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1. **Proposals for Monday’s GTW (August 16th)**

After reviewing contributions submitted in this meeting, I observed that companies’ views on supporting inter-UE coordination information for each scheme (see below) are not so much changed compared to the situation at the last meeting.

* Type(s) of inter-UE coordination information
  + In scheme 1,
    - Preferred and non-preferred resource set
      * [Huawei,1] [Mitsubishi,3] [Spreadtrum,5] [CATT,9] [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [NEC,13] [Panasonic,18] [Qualcomm,19] [CMCC,20] [ETRI,21] [MediaTeK,22] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Apple,26] [ZTE,27] [Sharp,28] [DCM,29] [CEWiT,35] [Xiaomi,30] [Lenovo/Motorola Mobility] (**21** companies)
    - Preferred resource set only
      * [vivo,4] [Samsung,8] (**2** companies)
    - Non-preferred resource set only
      * [OPPO,17] [Ericsson,36] (**2** companies)
  + In scheme 2,
    - Presence of potential resource conflict and detected resource conflict
      * [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [Qualcomm,19] [ETRI,21] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] [Xiaomi,30] [CEWiT,35] [Ericsson,36] [Lenovo/Motorola Mobility, 14] (**12** companies)
    - Presence of potential resource conflict only
      * [Mitsubishi,3] [vivo,4] [LG,23] [Samsung,8] [CATT,9] [Panasonic,18] [ZTE,27] [Sharp,28] [InterDigital,33] (**9** companies)

To be specific, in scheme 1, majority companies support both preferred resource set and non-preferred resource set. So, I put the last proposal suggested at the last meeting as Option 1, which has the 1st priority from FL’s perspective. However, considering the case in which it is difficult to agree on Option 1, I prepare another proposal as Option 2, which has the 2nd priority from FL’s perspective. To be specific, in Option 2, one signalling is used to send inter-UE coordination information informing UE-B of a resource to be excluded from its resource selection, but UE-A could use “preferred resource set” or “non-preferred resource set” to generate the information.

In scheme 2, there is no clear majority to support detected resource conflict indication. So, I list up two alternative options for scheme 2. One is to support both expected/potential resource conflict indication and detected resource conflict indication, which has the 1st priority from FL’s perspective. The other is to support only expected/potential resource conflict indication, which has the 2nd priority from FL’s perspective.

**Regarding this topic**, **RAN1 already had the lengthy discussion at the last meeting, but failed to make the conclusion. I don’t think that having additional email discussion can make any meaningful progress. Also without the relevant conclusion, it is not possible to agree the details to support the feature of inter-UE coordination in Mode 2. So, I ask Chairman to make a decision on Draft Proposal 1/2 in Monday’s GTW session**.

***Draft proposal 1:***

***Option 1 with 1st preference from FL’s point of view****:*

* *For scheme 1, the following inter-UE coordination information signalling from UE-A is supported. FFS details including condition(s)/scenario(s) under which each information is enabled to be sent by UE-A and used by UE-B.*
  + *Set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
  + *Set of resources non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
  + *FFS: Whether in one signalling instance of coordination information, UE-A sends one type of resources (either preferred or non-preferred)*
  + *FFS: Whether information for another resource set can be implicitly derived from signalling of information for a specific resource set*
  + *Note that this implies that RAN1 decides no further down-selection between the preferred resource set and the non-preferred resource set in the following FFS point (marked with grey) of agreement made in RAN1#104bis-e meeting.*

|  |
| --- |
| *Agreement made in RAN1#104bis-e meeting:*   * *Support the following schemes of inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *Inter-UE Coordination Scheme 1:*      - *The coordination information sent from UE-A to UE-B is the set of resources preferred and/or non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*       * *FFS details including a possibility of down-selection between the preferred resource set and the non-preferred resource set, whether or not to include any additional information other than indicating time/frequency of the resources within the set in the coordination information*     - *FFS condition(s) in which Scheme 1 is used*   + *Inter-UE Coordination Scheme 2:*      - *The coordination information sent from UE-A to UE-B is the presence of expected/potential and/or detected resource conflict on the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI*       * *FFS details including a possibility of down-selection between the expected/potential conflict and the detected resource conflict*     - *FFS condition(s) in which Scheme 2 is used* |

***Option 2 with 2nd preference from FL’s point of view****:*

* *For scheme 1, the following inter-UE coordination information signalling from UE-A is supported. FFS details including condition(s)/scenario(s) under which each information is enabled to be sent by UE-A and used by UE-B.*
  + *A set of resources is indicated in the inter-UE coordination information. UE-B excludes in its resource selection the resources in the set.* 
    - *The set indicated in the inter-UE coordination information is the set of non-preferred resources determined by UE-A or the complementary set of preferred resources determined by UE-A.*

***Draft Proposal 2:***

***Option 1 with 1st preference from FL’s point of view:***

* *For scheme 2, the following inter-UE coordination information signalling from UE-A is supported. FFS details including condition(s)/scenario(s) under which each information is enabled to be sent by UE-A and used by UE-B*
  + *Presence of expected/potential resource conflict on the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI*
  + *Presence of detected resource conflict on the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI*
  + *Note that this implies that RAN1 decides no further down-selection between the expected/potential conflict and the detected resource conflict in the following FFS point (marked with grey) of agreement made in RAN1#104bis-e meeting.*

|  |
| --- |
| *Agreement made in RAN1#104bis-e meeting:*   * *Support the following schemes of inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *Inter-UE Coordination Scheme 1:*      - *The coordination information sent from UE-A to UE-B is the set of resources preferred and/or non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*       * *FFS details including a possibility of down-selection between the preferred resource set and the non-preferred resource set, whether or not to include any additional information other than indicating time/frequency of the resources within the set in the coordination information*     - *FFS condition(s) in which Scheme 1 is used*   + *Inter-UE Coordination Scheme 2:*      - *The coordination information sent from UE-A to UE-B is the presence of expected/potential and/or detected resource conflict on the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI*       * *FFS details including a possibility of down-selection between the expected/potential conflict and the detected resource conflict*     - *FFS condition(s) in which Scheme 2 is used* |

***Option 2 with 2nd preference from FL’s point of view:***

* *For scheme 2, the following inter-UE coordination information signalling from UE-A is supported. FFS details including condition(s)/scenario(s) under which each information is enabled to be sent by UE-A and used by UE-B*
  + *Presence of expected/potential resource conflict on the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI*

1. **Email discussion after Monday’s GTW (August 16th)**

**2.1 Conditions for UE(s) to be UE-A(s) and/or UE-B(s)**

During a few meetings, the conditions for UE(s) to be UE-A(s) and/or UE-B(s) have been discussed, but have not been concluded since companies have divergent views. I think that one way to overcome this difficulty is to discuss the condition(s) that UE(s) become UE-A(s) and/or UE-B(s), assuming a situation in which a technique supported by majority companies is applied. According to the submitted contributions in this meeting, as majority companies support request-based inter-UE coordination information transmission for scheme 1, I prepare Draft Proposal 3 for the condition(s) that UE(s) become UE-A(s) and/or UE-B(s) under the assumption that this technique is applied. For scheme 2, as majority companies proposed that UE-A transmits inter-UE coordination information after observing resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B, I prepare Draft Proposal 4 for the condition(s) that UE(s) become UE-A(s).

**I ask companies to provide inputs on the following two questions below. The deadline for companies to provide inputs is August 17th 11:59am UTC. To prepare/make more stable draft proposals before the start of Wednesday’s GTW session (August 18th), it would be highly appreciated if companies make comments as soon as possible. Also to make progress more efficiently, I would like to encourage companies to directly provide “revised wording” or “new wording needed to be added”.**

**Question 1**: Do you agree Draft Proposal 3 for scheme 1?

***Draft Proposal 3****:*

* *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*
  + *A UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information and can be UE-B*
    - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*
  + *A UE that received a request from UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B* 
    - *FFS: Details including* 
      * *Whether UE-A that received a request from UE-B always sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*
      * *Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request*
      * *Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with or without receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*
  + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*
    - *FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*
  + *FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | In our understanding, the following is still FFS in this proposal.   * non-request-based approach * UE-A is not a destination UE of UE-B’s transmission.   If correct, we are supportive of this proposal. |
| Qualcomm | No | The proposal is specific to request-based schemes and excludes event-based schemes. It is also more suited for the scheme with preferred resources than non-preferred resources. Our results show that event-based schemes have lower latency and provide better gain in many scenarios.  We propose the following   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *At least when preferred resources are indicated:*     - *A UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information and can be UE-B*       * *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*       * *FFS: Whether the request is dynamic and/or semi-static*     - *A UE that received a request from UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*        * *FFS: Details including*          + *Whether UE-A that received a request from UE-B always sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*         + *Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request*         + *Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with or without receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*     - *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*       * *FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*     - *FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures*   + At least when non-preferred resources are indicated:     - A UE sends inter-UE coordination messages when conditions are met and becomes a UE-A:       * FFS: Details, including conditions to transmit inter-UE coordination information.     - A UE that receives the coordination information becomes a UE-B     - It is supported that any UE-A can be a UE-A |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Yes | We are supportive of the FL proposal. Below are few comments on the FL proposal for consideration   * Conditions of sending a request can be left to UE implementation. * Periodic reporting of inter-coordination message should be supported   UE-A after encountering consecutive TB failure may transmit the inter-UE coordination message which can be an example for the non-request based inter-UE coordination information |
| Futurewei | See comments | UE-B triggering the inter-UE coordination can be one option. Inter-UE coordination can also be configured by higher layer semi-statistically, without explicitly triggering. On the other hand, UE-A can also send request for inter-UE coordination. In public safety, e.g., a fire scene, and truck platooning cases, the chief commander and the leading truck, as UE-A’s, can send the inter-UE request to the transmit UEs when they are either receivers of UE-B or not the receivers of UE-B. We also propose to the last FFS shall be one of the options.  So we propose to revise the proposal as   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information and can be UE-B or UE-A*     - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received a request from UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including*        * *Whether UE-A that received a request from UE-B always sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*       * *Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request*       * *Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with or without receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received a request from the UE-A can be UE-B and receive the inter-UE coordination information from UE-A*     - *FFS: Details*   + *Inter-UE coordination can be configured by high layer semi-statically*   + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*     - *FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*   + *~~FFS:~~ It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures* |
| InterDigital | Yes with comments | We support the FL proposal in principle. Few comments from our side:   * It would be clearer if 1st bullet that the request based Scheme 1 is supported in all cast types, because the FFS of “in which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B” seems to presume all cast types are supported already   When all cast types can be supported, a broadcast transmission involve many destination UEs and conditions of sending such a request can be quite different from a unicast or groupcast. Therefore, we’d prefer to change it to e.g., “FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request for each supported cast type is specified or up to UE implementation” to take cast type into consideration accordingly. |
| Samsung | See comments | At first, we think that this proposal can be applied not only for Scheme 1 but also for Scheme 2. In our understanding, the intension for Proposal 3 and 4 is to decide whether UE-A can be any UE or intended receiver from UE-B. Our preference is that UE-A can only be an intended receiver of UE-B. We think that it not good idea to connect this issue for two schemes of inter-UE coordination since details for managing two schemes were not decided yet. For example, according to current proposal 3 and 4, may UE-A need to send the coordination information at the same time for Scheme1 and Scheme2? Considering the remaining time for this WI, we think that a common design should be considered rather than introducing separate design for each scheme. |
| ZTE | Yes | We are supportive of this proposal. And updates as below are also preferred:  In general, for the 1st bullet, in our view, at least the UE implementation based solution should be supported and whether to define additional condition can be FFS.   * + *At least, a UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information up to its own implementation and can be UE-B*      - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified ~~or up to UE implementation~~* |
| Vivo | Yes, with minor wording change | Event-triggered based coordination transmission and periodic coordination transmission is FFS based on the proposal. Then the following bullet should be sub-bullet of the main bullet.   * + - * *Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request*   We also think such mechanism is at least applied to scheme 1 preferred resource; for non-preferred resource, we are free for further discussion. |
| Intel | Yes with comments | It is important to support scenario when UE-A shares inter-UE coordination information without dedicated request based on pre-defined conditions.  ***Draft Proposal 3****:*   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE sends inter-UE coordination information based on pre-configured conditions can be UE-A*     - *FFS conditions to initiate transmission of inter-UE coordination information*   + *A UE that received inter-UE coordination information from UE-A and takes it into account for resource allocation can be UE-B without prior transmission of a request for inter-UE coordination information*   + *A UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information and can be UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received a request from UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*      - *FFS: Details including*        * *Whether UE-A that received a request from UE-B always sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*       * *~~Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request~~*       * *Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with ~~or without~~ receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*     - *FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*   + *~~FFS:~~ It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A ~~when higher layer(s) configures~~* |
| Fujitsu | Yes with comments | 1. The 3rd and 4th sub-bullet should be under the umbrella of the 2nd sub-bullet since the whole proposal is for the request-based inter-UE coordination scheme.  2. “*Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with or without receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*” belongs to the 2nd level FFS. Currently, we may only focus on the 1st level FFS and delete this sentence.  3. “*Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request*” should be parallel with the 1st and 2nd sub-bullet since it is not for the request-based inter-UE coordination scheme.  The suggested modifications are summarized as follows.   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information and can be UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received a request from UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*      - *FFS: Details including*        * *Whether UE-A that received a request from UE-B always sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*       * *~~Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request~~*       * *~~Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with or without receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation~~*     - *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*       * *FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*     - *FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures*   + *FFS: Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request* |
| Panasonic | Yes | For scheme 1, UE-A should know whether UE-B needs resource or not. It is similar to a scheduling request in Uu. If this information is not available to UE-A, UE-A does not allocate the resource and does not know how much the resource needs to be allocated. Therefore, UE-B needs to trigger the request to UE-A |
| CMCC |  | We share similar views as other companies that non-request-based solution based on pre-defined conditions is also a big part of UE-A sending inter-UE coordination information, especially for the non-preferred set of resources.  In our understanding, the current proposal includes this solution in the bullets under the FFS bullet of the 2nd main bullet. However, we think that putting request-based and non-request-based solution in a parallel way to discuss the determination of UE-A/UE-B is a clearer layout. |
| OPPO | Fine in general, with comments | 1. we suggest to remove the last FFS, if a UE can be configured to be UE-A by higher layer, e.g. a RSU, a lot of new procedures are needed to support the scenario, e.g. UE-A discovery, connection setup between UE-A and UE-B, connection maintenance, etc., it is better not to touch this in Rel-17.  2. UE-A needs traffic characteristics of UE-B (e.g. priority, PDB, periodicity) to determine the coordination information, these information is supposed to be indicated to UE-A in the request signalling, and without the request, UE-A cannot know when UE-B will trigger resource reselection. So we do not think it is reasonable for UE-A to send the coordination information w/o receiving the request.  3. For the 2nd sub-bullet (UE-A determination), UE-A should be a UE received the request AND send the coordination information, if it does not send the coordination information, it is not UE-A.  4. the 1st sub-bullet and the 3rd sub-bullet under “FFS: details including” are relevant and can be merged.  In general we suggest following changes:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE that sends a request for inter-UE coordination information ~~and~~ can be UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received a request from UE-B ~~can be UE-A~~ and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B can be UE-A*     - *FFS: Details including*        * *Whether additional condition(s) needs to be satisfied for the UE~~-A~~ that received a request from UE-B to ~~always~~ send~~s~~ inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B, and if so, Whether the additional condition(s) is specified or up to UE implementation*       * *~~Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request~~*       * *~~Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with or without receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation~~*   + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*     - *FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*   + *~~FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures~~* |
| LG | Yes | In our view, currently, we do not need to mention about this approach is applied to only preferred resource set or non-preferred resource set. This is related to the issue on how to generate the preferred resource set or non-preferred resource set. If UE-A is intended receiver of UE-B, and the non-preferred resource set is determined by slots where UE-A cannot perform SL reception, the request-based coordination is applied to non-preferred resource set as well.  Regarding the condition-triggering coordination scheme, we also supportive of this approach, but it seems that there are divergent views which condition will be used to trigger coordination information transmission. At least, we can list up some candidates as FFS. For instance, coordination information can be transmitted as indicated by higher layers. It will include periodic transmission. |
| Sony | Yes with modification | We are basically OK with the FL proposal with removing “FFS” in the last sub-bullet as follows:   * + *~~FFS:~~ It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures*   We think UE-A should be able to be any UE configured by higher layer signaling. |
| Nokia, NSB | See comments | The current wording is focussed on only the case of scheme 1 based on explicit request by UE-B. The structure should be changed to list both the cases of explicit request by UE-B and other triggers/conditions. We are OK to leave other triggers/conditions as FFS for now. |
| Mitsubishi | Yes with comments | We are generally fine with the direction of this proposal. As other companies, we think that non-request based should not be a sub-bullet of request-based techniques but have its own line in the agreement.  We are not favourable to a split by preferred/non-preferred resource type at this point: having a common framework should be privileged, and if somehow this is not possible, a future split by resource type is already covered by the FFS sub-bullets conditions/details.  We agree with IDC that the wording around the cast types is a bit unclear and that some clarification of the intention is needed. I’m not sure of the best wording, we can further discuss.  We do not think that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B should be UE-A regardless of higher layer(s) configuration. Higher layer configuration can on the other hand be a condition based on which a UE which IS a destination UE of a TB decides to transmit or not coordination information.   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information and can be UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received a request from UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*      - *FFS: Details including*        * *Whether UE-A that received a request from UE-B always sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*       * *~~Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request~~*       * *Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information ~~with or without~~ upon receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *FFS Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request*   + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*     - *~~FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B~~*     - *FFS: Details including whether specific conditions are needed for each supported cast type*   + *~~FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures~~* |
| Xiaomi | Yes / with comment | We are generally fine with FL proposal.  In our understanding, the discussion on case where UE A send inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request should not be a sub-bullet of the 2nd sub-bullet, as the 2nd sub-bullet states clearly that UE-A receives request from UE-B. In addition, we think condition based inter-UE coordination should be further studied. Therefore, we propose to revise the proposal as:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information and can be UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received a request from UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*      - *FFS: Details including*        * *Whether UE-A that received a request from UE-B always sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*       * *~~Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request~~*       * *Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with ~~or without~~ receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*     - *FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*   + *FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures*   + *FFS: Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information based on a condition without receiving UE-B’s request.* |
| CATT, GOHIGH | Yes in principle | We are generally fine with the proposal. We think it would be better to add FFS part on supported cast type in scheme 1, the updated proposal is as following:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information and can be UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received a request from UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*      - *FFS: Details including*        * *Whether UE-A that received a request from UE-B always sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*       * *Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request*       * *Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with or without receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*     - *~~FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B~~*   + *FFS: Supported cast type in scheme 1*   + *FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures* |
| Fraunhofer | Yes, with comments | We are supportive of the FL’s proposal, but it is limited to only explicit triggers or request-based schemes. We also support the inclusion of event-based schemes, as mentioned by Qualcomm and others, where a UE-A detects a potential collision for a transmission by UE-B.  We also are supportive of UE-A not being the receiver for UE-B’s intended transmission, for both the request-based and event-based schemes. For request-based schemes, higher layers should be able to configure UE-B to transmit a request to a UE-A that is not the destination UE for its transmission. For event-based schemes, the UE that detects the collision may not be the intended receiver UE for the transmission by UE-B.  Hence we propose the following:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information and can be UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received a request from UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*      - *FFS: Details including*        * *Whether UE-A that received a request from UE-B always sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*       * *~~Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request~~*       * *~~Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with or without receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation~~*   + *A UE that detected a condition that results in resource collisions for a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*     - * *FFS: Details including the conditions that UE-A detects to trigger sending inter-UE coordination to the UE-B*   + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*     - *FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*   + *~~FFS:~~ It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures* |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | This proposal seems to only agree on the request based procedure. However, event-triggered procedure is also useful in some cases and it has the benefits of reduced signalling overhead. For example, UE-A may transmit the coordinating information to UE-B of its own accord, depending on certain pre-defined conditions, e.g. periodically. Therefore, we suggest to also agree on non-request based, i.e. event-triggered, procedure.  On UE-A determination: In Rel-16, the link establishment for unicast and groupcast is performed at higher layer in TS 23.287. V2X application layer can designate the role of UE-A and UE-B when the link is established. The UE-A does not need to be the intended receiver of UE-B, any UE configured by higher layer can be UE-A, and it can be applied to the both Scheme 1 and Scheme. With the higher layer determining UE-A and UE-B, the extra design complexity can be avoided and the impact to specification can also be minimized. So we propose that “higher layer determination” is the baseline solution, and FFS any restriction in addition to this. As a compromise, we can say that it is possible to restrict higher layers to configuring only a destination UE as a UE-A.  In summary, we propose the following changes in red   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information, or receives inter-UE coordination information, ~~and~~ can be UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received a request from UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B, or UE-A can send inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request*      - *FFS: Details including*        * *Whether UE-A that received a request from UE-B always sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*       * *~~Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request~~*       * *Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with or without receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *~~It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B~~*     - *~~FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B~~*   + *~~FFS:~~ It is supported that any UE ~~which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B~~ can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures*     - *Additional restriction can be applied, including that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B* |
| Ericsson | No | Some comments and proposed modifications to the proposal:  In our view, we do not need the three sub-bullets in the FFS. The last one of them covers the two previous ones. We suggest keeping only the last FFS bullet in order to make the discussion easier without deleting any option.  For the last FFS, we propose to remove it.   * In our view for scheme 1 it is not feasible that a UE that it is not a destination UE of the TB can send the coordination message. Based on the agreements, the payload of the coordination message is expected to be non-negligible (preferred or non-preferred set of resources). Therefore, allowing any UE to send this coordination message could lead to congestion in the system without a clear benefit.   Sending the scheme 1 coordination message without previous enquiry is not an optimal scheme. Since scheme 1 is intended to be mostly as an optimization/assistance information, e.g., in addition to the own sensing results from the UE, sending it without previous enquiry could lead to a waste of resources since the UE-B can discard the information in the coordination message (since it was not expecting it or does not need it). |
| Spreadtrum | Yes with comments | We are generally OK with the proposal. We have similar view with many companies. Non-request-based is also important for scheme 1, but the current proposal mainly focus on request-based. So, we propose the following changes:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information and can be UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including whether the condition of sending a request is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received a request from UE-B can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*      - *FFS: Details including*        * *Whether UE-A that received a request from UE-B always sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*       * *~~Whether there is a case where UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request~~*       * *~~Whether the condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with or without receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation~~*   + *UE-A sends inter-UE coordination information without receiving UE-B’s request*     - * *FFS: Details including the conditions that trigger UE-A to send inter-UE coordination to UE-B.*   + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*     - *FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*   + *FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A when higher layer(s) configures* |
| Apple |  | 1. For the first FFS, we prefer to make it general, since there are several aspects to be discussed, including what is the signaling of the request, the condition of sending the request, etc. Hence, we propose to change to  “*FFS: Details including the condition of sending a request, the signaling of a request”* or simply “*FFS: Details*”  2. For the second FFS, we think the second and the third sub-bullets do not fit in, since it is against the assumption in the second bullet (“*A UE that received a request from UE-B…”*). Also, we prefer not to specify the details here. In other words, we prefer to remove all the three sub-bullets here. |
| CEWiT | Yes | We support modified proposals by Intel. Further we feel that trigerring for inter-coordination should also be based on cast type i.e weather based on request from UE-B or based on pre-defined condition . |
| Convida Wireless |  | We share similar views as other companies that implicit or condition-based approach that is not based on explicit request signal should also be considered for UE-A sending inter-UE coordination information to UE B and should also be considered for deciding UE A and UE B. |

**Question 2**: Do you agree Draft Proposal 4 for scheme 2?

***Draft Proposal 4****:*

* *In scheme 2, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*
  + *Any capable UE that detects resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B*
    - *FFS: Details including*
      * *Definition of resource conflict, e.g.,*
        + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*
        + *UE-B is a destination UE of other UE whose reserved resource(s) overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*
      * *Whether to define additional condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s), e.g.,* 
        + *a UE receives a request from UE-B*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes with modifications | Based on the last sub-bullet, condition to be UE-A is still FFS. In that sense, ‘any capable UE’ is not good. In addition, ‘resource conflict’ should be clarified sufficiently. Therefore, the following update is preferable.   * + *~~Any~~ A capable UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B* |
| Qualcomm | Yes with comment | We’d like to remove the examples from the proposal. This can all be addressed as part of FFS details.   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *Any capable UE that detects resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including*       * *Definition of resource conflict, ~~e.g.,~~*         + *~~RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold~~*         + *~~UE-B is a destination UE of other UE whose reserved resource(s) overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time~~*       * *Whether to define additional condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s), ~~e.g.,~~*          + *~~a UE receives a request from UE-B~~* |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | no | On the definition of resource conflict one additional condition should be considered: the time gap between two SCIs whose reserved resources are overlapping should be smaller than the processing delay. If not, the resource conflict can be addressed by pre-emption checking.  ***Modified Draft Proposal 4****:*   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *Any capable UE that detects resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including*       * *Definition of resource conflict, e.g.,*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*         + T*he time gap between SCIs whose reserved resources are overlapping is smaller than the processing delay*         + *UE-B is a destination UE of other UE whose reserved resource(s) overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*       * *Whether to define additional condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s), e.g.,*          + *a UE receives a request from UE-B* |
| Futurewei | Yes with comments | We are general fine with the proposal. For FFS, we may include the half-duplex as resource conflict.   * + - *FFS: Details including*       * *Definition of resource conflict, e.g.,*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*         + *UE-B is a destination UE of other UE whose reserved resource(s) overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*         + *UE-A as a receiver of UE-B has a resource conflict due to the uplink or other sidelink transmissions*       * *Whether to define additional condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s), e.g.,*          + *a UE receives a request from UE-B* |
| InterDigital | No | We support the proposal in principle. However, while it spells out in the proposal that any capable UE can become a UE-A upon a detected conflict based on at least the exemplary conflict definition, the definition in this scenario regarding which UE becoming UE-B is missing. In our view, it is critical to clarify for Scheme 2 which UE becomes UE-B, but the proposal seems to indicate UE-B is already determined prior to the conflict detection.  We consider it difficult to support the scenario in which a UE who is not intended RX UE of any UE-Bs to become a UE-A, e.g., when a UE detect a conflict in sensing between two UEs and this UE is not the intended RX UE of either detected UEs. If any such UE is allowed to become a UE-A and send an indication message to either detected UE, it could cause large overhead and in addition, this conflict detection may likely be already performed by another UE who is the intended RX UE of either detected UE. Without such a priori UE-B definition, a UE-A will perform brute force conflict detection over all resources, which we consider not as the purpose of Scheme 2.  Therefore, for Scheme 2, we suggest to start with a scenario in which a UE becomes UE-A when it is an intended RX UE from a UE-B and upon conflict detection based on this UE-B’s SCI, the UE-A can find another UE with conflicting reservation and the detected UE becomes another UE-B in the sense that the UE-A can send indication to either UE-B. In addition, a UE-B should have certain capability to act on indication received from UE-A in Scheme 2.  In addition, about the definition of resource conflict, we prefer to include further definitions when UE-A is the intended RX UE into consideration. For example, the conditions include UE-A’s resource(s) for SL and/or UL transmissions overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time and UE-A’s resource(s) for SL reception from another UE overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI. |
| Samsung | No | See our comment in Proposal 3. Our preference is that UE-A can only be an intended receiver of UE-B. If any capable UE may report the coordination message when collision is detected, it will introduce huge overhead and decrease overall system performance. |
| ZTE | Yes with modification | Actually this proposal seems not be strong since all details are FFS.  W.r.t the description of this first sub-bullet, we are negative to enable “any capable UE” to be UE-A since it will lead to complicated mechanism for reporting design including conflict resolving among different reports.  The updated version from DCM can be compromise and following description for scheme-1 should also be applied for scheme-2 as baseline since if the 2rd party UE may not share same understanding due the location difference.   * + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*     - *FFS: In which cast type UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*   One additional part is that we can remove the “~~e.g., …~~” to avoid the potential “implication”. |
| vivo | Yes in principle | The example for resource conflict should be deleted. |
| Intel | Yes, with comments | If there is no intention to define definition of sidelink conflicts then we prefer to remove examples, otherwise let’s discuss one by one.  Scheme-2 should operate based on request otherwise inter-UE coordination information can be provided but not considered by UE-B.  ***Draft Proposal 4****:*   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *Any UE that performs TB transmission and requests inter-UE coordination information can be UE-B*   + *Any capable UE that detects resource conflict(s) on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B*     - *FFS: ~~Details including~~*       * *Additional condition(s) for transmission of inter-UE coordination information*       * *Definition of resource conflict(s)*       * *, ~~e.g.,~~*         + *~~RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold~~*         + *~~UE-B is a destination UE of other UE whose reserved resource(s) overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time~~*       * *~~Whether to define additional condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s), e.g.,~~*          + *~~a UE receives a request from UE-B~~* |
| Fujitsu | No | 1. Do not support 2nd example in the definition of resource conflict. In our view, the possibility of using inter-UE coordination for 2nd example is very small. If UE B and UE C have a half duplex issue on the resources reserved by prior SCIs, UE B can identify and avoid the issue based on the prior SCIs but not by using inter-UE coordination. One case which may benefit from inter-UE coordination could be that UE B and UE C have half duplex issues on the prior SCIs and have half duplex issues on the resources reserved by prior SCIs. However, the possibility that half duplex happens to more than one TX resource of two UEs is very small.  2. In the 1st example, the relationship of priorities in SCIs of UE-B and other UE is missing.  3. It better be clarified that the proposal is for Scheme 2 with expected/potential resource conflict indication.  The suggested modifications are summarized as follows.   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *Any capable UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including*       * *Definition of resource conflict, e.g.,*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold, and the priority of other UE is higher than that of UE-B*         + *~~UE-B is a destination UE of other UE whose reserved resource(s) overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time~~*       * *Whether to define additional condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s), e.g.,*          + *a UE receives a request from UE-B* |
| Panasonic | Yes, with modification | Agree with DOCOMO’s modification. In addition, whether UE-A knows the capability of UE-B or not should be clarified. If UE-B has no capability of inter UE coordination and UE-A send inter UE coordination, UE-B doesn’t aware the inter UE coordination. |
| CMCC | No | In our view, Scheme 2 works better when UE-A is among the destination of UE-B. If UE-A is any UE that is capable of detecting resource conflicts on resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI, then my concerns would be, how does UE-A know that an identified conflict will impact the UE-B’s transmission? For example, suppose that UE-A detects resource conflict between UE-B and UE-C on a resource. In this case, if UE-B intends to use this resource to communicate with UE-C, then half-duplex issue happens; otherwise, if UE-B and UE-C use the same resource to communicate with its own receiver, which maybe far away from each other, no problem on this conflict. However, if UE-A is a third-party UE, how does UE-A recognize that the conflict belongs to which case? |
| OPPO | Fine in general, with comments | Similar as that in Scheme 1, UE-A should be a UE that sends the coordination information.   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *Any capable UE that detects resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI ~~can be UE-A~~ and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B can be UE-A*     - *FFS: Details including*       * *Definition of resource conflict, e.g.,*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*         + *UE-B is a destination UE of other UE whose reserved resource(s) overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*       * *Whether to define additional condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s), e.g.,*          + *a UE receives a request from UE-B* |
| LG | Yes | We are fine to remove the examples. It will be handled in the next proposals. In addition, we prefer to add some FFS for the conditions to be UE-B in scheme 2. |
| Sony | Yes | We are OK with the FL proposal. But on FFS part, we are fine with Qualcomm’s update to make a progress. |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes, with additions | * + - * *Whether to define additional condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s), e.g.,*          + *a UE receives a request from UE-B*         + *RSRP value measured on UE-B’s SCI (or distance from UE-B)*         + *UE density (e.g., number of UEs within a predefined range/distance of the UE detecting the resource conflict)*   In high-density scenarios (e.g., a traffic jam), allowing every capable UE to indicate a resource conflict may lead to many UEs transmitting a conflict indication. If the PSFCH symbol is used for Scheme 2 (which seems likely), even if the Scheme 2 transmissions add up in an SFN manner (i.e., they don’t interfere with each other), this may lead to conflicts with legacy PSFCH transmissions for SL HARQ-ACK indication (e.g., PSFCH TX/RX conflicts or PSFCH TX/TX conflicts). Thus, a mechanism to dampen Scheme 2 under high UE density might be beneficial.  The examples under “Definition of resource conflict” can be removed, since there is anyway a separate question to discuss this aspect in more detail. |
| Mitsubishi | No | For reasons already spelled out by many companies, we do not think that any UE should be allowed to provide coordination info. UE-A should be among the destination UEs of UE-B. Further detail on who is UE-B is also needed. |
| Xiaomi | Yes /comments | We support with FL’s proposal .  The definition of capable UE need to be clarified, from our understanding, a capable UE is a UE that is able to do inter-UE coordination. Is this understanding aglined with FL? |
| CATT, GOHIGH | See comments | First, we share similar views with DCM, the first sub-bullet should be update:  *~~Any~~ A capable UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B*  Before we discuss the details on the resource conflict, it would be better to determine the supported cast type for scheme 2, otherwise it is unclear on the “other UE” in the examples of resource conflict. Therefore, similar as scheme 1, and FFS part on supported cast type is necessary.   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *~~Any~~ A capable UE that detects resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including*       * *Definition of resource conflict, ~~e.g.,~~*         + *~~RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold~~*         + *~~UE-B is a destination UE of other UE whose reserved resource(s) overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time~~*       * *Supported cast type in scheme 2*       * *Whether to define additional condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s), e.g.,*          + *a UE receives a request from UE-B* |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | We are supportive of the FL’s proposal. We are also fine to remove the examples under the definition of resource conflicts. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | If any UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict can be UE-A, then there might be a lot of UE-As for a single UE-B. This would jump ahead of knowing which cast types are supported by scheme 2.  It’s possible that some conflict indications might be inaccurate and cause unnecessary resource re-selection. Therefore, we propose to adopt similar rule as Scheme 1 that the role of UE-A or UE-B can be determined by the V2X application layer and passed to PHY layer.  We suggest to add “expected/potential” prior to “resource conflict” to align with the latest agreement.  The examples under “Definition of resource conflict” are discussed in Proposal 6. So we suggest to remove them to avoid any duplicate discussions.  We suggest to remove the last example, i.e., ”*a UE receives a request from UE-B*”, or companies can further clarify what’s the intended scenario.  In summary, we propose the following changes in red   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *The role of UE-A or UE-B is determined by the V2X application layer and passed to PHY layer.*   + *~~Any capable~~ UE-A that detects expected/potential resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI ~~can be UE-A and~~ send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including*       * *Definition of resource conflict~~, e.g.,~~*         + *~~RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold~~*         + *~~UE-B is a destination UE of other UE whose reserved resource(s) overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time~~*       * *Whether to define additional condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s)~~, e.g.,~~*          + *~~a UE receives a request from UE-B~~*       * *Applicable cast type(s)* |
| Ericsson | Yes, in principle | For the last bullet, we think it is also important to consider limitations for the UEs that can be UE-A based on the following, e.g., distance to the UE-B, measured RSRP, etc...  These limitations are necessary to avoid having UEs transmit the coordination message if they are too far away. |
| Spreadtrum | No | Firstly, it should be clarified that this proposal is for expected/potential resource conflict indication.  Secondly, in the first example of definition of resource conflict, priority condition should also be added which is similar as pre-emption mechanism.  So, we proposal the following changes:   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *Any capable UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B*     - *FFS: Details including*       * *Definition of resource conflict, e.g.,*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold, and the priority of other UE is higher than that of UE-B*         + *UE-B is a destination UE of other UE whose reserved resource(s) overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*       * *Whether to define additional condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s), e.g.,*          + *a UE receives a request from UE-B* |
| Apple |  | 1. For scheme 2, we prefer only the receiver UE can be UE-A. Since the inter-UE coordination in scheme 2 is most likely delivered in feedback channel, it is natural that UE-A is an intended receiver of UE-B to qualify UE-A’s usage of the feedback channel corresponding to UE-B’s PSCCH/PSSCH transmissions.  “*~~Any capable~~Receiver UE that detects resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B……”*  2. In the definition of resource conflict:  “*UE-B is a destination UE of other UE whose reserved resource(s) overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time”* seems to address the half duplex issue at UE-B. However, the half duplex issue at the receiver UE of UE-B’s transmission needs to be considered as well. In this sense, we propose to add one sub-bullet as “*A destination UE of UE-B has scheduled transmission which has time overlap with resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI”* |
| CEWiT | yes | We support the FL’s proposal. We are okay to remove the examples but feels that it will preclude any other possibilities as all are any way FSS. |
| Convida Wireless |  | Some clarification may be needed for the proposal   * + *Any capable UE that detects resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI can be UE-A and send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B*   Regarding capable UE that detects resource conflict, does it imply such UE could be intended receive UE of UE B or non-intended receive UE of UE B? Should it be made more clear in the proposal? |

**2.2 How to determine inter-UE coordination information for each scheme**

During Monday’s GTW session (August 16th), RAN1 agreed to support the following inter-UE coordination information signalling for each scheme.

* Scheme 1
  + Set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission
  + Set of resources non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission
* Scheme 2
  + Presence of expected/potential resource conflict on the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI

From FL’s point of view, further discussion is needed on how inter-UE coordination information is determined in each scheme. One thing I would like to emphasize is that for scheme 1, there should be a difference between “condition(s) for determining preferred resource set” and “condition(s) for determining non-preferred resource set”. Otherwise, from a signalling point of view, there is no need to separate the preferred resource set and the non-preferred resource set.

**I ask companies to provide inputs on the following two questions below. The deadline for companies to provide inputs is August 17th 11:59am UTC. To prepare/make more stable draft proposals before the start of Wednesday’s GTW session (August 18th), it would be highly appreciated if companies make comments as soon as possible. Also to make progress more efficiently, I would like to encourage companies to directly provide “revised wording” or “new wording needed to be added”.**

**Question 1**: Do you agree Draft Proposal 5 for scheme 1?

***Draft Proposal 5****:*

* *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*
  + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
    - *Condition 1-A-1:*
      * *Resource(s) at least except for* 
        + *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*

*FFS: Details*

* + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
    - *Condition 1-B-1:*
      * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception*
        + *FFS: Details*
  + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Comment | It seems that the above direction intends that preferred has the complementary relationship with non-preferred. Whether this view is shared among companies is unclear for us.  If this direction is OK, for example a condition corresponding to condition 1-B-1 should be added to preferred. 1-A-1 to non-preferred is the same.  If this direction is not OK, what is each goal of preferred/non-preferred should be clarified first. |
| Qualcomm | No | In non-preferred resource indication, UE-A’s task is to minimize resource collisions. This is independent of whether UE-A itself can receive or not in that slot.  Separately, we observed in out evaluations that performance significantly improved when utilizing the expected interference level at UE-A as part of selecting preferred resources.  We propose the following update:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) ~~at least except for~~ excluding*         + *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *Reserved resource(s) of other UEs identified by UE-A for which the ratio of the expected RSRP for a transmission from UE-B to the RSRP measured for this reserved resource is below a threshold.*   *FFS: Details*   * + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *~~Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception~~*         + *~~FFS: Details~~*       * *Resources that UE-A has selected for its own initial transmission*         + *FFS Details*     - *Condition 1-B-2:*       * *Resource that other UEs will use for their transmissions.*         + *FFS Details*   + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Yes with comments | We are supportive of the FL proposal and below are few comments for further consideration   * Preferred resource may also comprise of resource set information extracted from candidate resource selection which includes SA whose RSRP level above RSRP threshold. * Non-preferred resource may also comprise of resource set information extracted from candidate resource exclusion that are not part of SA whose RSRP level is below RSRP level   On the RSRP threshold used to determine the preferred/non-preferred resource(s) it should be further studied including a) the RSRP threshold is (pre-)configured or b) the RSRP threshold is indicted by UE-B |
| Futurewei | See comments | For non-preferred resource set, it shall include the case that measured RSRP value on the same reserved resources from other UE is larger a configured threshold. So for the sub-bullet, we propose to add   * + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception*         + *FFS: Details*     - *Condition 1-B-2:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details* |
| InterDigital | Yes | We support the proposal |
| Samsung | See comments | For Scheme 1, we think that Rel-16 mode 2 sensing and resource selection procedure can be reused as much as possible to decide the set of preferred or non-preferred resource. Specifically, Rel-16 sensing and resource selection procedure can generate a set of candidate resource (this can be candidates for preferred) and a set of excluded resource (this can be candidates for non-preferred). So, we suggest to modify the proposal such that:   * *In scheme 1, Rel-16 mode 2 sensing and resource selection procedure is a starting point*   + *A set of identified resource from Rel-16 mode sensing and resource selection procedure becomes the candidate for preferred resource.*     - * *FFS: how to determine a set of preferred resource for signaling*   + *A set of excluded resource from Rel-16 mode sensing and resource selection procedure becomes the candidate for non-preferred resource.*     - * *FFS: how to determine a set of non-preferred resource for signaling*   FFS: additional conditions to decide a set of preferred or non-preferred resources (ex, excluding scheduled UL resources and reserved SL resources for UE-A’s own transmission) |
| ZTE | Comments | In our views, the intention to introduce the preferred resource is to enable the optimized resource feedback from UE-A based on the UE-B’s guidance, including details requirement for future traffic. Then, for condition 1-A-1, following updated version si preferred:   * + - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) satisfying the requirement indicated by UE-B*         + *FFS: details of requirement*         + *FFS: indication signalling*       * *~~Resource at least except for~~*          + *~~Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold~~*   *~~FFS: Details~~* |
| vivo | Yes | For preferred resource, the condition is modified as following, since RSRP threshold may be derived by UE-A based on defined rule. We are also fine to discuss the SINR based condition as proposed by QC.   * + - Condition 1-A-1:       * Resource(s) at least except for         + Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than ~~(pre)configured~~ RSRP threshold |
| Intel | Yes, with comments | Additional conditions to define preferred and non-preferred resource sets are added  ***Draft Proposal 5****:*   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Non-reserved resources*       * *~~Resource(s) at least except for~~*       * *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is below ~~larger~~ than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception*         + *FFS: Details*     - *Condition 1-B-2:*       * *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*         + *FFS: Details*   + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| Fujitsu | No | 1. The proposal is under the assumption that UE-A is the RX UE of UE-B as proposed in draft proposal 3. This should be clarified.  2. Both preferred and non-preferred resources can be determined based on other UE’s reserved resources and UE-A’s TX resources. Therefore, the preferred resources should also exclude the slots determined by the non-monitored slots of UE-A, and the non-preferred resources should also include other UE’s reserved resources. The principle is that UE-B should be able to perform (re)selection based on either preferred resources alone or non-preferred resources alone.  The suggested modifications are summarized as follows.   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information if UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B:*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) at least except for*          + *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *Slot(s) excluded based on UE-A’s non-monitored slot(s)*   *FFS: Details*   * + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception*          + *FFS: Details*       * *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*         + *FFS: Details*   + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| Panasonic | Yes, with comment | We are supportive of the proposal. For condition of preferred resource, when UE-A is receiver UE of UE-B, the resources are selected form UE-A can perform SL reception could be added. |
| CMCC |  | A similar question for clarification, are we precluding other conditions for the UE-A to determine the non-preferred/preferred set of resources?  Regarding the condition 1-A-1, we believe that it also works for UE-A determines non-preferred set of resources. The conditions depend on different detailed solutions. To our understanding, the condition 1-A-1 under preferred set of resources applies for the case when the preferred and non-preferred set of resources are complementary resources. However, there is one possible solution for indicating the non-preferred set of resources is that, UE-A identifies reserved resource(s) of other UE whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold, then the UE-A can forward the SCI carrying the detected reservations, which are non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission. In such a case, the non-preferred set of resources sent by UE-A is not the complementary set of preferred resources. Therefore, we believe that the condition 1-A-1 should also be considered for the non-preferred set of resources. |
| OPPO | Yes | Support the proposal |
| LG | Yes | In our understanding, for the preferred resources, other exception conditions could be added depending on the discussion. In this point of view, the position of “Condition 1-A-1” need to be placed before each exceptional condition to be preferred resource set. |
| Sony | Yes | We are fine with the FL proposal basically. |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes, with changes | * + - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) at least except for*          + *Resources overlapping in time-and-frequency with reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception, if UE-A is an intended recipient of UE-B’s transmission* |
| xiaomi | Yes with comments | *For condition 1-A-1, it is not clear from which set the resource is except for. From our understanding, a candidate resource set would be needed for UE- A to decide the preferred resource set. Therefore, the proposal of condition 1-A-1 is suggested to be revised:*   * + - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s)* ***in a candidate resource set*** *at least except for*          + *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *FFS on the candidate resource set* |
| CATT, GOHIGH | See comments | From our understanding, the UE-A should be an intended receiver of UE-B’s transmission.  Therefore, for the preferred resource set, slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception should be excluded from the preferred resource set.  Since there is a “at least” for the conditions, we don’t broad it too much. The updated proposal is as following:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) at least except for*          + *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - *Condition 1-A-2:*       * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception*         + *FFS: Details*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception*         + *FFS: Details*   + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| Fraunhofer | Yes, with comments | We are supportive of the FL’s proposal, and would like to add conditions for determining the preferred and non-preferred resource set.  For the preferred resource set, any resource that is not reserved by other UE’s received SCIs, and is below the RSRP threshold, should also be considered. In other words, any resource that can be included in the candidate resource set as per Rel-16 should be considered as a preferred resource for UE-B.  For the non-preferred resource set, we also agree that resources reserved by other UEs, or resources that can be excluded in the candidate resource set as per Rel-16, where the measured RSRP is larger than the (pre-)configured threshold should be considered.  Hence we propose the following:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) ~~at least except for~~ identified as candidate resources using Rel-16 sensing and selection procedure*          + *This excludes Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *This excludes resource(s) in non-monitored time slots*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception*         + *FFS: Details*       * *Resource(s) identified to be excluded as candidate resources using Rel-16 sensing and selection procedure*     - *Condition 1-B-2:*       * *Resource(s) reserved by other UEs that overlap with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | For preferred resources, when UE-A determines preferred resources for UE-B’s transmission, UE-B’s traffic requirement should be taken into account.  It would be the scenario that UE-A provides the coordination information for multiple UE-Bs (e.g., RSU, platooning, etc.), thus the resource sets have been selected by UE-A for other UE-B’s transmission should be excluded when UE-A determines the preferred resources.  For non-preferred resources, we assume “from UE-B” needs to be added as below to correctly reflect the intention.  It seems the last FFS is redundant with “*Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*”. So we suggest to remove it. If this FFS has other intentions, it should be clarified first.  In summary, we propose the following changes in red   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) at least except for*          + *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details, including considering UE-B’s traffic requirement*   * + - * + *Resource set selected by UE-A for other UE-Bs’ transmissions*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception from UE-B*         + *FFS: Details*   + *~~FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)~~* |
| Ericsson | Yes, with comments | In the first condition (1-A-1), we propose to add the word “all” to the resources:  All resource(s) at least except for |
| Spreadtrum | No | Firstly, reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A can be used to determine both preferred and non-preferred resources.  Secondly, in condition 1-B-1, “from UE-B” should be added.  So, we proposal the following changes:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) at least except for*          + *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception from UE-B*         + *FFS: Details*     - *Condition 1-B-2:*       * *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*         + *FFS: Details*   + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| Apple |  | For condition 1-B-1, we think “Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception” is only applicable where UE-A is the receiver UE of UE-B, since otherwise, it does not matter whether UE-A can or cannot perform SL reception.  Also, we think the criteria of a resource is preferred or non-preferred should be aligned. For example, the criteria *“reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold”* should be applicable (complementary) to both preferred and non-preferred resources. |
| CEWiT | yes | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Convida Wireless | Yes | We are ok with the proposal. |

**Question 2**: Do you agree Draft Proposal 6 for scheme 2?

***Draft Proposal 6****:*

* *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*
  + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s):* 
    - *Condition 2-A-1:*
      * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*
        + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*

*FFS: Details*

* + - *Condition 2-A-2:*
      * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*
        + *Groupcast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as groupcast destination ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*

*FFS: Details*

* + - * + *Unicast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as unicast source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*

*FFS: Details*

* + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Comment** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Comment | Condition 2-A-1 should include both full overlapping and partial overlapping. Current text is unclear for this point, so update is needed.   * + - * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*   On condition 2-A-2, there is no motivation for UE-A to transmit UE-B. In this case, it might be feasible that no UE has capability to do so. Condition beneficial for both UE-A and whole system should be discussed in my understanding.  In addition, the following collision should be included.   * Collision between UE-A and UE-B * Collision related to PSFCH * Collision between SL and UL |
| Qualcomm | Yes with comment | We understand the conditions as alternative not that both have to be satisfied simultaneously. With that understanding, we propose the following clarification:   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s):* |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | No | We have few comments  *Condition 2-A-1:*   * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time, time-and-frequency.* * *In condition 2-1* besides the RSRP value the time gap between two SCIs whose reserved resources are overlapping should be smaller than the processing delay. If not, the resource conflict can be addressed by pre-emption checking.   ***Modified Draft Proposal 6****:*   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time, time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + T*he time gap between SCIs whose reserved resources are overlapping is smaller than the processing delay*     - *Condition 2-A-2:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*         + *Groupcast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as groupcast destination ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *Unicast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as unicast source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| Futurewei | See comments | We are ok with condition 2-A-1. For condition 2-A-2, we are not clear on condition 2-A-2. If it is for the case that other UE reserved the same resources for UE-A, it shall still be the resource indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency meaning at least with a partial overlap in time-and-frequency. The reserved resources on the same time slot does not necessary mean that they have a conflict. So we suggest move it to 2-A-1  Also the proposal does not include the conflict due to half-duplex.  We propose the following change on the proposal   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *Groupcast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as groupcast destination ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *Unicast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as unicast source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + - *Condition 2-A-2:*       * *~~Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time~~*         + *~~Groupcast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as groupcast destination ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI~~*   *~~FFS: Details~~*   * + - * + *~~Unicast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as unicast source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI~~*   *~~FFS: Details~~*   * + - * *Resource(s) reserved for UE-A’s transmissions are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE B’s SCI in time*         + *FFS: Details*   + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| InterDigital | No | As discussed for draft proposal 4, it is not clear to us which SCI is “UE-B’s SCI” indicated in the beginning of the proposal. In our view, It is also necessary to define which UE-B’s SCI in the context of cast type to understand the Condition 2-A-2 correctly. |
| Samsung | See comments | We think the most important condition should be UE-A’s reserved resource(s) is overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency. Also, we can consider other condition additionally, We do not see necessity of condition 2-A-2 on the top of condition 2-A-1. |
| ZTE | Comments | For scheme-2, we should firstly identify the collision between UE-A and UE-B. Then, whether to introduce the additional consideration related to “other UEs” can be considered later once the definition is clear. |
| vivo | See comment | Agree with DCM, at least UL transmission needs to be considered, we proposed to add another condition 2-A-3.   * + - condition 2-A-3       * UE-A’s UL transmission resource and UE-A’s LTE SL transmission/reception resource are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time   Regarding condition 2-A-2, the motivation is not clear. Do you mean that UE-B may not able to receive multiple TBs simultaneously? |
| Intel | Yes, with comments | ***Draft Proposal 6****:*   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *FFS: Distance based criteria b/w UE-A and UE-B*     - *Condition 2-A-2:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*         + *Groupcast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as groupcast destination ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *Unicast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as unicast source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *FFS additional criteria*   + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| Fujitsu | No | The comments are similar with those for draft proposal 4.  1. We do not support Condition 2-A-2 since its probability is very small.  2. In Condition 2-A-1, the relationship of priorities of UE-B and other UE is missing.  The suggested modifications are as follows.   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold, and the priority of other UE is higher than that of UE-B*   *FFS: Details*   * + - *~~Condition 2-A-2:~~*       * *~~Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time~~*         + *~~Groupcast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as groupcast destination ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI~~*   *~~FFS: Details~~*   * + - * + *~~Unicast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as unicast source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI~~*   *~~FFS: Details~~*   * + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| Panasonic | Yes, with comments | We support condition 2-A-1. For condition 2-A-2, the detailed condition should be clarified. In our view, when UE-A can judge UE-B should prioritize reception from UE-C by priority indication, UE-A can transmit the inter -UE coordination to UE-B to cancel transmission. If UE also can transmit inter coordination to UE-C, UE can transmit inter UE coordination to stop transmission from UE-C to UE-B when UE-B should prioritize the transmission. |
| CMCC |  | Regarding the condition 2-A-2, we have a question of how it works? Let’s take the unicast as an example, to our understanding, this condition is for the case when half-duplex issue happens between UE-B and other UEs, e.g, UE-C selects resource X to send messages to UE-B, while UE-B reserves a resource with same slot as resource X to transmit to UE-D. As noted in the proposal, UE-A can only recognize this issue when the destination ID carried in the 2nd stage SCI sent by UE-C is the same as the source ID carried in the SCI sent by UE-B. However, since these are two different unicast links (link 1 is UE-C to UE-B, link 2 is UE-B to UE-D), the destination ID of UE-B in link 1 may not be the same as the source ID in link 2. Similar as our comments to Draft Proposal 4, we think that when UE-A is a third-party UE, the benefit of Scheme 2 seems limited. |
| OPPO | Agree in general with comments | *1. agree with Qualcomm, “one of ” should be added at the end of the first sub-bullet.*  *2. For condition 2-A-2, one more condition is that the other UE is within the communication range of UE-B.*  *Suggested changes as below:*   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least one of following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - *Condition 2-A-2:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*         + *Groupcast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as groupcast destination ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *Unicast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as unicast source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *Zone of the other UE is located within the communication range of UE-B*   *FFS: Details*   * + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| LG | Yes in principle | *In our understanding, Condition 2-A-1 targets resource collision while condition 2-A-2 targets half-duplex problem.*  *For condition 2-A-1, we need additional FFS to determine the resource collision. To be specific, for accuracy, the RSRP value measured by UE-A from UE-B’s transmission needs to be high enough.*  *Regarding the proposal, since it says “at least”, nothing is precluded. In our understanding, the currently listed ones are supported by a majority companies in this meeting.* |
| Sony | Yes with comments | *We are basically fine with the FL proposal, but we think we should classify the resource conflict into two categories like: (1) Resource conflict happened between UE-A and UE-B, we further consider the UE-A reserved resources and UE-A’s UL transmission and so on.*  *(2) Resource conflict happened between other UE and UE-B, and identified by UE-A.* |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes, with additions | * + - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *UE-A is an intended recipient of UE-B’s transmission and/or other UE’s transmission*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * *UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission of a TB are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *UE-A’s intended recipient(s) overlap with UE-B’s*         + *UE-A’s priority is higher than UE-B’s*     - *Condition 2-A-2:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*         + *Groupcast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as groupcast destination ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *Unicast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as unicast source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * *UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission of a TB are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*         + *UE-A is an intended recipient of UE-B’s transmission*         + *UE-A’s priority is higher than UE-B’s*   For half-duplex detection, in the case of distance-based HARQ feedback the zone and range indicated by UE-B and the zone of the other UE need to be considered. |
| Xiaomi | Comment | *We agree with QC, that two conditions are alternatives, for condition 2-A-2, our understanding is to solve the half duplex issue, if our understanding is correct, we suggest to make the following revision for clarification:*   * + - *Condition 2-A-2:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A with UE-B as a destination are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time.* |
| CATT, GOHIGH | See comments | Currently, we haven’t discussed the supported cast type for scheme 2. Therefore, we prefer to remove the condition 2-A-2 which is related to the supported cast type in scheme 2.   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - *~~Condition 2-A-2:~~*       * *~~Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time~~*         + *~~Groupcast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as groupcast destination ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI~~*   *~~FFS: Details~~*   * + - * + *~~Unicast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as unicast source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI~~*   *~~FFS: Details~~*   * + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | We are supportive of the FL’s proposal.  We are supportive of the conditions added by Nokia w.r.t UE-A’s reserved resources. Also, since other conditions are not precluded, and these conditions are a starting point, we would prefer to add an FFS to allow other conditions to be considered. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Possible if limited to non-monitored slots. | As analysed in our Tdoc R1-2106478 Section 3.2.2.1, the benefits of expected resource conflict might very limited since UE-B itself will always do pre-emption check before using the reserved resource and can possibly find such collision. Expected resource conflict triggers UE-B to reselect resource and further perform unreserved transmission, which has high chance of collision and increased delay. Therefore, expected/potential resource conflict may have drawbacks in most cases. So we propose to limit it to the case of non-monitor slots of UE-B, where UE-B has no sensing information about the non-monitored slots and such conflict indication might be useful.  According to R16 NR-V design, by transmitting SCI, a UE can reserve up to two resources for re-transmissions (i.e., dynamic reservation), and reserve periodic resources for transmitting different TBs (i.e., periodic reservation). As shown in Figure 10 in our Tdoc R1-2106478 (also copied below), the resource conflict situations may include many cases, e.g., conflict happens on one, or two, or multiple of those dynamically and/or periodically reserved resources by UE-B. RAN1 needs to discuss whether the conflict indication from UE-A needs to differentiate different conflict situations, and which resource(s) should UE-B reselect accordingly. For example, if the conflict indication does not differentiate different conflict situations and UE-B reselects all the dynamically and periodically reserved resources when receiving the conflict indication, there could be some unnecessary reselection since some reserved resources may have no conflicts, and thus cause waste of resources, increased delay, higher collision chance due to unreserved transmission, etc.    **Figure 10: Different resource conflict situations**  We are unclear about the scenario and benefits of Condition 2-A-2 in addition to Condition 2-A-1. Does it refer to half-duplex indication?  Similar as commented for Proposal 5, it seems the last FFS, i.e., “*FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)*” is redundant with Condition 2-A-1. So we suggest to remove it. If this FFS has other intentions, it should be clarified first.  In summary, we propose the following changes in red   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *When other UE’s SCI is transmitted in the non-monitor slots of UE-B, and o~~O~~ther UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details*   * + - *~~Condition 2-A-2:~~*       * *~~Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time~~*         + *~~Groupcast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as groupcast destination ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI~~*   *~~FFS: Details~~*   * + - * + *~~Unicast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as unicast source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI~~*   *~~FFS: Details~~*   * + *FFS: whether the conflict indication from UE-A needs to differentiate different conflict situations, and which resource(s) should UE-B reselect accordingly*   + *~~FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)~~* |
| Ericsson | Yes | Support this proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Yes with comments | Firstly, as the comments in proposal 4, priority condition should be added in condition 2-A-1 which is similar as pre-emption mechanism.  Secondly, when UE-A is an intended RX UE of UE-B’s transmission, the condition that the resource(s) of UE-A’ transmission /reception are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time should also be included.  So, we proposal the following changes:   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than (pre)configured RSRP threshold, and the priority of other UE is higher than that of UE-B*   *FFS: Details*   * + - *Condition 2-A-2:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*         + *Groupcast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as groupcast destination ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + - * + *Unicast destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as unicast source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*   *FFS: Details*   * + - *Condition 2-A-3:*       * *The resource(s) of UE-A’ transmission /reception are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*         + *UE-A is an intended RX UE of UE-B’s transmission*   + *FFS: Details on how UE-A identifies other UE’s reserved resource(s)* |
| Apple |  | For Condition 2-A-2, the last sub-bullet only covers the half duplex at UE-B side (i.e., UE-B’s transmission and reception occurs in same slot). However, we also have the case of half duplex at receiver UE side from UE-B’s transmission. For example, if UE-B sends data to UE-C, while UE-C has sidelink transmission on the same slot, then UE-C is unable to receive the data from UE-B due to half-duplex constraints. Also, we do not restrict the application to unicast. Hence, we propose to  1. Modify the last sub-bullet to “Destination ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as source ID of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI”  2. add a new sub-bullet “Source ID of resource(s) reserved by other UE is the same as destination ID of the resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI”  Also, we prefer to cover the half-duplex issue for both PSCCH/PSSCH and PSFCH. |
| CEWiT | yes | We support the FL’s proposal. Also we would prefer to add an FFS to consider other conditions. |
|  |  |  |

1. **Proposals for Wednesday’s GTW (August 18th)**

During the email discussion after Monday’s GTW session (August 16th), we have discussed how to define condition(s) for UE(s) to be UE-A(s) and/or UE-B(s).

For Scheme 1, I suggest to make a decision on which alternative is agreed during Wednesday’s GTW session.

***Draft Proposal 3****:*

***Alt 1****:*

* *In scheme 1, the following two options are supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*
  + *Option A:*
    - *A UE that sends a request for inter-UE coordination information can be UE-B*
      * *At least it is supported that a UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information up to its own implementation.*
      * *FFS: Details including whether additional condition of sending a request is specified*
    - *A UE that received a request from UE-B and sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B can be UE-A*
      * *FFS: Details including whether condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*
    - *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B* 
      * *FFS: Detail including a possibility of specifying additional limitation for UE to be UE-A/UE-B and cast type(s) between UE-A and UE-B*
    - *FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A*
  + *Option B:*
    - *A UE that sends inter-UE coordination information to UE-B when conditions are met can be UE-A*
      * *FFS: Details*
    - *A UE that receives inter-UE coordination information from UE-A can be UE-B* 
      * *FFS: Details*
    - *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*
      * *FFS: Detail including a possibility of specifying additional limitation for UE to be UE-A/UE-B and cast type(s) between UE-A and UE-B*
    - *FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A*

***Alt 2****:*

* *In scheme 1, at least the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*
  + *A UE that sends a request for inter-UE coordination information can be UE-B*
    - *At least it is supported that a UE sends a request for inter-UE coordination information up to its own implementation.*
    - *FFS: Details including whether additional condition of sending a request is specified*
  + *A UE that received a request from UE-B and sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B can be UE-A*
    - *FFS: Details including whether condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with receiving a request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*
  + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B* 
    - *FFS: Detail including a possibility of specifying additional limitation for UE to be UE-A/UE-B and cast type(s) between UE-A and UE-B*
  + *FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A*

For Scheme 2, I suggest to make a decision on the following draft proposal during Wednesday’s GTW session.

***Draft Proposal 4****:*

* *In scheme 2, at least the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*
  + *A capable UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI and sends inter-UE coordination information to UE-B can be UE-A*
    - *FFS: Details including*
      * *Definition of expected/potential resource conflict*
      * *Whether/how to specify additional condition for UE to be UE-A/UE-(B)*
  + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B*
    - *FFS: Detail including a possibility of specifying additional limitation for UE to be UE-A/UE-B and cast type(s) between UE-A and UE-B*
  + *FFS: It is supported that a UE which is not a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B can be UE-A*

1. **Email discussion after Wednesday’s GTW (August 18th)**

**4.1 Conditions for UE(s) to be UE-A(s) and/or UE-B(s)**

According to Chairman’s guideline, we can continue further discussion by considering the following contents as a starting point.

***Possible Agreement***

* *In scheme 1, at least the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*
  + *A UE that sends an explicit request for inter-UE coordination information can be UE-B*
  + *A UE that received a request from UE-B and sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B can be UE-A*

***Possible Agreement***

* *In scheme 1, at least the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*
  + *A UE that is trigger implicitly by an event sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B*

**I ask companies to provide inputs on the following three questions below. The deadline for companies to provide inputs is August 19th 4:59am UTC. To prepare/make more stable draft proposals before the start of Friday’s GTW session (August 20th), it would be highly appreciated if companies make comments as soon as possible. Also to make progress more efficiently, I would like to encourage companies to directly provide “revised wording” or “new wording needed to be added”.**

**Question 1**: Do you agree Draft Proposal 1 for scheme 1?

***Draft Proposal 1****:*

* *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*
  + *A UE that sends an explicit request for inter-UE coordination information is UE-B*
  + *A UE that received an explicit request from UE-B and sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B is UE-A*
    - *FFS: Detail including* 
      * *Whether condition of sending an explicit request is specified or up to UE implementation*
      * *Whether condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with receiving an explicit request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Comment** |
| Intel | No | We suggest discussing proposals for explicit and implicit Inter-UE coordination triggering together as a single proposal.  We suggest the following changes:  ***Draft Proposal 1****:*   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination information transmission* * *triggered by explicit request in Mode 2:*   + *A UE that sends an explicit request for inter-UE coordination information is UE-B*   + *A UE that received an explicit request from UE-B and sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Whether condition of sending an explicit request is specified or up to UE implementation*       * *Whether condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with receiving an explicit request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation* * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination information transmission triggered by a pre-configured condition other than explicit request reception in Mode 2:*   + *A UE that ~~is triggered implicitly by an event to~~ sends inter-UE coordination information ~~to UE-B~~ is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Whether event of sending inter-UE coordination information is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received inter-UE coordination information from UE-A and used it for resource allocation procedures can be UE-B* |
| Ericsson | No | For this proposal we have the following comments:  In our view, it is needed to clarify that UE-A is the destination of the TB transmission from UE-B which was also part of the previous version. Therefore, we propose to add the following sub-bullet to the proposal:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE that sends an explicit request for inter-UE coordination information is UE-B*   + *A UE that received an explicit request from UE-B and sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Whether condition of sending an explicit request is specified or up to UE implementation*       * *Whether condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with receiving an explicit request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B* |
| Mitsubishi | Yes with comments | While we agree that a UE that sends […] IS UE-B, we believe that the wording of the second bullet is a bit misleading, since it can be interpreted that ALL UEs having received the request must transmit coordination info and become UE-A, which is a bit puzzling in combination with the second FFS point and undesirable in multicast/broadcast. A clarification is proposed:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE that sends an explicit request for inter-UE coordination information is UE-B*   + *A UE that received an explicit request from UE-B and sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B is UE-A*     - *Note: this does not imply that all Ues receiving the explicit request must send inter-UE coordination/be UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Whether condition ~~of~~ for sending an explicit request is specified or up to UE implementation*       * *Whether condition ~~of~~ for sending inter-UE coordination information ~~with~~ when receiving an explicit request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B* |
| InterDigital | Yes | We support this proposal for request-based Scheme 1 coordination |
| Qualcomm | No | We don’t think that either proposal on its own is sufficient to address the use cases identified in the WID. We provide simulation results for those use cases in our contribution.  Proposal 1 would primarily apply to cases where most or all UEs are performing unicast transmissions, e.g., commercial use cases. In V2X multicast cases, the number of requests and their associated latency would be too large. In our contribution, we provided results showing that event-triggered transmission provides significant gains for unicast, groupcast option 1, and groupcast option 2, demonstrating that it is a general approach.  To address all cases identified in the WID, we think both triggered-based and request-based can be adopted with pre-configuration enabling/disabling each as appropriate for the deployment scenario.  We worry that interpreting the request as dynamic for every transmission could lead to work that cannot be finished within the Rel-17 timeframe. We propose to clarify this aspect in the proposal.  We propose some additions to the text proposed by Intel:  Draft Proposal:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination information transmission triggered by explicit request in Mode 2:*   + *A UE that sends an explicit request for inter-UE coordination information is UE-B*   + *A UE that received an explicit request from UE-B and sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Whether condition of sending an explicit request is specified or up to UE implementation*       * *Whether condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with receiving an explicit request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*       * *Whether the request is for each transmission or for multiple transmissions of the coordination information.*   + *Can be enabled/disabled in a resource pool by (pre-)configuration.* * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination information transmission triggered by a pre-configured condition other than explicit request reception in Mode 2:*   + *A UE that ~~is triggered implicitly by an event to~~ sends inter-UE coordination information ~~to UE-B~~ is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Whether event of sending inter-UE coordination information is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *A UE that received inter-UE coordination information from UE-A and used it for resource allocation procedures can be UE-B*   + *Can be enabled/disabled in a resource pool by (pre-)configuration.* |
| Apple | Yes with modifications | We are fine with the main bullet.  However, we have a comment on FFS part. Here, only the conditions of sending explicit request and sending inter-UE coordination information are listed. In our view, the signaling details of explicit request also need to be mentioned if the explicit request-based inter-UE coordination is supported. We could either add a sub-bullet of “signaling of explicit request” or remove all the sub-bullets of FFS if it is more acceptable.   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE that sends an explicit request for inter-UE coordination information is UE-B*   + *A UE that received an explicit request from UE-B and sends inter-UE coordination information to the UE-B is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Whether condition of sending an explicit request is specified or up to UE implementation*       * *Whether condition of sending inter-UE coordination information with receiving an explicit request from UE-B is specified or up to UE implementation*       * *Signaling of explicit request* |
| Nokia, NSB | No | We share other companies’ view that explicit and implicit triggering should be combined into one proposal for agreement. |

**Question 2**: Do you agree Draft Proposal 2 for scheme 1?

***Draft Proposal 2****:*

* *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*
  + *A UE that is triggered implicitly by an event to send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B is UE-A*
    - *FFS: Detail including* 
      * *Whether event of sending inter-UE coordination information is specified or up to UE implementation*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Comment** |
| Intel | No | We suggest discussing proposals for explicit and implicit Inter-UE coordination triggering together as a single proposal. |
| Ericsson | Yes, with comments | In our view, we need to have a common understanding about the events that are considered to trigger the transmission of the inter-UE coordination information.  We do not think that it is feasible to leave the event of sending inter-UE coordination information up to UE implementation. How can UE-B interpret the inter-UE coordination message if it is triggered by a condition that is determined by the implementation of UE-A?  Therefore, we propose to make the following changes to the proposal:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE that is triggered implicitly by a~~n~~ specified event to send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Definition of triggering event(s)*       * *~~Whether event of sending inter-UE coordination information is specified or up to UE implementation~~* |
| Mitsubishi | Yes with comments | We would like to have implicit triggering supported, but the current wording is very confusing. UE-A sends something to UE-B, but there is no definition of UE-B. Moreover, the FFS point is not agreeable in its current form since we do not believe that having random UEs sending coordination information up to their own liking/implementation should be supported   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE that is triggered implicitly by a~~n~~ specified event to send inter-UE coordination information is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *~~Whether event of sending inter-UE coordination information is specified or up to UE implementation~~*       * *Triggering event*   + *A UE that received inter-UE coordination information from UE-A and used it for resource allocation procedures can be UE-B*     - *FFS details, including relationship with the triggering event*   We also believe that the decision on restricting UE-A as being an intended receiver of UE-B is useful and necessary either as standalone agreement or bundled with proposals 1 and 2.   * + *It is supported that UE-A is a destination UE of a TB transmitted by UE-B* |
| InterDigital | Yes | We support this proposal in principle. In addition, we prefer to highlight potential relationship and/or association between the triggering event and UE-B(s).   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A UE that is triggered implicitly by an event to send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Whether event of sending inter-UE coordination information is specified or up to UE implementation*       * *Association and/or relationship between the event of sending inter-UE coordination and UE-B(s), e.g.,*   + *A UE that receives the triggered inter-UE coordination information can be a UE-B.* |
| Qualcomm |  | We propose to adopt both proposals together to address all use cases listed in the WID. Please see our reply to Question 1 for the proposed text. |
| Apple | Yes with modifications | The “event” may be misunderstood to be “the reception of inter-UE coordination request”, which still does not differentiate with Draft Proposal 1. Hence, we should avoid the usage of event.  We suggest rewording “triggered implicitly by an event” to “non-explicit-request triggered”, and open for other better wording. |
| Nokia, NSB | No | We share other companies’ view that explicit and implicit triggering should be combined into one proposal for agreement. |

**Question 3**: Do you agree Draft Proposal 3 for scheme 2?

***Draft Proposal 3****:*

* *In scheme 2, at least the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*
  + *A capable UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI and sends inter-UE coordination information to UE-B is UE-A*
    - *FFS: Detail including* 
      * *Definition of expected/potential resource conflict*
      * *Whether condition of sending inter-UE coordination information when expected/potential resource conflict is detected is specified or up to UE implementation*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Comment** |
| Intel | Yes, with comments | When we introduce definition for UE-A, the referred UE-B is not defined.  In addition, Scheme-2 should operate based on request otherwise inter-UE coordination information can be provided but not considered by UE-B.  To fix this issue we propose to modify proposal as follows:  ***Draft Proposal 3****:*   * *In scheme 2, at least the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *Any UE that performs TB transmission and requests inter-UE coordination information can be UE-B*   + *A capable UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict(s) on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI and sends inter-UE coordination information to UE-B is UE-A*     - *FFS: ~~Detail including~~*        * *Additional condition(s) for transmission of inter-UE coordination information for identified resource conflict(s)*       * *Definition of expected/potential resource conflict* * *Note: The above is also applicable for the case of detected resource conflict on the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI if it is agreed* |
| Ericsson | Yes, with comments | We propose to remove the word “capable” from the first bullet. We think that at this stage of the discussion we do not need to get into capability discussions that will come at the end of the release.  Moreover, in our view, the last sub-bullet makes no sense. Clearly the condition for detecting a resource conflict will have to be specified. Otherwise, UE-B does not know how to interpret the coordination message. Therefore, we propose to modify it.  The updated proposal is as follows:   * *In scheme 2, at least the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A ~~capable~~ UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI and sends inter-UE coordination information to UE-B is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Definition of expected/potential resource conflict*       * *~~Whether~~ condition of sending inter-UE coordination information when expected/potential resource conflict is detected is specified ~~or up to UE implementation~~* |
| InterDigital | Yes, with comments | As we pointed out in last round of discussions, the formulation of this proposal indicates UE-B is determined prior to the conflict detection, because UE-A detects collision on the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI. Thus, in our view, it is important to include which UE’s SCI UE-A’s conflict detection is based on. We can start with supporting UE-A is the intended RX UE for a UE-B and we suggest the following:   * *In scheme 2, at least the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A capable UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI and sends inter-UE coordination information to UE-B is UE-A*     - *UE-B is any UE sending transmissions with UE-A as an intended RX UE*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Definition of expected/potential resource conflict*       * *Whether condition of sending inter-UE coordination information when expected/potential resource conflict is detected is specified or up to UE implementation* |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We agree with the proposal but would like to add a parameter to enable/disable the signalling per resource pool to accommodate different deployments.  ***Draft Proposal 3****:*   * *In scheme 2, at least the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A capable UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI and sends inter-UE coordination information to UE-B is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Definition of expected/potential resource conflict*       * *Whether condition of sending inter-UE coordination information when expected/potential resource conflict is detected is specified or up to UE implementation*   + *Can be enabled/disabled in a resource pool by (pre-)configuration.* |
| Apple | No | We could accept that only the receiver UE be to UE-A. This is because in Scheme 2, the inter-UE coordination is likely sent in feedback channel or FDM-ed with PSFCH, which is designed for receiver UEs. We have the following modifications:   * *In scheme 2, at least the following is supported for UE(s) to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) in the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*   + *A ~~capable~~ targeted receiver UE that detects expected/potential resource conflict on resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI and sends inter-UE coordination information to UE-B is UE-A*     - *FFS: Detail including*        * *Definition of expected/potential resource conflict*       * *Whether condition of sending inter-UE coordination information when expected/potential resource conflict is detected is specified or up to UE implementation* |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes |  |

**4.2 How to determine inter-UE coordination information for each scheme**

Based on the email discussion after Monday’s GTW session (August 16th), I have updated the draft proposals.

**I ask companies to provide inputs on the following two questions below. The deadline for companies to provide inputs is August 19th 4:59am UTC. To prepare/make more stable draft proposals before the start of Friday’s GTW session (August 20th), it would be highly appreciated if companies make comments as soon as possible. Also to make progress more efficiently, I would like to encourage companies to directly provide “revised wording” or “new wording needed to be added”.**

**Question 1**: Do you agree Draft Proposal 4 for scheme 1?

***Draft Proposal 4****:*

* *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*
  + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
    - *Condition 1-A-1:*
      * *Resource(s) excluding reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than a RSRP threshold*
        + *FFS: Details including*

*Whether/how to specify metric other than RSRP*

*Whether/how UE-B’s traffic requirement is considered*

* + - *Condition 1-A-2:*
      * *Resource(s) excluding slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception from UE-B* 
        + *FFS: Details*
    - *FFS: Other condition(s) including*
      * *Resource(s) other than slot(s) excluded based on UE-A’s non-monitored slot(s)*
      * *Resource(s) other than resource(s) selected by UE-A as preferred resource set for other UE-Bs’ transmissions*
  + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
    - *Condition 1-B-1:*
      * *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than a RSRP threshold*
        + *FFS: Details*
    - *Condition 1-B-2:*
      * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception from UE-B*
        + *FFS: Details*
    - *FFS: Other condition(s) including*
      * *Resource(s) that UE-A has selected for its own transmission(s) (e.g., initial transmission)*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Comment** |
| Intel | Yes | Additional information on top of preferred/non-preferred resources may be included into inter-UE coordination information. We suppose that information on conditions (1-B-1, 1-B-2 etc.) used to identify non-preferred resources may be useful at UE-B side. We also think that multiple sets can be provided.  Therefore, we propose to modify text as follows:  ***Draft Proposal 4****:*   * *In scheme 1, at least the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set(s) of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) excluding reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than a RSRP threshold*         + *FFS: Details including*   *Whether/how to specify metric other than RSRP*  *Whether/how UE-B’s traffic requirement is considered*   * + - *Condition 1-A-2:*       * *Resource(s) excluding slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception from UE-B*          + *FFS: Details*     - *FFS: Other condition(s) including*       * *Resource(s) other than slot(s) excluded based on UE-A’s non-monitored slot(s)*       * *Resource(s) other than resource(s) selected by UE-A as preferred resource set for other UE-Bs’ transmissions*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s) as set(s) of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than a RSRP threshold*         + *FFS: Details*     - *Condition 1-B-2:*       * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception from UE-B*         + *FFS: Details*     - *FFS: Other condition(s) including*       * *Resource(s) that UE-A has selected for its own transmission(s) (e.g., initial transmission)*   + *Condition used to identify set of non-preferred resource(s)*      - *FFS indication details* * *FFS other information* |
| Ericsson | Yes, with comments | We are supportive of the proposal, but we think some clarifications are necessary:  Regarding the first bullet where RSRP threshold is mentioned, we have the following comments:   * Is the RSRP threshold the one defined in Rel-16 for the resource selection procedure as defined in TS 38.214? * Moreover, we propose that in order to exclude resources that are reserved by other UE(s), the same procedure as in Rel-16 should be used, i.e., measured RSRP + reserved resources based on SCI.   For the FFS on other conditions, we propose to remove then since the main bullet already says “at least” so there is no need to list options, since there are no options precluded yet.  Therefore, we propose the following updated proposal:   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *UE-A considers any resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) excluding reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A reusing the Rel-16 procedure for resource (re-)selection, i.e., resources reserved by an SCI and whose RSRP measurement is larger than a RSRP threshold*         + *FFS: Details including*   *Whether/how to specify metric other than RSRP*  *Whether/how UE-B’s traffic requirement is considered*   * + - *Condition 1-A-2:*       * *Resource(s) excluding slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception from UE-B*          + *FFS: Details*     - *~~FFS: Other condition(s) including~~*       * *~~Resource(s) other than slot(s) excluded based on UE-A’s non-monitored slot(s)~~*       * *~~Resource(s) other than resource(s) selected by UE-A as preferred resource set for other UE-Bs’ transmissions~~*   + *UE-A considers any resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A reusing the Rel-16 procedure for resource (re-)selection, i.e., resources reserved by and SCI and whose RSRP measurement is larger than a RSRP threshold*         + *FFS: Details*     - *Condition 1-B-2:*       * *Slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception from UE-B*         + *FFS: Details*     - *~~FFS: Other condition(s) including~~*       * *~~Resource(s) that UE-A has selected for its own transmission(s) (e.g., initial transmission)~~* |
| InterDigital | Yes | We support this proposal. Considering the information included can be a starting baseline information set, we suggest to add “*at least”* before *“the following is supported…”* into the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Yes with comments | In Condition 1-B-2, it’s the resources that are considered as non-preferred, not the slots. We propose to update the wording to say resources since the scheme indicates non-preferred resources.  We also think that the conditions should be enabled/disabled by resource pool (pre-)configuration to match the deployment scenario.  We’re not clear about the benefit of Condition 1-A-2 to determining preferred resources. We’re ok to further consider and propose to move it under the FFS bullet.  ***Draft Proposal 4****:*   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) excluding reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than a RSRP threshold*         + *FFS: Details including*   *Whether/how to specify metric other than RSRP*  *Whether/how UE-B’s traffic requirement is considered*   * + - *~~Condition 1-A-2:~~*       * *~~Resource(s) excluding slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception from UE-B~~*          + *~~FFS: Details~~*     - *FFS: Other condition(s) including*       * *Resource(s) other than slot(s) excluded based on UE-A’s non-monitored slot(s)*       * *Resource(s) other than resource(s) selected by UE-A as preferred resource set for other UE-Bs’ transmissions*       * *Resource(s) excluding slot(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception from UE-B*     - Conditions can be independently enabled/disabled by resource pool (pre-)configuration.   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than a RSRP threshold*         + *FFS: Details*     - *Condition 1-B-2:*       * *~~Slot(s)~~ Resource(s) where UE-A cannot perform SL reception from UE-B*         + *FFS: Details*     - *FFS: Other condition(s) including*       * *Resource(s) that UE-A has selected for its own transmission(s) (e.g., initial transmission)*     - Conditions can be independently enabled/disabled by resource pool (pre-)configuration. |
| Apple |  | The conditions 1-A-2 and 1-B-2 are applicable only when UE-A is the receiver UE of UE-B. If UE-A is not the targeted receiver UE of UE-B, then does not matter whether UE-A can or cannot perform SL reception.  This proposal is lengthy, and it is preferred to shorten it by not listing all the FFS points.   * *In scheme 1, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least following condition(s) as set of resource(s) preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-A-1:*       * *Resource(s) excluding reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than a RSRP threshold*         + *~~FFS: Details including~~*   *~~Whether/how to specify metric other than RSRP~~*  *~~Whether/how UE-B’s traffic requirement is considered~~*   * + - *Condition 1-A-2:*       * *Resource(s) excluding slot(s) where targeted receiver UE ~~UE-A~~ cannot perform SL reception from UE-B*          + *~~FFS: Details~~*     - *FFS: Details ~~Other condition(s) including~~*       * *~~Resource(s) other than slot(s) excluded based on UE-A’s non-monitored slot(s)~~*       * *~~Resource(s) other than resource(s) selected by UE-A as preferred resource set for other UE-Bs’ transmissions~~*   + *UE-A considers resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s) as set of resource(s) non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*     - *Condition 1-B-1:*       * *Reserved resource(s) of other UE identified by UE-A whose RSRP measurement is larger than a RSRP threshold*         + *~~FFS: Details~~*     - *Condition 1-B-2:*       * *Slot(s) where targeted receiver UE ~~UE-A~~ cannot perform SL reception from UE-B*         + *~~FFS: Details~~*     - *FFS: Details ~~Other condition(s) including~~*       * *~~Resource(s) that UE-A has selected for its own transmission(s) (e.g., initial transmission)~~* |
| Nokia, NSB | No, see comments | It should be explicitly indicated that Condition 1-A-2 & 1-B-2 are only applicable when UE-A is an intended recipient of UE-B’s transmission.  Condition 1-A-1 & 1-B-1 are problematic when UE-A is not an intended recipient of UE-B’s transmission, because UE-A cannot know the actual interference experienced by the actual intended recipients. For example, according to Condition 1-A-1, a resource reserved by UE-C located very close to UE-A would be excluded (high RSRP measured) from the preferred resource set even if the intended recipients of UE-B’s transmission are far away from UE-C, thus adversely impacting spatial reuse. |

**Question 2**: Do you agree Draft Proposal 5 for scheme 2?

***Draft Proposal 5****:*

* *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*
  + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s):* 
    - *Condition 2-A-1:*
      * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*
        + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than a RSRP threshold*

*FFS: Details including*

*Whether/how to consider priority values of overlapped resource(s) between UE-B and other UE*

* + - * + *FFS: Whether/how to specify additional criteria including*

*Whether/how to consider distance between UE-A and UE-B*

*Whether UE-A’s sensing is limited to UE-B’s non-monitored slot(s).*

* + - *Condition 2-A-2:*
      * *UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*
        + *FFS: Details*
    - *FFS: Other condition(s) including*
      * *UE-A’s UL transmission resource and/or UE-A’s LTE SL transmission resource are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*
      * *PSFCH occasion of UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission is overlapping with PSFCH occasion of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*
      * *Time gap between SCIs whose resources of UE-B and other UE are overlapping is smaller than a processing delay*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Comment** |
| Intel | No | Resource overlapped in time but not overlapped in frequency should be also considered as a conflict. Priority should be considered for *Condition 2-A-2:*  Therefore, we propose to modify proposal as follows:  ***Draft Proposal 5****:*   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency or in time only*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than a RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details including*  *Whether/how to consider priority values of overlapped resource(s) between UE-B and other UE*   * + - * + *FFS: Whether/how to specify additional criteria including*   *Whether/how to consider distance between UE-A and UE-B*  *Whether/how to consider distance between UE-B and Other UE*  *Whether UE-A’s sensing is limited to UE-B’s non-monitored slot(s).*  *Whether/how to consider Source/Destination IDs of UE-B and Other UE(s)*   * + - *Condition 2-A-2:*       * *UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*   *FFS: Details including*  *Whether/how to consider priority values of overlapped resource(s) between UE-B and other UE*   * + - *FFS: Other condition(s) including*       * *UE-A’s UL transmission resource and/or UE-A’s LTE SL transmission resource are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*       * *PSFCH occasion of UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission is overlapping with PSFCH occasion of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*       * *Time gap between SCIs whose resources of UE-B and other UE are overlapping is smaller than a processing delay* |
| Ericsson | Yes, with some modifications | For this proposal, we propose the following modifications and clarifications:  Regarding the first bullet where RSRP threshold is mentioned, we have the following comments:   * Is the RSRP threshold the one defined in Rel-16 for the resource selection procedure as defined in TS 38.214? If that is the case, we propose to add a clarification.   For the FFS on other conditions, we propose to remove then since the main bullet already says “at least” so there is no need to list options, since there are no options precluded yet.  Therefore, we propose the following updated proposal:   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than a RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details including*  *Whether/how to consider priority values of overlapped resource(s) between UE-B and other UE*   * + - * + *FFS: Whether/how to specify additional criteria including*   *Whether/how to consider distance between UE-A and UE-B*  *Whether UE-A’s sensing is limited to UE-B’s non-monitored slot(s).*   * + - *Condition 2-A-2:*       * *UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *FFS: Details*     - *~~FFS: Other condition(s) including~~*       * *~~UE-A’s UL transmission resource and/or UE-A’s LTE SL transmission resource are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time~~*       * *~~PSFCH occasion of UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission is overlapping with PSFCH occasion of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI~~*       * *~~Time gap between SCIs whose resources of UE-B and other UE are overlapping is smaller than a processing delay~~* |
| InterDigital | Yes | We suggest to include priority associate with UE-A’s UL/SL transmission into consideration in Condition 2-A-2.  ***Draft Proposal 5****:*   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than a RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details including*  *Whether/how to consider priority values of overlapped resource(s) between UE-B and other UE*   * + - * + *FFS: Whether/how to specify additional criteria including*   *Whether/how to consider distance between UE-A and UE-B*  *Whether UE-A’s sensing is limited to UE-B’s non-monitored slot(s).*   * + - *Condition 2-A-2:*       * *UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*   *FFS: Details including*  *Whether/how to consider priority value associated with UE-A’s transmission and that indicated in UE-B’s SCI*   * + - *FFS: Other condition(s) including*       * *UE-A’s UL transmission resource and/or UE-A’s LTE SL transmission resource are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*       * *PSFCH occasion of UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission is overlapping with PSFCH occasion of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*       * *Time gap between SCIs whose resources of UE-B and other UE are overlapping is smaller than a processing delay* |
| Qualcomm | Yes with comments | One aspect to consider is the impact of the inter-UE coordination on reception of other signals, e.g. feedback on PSFCH, at UE-B. For example, the near-far effect when UE-A is close to UE-B could cause UE-B to not properly receive feedback on PSFCH from other UEs. To mitigate this issue, an upper bound on the measured RSRP could be used to determine whether to transmit the coordination information or not.  We share Intel’s view to consider overlap in time only with (pre-)configuration selecting between the two.  Condition 2-A-2 is already covered, at least in many cases, by pre-emption and re-evaluation checking. We’re ok to further discuss it as an FFS.  We propose that the conditions can be enabled/disabled by resource (pre-)configuration to match the deployment scenario.  ***Draft Proposal 5****:*   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency or in time*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than a RSRP threshold and below another RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details including*  *Whether/how to consider priority values of overlapped resource(s) between UE-B and other UE*   * + - * + *FFS: Whether/how to specify additional criteria including*   *Whether/how to consider distance between UE-A and UE-B*  *Whether UE-A’s sensing is limited to UE-B’s non-monitored slot(s).*   * + - * + *Resource pool (pre-)configuration indicates whether the overlap is time-and-frequency or in time.*     - *~~Condition 2-A-2:~~*       * *~~UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency~~*         + *~~FFS: Details~~*     - *FFS: Other condition(s) including*       * *UE-A’s UL transmission resource and/or UE-A’s LTE SL transmission resource are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time*       * *PSFCH occasion of UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission is overlapping with PSFCH occasion of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI*       * *Time gap between SCIs whose resources of UE-B and other UE are overlapping is smaller than a processing delay*       * *UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *FFS: Details*     - Conditions can be independently enabled/disabled by resource pool (pre-)configuration. |
| Apple |  | For condition 2-A-1:  The sub-bullets of the last FFS seem to be too specific. We suggest removing these two sub-bullets.  For condition 2-A-2:  1. The resource conflict in time (but not in frequency) should also be supported.  2. “UE-A’s reserved resource has overlap with resources reserved by UE-B’s SCI” should be based on the assumption that UE-A is the receiver UE of UE-B. This applies to the other conditions as well.   * *In scheme 2, the following is supported to determine inter-UE coordination information:*   + *Among resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, UE-A considers that expected/potential resource conflict occurs on the resource(s) satisfying at least one of the following condition(s):*      - *Condition 2-A-1:*       * *Other UE’s reserved resource(s) identified by UE-A are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency*         + *RSRP value measured on other UE’s reserved resource(s) is larger than a RSRP threshold*   *FFS: Details including*  *Whether/how to consider priority values of overlapped resource(s) between UE-B and other UE*   * + - * + *FFS: Whether/how to specify additional criteria ~~including~~*   *~~Whether/how to consider distance between UE-A and UE-B~~*  *~~Whether UE-A’s sensing is limited to UE-B’s non-monitored slot(s).~~*   * + - *Condition 2-A-2:*       * *UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission are fully/partially overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time-and-frequency or time-only, if UE-A is a targeted receiver UE of UE-B.*         + *FFS: Details*     - *FFS: Other condition(s) including*       * *UE-A’s UL transmission resource and/or UE-A’s LTE SL transmission resource are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time, if UE-A is a targeted receiver UE of UE-B.*       * *PSFCH occasion of UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission is overlapping with PSFCH occasion of resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI, if UE-A is a targeted receiver UE of UE-B.*       * *Time gap between SCIs whose resources of UE-B and other UE are overlapping is smaller than a processing delay* |
| Nokia, NSB | No, see comments | We think it is necessary to distinguish between two cases:   * UE-A is an intended recipient of UE-B’s transmission in the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI. In this case, the condition should be:   + - * *UE-A’s reserved resource(s) for its transmission are overlapping with resource(s) indicated by UE-B’s SCI in time.*         + *FFS Whether/how to consider priority values* * UE-A is not an intended recipient. In this case, Conditions 2-A-1 and 2-A-2 are problematic because UE-A cannot know the actual interference experienced by the actual intended recipients. |

**4.3 UE-B’s behaviour when receiving inter-UE coordination information**

I think that we need to discuss how to define UE-B’s behaviour when it receives inter-UE coordination information from UE-A.

**I ask companies to provide inputs on the following two questions below. The deadline for companies to provide inputs is August 19th 4:59am UTC. To prepare/make more stable draft proposals before the start of Friday’s GTW session (August 20th), it would be highly appreciated if companies make comments as soon as possible. Also to make progress more efficiently, I would like to encourage companies to directly provide “revised wording” or “new wording needed to be added”.**

**Question 1**: Do you agree Draft Proposal 6 for scheme 1?

***Draft Proposal 6****:*

* *In scheme 1, at least following UE-B’s behavior is supported for inter-UE coordination:* 
  + *For preferred resource set,* 
    - *UE-B excludes in its resource selection resource(s) not belonging to the preferred resource set*
      * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B takes resource(s) not belonging to the preferred resource set into account in its resource selection*
  + *For non-preferred resource set,* 
    - *UE-B excludes in its resource selection resource(s) belonging to the non-preferred resource set*
      * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B takes resource(s) belonging to the non-preferred resource set into account in its resource selection*
    - *UE-B reselects resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) are fully/partially overlapping with the non-preferred resource set*
      * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B does not reselect resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) are fully/partially overlapping with the non-preferred resource set*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Comment** |
| Intel | Yes, with comments / modifications | In general case each UE-B may receive assistance information from one or multiple UE-A(s). For that case it should be further studied how to generate preferred/non-preferred resource sets used in UE-B resource selection.  We also have questions whether proposal is also applicable for re-evaluation procedure?  We would like to better understand the meaning of “resource selection *resource(s)*” and “*resources to be used for transmission*”. Is it about selected candidate resource set for transmission, reserved resources or pre-selected resources which are subject to re-evaluation procedure or none of the above options is precluded at this stage?  ***Draft Proposal 6****:*   * *In scheme 1, at least following UE-B’s behavior is supported for inter-UE coordination:*    + *For preferred resource set,*      - *UE-B excludes in its resource selection resource(s) not belonging to the preferred resource set*       * *FFS how preferred resource set is generated using inter-UE coordination information received from multiple UE-A(s)*       * *~~FFS: Details including condition that~~ UE-B can take~~s~~ resource(s) not belonging to the preferred resource set into account in its resource selection*         + *FFS details*   + *For non-preferred resource set,*      - *UE-B excludes in its resource selection resource(s) belonging to the non-preferred resource set*       * *FFS how non-preferred resource set is generated using inter-UE coordination information received from multiple UE-A(s)*       * *~~FFS: Details including condition that~~ UE-B can take~~s~~ resource(s) belonging to the non-preferred resource set into account in its resource selection*         + *FFS details*     - *UE-B reselects resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) are fully/partially overlapping with the non-preferred resource set*       * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B does not reselect resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) are fully/partially overlapping with the non-preferred resource set* |
| Ericsson | No, see comments | For this proposal, we have the following comments and modifications:  In the bullet related to preferred resource set, we propose to modify the exclusion of resources not belonging to the preferred set, and instead to prioritize the set of resources which are included in the preferred set when performing the resource re-selection as defined in Rel-16 procedure.   * By doing this, we achieve that UE-B uses the information of the preferred resource set contained in the inter-UE coordination message to enhance its resource selection. * Additionally, by using this wording we avoid that the sensing results obtained by UE-B are not used. This is something we cannot agree to. We have shown in our contribution (R1-2108137) that UEs which do not use its sensing results, i.e., for resource re-selection and re-evaluation/pre-emption checking, and only use the coordination information have a worse performance than those which use both information. * The only situation where a UE can perform the resource selection without using its own sensing results, it is for the case where UE-B does not perform/is not capable of sensing.   ***Draft Proposal 6****:*   * *In scheme 1, at least following UE-B’s behavior is supported for inter-UE coordination:*    + *For preferred resource set,*      - *UE-B ~~excludes~~ prioritizes in its resource selection procedure, resource(s) ~~not~~ belonging to the preferred resource set*       * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B takes resource(s) not belonging to the preferred resource set into account in its resource selection procedure*   + *For non-preferred resource set,*      - *UE-B excludes in its resource selection procedure resource(s) belonging to the non-preferred resource set*       * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B takes resource(s) belonging to the non-preferred resource set into account in its resource selection procedure*     - *UE-B reselects resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) are fully/partially overlapping with the non-preferred resource set*       * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B does not reselect resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) are fully/partially overlapping with the non-preferred resource set*   + *Rel-16 (re-)selection procedure is used as the baseline.* |
| Mitsubishi |  | OK with the wording and reasoning from Ericsson |
| InterDigital | Yes | We support the proposal |
| Qualcomm | Please see comment | We like to clarify that “UE-B excludes in its resource selection resource(s) not belonging to the preferred resource set” hasn’t down-selected to one of the options from the RAN1 104-bis agreement on UE-B behavior and that subsequent discussion on the options is still needed. We’re ok with the wording if that’s the intention.  The wording “UE-B excludes in its resource selection resource(s) belonging to the non-preferred resource set” implies that UE-B always excludes those resources, which is not necessarily the case. We propose to incorporate the non-preferred resources into the resource selection mechanism.  We think that reselection based on non-preferred resource set could be beneficial and would like to further consider this case as a second priority after resource exclusion. Therefore, we propose to make it FFS for now.  ***Draft Proposal 6****:*   * *In scheme 1, at least following UE-B’s behavior is supported for inter-UE coordination:*    + *For preferred resource set,*      - *UE-B excludes in its resource selection resource(s) not belonging to the preferred resource set*       * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B takes resource(s) not belonging to the preferred resource set into account in its resource selection*   + *For non-preferred resource set,*      - *UE-B potentially excludes in its resource selection resource(s) belonging to the non-preferred resource set*       * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B takes resource(s) belonging to the non-preferred resource set into account in its resource selection and how the non-preferred resources are incorporated into UE-B’s resource selection*     - *FFS UE-B reselects resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) are fully/partially overlapping with the non-preferred resource set*       * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B does not reselect resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) are fully/partially overlapping with the non-preferred resource set* |
| Apple | Yes with comments | For preferred resource set, does “*UE-B excludes in its resource selection resource(s) not belonging to the preferred resource set”* mean any resources not in the preferred resource set will not be selected by UE-B? This may not work for multiple UE-A case. Consider the example where UE-B receives two sets of preferred resource sets from UE-A1 and UE-A2. If there is no intersection between the two sets, then UE-B cannot select any resources by the above statement.  For non-preferred resource set, UE-B may use this information also for its resource re-evaluation. Does “*UE-B excludes in its resource selection resource(s) belonging to the non-preferred resource set*” mean any resources in the non-preferred resource set will not be selected by UE-B? This may not work for multiple UE-A case. |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes, with modifications | ***Draft Proposal 6****:*   * *In scheme 1, at least following UE-B’s behavior is supported for inter-UE coordination:*    + *For preferred resource set,*      - *UE-B excludes in its resource selection resource(s) not belonging to the preferred resource set*       * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B takes resource(s) not belonging to the preferred resource set into account in its resource selection*   + *For non-preferred resource set,*      - *UE-B excludes in its resource selection resource(s) ~~belonging to~~ overlapping with the non-preferred resource set*       * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B takes resource(s) ~~belonging to~~ overlapping with the non-preferred resource set into account in its resource selection*     - *UE-B reselects resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) are fully/partially overlapping with the non-preferred resource set*       * *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B does not reselect resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) are fully/partially overlapping with the non-preferred resource set* |

**Question 2**: Do you agree Draft Proposal 7 for scheme 2?

***Draft Proposal 7****:*

* *In scheme 2, at least following UE-B’s behavior is supported for inter-UE coordination:* 
  + *UE-B reselects resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) is indicated with expected/potential resource conflict*
    - *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B does not reselect resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) is indicated with expected/potential resource conflict*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes or no** | **Comment** |
| Intel | Yes with comments | Scheme-2 should operate based on request otherwise inter-UE coordination information can be provided but not considered by UE-B.  We suggest to support scenario when UE-B may not reselect resource.  ***Draft Proposal 7****:*   * *In scheme 2, at least following UE-B’s behavior is supported for inter-UE coordination:*    + *UE-B indicates whether feedback on expected/potential resource conflict detection is requested*   + *UE-B can reselect~~s~~ resource(s) reserved for transmission ~~to be used for its transmission~~ when the reserved resource(s) is indicated with expected/potential resource conflict*     - *FFS: Details including condition that UE-B does not reselect resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) is indicated with expected/potential resource conflict* |
| Ericsson | Yes | We are supportive of this proposal. |
| InterDigital | Yes | In our view, Scheme 2 can be triggered at UE-A when a conflict is detected on a resource indicated in a UE-B’s SCI and this UE-B has UE-A as the intended RX UE. In addition, when a conflict is detected, the UE with the overlapping resource reservation should be considered as a UE-B as well. Basically, these UE-Bs can decide whether or not to act on the indication from UE-A based on certain conditions or (pre)configurations. Certain UE-B may not have the capability to act, e.g. re-select the resources when receiving an indication, e.g. a UE performing random selection RA. This capability or (pre)configuration should be taken into consideration. Thus, we suggest to modify the conditions for FFS in this proposal as following  ***Draft Proposal 7****:*   * *In scheme 2, at least following UE-B’s behavior is supported for inter-UE coordination:*    + *UE-B reselects resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) is indicated with expected/potential resource conflict*     - *FFS: Details including condition(s) that UE-B does not reselect resource(s) to be used for its transmission when the resource(s) is indicated with expected/potential resource conflict*     - *FFS: Details including (pre)configuration and corresponding indication of UE-B’s ability to reseslect resource(s) upon receiving the indication* |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes with comments | UE-B may indicate the inter-UE coordination request, and UE-A only sends inter-UE coordination at this request. In this sense, we support the proposed first sub-bullet from Intel. |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes |  |

1. **Summary of contributions**

* Type(s) of inter-UE coordination information
  + In scheme 1,
    - Preferred and non-preferred resource set
      * [Huawei,1] [Mitsubishi,3] [Spreadtrum,5] [CATT,9] [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [NEC,13] [Panasonic,18] [Qualcomm,19] [CMCC,20] [ETRI,21] [MediaTeK,22] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Apple,26] [ZTE,27] [Sharp,28] [DCM,29] [CEWiT,35] [Xiaomi,30] [Lenovo/MoTM, 14] (21 companies)
    - Preferred resource set only
      * [vivo,4] [Samsung,8] (2 companies)
    - Non-preferred resource set only
      * [OPPO,17] [Ericsson,36] (2 companies)
  + In scheme 2,
    - Presence of potential resource conflict and detected resource conflict
      * [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [Qualcomm,19] [ETRI,21] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] [Xiaomi,30] [CEWiT,35] [Ericsson,36] [Lenovo/MoTM, 14] (12 companies)
    - Presence of potential resource conflict only
      * [Mitsubishi,3] [vivo,4] [LG,23] [Samsung,8] [CATT,9] [Panasonic,18] [ZTE,27] [Sharp,28] [InterDigital,33] (9 companies)
* Details of inter-UE coordination signaling
  + In scheme 1,
    - Sensing-related information
      * [Fujitsu,11] [Apple,26] [InterDigital,33] [ASUSTeK,34]
    - Indicator to indicate either preferred resource or non-preferred resource
      * [Fraunhofer,10]
    - Purpose of the set of resources (e.g. avoiding half-duplex problem or high interference resources)
      * [LG,23]
    - Target UE-B’s transmission to use inter-UE coordination information
      * [Fraunhofer,10] [LG,23]
    - Reference feedback timestamp
      * [Intel,24]
    - Location information
      * [InterDigital,33]
  + In scheme 2,
    - Indication of whether resource conflict is due to either half-duplex or resource collision
      * [LG,23] [Intel,24] [InterDigital,33]
    - Time location of the resource conflict
      * [Zhejiang Lab,6] [Intel,24]
    - Indication of whether half-duplex in reception of UE-A
      * [Intel,24]
* Condition(s) for UEs to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) for inter-UE coordination
  + For scheme 1,
    - UE(s) among the intended receiver(s) of UE-B can be a UE-A
      * The intended receiver(s) is the destination UE(s) of a TB transmitted by UE-B
        + [Mitsubishi,3] [vivo,4] [Spreadtrum,5] [Samsung,8] [CATT,9] [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [OPPO,17] [Qualcomm,19](for preferred resource) [CMCC,20] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [ZTE,27] [Sharp,28] [DCM,29] [Xiaomi,30] [InterDigital,33] [Ericsson,36] [Lenovo/MoTM, 14] (20 companies)
    - Any UE can be a UE-A
      * [Huawei,1] [vivo,4] [Spreadtrum,5] [Fraunhofer,10] [Futurewei,12] [Panasonic,18] [Qualcomm,19](for non-preferred resource) [CMCC,20] [MediaTeK,22] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [InterDigital,33] [Lenovo/MoTM, 14] (13 companies)
      * Additional condition
        + UE-A is RX UE of the PSSCH of which resource(s) is conflicted with UE-B’s resource [Fujitsu,11]
        + Radio or geometric distance between UEs are close [Ericsson,36]
        + Negotiation between UEs to be UE-A and/or UE-B [vivo,4] [Samsung,8] [LG,23]
        + Semi-persistent transmissions are enabled for a resource pool [Intel,24]
        + Provided by its own higher layer to be UE-A and/or UE-B

[Huawei,1] [Fraunhofer,10] [CMCC,20] [LG,23]

* + - * + Pre-configuration and UE-capability

[Panasonic,18]

* + For scheme 2,
    - UE(s) among the intended receiver(s) of UE-B can be a UE-A
      * The intended receiver(s) is the destination UE(s) of a TB transmitted by UE-B
      * [Mitsubishi,3] [vivo,4] [Spreadtrum,5] [Samsung,8] [CATT,9] [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [OPPO,17] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Apple,26] [Sharp,28] [DCM,29] [InterDigital,33] [Lenovo/MoTM, 14] (16 companies)
    - Any UE can be a UE-A
      * [Huawei,1] [Spreadtrum,5] [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [Panasonic,18] [Qualcomm,19] [MediaTeK,22] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [DCM,29] [Xiaomi,30] [InterDigital,33] [Ericsson,36] (14 companies)
      * Additional conditions
        + UE-A is RX UE of the PSSCH of which resource(s) is conflicted with UE-B’s resource [Fujitsu,11] [DCM,29] [Lenovo/MoTM, 14]
        + Radio or geometric distance between UEs are close [Intel,24] [Ericsson,36]
        + Negotiation between UEs to be UE-A and/or UE-B [LG,23]
        + Provided by higher layer to be UE-A and/or UE-B

[Huawei,1] [Fraunhofer,10] [LG,23]

* + - * + Pre-configuration and UE-capability

[Panasonic,18]

* Information to generate inter-UE coordination information
  + In scheme 1,
    - Other UEs’ reserved resources or candidate resource set based on UE-A’s sensing result
      * [Huawei,1] [vivo,4] [Samsung,8] [CATT,9] [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [Lenovo,14] [OPPO,17] [CMCC,20] [ETRI,21] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Kyocera,25] [Apple,26] [ZTE,27] [DCM,29] [Xiaomi,30] [InterDigital,33] (20 companies)
      * Details
        + Sensing operation is performed based on UE-B’s traffic requirements if available [Huawei,1] [vivo,4] [Samsung,8] [NEC,13] [Lenovo,14] [OPPO,17] [LG,23] [ZTE,27]
        + Estimated SINR is used instead of RSRP measurement [Fujitsu,11]
        + UE-A’s sensing results in non-monitored slot(s) of UE-B [Fujitsu,11] [LG,23]
        + RSRP measurement is within a certain range [LG,23]
        + Periodic transmissions [Kyocera,25]
    - Coordination information received from other UEs
      * [Samsung,8] [Futurewei,12] [Qualcomm,19] [LG,23] [Apple,26] (5 companies)
      * Details
        + Resources to be used for other UE’s initial transmission [Qualcomm,19]
        + Non-preferred resources identified by scheme 2 [Samsung,8]
        + Preferred or non-preferred resources for UE-B’s transmission [LG,23]
    - Resource set for other UE-B’s transmissions is selected by UE-A
      * [Huawei,1] [vivo,4] [CATT,9] [DCM,29] (4 companies)
    - For the case where UE-A is intended receiver of UE-B’s transmission
      * UE-A’s NR SL resources selected for its transmission(s) of TB(s)
        + [Huawei,1] [CATT,9] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [Lenovo,14] [Qualcomm,19] [CMCC,20] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Kyocera,25] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] (12 companies)
        + Details

Only resources to be used for initial transmisison [Qualcomm,19]

* + - * UE-A’s scheduled and/or configured resources for UL
        + [Nokia,2] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Kyocera,25] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] (8 companies)
      * LTE SL transmission and/or reception of UE-A
        + [CATT,9] [Futurewei,12] [LG,23] [Kyocera,25] [DCM,29] (5 companies)
      * PSFCH transmission and/or reception of UE-A
        + [Apple,26] [DCM,29] (2 companies)
      * Non-active time
        + [Kyocera,25]
  + In scheme 2,
    - Other UEs’ reserved resources based on UE-A’s sensing result
      * [Huawei,1] [Nokia,2] [vivo,4] [Fraunhofer,10] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [OPPO,17] [ETRI,21] [MediaTeK,22] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] (13 companies)
      * Details
        + UE-A’s sensing results in non-monitored slot(s) of UE-B [Huawei,1] [LG,23]
        + RSRP measurement is within a certain range [LG,23]
        + Source ID/destination ID of other UE’s resource [Intel,24]
    - Other UEs’ existing transmission (i.e. used resources) based on UE-A’s sensing result
      * [Nokia,2] [Fraunhofer,10] [NEC,13] [Intel,24] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] (6 companies)
      * Details
        + Source ID/destination ID of other UE’s resource [Intel,24]
    - Coordination information received from other UEs
      * [Samsung,8] [Fraunhofer,10] [Futurewei,12] [LG,23] [Apple,26] (5 companies)
      * Details
        + Preferred or non-preferred resources for UE-B’s transmission [Samsung,8] [LG,23]
    - SL resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI
      * [vivo,4] [Samsung,8] [OPPO,17] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Apple,26] (6 companies)
    - For the case where UE-A is intended receiver of UE-B’s transmission
      * UE-A’s NR SL resources selected for its transmission(s) of TB(s)
        + [Nokia,2] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [LG,23] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] (6 companies)
      * UE-A’s scheduled/configured resources for UL
        + [Nokia,2] [vivo,4] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [LG,23] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] (7 companies)
      * LTE SL transmission and/or reception of UE-A
        + [vivo,4] [Futurewei,12] [LG,23] [DCM,29] (4 companies)
      * PSFCH transmission and/or reception of UE-A
        + [vivo,4] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] (3 companies)
  + Further consideration on the processing time budget for generating and transmitting inter-UE coordination information from UE-A
    - [vivo,4] [Fraunhofer,10] [Futurewei,12] [Lenovo,14] [LG,23] [Apple,26] (6 companies)
* Condition(s) for UE-A to send inter-UE coordination information to UE-B
  + In scheme 1,
    - UE-A receives the request from UE-B
      * [Huawei,1] [Nokia,2] [vivo,4] [Spreadtrum,5] [Sony,7] [Samsung,8] [CATT,9] [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [Lenovo,14] [OPPO,17] [Panasonic,18] [CMCC,20] [ETRI,21] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Kyocera,25] [Apple,26] [ZTE,27] [Sharp,28] [Xiaomi,30] [ITL,31] [InterDigital,33] [CEWiT,35] (26 companies)
      * Details of the request signaling
        + Information

A set of preferred or non-preferred resources determined at UE-B [Nokia,2]

UE-B’s resource (re)selection procedure-related parameters [Huawei,1] [vivo,4] [CATT,9] [Fujitsu,11] [OPPO,17] [LG,23] [Xiaomi,30] [InterDigital,33] (8 companies)

Resource reserved for UE-A’s transmission with coordination information [Nokia,2]

Type of coordination information to be requested [Fraunhofer,10] [ZTE,27]

* + - * + Container

PSFCH-like format [ETRI,21] [Kyocera,25]

SCI [Huawei,1] [Nokia,2] [vivo,4] [Futurewei,12] [Lenovo,14] [Kyocera,25]

MAC CE [vivo,4] [Lenovo,14] [LG,23] [ZTE,27]

PC5-RRC signaling [ZTE,27]

* + - * + Further consideration on how UE-B to transmit the request [Nokia,2] [vivo,4] [Xiaomi,30]
    - UE-A’s higher layer decision [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [LG,23]
    - Based on (pre)configured periodicity [Huawei,1] [vivo,4] [LG,23] [CEWiT,35]
    - Based on presence of resource conflict [Spreadtrum,5] [Sony,7] [Fraunhofer,10] [OPPO,17] [LG,23] [ITL,31] [InterDigital,33]
    - Based on RSRP measurement and/or distance at UE-A side [Mitsubishi,3] [CMCC,20] [Xiaomi,30] [ITL,31]
    - Based on the SL HARQ-ACK states [NEC,13] [Lenovo,14] [ITL,31]
  + In scheme 2,
    - UE-A receives the request from UE-B
      * [Samsung,8] [CATT,9] [Panasonic,18] [Intel,24] [Sharp,28]
      * Details of the request signaling
        + Container

SCI [CATT,9] [Intel,24]

* + - Based on presence of resource conflict [vivo,4] [Spreadtrum,5] [Sony,7] [CATT,9] [Fraunhofer,10] [Lenovo,14] [Panasonic,18] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Apple,26] [Xiaomi,30] [InterDigital,33]
      * Further consideration on checking condition to decide resource conflict [Fujitsu,11] [Lenovo,14] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Apple,26] [Xiaomi,30]
        + Portion of overlapping [Fujitsu,11] [Lenovo,14] [LG,23]
        + RSRP measurement [Lenovo,14] [LG,23] [Intel,24]
        + Location of UE-B and other UEs [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Xiaomi,30]
        + Whether this transmission is UE-B’s last retransmission or not [Apple,26]
        + Whether or not L2-IDs are achieved [Lenovo,14] [LG,23]
    - Based on the SL HARQ-ACK states [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [Lenovo,14]
* Container used for carrying coordination information
  + In scheme 1,
    - 1st SCI format
      * [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [CAICT,15] [Hyundai,16] [CMCC,20] [MediaTeK,22] [Sharp,28]
    - 2nd SCI format
      * [Huawei,1] [vivo,4] [Spreadtrum,5] [Sony,7] [Samsung,8] [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [Hyundai,16] [OPPO,17] [CMCC,20] [Apple,26] [Xiaomi,30] [CEWiT,35]
    - MAC CE
      * [vivo,4] [Spreadtrum,5] [Fujitsu,11] [NEC,13] [Panasonic,18] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [ZTE,27] [DCM,29] [InterDigital,33] [CEWiT,35]
    - PC5-RRC signaling
      * [NEC,13] [OPPO,17] [ZTE,27] [InterDigital,33] [CEWiT,35] [Ericsson,36]
    - PSFCH-like signaling
      * [NEC,13] [OPPO,17]
    - Details
      * Whether or how to Multiplex with data
        + SCI transmission without SL-SCH [Huawei,1] [Fraunhofer,10] [Qualcomm,19]
        + Multiplexing without data other than coordination information [Fraunhofer,10] [Qualcomm,19] [LG,23]
        + Multiplexing with data other than coordination information[Fraunhofer,10] [Intel,24]
      * Cast type of inter-UE coordination signaling
        + Unicast [Huawei,1] [Spreadtrum,5]
        + Groupcast [Nokia,2] [OPPO,17]
        + Broadcast
  + In scheme 2,
    - PSFCH-like format
      * [Huawei,1] [Nokia,2] [vivo,4] [Zhejiang Lab,6] [Sony,7] [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [CAICT,15] [Hyundai,16] [Panasonic,18] [Qualcomm,19] [MediaTeK,22] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] [Xiaomi,30] [InterDigital,33] [Ericsson,36]
      * Details
        + Unused PSFCH resources for SL HARQ-ACK feedback are used [Huawei,1] [Lenovo,14]
        + Unused PSFCH resources for SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 2 can be used [Nokia,2]
        + Timing of the PSFCH-like channel

With respect to the time location of the potential conflicted PSSCH resource

[vivo,4] [Fraunhofer,10] [LG,23] [DCM,29]

With respect to the time location of a SCI indicating PSSCH resource with potential resource conflict

[Apple,26]

* + - * + NACK transmission of UE-A on behalf of the intended receiver for detected resource conflict [Lenovo,14] [Qualcomm,19] [Intel,24]
        + More than 1 bits can be conveyed on a PSFCH-like channel [Intel,24]
      * Further consideration prioritization rule for PSFCHs for SL HARQ-ACK feedback and inter-UE coordination [Fujitsu,11] [Lenovo,14] [Intel,24]
    - 1st SCI format
      * [Sharp,28]
    - 2nd SCI format
      * [Samsung,8]
    - MAC CE
      * [Futurewei,12]
  + Further consideration on whether shared or dedicated resource is used for inter-UE coordination signaling [Nokia,2] [Qualcomm,19] [Kyocera,25]
* UE-B’s behavior upon receiving inter-UE coordination information from UE-A
  + In scheme 1,
    - Option 1-1: UE-B’s resource(s) to be used for its transmission resource (re)-selection is based on both UE-B’s sensing result (if available) and the received coordination information
      * [Huawei,1] [Mitsubishi,3] [vivo,4] [Samsung,8] [CATT,9] [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [Lenovo,14] [Hyundai,16] [OPPO,17] [Qualcomm,19] [CMCC,20] [ETRI,21] [MediaTeK,22] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Kyocera,25] [Apple,26] [ZTE,27] [Sharp,28] [DCM,29] [Xiaomi,30] [Convida,32] [InterDigital,33] [CEWiT,35] [Ericsson,36]
      * Details
        + For preferred resource set, use intersection of preferred resource set and UE-B’s candidate resource set [Huawei,1] [vivo,4] [Samsung,8] [Fraunhofer,10] [Lenovo,14] [LG,23]
        + For preferred resource set, use union of preferred resource set and UE-B’s candidate resource set [vivo,4]
        + For non-preferred resource set, exclude the non-preferred resource set from UE-B’s candidate resource set [Huawei,1] [CATT,9] [Lenovo,14] [LG,23]
        + For non-preferred resource set, reselect UE-B’s transmission resource overlapping with the non-preferred resources [Lenovo,14] [OPPO,17] [CMCC,20] [MediaTeK,22] [LG,23] [Apple,26] [InterDigital,33]
        + Inter-UE coordination information is used in resource (re)selection procedure at MAC layer [ZTE,27]
      * Further clarification when UE-B has no available sensing results [LG,23]
    - Option 1-2: UE-B’s resource(s) to be used for its transmission resource (re)-selection is based only on the received coordination information
      * [Huawei,1] [vivo,4] [Fraunhofer,10] [Futurewei,12] [NEC,13] [Hyundai,16] [Qualcomm,19] [CMCC,20] [ETRI,21] [MediaTeK,22] [Apple,26] [Convida,32] [InterDigital,33]
      * Condition
        + When UE-A is a leading UE of a UE group of UE-B [Huawei,1] [vivo,4]
        + When UE-B has no sensing results [ETRI,21] [InterDigial,32]
        + When UE-A is the intended receiver of the UE-B’s transmission [MediaTeK,22]
      * Further clarification when UE-B has no available sensing results [LG,23]
  + In scheme 2,
    - Option 2-1: UE-B can determine resource(s) to be re-selected based on the received coordination information
      * [vivo,4] [Samsung,8] [CATT,9] [Fujitsu,11] [NEC,13] [OPPO,17] [Qualcomm,19] [ETRI,21] [MediaTeK,22] [LG,23] [Intel,24] [Apple,26] [Sharp,28] [DCM,29] [Xiaomi,30] [Convida,32] [InterDigital,33] [Ericsson,36]
      * Details
        + Exclude resource and perform resource reselection [LG,23] [Intel,24]

When the type of resource conflict is resource collision, UE-B assumes that its reserved time-and-frequency PSSCH resources associated with resource conflict is non-preferred resources for UE-B’s transmission [LG,23]

When the type of resource conflict is half-duplex problem, UE-B assumes that all the frequency resources in a slot associated with the resource conflict is non-preferred resources for UE-B’s transmission [LG,23]

* + - * + Continue transmission on reserved resource [Intel,24]
        + Skip transmission on reserved resource [Intel,24]
    - Option 2-2: UE-B can determine a necessity of retransmission based on the received coordination information
      * [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [NEC,13] [Qualcomm,19] [ETRI,21] [Intel,24] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] [Xiaomi,30] [Convida,32] [Ericsson,36]
      * Condition
        + Groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback option 1 is enabled [Fujitsu,11] [Apple,26] [DCM,29] [Xiaomi,30]
      * Details
        + Increase amount of intended (re)transmission or increment max number of retransmissions [Intel,24]
  + Further consideration whether using the coordination information is mandated or not [Futurewei,12] [DCM,29] [Convida,32]
* Validity check for the inter-UE coordination information received by UE-B
  + In scheme 1,
    - Based on PDB [Samsung,8]
    - Based on whether the indicated resource set is inside UE-B’s selection window [Fraunhofer,10] [LG,23]
    - Based on RSRP values conveyed by coordination information [Fraunhofer,10]
    - Based on distance between UE-A and UE-B [Samsung,8] [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11]
    - Based on RSRP measured by coordination information signaling [Samsung,8] [Fraunhofer,10] [Fujitsu,11] [LG,23]
    - Based on the target of the coordination information and/or the parameters of PSCCH/PSSCH to be transmitted by UE-B [Samsung,8] [Fraunhofer,10] [LG,23]
    - Based on the candidate resource ratio [LG,23]
    - Based on the aging time with respect to the reference feedback timestamp [Intel,24]
  + In scheme 2,
    - Based on PDB [Samsung,8]
    - Based on distance between UE-A and UE-B [Samsung,8] [Fraunhofer,10]
    - Based on the target of the coordination information and/or the parameters of PSCCH/PSSCH to be transmitted by UE-B [Samsung,8] [Fraunhofer,10] [LG,23]
* Others
  + Further consideration of indication to UE-A of ID(s) used by UE-B and the intended receiver(s) of UE-B’s transmission [Nokia,2]
  + Further consideration on relaying the received SCI [Nokia,2]
  + Further consideration on having preferred resources with different preference levels [Samsung,8]
  + Send SL to RAN2 to ask the feasibility of hierarchical mechanism [Panasonic,18]
  + Further consideration on the impact on Rel-16 UE sharing the same resource pool with UEs using inter-UE coordination operation [Panasonic,18]
  + Further consideration on the possibility that UE-B changes PSCCH/PSSCH parameters (e.g. source ID, destination ID, whether SL HARQ-ACK feedback enabled or disabled) period-to-period [LG,23]
  + Further consideration on SL DRX to determine “A set of resources” at UE-A side [ASUSTeK,34]
  + Further consideration of that non-sensing UE uses scheme 2 [Ericsson,36]
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**7.1 Conclusions made in RAN1#103-e meeting**

* ***Conclusion****:*
  + *The schemes of inter-UE coordination in Mode 2 are categorized as being based on the following types of “A set of resources” sent by UE-A to UE-B:*
    - *UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
      * + *e.g., based on its sensing result*
    - *UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
      * + *e.g., based on its sensing result and/or expected/potential resource conflict*
    - *UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resource where the resource conflict is detected*
    - *FFS: details of resource conflict, e.g., including type of resource conflict*
    - *FFS: details of sensing operation at UE-A side*
    - *FFS: which type(s) of resource set information is(are) beneficial/feasible to which cast type(s)*
    - *Note: these different types may be used in combination with each other*
  + *From RAN1 perspective, further study on the feasibility/benefit of inter-UE coordination is required*
  + *Send an LS to RAN plenary*
    - *Final LS in R1-2009841*
* ***Conclusion****:*
  + *For the schemes of inter-UE coordination identified as feasible/beneficial, at least the following aspects are further discussed.*
    - *How/when UE-A determines the contents of ”A set of resources”, including consideration of UL scheduling*
    - *When UE-A sends ”A set of resources” to UE-B, including which UE(s) sends it*
    - *How UE-A and UE-B are determined*
    - *How UE-A sends ”A set of resources” to UE-B, including container used for carrying it, implicitly or explicitly or both*
    - *How/when/whether UE-B receives “A set of resources” and takes it into account in the resource selection for its own transmission*
    - *How/whether to define the relationship between support/signaling of inter-UE coordination and cast type*

**7.2 Conclusions made in RAN1#104-e meeting**

* ***Conclusion****:*
  + *RAN1 concludes that the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2 is feasible, and is beneficial (e.g., reliability, etc.) compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, and thus recommends specification of the feature.*
    - *The detailed observations can be found in the attachment of the LS*
* *Draft LS in R1-2102165, along with the attachment R1-2102166, is approved (with a typo fix)* 
  + *Final LS in R1-2102168*

**7.3 Agreements made in RAN1#104bis-e meeting**

* *Agreement:*
  + *Support the following schemes of inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:*
    - *Inter-UE Coordination Scheme 1:* 
      * *The coordination information sent from UE-A to UE-B is the set of resources preferred and/or non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
        + *FFS details including a possibility of down-selection between the preferred resource set and the non-preferred resource set, whether or not to include any additional information other than indicating time/frequency of the resources within the set in the coordination information*
      * *FFS condition(s) in which Scheme 1 is used*
    - *Inter-UE Coordination Scheme 2:* 
      * *The coordination information sent from UE-A to UE-B is the presence of expected/potential and/or detected resource conflict on the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI*
        + *FFS details including a possibility of down-selection between the expected/potential conflict and the detected resource conflict*
      * *FFS condition(s) in which Scheme 2 is used*
* *Agreement:*
  + *Study further to determine the conditions for UEs to be UE-A(s)/UE-B(s) for inter-UE coordination:*
    - *Details include applicable scenario(s)/inter-UE coordination scheme(s)*
    - *E.g., only UE(s) among the intended receiver(s) of UE-B can be a UE-A, any UE can be a UE-A, high-layer configured, etc.*
      * *Including the possibility of being subject to certain conditions and/or capability*
* *Agreement:*
  + *When UE-B receives the inter-UE coordination information from UE-A, consider at least one of the following options (with details FFS including possibly down-selecting/merging one or more of the options below, applicable scenario(s)/condition(s) for each option, UE behavior) for UE-B’s to take it into account in the resource (re)-selection for its own transmission*
    - *For scheme 1:*
      * *Option 1-1: UE-B’s resource(s) to be used for its transmission resource (re)-selection is based on both UE-B’s sensing result (if available) and the received coordination information*
      * *Option 1-2: UE-B’s resource(s) to be used for its transmission resource (re)-selection is based only on the received coordination information*
      * *Option 1-3: UE-B’s resource(s) to be re-selected based on the received coordination information*
      * *Option 1-4: UE-B’s resource(s) to be used for its transmission resource (re)-selection is based on the received coordination information*
    - *For scheme 2:*
      * *Option 2-1: UE-B can determine resource(s) to be re-selected based on the received coordination information*
      * *Option 2-2: UE-B can determine a necessity of retransmission based on the received coordination information*

**7.4 Agreements made in RAN1#106-e meeting**

* *Agreement:*
  + *For scheme 1, the following inter-UE coordination information signalling from UE-A is supported. FFS details including condition(s)/scenario(s) under which each information is enabled to be sent by UE-A and used by UE-B.*
    - *Set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
    - *Set of resources non-preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
* *Agreement:*
  + *For scheme 2, the following inter-UE coordination information signalling from UE-A is supported. FFS details including condition(s)/scenario(s) under which each information is enabled to be sent by UE-A and used by UE-B*
    - *Presence of expected/potential resource conflict on the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI*
      * *FFS: UE behaviour when the presence of expected/potential resource conflict is detected by the transmitter*
    - *FFS: Whether to additionally support the presence of detected resource conflict on the resources indicated by UE-B’s SCI*