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# Introduction

This document provides the email discussion summary on Reply LS to R1-2106430.

[106-e-NR-R17-Sidelink-05] Reply LS to [R1-2106430](file:///D:\08_Rel-17\05_会议文稿\Docs\R1-2106430.zip) (LS on synchronous operation between Uu and SL in TDD band n79, RAN4) by August 20 – Rui (CATT)

# Summary of contributions

In the LS from RAN4, the synchronous operation between Uu and SL in TDD band n79 is raised, and provide two potential options:

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Overall Description:**  Partially used SL with Uu in TDD band, e.g. n79, irrespective of TDM or FDM is being discussed for Rel-17 SL enhancement in RAN4.  In Rel-16 NR V2X, SL transmission timing is aligned with DL timing of Uu based on RAN1 agreements. The same SL transmission timing if applied to Rel-17 SL in the scenario of partially used SL with Uu in TDD band may give rise to interference problem between SL and Uu.  There are two options under discussion in RAN4 as below.  Option 1: To follow the Rel-16 agreement to align SL transmission timing with DL timing.  Option 2: To reconsider SL transmission timing to align with UL timing to mitigate the interference between Uu and SL, i.e.   * For sidelink transmissions,   + SL transmission timing is aligned with Uplink timing when Uu and sidelink is TDMed/FDMed coexistence in the same band, including TDM coexistence within the same carrier or different carriers.   + Otherwise, SL transmission timing is aligned with Downlink timing.   RAN4 respectfully ask RAN1 to clarify that is it feasible that RAN4 consider option 2 from RAN1 perspective to define SL transmission timing to align with UL timing when SL is synchronized to a network?  **2. Actions:**  **To RAN WG1:**  RAN4 respectfully request RAN1 to clarify the above question regarding partially used SL with Uu in TDD band. |

Companies’ views are summarized as following:

* Samsung [2]: Option 1, the reason is that option 2 will lead to backward compatibility issues between UEs supporting option 1 (i.e. Rel-16) and UEs supporting option 2 in the same network.
* OPPO [3][9]: Option 1, the reason is as following:
* No timing advanced field in Rel-16 SCI, PSCCH and PSSCH are transmitted in same slot, the Rel-12 D2D mechanism cannot be reused.
* Only 1 reference timing is maintained by UE
* Option 2 will lead to timing misalignment between RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state UEs
* Qualcomm [4]: Option 1, the reason is as following:
* Option 2 will lead to timing misalignment between RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state UEs
* Interference between SL and Uu could exist even if option 2 is used.
* LG [5]: Option 1, the reason is as following:
  + No timing advanced field in Rel-16 SCI, PSCCH and PSSCH are transmitted in same slot, the Rel-12 D2D mechanism cannot be reused.
  + If option 2 is used, the maximum timing differences between different UEs(UEs with UL timing vs. UEs with DL timing) would be increased compared to Rel-16 NR-V2X, which has negative impacts on SL transmission/reception.
  + Insufficient remaining time of Rel-17 WI.
* Apple [6]: Provides clarification on the feasible or infeasible scenarios on option 2:
  + For a mode 1 UE in RRC idle or inactive state or a mode 2 UE, the uplink timing may not be maintained at the UE, and hence Option 2 is infeasible.
  + For a mode 1 UE in RRC connected state, the uplink timing is maintained at the UE, and hence Option 2 is feasible. In other words, Option 2 is feasible for mode 1 UE in RRC connected state.
* Xiaomi [7]: Option 1: the reason is as following:
  + TA is only available for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, and not possible for RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE UEs
  + Option 2 will lead to timing misalignment between RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state UEs, the SL communication between RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state UEs may be broken due to the timing misalignment
* Vivo [8]: Option 1, the reason is as following:
  + TA is only available for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs, and not possible for RRC\_IDLE and RRC\_INACTIVE UEs
  + Option 2 will lead to timing misalignment between RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state UEs, the SL communication between RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state UEs may be broken due to the timing misalignment
  + Option 2 will lead to backward compatibility issue between Rel-16 and Rel-17 UEs in SL communication because different transmission timings are applied
* ZTE, Sanechips [10]: Option 1, the reason is as following:
  + Supporting SL communication between between RRC\_CONNECTED state and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state UEs, and reduce the timing misalignment as much as possible.
  + The GAP symbol can address Tx/Rx switching/the misalignment of SL transmission timing and Uplink timing, etc.
  + Option 2 will seriously affect LTE and NR sidelink coexistence and mutual communication between Rel-17 UEs and Rel-14/15/16 UEs.
* Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell [11]: Option 2 at least when Uu and SL are in same carrier, the reason is as following:
  + If SL and Uu are in the same carrier, SL mode 1 operation can be assumed, while mode 2 would not be efficient usage of resources when all the UL transmissions are dynamically scheduled by the gNB.
  + Option 1 could create interference to the UL transmissions because in the time domain consecutive SL and Uu slots would overlap and in the frequency domain adjacent SL and UL subcarriers would not be fully orthogonal.
* Ericsson [12][13]: Provides clarification on both options
  + For option 1:
    - The use of DL timing allows for SL communication between nearby UEs in the same cell.
    - The use of DL timing for SL communication may require a tight OLPC using DL PL if the TX UE is close to the gNB.
    - With the Rel-16 requirement of tracking a single timing reference, SL communication across cell borders using DL timing may not be possible in general.
  + For option 2:
    - The use of UL timing for SL transmission requires that all SL active UEs (i.e., interested in TX or RX over SL) are RRC\_CONNECTED.
    - The use of UL timing (i.e., requiring UEs to be RRC\_CONNECTED to have a TA value, etc.) for SL transmission must be configurable and always complementary to using DL timing, not a standalone solution.
    - If the Rel-16 requirement of tracking a single timing reference is reused, SL communication across cell borders using UL timing may not be possible in general.
  + Coexistence is not possible in a scenario where some UEs use DL timing for SL transmission (Option 1) and other UEs use UL timing for SL transmission (Option 2) if the Rel-16 requirement of tracking a single timing reference is kept.
* Huawei, Hisilicon [14]: Option 2 when Uu and SL are in same carrier, the reason is as following:
  + Option 1 will lead to timing misalignment between UL and SL, in this situation, SL transmission will cause interference to UL reception, and UL transmission will cause interference to SL transmission or reception.
  + Band n79 is specified for Rel-17 UE only by now, and whether to support Rel-16 UE operating in this band is not clear yet.

# Round 1 discussion

Based on the summary of companies’ contributions, the observations are as following:

* For option 1(DL timing):
  + Allows sidelink communication between RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs
  + No backward compatible issues when R17 is coexisting with R14/R15/R16 SL UEs.
  + The UL interference due to SL transmission can only be mitigated by power control based on DL pathloss and gap symbol.
* For option 2(UL timing) at least when UL and SL are in same carrier.
  + The precondition for option 2 is that all the SL UEs should be RRC\_CONNECTED state, including Tx UEs and Rx UEs.
  + There is potential coexistence issue between R17 and R14/R15/R16 SL UEs.

Based on the above observations, I would like to collect companies’ views on the following questions firstly.

**Q1: From RAN1’s perspective, is it acceptable to mandate all the SL active UEs being RRC\_CONNECTED state when Uu and SL share same carrier?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | No | If it is mandatory that all SL UEs are in RRC\_CONNECTED state, one of the preconditions is that the network coverage should be everywhere and all UEs should be IC. However, the precondition is not realistic for all the releases by now.  Furthermore, Q1 precludes the SL UEs in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE working on the share carrier. |
| Xiaomi | No | From Rel-17 SL WID, three use cases have been considered for NR sidelink including V2x, public safety and commercial. At least for V2x and public safety services, it would be critical to support sidelink operation when UEs are in RRC\_idle state, or to support SL operation when UEs are in partial coverage or out of coverage. Even for commercial services, it would be much beneficial to enable sidelink operation among UEs in RRC\_idle state, and enable sidelink operation between UEs in RRC\_connected and UEs in RRC\_idle.  From our point of view, a solution can be considered as “acceptable” only if it can satisfy the targeted service requirement and application scenario. Therefore we do not think mandating all SL UEs are in RRC\_connected is “acceptable”. |
| Ericsson | It depends | If all UEs need to be in RRC\_CONNECTED state, depending on the number of UEs this could pose a management problem at the gNB. This is unacceptable for a mass UC such as V2X. On the other hand, for a UC with a handful of users such as PS, it may be possible and indeed preferrable over having larger interference to Uu. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | Same view with Ericsson. It would be up to use case. |
| Apple |  | This may be up to use cases. |
| Qualcomm | No | Requiring UEs to be in RRC\_CONNECT to use sidelink is not backwards compatible with the existing design and runs counter to use cases that are listed in the WID.  The question from RAN4 is about the same band and it isn’t clear why Q1 is signaling out the same carrier case.  We prefer to focus the discussion directly on the question from RAN4. RAN4 did not ask RAN1’s view on whether all UEs could be required to be in the RRC\_CONNECTED state for example. |
| LG Electronics | No | We don’t understand why Q1 is related to the question (asked to RAN1) in RAN4 LS. In addition, the motivation of specifying such a restriction does not seem reasonable even from a technical point of view. |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | No | We prefer legacy sidelink operating principle defined based on DL timings and even mandating all SL active UEs to be in RRC connected state will still create backward compatibility issues with R16 SL UEs. |
| vivo | Comment | This is not a decision 3GPP/RAN1 can make; it is a deployment issue.  On the other hand, even in Rel-16 (and actually also in LTE), it is already possible for the network to enforce that only connected mode UEs can use SL. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No | Considering the scenarios for sidelink (InC, OoC, and partial coverage), and backward compatibility with Rel-14/15/16 sidelink UEs, it is not reasonable to mandate all the Rel-17 SL active UEs being RRC\_CONNECTED state. |
| Sharp | No | Agree with other companies that this is not backward compatible with legacy UEs. |
| Intel | Comments | We suggest aligning question with LS from RAN4, e.g.  Is it feasible from RAN1 perspective to define SL transmission timing to align with UL timing when SL is synchronized to a network? |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  | We agree with Ericsson. In the shared carrier interference from SL to Uu need to be considered. We think that the option to only have SL between RRC\_CONNECTED UEs and the use UL timing for SL should be supported in the shared carrier. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | This question was not asked by RAN4, neither clear about the relationship with RAN4 question in the LS, so we suggest to focus the discussion directly on the RAN4’s question. Considering from technical perspective, it is not reasonable either to mandate a UE always work in RRC\_CONNECTED state, especially for the UE using resource allocation mode-2. |
| Samsung | No | It is not clear how this question relates to the response RAN4 is seeking.  SL active UE’s can be in RRC Connected state, RRC INACTIVE or RRC IDLE. In partial coverage scenarios, it seems unreasonable to mandate that all SL active UE’s are RRC connected state as this requires all UEs to be in coverage, and even if all UEs are in coverage this will increase the load on the network. |
| Fraunhofer | No | We do not think that all SL active UEs have to be mandated to be in the RRC\_CONNECTED state, primarily because it would not be possible for a UE to be always in coverage with a gNB and has backward compatibility issues. Also, even if this were possible, it should be considered depending on the use case, as mentioned by Ericsson and others. |
| Convida Wireless | No | We don’t think that all SL active UEs should be mandated to be in the RRC\_CONNECTED state. |
| Futurewei | No | The question is not directly related to the question that RAN4 asked.  It may be possible and beneficial for some scenarios, but not reasonable to mandate all the SL active UEs being RRC\_CONNECTED state for all cases. |
| MediaTek | No | Unclear the relation to the RAN4 question. But such restriction may not be reasonable, especially if SL UE may not have the uu interface. |

**Q2: From RAN1’s perspective, whether the coexistence between R17 SL UEs and R14/R15/R16 SL UEs in shared carrier or dedicated carrier need to be supported?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Yes | Backward compatibility issue should always be considered at least for those releases by now. Band n79 is defined specifically for Rel-17 SL only by now, however n79 is not a release-specific band. If it will not support other releases of SL UEs on band n79, this band must be useless by only supporting only one release SL features with a precondition that all UEs should be in RRC\_CONNECTED states. Therefore, the coexistence should be supported. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | In Rel 17 sidelink WID, it has clearly stated “Enhancements introduced in Rel-17 should be based on the functionalities specified in Rel-16, and Rel-17 sidelink should be able to coexist with Rel-16 sidelink in the same resource pool.” |
| Ericsson | Yes, but only for bands with Rel-16 UEs | In our view, it is important that backward compatibility is ensured. Clearly, mixing DL and UL timing in the same cell or area is not possible. However, for the new bands from Rel-17 a NW operator may choose to use a configuration that is not suitable for Rel-16 UEs. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes, at least with Rel-16 UE | Rel-16 UE may be configured with SL in the band. This possibility should be kept. |
| Apple | Yes | The coexistence of Rel-17 UE and Rel-16 UE needs to be supported. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Our understanding of the WID is that ensuring coexistence between Rel-16 and Rel-17 is needed:  Enhancements introduced in Rel-17 should be based on the functionalities specified in Rel-16, and Rel-17 sidelink should be able to coexist with Rel-16 sidelink in the same resource pool. This does not preclude the possibility of operating Rel-17 sidelink in a dedicated resource pool  Similar to our comment on Q1, we prefer to focus the discussion directly on the question from RAN4. |
| LG Electronics | Comment | According to our understanding on the current RAN4 specification, Rel-16 SL operation on the band of “n79” is supported. This means that in this band, Rel-16 SL UE and Rel-17 SL UE can coexist (see Table 5.2E.2-1 in TS 38.101-1). We think that the coexistence between Rel-14/15 LTE SL UE and Rel-16/17 NR SL UE in the same band does not need to be discussed here. For your information, the following note is explicitly written in WID of Rel-17 SL enhancement (regardless of carrier type (e.g., shared licensed carrier, ITS dedicated carrier)).   * *Enhancements introduced in Rel-17 should be based on the functionalities specified in Rel-16, and Rel-17 sidelink should be able to coexist with Rel-16 sidelink in the same resource pool.* |
| Lenovo/Motorola Mobility | Yes | We share the same view as OPPO |
| vivo | Yes with comment | Backward coexistence should be supported from RAN1 specification perspective. However, it is not precluded that there may be some SL bands introduced in future release but not in a release independent way. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes | Backward compatibility in system and multi-RAT(NR and LTE sidelink) coexistence in one device should be considered. |
| Sharp | Yes | Same view as Xiaomi. |
| Intel | Comments | Our understanding is that R14/R15 UEs are out of WID scope. Our answer is yes for R16 UEs only. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes, but only for bands with Rel-16 UEs | Our understanding is that the scenario discussed in the LS i.e. “SL and Uu in the same TDD band” is not supported in Rel-16 in RAN4, so there would not be coexistence problems if UL timing was used in this case. We think that if RAN1 specifies an option to use UL timing in the shared carrier case, it does not create coexistence problems. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | LTE-V2X releases are not in-scope. | Similar as our comments in Q1, we suggest to discuss the question asked by RAN4 directly.  As per the coexistence for different releases’ UE, in the WID of Rel-17 SL enhancements, it supports the coexistence between Rel-16 and Rel-17 in the same resource pool, so based on our understanding, at least in ITS bands, Rel-16/Rel-17 UE can coexist.  For the coexistence among Rel-14/Rel-15 and Rel-16/Rel-17 UE, we think it is out of the scope of RAN1 discussion. We also share the views that does not need to be discussed here. |
| Samsung | Yes | Backward compatibility to release 16 for bands where Rel-17 and Rel-16 UEs can co-exist. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | We agree that there should be co-existence between at least Rel-16 and Rel-17 UEs. |
| Convida Wireless | Yes | From RAN1’s perspective, we should support the coexistence between R17 SL UEs and R16 SL UEs in shared carrier or dedicated carrier. |
| Futurewei | comments | Coexistence among R14/R15 and R16/R17 UEs is not related to the question RAN4 asked. It is out of scope. The coexistence of R16 and R17 UEs in the same resource pool is supported based on R17 sidelink WID |
| MediaTek | comments | Rel’17 can co-exist with Rel’16 UEs but it doesn’t preclude that Rel’17 UE can have its own resource pool for operation.  Co-existence between Rel’14/15 UEs and Rel’16/17 UEs is another issue and no new mechanism is required for Rel’17 UE. |

# Round 2 discussion

Based on the Round 1 discussion, most of companies have concerns on mandating all the SL active UEs to be RRC\_CONNECTED state. In this situation, if some of SL UEs with RRC\_CONNECTED state are using UL timing(option 1), and some of SL UEs with RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state are using DL timing(Option 2), the SL communication between these two types of UEs may be broken. From RAN1’s perspective, we should avoid this issue.

As comment by some companies, whether mandating all the SL active UEs to be RRC\_CONNECTED state is up to use case. But other companies think it is not necessary mandate that all the SL active UE is RRC\_CONNECTED state or always work in RRC\_CONNECTED state. Based on this situation, it is moderator’s opinion that RAN1 has no consensus on that UE can always maintain the UL timing even when the UE is worked within network coverage.

Regarding the coexistence between R17 SL and R16 SL, as comment by most of companies, there is a clear note in R17 eSL WID that “Enhancements introduced in Rel-17 should be based on the functionalities specified in Rel-16, and Rel-17 sidelink should be able to coexist with Rel-16 sidelink in the same resource pool. This does not preclude the possibility of operating Rel-17 sidelink in a dedicated resource pool”. From WID’s perspective, even there is a potential room for defining new feature which is not backward compatible with R16 in a dedicated resource pool. However, according to R16 SL design, SL synchronization is designed in a system/cell-specific manner which will used for all the resource pool. If there is a R16 SL UE which is coexistence with R17 SL UE in same band, the SL synchronization operation in 17 should be backward compatible with R16 design aspects, otherwise, they cannot communicate with each other.

Regarding whether a new SL band is only defined for R17 or not, it is out of scope of RAN1 discussion.

Based on above summary/observation, the following proposals and questions are prepared.

***Draft Proposal 1: In case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in same band, only option 1 is used in R17 SL synchronization, i.e. SL transmitting timing is aligned with DL timing when SL is synchronized to a network.***

**Q1: Do you agree draft proposal 1? Please feel free to revision the proposal in your feedback**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Comments | We are supportive of the proposal intention, but we prefer to stick to the question/action in LS. In our view RAN1 can reply something along the following lines:  RAN1 has not studied feasibility of Option 2 for NR sidelink communication. Option 2 is not supported by NR specification and RAN1 is not considering support of Option 2 in R17, since it implies quite many challenges for sidelink communication (e.g. sidelink communication with RRC\_IDLE UEs) |
| Ericsson | Comments | What is the intention of this proposal? Capture it as a conclusion? In any case, the statement as such requires some changes  “In case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in same band, of the options described in the LS by RAN4, only option 1 is suitable ~~used in R17 SL synchronization~~, i.e., SL transmitting timing is aligned with DL timing when SL is synchronized to a network.” |
| OPPO | comments | We share the similar view with Intel that the reply LS should be focused on the question from RAN4.  RAN4 is asking about the feasibility of option 2. So the reply LS can have following 2 aspects:   1. Answer the question directly about option 2: **Based on RAN1’s discussion/understanding, it is not feasible for RAN4 to consider option 2 to define SL transmission timing to align with UL timing when SL is synchronized to a network.** 2. In addition to the question, RAN1 can also provide suggestion/analysis about option 1. I am not sure this is necessary since RAN4 did not ask anything about option 1:   **Option 1 can be used by following the Rel-16 agreement to align SL transmission timing with DL timing.**  Besides the answers in bold words above, the reason of why option 2 is not feasible can also be added. Even we do not think it necessary, since RAN4 did not ask about it. |
| Samsung | Comment | We agree with Intel and Oppo to focus on the question asked by RAN4.  The proposal is not clear as we haven’t yet agreed on Rel-17 SL UE behavior. Does this proposal presume option 2 is supported?  We can simply say: Rel-16 SL UEs only support option 1. The support of option 2 in a band precludes Rel-16 SL UEs from operating in that band.  We can also add that RAN1 has not studied the specification impact of option 2, and thus, can’t comment now of the feasibility of supporting option 2 in a band that precludes Rel-16 SL UEs.  There will be design impacts at least in regards to the state of the UE (RRC connected/inactive/idle), as well as the coverage status (in coverage/partial coverage). |
| Xiaomi | Comment | We have the same understanding as OPPO that a direct answer to RAN4 question is enough:  **From RAN1 perspective, it is not feasible for RAN4 to consider option 2 to define SL transmission timing to align with UL timing when SL is synchronized to a network.**  There are many reasons why RAN1 consider it is not feasible, including but not limited to R16/R17 coexistence, idle/connected UE communication, partial coverage support, etc. So we prefer to not spending time to discuss different reasons and cases. |
| LG Electronics | Comment | As already commented by several companies, we do not think that it is necessary to make an agreement on Draft proposal 1. |
| Apple | Comment | We also think no new agreements should be made, since we already had one agreement RAN1 #101-e meeting. Reply LS to RAN4 is enough. |
| Qualcomm |  | We’d like to first clarify whether this a proposal for a RAN1 conclusion or to include in the reply LS.  We share the other companies’ preference to focus on the question from RAN4 and we don’t think a conclusion is necessary if that’s the intention.  If this is to include in the reply, the wording from OPPO looks good to us. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | Same view with companies. We should focus on reply LS to RAN4. |
| vivo | Comments | We agree with the intention, but the wording of the proposal 1 could be clarified for better understanding:   1. Not only the transmitting, but also the reception timing is aligned with DL timing, so it is better to use ‘SL transmission timing’ or ‘SL timing’ instead.   The wording of “**only** option 1” may be misunderstood as GNSS based synchronization is not allowed for coexistence of R16 and R17 in the same band. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Comment | Similar view as others that we can focus on the second question. |
| Futurewei | Comment | Agree with other companies, it is sufficient to discuss Proposal 2 for LS reply to RAN4. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We share similar views with others that RAN1 should answer the question of RAN4 directly, i.e. the feasibility of option 2, especially for n79 band.  In Table 5.2E.2-1 of TS38.101-1, n79 and n47 are *inter*-band con-current, and thus has no relation to inter-release coexistence. There is no agreement that Rel-16 UEs can operate on the n79 band as well and n79 does not appear in Rel-16 RAN4 specs, i.e. Rel-16 and Rel-17 UEs do not coexist in the same band of n79. In that case, only Rel-17 UEs work on the band n79, thus no coexistence issue between the two releases’ UEs and the option 2 is feasible.  Therefore, RAN1 should reply to RAN4 that Option 2 is feasible in the case of only Rel-17 UE works on n79 band. The proposal as formulated omits this fact.  For the coexistence of Rel-16 and Rel-17 UEs, if Rel-17 UE can support DL timing as well, then they can coexist in the ITS bands, e.g. n47. The reply LS can also mention this. This is the only case where RRC state is relevant, but RRC states are not part of the LS from RAN4. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Comment | We agree with other companies to focus on proposal 2. |
| MediaTek | Comment | Seems not relevant to the RAN4 question. |

***Draft proposal 2: Reply LS to RAN4***

***From RAN1’s perspective, option 2 is not feasible in case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in same band, otherwise they cannot communicate with each other.***

**Q2: If Q1 is Yes, do you agree draft proposal 2? Please feel free to revision the proposal in your feedback.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Comments | We are supportive of the proposal intention, but we prefer to stick to the question/action in LS. In our view RAN1 can reply something along the following lines:  RAN1 has not studied feasibility of Option 2 for NR sidelink communication. Option 2 is not supported by NR specification and RAN1 is not considering support of Option 2 in R17, since it implies quite many challenges for sidelink communication (e.g. sidelink communication with RRC\_IDLE UEs) |
| Ericsson | Comments | We think that the proposed reply needs a bit of clarification.  From RAN1’s perspective, option 2 is not feasible in case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in the same band~~, otherwise~~ as they cannot communicate with each other. For operation without coexisting R16 SL UEs, option 2 is feasible but not supported by the current RAN1 specifications. |
| OPPO | Agree in principle | Directly reply on the question in the LS is OK.  Some minor changes on the feedback:  ***Draft proposal 2: Reply LS to RAN4***  ***From RAN1’s perspective, option 2 is not feasible in case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in same band~~, otherwise they cannot communicate with each other~~.*** |
| Samsung |  | Please see answer to question 1. |
| Xiaomi |  | We have the same comment as our answer to question 1. |
| LG Electronics | Comment | An additional possible problem we would like to point out is that if all SL channels/signals are transmitted based on Option 2, the maximum value of timing differences between SL channels/signals received from different in-coverage UEs would be increased compared to Rel-16 NR V2X. Note that RAN1 has not yet studied the exact impact of this phenomenon. For your information, in Rel-12/13 D2D, since SL transmission timing is aligned with UL timing only when performing Mode 1 based PSSCH transmission, PSCCH and PSSCH pools are TDMed and the “Timing advance indication” field of PSCCH provides the timing offset information for PSSCH reception from PSCCH reception timing, this issue could be resolved.  In summary, we think that the current version of Draft proposal 2 is somewhat misleading. From our perspective, the following two points need to be captured/reflected in RAN1’s reply.   * RAN1 has not sufficiently studied the problems that could occur when Option 2 is applied. * From RAN1’s perspective, there is no plan to consider SL operation based on Uplink timing in Rel-17. |
| Apple |  | We may simply answer the question from RAN4, rather than focusing on one of the reasons why it is infeasible.  “From RAN1 perspective, it is infeasible to support option 2 where SL transmission timing is aligned with UL timing.” |
| Qualcomm |  | We’d like to clarify whether the proposals are alternative replies or that both are planned to be included.  We agree with the intention of the proposal as reply but don’t think it covers all issues. As pointed out by LG, that there are issues beyond coexistence that would also need to be considered. |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | Agree with LGE/QC. Coex would not be only the issue. Apple’s wording is fine for us. |
| vivo | Agree in principle | Similar view as Qualcomm, we also agree with the intention, but has concern that it only refers to a specific case, e.g., the coexistence between idle/inactive and connected UEs is not covered. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Comment | Prefer a straightforward response on the question itself. The wording from OPPO is fine. |
| Futurewei | Comment | Option 2 can be feasible if R17 SL UE is not coexisting with R16 SL-UE. We suggest following change:  *From RAN1’s perspective, option 2 is not feasible in case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in same band. ~~, otherwise they cannot communicate with each other.~~ If R17 SL-UE is not coexisting with R16 SL UEs, option 2 is feasible.* |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree | As our comments in Q1 round 2. For the case that only Rel-17 UE operates on n79 band, option 2 is feasible. So RAN1 should reply to RAN4 based on two aspect:   * Option 2 is feasible in the case of only Rel-17 UE works on the shared bands, e.g. n79. * For the band Rel-16 and Rel-17 UE coexistence, e.g. ITS bands, n47, DL timing should be used. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Comment | We agree in principle. We propose the following wording:  From RAN1’s perspective, option 2 is not feasible in case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in the same band~~, otherwise~~ as they cannot communicate with each other. For operation without coexisting R16 SL UEs, some companies think that option 2 is feasible and some companies think that further study is needed to conclude the feasibility of option 2. |
| MediaTek | Comments | There is no RAN1 study on this issue but also no plan to support it in Rel17, as somehow mentioned by LG.  Besides，the proposal may mislead the people. It sounds that if there is not co-existence issue, then option 2 will be feasible.  However, even if there is no co-existence issue, it may not be feasible yet supposing there are the out-of-coverage Rel17 UEs using SL timing rather than UL timing for transmission. Then the in-coverage UEs using UL timing can’t communicate with the out-of-coverage UEs using SL(/DL) timing. |

# Round 3 discussion

Base on the round 2 email discussion, the observations are as following:

* Option 2 is not feasible at current stage or feasibility of option 2 need further study.
  + **Support companies (11):** Intel, OPPO, Samsung, Xiaomi, LG, Apple, Qualcomm, NTT DOCOMO, vivo, ZTE, Nokia
* Option 2 is feasible for R17 only in the case that no R16 SL UE is coexisting with R17
  + **Support companies (3)**: Ericsson, Futurewei, Huawei,

From moderator’s understanding, every company agrees that option 2 is not feasible in case that Rel-16 SL-UE is coexisting with Rel-17 SL-UE in same carrier(because R16/R17 SL is not support multi-carrier operation, so it is changed from band to carrier).

Based on the companies’ feedback, only 3 companies think option 2 is feasible in R17 in case without Rel-16 SL UE coexisting. Most of companies think option 2 is not feasible at current stage. So it would be fair to say that RAN1 has not sufficiently studied the feasibility of Option 2 for NR sidelink communication.

And based on Rel-17 eSL WID, there is no working scope with SL synchronization enhancement, that means RAN1 also has no plan to consider synchronization enhancement in R17.

Based on this situation, two alternatives are provided as following:

***Alt 1:***

***From RAN1’s perspective, Option 2 is not feasible at least in case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in same carrier. For other cases, RAN1 has not sufficiently studied the feasibility of Option 2 for NR sidelink communication, and RAN1 has no plan to consider SL operation based on Uplink timing in Rel-17.***

***Alt 2:***

**From RAN1 perspective, it is not feasible for RAN4 to consider option 2 to define SL transmission timing to align with UL timing when SL is synchronized to a network.**

Please provide your preference between alt 1 and alt 2 in the following table, and feel free to revisit the proposal in your comments.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Alt 2 |  |
| OPPO | Alt 2 | We support Alt 2.  A explicit and clear answer directly to the question in the LS is more proper and straight way.  Since this is a reply LS, I am not quite sure any analysis or discussion background from RAN1 can also be captured as a background description in the official reply LS to RAN4. Since this issue can have different answers case by case, and RAN1 did not have studied them, Alt 2 is more preferred.  Furthermore, for Alt 1, “**Option 2 is not feasible at least in case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in same carrier**” may lead to further discussion/expectation in RAN4 about the feasibility of other cases, even RAN1 has not studied those cases. By the way, we are not also sure that the last sentence is necessary or not since SL SYNC enh. is not contained in the WID. |
| vivo | Alt 2 with revision | The current wording of Alt 2 is not suitable because RAN1 cannot decide whether another WG (RAN4) is feasible to do something or not. I tried to revise a little:  **Alt 2’:**  **From RAN1 perspective, it is not feasible ~~for RAN4~~ to consider option 2 to define SL transmission timing to align with UL timing when SL is synchronized to a network in Rel-17.**    On the other hand, Alt 1 may also be OK to us with the following modification:  **Alt 1’:**  **From RAN1’s perspective, Option 2 is not feasible at least in case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in same carrier.~~For other cases, RAN1 has not sufficiently studied the feasibility of Option 2 for NR sidelink communication, and~~RAN1 has no plan to consider SL operation based on Uplink timing in Rel-17.** |
| ZTE,Sanehcips | Alt 2 | Prefer a direct reply to the question posed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Neither | Both options materially mislead RAN4.  [HW1]: It is misleading to say that RAN1 has to draw a conclusion on the basis of Rel-16 UEs being in band n79 when there is no Rel-16 spec which allows that. Of course RAN1 can – and must – deal with this fact of deployments of only Rel-17 UEs in n79 that we have in front of us. It is then incorrect for the group or the moderator, to seek for a conclusion that because of something assumed that isn’t the case, RAN1 has to conclude that UL timing is impossible in all cases of band n79. It is clear there is a case for band n79 where using UL timing (i.e. RAN4’s option 2) is feasible. We do not accept either of the proposed options, and any LS on the basis of either of them would materially mislead RAN4. This is why we consider the LS should inform RAN4 of the truth of the case for band n79 as it is currently specified. An appropriate amount of limiting statements can be included to make that clear.  Even if RAN1 might have to do some small amount of work in case of agreeing with RAN4’s preference to have UL timing, it is not guaranteed yet, because RAN4 would still need to confirm that they ask for it.  To be clear, what I refer to here is that Rel-16 of 36.101-1 does not include band n79 in section 5.2E-2, whereas from v17.0.0, i.e. Rel-17,  it does.  [HW2]: it would not be right to draw RAN4 in the direction of interpreting that RAN1 found this option 2 infeasible, whilst majoring the response on the possible issues of an ‘inter-release coexistence’ case which is of low relevance to band n79 given there are no Rel-16 V2X UEs in band n79 (it is not defined in their Rel-16 version of the RAN4 specifications). In that sense, we are not clear on the need to mention that inter-release point in the reply to a LS marked as Rel-17, but we can accept a compromise such as structured by Ericsson below – into which we would also suggest adding a statement that RAN1 has yet to discuss new UE capabilities for Rel-17. |
| Samsung | Alt 2 | In addition to the Rel-16 co-existence issue (bands are release agnostic, i.e. a band defined in Rel-17, can be used by UEs following any release), aligning SL and UL is not feasible for SL UEs not in RRC connected state and partial coverage scenarios when some UEs are outside of network coverage.    We prefer Alt 2, with a slight wording modification. We think RAN1 should not be determining what is feasible or not for other working groups to consider! It is sufficient to just say “non-feasible”  **Alt 2:**  **From RAN1 perspective, it is not feasible ~~for RAN4~~ to consider option 2 to define SL transmission timing to align with UL timing when SL is synchronized to a network.** |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Alt 1 | We think that based on the discussion so far it is not possible to conclude that option 2 is not feasible. If option 2 is ruled out then the RAN4 WID objective regarding licensed band/shared carrier operation must be implemented assuming that Uu UL uses UL timing and SL uses DL timing. This results in constraints and performance degradation to SL. We prefer to modify Alt1 as follows:  ***From RAN1’s perspective, Option 2 is not feasible ~~at least~~ in case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in same carrier. For other cases, RAN1 has not sufficiently studied the feasibility of Option 2 for NR sidelink communication~~, and RAN1 has no plan to consider SL operation based on Uplink timing in Rel-17.~~*** |
| Ericsson | Neither | In our view, the group should focus on answering the questions and describing the facts as they are.   In our view, the answer should contain the following points:   * RAN1 deemed Option 2 as feasible for LTE in Rel-12. RAN1 has not made any other study on the topic. * RAN1 has only identified issues regarding Option 2 for bands where Rel-16 and Rel-17 UEs coexist. * Existing RAN1 specifications do not support Option 2. |
| Qualcomm | Alt 2 | NR sidelink uses DL timing when synchronized to a network. That other systems such as LTE SL Rel-12, but not Rel-14, used UL time doesn’t change the fact it is currently infeasible for NR sidelink to use UL timing. This requires changes from RAN1’s side and RAN1 needs to consider the impact of such changes before concluding that they’re minor.  Separately, in this thread RAN1 has identified issues even when only Rel-17 UEs are in the band. Specifically, that only RRC\_CONNECTED UEs can use UL timing. This aspect is missing in Alt 1. |
| Apple | Alt 2 |  |
| Futurewei | Neither | Neither alternative in the list is appropriate for the rely to RAN4. Note that RAN4 asks RAN1 clarify whether option 2 is feasible. Simply replying that it is not feasible for the coexistence case would not be a right way to provide the direction to RAN4. Particularly, RAN4 mentioned the TDD band with the example of band n79 which may not be the coexistence case. On the other hand, we think companies would not agree that option 2 is infeasible for any cases, as the reply. Therefore, we do not support either of alternatives. But we are ok to take Ericsson’s proposals as basis for the reply, if our previous proposal is not accepted by other companies. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Alt 2 | In any LS discussions, there are comments as “let’s put simple answer only based on the text of question”. Now the question is “is it feasible that RAN4 consider option 2 from RAN1 perspective…?”. Then the answer should be just YES or NO. No other detailed information is necessary.  Therefore, Alt 2 should be fine. |
| CMCC | Neither | From our perspective, n79 band would be a promising deployment to support R17 and upcoming R18 SL, with various commercial use cases. Based on the discussion in the group, my understanding is that we cannot conclude that Option 2 is not feasible (at least n79 is supported only for R17 UE for now, and seems that backward compatibility may not be a big issue). By replying to RAN4 to go with Option 1, we are concerned about the interference on UL transmissions by the misalignment. This results in constraints and performance degradation to Uu, and SL as well. |
| Sharp | Alt 2 |  |
| LG |  | First of all, from our perspective, it is very clear that the RAN1 does not support “UL timing based NR SL operation” in Rel-17, which is outside WID scope. With this understanding, we do not think that the RAN1 necessarily has to give an answer to the feasibility of Option 2. In other words, we think that the yellow marked part above would be enough as the contents of reply LS. Note that we do not understand why the RAN4 makes the RAN1 the feasibility study for a solution that is not covered by the objectives of WID from RAN1’s perspective. |
| MediaTek | Alt 2 |  |

Moderator’s response on the companies who have strong concern on the two alternatives.

|  |
| --- |
| Regarding whether is feasible or not feasible in n79, based on current discussion, it is clear that most of companies have concern even there is no R16 SL UE.  As mentioned in R17 eSL WID, there are mainly three use cases in WID(i.e. V2X, Public safety, and commercial), and can be potentially deployment in n79, since band is not defined by use case related, these three use cases should be considered together.  If option 2 is applied, the pre-condition is to mandate all the SL active UE being in RRC connected state, it is clearly objected by all the companies in first round of email discussion.  Another aspect is that synchronization is defined in system/cell-specific manner in R16 SL. Even there is a potential optimization on some use cases when the use cases are operating in a dedicated resource pool, but it should avoid to change this principle (i.e. synchronization is defined in system/cell-specific manner), otherwise RAN1 should have a sufficient study.  R12 D2D should not be as a valid point for option 2’s feasibility. Since the question from RAN4 should be restricted into R17 WID scope, R17 WID has clear description that “Enhancements introduced in Rel-17 should be based on the functionalities specified in Rel-16, and Rel-17 sidelink should be able to coexist with Rel-16 sidelink in the same resource pool. This does not preclude the possibility of operating Rel-17 sidelink in a dedicated resource pool”. In R12 D2D, the PSCCH and PSSCH in R12 D2D is transmitted in different subframes, which is totally different from R16 sidelink design. |

The further refining two alternatives are provided, one is to provide RAN1’s observations on option 2, the other is following majority’s views and provide a simply answer to RAN4.

**Alt 1:**

**From RAN1’s perspective, RAN1 observes that Option 2 is not feasible ~~at least~~ in case that R16 SL-UE is coexisting with R17 SL UE in same carrier, and RAN1 also observes that Option 2 is not feasible if not ~~due to~~ mandating all the SL-active UEs within network coverage being RRC\_CONNECTED state. RAN1 does not intend to study SL synchronization enhancement in Rel-17.**

**Alt 2:**

**From RAN1 perspective, in Rel-17, it is not feasible ~~for RAN4~~ to consider option 2 to define SL transmission timing to align with UL timing when SL is synchronized to a network**

Companies preference are provided in following based on email discussion.

* Alt 1(1 company): Nokia
* Alt 2(11 companies): Xiaomi, OPPO, vivo, ZTE, Samsung, Qualcomm, Apple, NTT DOCOMO, Sharp, LG(based on comment), MediaTek
* LG comment that “RAN1 does not support UL timing based NR SL operation in Rel-17, which is outside WID scope” is sufficient for LS reply to RAN4.
* Neither(4 companies): Huawei, Ericsson, Futurewei, CMCC

# Conclusion of email discussion

The email discussion is closed with conclusion that no reply LS is provided to RAN4 in this meeting, and continue discussion in future meetings if necessary.
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