3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #109 electronic R2-2001913

Elbonia, 24th–28th February 2020

Source: CATT

Title: Summary of open issues for PDCCH

Agenda Item: 6.11.2

Document for: Discussion and Decision

# Introduction

This contribution provides a summary of the contributions posted in the Agenda Item 6.11.2 PDCCH-based power saving signals/channel Additional stage-3 RAN2 aspects. The addressed issues are classified as:

* New issues not addressed in the email discussions
* Issues already addressed in the email discussions [108#78] (MAC running CR [3][4]) and [108#38] (RRC running CR [1][2]);

For each new issue, companies are invited to provide their answers to the following questions:

* Does the issue need to be solved for rel-16?
* If yes, what are the companies’ opinion(s) on solution(s)?

# Discussion

* 1. **New issues not addressed in the email discussions**

### *Issue #1: Capturing CSI reporting when the drx-onDurationTimer is not started due to DCP indication, but the MAC entity is in Active Time during on-duration due to other reasons*

Company/Tdoc: CATT [5]

Proposed solution: When evaluating Active Time when *drx-onDurationTimer* is not started due to DCP, the same triggers, with same ambiguity period (4ms) as in legacy should be taken into account.



Proposed TP (wrt [3]):

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

1> if DCP is configured for the active DL BWP:

2> in current symbol n, if the symbol occurs within *drx-onDurationTimer* duration and *drx-onDurationTimer* would not be running considering DCP occurrence(s) associated with the current DRX cycle until [x] ms prior to symbol n as specified in this clause; and

2> if the MAC entity would not be in Active Time considering grants/assignments/DRX Command MAC CE/Long DRX Command MAC CE received and Scheduling Request sent until 4 ms prior to symbol n when evaluating all DRX Active Time conditions as specified in this clause:

3> not transmit periodic SRS and semi-persistent SRS defined in TS 38.214 [7];

3> not report semi-persistent CSI;

3>  if *ps-Periodic\_CSI\_Transmit* is not configured with value *true*:

4>  not report periodic CSI on PUCCH.

------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

*Q1a. Do you think this issue needs to be solved for Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We agree with CATT’s analysis. |
| Apple | No | When NW configures the WUS, the offset between WUS occasion and on duration should take the ambiguity period into account.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | The case CATT mentioned is valid. The SRS/CQI report should be based on the deciding of whether UE is in active time. There are a lot of triggers for UE into active time, e.g. MAC CE , UE initiating SR, receiving a positive PDCCH-WUS etc.We are wondering whether we can put all these triggers together when describing the conditions for SRS/CQI reporting. I remembered in the first version of our drafted 38.321, it was captured like this: in current symbol n, if the MAC entity would not be in Active Time considering grants/assignments/DRX Command MAC CE/Long DRX Command MAC CE received, Scheduling Request sent and DCP occured until 4 ms prior to symbol n when evaluating all DRX Active Time conditions as specified in this clause:2> not transmit periodic SRS and semi-persistent SRS defined in TS 38.214 [7];2> if the MAC entity would not be in Active Time considering DCP occured until 4 ms prior to symbol n when evaluating all DRX Active Time conditions as specified in this clause and *ps-Periodic\_CSI\_TransmitOrNot* is configured with value *true*:3> not report CSI on PUCCH except for periodic CSI on PUCCH, and semi-persistent CSI on PUSCH.2> else:3> not report CSI on PUCCH and semi-persistent CSI on PUSCH.We think the above capturing is logically clearer.I know that some may want to take the DCP out and put it in a separate place. Well, in that case, we still need to consider the concurrency of those triggers as CATT says. |
| Nokia | Yes, but | This is needed for the case when DCP can be received without ambiguity. However, we should consider this together with issue 9b as there can be ambiguity in receiving the DCP as well. |
| Huawei | Yes  | Agree that legacy behavior should be performed in Active Time. |
| Ericsson | Yes, but | In the figure above, in our understanding, two use cases are depicted, i.e. first the use case DCP is not triggered but periodic CSI is reported during *drx-OnDurationTimer* and the other use case where SR starts Active Time and the UE reports CSI during Active Time. We understand that for the first use case there is no ambiguity. For the second use case the ambiguity exists when the Active Time ends due to DRX command, but this is already captured in legacy text. PS: we are not sure if CATT points to a very specific corner case, where UE is reporting periodic CSI when DCP is not triggered, and UE is in Active Time due to SR as depicted in figure above, but this Active Time is ended within 4 ms of the end of the drx-onDurationTimer due to DRX command? We assume that the Active Time covers the CSI reporting behavior of the UE in that case. |

*Q1b. If the answer to Q1a is Yes, do you agree with the proposed solution (TP)?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments and/or other solutions (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | No | See above. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

### *Issue #2: Impact of DCP associated with a long DRX cycle on the short DRX cycles within this long DRX cycle*

Company/Tdoc: vivo [7]

Proposed solution: PDCCH-WUS only locates before *onDuration* timer for long DRX cycle and such PDCCH-WUS can be also used to control the activation/deactivation of *onDuration* timer for short DRX cycle in the same long DRX cycle.



*Rapporteur:* This issue depends on the outcome of the issue of Short DRX support for DCP.

*Q2a. Do you think this issue needs to be solved for Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | No | In our understanding, at any point of time, UE uses either short or long DRX. When short DRX cycle is running, if WUS is not configured (or not supported) for short DRX cycle, then there is no WUS occasions to monitor. |
| Apple | No | We do not support the WUS applicability on short DRX cycle.  |
| Xiaomi | No | We have the same understanding with QC. And it goes a littler far away since we have not decided the WUS applicability on short DRX cycle. |
| Nokia |  | It should be possible for the NW to configure WUS to be applicable for Short and/or Long DRX cycle. |
| Huawei | No |  |
| Ericsson | No | Our understanding is that current agreements/assumptions say that WUS is not supported with Short DRX cycle. In our understanding this means that WUS and Short DRX cycle can be configured simultaneously, but when the UE is in short DRX cycle the UE does not monitor WUS. We would like to see a proper/full use of WUS with short DRX cycle, and do not see the need for the proposed compromise.  |

*Q2b. If the answer to Q2a is Yes, do you agree with the proposed solution?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments and/or other solutions (if any)** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### *Issue #3: UE behaviour when it is configured with multiple DCP monitoring occasions and detects one*

Company/Tdoc: OPPO [9]

Proposed solution: If UE detects WUS indicating UE to wake up, UE can skip the left WUS monitoring occasions associated with the next occurrence of *drx-onDurationTimer*.

*Rapporteur:* This issue looks more in the RAN1 domain.

*Q3a. Do you think this issue needs to be solved by RAN1 or RAN2?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **RAN1/RAN2** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | RAN1 | How to monitor WUS is a PHY layer issue and hence should be discussed by RAN1. |
| Apple | RAN1 | This is a physical layer issue and should be discussed by RAN1. |
| Xiaomi | RAN1 |  |
| Nokia | RAN1/2 | To make some progress, compromise could be that this should be configurable by the NW whether one or all monitoring occasions need to be monitored. |
| Huawei | RAN1 | It is PHY layer issue. |
| Ericsson | RAN1 | We think that RAN1 should discuss and agree on this, if needed. If this needs to be specified, it should only be specified in PHY, and not duplicated in MAC. |

*Q3b. If the answer to Q3a is RAN2, do you think this issue needs to be solved for Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

*Q3c. If the answer to Q3b is Yes, do you agree with the proposed solution?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments and/or other solutions (if any)** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### *Issue #4: Notification of SI/PWS change and DCP*

Company/Tdoc: Intel Corporation [11]

Proposed solution: RAN2 assumes that a UE using WUS can still rely on legacy mechanism to receive notifications of SI or PWS change (as other paging DCI can be received in parallel to PDCCH-WUS).

*Rapporteur:* As mentioned in [11], “RAN1 is considering that paging DCI could be monitored in parallel to WUS when required by a UE. Therefore, no new solution is required unless RAN1 indicates otherwise”. Given no further work is expected from RAN1, it seems nothing needs to be done and the current situation is already what is proposed.

*Q4a. Do you think this issue needs to be solved for Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | No | We think the current behaviors are fine and no further enhancement is needed. |
| Apple | No | The WUS indication is just to control the UE monitoring the PDCCH for the UE dedicated transmission, and there is no impact the SI/paging mechanism. |
| Xiaomi | No | Legacy behavior is ok. Intel’s optimization can be considered in R17. |
| Nokia | No | We assume that nothing needs to be done in RAN2 unless RAN1 indicates otherwise. Our understanding is that there is no issue. |
| Huawei | No | No further enhancement is needed. |
| Ericsson | No | We do not see the need to enable paging via WUS, anyways this topic should not be discussed in RAN2.  |

*Q4b. If the answer to Q4a is Yes, do you agree with the proposed solution?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments and/or other solutions (if any)** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### *Issue #5: Improving Power Saving when the UE is configured to report L1 RSRP/CSI report irrespective of DCP indications*

Company/Tdoc: Apple [12]

Proposed solution: NW configures UE to report CSI/SRS in sparse mode, i.e. report once per N DRX cycles.



*Q5a. Do you think this issue needs to be solved for Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We think this is an important feature to have, given that network now has the option to require UE to report L1-RSRP even if DCP indicates no wakeup. This is because network may configure L1-RSRP with short periodicity during active traffic, in order to continuously refine UE’s serving beams to achieve high throughput. But if DCP indicates no data, then there is no need for UE to report L1-RSRP frequently. Network only needs occasional L1-RSRP report to ensure UE has a working PDCCH beam to receive DCP. This can be done by scaling up the periodicity of L1-RSRP when there is no data, as proposed by [12].  |
| Apple | Yes | It can provide both benefits in NW and UE side at the same time. NW can track UE radio quality and UE can save power compared to legacy periodic CSI report.  |
|  |  |  |
| Xiaomi | ? | Well, sounds reasonable. But we are not sure. Will the sparse reporting impact the effect of beam management?Not sure of the gain. |
| Nokia | No | This does not seem to be inline with RAN1 agreements. This is new functionality we don’t think is needed. i  |
| Huawei | No | No further enhancement is needed. |
| Ericsson | No | RAN1 has already discussed this and agreed to enable L1-RSRP reporting based on NW configuration, when DCP is not triggered. When configured to report L1-RSRP the UE should be report according to the RRC configuration.  |
|  |  |  |

*Q5b. If the answer to Q5a is Yes, do you agree with the proposed solution?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments and/or other solutions (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes | If UE keeps in “sleep” DRX cycle for N-1 times, UE will wakeup in the Nth “sleep” DRX cycle for the L1\_RSRP/CSI report. According to current running CR, if NW configures L1\_RSRP/CSI report for each DRX cycle, it can assume the N=1. Therefore, this solution has little impact to the running CR, which is just to allow NW to configure a value of “N” to UE. Actual NW deployment could decide the optimal value of “N” taking into account necessary UE and NW performance characteristics. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### *Issue #6: DCP mis-detection avoidance*

Company/Tdoc: Apple [12]

Proposed solution: Support periodical wake up and/or always wake up in poor radio condition mechanism.



*Q6a. Do you think this issue needs to be solved for Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | No | We think similar effect can already be achieved with the existing behaviors. For example, network can learn about UE’s link quality from UE’s measurement report. If link quality has dropped and mis-detection of DCP may become a concern, NW can configure UE to wake up if WUS is not received. Or alternatively, what is proposed can be just UE implementation, i.e. UE can choose to wake up and monitor PDCCH if it feels that is necessary when its link quality has dropped to a sufficiently low level. |
| Apple | Yes | According to current agreements, even though UE can report L1-RSRP/CSI report to NW to help NW tracking the UE radio quality, if UE does not wake up, NW has no way to change the UE’s configuration. Therefore, we should allow UE to wake up at least once when the current radio quality is worse than a pre-configured threshold in order to help NW to adjust the configuration within a timely manner.  |
| Xiaomi | No | I guess Apple’s intention was to target the case that the UE cannot receive wake up signal in poor radio condition for a long time. In that case, based on the previous agreement the RLM or RRM measurements are not impacted by WUS design, it would potentially mean that UE would be performing beam failure detection, radio link monitoring. |
| Nokia | No | NW can already achieve this behavior by configuring measurements and can de-configure the DCP, for instance. In addition the UE should be able to receive DCP in worse radio conditions than normal PDCCH, because it can be assumed that DCP has lower payload. The proposed solution seems to require UE to wake up always. |
| Huawei | No | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Ericsson | Yes, but… | We like this idea and consider it more efficient then a semi-static RRC configuration. But we also agree that missed WUS detection should and has been discussed in RAN1, not sure if RAN2 should come up with an idea on top of that at this point in time when we are about to close… |

*Q6b. If the answer to Q6a is Yes, do you agree with the proposed solution?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments and/or other solutions (if any)** |
| Apple | Yes | Solution 1: NW can configure UE to wakeup per N DRX cycle regardless of the WUS indication;Solution 2: UE can wakeup when the current radio quality becomes worse, e.g. L1\_RSRP/CSI report < threshold.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### *Issue #7: ASN.1 options for capturing the search space for the DCP*

Company/Tdoc: ZTE Corporation, Sanechips [14]

Proposed solution:

Select one from the following options to introduce DCI format 2\_6 in TS38.331.

* Option 1: Introduce a SearchSpace-r16 in which the searchSpaceType-r16 includes all the indications for UE to monitor PDCCH candidates for Rel-15 DCI formats and DCI format 2-6.
* Option 2: Introduce SearchSpaceExt-r16 and searchSpacesToAddModListExt-r16.
* Option 3: Introduce powersavingSearchSpaceList-r16 in PCCCH-Config.

*Q7a. Do you think this issue needs to be solved for Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Apple | No | We think the ASN.1 in RRC running CR is ok. According to current CR, the new parameters can be configured for legacy DCI format. Then we do not see the problem.  |
| Xiaomi | No | The current ASN.1 in RRC running CR is ok. |
| Nokia |  | RAN1 has agreed the following to re-use the existing SS IE:“**Conclusion:** (RAN1#98bis Chongqing) With the above agreement, it is understood that the search space(s) for WUS PDCCH reuses the existing SS IE (i.e., no new SS IE). ” |
| Huawei | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | We understood this question to be about the ASN.1 encoding. We share the understanding that the legacy search space is re-used for WUS. |

*Q7b. If the answer to Q7a is Yes, which of option 1/2/3 do you prefer?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Comments and/or other options (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 |  |
| Huawei |  | No strong view, all options can work. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 | The “Rel-16 CR Merge\_v3” CR (see offline 056) includes a r16 search space extension which includes all the new REL-16 DCI formats, including DCP format 2-6. In case the NW wants to configure a search space with both legacy and REL-16 DCI formats, the NW can configure this using the same *searchSpaceId* in *searchSpacesToAddModList* in and *searchSpacesToAddModList-r16*. The running CR however includes an editor’s NOTE to discuss further: *Editor’s Note: The structure of the new search space for DCI 2-6 needs further discussion and has to be aligned with all new DCIs introduced in Rel-16.*In our understanding the running CR is according to option 2 (except that the wording “ext” is not used).  |
|  |  |  |

### *Issue #8: UE behaviour when it misses DCP during handover*

Company/Tdoc: Xiaomi Communications [16]

Proposed solution: UE starts the associated *drx-onDurationTimer* if UE misses the PDCCH-WUS after handover at a new cell.



*Q8a. Do you think this issue needs to be solved for Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | No | We do not think there is any critical issue to be solved here. |
| Apple | No | UE will first perform RACH procedure during HO, and UE keeps on PDCCH monitoring during the RACH procedure. We do not see the issue.  |
| Nokia | No | RA procedure will dictate the PDCCH monitoring upon HO. |
| Huawei | No |  |
| Ericsson | No | We do not think there is an issue to solve. |

*Q8b. If the answer to Q8a is Yes, do you agree with the proposed solution?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments and/or other solutions (if any)** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### *Issue #9: DCP and ambiguity period*

Two distinct issues are now discussed related to DCP and ambiguity period:

* Issue 9a: Does an ambiguity period need to be accounted for considering a DCP occasion when determining whether the UE is during an on-duration period for the purpose of CSI/SRS reporting/transmission?
* Issue 9b: Does an ambiguity period need to be accounted at the time of DCP occasion when determining whether the UE is in Active Time (for the purpose of deciding whether to monitor or not DCP) considering grants/assignments/DRX Command MAC CE/Long DRX Command MAC CE received and Scheduling Request sent until 4 ms before the DCP occasion?



#### Issue 9a: Does an ambiguity period need to be accounted for considering a DCP occasion when determining whether the UE is during an on-duration period for the purpose of CSI/SRS reporting/transmission.

This issue was discussed during the email discussion [108#78] (MAC running CR [3][4]) and resulted in all participating companies to agree that no ambiguity period is needed when considering DCP for on-duration determination. And a TP was converged as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| 1> if DCP is configured for the active DL BWP:2> in current symbol n, if the symbol occurs within *drx-onDurationTimer* duration and *drx-onDurationTimer* would not be running considering DCP occurrence(s) associated with the current DRX cycle ~~until [x] ms prior to symbol n~~ as specified in this clause:3> not transmit periodic SRS and semi-persistent SRS defined in TS 38.214 [7];3> not report semi-persistent CSI;3> if *ps-Periodic\_CSI\_Transmit* is not configured with value *true*:4> not report periodic CSI on PUCCH. |

*Q9a. Do you agree that no ambiguity period is needed when considering DCP for on-duration determination? If Yes, do you agree the above TP captures it correctly?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposal****Yes/No** | **TP****Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  | See below. *No ambiguity period is needed when considering DCP for on-duration determination* |
| Nokia |  |  | The ambiguity should apply in scenarios of issues #1 and #9b. |
| Huawei | Yes | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Yes | We agree there is no ambiguity for “issue 9a” in figure above, i.e. we also discussed this with issue #1. We assume there is no ambiguity during ps-offset, which is configured taking into account the UE capability. We agree with the proposed TP correction.  |
|  |  |  |  |

#### Issue 9b: DCP is only monitored outside Active Time, so is there any ambiguity period associated with the DCP monitoring?

Company/Tdoc: Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell [17], ZTE Corporation, Sanechips [21]

Proposed solutions:

* *Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell [17]*:

The active time ambiguity period of 4ms applies on whether the UE can monitor the DCP or not (since the UE cannot monitor DCP when in active time).

Proposed TP (wrt [3]):

|  |
| --- |
| 5.7 Discontinuous Reception (DRX)…1> if the Short DRX Cycle is used, and [(SFN × 10) + subframe number] modulo (*drx-ShortCycle*) = (*drx-StartOffset*) modulo (*drx-ShortCycle*):2> start *drx-onDurationTimer* after *drx-SlotOffset* from the beginning of the subframe.1> if the Long DRX Cycle is used, and [(SFN × 10) + subframe number] modulo (*drx-LongCycle*) = *drx-StartOffset*:2> if DCP is configured for the active DL BWP:3> if DCP associated with the current DRX Cycle indicated to start *drx-onDurationTimer*, as specified in TS 38.213 [6]; or:3> if all DCP occasion(s) in time domain, as specified in TS 38.213 [6], associated with the current DRX Cycle occurred in Active Time considering grants/assignments/DRX Command MAC CE/Long DRX Command MAC CE received and Scheduling Request sent until 4 ms prior to start of the last DCP occasion, or within BWP switching interruption length, or during a measurement gap; or3> if *ps-Wakeup* is configured with value *true* and DCP associated with the current DRX Cycle has not been received:4> start *drx-onDurationTimer* after *drx-SlotOffset* from the beginning of the subframe.2> else:3> start *drx-onDurationTimer* after *drx-SlotOffset* from the beginning of the subframe.Editor’s Note: FFS how to progress the support of short DRX cycle for WUS.Editor’s Note: For DCP overlapping with Active time, it is still FFS in RAN1 whether it refers to all DCP occasions or some DCP occasions. |

* *ZTE Corporation, Sanechips [21]*

[21] specifically addresses the case where DCP occasion occurs right after UE received a DRX Command MAC CE or a Long DRX Command MAC CE:



In such case, the proposed solution is to apply the (long) DRX command (i.e. stop the *drx-onDurationTimer* and *drx-InactivityTimer* ) only when sending the ACK feedback:

“For the case that DCP is configured and the reception of (long) DRX confirmation MAC CE, stop the *drx-onDurationTimer* and *drx-InactivityTimer* in the first symbol after the end of the corresponding transmission carrying the DL feedback of ACK.”

The corresponding TP is:

|  |
| --- |
| 1> if a *drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerUL* expires:2> start the *drx-RetransmissionTimerUL* for the corresponding HARQ process in the first symbol after the expiry of *drx-HARQ-RTT-TimerUL*.1> if a DRX Command MAC CE or a Long DRX Command MAC CE is received:2> if DCP is configured for the active DL BWP;3> stop the *drx-onDurationTimer* and *drx-InactivityTimer* in the first symbol after the end of the corresponding transmission carrying the DL feedback of ACK.2>else;~~2~~3> stop *drx-onDurationTimer*;~~2~~3> stop *drx-InactivityTimer*.1> if *drx-InactivityTimer* expires or a DRX Command MAC CE is received:2> if the Short DRX cycle is configured:3> start or restart *drx-ShortCycleTimer* in the first symbol after the expiry of *drx-InactivityTimer* or in the first symbol after the end of DRX Command MAC CE reception;3> use the Short DRX Cycle. |

*Q9b1. Do you think this issue needs to be solved for Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | No | We don’t think DRX ambiguity period should include or affect DCP. We analyzed this problem in R2-1916175. |
| Apple | No | The configuration of the offset between the WUS occasion and DRX onDuration should take the UE processing time/ambiguity period into account.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We want to clarify that what we discussed in last night’s email summary is whether the DRX ambiguity period impacts the DCP decoding/processing which leads to whether UE has enough time to report CSI/SRS. It seems we have reached the consensus that the ps\_offset should allow enough processing time for the UE to decide this right at the beginning of drx-onDurationTimer start. So there is no problem at all.But in this section, Nokia and ZTE brought out another question whether the ambiguity period should be applied on deciding whether the UE expects to monitor DCP in the next occasion(s) since the UE is not required to monitor DCP when in active time. We think it is valid and we should resolve this.They are separate issues as someone mentioned on the e-meeting. So Nokia’s solution is ok and can over ZTE’s concern. |
| Nokia | Yes | It seems the above response is talking about issue 9a, not issue 9b..Since the UE cannot know if it will be in active time during DCP monitoring occasion, we need to apply the ambiguity period for DCP reception. The legacy 4ms period seems to be fine for this.Only by applying the ambiguity period, NW and UE can be in sync if and how the UE transmits SRS/CSI report. It is problematic for the NW if it does not know what the UE will report. |
| Huawei | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | There can be ambiguity if the UE can monitor the following DCP occasion after the end of Active Time due to DRX command processing, and we agree with the correction proposed by Nokia. |

*Q9b2. If the answer to Q9b1 is Yes, which of the proposed solutions (TPs) do you prefer:*

* *Option 1: Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell [17]*
* *Option 2: ZTE Corporation, Sanechips [21]*
* *Option 3: Both*
* *Option 4: Other*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Comments and/or other solutions (if any)** |
| Xiaomi | Option1 | See above. |
| Nokia | Option 1 | We did not fully understand how the ZTE proposal works or solves the problem. |
| Huawei | Option 2 | We prefer similar wording as we used for Rel-15 DRX ambiguous period. It can be the baseline, we can finalize the text in 38.321 running CR. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |  |
|  |  |  |

### *Issue #10: What should the UE monitor if it misses DCP when configured with SCell dormancy?*

Company/Tdoc: Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell [18]

Proposed solution: Agree what the UE shall monitor if it misses DCP when configured with SCell dormancy.

*Rapporteur:* It might be checked first if this is to be discussed in Power Saving WI or in DCCA WI, and in both cases it might rather be a RAN1 issue anyways (since the dormancy state is not visible to MAC).

*Q10a. Do you think this issue needs to be discussed in RAN2 Power Saving session instead of DCCA WI or RAN1?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | No | We should leave this discussion to RAN1. In fact, RAN1 has already been discussing this issue. |
| Apple | Yes | Maybe DCCA is more better to the potential impact on the impact on the SCell dormancy.  |
| Xiaomi | ? | To Nokia:Are you considering the UE’s behavior for Scell groups when UE missing the DCP command? If you are considering the impact to the Scell state, then RAN1 is discussing this. |
| Nokia | Yes | This is RAN2 functionality and this seems to have no RAN1 specification impact. We should think this issue from the UE power saving point of view. This is occurring only when the UE misses (or cannot monitor) the DCP and starts the on-duration timer. Hence this is UE power saving issue and solution should be considered from UE power saving perspective.  |
| Huawei | No | it should be discussed in RAN1, maybe DCCA WI. |
| Ericsson | No | The dormancy state is not visible to L2/3, i.e. this should be discussed, and captured if needed, in RAN1. |

*Q10b. If the answer to Q10a is Yes, do you think this issue needs to be solved for Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Apple | Yes | UE should follow the same principle for both SCell dormancy and non SCell dormancy configuration, i.e. start onDuration timer.  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

*Q10c. If the answers to Q10a/b are Yes, what should be the solution?*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Solution (if any)** |
| Apple | NW can configure the UE’s behavior when missing the DCP command, e.g. fallback to default BWP, or keep on current BWP, or switch to dormant BWP. |
| Nokia | For us, it needs to be clear what the UE monitors in this case taking power saving aspects into account. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### *Issue #11: Network is not able to perform beam management actions when WUS has not indicated UE to wake-up but UE has transmitted CSI/SRS*

Company/Tdoc: Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell [18]

Proposed solution: When UE has reported CSI/transmitted SRS, it would be required to monitor PDCCH for at least part of the on duration. Duration should be configurable by network.

*Q11a. Do you think this issue needs to be solved for Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | No | We do not see it as a critical issue that need to be solved in Rel-16, because if network only needs to perform beam refinement, it can wait until the next DRX cycle and wake up UE to do it. If beam(s) fails, UE can initiate BFR itself. Moreover, the proposed solution is not power efficient. For example, UE is required to monitor PDCCH regardless of whether CSI indicates good or poor link quality. |
| Apple | Yes | It’s not good when NW detect the link problem but cannot do anything timely.  |
| Xiaomi | No | If gNB wants to perform beam management actions, it can indicate UE to wake up to report P/SP SRS and CSI for maintaining radio link if necessary. |
| Nokia | Yes | See our Tdoc |
| Huawei | No | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Ericsson | - | The problem may be dependent on the configured DRX cycle length and UE movements. |

*Q11b. If the answer to Q11a is Yes, do you agree with the proposed solution?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments and/or other solutions (if any)** |
| Apple | No | It’s unnecessary for UE to wake up when the radio quality is good. We only see the benefit that UE wakeup when the radio quality is worse than a threshold.  |
| Nokia | Yes | See our Tdoc |
| Ericsson | - | In case of a solution, it is not clear to us, that the monitoring should depend on radio quality, i.e. it may also depend on UE speed/movements. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### *Issue #12: Can DCP and DRX groups be configured together?*

Company/Tdoc: Qualcomm Inc, Samsung [22]

Proposed solution:

RAN2 confirm that the existing RAN1/2 agreements on WUS can still be applied without change when DRX groups are configured. More specifically,

* WUS is configured only on SpCell and UE does not monitor WUS as long as SpCell is in DRX active time;
* If a WUS occasion is not monitored, UE starts DRX on duration timers of both DRX groups at their respective next occurrence;
* Upon a wakeup indication, UE starts DRX on duration timers of both DRX groups at their respective next occurrence

*Q12a. Can DCP and DRX groups be configured together in Rel-16?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments (if any)** |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We can expect more power saving when both DRX groups and DCP are configured. This is because DCP does not help save power where there is still active traffic. But with DRX groups, once traffic load drops, network can put FR2 cells to sleep first to save power, by using a separate, much shorter DRX inactivity timer for FR2 cells. Therefore, DCP and DRX groups can be configured together to complement each other’s power saving benefits. As analyzed in [22], the existing DCP procedures still can be applied without change, when DRX groups are configured. Therefore, we think DCP and DRX groups should be allowed to be configured together in Rel-16.  |
| Apple | Yes | We do not see any problem. DCP can also bring the benefit for power efficiency improvement for two DRX groups configuration.  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Yes, since the *OnDuration*s in both DRX groups start at the same time, the common WUS can be used without no problem.Whether we need to have the WUS to indicate which DRX group to wake up or not still needs further study. |
| Nokia | Yes | DCP should be only configured (based on earlier agreements) on the SpCell, even if there are two DRX groups and the DCP indication should control the onDurationTimer start of both. If DCP monitoring occasion overlaps with (SpCell) active time, UE should start it’s onDurationTimer on the next DRX cycle as agreed earlier. I.e. no change of behavior from DCP perspective.  |
| Huawei  | No | The impact on the legacy WUS mechanism and CDRX mechanism is not simple, and it may also impacts on RAN1. We don’t prefer this enhancement at this late stage. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Similar view as QC and Apple, i.e. WUS applies to both groups, i.e. *drx-OnDurationTime*r is (re-)started in both groups.  |

*Q12b. If the answer to Q12a is Yes, do you agree with the proposed solution?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments and/or other solutions (if any)** |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### *Issue #13: UE behavior when a DCP occasion occurs during RAR window*

This issue was discussed in the email discussion [108#78] (MAC running CR [3][4]) but could not get consensus in Tuesday’s Power Saving session, so it is re-discussed here. There are two options:

Option 1: UE monitors DCP (as it monitors other RNTIs in addition to RA-RNTI in legacy) and starts/does not start *drx-onDurationTimer* accordingly on its next occasion.

*Expressed concerns:*

* *Can UE monitor both PDCCH for RA-RNTI and for PS-RNTI?*
* *Can UE monitor both search spaces if RAR and DCP are monitored on different search spaces?*
* *Is this a configuration issue?*

Option 2: UE behaves as if it is in Active Time: it does not monitor DCP and starts *drx-onDurationTimer* on its next occasion.

*Expressed concern:*

* *Why a difference with legacy (where UE is not considered in Active Time during RAR window)?*
* *Since NW is not aware of the UE doing RACH, it would assume it received the DCP and would behave accordingly.*

*Q13.Which of option 1 or 2 do you prefer? Companies are invited to elaborate further on the above mentioned concerns associated with each option in the “Comments” column.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Option 2 | RAR window is not active time in legacy since the UE does not need to monitor C-RNTI other than in special case (e.g., CFRA BFR, 2-step RA).However, as the UE may need to monitor also C-RNTI during RAR window (due to CFRA BFR, 2-step RA), it seems we need to apply same principle for monitoring DCP as with Active time, ie., UE starts *drx-onDurationTimer* in case DCP overlaps with RAR response window. |
| Huawei | Option 2 | Although NW is not aware of the UE doing RACH, we don’t see any serious problem. There is the case that NW may indicate to sleep but UE does not monitor WUS and start the next onduration timer, the power waste for only one onduration is not serious since it does not always happen. Besides, there is high possibility that *ra-ContentionResolutionTimer* is running, so the power waste may be ignored. |
| Ericsson | - | We are also not sure what problem we are exactly trying to solve here. We also wonder why we discuss the required WUS monitoring behavior connected to the RAR window? It seems we have a common understanding there can be different cases when the UE is and is not in Active Time during RAR window, i.e. can’t we apply the general rule that UE is only required to monitor WUS outside Active Time here as well, i.e. capture when UE is in Active Time during RAR window the UE shall *drx-OnDurationTimer*? |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

* 1. **Issues already addressed in the email discussions**

### *MAC-PHY modelling for DCP - Issue #1 of [4]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Company/Tdoc*** | ***Related proposal*** |
| Ericsson [6] | Indicate in an LS to RAN1 that start of Active Time and *drx-OnDurationTimer* shall only be captured in 38.321, and ask RAN1 to specify an indication to upper layer when to start PDCCH monitoring during the next DRX cycle. |
| Intel Corporation [11] | Proposal 1. When a UE is configured with the DCP feature, TS 38.321 captures that UE only starts the *drx-onDurationTimer* upon indication for lower layer. LS is sent to inform RAN1 on this agreement in case any clarification is required on all the cases described in TS 38.213 when *drx-onDurationTimer* needs to be started.Proposal 2. When a UE is configured with the DCP feature, TS 38.321 only reports periodic CSI for next DRX cycle upon indication for lower layer. LS is sent to inform RAN1 on this agreement in case any clarification is required on the cases described in TS 38.213 when *drx-onDurationTimer* is not started and periodic CSI is required. |

### *Support of Short DRX cycle for DCP - Issue #2 of [4]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Company/Tdoc*** | ***Related proposal*** |
| Ericsson [6] | Indicate in an LS to RAN1 that DCP with short DRX is supported from RAN2 perspective, unless RAN1 concludes that this is technically not feasible. |
| vivo [7] | RAN2 to confirm RAN1 decision that PDCCH-WUS is not applicable for Short DRX cycle at least in Rel-16. |
| Apple [13] | Proposal 1: PDCCH-WUS for short DRX cycles will not be supported in Rel.16Proposal 2: PDCCH-WUS for short DRX cycles will be taken up for discussion again after Rel.16 is frozen. |
| Nokia [19] | Proposal 1: DCP is supported for both short and long DRX Proposal 2: DCP for short and/or long DRX is configurable by the network. |
| LG Electronics Inc [20] | Proposal 1. As RAN1’s final decision, i.e., the working assumption still stand, RAN2 should not support Short DRX cycle on DCP. |

### *Partial overlapping for DCP monitoring - Issue #3 of [4]*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Company/Tdoc*** | ***Related proposal*** |
| OPPO [9] | Proposal 1 UE does not monitor PDCCH-WUS if the PDCCH-WUS monitoring occasion partially overlaps with DRX Active Time or measurement gap or BWP switching.Proposal 2 If some of the configured PDCCH-WUS occasions overlap with DRX Active Time or measurement gap or BWP switching, whether UE monitors PDCCH-WUS on other PDCCH-WUS occasions is configured by network. |
| Nokia [18] | If UE misses one or multiple monitoring occasions before the associated on-duration it monitors the PDCCH i.e. starts the *drx-onDuration* timer. |

### *DRX ambiguous period in DCP - Issue #4 of [4]*

After Tuesday’s Power Saving sessions, the issue is pushed back to offline again and discussed in Section 2.1.9.1 of the current email discussion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Company/Tdoc*** | ***Related proposal*** |
| OPPO [10] | Proposal 1 When UE estimates the DRX Active Time status of symbols during period of (4ms-WUSoffset) of *drx-ondurationTimer*, the legacy events are considered irrespective of actual PDCCH-WUS indication.Proposal 2 When UE estimates the DRX Active Time status of symbols during period other than the periods of (4ms-WUSoffset) of *drx-ondurationTimer*, UE should take into account the PDCC-WUS indication besides the legacy eventsProposal 3 RAN2 discusses whether UE does not perform CSI/SRS transmission if PDCCH-WUS does not indicate UE to wake-up for symbols during period of (4ms-WUSoffset) of *drx-ondurationTimer*. |

# Conclusion

This contribution summarized the contributions posted in the Agenda Item 6.11.2 at this e-meeting, and extracted some new issues to discuss further.

TBC…
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