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**Introduction**

The document is to collect companies’ views and provide a summary for the email discussion thread [106-e-NR-5G\_V2X-04] Discussion on R1-2107977: Correction on HARQ reporting for multiple pools with PSFCH by August 20 – Siqi (vivo) based on the inputs from the preparation phase and [1][2].

The check point are planned as following, companies are highly appreciated to provide their inputs before the check point:

* 1st check point: August 17 (UTC 23:59 pm)
* 2nd check point: August 19 (UTC 11:59 am)

**Discussions**

gNB can configure multiple resource pools containing PSFCH for some purposes. For example, resource pools with different PSFCH periodicities can be used to meet the needs of services with different PDB. According to the spec, there are two types of SL HARQ-ACK codebook:

* **For type2 SL HARQ-ACK codebook, UE already supports type2 codebook for multiple pools** since the pseudo-code for type2 codebook construction is dependent on SAI and is irrelevant to pool id.
* **For type1 SL HARQ-ACK codebook,** the current specification only specifies how the UE generates HARQ-ACK codebook for one pool, **it is not clear how to report SL HARQ-ACK for multiple pools**.

From the highlighted part in 38.213, it can be seen that the pseudo-code applies to a specific pool(i.e., ’the sidelink resource pool’), and the set of of only includes the PSSCH occasion corresponding to a PSFCH occasion in the specific pool.

==============================38.213==============================

Set to the value of the period of PSFCH transmission occasion resources for the sidelink resource pool

while C

if

Set – index of a SL slot within an UL slot

while

if slot starts at a same time as or after a slot for an active UL BWP change on the PCell and slot is before the slot for the active UL BWP change on the PCell

;

else

if slot belongs to the sidelink resource pool and includes PSFCH resources as indicated by a sidelink resource pool bitmap and *sl-PSFCH-Period*, where is the *k*-th slot timing value in set

Set – index of a SL slot within an PSFCH period

while

;

;

;

end while

end if

;

end if

end while

end if

;

end while

==============================end==============================

Therefore, if there are multiple pools with PSFCH, it is not clear which one is ‘the sidelink resource pool’ in pseudo-code. Even if each pool with PSFCH can be assumed as ‘the sidelink resource pool’, and the corresponding set of and SL HARQ-ACK bits can be determined, it is not specified how to handle these multiple sets of and SL HARQ-ACK bits. Even for the case where these pools with PSFCH are configured in a pure TDM manner, the type1 codebook with SL HARQ-ACK for more than one pool still does not work with current specification. As shown in the figure below, pool1 and pool2 are TDM and F denotes PSFCH occasions, K1={2,6}. If ‘the sidelink resource pool’ is pool1, with the pseudocode, only the PSSCH occasions associated with PSFCH in slot n+10 of pool1 will be included in the set of , and if ‘the sidelink resource pool’ is pool2, only the PSSCH occasions associated with PSFCH in slot n+6 of pool2 will be included in the set of . How to handle the two sets is not specified.



Figure 1.Example of TDMed pools with PSFCH

Based on the inputs in the preparation phase, there are two options to handle the type1 codebook if there are multiple pools with PSFCH:

1. **Option1.support SL HARQ-ACKs reporting for multiple pool in a type1 codebook**

If we go with this option, some spec changes are needed. [1] [2] provide some changes for reference in the appendix.

1. **Option2.not support SL HARQ-ACKs reporting for multiple pool in a type1 codebook**

One way is that gNB always assigns different and non-overlapped PUCCH resources for different pools configured with PSFCH and ensure that SL HARQ-ACK for these pools will not be involved in a same codebook. Alternatively, the number of configured one pool with PSFCH should be no larger than one if type1 codebook is used.

Company views

Please kindly provide your views in the table below.

**Question 1: whether Type1 SL HARQ-ACK codebook for multiple resource pools configured with PSFCH should be supported in R16?**

* **Option1.Support, and spec changes are needed**
* **Option2.Not support**
* **please provide the reasons and your suggestions, if any.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option |  Comment |
| vivo | We prefer Option1 | Since type2 codebooks for multiple pools are already supported in R16, it would be strange for type1 codebooks to be defined per pool without multiplexing between pools. Regarding the concerns on the overhead of the multiplexed codebook mentioned by some companies, if the gNB predicts that the multiplexed codebook size will be too large, it can assign different PUCCHs to be associated with different resource pools so that the SL HARQ-ACK for different pools will be handled separately. If the size of multiplexed codebook will not be large, gNB can indicate the same PUCCH resource for SL HARQ-ACK reporting for multiple pools. |
| ASUSTeK | We prefer Option1 | We share the same view with vivo. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Slightly prefer Option 1 | Multiple resource pools with PSFCH would be a valid situation. Type-1 HARQ-ACK CB should be available in this case. Our preference is option 1, but option 2 for Rel-16 is also fine with TEI discussion in Rel-17. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | We prefer Option 1. | The candidate PSSCH transmissions may be scheduled by more than one DCI format 3\_0 or sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH-CG-Type1, which would be associated to more than one resource pools. And the corresponding spec changes are needed . More details were expressed in R1-2105611. |
| Intel | Option 2 | Although the intention is understood, we think this is not a correction rather a functional change. At this stage these changes are unwelcome. What we can do is to state the conditions how UE can handle the CB construction for a single RP. |
| LG | Option 2 | Currently, there is no implicit/explicit rule to make associations between TX resource pool(s) and RX resource pool(s). If there are more than RX pool with PSFCH, PSFCH reception timing or PSFCH resource determination at TX UE side would be ambiguous. In maintenance phase, it would not be desirable to spend much time to support this new functionality.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | We disagree with Vivo that Type 2 codebook has already supported reporting HARQ from multiple resource pools on the same PUCCH. Whether to report type 2 HARQ codebook from different pools on the same PUCCH is up to gNB indication, it does not imply it has already supported. However, in fact, RAN1 has no agreement or even no discussion on whether/how to report SL HARQ from multiple resource pools on the same PUCCH. We agree with companies that it is not only a simple correction, but a functionality change which is not appropriate nor essential in Rel-16 CR stage. |
| Apple | Option 2 | Option 1 seems to expand the functionality of supporting Type 1 codebook for HARQ feedback from multiple resource pools, which we did not have explicit agreements. We prefer not to modify the specifications for the new functionality at this stage.  |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | We prefer to not introduce Option 1 at this late stage. |
| Sharp | Option 2 |  |
| NEC | Option 2 | We understand it’s a valid case and current spec cannot support it. While it’s also a new feature that wasn’t touched before, we prefer not to add this new feature in maintenance stage. |
| CATT, GOHIGH | Option 2 | RAN1 has no agreement on this issue, we prefer not to introduce new feature in CR phase.  |
| Samsung | Option 2 | We also consider it as functionality change rather than correction, thus is inappropriate at the late stage. |
| OPPO | Option 2 | prefer not to introduce such new functionality at maintenance stage |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility  | Option 2 | This is not a necessary correction and can be avoided using proper configuration  |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 2 | Agree with others that support for this functionality has never been agreed. |
| MediaTek | Option 2 |  |

**Question 2: If option1 in Question1 is agreed, which option for spec changes do you prefer? Option1 in appendix1 or option2 in appendix2?**

* **please your suggestions (e.g., suggested CR), if any.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | option |  Comment |
| vivo | Option1 in appendix1 | It is straightforward to iterate through all the resource pools containing PSFCHs in the order of their pool IDs, then determining the HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to each pool separately, and concatenating these HARQ-ACK bits. |
| ASUSTeK | Either Option1 or Option2 in appendix1  | We see less difference between Option1 and option2 in appendix1 and either one is fine to us. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Either is OK | Outcome would be the same. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 1. | Similar proposed correction in R1-2105611. |
| LG | Nether option 1 nor option 2 | If Q1 is agreed, one simple solution is that the network ensures TDM between SL HARQ-ACK reporting of different resource pools. In this case, since the current specification already covers the SL HARQ-ACK codebook for a certain resource pool, further change would not be needed. Or, minimally, it can be considered to specify that “UE does not expect to multiplex SL HARQ-ACK information of different resource pool in a PUCCH or a PUSCH”.  |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 3: If option2 in Question1 is agreed, which option do you prefer?**

* **Option1.draw a RAN1 conclusion that type1 SL HARQ-ACK codebook for multiple pools configured with PSFCH is not supported in R16**
* **Option2.capture in RAN1 spec that UE is not expected to transmit a type1 SL HARQ-ACK codebook for multiple pools configured with PSFCH in R16**
* **Option3.capture in RAN2 RRC spec that type1 SL HARQ-ACK codebook for multiple pools configured with PSFCH is not supported in R16**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | option |  Comment |
| vivo | option2 | If option 2 in Question 1 is agreed, we prefer to explicitly prevent UE from supporting type1 codebooks for more than one pools in the RAN1 specification. |
| ASUSTeK | Either option1 or option 2 |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | Slightly prefer Option 2 | Other option is also OK for us. |
| LG | Option 1 | Similar with other discussion, if the network can avoid this situation, we do not need to specify it explicitly.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2 | It is fine for us to capture the conclusion in the spec if this is the majority view. |
| Apple | Either Option 1 or Option 2 |  |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 or Option 2 | If Option 2 is selected, the wording needs to be updated so that the UE is not expected “to be scheduled or configured” to transmit a Type 1 SL HARQ-ACK codebook for multiple pools. The wording in Q3 would imply that the UE has to drop the PUCCH instead of this being an unsupported case. |
| Sharp |  | We prefer to draw a RAN1 conclusion, but the description of Option1 above is confusing. Use of Type-1 HARQ-ACK should be OK even if multiple resource pools are configured with PSFCH. It would be up to gNB to avoid any problematic case.In our view, we should conclude like “Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook with HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to PSSCH transmissions in more than one resource pool is not supported”. |
| NEC | Option 1 | Option 1 without spec changes |
| CATT, GOHIGH | Option 1 |  |
| Samsung | Option 1 or 2 | If option 2 is selected, we’re fine to update specification wording to explicitly avoid the case. |
| OPPO | Option 1 |  |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility  | Either Option 1 or option 2 |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Option 2 with Qualcomm’s rewording |  |
| MediaTek | Option 1. |  |

**Summary and 2nd round**

Based on the first round of comments:

* 6 companies support option1: support Type1 SL HARQ-ACK codebook for multiple resource pools configured with PSFCH in R16
	+ vivo, ASUSTeK, DOCOMO, ZTE, Sanechips, Ericsson
* 16 companies support option2: **not** support Type1 SL HARQ-ACK codebook for multiple resource pools configured with PSFCH in R16
	+ Intel, LG, Huawei, HiSilicon, Apple, Qualcomm, Sharp, NEC, CATT, GOHIGH, Samsung, OPPO, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Nokia, NSB

Since the majority view is to not support type1 SL HARQ-ACK codebook with HARQ-ACK bit for multiple resource pools configured with PSFCH in R16, moderator suggest taking option2.

Huawei commented that the type2 codebook with SL HARQ-ACK for multiple resource pools is also not supported because there is no agreement or even discussion in RAN1 on whether/how to report SL HARQ for multiple resource pools on the same PUCCH so far. Moderator would like to know the companies' views on this aspect and raised the Question4 to collect companies’ inputs

### Question4.

**According to your understanding, is type2 SL HARQ-ACK codebook with HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to PSSCH transmission occasions in more than one resource pool configured with PSFCH already supported in R16 spec?**

* **If yes, the option2 is proposed**
	+ **Proposal#1 for option2：Type1 SL HARQ-ACK codebook with HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to PSSCH transmission occasions in more than one resource pool configured with PSFCH is not supported in R16**
* **If no, the following modified option2 is proposed**
	+ **Proposal#2 for modified option2：Type1 and Type2 SL HARQ-ACK codebook with HARQ-ACK bits corresponding to PSSCH transmission occasions in more than one resource pool configured with PSFCH is not supported in R16**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes(proposal#1) or no(proposal#2) |  Comment |
| LG | No | According to the clause 16.5.2.1 in TS38.213, a single set of PSFCH period, minimum time gap between PSSCH and PSFCH is used to determine the set of PDCCH monitoring occasions for which the UE transmits HARQ-ACK information in a same PUCCH in slot n.- a value of a period of PSFCH resources provided in *sl-PSFCH-Period*;- a value of a minimum time gap provided in *sl-MinTimeGapPSFCH*. |
| MediaTek | No. | Since there is no clear agreement about the case of the multiple resource pools, Option 2 is preferred for alignment between Type 1 and Type 2 cases. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Preference: YesAcceptable: No |  |
| Samsung | No | Since there was no clear agreement on multiple RP case, we prefer to understand the situation as not support multiple RP, especially considering potential technical impact, e.g. miss detection, in the late stage. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | As the comments in our first round reply, there is no definite conclusion to support multiplexing SL HARQ from different RPs in the same PUCCH, and a functionality enhancement is not preferred at this CR stage either. So we think Type-2 HARQ codebook does not correspond to multiple resource pools as well.  |
| OPPO | NO |  |
| Sharp | No |  |
| Apple | No | There is no explicit agreement of supporting it for multiple resource pools.  |

Regarding Question3# on option2, companies’ views are summarized as below

* + Prefer RAN1 conclusion without spec change: 6 companies
		- LG, Sharp, NEC, CATT, GOHIGH, OPPO
	+ Prefer RAN1 spec clarification: 5 companies
		- vivo, Huawei, HiSilicon, Nokia, NSB
	+ Either conclusion or spec clarification: 9 companies
		- ASUSTeK, Apple, Qualcomm, Samsung, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, DOCOMO, Huawei, HiSilicon(if the majority view is to have a conclusion)

Regarding the need for a RAN1 CR, 6 companies prefer to have a conclusion in the Chairman note, 5 companies prefer to have a CR to make the specification clearer, and two of them are also open to have a conclusion if this is the majority view. 9 companies are fine with either way. Considering that no company showed strong concerns about having a CR, moderator suggest clarifying this aspect in the spec to avoid confusion and revisiting it at a future meeting. Two draft CRs are uploaded in the draft folder. Moderator has also copied the changes for discussion. Please provide your comments in the table below.

**Note: The first draft CR is for proposal#1 and the second draft CR is for proposal#2. Only one of them may be agreed, depending on which proposal is approved.**

### Draft CR for proposal1(option2 for type1 codebook):

Note: This draft CR is for proposal#1[option2] where only type1 CB is concluded to not support HARQ-ACK reporting for multiple pools. If proposal#1 is approved, this draft CR should be considered.

==========draft CR start==========

16.5.1 Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook determination

This clause applies if the UE is configured with *pdsch-HARQ-ACK-Codebook = semi-static*.

===omitted===

within a set of occasions for candidate PSSCH transmissions with corresponding PSFCH reception occasions as determined in clause 16.5.1.1, the UE determines a HARQ-ACK codebook only for the PSFCH reception occasion associated with PSSCH transmissions scheduled by DCI format 3\_0 or only for the PSFCH reception occasion associated with PSSCH transmissions corresponding to a SL configured grant according to corresponding set of occasions, where a value of a counter SAI in DCI format 3\_0 is according to Table 16.5.2.1-1. Otherwise, the procedures in clause 16.5.1.1 and in clause 16.5.1.2 for a HARQ-ACK codebook determination apply.

A UE does not expect to be provided a PUCCH resource or a PUSCH resource to multiplex HARQ-ACK information corresponding to candidate PSSCH transmissions with corresponding PSFCH reception occasions from more than one sidelink resource pools.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Support or not |  Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | Question | If we agree the 2nd correction below, why also this correction is needed? I understand texts are bit different, but it seems that the 2nd one cover the 1st correction.[moderator reply]If proposal1 is agreed, then this change need to be considered. if proposal2 is agreed, then the change below should be considered.For clarification, I have added some notes before the draft CR |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

### Draft CR for proposal2(modified option2 for both type1 and type2 codebook):

Note: This draft CR is for proposal#2[modified option2] and is to clarify that neither type 1 nor t type 2 CB supports HARQ-ACK reporting for multiple resource pools. If proposal#2 is approved, this draft CR should be considered.

==========draft CR start==========

16.5 UE procedure for reporting HARQ-ACK on uplink

===omitted===

A UE does not expect to multiplex HARQ-ACK information for more than one SL configured grants in a same PUCCH.

A UE does not expect to to be provided a PUCCH resource or a PUSCH resource to multiplex HARQ-ACK information corresponding to more than one sidelink resource pools.

A priority value of a PUCCH transmission with one or more sidelink HARQ-ACK information bits is the smallest priority value for the one or more HARQ-ACK information bits.

In the following, the CRC for DCI format 3\_0 is scrambled with a SL-RNTI or a SL-CS-RNTI.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Support or not |  Comment |
| LG | Generally fine | Alternatively, we can borrow following expressionA UE does not expect to be provided a PUCCH resource~~s~~ or a PUSCH resource~~s~~ to report HARQ-ACK information ~~that start earlier than~~  for more than one sidelink resource pools. |
| MediaTek | OK w/ wording fine-tuning.Or just RAN1 conclusion. | Similar wording can be used for alignment w/ SL configured grant case. And it seems PUSCH resource is missing for SL configured grant case. So the change is as below:*“A UE does not expect to multiplex HARQ-ACK information for more than one SL configured grants in a same PUCCH or PUSCH resource.* A UE does not expect to multiplex HARQ-ACK information corresponding to the multiple resource pools in a same PUCCH or PUSCH resource.”  |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK | If correction text is controversial, just conclusion would be better. |
| Samsung | Generally fine | The revised wording from MTK seems fine for us. |
| moderator |  | I have made some refinement on top of LG and MTK’s suggestion.Regarding MTK’s changes on CG case, since it is not directly related to the discussed issue, I suggest leave it to next meeting.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not needed | It seems current spec has been already reflected as a single resource pool manner.For type-1, parameters such as refers to single resource pool. Also clarified by LG, PSFCH period, minimum time gap etc. are also represented within a single RP for type-2 codebook. So we do not think the CR is needed.Since this is not an essential issue and 6 companies (seems majority view) prefer not to have a CR, we think only capturing a conclusion in chair’s note is enough. |
| OPPO | NO | Prefer to have RAN1 conclusion only, the current spec on SL HARQ reporting has already implied that only one resource pool with PSFCH is supported.  |
| Sharp | No | Agree with other companies that the single pool restriction can already be derived from the current specification. A RAN1 conclusion is sufficient. |
| Ericsson | Support | We are supportive of the latest version of the draft CR. |

**Reference**

1. R1-2107977, Correction on HARQ reporting for multiple pools with PSFCH, vivo
2. R1-2108112, Discussion on Type-1 HARQ codebook regarding multiple resource pools, ASUSTeK

**Appendix1: Option1.proposed changes in [1]**

16.5.1.1 Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook in physical uplink control channel

====Omitted====

For the set of slot timing values, the UE determines a set of occasions for candidate PSSCH transmissions with corresponding PSFCH reception occasions according to the following pseudo-code.

Set - index of occasion for candidate PSSCH transmissions with corresponding PSFCH reception occasions

Set

Set C to the cardinality of set

Set – index of slot timing values , in descending order of the slot timing values, in set

Set to the number of resource pools containing PSFCH in the set of resource pools provided by *sl-TxPoolScheduling*

Set – index of resource pool, in ascending order of the sidelink resource pool id provided by *sl-ResourcePoolID* of resource pool, in the set of resource pool containing PSFCH

while

Set to the value of the period of PSFCH transmission occasion resources for the sidelink resource pool

while C

if

Set – index of a SL slot within an UL slot

while

if slot starts at a same time as or after a slot for an active UL BWP change on the PCell and slot is before the slot for the active UL BWP change on the PCell

;

else

if slot belongs to the sidelink resource pool and includes PSFCH resources as indicated by a sidelink resource pool bitmap and *sl-PSFCH-Period*, where is the *k*-th slot timing value in set

Set – index of a SL slot within an PSFCH period

while

;

;

;

end while

end if

;

end if

end while

end if

;

end while

;

end while

**Appendix2: Option2.proposed changes in [2]**

|  |
| --- |
| 16.5.1.1 Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook in physical uplink control channelIf a UE is provided a set of sidelink resource pool bitmaps, where sidelink resource pool bitmaps are placed in the set according to an ascending order of a sidelink resource pool index, the UE generates a Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook for sidelink resource pool bitmap in the set of sidelink resource pool bitmaps separately in the following pseudo-code. The UE concatenates the HARQ-ACK codebook generated for each sidelink resource pool bitmap in the set of sidelink resource pool bitmaps according to an ascending order of the sidelink resource pool index to obtain a total number of  HARQ-ACK information bits.For a SL BWP on a serving cell and an active UL BWP on the primary cell, as described in Clause 12, a UE determines a set of occasions for candidate PSSCH transmissions with corresponding PSFCH reception occasions for which the UE can multiplex corresponding HARQ-ACK information in a PUCCH transmission in slot . The determination is based on:a) a set of slot timing values associated with the SL BWP where is provided by *sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH* for DCI format 3\_0 or by *sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH-CG-Type1*b) the ratio between the sidelink SCS configuration and the uplink SCS configuration provided by *subcarrierSpacing* in *BWP-Sidelink* and *BWP-Uplink* for the SL BWP and the active UL BWP, respectivelyc) a set of sidelink resource pool bitmapsd) a value of a period of PSFCH transmission occasion resources for a sidelink resource pool provided by a respective *sl-PSFCH-Period*For the set of slot timing values, the UE determines a set of occasions for candidate PSSCH transmissions with corresponding PSFCH reception occasions according to the following pseudo-code. Set - index of occasion for candidate PSSCH transmissions with corresponding PSFCH reception occasionsSet Set C to the cardinality of set Set – index of slot timing values , in descending order of the slot timing values, in set Set to the value of the period of PSFCH transmission occasion resources for the sidelink resource poolwhile C if Set – index of a SL slot within an UL slotwhile if slot starts at a same time as or after a slot for an active UL BWP change on the PCell and slot is before the slot for the active UL BWP change on the PCell ; else if slot belongs to the sidelink resource pool and includes PSFCH resources as indicated by a sidelink resource pool bitmap and *sl-PSFCH-Period*, where is the *k*-th slot timing value in set Set – index of a SL slot within an PSFCH periodwhile ; ;;end whileend if;end ifend whileend if;end while |