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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following discussion:

* [POST121][312][NES] DTX/DRX - Configuration/activation/deactivation and alignment (Huawei)
  + - Scope: Provide and summarize companies' views on:
      * Configuration of Cell DTX/DRX
      * Activation/deactivation of Cell DTX/DRX
      * Alignment between Cell DTX/DRX and UE C-DRX.
    - Intended outcome: Report to the next meeting (with agreeable proposals)

The intention of this document is to invite companies to share their views regarding configuration, activation, deactivation and alignment of Cell DTX/DRX. Taking these into account, the Rapporteur of the discussion provides a set of proposals to be further discussed during RAN2#121-bis-e.

**Deadline for comments: Friday, March 31st, 10:00 UTC**

Companies providing input to this email discussion are requested to leave contact information below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Delegate name** | **Email address** |
| Apple | Peng Cheng | pcheng24@apple.com |
| Vivo | Jianhui Li | jianhui.li@vivo.com |
| Fraunhofer | Gustavo Costa | gustavo.wagner.oliveira.da.costa@iis.fraunhofer.de |
| Lenovo | Prateek Basu Mallick | pmallick@lenovo.com |
| Huawei | Marcin Augustyniak | marcin.augustyniak@huawei.com |
| Qualcomm | Sherif ElAzzouni | selazzou@qti.qualcomm.com |
| CATT | Pierre Bertrand | pierrebertrand@catt.cn |
| Vodafone | Alexey Kulakov | Alexey.kulakov@vodafone.com |
| Ericsson | Lian Araujo | lian.araujo@ericsson.com |
| OPPO | Zhe Fu | [fuzhe@OPPO.com](mailto:fuzhe@OPPO.com) |
| BT | Salva Diaz | salva.diazsendra@bt.com |
| Intel Corporation | Seau Sian Lim | seau.s.lim@intel.com |
| Nokia | Chunli Wu | Chunli.wu@nokia-sbell.com |
| Samsung | ByoungHoon Jung | bh14.jung@samsung.com |
| InterDigital | Faris Alfarhan | faris.alfarhan@interdigital.com |
| Futurewei | Yunsong Yang | yyang1@futurewei.com |
| ZTE | Ting Lu | lu.ting@zte.com.cn |
| LGE | Seong Kim | sj117.kim@lge.com |
| Fujitsu | Katsunari Uemura | u-katsunari@fujitsu.com |
| III | Jhihmin Yang | jhihminyang@iii.org.tw |
| Docomo | Shoki Inoue | syouki.inoue.cr@nttdocomo.com |
| NEC | Maxime Grau | [Maxime.grau@emea.nec.com](mailto:Maxime.grau@emea.nec.com) |
| CMCC | Xiaoman Liu | [liuxiaoman@chinamobile.com](mailto:liuxiaoman@chinamobile.com) |
| Turkcell | İzzet Sağlam | [Izzet.saglam@turkcell.com.tr](mailto:Izzet.saglam@turkcell.com.tr) |
| Deutsche Telekom | Efi Nikolitsa | enikolitsa@cosmote.gr |
| MediaTek | Mutai Lin | morton.lin@mediatek.com |

# 2 Discussion on open issues

The rapporteur identifies the following open issues to be discussed:

* Methods of configuring Cell DTX/DRX (not including joint/separate configuration and single/multiple configuration, as they have already been discussed and progressed online)
* Methods of activating and deactivating of Cell DTX/DRX
* Alignment between Cell DTX/DRX and UE C-DRX

RAN2 achieved the following agreements on Cell DTX/DRX during the RAN2#121 meeting [3]:

**Agreements**

1. There will be no impact to RACH, paging, and SIBs in idle/inactive for both gNB and Rel-18 and legacy UEs
2. Rel-18 NES capable CONNECTED UE(s) can perform RACH and receive SIBs in non-active duration of cell DTX and/or DRX (i.e., same behavior for cell DTX and cell DRX). No further enhancements for CBRA and CFRA will be pursued.
3. Pattern configuration for cell DRX/DTX is common for Rel-18 UEs in the cell. FFS whether we have DTX UE specific inactivity timer. FFS on configuration signaling and stage 3.
4. Confirm study item agreement that we can have separate DTX and DRX configuration. We will focus on designing DTX/DRX for at least single configuration. FFS whether multiple configuration of cell DTX or DRX will be supported.

The TR 38.864 [2] captured the following with regards to configuration and activation of Cell DTX/DRX, and C-DRX alignment:

|  |
| --- |
| Cell DTX/DRX is applied to at least UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state. A periodic Cell DTX/DRX (i.e., active and non-active periods) can be configured by gNB via UE-specific RRC signalling per serving cell. Below examples on Cell DTX/DRX behaviour during non-active periods are assumed to be possible options, and the UE behaviour/impact will be studied:  - Example 1: gNB is expected to turn off all transmission and reception for data traffic and reference signal during Cell DTX/DRX non-active periods.  - Example 2: gNB is expected to turn off its transmission/reception only for data traffic during Cell DTX/DRX non-active periods (i.e., gNB will still transmit/receive reference signals)  - Example 3: gNB is expected to turn off its dynamic data transmission/reception during Cell DTX/DRX non-active periods (i.e., gNB is expected to still perform transmission/reception in periodic resources, including SPS, CG-PUSCH, SR, RACH, and SRS).  - Example 4: gNB is expected to only transmit reference signals (e.g., CSI-RS for measurement).  The study focus on UE behavior when at any point in time the cell activates a single DTX/DRX configuration. It is up to NW whether legacy UEs can access cells with Cell DTX/DRX.  The Cell DTX/DRX mode can be activated/de-activated via dynamic L1/L2 signalling and UE-specific RRC signaling. Both UE specific and common L1/L2 signalling can be considered for activating/deactivating the Cell DTX/DRX mode.  Cell DTX and Cell DRX modes can be configured and operated separately (e.g., one RRC configuration set for DL and another for UL). Cell DTX/DRX can also be configured and operated together. At least the following parameters can be configured per Cell DTX/DRX configuration: periodicity, start slot/offset, on duration. Details related to UE behaviour can be discussed during WI phase. Whether to support multiple Cell DTX/DRX configurations can be discussed later in the WI phase.  It is beneficial to align UE DRX with Cell DTX and DRX alignment among multiple UEs. The alignment mechanism can be discussed during the WI phase.  From RAN2 perspective, Cell DTX/DRX is feasible. |

## 2.1 Configuration of Cell DTX/DRX

Are the Cell DTX/DRX parameters signalled to the UEs.

The UE can derive the Cell DTX/DRX configuration from various sources. Based on RAN2#120 contributions and TR 38.864 the Rapporteur identified the following options:

* **Option 1:** Explicit Cell DTX/DRX configuration signalled to the UEs, detailed in questions 2-4.
* **Option 2:** No explicit Cell DTX/DRX configuration, meaning that Cell DTX/DRX has no spec impact [5]

**Question 1:** *Which option do you support?*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 1 | | 1. From technique perspective, we are not sure how option 2 can work without spec impact. According to option 2 of P5 of [5], our understanding of the solution is:   1. "Mute" all or some periodic occasions of semi-static/periodic UL/DL transmission (e.g. CG, SPS, SR). 2. Refrain dynamic PDSCH/PUSCH by aligned UE CDRX.   For 1), we are not sure how to efficiently mute periodic occasions only for some time interval without spec impact. If it is done via RRC configuration / reconfiguration of CG/SPS/SR, it will incur extra high gNB power consumption caused by sending UE dedicated RRC signalling for each boundary of the non-active interval.  For 2), we think the key issue is that UE CDRX is per MAC entity, which means the same UE CDRX pattern is applied for all serving cells in CA. So, it will put a restriction on Cell DTX/DRX (i.e. only same DG refraining pattern in all serving cells is allowed). Since different serving cell may have different NES requirement, we think this restriction doesn't make sense.  2. Option 1 is captured in SI conclusion after extensive discussion. However, Option 2 was even not discussed in SI phase. We prefer to respect SI conclusion. |
| Vivo | Revised Option 2, see comment | | According to [5], it seems that no explicit cell DTX/DRX configuration does not necessarily imply there is no spec impact. For example, to achieve NES gain, the periodical signals should be deactivated once C-DRX patterns among UEs are aligned, which can also achieve the cell DTX/DRX NES gain. Therefore, for better understanding of all the potential solutions, **we suggest to revise option 2** as:   * Option 2: No explicit Cell DTX/DRX configuration, FFS whether some channels/signals are deactivated when C-DRX patterns among different UEs are aligned.   From our perspective, DRX alignment among UEs is a simple baseline solution to enable the serving cell to achieve a larger window (common C-DRX off duration of the RRC\_CONNECTED UEs) for potential NES occasion. If companies think option 1 provides further benefits, we are open to discuss it. |
| Fraunhofer | Option 1 | | In our understanding one of the main goals of Cell DTX/DRX for Rel-18 is to be able to change quite dynamically between different configurations to serve different loads. Without explicit configuration this goal cannot be achieved, as all that can be done with legacy signalling is reconfiguring C-DRX for each UE separately. Therefore, in the case of no explicit configuration (Option 2) adapting to a lower load or back to a higher load takes a very long time. Thus, option 1 is preferred. |
| Lenovo | Option 1 | | UE needs to know unambiguously when the network is not *receiving* – it needs to be explicitly informed to the UE – otherwise, the UE may attempt transmission at any time, irrespective of CDRX configuration.  UE needs to know unambiguously when the network is not *transmitting* – it needs to be explicitly informed to the UE – otherwise, the UE may expect a response to its transmissions (e.g., SR/ RACH/ CG), absence of which leading to wrong conclusions (RLF or data loss). |
| Huawei | Option 1 | | We support the outcome of the SI phase and think the configuration should be signalled to the UEs by the gNB. |
| Qualcomm | | See comment | Option 2 does not mean no spec. impact: As the rapporteur cites our contribution, we would like to clarify the difference between option 1 and option 2. In both cases, UE shall apply DL/UL restrictions associated with Cell DTX/DRX, respectively.   1. Option 1 means those Cell DTX/DRX restrictions would be applied with a fixed “window”. Outside of this window specific NES DL/UL restrictions do not apply and the UE applies legacy behavior depending on whether it is in inactive or active time. 2. Option 2 means that those NES related DL/UL restrictions apply automatically as long as UE is in inactive time. The spec impact would be the additional behavior expected by the UE on top of CDRX inactive time behavior (i.e., whether to transmit a CG, whether to send an SR, treatment of DL and UL reference signalling, etc.).     In any case, we think the following agreement “Pattern configuration for cell DRX/DTX is common for Rel-18 UEs in the cell.” Somewhat points us towards option 1 so we are fine to pursue that if majority wants, and we are open to further discussion as well now that option 2 should be better understood. |
| CATT | Option 1 | | Per Qualcomm’s further clarification of option 2, we understand the Cell DTX/DRX pattern would be implicitly given for each UE by its own C-DRX pattern, but as pointed out by Qualcomm, this would then assume different UEs have different (implicit) Cell DTX/DRX configurations which contradicts the RAN2 agreement. Note we also understand that this option means the same configuration applies to Cell DTX and Cell DRX which contradicts another RAN2 agreement. So, at this stage, we prefer the simple and straightforward explicit configuration. |
| Vodafone | Option 1 | |  |
| Ericsson | Option 1 | | Option 2 from [5] assumes that Cell DTX/DRX is achieved by introducing signalling restrictions that can be applied during UE C-DRX inactive time. Our opinion is that a more natural solution is to have UE C-DRX and Cell DTX/DRX as separate features that are designed for two different purposes, i.e., UE power savings and NW power savings, respectively. Therefore, we support Option 1, which would allow for better flexibility and future extensions of Cell DTX/DRX. |
| OPPO | Option 1 | | Option 1 is simple and reflects our agreements in the SI phase.  Option 2 also needs to configure some restrictions for DL signalling reception, thus it does not free of the spec impact. In addition, if we understand Option 2 correctly, the cell DTX/DRX should be UE-specific results, not cell-specific ones, since the Cell DTX/DRX inactive time for different UEs due to UE-specific CDRX Active time is different, which seems contradicting the RAN2 agreement. |
| BT | Option 1 | | This is the outcome of the SI phase.  In general and not related to this question. RAN2 needs to find common terms. In following questions, we have cell DTX active duration (Q7) and cell DTX-on (Q8) that may creates confusion. |
| Intel | Option 1 | | It is not clear to us how Option 2 will work without an explicit Cell DTX/DRX configuration to indicate where to restrict some UL/DL transmissions/receptions.  We agree with Apple that this has been extensively discussed in SI phase and should follow the agreement during the SI phase (i.e. to have Cell DTX/DRX configuration). |
| ETRI | Option1 | | To guarantee NES performance considering UE C-DRX for multiple UEs, the Cell DTX/DRX configuration should be configured by explicit signalling. |
| Nokia | Option 1 | |  |
| Samsung | Option 1. | | We believe Option 2 is already possible via implementation, e.g., gNB goes into (micro) sleep for power saving without any UE indication.  However, even with Option 2, there could be error cases such as UE transmitting signals not aware of gNB DRX. And it would be quite difficult to resolve such error cases without having the explicit cell DTX/DRX configuration.  So far 3GPP had discussed and studied to enhance the network power saving using explicitly indicated gNB sleep duration and it is aligned with Option 1 with additional DTX/DRX behaviour. So we support Option 1. |
| InterDigital | Option 1 | | Option 1 was agreed in the SI and also reflected in the agreement last meeting that “Pattern configuration for cell DRX/DTX is common for Rel-18 UEs in the cell”. Option 2 implies relying on UE C-DRX configurations, which is not common for all UEs. |
| Sony | Option 1 | | UE should know the DTX/DRX configurations and such configurations are allowed to change dynamically. |
| Futurewei | Option 1 | | We see benefits of explicit Cell DTX/DRX configurations signalling to the UE, at least for the following two reasons: Deactivate the configured pattern DTX/DRX completely for a duration of time, or an updated DTX/DRX pattern being configured overrides the existing DTX/DRX pattern. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | | We have similar view as Ericsson that generally UE C-DRX and Cell DTX/DRX are separate features and need to be configured separately.  Moreover, in *[POST121][311]* email discussion, the UE and gNB’ behaviour during Cell DTX/Cell DRX non-active periods are under discussion with intention of aligning the UE and gNB’ bbehaviour. We are not clear how to guarantee the NES performance without explicit Cell DTX/DRX configuration.  We also agree with Apple that Option 1 has been extensively discussed in SI phase and we’d better follow the agreement during the SI phase. |
| LGE | Option 2 | | As commented in [POST][311], if gNB configures SPS, CG and SR such that SPS, CG and SR occasions are aligned with cell DTX/DRX active period, and if gNB can schedule smartly such that UE CDRX active time does not exceed cell DTX active period and uplink transmission does not happen in cell DRX non-active period, a UE does not need to know cell DTX/DRX configuration explicitly.  We think that this issue needs to be discussed after [POST][311] discussion is concluded. |
| Fujitsu | Option 1 | | Option1 is straightforward way then we support this option, but we don’t think Cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX are completely independent. Because in SI phase, RAN2 agreed it is beneficial to align UE DRX with Cell DTX and DRX alignment among multiple UEs, then some limitation is required. |
| III | Option 1 | | Option 1 is captured in SI conclusion. |
| Docomo | Option1 | | For NES control, the NW side should be able to determine what state to create proactively to achieve specific power saving targets, taking into account the situation of UEs in the cell, rather than leaving it to the operating situation of individual UEs. The NW side should be able to determine what conditions to be made proactively in order to achieve specific power saving targets. |
| NEC | Option1 | | The configuration should be signalled to the UEs, which should not require too much overhead since the load should be low according to the WID. Also, as mentioned by other companies, Cell DTX/DRX may be independent from UE C-DRX, which is in contradiction with Option 2. |
| CMCC | Option1 | | As explained by Qualcomm, Option 2 from [5] introduces some DL signalling restriction to be applied during UE CDRX inactive time implicitly, which also introduces spec impact, and this may result in different non-active period for different UEs due to UEs’ different inactive timer. By contrast, Option 1 is a straight forward way and it can maximize the NES gain. |
| Turkcell | Option1 | | Option 2 has a spec impact as Qualcomm shared. |
| Deutsche Telekom | Option 1 | | In alignment with SI conclusion. |
| MedaiTek | Option2 | | Per the explanation from QC we think option 2 doesn’t break the SI conclusion. It means that the gNB can still have a cell-specific Cell DTX/DRX pattern for all UEs. However, the gNB doesn’t have to signal the whole pattern configuration to the UEs but to signal a UE-specific parameter instead to indicate the offset between the ON/OFF boundaries of C-DRX and Cell DTX/DRX somehow. In this way the UE could still know the Cell DTX/DRX pattern and when to apply the corresponding restrictions therefore the option2 looks simpler. |

**Summary:**

28 companies responded to Q1, with 24 supporting option 1. Option 2 is supported by 3 companies. The proponent of option 2 clarified that, contrary to rapporteur’s assumption, it has spec impact for controlling UE signalling restrictions. Furthermore, as noted by some companies, option 2 seems to conflict with the R2#121 agreements and was not sufficiently studied in the SI phase. Therefore, the rapporteur proposes to confirm the SI conclusion:

**Proposal 1:** A periodic cell DTX/DRX configuration is explicitly signalled to the UEs. (25/28)

How the Cell DTX/DRX parameters are signalled.

**Question 2:** If your answer to Q1 is Option 1, *do you agree to reconfirm the agreement from SI that it is done via RRC dedicated signalling (“periodic cell DTX/DRX pattern is configured by UE-specific RRC”)? If not, please comment on your preferred option.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Yes | As far as we know, NES gain can be maximized only if the gNB can sleep for a long time (i.e. we should avoid dynamic gNB on-off in short interval). Periodic pattern via RRC configuration is born to serve this purpose. |
| vivo | Yes | 1. It is not necessary to inform IDLE UE about the cell DTX/DRX configuration;  2. SIB update is not that frequent, hence it may not be suitable for handling cell DTX/DRX pattern change as the UE services may change from time to time. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | Configured by RRC, activated/de-activated by lower layers |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes | We support configuration by dedicated RRC signalling. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Agree with Apple |
| CATT | Yes | Per earlier RAN2 agreement quoted by Rapporteur: “periodic cell DTX/DRX pattern is configured by UE-specific RRC”. |
| Vodafone | Yes (see comments) | RRC as a protocol to send cell DTX/DRX configuration is a good choice, but in my view there is no need to do it very dynamically and because the Cell DRX/DTX configuration is the same for all UEs as far I understand, it is in my view good to consider to send it via SIB. It could apply from the next modification period or after a pre-defined time to ensure all UEs apply it.  To Vivo; I think we may speak about the case of 160 ms modification period and a small number (below 10) of devices.  It would be great to understand the motivation to go for dedicated signalling better to re-confirm the decision. |
| Ericsson | Yes | At least dedicated RRC signalling should be supported. |
| OPPO | Yes | Periodic cell DTX/DRX pattern can be configured by RRC. The UE-specific RRC is better than the common RRC, otherwise, the updated pattern can only be valid from the next system information modification period. |
| BT | Yes | We are ok to send at least the configuration via dedicated signalling. |
| Intel | Yes | Agree with Fraunhofer that the Cell DTX/DRX configuration is signalled by RRC but the activation/deactivation of the Cell DTX/DRX is indicated by lower layers. Since it is only applied to RRC\_Connected mode UE, dedicated RRC signalling should be used. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | As a baseline, we support to have the ‘UE specific RRC dedicated configuration signal of at least one periodic cell DTX/DRX pattern’. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes | Similar views as by Fraunhofer, also inline with observations from the SI:  “The Cell DTX/DRX mode can be activated/de-activated via dynamic L1/L2 signalling and UE-specific RRC signaling. Both UE specific and common L1/L2 signalling can be considered for activating/deactivating the Cell DTX/DRX mode.” |
| ZTE | Yes | Same view as Fraunhofer. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes | As it is used for connected mode UEs, then RRC dedicated signalling is preferred. |
| III | Yes |  |
| Docomo | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes | At least UE specific RRC dedicated signalling should be supported. |
| Turkcell | Yes | Ue specific RRC signalling should be supported. |
| Deutsche Telekom | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | See comments | Our views for SIB-based solution to signal the Cell DTX/DRX configurations:   1. In UMTS, we had SIB(s) for the configurations used by UE in CONNECTED mode. This is not something particularly unreasonable. 2. The SIB mechanism addresses the grouping requirement naturally. 3. There could be a chance to be as the indication of the NES mode/status of the serving cell. |

**Summary:**

28 companies responded to Q2, with 27 supporting rapporteur’s proposal. One company prefers the SIB solution, with one more wanting to still consider it. The majority of companies think that dedicated RRC configuration is mandatory and should be supported as a baseline.

Therefore, the rapporteur proposes the following:

**Proposal 2:** A periodic cell DTX/DRX pattern is configured by UE specific RRC signalling. (27/28)

Parameters to be configured to the UE.

**Question 3:** If your answer to Q1 is Option 1, *do you agree to confirm the SI outcome that the Cell DTX/DRX configuration contains at least: periodicity, start slot/offset and on-duration?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Yes | We think it is straight forward.  Meanwhile, we suggest to confirm we can reuse the formula of UE CDRX to calculate starting time of active duration, i.e. [(SFN × 10) + subframe number] modulo (*Periodicity*) = *StartOffset.* We think it will be helpful to discuss alignment between Cell DTX/DRX and UE CDRX. |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| Fraunhofer | Yes for Cell DTX  No for Cell DRX | Cell-DTX has C-DRX as the UE counterpart, so the design and configuration can be quite close to the C-DRX concept. The goal in Cell-DTX is to align quickly (in low load) and change back to non-alignment (in high load) also swiftly. The 3 mentioned parameters are the basic to move from alignment to non-alignment and vice-versa  Regarding Cell-DRX we think it is premature to define a certain configuration. First we need to discuss what Cell-DRX will look like. As Cell-DRX does not have a UE counterpart the best way to configure it may be quite different than these 3 parameters. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes | These parameters are mandatory and need to be signalled. We are OK to reuse the formula of UE C-DRX as indicated by Apple. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | As a baseline, this would make sense. We may need to revisit depending on how much “configurability” companies envision but for now, this is a good starting point. Also agree with Apple on reusing the formula |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Vodafone | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| BT | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | We agree. Also, we think we do not need to repeat the same discussion concluded in the SI. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes for only *periodicity* and *on-duration.* FFS *start slot/offset* | If here the Cell DTX/DRX configuration means the configuration provided via RRC signalling, we are fine with *periodicity* and *on-duration*, but suggest to FFS *start slot/offset.*  Per our understanding, it could be more flexible to provide *start slot/offset* in the lower layer activation indication. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| III | Yes |  |
| Docomo | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Turkcell | Yes |  |
| Deutsche Telekom | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | See comments. | We agree that these parameters *periodicity*, *start slot/offset* and *on-duration* are needed but it doesn’t have to be all visible to the UEs. |

**Summary:**

28 companies responded to Q3, with 25 fully supporting rapporteur’s proposal. One company agrees to the parameters for Cell DTX, but prefers to postpone the decision for Cell DRX. One company prefers to leave the decision on start slot/offset FFS to the discussion on lower layer activation indication. One company agrees on the parameters but doesn’t see the need to signal them all to the UEs.

Based on the majority of companies’ views and previous discussion in SI phase the rapporteur proposes the following:

**Proposal 3:** The Cell DTX/DRX configuration contains at least: periodicity, start slot/offset, on duration. (25/28)

Cell DTX/DRX UE specific inactivity timer was discussed during RAN2#121 and left FFS [3]. The Rapporteur would like to gather companies’ view on this topic.

**Question 4:** *Do you support adding to the list from Question 3 a Cell DTX/DRX inactivity timer (cell active time duration extension mechanism)?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Apple | No  (leave it to the discussion of FFS of RAN2#121) | As Rapporteur mentioned, we have discussed this issue in RAN2#121 and captured an FFS for it:   1. Pattern configuration for cell DRX/DTX is common for Rel-18 UEs in the cell. FFS whether we have DTX UE specific inactivity timer. FFS on configuration signaling and stage 3.   During the online discussion, this issue was controversial. Meanwhile we think how DTX UE specific inactivity timer work is not clear. For example:   1. Does it means the cell active time (common to all UEs in the cell) can be extended just because one particular UE has pending traffic? 2. If Yes to 1), does gNB need to reconfigure Cell DTX/DRX pattern to notify all UEs in the cell? 3. If both Cell DTX and UE DRX are configured, how does it work together with inactivity timer of UE CDRX?   Thus, we think it is premature to discuss configuration issue in this email discussion when its mechanism/feature is even not clear. Since an FFS has been captured, we believe companies will bring their solutions/analysis in their contributions. So, we see no necessity to discuss it here in a hurry. |
| vivo | Yes | We think it’s beneficial to keep inactivity timer mechanism in cell DTX/DRX as well if cell DTX is explicitly configured so that the serving cell can timely schedules the UE if necessary. Furthermore, cell DTX inactivityTimer can be smaller than UE DRX inactivityTimer of some UEs to achieve further potential NES gain. For the questions Apple mentions, we have the following opinion:  Q1: Yes. From the serving cell’s perspective, the cell DTX/DRX active time of it is extended even if just one particular UE is scheduled.  Q2: No, the actually extended period can be just kept within the serving cell and the scheduled UE(s). As for the other UEs that are not scheduled (i.e. cell DTX inactivity timer is not started), they do not need to extend the cell DTX pattern, hence the gNB does not need to reconfigure the pattern for therm.  Q3: One way to handle it is that if cell DTX and UE DRX are configured, UE only extend the cell DTX pattern when both cell DTX inactivityTimer and UE DRX inactivityTimer are running. |
| Fraunhofer | No | First and foremost, based on the discussion on RAN2#121, it seems different companies have different views on “cell active time”. The proposal for having an “inactivity timer” seems to come from the understanding that everything is OFF if not on “cell active time”. Other companies seem to regard “cell active time” to be closer to the C-DRX concept of “ON time” which in essence means a fixed time at which PDCCH needs to be decoded. In that case we think it is better to rely on the existing C-DRX inactivity timer – i.e inactivity is individual to each UE, rather than adding another complicated common timer.  Thus the definition of “cell active time” needs to be consolidated and clarified first (see also Q7 for a proposal). That said, we think it is appropriate to let the gNB schedule dynamic PDSCH/PUSCH regardless of “cell inactive time” if the gNB scheduler decides it is appropriate to do so. But the grant (PDCCH) should only start during a fixed phase. (on-duration) |
| Lenovo | Yes | It is indeed inefficient if the network would need to reconfigure Cell DTX/ DRX configuration often since the current configuration does not allow short burst(s) in UL/ DL to be catered to, or at least not respecting QOS. To present such frequent Cell DTX/ DRX reconfigurations, an inactivity timer can be useful. This should only be between the gNB and the concerned UE(s) and other UEs need not know or be informed about it…very similar to Inactivity timer in CDRX context.  The network would be in control and can choose if to extent (start the inactivity timer) or not and would then take appropriate action towards the UE. The details of such mechanism e.g., for which DCI the cell-inactivity timer should be started needs to be further discussed. |
| Huawei | No | We think that introduction of such timer would reduce the benefit of network energy saving, since the non-active time of the gNB would be shortened (gNB would need to run an inactivity timer for every connected UE in the cell). If any follow up transmission for a particular UE is needed it can be scheduled in the next gNB active time.  Furthermore, the complexity of such solution would be increased. As highlighted by Apple the meaning of this active time extension to other UEs would need to be clarified, because by default they would not be aware of such extension and could not benefit from it. |
| Qualcomm | No | We think there is a need to first resolve how the UE is expected to behave when it’s active time (due to inactivity timer running, retransmission in progress, SR transmitted, etc.) overlaps with the start of cell DTX non-active period.  If it is deemed that the UE can extend its active time within the configured cell DTX non-active period, i.e., postponing entering the cell DTX inactive time then there can just be an agreement on that, this does not need a cell inactivity timer.  On the other hand, we have concerns on the UE being required to track a gNB inactivity timer. Just complicates the process with no tangible gains. |
| CATT | No | Agree with Apple’s arguments. The Cell DTX/DRX active period should not be extended for all UEs due to one UE having traffic activity. However, as discussed in the other offline [311], we support allowing gNB serving a UE during Cell DTX/DRX non-active period in some scenarios e.g. if it overlaps with the UE’s C-DRX Active Time (up to gNB’s choice). |
| Ericsson | Yes, but | We should have a way to handle traffic initiated at the end of the cell dtx/drx active window, whether we model it exactly with inactivity timer or with dynamic L1/L2 signaling can be discussed. |
| OPPO | No | We understand introducing such an inactivity timer would low NW power saving gains. Additionally, it is unclear how such an inactivity timer works, e.g. 1) When and how to trigger NW inactivity timer; 2) What the impact to UEs is. In detail, if the Cell inactivity timer is started, the entities to be informed are only the concerned UEs or all UEs in the cell? If the former is correct, it means that Cell DTX/DRX is not per-cell designed. If the latter is correct, it inevitably increases the un-concerned UEs’ energy. |
| BT | No | There is no need to discuss this yet. Companies in favour can present their contribution in next meeting |
| Intel | Yes | Like in the case of UE DRX’s inactivity timer, there may be some new user data to be transmitted/received for a UE at the end of active period of Cell DTX. If UE DRX is configured, it can be specified that the UE will follow the UE behaviour of UE DRX inactivity timer. However, UE DRX may not be configured to the UE and if the active period of the Cell DTX needs to be extended for the UE by the network, there is a need to be able to extend the active period of the Cell DTX for the UE. In our view, the UE behaviour can follow the same behaviour as in UE DRX (i.e. the inactivity timer is restarted every time UE receives PDCCH for new transmission).  Whether to use or not this Cell DTX/DRX inactivity timer can be configurable by the network via the Cell DTX configuration. |
| ETRI | No, but | To maximize the NES gain, active/non-active time boundaries can be fixed as configured. FFS on how to handle UE C-DRX if UE-specific active time extension is needed. |
| Nokia | Not necessarily | We could have UE specific active time considering Cell DTX, but not necessarily be modelled as Cell DTX extension as it could be enough to have exceptional case saying e.g. when the UE’s DRX retx timer is running, the it keeps monitoring so that the NW could schedule the UE still even if not within the Cell DTX active time. |
| Samsung | No | The behaviour and mechanism of ‘*a Cell DTX/DRX inactivity timer’* is not clear yet. So we require more discussion with enough explanations from proponents.  Also, RAN2 is discussing activation/deactivation of Cell DTX/DRX. If NW want to extended cell’s active period, a simpler way could be deactivation of the Cell DTX/DRX. |
| InterDigital | Not necessarily | It is not necessary if the extension happens only for the scheduled UE; no need to have it common for all UEs in the cell.  This depends on whether the UE monitors PDCCH during it’s C-DRX active time during Cell DTX non-active periods for pending transmissions, which is discussed in the other email discussion. |
| Sony | No | We also think of a simple solution as explained by many companies above. |
| Futurewei | Not at this point |  |
| ZTE | No | We agree with Huawei’s analysis on the impact of such Cell DTX/DRX inactivity timer, e.g., it will shorten non-active time of the gNB and be harmful to NES gain.  Moreover, per our understanding, such Cell DTX/DRX inactivity timer is still a UE-specific timer. The UE who receives PDCCH would start this timer. As commented by Apple, it’s also not clear how does it work together with inactivity timer of UE C-DRX. |
| LGE | No | We prefer no extension of cell active time duration for clear cell DTX/DRX operation. |
| Fujitsu | No | Extension of cell active time would reduce the benefits of network energy saving gain. Even if the Cell DTX/DRX is extended by the inactivity timer for a UE, other UEs have to know whether the inactivity timer is running. |
| III | Yes | UE will start inactivity timer to receive/transmit data and retransmission timer will start if NACK feedback. If the on-duration of Cell DTX/DRX is aligned with UE’s C-DRX on-duration, Cell DTX/DRX inactivity timer can be used for accommodating legacy active time in C-DRX UE. |
| Docomo | No, but | At this point, it is too early to conclude whether to introduce the Inactive timer. We understand that in cases such as temporary burst transmissions, for example, gNB may decide to improve the user experience when applying Cell DTX/DRX in trade for a slight decrease in power saving gain. |
| NEC | See comments | We see some benefits of it to handle some cases at the end of cell DTX/DRX window. Especially when we specify to drop all UE transmission/reception within the cell DTX/DRX non-active period. We are fine to continue discussing this in RAN2#121bis-e.  On the other hand, we also understand that at this moment, this still remains as FFS from the RAN2#121. It may be too early to confirm this is included. |
| CMCC | Yes, but | We understand the intention is to extend the on-duration timer like UE C-DRX timer when there’s some new data to be transmitted/received for a UE at the end of active period of Cell DTX. But we are wondering whether it’s a cell-specific timer, since the FFS of last meeting is about UE specific inactivity timer, is the inactivity timer of this question applied to all connected NES UEs? |
| Turkcell | No | It can decrease the power efficiency of NodeB. |
| Deutsche Telekom | See comments | At this point, we believe that the details of the mechanism should first be clarified and then we can decide on the inclusion of the timer in the list. |
| MediaTek | Yes | If we want to keep the flexibility for the scenario where the UE without being C-DRX configured applies Cell DTX/DRX pattern directly. |

**Summary:**

27 companies responded to Q4. 15 companies prefer not to introduce a Cell DTX/DRX inactivity timer. 7 companies support this inclusion. Detailed comments indicate that this discussion is premature and further decisions are first needed on gNB and UE behaviour during cell DTX/DRX and gNB state definitions (e.g. cell active time).

Since the majority of companies are not in favour of introducing such timer and there are several questions (e.g. cell specific/UE specific timer, how to inform UEs), companies in favour can present their proposed solutions in contributions to the next meetings.

No proposal is made, topic to be discussed based on contributions.

## 2.2 Activating and deactivating of Cell DTX/DRX

A following issue is how to activate/deactivate the Cell DTX/DRX configuration. The SI phase identified the following options: dynamic L1/L2 signalling and UE-specific RRC signalling [2].

In our understanding, the “RRC signalling” in the TR 38.864 means that the Cell DTX/DRX is activated/deactivated implicitly for single configuration, i.e. activated once configured, and deactivated once de-configured. If there are multiple configurations configured by RRC, there is a need of explicit activation/deactivation of one of the parameter sets.

We see the following options for Cell DTX/DRX activation/deactivation:

* **Option 1:** Activated/deactivated by dynamic L1 or L2 signalling (in this option please state which one do you prefer)
* **Option 2:** Activated/deactivated implicitly, i.e. activated immediately once configured by RRC and deactivated once the RRC configuration is released
* **Option 3:** Both
* Option 4: Cell DTX/DRX activation/deactivation is aligned to modification period boundary

**Question 5:** Please indicate your preference on how the Cell DTX/DRX configuration is activated/deactivated. If you see a need you can propose other options.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 3 | For Option 2 (RRC only), as we replied in Q2, it should be baseline because a periodic pattern with long non-active duration can maximize NES gain.  For Option 1:   * We see some benefit of cell common or UE group common L1 signalling. Our consideration is that it can reduce the signalling overhead of sending UE dedicated RRC message to reconfigure Cell DTX/DRX. * For UE dedicated L1 or L2 signaling, we think it doesn't make sense because the dynamic switch of gNB ON-OFF pattern can't help save gNB power consumption. |
| vivo | Option 2/3 | If cell DTX/DRX is already activated, then it should also be activated for the UEs that just enter RRC\_CONNECTED mode and configured with cell DTX/DRX configuration(s). Therefore, option 2 is necessary.  If there is a need to configure multiple cell DTX/DRX configurations, option 1 may be necessary to dynamically change cell DTX/DRX pattern. Otherwise, option 2 is enough as we do not observe the need to activate cell DTX faster with L1/L2 signalling. |
| Fraunhofer | Option 1 with L1 | If the activation and de-activation is left only for RRC (assuming UE-specific RRC), the configuration will not be dynamic enough (like legacy). Being able to adapt more dynamically to the load is the best enhancement which Cell DTX/DRX can provide. For this reason we prefer Option 1. We prefer it on L1, as it is more suited to a single cell indication (see Q6). Or L1/L2 with L2 saving some bits of L1. |
| Lenovo | Option 4 (1st preference)  Option 2 (2nd preference) | We think the network energy saving will be based on statistical data available in the network and therefore network has reasonable/ stable assumptions about when and for how long it wants to (or can) save power. So, we think really dynamic signalling (unlike e.g., type-2 based CG configurations) do not bring in additional value.  Option 4 enables that Cell DTX/DRX activation/deactivation is aligned to modification period boundary and thereby provides a good sync point for gNB/ UEs, without requiring further activation signalling. |
| Huawei | Option 3 | At least one kind of UE-specific signalling for (de)activating Cell DTX/DRX should be supported. For that purpose, UE-specific RRC signalling can be used in the case of initial configuration and new UEs entering the cell.  In our view cell-level L1/DCI activation/deactivation is also useful as it would provide a fast and efficient way to dynamically control Cell DTX/DRX. |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 as a baseline.  FFS Option 3 For **single configuration only.** | First of all, the rapporteurs sentence above “If there are multiple configurations configured by RRC, there is a need of explicit activation/deactivation of one of the parameter sets” is not in line with last meeting agreement “We will focus on designing DTX/DRX for at least single configuration”, so we actually do not agree with discussing switching between multiple configurations now based on RAN2 agreements, and we don’t agree with neither that multiple configurations will be needed nor with using L1 to switch between them. To summarize why L1 switching is an implementation challenge: It requires UEs to decode a common L1 DCI and subsequently modify the MAC state machine which is maintained in MAC with many inputs that affect the state such as DL/UL traffic, re-Tx, MAC CE commands, etc.. When the new config is signalled, the CDRX state becomes ambiguous with sensitive timing.  As mentioned by other companies (and discussed during SI). It should be straightforward to allow the gNB to configure and/or activate Cell DTX/DRX via unicast RRC signalling, i.e., option 2.  For option 3 **for activating/deactivating single cell DTX/DRX configuration only**, we understand that L1 or group signalling is proposed to save the time and overhead of RRC signalling, however feasibility and details are RAN1 scope. Thus, we prefer to agree on option 2 to move things forward for now, and check with RAN1 on the following:   1. Whether it is feasible to use a group DCI to control CDRX (or cell DTX/DRX) state 2. What timelines would make sense for the UE to have time to adapt and whether in the end complexity would be prohibitive to the expected NES gain. 3. The exact L1 signalling design.   Based on that, L2 signalling can also be explored for activation/deactivation of DRX since it was already discussed in XR. |
| CATT | Option 3 | Considering the Cell DTX/DRX has no UE impact during the Cell DTX/DRX active period, it can be RRC-configured during an active period which leaves time to the UE to activate it before the next non-active period boundary. And if the network RRC-configures the Cell DTX/DRX during a non-active period, it could as well be considered activated upon reception of the RRC msg acknowledgement. So RRC-based Cell DTX/DRX activation works fine and is needed e.g. for an Idle/Inactive UE performing RRC establishment while the Cell DTX/DRX is already active for other Connected UEs. Other arguments in support of RRC-based activation:   * The latency of RRC based approach is deemed sufficient as activation/deactivation switching is not assumed so dynamic * RRC signal is more reliable than L1/L2 signalling * RRC configuration for Cell DTX/DRX is similar with configuration and activation for UE CDRX   In addition, we support L1 signalling for further deactivating/re-activating/updating a configured Cell DTX/DRX. We prefer L1 signalling over L2 (MAC) signalling because the former is more appropriate for group-signalling. |
| Vodafone | Option 2 | RRC is sufficient to switch off and on the functionality. As in my understanding there is no justification to activate/deactivate cell DRX/DTX functionality, there is also no need for L1/L2 signalling. If the cell DRX/DTX patterns are provided, it means the function is switched on, otherwise off. In my view, there is no need for multiple configuration. |
| Ericsson | Option 3, but | Our opinion is that Option 2 should be supported as a baseline, and Option 1 can be considered as an additional way for activating/deactivating Cell DTX/DRX if needed. Furthermore, the details of how Option 1 and Option 2 can be supported together can be discussed later. For example, Option 2 can contain an implicit or an explicit indication that the provided RRC configuration will be or will not be activated by dynamic L1/L2 signalling (e.g., by adding an RRC configuration field to indicate whether the configuration is active right away or will be activated later via L1/L2). |
| OPPO | Option 2 | We understand cell load may not change very frequently, thus option 2 is good since the switch between activation and deactivation is not assumed so dynamic. On L1/L2 signalling for deactivating/re-activating a configured Cell DTX/DRX, we understand it usually can be used for the case of multiple Cell DTX/DRX configurations and such L1/L2 signalling is used to indicate which one of multiple Cell DTX/DRX configurations to be activated/deactivated. If the case is only single Cell DTX/DRX configured, we are not sure if L1/L2 signalling for deactivating/re-activating is really needed. But, if majorities want Option 3, we can open to discussing the tethering scenarios of Option 1 and prefer to leave the details of L1 signalling to RAN1. |
| BT | Option 2 | In addition to receive the configuration, we consider it is important that network can explicitly indicate when cell DTX/DRX is activated/deactivated. That is, a new IE that clearly states when cell DTX/DRX is activated/deactivated. That facilitates to send the configuration without the need to be activated immediately.  For cell DTX/DRX, it should be assumed that the number of UEs in the cell is low (or very low) and some traffic may be impacted, e.g., low latency traffic. Therefore, the need to use cell-level L1/DCI activation/deactivation can be justified by companies with contributions that justify the extra complexity. |
| Intel | Option 1 with L1. Ok with Option 3 | Our understanding is that the periodic pattern configured by RRC should only be started when the network needs to perform network energy saving mode (e.g. due to low load) so that network has more chance of energy saving and at some point, the network may need to turn off the network energy saving mode by stopping the application of the periodic pattern configured by the RRC. However, RRC may not be an efficient way of activating Cell DTX/DRX pattern as such configuration is not just for a UE but most likely to all or a group of UEs in a cell. Using dedicated RRC to signal the activation will delay the network from applying Cell DTX/DRX as it needs to signal the information to each UEs of concern before any NES gain can be achieved. Using broadcast RRC signalling to activate the Cell DTX/DRX pattern configuration may not reduce the delay and overhead. For example, if paging is used for activation, the network will have to page in the POs of UEs of concern and hence the overhead may not be reduced and it may also delay the activation of the Cell DTX/DRX. Hence common L1 signalling is needed. However, we are fine to have both L1 signalling and dedicated RRC signalling as in Option 3. |
| ETRI | Option 3 | For option 1, prefer group-common L1 signalling for each of activation and deactivation. |
| Nokia | Option 3 | For Option 1, L1 is preferred. But it should not be mandatory for the feature to work, thus default activation via RRC should also be supported. |
| Samsung | Option 3 | We believe the Option 2 is naturally supported if UE dedicated RRC signalling of Question 2 is agreeable. Also, we think Option 2 is not called activation/deactivation. It’s just an RRC based signaling.  And we support Option 1, L1/L2 based UE specific signalling. With such the signal, network could have enough flexibility for adaptive cell DTX/DRX. Among L1 and L2, we prefer L2 signalling since we believe that there might not be such an urgent triggering of ‘activation/deactivation’ of cell DTX/DRX.  On behalf of Cell/ UE group common L1 signalling, we are ok to have it but it would be discussed by RAN1 (maybe this should be discussed in below Question 6). |
| InterDigital | Option 3 | Option 3 reflects the SI agreement "The Cell DTX/DRX mode can be activated/de-activated via dynamic L1/L2 signalling and UE-specific RRC signalling."  Given the Cell DTX pattern is common for UEs in the cell, common L1 signalling is best for activation/deactivation. |
| Sony | Option 1 | We are fine with L1 or L2 and have slight preference on L1, as the dynamic adaptation is necessary in order to cater for different traffics and NES gain requirement. |
| Futurewei | Option 1 | As replied to question 1, we see benefits of explicit Cell DTX/DRX configurations signalling to the UE, at least for the following two reasons: Deactivate the configured pattern DTX/DRX completely for a duration of time, or an updated DTX/DRX pattern being configured overrides the existing DTX/DRX pattern. |
| ZTE | Option 3 | We prefer Option 1 with similar view as some above that network could have enough flexibility for adaptive cell DTX/DRX. For Option 1, we prefer L1 signaling for activation and deactivation.  The second part of Option 2 also makes sense, e.g., Cell DTX/DRX is deactivated once the RRC configuration is released. However, we think it’s not needed that Cell DTX/DRX is activated immediately once configured by RRC. Firstly, whether all cell DTX/DRX parameters are configured via RRC has not been concluded yet. Secondly, activation via RRC and activation via L1 signaling seems redundant. |
| LGE | Option 2 | We think that cell DTX/DRX pattern does not change dynamically. Option 2 is sufficient. |
| Fujitsu | Option 3 | Implicit activation by RRC configuration is needed for already activated cell. For Option 1, it is beneficial for a case of multiple Cell DTX/DRX configurations. In addition, to maximize the energy saving gain, the gNB should dynamically control the Cell DTX/DRX activation/deactivation by the L1/L2 signalling rather than semi-static RRC signalling. |
| III | Option 3 | Same view as InterDigital. |
| NEC | Option 3 | We do not see why RRC configuration could not implicitly activate/deactivate Cell DTX/DRX. |
| CMCC | Option 3 | Share similar view with other companies that UE dedicated RRC signalling should be supported as baseline, since it is used to provide the related configurations. And Option 1 can be optional supported. With L1/L2 signalling, it can provide more flexibility, besides, in multiple cell DTX/DRX configurations case, activation/deactivation signalling is needed, and L1/L2 signalling can reduce signalling overhead. |
| Turkcell | Option 3 | It’s already discussed in SI phase. |
| MediaTek | Prefer option 4 but | option 1 could be considerable and we support L1 signalling. |

**Summary:**

26 companies responded to Q5, with 15 supporting option 3 (which is both option 1 and 2). From the detailed comments there is a common view that option 2 (activation implicitly by RRC) should be a baseline and mandatory supported (22/26). Two companies would like to align the activation to modification period boundary. It is a common understanding that option 1 (L1/L2) is needed if there are multiple configurations, but as noted by one company “at least single configuration” is the current RAN2 agreement.

The rapporteur proposes the following:

**Proposal 4:** As a baseline Cell DTX/DRX is activated/deactivated implicitly by RRC signalling, i.e. activated immediately once configured by RRC and deactivated once the RRC configuration is released. FFS a new IE explicitly stating activation/deactivation (22/26)

Companies’ positions regarding L1/L2 signalling are summarised in Q6.

If L1/L2 signalling is to be pursued, another issue is whether the L1 signalling can be UE specific or cell common, as indicated in the TR [2]. Note that we have already agreed in RAN2 #121 that pattern configuration for cell DRX/DTX is common for Rel-18 UEs in the cell. Also, in the rapporteur’s understanding, the cell common signalling is only for L1, not for L2.

**Question 6:** *Do you see a need of cell level common L1 signalling for activating/deactivating the cell DTX/DRX pattern in addition to RRC signalling?*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Yes with wording change.. | As we mentioned in Q5, We see some benefit of cell common L1 signaling. Our consideration is that it can reduce the signalling overhead of sending UE dedicated RRC message to reconfigure Cell DTX/DRX to each UE. And the saving of overhead/message number towards UE) will also transform to NES gain.  We think the question may be confusing what is "*in addition to UE specific signalling*": is it RRC signaling or UE dedicated L1 signaling? We believe it should be RRC signaling. So, we suggest below change:  *Do you see a need of cell level common L1 signalling for activating/deactivating the cell DTX/DRX pattern in addition to ~~UE specific signalling~~RRC signaling?* |
| vivo | Yes | If the A/D signalling is UE specific, then a simpler solution is to just reconfigure DRX pattern for different UEs for UE DRX alignment, and potentially restrict some channels/signals transmission/reception. Therefore, using common L1 signalling is more reasonable.  We agree with Apple on the revision for the question. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | Cell-DTX and Cell-DRX are cell concepts. So if the network wants to indicate a certain state (load state), that is on a cell level and we agree to rapporteur that L1 is more suited to cell common signalling. The individual interpretation of what to do on certain load state can still be configured specifically to each UE. |
| Lenovo | No | The proposed Option 4 to Q5 (Cell DTX/DRX activation/deactivation is aligned to modification period boundary) applies to all UEs and therefore no separate common or UE-specific signalling is necessary. |
| Huawei | Yes | As described above it can be useful if the need of activation/deactivation is more dynamic.  We agree with Apple’s proposal and we also think UE specific L1/L2 signalling does not bring much gains. In our view the L1 signalling should be used for cell level changes. |
| Qualcomm | Leave to RAN1 in single configuration case only | Assuming we are talking about activating/deactivating a single cell DTX/DRX configuration only:  As mentioned in the previous question, there are a lot of difficulties in aligning timing this way between gNB and UE that are not being thoroughly discussed here, and would probably make much more sense to discuss in RAN1. RAN2 cannot design a new group common DCI to control CDRX cycles. |
| CATT | Yes | We see the benefit of reducing signalling overhead by cell common L1 signalling and also prefer Apple’s rewording. However, we agree with Qualcomm that it falls in RAN1 domain, so we should LS RAN1 expressing RAN2 preference to support it and ask about feasibility and design details. |
| Vodafone | No | This can be done with RRC and it is to think if broadcast (e.g. SIB1) could be used for. |
| Ericsson |  | We can leave for RAN1 to decide on this aspect. |
| OPPO | See comments | In our view, either common DCI or UE-specific DCI can work from the tech perspective, but as companies indicated above, we would better leave the issue to RAN1 since the details anyway should be discussed/designed by RAN1.  Also, a similar question as Apple, “*UE specific signalling*” means Option 2 of Q5, right? i.e. Cell DTX/DRX (de)configured equals Cell DTX/DRX (de)activated. |
| BT | No | Considering this is for low number of UEs, other case, cell DTX/DRX will be deactivated, the benefit can be negligible. |
| Intel | Yes | As per our response to Q5, it is most likely that the Cell DTX/DRX configuration is to all the UEs within a cell and thus a cell common L1 signalling is needed. We are fine with Apple’s update of the wording. |
| ETRI | Yes | Group-common signalling should be prioritized. FFS: UE-specific signalling |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes But… | Although we agree that there could be some signalling overhead reduction by having such cell common L1 signalling, but this would be discussed in RAN1 so RAN2 may not need to decide. |
| InterDigital | Yes | Given the Cell DTX pattern is common for UEs in the cell, common L1 signalling is best for activation/deactivation. |
| Sony | Yes | Common L1 signaling is useful for cell level DTX/DRX |
| Futurewei | Yes | To minimize L1 signalling overhead, common L1 signalling should be considered and supported. |
| ZTE | Yes but… | If here *UE specific signalling* means RRC signalling, we think the issue of whether to support both RRC and L1/L2 signalling are already discussed in **Question 5** and no need to discuss here again.  For another issue that whether a cell common L1 signalling is needed, we can see the benefit but also think this issue should be decided by RAN1. RAN2 can send a LS to RAN1 to trigger the discussion on common L1 signalling for Cell DTX/DRX configuration activation/deactivation. |
| LGE | No | We think RRC signalling is enough. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | Agree with rapporteur’s understanding, common signalling should be L1. We think L1 common signalling is beneficial to reduce overhead and gNB power consumption. |
| III | Yes | Same view as Futurewei. |
| Docomo |  | We prefer to leave it to RAN1 discussion. |
| NEC |  | Leave it to RAN1. |
| CMCC | Yes | Common L1/L2 signalling can save signalling overhead to multiple UEs compared to the UE specific L1/L2 signalling.  We prefer Apple’s revision for the question. |
| Turkcell | Yes | Apple’s text proposal is ok. |
| Deutsche Telekom |  | We prefer to leave it to RAN1 discussion. |
| MediaTek | See comments | Up to RAN1 decision. |

**Summary:**

28 companies responded to Q6, with 17 supporting cell level common L1 signalling for Cell DTX/DRX activation/deactivation, in addition to RRC. Several companies noted that this is in RAN1 scope and prefer to send an LS with our preference and ask about feasibility and design details. It is highlighted that L1 common signalling is beneficial to reduce overhead, activation/deactivation latency and gNB power consumption.

The rapporteur proposes the following:

**Proposal 5:** Cell level common L1 signalling for Cell DTX/DRX activation/deactivation is beneficial from RAN2 perspective, send an LS to RAN1 with our preference and ask about feasibility and design details. (17/28)

## Alignment between Cell DTX/DRX and UE C-DRX

The alignment of UE C-DRX with Cell DTX and DRX was deemed beneficial in the TR 38.864 [2]. The mechanism will be discussed during the WI phase.

The alignment needs to be specified as per WID [1] objective 2:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Specify enhancement on cell DTX/DRX mechanism including the alignment of cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX in RRC\_CONNECTED mode, and inter-node information exchange on cell DTX/DRX [RAN2, RAN1, RAN3]   • Note: No change for SSB transmission due to cell DTX/DRX.  • Note: The impact to IDLE/INACTIVE UEs due to the above enhancement should be avoided. |

In order to specify the alignment RAN2 needs to have a common understanding of what the alignment of Cell DTX/DRX and UE C-DRX means.

In the rapporteur’s understanding, an aligned UE C-DRX configuration with Cell DTX means that the on-duration of C-DRX falls within Cell DTX active time. As highlighted in [4] the active duration of UE C-DRX can be extended by the UE DRX inactivity timer, therefore it is impossible to ensure that active duration of Cell DTX is always overlapping with UE C-DRX active time (T2 in the figure below). But it is possible to ensure that the on-duration of UE C-DRX is within the Cell DTX active time and this is proposed by the rapporteur.



Fig. 1. Illustration of issue scenarios of Cell DTX and UE CDRX alignment [4]

**Question 7:** *Do companies agree to the following statement:*

“An aligned UE C-DRX configuration with Cell DTX means that the on-duration of C-DRX falls within Cell DTX active time.” This definition includes all cases regardless if the periodicity and on-duration are the same or different across the cell, and starting time of UE C-DRX on-duration is the same as cell DTX active duration or not.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Yes | We think Rapporteur suggested statement is reasonable. |
| Vivo | No | We think Rapporteur’s statement involves several issues and would like further clarification:   1. cell DTX active time definition?   It’s a little bit early to define cell DTX active time as the cell DTX pattern may be extended.   1. How to understand ‘alignment’?   We think ‘UE C-DRX pattern aligns with cell DTX pattern’ means that the on-duration of UE C-DRX is at least partially overlapped with cell DTX on-duration, and the wording ‘within’ is just part of all the cases.  If rapporteur’s statement is intending to clarify this issue, then we suggest to revise the statement as:  An aligned UE C-DRX configuration with Cell DTX means that the on-duration of C-DRX ~~falls within~~ is at least partially overlapped with Cell DTX ~~active time~~ on-duration.   1. Whether the UE C-DRX active time regarding UE C-DRX onDurationTimer is submissive to cell DTX active time regarding cell DTX onDurationTimer？   If rapporteur’s statement is intending to clarify this issue, then we agree that the cell DTX active time includes the UE C-DRX on-duration within the cell DTX on-duration. |
| Fraunhofer | Partially | We agree to the general direction of the statement, but as we already discussed Q4 we think that “Cell DTX active time” needs to be more accurately defined. Using C-DRX concept as basis, TS 38.300 on section 11 distinguishes “active time” from “on-duration”. Basically, “on-duration” is fixed whereas “active time” varies and includes the “on-duration” . We would suggest to define “Cell-DTX active time” and “Cell-DTX on-duration” in a similar way:  “Cell-DTX on-duration is the time when a cell may transmit PDCCH” (fixed per cycle)  “Cell-DTX active time is the time a cell stays active within Cell-DTX cycle”  We don’t think Ues need to track Cell-DTX active time. A UE should only track its own active time. If a UE is not scheduled during “Cell-DTX on-duration” it should sleep regardless of other Ues and Cell actitivity.  So the statement could be revised to “An aligned UE C-DRX configuration with Cell DTX means that the on-duration of C-DRX falls within Cell DTX on-duration.” We would agree with this revised version. |
| Lenovo |  | While the intention of the statement from Rapp is not wrong in our view, we need to focus on necessary UE behaviour for Cell DTX/ Cell DRX. As long as it is clear what UE does when the cell is not receiving and/ or when the cell is not transmitting, we can do away with such definition…at least for now. |
| Huawei | Yes | To answer Vivo’s questions:   1. Even if Cell DTX active time is extended by the inactivity timer, this definition would still hold (i.e. UE on-duration would fall within Cell active time). 2. The partially overlapping case would bring complexity to the solution. If the overlap would be short, the opportunity for the UE to receive PDCCH might be limited. RAN2 would need to specify behaviours and timer values for this case, which is not needed if we agree on the initially proposed statement. Furthermore, the UE would waste power in the time when UE on-duration fall outside of Cell active time. 3. We use the term “Cell DTX active time” on purpose, not knowing if it will be only on-duration or on-duration + inactivity timer. We would be fine to change the wording to “(…)on-duration of C-DRX falls within Cell DTX on-duration ~~active time~~”. |
| Qualcomm | No | First of all: Rapporteurs proposal is not very clear to us, “on-duration of C-DRX falling within Cell DTX active time.” On-duration is not the issue here as this is easily done by configuration. The issue is the active time of CDRX which may conflict with cell DTX non-active period (T2 in the figure), so we will answer the question assuming both cases here until there is clarity on the exact proposal.  **Active time**  We prefer that when the UE needs to extend UE CDRX (T2 in the figure), gNB does not go into Cell DTX non-active period (as per this specific UE understanding). Thus, we propose a more straightforward proposal like this: **“Cell DTX non-active period can only occur when the UE is already during CDRX inactive time”.** We think this is the proper order of things with respect to MAC spec. UE goes to inactive time using legacy CDRX procedure then starts applying cell DTX/DRX non-active time restrictions.  The issue with the proposal “An aligned UE C-DRX configuration with Cell DTX means that the on-duration of C-DRX falls within Cell DTX active time”, assuming the same logic applies for active time would be:   1. Forces UE into a fixed duty cycle, i.e., extending UE active time for a transmission or a retransmission becomes impossible. This not acceptable for most type of traffic to have zero flexibility in timelines for retransmissions or HARQ ACK/NACKs etc. as those events are pretty important that’s why we define HARQ-specific retransmission and RTT-timers. We cannot simply cancel this whole mechanism for NES purposes. 2. Cell DTX/DRX is maintained per serving cell, so it will not even be possible to align individual serving cells cell DTX cycles with the MAC entity CDRX operation. Recall that the SI phase agreement “Cell DTX/DRX can be configured per serving cell and can be applicable for different cells in CA. No additional RAN2 impacts or enhancements are foreseen.” 3. Requires modification of existing DRX timers to consider cases when cell DTX non-active timer overlap with a running timer (Case T2 above) 4. May have RAN1 impact: Requires modifications for PHY timelines (K0,K1,K2) to consider cases where Cell DTX overlaps with any transmission/reception event.   **On-Duration**  If we are discussing on-duration here then it would be easy to align on-duration with cell DTX non-active time by configuration, but that wouldn’t answer the more important issue of active time overlap with Cell DTX non-active time (our understanding of T2 duration) |
| CATT | Yes w/t comments | We agree the Cell DTX/DRX feature brings most energy saving when the UE C-DRX configuration is *aligned* with the Cell DTX configuration, per Rapporteur’s definition. Some questions/comments though:  1) We understand only Cell DTX is mentioned here because C-DRX constrains the PDCCH monitoring only. However it can be questioned if there is also a point in aligning Cell DRX active time and C-DRX on-duration.  2) “…C-DRX falls within Cell DTX active time”: reusing the same terminology (active time) as for C-DRX leaves the impression that Cell DTX/DRX also has an active time that may be different from the on-duration, i.e. can be extended as discussed in Q4. For Cell DTX/DRX, the TR has consistently used the terminology Cell DTX/DRX active period / non-active period, and we would suggest keeping this terminology. |
| Ericsson | Yes with comments | We agree with the rapporteur that the alignment does not have to imply that the UE C-DRX active period is a proper subset of a Cell DTX active period, i.e., the alignment does not have to imply that the UE C-DRX active period falls “completely” under Cell DTX active period. Instead, for the two features to function together, it is enough that the UE C-DRX onDuration period at least partially overlaps with the Cell DTX active period. However, our opinion is that this aspect is more of an implementation option for which the details do not need to be specified. |
| OPPO | Yes with comments | We understand the intention of the statement “An aligned UE C-DRX configuration with Cell DTX means that the on-duration of C-DRX falls within Cell DTX active time” is to achieve better NW energy saving gains but at the stage, we would like to restrict it as “the on-duration of C-DRX falls within Cell DTX on-duration” since whether there is an extension of Cell DTX active time beyond Cell DTX on-duration is FFS.  On the other hand, we would like to indicate the non-ideal case of alignment may exist, i.e. T2. For T2, RAN2 should discuss and decide the gNB/UE behaviour, e.g. the UE should behave as that is expected in Cell DTX non-active. |
| BT | Yes | Cell DTX cannot be designed with the constraint that it is mandated to support legacy Ues without any impact to them. As per WID, legacy Ues will be supported on a cell with DTX activated but it is reasonable to expect some inefficiencies, e.g., power consumption. Other case, there is no need for any specification.  We support rapporteur statement, and we are fine to consider T1 and T2 as valid cases to be solved for NES Ues. |
| Intel | Yes with comments | We think that alignment between UE DRX and Cell DTX means that the on-duration of UE DRX is fully overlapped within the on-duration of Cell DTX to achieve the maximum NES gain. Even with this assumption on the network implementation, there is a possibility that the active time of UE DRX may lie in the non-active period of Cell DTX and the behaviour will still need to be defined as in the other email discussion. |
| ETRI | No | Depends on how cell DTX/DRX active time is managed (not clear yet). Since UE C-DRX is UE-specifically configured, it may be inevitable to have T1 and T2 durations in Fig. 1 at least for some Ues. |
| Nokia | - | Alignment is up to NW configuration. From UE behaviour point of view, it only needs to monitor PDCCH when it is in active time of both UE’s DRX and active time of Cell DTX (with some exceptions e.g. for retransmission). |
| Samsung | Not yet | We agree with the intention, but we believe that the ‘Cell DTX/DRX inactivity timer’ discussion should be concluded first.  And also, we would like to larify that the UE DRX ON duration is not the same as Active Time which could be extended due to DRX inactivity timer. This UE DRX is UE-specific.  Considering Active Time, it might be impossible for Cell DTX/DRX active duration to accommodate all the Active Time of the Ues. |
| InterDigital | Yes | Alignment does not have to imply that the UE C-DRX Active Time falls entirely under Cell DTX active period, as the C-DRX Active Time is not deterministic and can vary according to scheduling and UL data arrival. |
| Sony |  | We share the view with Samsung that inactivity timer for Cell DTX/DRX discussion should be resolved first. |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| ZTE | No | We can understand the intention but we are not so sure whether it’s necessary or what’s the benefit to provide such definition for “the alignment of cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX in RRC\_CONNECTED mode”. We agree with Lenovo that we should mainly focus on necessary UE behaviour for Cell DTX/ Cell DRX.  Here are some of our considerations/assumptions for such alignments:   * Agree with CATT that we’d better to keep the terminology of Cell DTX/DRX active period / non-active period. * Agree with ETRI that, since UE C-DRX is UE-specifically configured (according to UE’s traffic), it may be inevitable to have T1 or T2 durations in Fig. 1. In other word, from a purely configuration point of view, we don’t think it’s possible to guarantee that the on-duration of C-DRX (of each UE) falls within Cell DTX active time (also similar view as InterDigital). * Generally UE C-DRX and Cell DTX/DRX need to be configured separately. So it’s more possible that on-duration of UE C-DRX is partially overlapping with both active period and non-active period of Cell DTX. In the place where on-duration of UE C-DRX is overlapped with non-active period of Cell DTX, the UE behavior can refer to the discussion in *[POST121][311],* e.g., to stop monitoring or transmitting. In the place where UE C-DRX is overlapped with active period of Cell DTX, UE’s real active time can be derived using an AND function of UE C-DRX active time and cell’s active time. |
| LGE | Yes | We think that cell DTX/UE C-DRX alignment means that on duration of Cell DTX pattern covers Active times of all UE C-DRX patterns. |
| Fujitsu | Yes with comments | We basically support rapporteur statement. However Cell DTX active time is not clearly defined, then it should be at least UE DRX on-duration period falls within Cell DTX on-duration period. |
| III | Yes | We think Rapporteur suggested statement is reasonable. |
| NEC | - | We agree with Nokia. Also, we should focus on UE behaviour first in case of Cell inactive time, regardless of UE C-DRX. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Turkcell | Yes | T1 and T2 cases are valid. |
| MediaTek | No | Active time depends on how the network to organize the opportunities for Cell DTX/DRX which is still not clear now. And the active period of Cell DTX/DRX completely covers the UE C-DRX ON duration with no exception shall be the minimum requirement. |

**Summary:**

25 companies responded to Q7, with 15 supporting the rapporteur’s statement, but with modifications. It is highlighted that for cell DTX/DRX there are no definitions agreed for e.g. cell DTX active time. Therefore companies would like to define cell DTX/DRX parameters before agreeing on alignment definition. Since there is a common understanding for “on-duration” it is proposed to agree on an updated statement:

**Proposal 6:** An aligned UE C-DRX configuration with Cell DTX means that the on-duration of C-DRX falls within Cell DTX on-duration. FFS extension of Cell DTX active time beyond Cell DTX on-duration. (15/25)

The rapporteur’s understanding is that the gNB/UE behaviour during T2 from Fig.1 is addressed in proposals 5/6/7/8 from discussion [311].

**Question 8:** *Which option of NW-UE alignment do you prefer:*

* **Option 1:** As long as the on-duration of C-DRX falls within Cell DTX active time, the aligned C-DRX of different UEs can vary in offset, periodicity or on-duration [9] as in Fig. 2.



Fig. 2. Different UE DRX patterns aligned with a certain Cell DTX (if Cell DTX is activated).

* **Option 2:** In addition to the on-duration of C-DRX falling within Cell DTX active time, the alignment between cell DTX/DRX and UE C-DRX also requires the starting time of UE C-DRX active duration to be the same as cell DTX active duration (i.e. there is a NES specific start offset).



Fig. 3: C-DRX start offset alignment among multiple UEs [23]

* **Option 3:** There is only a single UE C-DRX pattern in a cell which is fully aligned with cell DTX (i.e. exactly the same on/off configurations for the cell and all UEs in this cell).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Option 2 | We believe Option 2 can maximize NES gain because the same starting time of active duration can make the UEs to finish their transmissions as early as possible, so that gNB can enter non-active duration early.  For option 1, the distributed on-durations of different UEs will make gNB have to keep waking up to wait the last UE's ON-duration finished, and correspondingly gNB has to configure a long active duration of Cell DTX. It is bad for gNB power saving. As example, in below figure, if UE1 and UE2's on-duration are distributed, the active duration of Cell DTX has to be configured to end in T2 to wait UE 2's on-duration finished. However, if UE2's on-duration starts from T0, the Cell DTX active duration can be reduced to end in T1.    For option 3, we don't see the point to make this strong restriction on alignment:   * Different UE may have different traffic requirements. It doesn't make sense to mandate all UEs to have same ON-OFF pattern. * Because we have inactivity timer for UE CDRX anyway, the totally equal on/off duration may also result in the situation of Figure.1. |
| vivo | Option 1 | This question is related to how we understand question 7, which we suggest the wording ‘within’ needs to be further clarified. It is not necessary to assume the cell DTX onDurationTimer in cell DTX configuration is definitely larger than the UE C-DRX onDurationTimer in UE DRX configuration. From our understanding, UE monitors some PDCCH within the overlapping part of cell DTX on-duration and UE C-DRX on-duration.  We think Option 1 is beneficial for the gNB to balance the location of scheduling occasions among UEs within cell DTX on-duration. It is up to gNB implementation to realize option 2 with the support of option 1.  As for Option 3, we share similar view with Apple. |
| Fraunhofer | Option 1 | We prefer Option 1 - Assuming it is actually aligned to “Cell-DTX on” duration (as in Fig 2) and not to “Cell-DTX active time” (see our answer to Q7 for the distinction).  Option 2 is too inflexible for non-zero load. For example, if Cell-DTX on time is 5 ms and cycle is 20 ms , why would all UEs need to align to the beginning of the 5 ms? It would be better to distribute the load over those 5 ms  Option 3 does not consider the UE needs. Why a UE with C-DRX cycle of 320 ms would be forced to a Cell-DTX cycle of 20 ms? That would drain UE battery. |
| Lenovo | Option 2 | Option 1 does not allow use of a more optimized separate CDRXs for UE when cell is saving power and when it is not.  Option 2 provides the maximum power saving opportunity for the network.  Option 3 is sub-optimal as the network then would need to conservatively configure same UE CDRX to all UEs in the cell and this would be then according to most strict/ demanding QoS.  Another point that is not yet discussed here concerns Cell DRX specifically. Today, the UE can transmit at any point i.e., even when in CDRX sleep time e.g., perform a RACH procedure if need be. However, this will not necessary be the case when the Cell is not receiving. Discussion around the current question does not address this. |
| Huawei | Option 1 | In our view there is no need to restrict the starting time of UE C-DRX on-duration if the network can achieve the alignment as defined in Question 7 without it. This should be left up to the network to configure for connected UE load balancing in the Cell DTX active time.  From our perspective the periodicity of C-DRX should be same or a multiple of Cell-DTX's periodicity, and the on-duration cannot exceed the Cell-DTX's on-duration but can be different for various UEs. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | Option 3 should not be considered since it forces all UEs to have the same active time, which naturally would be configured conservatively according to the UE with most stringent QoS needs. This is bad for UE power, since almost all UEs are forced into larger than needed ON duration.  Option 2 unnecessarily limits both the capacity and the NES gains of the gNB while also requiring the UE to have larger than needed active time. Since it does not properly distribute PDCCH occasions over time (like option 1 does) it needs to keep some UEs awake (and the gNB itself) until enough PDCCH occasions are there to accommodate all UEs. |
| CATT | Option 2 | We think option 1 is always possible by NW configuration, but option 2 can be a useful (while simple) enhancement to consider, as it always yields the optimal alignment across all UE’s C-DRX configurations wrt the Cell DTX/DRX pattern when the network activates the Cell DTX/DRX operation w/o the need to re-configure all UE’s C-DRX configurations. |
| Vodafone | Option 2 | I would choose the option with the highest gains in terms of NW energy saving (considering some flexibility on UE side). If the savings achieved with the cell DRX/DTX are not big enough, operator will just continue to switch off the cells/frequency layers.  Option 1 is flexible from the UE perspective, but from the gNB site, it would lead to configuration of the larger cell DTX periods. Considering that we are speaking about the cells with a small numbers (in my view not more than 10 if at all) of the UEs, the PDCCH load is an issue of a smaller importance. In my view, it might be hard to avoid service impact due to the alignment of cell DTX with a C-DRX UEs especially for services which requires periodic traffic with a high frequency like Voice or XR...  C-DTX could be configured in a way that it wakes up every e.g 20 ms for 5 ms (as provided by Fraunhofer as an example), but does it bring sufficient benefit and if there is XR traffic with a traffic periodicity of e.g 11 ms?  It would also be desirable if a typical example of the cell DRX values would be shown in some further contributions. |
| Ericsson |  | As stated in the answer to Question 7, our opinion is that this aspect is more of an implementation option for which the details do not need to be specified. Instead, the NW can choose an appropriate option depending on a particular situation. |
| OPPO | Option 1 | Option 2 is not flexible. Let all UEs have the same starting time of UE C-DRX active duration does not align with the UEs’ traffic model and may increase UE power consumption as well as lead to inflexible NW scheduling, as all PDCCHs should be in a shorter and certain duration.  On Option 3, we share a similar view as Apple and Qualcomm. |
| BT | - | As Vodafone mention, we should select the option that provides highest energy saving.  At this moment, we prefer to see contributions on this to evaluate the potential options.  A few considerations:   * With a low number of UEs, it should not be a problem the number of PDCCH occasions. * Cell DTX active time needs to be as smallest as possible to save as much energy as possible.   Initially, we prefer a combination of option 1 and option 2 were cell DTX active duration is configured to save as much network energy as possible and C-DRX on-duration are fit inside. Option 1 seems to be the other way around. Option 2 in the figure, it seems no need to align UE1 and UE3. |
| Intel | Option 1 and 2 | We can leave it to network implementation. In our view, Option 1 will help spread the PDCCH load across the on-duration of Cell DTX while Option 2 provides the maximum NES gain. |
| ETRI | Option 1 with comment | Agree with comments of Ericsson, Intel that this may be a network implementation issue. However, if this comprehensive relationship between cell DTX and C-DRX is to be enforced, it supports option 1 (Q8 appears to be related to Q7). |
| Nokia | Option 1 | Up to NW implementation. We do not see any spec impact.  Option 2/3 does not make sense. In the figure, why is the Cell DTX not a periodic pattern to start with? |
| Samsung | Option 1 or 2  (but no need to mandate NW configuration) | We object to Option 3.  For Option 1 and 2, we believe network could adjust each UE’s CDRX cycle and on duration, along with capability of configuring cell DTX/DRX. |
| InterDigital | Option 1 | Agree with Ericsson and Nokia that this is a configuration issue that does not need to be specified. |
| Sony |  | We share the view from Ericsson that it can be left to NW implementaiton |
| Futurewei | Option 1 | Same view as Fraunhofer and Qualcomm. |
| ZTE | None | As we think from configuration perspective, it’s impossible to guarantee that the on-duration of C-DRX falls within Cell DTX active time, we think Option 1 may be infeasible.  We also object to Option 2. In legacy, it is gNB’s implementation to configure UE’s CDRX. The gNB could configure different start time of C-DRX for different UEs with purpose of interference coordination or reducing collision. If forcibly making the starting time of UE C-DRX active duration to be the same as the start time of cell DTX active duration, the benefit of interference coordination and collision reduction in legacy UE C-DRX feature would be affected. That’s undesired.  As commented for **Question 7**, we think the feasible way for alignment between UE and gNB is that, under the premise that UE C-DRX and Cell DTX/DRX are configured separately, in the place where on-duration of UE C-DRX is overlapped with non-active period of Cell DTX, the UE behaviour can refer to the discussion in *[POST121][311],* e.g., to stop monitoring or transmitting. In the place where UE C-DRX is overlapped with active period of Cell DTX, UE’s real active time can be derived using an AND function of UE C-DRX active time and cell’s active time. |
| LGE | Option 1 | We think gNB should have flexibility in scheduling decision and Option 1 is beneficial for satisfying various requirements of data traffics to UEs. |
| Fujitsu | Option 1 | We agree it would be implementation issue. At least Option 1 is flexible and the network can support option2/3 alignments by appropriate configurations. Then we prefer Option 1 as a baseline. |
| III | Option 2 | Option 2 can provide maximum NES gain. |
| Docomo | Option 1 | We think it is not necessary to specify that start is the same among UEs or that each cell-DTX active is covered by a C-DRX active, as in Option 2/3. |
| NEC | Yes, but | We see some benefits of it to handle some cases at the end of cell DTX/DRX window. Especially when we specify to drop all UE transmission/reception within the cell DTX/DRX non-active period. We are fine to continue discussing this in RAN2#121bis-e.  On the other hand, we also understand that at this moment, this still remains as FFS from the RAN2#121. It may be too early to confirm this is included. |
| CMCC | Option 1 or Option 2 | Option 2 can maximize the NES gain and avoid UE’s power consumption. But we also support Option1 which brings more flexibility. |
| Turkcell | Option 1 | Option 2 is not flexible. |
| MediaTek | Option 2 | (Proponent) |

**Summary:**

27 companies responded to Q8. 16 companies are fine with option 1, 9 with option 2. Option 3 has no support and is opposed by some companies so it can be excluded. Some companies see it as an implementation issue not to be defined.

The rapporteur would like to propose a following statement that is common to both option 1 and option 2:

**Proposal 7:** The periodicity of UE C-DRX configurations in a cell should be the same or a multiple of the serving Cell’s DTX periodicity.

**Question 9:** *Do you agree to leave the alignment mechanism up to NW implementation? If not please state the possible spec impact in the comments.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Apple | No | 1) It is too early to conclude no spec impact. We think we should first make the alignment mechanism clear, and then discuss whether it has spec impacts or not.  2) In Rapporteur’s Figure 1, the UE behaviour in duration T1 and T2 are not clear. For the moment, it is hard to say whether the UE will always follow legacy UE CDRX behaviour (i.e. without spec change) because we don’t even conclude UE behaviour in Cell DTX (and whether the restriction on UE reception in Cell DTX is more strict than UE CDRX). |
| Vivo | Maybe yes | We agree with Apple that it is too early to discuss this. Maybe we can come back to this issue later. |
| Fraunhofer | No | If we leave it fully to NW implementation the adaptation will not be dynamic enough and the network will not save more energy than a Rel-17 network.  The main spec need is explicit parameters to align the cycle quickly. The simplest solution to achieve dynamic adaptation is: When Cell-DTX is not activated, the existing C-DRX parameters apply. When Cell-DTX is activated a new set of parameters apply. On top of that it is worth to consider more than 2 configurations, in order to adapt to different loads more quickly, e.g. 5%, 10%, 15% and 20% load. |
| Lenovo | No | We think there will need to be specific UE behaviour and any reasonable solution (unlike Option 3 of Q8) will find it difficult to keep this only up to network implementation.” |
| Huawei | Maybe Yes | The alignment should be decided and executed by the NW. There might be a need of a “start offset” signalling but it should be a part of the signalling from Q5-Q6, so if a start offset is agreed it is enough for the network to be able to align the Ues. We are fine to postpone this to a later stage. |
| Qualcomm | No | Agree with Apple |
| CATT | No | Agree with above comments that it is too early to rule out. For example it could be useful to use L1 group signalling for that purpose when, e.g. the Cell DTX on-duration needs to be “advanced” to cope with one (or more) new Ues’ traffic pattern, and have all Ues aligned to it. |
| Vodafone | No | We shall first define how it works (agree with Apple). We also think one single configuration is sufficient and there is not sufficient justification for multiple configurations |
| Ericsson | Yes | This aspect should be up to the NW, and hence it does not need to be specified. While we do not think there is an “alignment mechanism” to be specified, we understand that once further details on cell dtx/drx behaviour are clear one can discuss whether there is any spec impact on this lignment. But as said, we think this is merely a NW option without any need to introduce further behaviours for the sake of alignment. |
| OPPO | No | At least, we need to discuss and specify UE’s behaviour on T1/T2/T3(also depends on the results of #311). |
| BT | No | Agree with Apple. First, we need to define how this work. |
| Intel | Maybe yes | Agree with Vivo that it may be too early to discuss this until we have a more concrete view of the UE behaviour. |
| ETRI | Maybe Yes | Potential spec impact may include clarification of UE behaviour during T1 and T2 and timer behaviour across cell DTX and UE C-DRX. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | As a baseline, we believe the network has means to align each different UE’s CDRX on durations.  And such alignment may not need additional signalling. |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes | This should at least be the default assumption, but agree also that this can be decided or will be clear once the alignment mechanisms are agreed. |
| ZTE | No | Agree with Apple. |
| LGE | Yes | if gNB configures SPS, CG and SR such that SPS, CG and SR occasions are aligned with cell DTX/DRX active period, and if gNB can schedule smartly such that UE CDRX active time does not exceed cell DTX active period and uplink transmission does not happen in cell DRX non-active period, cell DTX/DRX and UE CDRX alignment is maintained. No special mechanism is needed and everything is up to network implementation. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | In our view, there is no need to additional mechanism for alignment. |
| III | No | Agree with Apple. |
| Docomo | No | Agree with Apple. The discussion should not be closed at a stage where a common understanding of how it works has not yet been reached. |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| CMCC | No | Agree with Apple. |
| Turkcell | No | Share Apple’s concerns. |
| Deutsche Telekom | No | Agree with Apple. First, we need to define how this works. |
| MediaTek | No but | We are open to discuss if any network-based alignment solution. |

**Summary:**

28 companies responded to Q9. 15 companies don’t want to leave it up to NW implementation or think it is too early to decide. 13 would like to leave it to the NW to some extent. This needs to be discussed at a later stage when the alignment mechanism is more mature. No proposal is made.

# 3 Conclusion

Based on the discussion in the previous sections we propose the following:

**Proposal 1:** A periodic cell DTX/DRX configuration is explicitly signalled to the UEs. (25/28)

**Proposal 2:** A periodic cell DTX/DRX pattern is configured by UE specific RRC signalling. (27/28)

**Proposal 3:** The Cell DTX/DRX configuration contains at least: periodicity, start slot/offset, on duration. (25/28)

**Proposal 4:** As a baseline Cell DTX/DRX is activated/deactivated implicitly by RRC signalling, i.e. activated immediately once configured by RRC and deactivated once the RRC configuration is released. FFS a new IE explicitly stating activation/deactivation (22/26)

**Proposal 5:** Cell level common L1 signalling for Cell DTX/DRX activation/deactivation is beneficial from RAN2 perspective, send an LS to RAN1 with our preference and ask about feasibility and design details. (17/28)

**Proposal 6:** An aligned UE C-DRX configuration with Cell DTX means that the on-duration of C-DRX falls within Cell DTX on-duration. FFS extension of Cell DTX active time beyond Cell DTX on-duration. (15/25)

**Proposal 7:** The periodicity of UE C-DRX configurations in a cell should be the same or a multiple of the serving Cell’s DTX periodicity.
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