to monitor the corresponding slot of the retransmisson resource present in the SCI, before this slot, the Rx UE does not expect to receive additional retransmission packet. For Scenario D, RAN2 can do a simple enhancement on step 2 of resource selection procedure, that is, when Rx UE is configured with SL DRX, Tx UE shall ensure the new selected resource occurs after the resource initially indicated in SCI. |
| Nokia | A,B,C |  |
| ITL | Comments | We are not sure whether we needs to address those cases (i.e. A, B, C and others) seperately. For the commonality and simplicity, we prefer to support RTT timer for all cases. |
| ASUSTeK | A, B |  |
| Fraunhofer | See comments | We support LG’s view, that HARQ RTT timer should be applicable regardless of the scenario involved. |
| Apple | A, B | The RTT and retransmission resources are clearly indicated by the transmitter in SCI. For preemption, there is some uncertainty. But for SL-DRX enabled RX UE, TX UE may be forbidden to use per-emption if we really care about power savings of RX UE. So, Case C can be prohibited for SL DRX. |
| ZTE | See comments | We fail to understanding the definition of HARQ RTT. The value of HARQ RTT is calculated based on the UE capability, not the period in which the UE does not expect to be scheduled for retransmission of the same HARQ process. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | None. | We prefer a SL HARQ RTT timer-based solution. |
| Lenovo | A, B, C | Share the view from Samsung |
| Qualcomm | A, B, C | Rx UE may manage its inactive state (HARQ RTT timer running) based on SCI indication. |

For the cases identified in Q19, the use of a timer may be unnecessary due to the knowledge of the timing of the retransmission resource. Alternatively, to align behaviour at the UE, a SL HARQ RTT timer can still be used and be set using the timing of the retransmission resource in the SCI.

**Q20) What is the preferred approach to handle SL HARQ RTT in the cases identified in Q19?**

1. **Use/start a HARQ RTT timer with value determined using the timing of the retransmission resource in the SCI**
2. **Do not use/start a HARQ RTT timer**
3. **Other**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | C | As our comments for Q19, we do not think case differentiation is needed, and we believe HARQ RTT timer is needed for all the scenarios. |
| Xiaomi | C | We prefer a common solution to simplify the UE behavior. UE just follow the configuration. If RTT timer is not configured, UE would not start the timer. If it is configured, UE start the timer with configured value. |
| Samsung | A | We prefer using HARQ RTT since it brings the most commonality between Uu DRX and SL DRX. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | B, with comments | For Mode-1, we think Option B can apply to Scenario B in Q19 for Mode-1. However, it is necessary, as what we clarified in Q19, to further point out that, if the SCI is associated with the **last** transmission opportunity for the SL transmission/TB as indicated by the SCI, the UE needs to start the HARQ RTT Timer for the corresponding SL process in the first symbol after the end of the corresponding transmission carrying the SL HARQ feedback.  For mode-2, it is unclear to us whether/how the RX UE can know if the pre-emption will happen. If yes, then it seems Option B can also be applied to Scenario D in Q19 for Mode-2. |
| LG | C | Same as Q19. |
| InterDigital | A | We prefer A for simplicity and to have commonality with the other cases. |
| vivo | A | We prefer a common solution for all scenarios and most aligned with Uu DRX. HARQ RTT timer length can be set to a value which is less than or equal to the interval indicated in SCI. |
| CATT | C | We prefer to use HARQ RTT timer for all cases. |
| Ericsson (Min) | A | We share same views as Samsung, HARQ RTT timer shall be used in all cases, however, for the scnearios where the timing of retransmissions can be determined in the SCI, the UE uses the value determined from the SCI, while in other scenarios, UE applies the value explicitly configured in DRX configuration. |
| Intel | C | We agree with OPPO and Xiaomi in that a single timer with value configured explicitly as per Uu (i.e. no need to derive based on certain scenarios) |
| Sharp | C |  |
| Fujitsu | A | HARQ RTT timer should be used since during its running time, Rx UE does not expect the to receive the retransmission packet. |
| Nokia | A |  |
| ITL | C | We prefer a common solution for all cases and thus, HARQ RTT timer can be set to a configured value when necessary. |
| ASUSTeK | C | A configured timer value for applying all scenarios is sufficient, while A and B are enhancements. In order to deteremine when to start retransmission timer, the HARQ RTT timer is needed for all scenarios. |
| Fraunhofer | C | Same as Q19. |
| Apple | A with comments | We think this UE implementation of RTT timer is not the traditional sense of HARQ RTT timer in the Uu case because the value is dynamically change per-packet, but for commonality, we can agree to have a timer and define the triggering conditions, but let the setting of its value to UE implementation. |
| ZTE | C | See comments in Q19 |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | C | We prefer an unified SL HARQ RTT timer solution for all scenarios. |
| Lenovo | B | the resources indicates in SCI are considered as Active Time directly |
| Qualcomm | A, C | UE may derive HARQ RTT timer value based on the retransmission indication in SCI if available or based on a (pre-)configured value. |

For the other cases (i.e. those not identified in Q19), HARQ RTT timer can be configured explicitly to the UE. However, the value of the HARQ RTT may differ because the uncertainty depends on different factors, as illustrated in table 1. For example, for mode 1, NW delay/scheduling is involved, while in mode 2, the delay/scheduling is fully upto the TX UE.

**Q21) Which of the following factors can be used to determine the value of the SL HARQ RTT timer when it is explicitly configured at the UE?**

1. **Scheduling mode at the TX UE (mode 1 or mode 2)**
2. **HARQ enabled/disable**
3. **Priority/PDB of the transmission**
4. **Availability of PUCCH resources at the RX UE**
5. **Pre-emption at the TX UE is enabled/disabled (mode 2 case)**
6. **Others**
7. **PQI**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | NONE with comment | As rapporteur said, the uncertainty of RTT timer may depend on the NW delay/scheduling for mode 1 and Tx UE delay/scheduling for mode 2, but the length of RTT timer should be configurable and determined by network or the Tx UE implementation, taking all the related factors into account, so there should be no spec impact due to this. |
| Xiaomi | All | All the factors should be considered by NW in mode 1 or UE in mode 2. But we don’t see spec impact. It should be up to implementation to decide appropriate value. |
| Samsung | FFS on A and B. | We think A and B may impact the value of SL HARQ RTT. We’re not sure of other cases at the moment. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | B, C, G for Groupcast;  Comments for Unicast. | For SL unicast, same as our comments in Q5, we fail to see the need of any Spec impact on how to set the DRX parameters (i.e. can be left to implementation), although the QoS parameters can be considered in setting DRX configuration.  For SL groupcast, similar to Q5, SL HARQ RTT timer should be set per PQI, with it being one of the DRX parameters. We are also OK to consider only a portion of the QoS parameters, e.g. Priortiy or PDB as in Opt C, which clearly have impacts on DRX parameter setting. In addition, HARQ FB enabled/disabled situation may also need to be considered. |
| LG | None | Mode 1) Fixed HARQ RTT Timer value based on RAN1 agreement.  Mode 2) UE implementation: The UE is set to a value less than or equal to the HARQ RTT timer value of mode 1. |
| InterDigital | A, C and/or G  (other factors can be UE/NW implementation) | For A) the UE should determines whether to use NW defined HARQ RTT or not.  Similar to SLRB parameters, DRX parameters (including HARQ RTT) should be dependant on QoS. |
| vivo | F | We prefer a common solution. RTT timer length can equal to the value of interval indicated in SCI minus a configured offset. |
| CATT | See comments | There is no spec impacts identified for this part from our sight right now. |
| Ericsson (Min) | None | As OPPO, xiaomi and LG pointed out, how to set/configure shall be up to configuration or preconfiguration. There is no spec impact. For a smart configuration, RTT shall be set as a minimum value of all possible value ranges. |
| Intel | See comment | We assume that NW implementation might take none, some or all of the stated factors, but we do not need to specify them explicitly. |
| Sharp | none | It could be left for NW/UE inplementation. |
| Fujitsu | B, E | For A, Rx UE cannot know whether Tx UE is working on mode 1 or mode 2, then cannot perform different behavior;  For B, When HARQ is enabled, a PSFCH processing gap shall be ensured for both mode 1 and mode 2 b/w a PSFCH next selected Re-Tx resource, HARQ RTT timer should be running during this gap; When HARQ is disabled, two adjacent (re)transmissions may be consecutive, then the HARQ RTT timer should not be started/supported in this case, i.e., the value of RTT timer equals to zero.  For E, if UE has found pre-emption occurs, HARQ RTT timer should not be started/supported because there is no gap restriction b/w the pre-selected and the re-selected resources i.e., the value of RTT timer equals to zero. |
| Nokia | None | As already explained by majority of companies there is no need to explicitly specify the setting of the HARQ RTT value – no spec impact from our point of view. |
| ITL | All | All the considered factors listed in above can be considered for determining the value of HARQ RTT timer. But, it should be up to NW or UE implementation. |
| ASUSTeK | See comment | Agree with OPPO. |
| Fraunhofer | See comments | Principally, all the factors can be taken into account, but how this will be set up can be left to e.g. the NW. |
| Apple | A,B,C,G |  |
| ZTE | None | How to determine the value of HARQ RTT can be left to UE implementation. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | FFS | Wondering the spec impact which RAN2 needs to address in this question. |
| Lenovo | None | Left for NW implementation |
| Qualcomm | None | Up to UE implementation or gNB’s management. |

In Uu, the drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerDL is started following transmission of HARQ feedback by the UE. The equivalent behaviour in SL would be to start the timer following transmission of PSFCH by the RX UE. However, this does not cover the cases where PSFCH is not transmitted by the RX UE, either because HARQ feedback is disabled for that transmission, or because the RX UE does not transmit the PSFCH (e.g. due to UL/SL prioritization).

Firstly, It would be best to confirm whether SL HARQ RTT timer and SL HARQ retransmission timer are applied to HARQ disabled transmissions in SL.

**Q22) Should SL HARQ RTT Timer and SL HARQ retransmission timer be supported for HARQ disabled transmissions?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (please explain/motivate your answer) |
| OPPO | See comments | HARQ RTT Timer   * Should be supported at least when PSFCH is configured for the pool and HARQ feedback is enabled, and can be disabled when PSFCH is not configured for the pool * For the case where the pool is configured with PSFCH but HARQ feedback is disabled, due to that the Tx-UE may be in mode-1, and the network may provide SL grant in a conservative way due to network being not aware of HARQ FB enable/disable decision by Tx-UE, i.e., always assuming FB being enabled and the gap between new/re-transmission needs to be secured, further discussion is needed.   Retransmission Timer should be supported for both HARQ enabled and disabled case, since the usage of retransmission does not restricted by FB enabled/disabled case. |
| Xiaomi | Comments | UE would not transmit PSFCH for HARQ disabled transmssion. Therefore, RTT timer and retransmission timer would not be triggered. We don’t need special handling. |
| Samsung | Yes | We think both options are possible, i.e. either to define separate SL HARQ RTT for HARQ disabled transmissions or to define separate UE behavior w/o SL HARQ RTT. However we prefer using SL HARQ RTT to have most commonality. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes for both | First, we want to pusue a unifom timer handling for HARQ enabled and disabled cases on these two timers, aiming to simplify UE implementation.  Then, at least for the case of mode-1, even if the HARQ FB is disabled in SL, the TX UE, based on its own decision, may still need to rely on PUCCH FB to request retransmission resources from the gNB, and thus have to wait for a period of time to get the resources scheduled by the gNB before sending the retransmission to the RX UE. In this sense, it still makes sense for the RX UE to wait for a period of time before monitoring the retransmisison resources to appear. |
| LG | See comments | In the case of HARQ Feedback disabled, the HARQ RTT timer may not be used. If the RTT timer can be used even in the case of HARQ Feedback disabled, it is possible to operate by setting the value to 0. |
| InterDigital | Yes | We prefer to specify a common behavior for both HARQ enabled and HARQ disabled. |
| vivo | Comments | We believe, only HARQ retransmission timer is necessary because the retransmission (i.e., blind retransmission) still could happened even in HARQ disabled transmissions. Unlike HARQ enabled case, the blind retransmission does not have any restriction between two reserved resources in time domain (i.e., it does not need to care the associated PSFCH resource). Thus, HARQ RTT timer does not work anymore. Instead, Rx UE can trigger the HARQ retransmission timer right after the SCI reception. |
| CATT | See comments | If sidelink HARQ feeback is disabled for sidelink unicast, drx-HARQ-RTT-Timer is not needed.  Even if the sidelink HARQ feeback is disabled for sidelink unicast, the drx-RetransmissionTimer still needs to be maintained at least in the case that UE has PUCCH in Uu. |
| Ericsson (Min) | comments | RTT timer is unnecessary to be applied in this case, however, the retranmission timer is still needed. So, RX UE can start the retransmission timer for the corresponding SL process in the N-th symbol after the end of the reception of the corresponding PSSCH. Such behaviors can be captured in the spec in a hard coded fashion. |
| Intel | Yes (see comment) | Since blind retransmisison are possible, at least HARQ Retransmission timer should be supported. For HARQ RTT timer, we agree with Samsung that while both options are possible, we prefer to have a common approach to support it for all cases (i.e. HARQ FB enabled and disabled). |
| Sharp | Yes | We share the view of LG, for a HARQ disabled case, the value could be set as 0. |
| Fujitsu | See comments | For the “Retransmission resource present” case,   * SL HARQ RTT should be supported and its value should be derived directly from the timing of the retransmission resource in the SCI; * SL retransmission timer should not be supported/started since Rx UE only needs to monitor the corresponding slot of reserved retransmission slot.   For the “Retransmission resource not present” case,   * As anwsered in Q21), SL HARQ RTT timer should not be started/supported (i.e., the value of RTT timer equals to zero) in this case; * SL retransmission timer should be supported in this case. |
| Nokia | Yes | Both HARQ RTT and HARQ retransmission timers should be supported regardless w/wo HARQ feedback. A common behavior is preferred. |
| ITL | Comments | We have same view with OPPO.  For HARQ RTT timer, when HARQ FB is enabled, SL HARQ RTT timer is started/used after PSFCH transmission is performed, while SL HARQ RTT timer is disabled otherwise.  In addition, we may need to discuss further aspects on how to use SL HARQ RTT with relationship of PUCCH transmission carrying SL HARQ-ACK if configured in mode 1. |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | Retransmission timer is needed for both HARQ feedback enabled and disabled case for possible retransmissions. In addtion, in order to determine when to start retransmission timer, HARQ RTT timer is needed for all scenarios, therefore including HARQ feeback disabled case. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | We prefer to support HARQ RTT timer or both HARQ enabled and HARQ disabled. |
| Apple | Comments | We failed to see why HARQ RTT timer can be set as a fixed value for FB disabled case. So for blind retransmission, this timer is either not needed or left to UE implementation for setting its value. |
| ZTE | See comments | In uu interface, UE will start DL RTT timer after sending HARQ feedback. For sidelink communication, we can mimic uu interface, i.e. whether RTT timer is started depends on whether UE signals HARQ feedabck on PSFCH resource. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Yes | Common solution is preferred for both SL HARQ disabled/enabled scenario since there is no additional concern. |
| Lenovo | See comments | Agree with others that blind retransmission case needs to be somehow handled. This is different to Uu where only HARQ feedback is supported. It needs to be ensured that UE is awake for receiving the blind retransmissions. Either define separate SL HARQ RTT for HARQ disabled transmissions or to define separate UE behavior w/o SL HARQ RTT.  Additionally, when retransmission is explicitly reserved in SCI, retransmission timer does not need to be started. Otherwise, retransmission timer is needed for potential retransmission either in mode 1 or mode 2 |
| Qualcomm | Comment | For Mode 1, if gNB indicated feedback PUCCH, then the HARQ RTT timer for Uu is needed even if the actual TB transmission with HARQ disabled.  For Mode 2, don’t see the need for HARQ RTT is HARQ is disabled. |

If SL HARQ RTT timer is supported for transmissions without HARQ feedback, when the RX UE starts the HARQ RTT timer should therefore be discussed, as there is no Uu equivalent for this case.

**Q23) If the answer to Q22 is yes, when should the RX UE start the SL HARQ RTT timer for HARQ disabled transmissions?**

1. **In the symbol immediately following SCI reception/decoding**
2. **A (pre)configured or predefined number of symbols after reception of a SCI**
3. **Other**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| Samsung | A | We think A is baseline. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | C | Only if the RX receives the indication from TX that the TX will request retransmission resource after all the transmission oppotunies of the current DG/CG period are used for the corresponding SL process, will the RX start the SL HARQ RTT timer for HARQ disabled transmissions. Additioanlly, RX starts the SL HARQ RTT timer when it receives the SCI assocaited with the last transmission opportunity of the current DG/CG period. On this basis, the specific time when RX starts the SL HARQ RTT timer for HARQ disabled transmissions, e.g. in the symbol immediately following SCI or PSSCH reception/decoding, needs more discussions. |
| LG | A |  |
| InterDigital | A |  |
| vivo | A |  |
| Intel | A |  |
| Sharp | A |  |
| Fujitsu | A with comments | Only for the “Retransmission resource present” case. |
| OPPO | See comments | For option A, may be „in the symbol immediately following PSSCH reception/decoding“ is more feasible, since the size of 2nd SCI is not a fixed, but variable, depending on the MCS selected, so that it is hard for the DRX timer to adapt with this per-transmssion starting point (i.e., the end of 2nd stage sci) |
| Nokia | A |  |
| ASUSTeK | A |  |
| Fraunhofer | A |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | A | A could be the baseline. |

For transmissions with HARQ feedback, whether to follow a similar definition as Uu, or also to use a new starting point compared to Uu (if we support HARQ RTT for HARQ disabled transmissions) should be discussed.

**Q24) For transmission with HARQ feedback, when should the RX UE start the HARQ RTT timer?**

1. **In the symbol following the end of PSFCH transmission**
2. **In the symbol immediately following SCI reception/decoding**
3. **A (pre)configured or predefined number of symbols after reception of a SCI**
4. **Other**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | A | Align with Uu legacy. |
| Xiaomi | A | Uu design should be baseline. |
| Samsung | B | We think B is common for both HARQ enabled and disabled. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A | Same as Uu DRX. |
| LG | A |  |
| InterDigital | A or B | Either is possible, depending on whether we prefer to align with Uu or have common behavior for HARQ enable/disable. |
| CATT | A |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | A |  |
| Intel | B | Prefer to have same behavior both HARQ FB enabled/disabled cases, but we assume option A can also work |
| Sharp | A |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| vivo | A | A is preferable. It has better mimic Uu, that only HARQ NACK can trigger HARQ RTT timer. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Fujitsu | A | Uu mechanims should be reused for this case. |
| Nokia | A |  |
| ITL | A |  |
| ASUSTeK | A |  |
| Fraunhofer | A |  |
| Apple | A or B |  |
| ZTE | A |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | A or B | No strong view to either A or B. |
| Lenovo | A |  |
| Qualcomm | A |  |

Finally, if the preferred solution for Q24 is aligned with Uu, RAN2 should discuss whether the UE still starts the HARQ RTT timer when it does not transmit PSFCH.

**Q25) If the RX UE does not transmit the PSFCH (e.g. due to UL/SL prioritization) should the UE still start the HARQ RTT timer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (if no, please explain why) |
| OPPO | Y | Since anyway Tx-UE will monitor the PSFCH before generating re-transmission. |
| Xiaomi | Y | If TX UE doesn’t receive HARQ feedback, it would perform retransmission. Even RX UE decodes MAC PDU successfully, it still need to monitor retransmission and send ACK to avoid TX UE trigger RLF due to reaching max retransmission number. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | In most cases, the TX UE is still likely to perform retransmissions due to the PSFCH loss from the RX UE, e.g. due to UL/SL priortizaiton; as a result, we think to make RX UE start HARQ RTT timer should be safe. |
| LG | Y | Since the Tx UE will transmit retransmission packets, it is necessary to start the RTT/Retransmission timer. |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
| vivo | Y | Not transmit the PSFCH equals to HARQ NACK case. |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Y | This case will be just similar as if the transmission on PSFCH is failed to be decoded by TX UE. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y | Because retransmission timer can only start running when RTT timer expired, UE need to receive the retransmission packet if it has not correctly decode current TB; even if the current TB has been correctly decoded, the Rx UE should also receive the next retransmission to fed back an “ACK” for early termination. |
| Nokia | Y |  |
| ITL | Y |  |
| ASUSTeK | Y |  |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| ZTE | Y |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | For synchronized behavior between Tx UE and Rx UE. |

### 2.4.2 SL HARQ Retransmission Timer

In RAN2#103, the need for retransmission timer was left FFS. Referring again to the table 1, scenario B may have no uncertainty in the timing of the retransmission resource. For the other scenarios, it is expected that the retransmission resource may come at any time following the expiry of the HARQ RTT timer, or following an SCI which is not received at the previously announced slot. This seems to lend itself well to the use of a retransmission timer to ensure the UE is monitoring for SCI.

**Q26) Can a retransmission timer be used in cases A, C, and D of Table 1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (if no, indicate what behaviors at the RX UE is preferred to ensure the RX UE receives the retransmission resource) |
| OPPO | Y | As our comments for Q19, there is always some uncertainty. |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes, with comments | For Case A and C, we think anyway the retransmission timer needs to be started, as there is no retransmission resource with certainty that can be foreseen by the UE.  For Case D, see our comments for Q20: the retransmission timer is started after the expiry of HARQ RTT timer which was only started at the end of the **last** one of the echanismon opportunities indicated by an SCI. Basically, we mean the handling of Scenario D follows the same echanism as that of Scenario B to be discussed in the next question. |
| LG | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Y |  |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y with comments | For scenario D, the Rx UE only start the retransmission timer after it has found the reserved resource has been pre-empted, refer to Q28). |
| Nokia | Y |  |
| ITL | Y |  |
| ASUSTeK | Y |  |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| Apple | Y with comments | Same view as Huawei and Fujitus. For Scenario D, non-preemption case, there is no need to start a retransmission timer for every retransmission opportunity. |
| ZTE | Y |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y | For Rx UE to monitor retransmission. |

Scenario B may not require the use of a HARQ RTT timer (as pointed out in the previous section). To monitor sidelink for the retransmission, this can be handled by the RX UE in two ways. A UE could not use/start the retransmission timer in this case and rely simply on the indication in the SCI to determine its active time. Specifically, the RX UE’s active time would include the slot(s) associated with the next retransmission resource in the SCI. Alternatively, the UE could start the retransmission timer (e.g. after expiry of the HARQ RTT timer) so that it is running on the slot associated with the retransmission resource indicated in the SCI.

**Q27) How Should monitoring of the planned retransmission resource in scenario B of table 1 be handled by the RX UE in DRX?**

1. **By starting a retransmission timer prior to the planned retransmission resource**
2. **No retransmission timer: UE always monitors SCI at the slot associated with the retransmission resource**
3. **Other**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | NONE | As we have explained in Q19, we do not think this effort to differentiate cases is feasible, so the usage of re-transmission timer should be of no difference compared to other cases. |
| Xiaomi | C | We prefer common solution to simplify UE implementation, i.e. retransmission timer triggered by RTT timer expiry. |
| Samsung | C | Agree with Xiaomi. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | B | See also our comments to Q20 and Q26. |
| LG | C | Retransmission timer is triggered by RTT timer expiry.  Since gNB can schedule the planned retransmission resource at the expiration point of the HARQ RTT timer, the retransmission timer can be started after the HARQ RTT timer expires. |
| InterDigital | B | We have preference for B for this case, since retransmission timer behavior is not needed for case B (the UE only needs to monitor a single slot, and there is no uncertainty necessitating the use of a timer).  Option A (which is aligned with the common understanding of the group that retransmission resource is started following HARQ RTT expiry) would also be acceptable, but would require retransmission timer can be configured to run for only one slot (the retransmission resource). |
| Vivo | C | The suitable RTT timer value and retransmission timer value can meet the expection. |
| CATT | C | RTT timer expiry |
| Ericsson (Min) | C | Agree with xiaomi, Samsung, we shall have a common solution. RTT timer is used in all scenarios, and therefore, retransmission timer is also used in all scenarios. However, for the value of RTT timer, for the cenarios where the timing of retransmissions can be determined in the SCI, the UE uses the value determined from the SCI, while in other scenarios, UE applies the value explicitly configured in DRX configuration. |
| Intel | None | Agree with OPPO as per our previous comment to Q19 |
| Sharp | C |  |
| Fujitsu | B | Option B) can also used for scenario D when the reserved resource has not found to be pre-empted. |
| Nokia | C |  |
| ITL | B |  |
| ASUSTeK | C | RTT timer expiry. |
| Fraunhofer | C | RTT timer expiry. |
| Apple | B | We hall not introduce useless behavnor just for cosmetic purpose. The Uu HARQ retranmsisison timer is designed for a specific scenario when there is uncertainty of NW-scheduled retransmisison. For SL case, when is not such a case, we do not need to artificially force UE to start a useless timer. |
| ZTE | C | RTT timer expiry. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | C | While the SL HARQ RTT timer expiry. |
| Lenovo | B or C | besides option B, we are also OK to support that UE starts the timer without HARQ RTT timer |
| Qualcomm | C or B | If HARQ RTT enabled, then it’s based on HARQ RTT timer expiration; Otherwise, based on SCI indication for the retransmission. |

Scenario D may also not require on the use of a HARQ RTT timer. This would depend on companies’ understanding of the pre-emption case pointed out in Q19. If this is the case, the UE may need to start the retransmission timer to handle TX UE reselection in the case of UL/SL prioritization (for example).

**Q28) Should the RX UE start the SL retransmission timer in scenario D if the expected retransmission SCI is not decoded?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (if no, please explain why) |
| OPPO | See comments | Fail to understand the intension of this question, isn’t that so that for case-D, the re-transmission resource may be re-selected due to various reasons as captured by rapporteur (i.e., „TX UE triggers resource reselection for the retransmission resource due to UL/SL prioritization, CBR, or pre-emption“)? |
| Xiaomi | Comments | UE should start retransmission timer. But the timing should be further discussed. We prefer common solution to simplify UE implementation, i.e. retransmission timer triggered by RTT timer expiry. |
| Samsung | Y | We think if preemption happens, the reselected resource due to preemption would be handled by HARQ retransmission timer, so it is still helpful. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | We think no special handling is needed for this exceptional case, and the start of the retransmission timer can just follow the way we commented in Q26 for Scenario D. |
| LG | Y | It is necessary to determine the start time of retransmission timer in consideration of resource reselection due to pre-emption and etc. |
| InterDigital | Y | In scenario D, retransmission timer is only needed if the SCI is not decoded at the expected location (which corresponds to UL/SL prioritization, CBR, or pre-emption). |
| vivo | See comments | SL retransmission timer is triggered by HARQ RTT expiry, not by SCI non-decoding. |
| CATT | See comments | RTT timer is always needed in our understanding for scenario D, retransmission timers is triggered when the RTT timer expires, there is no relationship with whether SCI can be detected or not. |
| Ericsson (Min) | Y | Shall the same view as Xiaomi and Samsung |
| Intel | See comment | For this case, we assume that the UE can start the retransmission timer when the HARQ RTT timer expires, which we assume is applicable for all scenarios |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y | The case is UE has found pre-emption occurs; at the same time, Tx UE should ensure the re-selected resource is not before the pre-empted resource in time domain as answered in Q19). |
| Nokia | Y |  |
| ITL | Y |  |
| ASUSTeK | Y |  |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| Apple | See comment | SCI is not decoded at the expected location is not a very special case to justify changed behavior. We prefer to keep the same behavior as Q26/Q27. For SL-DRX enabled RX UE, TX UE may be forbidden to use per-emption if we really care about power savings. |
| ZTE | See comments | Is this a new trigger condition for retransmission timer? From our perspective, retransmission timer will be triggered after RTT timer expiry, not the decoding of SCI.  And a smart TX UE can configure a suitable value of retransmission timer to handle pre-emption or SL/UL prioritization issue. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y | If RTT timer is not required |
| Qualcomm | Y | Retransmission timer may be used for monitoring SCI for resource reselection due to priority based dropping or pre-emption. |

Similar to HARQ RTT timer, retransmission timer value may have dependencies on the scenarios presented in table 1. For instance, the total amount of time the UE should continue to monitor for the retransmission resource could further depend on a number of other factors such as mode 1/2, HARQ enabled/disabled, priority/PDB, the availability of PUCCH resources at the RX UE, whether pre-emption is enabled/disabled at TX UE, etc. Companies are therefore asked which of these factors should be considered when determining the retransmission timer.

**Q29) Which of the following factors can be used to determine the SL retransmission timer?**

1. **Scheduling mode at the TX UE (mode 1 or mode 2)**
2. **Presence of retransmission resource in the SCI**
3. **HARQ enabled/disable**
4. **Priority/PDB of the transmission**
5. **Availability of PUCCH resources at the RX UE**
6. **Pre-emption at the TX UE is enabled/disabled**
7. **Others**
8. **PQI**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | NONE | The length of re-tx timer should be configurable and determined by network or the Tx UE implementation, taking all the related factors into account, so there should be no spec impact due to this. |
| Xiaomi | All | All the factors should be considered by NW in mode 1 or UE in mode 2. But we don’t see spec impact. It should be up to implementation to decide appropriate value. |
| Samsung | FFS on A, C, and D. | However we’re not sure if we need to take all into account in the specification point of view, e.g. for D, it can be up to UE implementaiton. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | C, D, H for Groupcast;  Comments for Unicast. | For SL unicast, same as our comment in Q5, we fail to see the need of any Spec impact on how to set the DRX parameters (i.e. can be left to implementation), although the QoS parameters can be considered in setting DRX configuration.  For SL groupcast, similar to Q5, SL retransmission timer should be set per PQI, with it being one of the DRX parameters. We are also OK to consider only part of the QoS parameters, e.g. Priortiy or PDB as in Opt D, which clearly have impacts on DRX parameter setting. In addition, HARQ FB enabled/disabled situation may also need to be considered. |
| LG | C, H |  |
| InterDigital | A, B, D and/or H  (other factors can be UE/NW implementation) | For A) the UE should determines whether to use NW defined HARQ RTT or not.  Similar to SLRB parameters, DRX parameters (including HARQ RTT) should be dependant on QoS.  For B, this may need to be considered at least for mode 1 (e.g. if a planned retransmission resource is indicated in SCI, retransmission timer may be short or configured to 0, which is not the case SCI without a next indicated retransmission. |
| vivo | A and F with comments | A and F are main factors to determine the Retransmission timer. But we prefer a semi-static solution for Retransmission timer uses, e.g. based on configuration. |
| CATT | See comments | There is no spec impacts identified for this part from our sight right now. |
| Ericsson (Min) | None or all | Share the same view as OPPO and Xiaomi. There is no additional spec impact due to this question. |
| Intel | See comment | Same comment as above, i.e we assume that NW implementation might take none, some or all of the stated factors, but we do not need to specify them explicitly. |
| Sharp | All | Share the same view as Xiaomi, and there is no spec impact for this question. |
| Fujitsu | B and D with comments | As answered in Q27), retransmission timer is not needed in scenario B and non-pre-empted case in scenario D;  If the priority value is low (i.e., with high priority), the Rx UE may need to perform longer monitoring to ensure the reception of retransmission, so D). |
| Nokia | None | Share same view as Oppo, Xiaomi, Ericsson |
| ITL | All | It should be up to implementation to decide proper value. |
| ASUSTeK | See comment | Agree with OPPO. |
| Fraunhofer | See comments | Principally, all the factors can be taken into account, but how this will be set up can be left e.g. to the NW. |
| Apple | A, B, D, H |  |
| ZTE | None | Share same view with OPPO, |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | FFS | Wondering the spec impact that RAN2 should discuss. |
| Lenovo | None | Share the view as OPPO |
| Qualcomm | Comment | Rx UE doesn’t know if it’s Mode 1 or Mode 2, No A.  Mode 1: B, D, E  Mode 2: B, D, F |

### 2.4.2 SL HARQ RTT and Retransmission Timers for Broadcast

In RAN2#113[1], no agreements were made for HARQ RTT timer and HARQ retransmission timers for broadcast. Depending on company feedback thus far, the need for these timers may not necessarily be dependant on the presence of HARQ feedback, which would make it possible to support these timers also for broadcast.

**Q30) Do companies support the use of SL HARQ RTT timer and SL retransmission timer also for broadcast?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (please motivate your answer) |
| OPPO | N | Without feedback, the power saving gain from RTT timer vanishes, and by restricting both new/re-transmission into active-time due to on-duration timer, there is no need for re-transmission timer either |
| Xiaomi | N | There is no feedback in broadcast. |
| Samsung | Y | We think it’s similar as groupcast w/o HARQ feedback, so it would be good to reuse it to broadcast if we have it for groupcast. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| LG | See comments | RTT timer is not required, but retransmission timer can be required. If RAN2 define a new timer for monitoring additional broadcast messages, the retransmission timer is not required. |
| InterDigital | Y | We should allow the RX UE to benefit from power savings even for blind retransmissions. The RX UE can sleep between the planned retransmissions similar to the case of HARQ enabled.  There seems no direct relationship between the presence of HARQ feedback and the use of HARQ RTT/retransmission to save power between retransmissions. |
| Vivo | N | Similar with Q14, broadcast is good to use the simplest DRX pattern, i.e. only onDuration timer. |
| CATT | N |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | No |  |
| Intel | N |  |
| Sharp | N |  |
| Fujitsu | N |  |
| Nokia | N |  |
| ITL | N |  |
| ASUSTeK | No |  |
| Fraunhofer | N |  |
| Apple | N |  |
| ZTE | N |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y | SL HARQ RTT timer and SL re-transmission timer should for broadcast should also be supported by considering the power saving gain. |
| Lenovo | Y | Share the view from LG and Samsung |
| Qualcomm | N | Inactivity timer should be good enough for extending the active time. |

## 2.5 Overall Aspects Related to DRX Active Time

In Uu, the active time includes the time when the drx-onDuration or drx-InactivityTimer, or drx-RetransmissionTimerDL or drx-RetransmissionTimerUL are running.

**Q31) Can the SL active time at the RX UE include the time when any of the sl-drx-OnDuration(s), sl-DRXInactivityTimer(s), or sl-drx-RetransmissionTimer(s) are running, as in Uu?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response (Y/N) | Comments (if no, please explain why) |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| Xiaomi | Y | Uu design should be baseline. |
| Samsung | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes for Groadcast and Unicast;  No for Broadcast | As we commented above, we don’t support inactivity timer, HARQ RTT timer or Retransmisison timer for SL Broadcast. |
| LG | Y |  |
| InterDigital | Y |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Y | Same as Uu DRX. |
| Intel | Y |  |
| Sharp | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Nokia | Y |  |
| ITL | Y |  |
| ASUSTeK | Y |  |
| Fraunhofer | Y |  |
| Apple | Y |  |
| ZTE | Y |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | Y |  |
| Lenovo | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |

In addition to the above, some companies also proposed to include periodic transmissions into the active time. This could allow the TX UE to perform periodic transmissions to a UE in DRX without the need to consider the DRX period of the RX UE. To handle the possibility of pre-emption, some companies further suggested to add some additional slots to the active time in the event of pre-emption. Also, some companies mentioned that active time should also consider reception of CSI reports from a peer UE. Specifically, if a UE in DRX requires CSI reports from its peer UEs, it should also monitor SL to be able to receive CSI reports from the peer UE without being constrained to active time defined by the DRX timers.

**Q32) Should the active time at the RX UE also include:**

1. **the slots associated with announced periodic transmissions by the TX UE (i.e. in the SCI)?**
2. **Additional slots to those associated with periodic transmissions (e.g. to handle pre-emption)**
3. **The slots when the UE is expected CSI reports following a CSI request**
4. **Others**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | C, D | For A, the periodic transmission can be covered by on duration timer / inactivity timer by appropriate DRX configuration.  For B, the effect of premeption should not be handled by Rx-UE DRX pattern extension, but should be handled by Tx-UE, i.e., to ensure the reselected resource due to preemption (and further revaluation/congestion control/prioritization) should fall into the DRX active time of Rx-UE.  The UE should be active when it sends some message that needs reply from peer UE, like CSI request or inter-UE coordination message which is pending RAN1 conclusion in the future. |
| Xiaomi | N | All these cases could be covered by DRX timer controlled wake up time with appropriate UE implementation and configuration. |
| Samsung | A and FFS on C. | We think A can be supported since the time information for next periodic transmission is already included in SCI. For B, we think on-duration timer and inactivity timer can handle it. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A, C | For such slots where the transmissions can be expected to occur in advance, they should be regarded as also active time for reception, irrespective of whether they are really included in the Active Time defined by those DRX timers. This is in line with the Uu DRX logic. |
| LG | A, B, C | Additional PSCCH monitoring or CSI reporting MAC CE monitoring not supported by on-duration timer, inactivity timer, or retransmission timer should be considered as active time. |
| InterDigital | A, C (B can be FFS) | Configuring the DRX cycle and on-duration to tailor it to the transmission periodicity is limited as a TX UE can have different transmissions with different periodicity and may change this often (as a result of UE assistance information).  We prefer to make periodic transmissions I of DRX configuration and so A would be necessary. B would be useful so that a TX UE which performs preemption has more slots to choose from for reselection. |
| Vivo | C | A and B can be solved by current DRX operation and suitable configuration, e.g. onDuration timer, inactivity timer and retransmission timer.  For C, UE may be active when it triggers CSI reporting and waits for response for the peer UE within a time boundary. |
| CATT | C | For C, the basic mechanism for SL DRX should be enhanced. |
| Ericsson (Min) | A, C | B can be handled by UE implementation. |
| Intel | See comment | We agree with Xiaomi all these cases can be handled by proper configuration of SL DRX configuration. No need to have any special handling for now |
| Sharp | C |  |
| Fujitsu | A, B, C and D | Besides A,B,C, the slot indicated in the SCI in the case of Scnario B and Scnario D but no pre-emption occurs should also be regrarded as SL DRX active time, according to our repley of the previous Section. |
| Nokia | A, C |  |
| ITL | A and B | It is reasonable to support A since the periodic resource allocation in time is already shared between Tx UE and Rx UE. For B, additional slots to those associated with periodic transmissions should be considered to provide additional scheduling flexibility and accomodate pre-emption. |
| ASUSTeK | A, C |  |
| Fraunhofer | A, B, C | The DRX active time at the RX UE should also consider the time slots where a periodic transmission can be expected. |
| Apple | None | For A and B, I think this can be left for resource reservation when TX UE taking into account of DRX configuration of RX UE.  For C, this is not from RX UE perspective, why a UE sends a CSI request when itself is in DRX INACTIVE? |
| ZTE | A | For B, this can be solved by a smart RTT timer and retransmission timer configuration.  For C, we do not see too much benefits to support this. |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | A, B, C | We are open to consider A), B), and C) in the definition of active time and RNA2 could analyze the possible spec impact. |
| Lenovo | A, C |  |
| Qualcomm | A, C | RAN2 may further discussion if B is needed. |

In general, TX UE transmissions to an RX UE in SL DRX should be aligned to DRX active time of the RX UE. This can be achieved if the TX UE maintains a similar/synchronized set of DRX timers with the RX UE. RAN2 can study a number of impacts at the TX UE transmission procedures to achieve this alignment, including impacts to LCP and resource selection.

**Q33) Which of the following should be studied further by RAN2 to align transmissions by the TX UE with the active time of the RX UE?**

1. **LCP enhancements to avoid TX UE transmitting data in a grant to a non-active RX UE**
2. **LCP enhancements to prioritize transmissions to DRX RX UEs for grants which fall in the active time of these RX UEs**
3. **Resource selection enhancements taking into account the active time of the RX UE**
4. **Others**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Response | Comments |
| OPPO | A | C can be up to UE implementation.  Literally, we wonder what is the difference between A and B? We did not choose B since we assume the gap is option-B can still allow transmitting to Rx-UE in non-active state (i.e., if there is no active Rx UE to prioritize..) |
| Xiaomi | A | Option C has impact in RAN1 not RAN2. Option A is preferred than optin B. LCH with higher priority should not be down prioritized if there is available transmission resource. |
| Samsung | FFS | We think it’s somewhat early to discuss this issue. First we would like to see how DRX is operated in basic. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A, B, C | All can be reasonably further discussed. |
| LG | A |  |
| InterDigital | A,B, C | At a minimum, A and C are needed to avoid transmitting to a UE which is not "listening“ as well as ensuring we have sufficient resources in resource selection for those UEs. B also has benefits in that it may result in latency reduction for DRX Ues, but details can be discussed further. |
| vivo | FFS | When SL DRX operation is specified completely, TX UE must follow the DRX pattern to transmit data. LCP impacts can be left to UE implementation.  B and C are further optmization and can be FFS. |
| CATT | A | LCP enhancement is needed to guarantee the receiving UE has to be awake. |
| Ericsson (Min) | A and C | B can be caterogirzed as UE implementation. |
| Intel | See comment | While these enahncements might be useful to consider, we think it is too early to discuss. We can discuss them once the basic DRX design/timer operation is stable |
| Sharp | A |  |
| Fujitsu | A,C | Both A and C can ensure that the SL transmissions fall into the RX UE’s SL DRX active time. |
| Nokia | A,B,C | All options are worth to be discussed further. |
| ITL | A,B,C |  |
| ASUSTeK | A,B,C |  |
| Fraunhofer | A, C | In order to ensure that the TX is not transmitting to UE in inactive time, LCP and resource allocation enhancements should be considered. However, at this stage other options cannot be precluded. |
| Apple | A.B.C |  |
| ZTE | A.B.C |  |
| Asia Pacific Telecom | A), B), C) |  |
| Lenovo | A, C |  |
| Qualcomm | A or C | Either A or C may work. |

## 2.5 Other Aspects related to DRX Timers

**Q34) Are there any other aspects related to DRX Timers that RAN2 should discuss in the scope of this email discussion?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 4 Agreements from RAN2#103 [1]

Agreements on SA2’s questions:

1: For Q1, RAN2 reply AS layer can determine DRX parameters and no additional input from V2X layer other than the currently available QoS is needed.

2: RAN2 confirms that for unicast, the PC5 DRX may be negotiated between the UEs in AS layer. We can also include this RAN2 confirmation into the response LS.

3: For Q2, RAN2 further reply that for SL unicast, other than DRX parameter negotiation/sharing reason, AS layer can provide the PC5 DRX related information to the V2X layer, and RAN2 is working on the detailed DRX parameter that applies to each cast type. RAN2 would keep SA2 being update on the RAN2 progress.

4: For Q3, RAN2 reply that RAN2 does not think it is beneficial for broadcast and groupcast to share the PC5 DRX related information amongst UEs in the vicinity in V2X layer.

5: For Q4, RAN2 reply that RAN2 is working on this aspects following the WID bullet of “Specify mechanism aiming to align sidelink DRX wake-up time with Uu DRX wake-up time in an in-coverage UE”, RAN2 would keep SA2 updated on related working progress.

Agreements on high-level principles for SL DRX

1: For SL unicast (after SL unicast link is established), SL DRX configuration can be configured per a pair of source/destination. FFS whether SL DRX operates per direction or for both directions.

2: For SL groupcast/broadcast, SL DRX configuration can be configured in common. FFS on granularity of SL DRX configuration.

3: Short DRX cycle is not introduced for SL unicast, groupcast and broadcast in Rel-17.

4: For data reception, RAN2 defines the behaviour for monitoring the SCI reception (i.e., PSCCH and 2nd SCI on PSSCH) during the SL active time for SL DRX. For data reception, the UE may skip monitoring of PSCCH and 2nd SCI on PSSCH during inactive time for SL DRX. Sensing aspect is not considered in this agreement.

5a: At least, On-duration timer and Inactivity timer are supported in SL unicast.

5b: HARQ RTT is supported in SL unicast. FFS for the detailed condition when it is supported. FFS whether HARQ RTT is explicitly configured or can be based on SCI. FFS on the need of HARQ retransmission timer.

6a: At least, on-duration timer is supported for SL groupcast. FFS for the need and detailed condition when inactivity timer is supported.

6b: HARQ RTT is supported in SL groupcast. FFS for the detailed condition when it is supported. FFS whether HARQ RTT is explicitly configured or can be based on SCI. FFS on the need of HARQ retransmission timer.

7: At least, on-duration timer is supported for SL broadcast.

8: SL DRX Command MAC CE is introduced for SL DRX operation in unicast. FFS on the need of groupcast. FFS on the detailed UE behaviour (including relation to inactivity timer).

9: In mode 1, when in RRC\_CONNECTED, if DRX is configured, the MAC entity monitors the PDCCH for the MAC entity's SL-RNTI, SLCS-RNTI and SL Semi-Persistent Scheduling V-RNTI in Uu DRX Active Time. MAC entity does not need to monitor the PDCCH for the MAC entity's SL-RNTI, SLCS-RNTI and SL Semi-Persistent Scheduling V-RNTI in Uu DRX in-active Time.

Agreements on SL DRX configurations

1: For broadcast/groupcast, for out-of-coverage case, TX-UE/RX-UE obtain DRX configuration from pre-configuration.

2: For broadcast/groupcast, for in-coverage case, RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE TX-UE/RX-UE obtain DRX configuration from SIB. It is up to network implementation how to coordinate active time between different cells.

3: For broadcast/groupcast, for in-coverage case, for RRC\_CONNECTED TX-UE/RX-UE can obtain DRX configuration from SIB. FFS on whether dedicated-RRC is also used.

4: For unicast, for OOC scenario, the UE who sends out the DRX configuration decides on the DRX configuration. FFS on whether pre-configuration and/or the assistance information from the peer UE is also taken into account when determining the DRX configuration.

5: For unicast, for OOC scenario, adopt per-direction DRX configuration is as baseline. FFS on whether it is TX-centric or Rx-centric, i.e. TX UE or RX UE decides it.

Agreements on granularity of SL DRX operation for groupcast/broadcast

1: RAN2 kindly agree that for groupcast and broadcast communication further granularity to multiple sets of DRX configurations (beyond just cast type) is required i.e. more than two DRX Cycle configurations should be supported in specification.

2: RAN2 will study/discuss how PQI and/or L2 destination ID is used to derive groupcast and broadcast DRX configuration.

Agreements on SL DRX on groupcast/broadcast

1: Timer-based SL DRX is also applied to SL groupcast/broadcast.
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