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Introduction

In the last RAN#99 meeting, the revised WID for Rel-18 NR sidelink evolution project was updated in [1] but nothing was changed for the SL-U objective. The latest objective for SL-U is provided in the following for convenience.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Study and specify support of sidelink on unlicensed spectrum for both mode 1 and mode 2 where Uu operation for mode 1 is limited to licensed spectrum only [RAN1, RAN2, RAN4]
* Channel access mechanisms from NR-U shall be reused for sidelink unlicensed operation
	+ Assess the applicability of sidelink resource reservation from Rel-16/Rel-17 to sidelink unlicensed operation within the boundaries of unlicensed channel access mechanism and operation
		- No specific enhancements for Rel-17 resource allocation mechanisms
		- If the existing NR-U channel access framework does not support the required SL-U functionality, WGs will make appropriate recommendations for RAN approval.
* Physical channel design framework: Required changes to NR sidelink physical channel structures and procedures to operate on unlicensed spectrum
	+ The existing NR sidelink and NR-U channel structure shall be reused as the baseline.
* No specific enhancements for existing NR SL feature
* Focus on FR1 unlicensed bands (n46 and n96/n102).
* Note: In sidelink unlicensed operation, the gNB does not perform Type 1 channel access to initiate and share a channel occupancy, neither Type 2 channel access to share an initiated channel occupancy, nor semi-static channel access procedures to access an unlicensed channel.
 |

This contribution provides a summary of submitted contributions, discussion topics and outcomes that are related to the channel access mechanisms for SL-U (blue text part of objective) during this RAN1 meeting. Note that, all past outcomes including agreements, conclusions and working assumptions reached during this WI are captured in Section 5 (Appendix) of this document.

Collection of agreements / outcomes of RAN1#112bis-e

**Agreements reached over email endorsement on Thursday**

**Agreement**

The existing NR-U EDT procedures for uplink transmissions is taken as the baseline for SL-U in Rel-18.

* FFS: details for S-SSB and PSFCH transmissions (e.g., EDT determination based on PC,MAX and/or network configured EDT, value for TA), if needed

**Agreement**

For the CPE agreements reached so far in this agenda, the 1 or at most 2 symbols just before the next AGC symbol for CPE transmission is/are physical symbol(s).

**Agreement**

The container for carrying the COT sharing information from a COT initiator UE includes at least the SCI.

* FFS 1st and/or 2nd stage SCI

**Agreements from Week 1 Thursday GTW session**

**Agreement**

For dynamic channel access mode with multi-channel case in SL-U, both NR-U DL Type A and Type B multi-channel access procedure are supported for multiple PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels.

* FFS: It is up to UE implementation to perform either Type A or Type B multi-channel access procedure.
* FFS: whether this can initiate a shared COT
* FFS: whether there is any special handling needed for transmission in a shared COT on one or more of the channels

Topics for discussion

## [ACTIVE] Topic #1: Type 1 SL channel access procedures

**Background**: For Type 1 channel access procedures, the following agreements have been reached so far with remaining details/open issues highlighted in yellow (considering CW adjustment procedures as a separate topic).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agreement**Type 1 and Type 2 (2A/2B/2C) channel access procedures, transmission gap and LBT sensing idle time requirements specified in TS37.213 for NR-U are taken as baseline for NR sidelink operation in a shared channel.* FFS conditions for the actual channel access type(s) used for each SL channel and signal transmitted, and based on COT sharing conditions (if supported)
* FFS whether UL CAPC or DL CAPC or both should be used as the baseline,
	+ FFS how the channel access priority classes apply to each SL channel and signal
	+ FFS sidelink priority levels (PQI or L1 priority), channel and signal mapping to the 4 channel access priority classes. The discussion may involve other WGs.

**Agreement*** Type 1 SL channel access procedure is applicable to the following transmissions by a UE:
	+ PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) scheduled or configured by a gNB in SL Mode 1 resource allocation.
	+ PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) from the UE in SL Mode 2 resource allocation.
	+ Other SL transmissions including S-SSB and PSFCH transmissions from a UE
		- FFS: how to set CAPC for S-SSB and PSFCH
	+ Note: Type 1 can be used to initiate a COT
* A UE uses a channel access priority class applicable to the sidelink user plane data multiplexed in PSSCH for performing the Type 1 channel access procedures to transmit transmission(s) including PSSCH with user plane data and its associated PSCCH.
	+ Note: how to set CAPC for MAC CE multiplexed in PSSCH is up to RAN2
* A UE shall not transmit on a channel for a Channel Occupancy Time that exceeds the maximum COT duration where the channel access procedures are performed based on a channel access priority class *p* associated with the UE transmissions, as given in CAPC table for SL.

**Agreement**In Type 1 SL channel access procedure, the following table is adopted for channel access priority class (CAPC) for SL. * FFS: the applicability and usage of NOTE1 in the table
* FFS: whether ***mp****=1* can be used with ***p=1***, and applicable cases

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Channel Access Priority Class (*p*) | *mp* | *CWmin,p* | *CWmax,p* | *Tslmcot,p* | allowed *CWp* sizes |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 2 ms | {3,7} |
| 2 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 4 ms | {7,15} |
| 3 | 3 | 15 | 1023 | 6ms [or 10 ms] | {15,31,63,127,255,511,1023} |
| 4 | 7 | 15 | 1023 | 6ms [or 10 ms] | {15,31,63,127,255,511,1023} |
| [NOTE1:  For *p*=3,4, *Tslmcot*,*p*=10*ms* if the higher layer parameter absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology-r14 or absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology-r16 is provided, otherwise,*Tslmcot*,*p*=6*ms*.]NOTE 2:  When *Tslmcot*,*p*=6*ms* it may be increased to 8*ms* by inserting one or more gaps. The minimum duration of a gap shall be 100*μs*. The maximum duration before including any such gap shall be 6*ms*.  |

**Agreement**The CAPC level that should be used for S-SSB transmissions:* Option 1: CAPC value (p) should be set to 1 when UE performs Type 1 channel access procedure for S-SSB transmission

**Agreement**The CAPC level that should be used for PSFCH transmission, CAPC value (p) should be set to 1 when UE performs Type 1 channel access procedure for PSFCH transmission |

* NOTE 1 in the CAPC table for SL

One of the remaining issues in Type 1 channel access procedures for SL is related to whether a higher layer parameter “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” should be supported. When it is (pre-)configured (i.e., by gNB or supported by regulation) the MCOT length is extended from 6ms to 10ms for SL transmissions with CAPC value p = 3 and 4.

Based on Tdoc review in this meeting, firstly the support of this (pre-)configuration is independent to whether FBE is supported or not for SL-U. Secondly, it can greatly improve SL-U performance according to simulation results provided by [2]. This FFS/remaining issue has been on the table for some time already, and according to Tdoc review summary in Section 4.2, no concern has been raised. Therefore, FL proposes to support the (pre-)configurability of this higher layer parameter in Proposal 1-1 below.

* Additional LBT sensing before transmission (i.e., 43µs for p=1 and 2, 55µs for p=3, 88µs for p=4)

In [7], it is pointed out the additional LBT sensing in the Type 1 channel access procedures is longer than the GP symbol in a SL slot structure. In 15kHz SCS, a GP symbol length = 71.35us. In 30kHz SCS, a GP symbol length = 35.68us. In 15kHz SCS, a GP symbol length = 17.84us. That is,

* In 15kHz SCS, the additional LBT length when p=4 will be longer than a GP symbol
* In 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs, the additional LBT length for all CAPC level will be longer than a GP symbol

In [7], it is proposed that the additional LBT sensing length should be based on (pre-)configuration such that it will be shorter than one GP symbol in a corresponding SCS. Since the (pre-)configuration can significantly help with Type 1 channel access especially in 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs, the FL would like to ask whether this (pre-)configurability can be supported in SL-U.

* Which one of the EDT procedures (DL or UL from NR-U) should be used as the baseline for SL-U

RAN1 has not yet discussed the energy detection threshold adaptation procedure for SL-U in Rel-18, but it is a necessary part of LBT operation in both Type 1 and Type 2 channel access procedures. Based on Tdoc review in this meeting, the majority of company (except one) expressed that the existing NR-U EDT procedures for uplink transmission should be used as the baseline for SL-U operation. But since there were only a limited number of contributions discussed about this topic/issue in this meeting, the FL would first like to ask if taking NR-U EDT procedures for uplink transmissions as the baseline for SL-U is acceptable for the group in Question 1-3 below.

### FL Proposal for round 1 discussion

**Proposal 1-1 (I):**

* A higher layer parameter “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” is supported in Rel-18 for SL transmissions in unlicensed bands (e.g., by level of regulation) and it is a per resource pool (pre-)configuration.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM | NO | Why is longer COT necessary in SL when there is no other technology?If longer COT is allowed, it becomes more difficult to perform other UE’s transmission with higher priority due to existence of SL transmission with lower priority during the COT and thus due to LBT failure.Or if some solution for inter-UE blocking issue discussed in section 3.8 is introduced, then we are fine with this proposal. |
| LGE | No | In case of NR-U, gNB can control DL transmission and UL transmission, and resources for CG-PUSCH. However, in case of NR SL, especially for Mode 2 UE, LBT operation and channel occupancy will be done in distributed manner. In this case, it is unclear whether some fairness issue is present or not. Moreover, even if we live with this direction, it would be necessary to further investigate whether this parameter will be separated or common with that of Uu link. Moreover, whether it is allowed to enable both parameters simultaneously or it is possible that either of them is enabled in a time.  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | YES | We are fine with per resource pool (pre-)configuration, but could also consider other options, i.e., FFS where channel access parameter for SL-U should be defined, e.g., per RP, per BWP, other. |
| Lenovo | Yes, see comment | Regarding the scope, we prefer to have the following FFS instead of agreeing already on RP configuration:A higher layer parameter “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” is supported in Rel-18 for SL transmissions in unlicensed bands (e.g., by level of regulation). FFS configuration details, e.g. per RB set, resource pool, …We may further consider an indication that there is no Uu (i.e., absence of unlicensed UL/DL) in addition to the absence of other technology. With such deployment awareness, SL UEs would not need to perform LBT and can perform channel access and resource selection only based on Rel-17 SL sensing.  |
| Apple | No |  For in-network with NR-U gNB, can reuse the same configuration. For out of network, it is not clear how pre-configuration can ensure no other technologies exists.  |
| CableLabs | No | We consider the question as being implicit, rather than explicit: we suspect that this is about FBE (semi-static) transmissions, but it is not clear |
| QC | Yes | This was supported in NR-U and we do not see any technical reason for which this should not be supported in SL-U as well. |
| Intel | Yes with comment | We are fine in defining such parameter, which in our understanding was defined since LAA with the understanding that the network could know via implementation or by deployment whether there would be a presence or absence of an incumbent. Moving forward with SL-U, we believe same principle could be used and this should then be reflected in the way how the EDT calculation is done as similar to NR-U some relaxation could be applied. Also we agree with other companies to leave at least for the moment the type of configuration. Therefore, we propose the following text update until we converge on the details for the EDT:A higher layer parameter “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” is supported in Rel-18 for SL transmissions in unlicensed bands (e.g., by level of regulation) ~~and it is a per resource pool (pre-)configuration.~~ FFS configuration details, e.g. per RB set, resource pool, …FFS: relaxation of the energy detection threshold in absence of incumbent |
| Vivo |  | We prefer the configuration is per-BWP. It is much simpler to configure “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” per-BWP especially when a UE is configured with FDMed or TDMed resource pools. There is no motivation to configure different resource pools with different parameters in case of the absence of other technology. |
| CMCC | Yes | NR-U design should be followed. |
| Sony | Yes | We are fine with supporting the same parameter in SL-U. |
| Spreadtrum | No | When there is only SL-U device, mode 2 sensing is enough, and there is no need to increase the COT length.  |
| JHUAPL | Yes | This is the same as in 37.213 |
| Futurewei | No | We do not see how this parameter is determined for the out of coverage scenarios. In addition, it is not clear how would be used and propagated between the SL-U in coverage and those SL-U out of coverage. Given the potential ramifications and spec complications we prefer not consider it in Rel 18. |
| Samsung | Yes | OK with the parameter if regulation allows |
| NEC | Yes with comment | Besides “it is a per resource pool (pre-)configuration”, it may also be (pre-)configured per BWP, or per RB set. |
| ETRI | Yes | Also fine with FFS: per RB set, per resource pool, per BWP |
| Panasonic | No | In SL-U, a COT is shared when only a responding UE has transmission to the COT initiating UE. If longer COT duration is allowed, other UE's PSSCH with higher priority cannot be transmitted. |
| Sharp | Yes with comments | We think the parameter should be (pre-)configured per SL carrier or SL BWP. |
| Xiaomi  | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| WILUS | Yes | We fine with this high layer parameter as in NR-U and it should be further discussed for the FFS point such as per RB set, per resource pool or per BWP. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes  | General fine with the proposal, and if there is the case that the absence of any other technology sharing the channel can be guaranteed, FBE (semi-static) should also be supported. |
| CATT/GH | Comments | As we mentioned in our contribution, it is unclear whether “absence of any other technology” is a valid scenario in SL-U, since sidelink transmission at least may be coexistent with Uu transmission. Therefore, before we conclude to (pre-)configure this parameter, the validity of the scenario needs to be accepted first. |
| MediaTek | Yes | It is align with NR-U design |
| Transsion | Yes | At least it is useful in the case of SL mode 2. |

**Question 1-2 (I):**

* Should (pre-)configurability of the additional LBT sensing duration in Type 1 channel access procedure be supported in SL-U?
	+ E.g., at least for 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs, when the (pre-)configuration is provided, the (pre-)configured length is applied for the additional LBT sensing duration; otherwise, the additional LBT sensing duration is determined according to NR-U.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support | The actual value for each SCS and channel (PSCCH/PSSCH, PSFCH, S-SSB) can be FFS, by also taking into account of CPE starting position. |
| DCM |  | Intention of this proposal is unclear. If this proposal is trying to solve inter-UE blocking issue, it should be discussed in section 3.8. Otherwise, what is the assumed situation should be clarified. |
| LGE | No | Even in NR-U, for 30 or 60 kHz SCS, they do not change the additional LBT sensing duration in Type 1 channel access procedure. The shortened additional LBT sensing duration will cause fairness issue with other RAT.  |
| InterDigital |  | It is preferable to defer the discuss on additional LBT sensing duration for Type 1 after more progress on CPE starting position for both full RB allocation and partial RB allocation. |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No | It is not clear what could be a better additional LBT sensing duration compared with what is already specified in 37.213 and compliant with regulation. The additional sensing slot duration, i.e., one sensing slot, seems to be already the minimum duration it can be. |
| Ericsson | No | LBT sensing duration should be compliant with the regulations. |
| Lenovo | No | Our understanding of 37.213 is that for p=1,2 mp=2 -> 34 µs, for p=3 mp=3 -> 43 µs, for p=4 mp=7 -> 79 µs. So FL’s numbers would be 9 µs too large, maybe this could be confirmed by others?To allow arbitrary sensing duration configuration would affect coexistence with NR Uu as well as other technologies, so we don’t see sufficient motivation at this point. |
| Apple | No | Follow 37.213 type 1 UL channel access procedure, as agreed in previous meeting.  |
| CableLabs | No | The LBT sensing duration is clearly specified in 37.213 |
| QC | No  | Firstly, in our understanding the set of values for different CAPCs is {34, 34, 43, 79} (and not {43, 43, 55, 88} ), so it seems that at least for p=1,2 the measurement could fit in the gap symbol. Secondly, we do not see a critical problem that needs solution here. In our understanding fitting the additional LBT into the gap symbol is not even something a UE would strive for in the first place: the UE that concludes the countdown of Type1 access will select a starting position with CPE (discussion still open in Topic #3) and perform the additional LBT sensing to check if the medium has been occupied between the end of its countdown and the selected TX starting point, in practice it is checking if the slot before is free. Given the past agreements on CPEs, it seems RAN1 wants to support collision resolution via CPE selection as in NR-U. In some cases a CPE from Option 2 can be chosen (2 symbols in 30 and 60 KHz). We do not see what the benefit of making the measurement shorter would be if one of the early starting position is selected (e.g. within symbol 12), that is actually what a UE would strive for (to avoid to get blocked). To summarize, the additional LBT measurement would naturally fail anyway if the slot before is occupied, as it was the case in NR-U. |
| Intel | No | It is quite unclear why we should modify the procedure already defined in the specification, and as mentioned by other companies there is no supportive study that indicates any gain.  |
| Vivo | No | Following the regulation, LBT sensing duration is determined according to NR-U. if the issue is to be handled, we prefer to enlarge the gap length, e.g., more than 1 symbol |
| CMCC | No | We think NR-U design should be reused, otherwise, it will cause some unfairness to other RAT. |
| Sony | No | LBT sensing duration should be followed in 37.213. |
| Spreadtrum | No | The sensing duration specified in 37.213 should be reused. |
| Futurewei | No | We prefer reusing the existing NR-U channel access as the WID indicates *Channel access mechanisms from NR-U shall be reused for sidelink unlicensed operation* |
| Samsung | No | No, this is against regulation. We should strictly follow the LBR sensing duration. |
| NEC |  No |  |
| Panasonic | No | The shortened additional LBT sensing duration is not fair to other RATs. |
| Sharp | No | We think the additional sensing duration should be compatible with that of NR-U. |
| xiaomi | Not  | NR-U existing solution is enough. |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| WILUS | No | For the fairness of coexistence with other RAT, the sensing duration specified in 37.213 should not be changed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | The duration of LBT should follow the regulation and NR-U spec.A more promising issue how to support Type 2A channel access procedure in the case of 60kHz SCS, which one gap symbol (17.84us) is not sufficient for Type 2A (25us). |
| CATT/GH | No | Firstly, we think we haven’t agreed to restrict the additional LBT sensing duration only within the gap symbol. The motivation of redefining the length of additional LBT sensing duration is unclear.Secondly, we have already achieved the following agreement in our first meeting:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**Type 1 and Type 2 (2A/2B/2C) channel access procedures, transmission gap and LBT sensing idle time requirements specified in TS37.213 for NR-U are taken as baseline for NR sidelink operation in a shared channel.* FFS conditions for the actual channel access type(s) used for each SL channel and signal transmitted, and based on COT sharing conditions (if supported)
* FFS whether UL CAPC or DL CAPC or both should be used as the baseline,
	+ FFS how the channel access priority classes apply to each SL channel and signal
	+ FFS sidelink priority levels (PQI or L1 priority), channel and signal mapping to the 4 channel access priority classes. The discussion may involve other WGs.
 |

Therefore, the definition of LBT sensing idle time requirements (including additional LBT sensing duration in Type 1) in TS 37.213 should be respected. |
| MediaTek | No | It is not clear for us why the additional LBT sensing is needed and when it could be applied.  |
| Transsion | No |  |

**Question 1-3 (I):**

* Should the existing NR-U EDT procedures for uplink transmissions to be taken as the baseline for SL-U in Rel-18?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM |  | Before agreeing this direction, at least why NR-U UL rather than NR-U DL can be reused should be clarified first. |
| LGE | Yes | It would be also useful to consider EDT for COT sharing as in NR-U EDT procedure for UL transmission.  |
| InterDigital | Yes | We are fine with to re-use the existing NR-U EDT for uplink as baseline. |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | YES |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | As per WID. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes | Use NR-U UL EDT as baseline. Consider both NW configured EDT and UE autonomously determined EDT based on PC,MAX. |
| CableLabs | No | Before proceeding with the UL selection, we should clarify firstly when the UE assumes a gNB role and when a UE role (see also R1-230002). EDT will be used in different ways by SL-U: when acting as gNB (the SL-U will apply EDT for S-SSB with TA=5dB and when acting as UE, TA=10dB). The gNB/UE acting ambiguity must be resolved before answering this question |
| QC | Yes | It is acceptable.One needed addition would be for S-SSB (that is covered in DL EDT adaptation procedure RS 37.213, Section 4.1.5) |
| Intel | Yes | However, we should discuss separately how to treat S-SSB (and PSFCH if any excemption are also applied to it) as this cam be transmitted using type 2A LBT inside and outside a COT. |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| JHUAPL | Yes | Support with the clarifications for  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | For S-SSB (e.g., using Type 2A LBT), a different EDT should be applied, similar to SSB in NR-U. Other than this, we can follow UL in NR-U. |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Panasonic | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| WILUS | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | The energy detection threshold of NR-U can be reused directly. |
| CATT/GH | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | We are fine to reuse NRU EDT procedures for UL transmission to be the baseline for SLU. However, S-SSB can be discussed separately since NRU DL EDT has defined a specific procedure for DRS transmission |
| Transsion | Yes |  |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 2 discussion

FL summary of Round 1 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 1-1 (I), supporting a higher layer parameter “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” in Rel-18 for SL transmissions in unlicensed bands (e.g., by level of regulation)?
	+ Yes/OK (21): OPPO, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, QC, Intel, vivo, CMCC, Sony, JHUAPL, Samsung, NEC, ETRI, Sharp, xiaomi, ZTE, WILUS, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek, Transsion
	+ Not support (7): DCM, LGE, Apple, CableLabs, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, Panasonic
	+ FFS: CATT/GOHIGH
	+ FL: In mode 1 and mode 2, under network gNB coverage, “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” RRC parameter can be configured by the gNB (just as in NR-U). when SL is operating in out-of-coverage, it is the same as V2X operating in ITS band, all RRC parameters are (pre-)configured according to regulation. This signalling mechanism is already in-place since Rel-12. When SL-U is operating in out-of-coverage in an unlicensed band, as the proposal mentioned and also mentioned in NR-U spec that “by level of regulation”, this parameter can be pre-configured to a SL UE.

In majority’s view, since this is already supported in NR-U, it should be allowed for SL-U as well. Please note, the (pre-)configuration of “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” would be independent to the FBE feature, which we don’t’ have an explicit agreement to support yet.

Hope the above clarifies the operation of SL-U with (pre-)configured higher layer parameter “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*”.

The proposal is updated below to reflect comments about (pre-)configuration details.

* On Question 1-2 (I), should (pre-)configurability of the additional LBT sensing duration in Type 1 channel access procedure be supported in SL-U? The majority of companies (except only two) expressed concerns of adopting such mechanism to determine the additional LBT sensing duration. Therefore, this will not be pursued anymore in this meeting.
* On Question 1-3 (I), should the existing NR-U EDT procedures for uplink transmissions to be taken as the baseline for SL-U in Rel-18?
	+ FL: It is clear the majority of companies supports this proposal. For the questions (from DCM and CableLabs) as to why the NR-U UL EDT procedure should be used as the baseline, this is intended for two reasons, 1) all SL-U transmissions are from UEs only and not gNB, 2) the UL EDT procedure considers the case of COT sharing. However, we need to consider the case for S-SSB transmission which is not applicable in UL.

Given that there is strong support (from almost every company), an updated proposal will be put up for email endorsement over the reflector.

**Proposal 1-1 (II):**

* A higher layer parameter “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” is supported in Rel-18 for SL transmissions in unlicensed bands (e.g., by level of regulation) ~~and it is a per resource pool (pre-)configuration~~.
	+ FFS (pre-)configuration details (e.g., per carrier, per BWP, etc)
	+ FFS: whether relaxation of the energy detection threshold can be applied in absence of incumbent technology

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| DCM | No, at least in this stage | Motivation should be explicitly explained. Just saying ‘let’s reuse NR-U’ is not valid way.In our understanding, in NR-U, if this parameter is configured, longer COT can be obtained, which is good since type 1 LBT can be avoided in more situations. However, this advantage is true only in case of system with gNB scheduler. In SL mode 2, such a longer COT with lower priority would have impact on other UE’s TX with higher priority. This should be considered sufficiently. If inter-UE blocking issue is solved as in section 3.8, then agreeing this parameter would be OK. |
| LGE |  | In our understanding, when the “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” is configured by gNB for Uu link, the “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” for SL-U should not be configured or preconfigured. Otherwise, NR-U would not work properly since the gNB cannot know how the SL UEs are doing in the same LBT channel. For a sake of progress, we can accept it by adding a sub-bullet “UE does not expect that the above parameter for Rel-18 SL-U is provided together with “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” for NR-U in the same time”.  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| Vivo | Yes | We prefer the configuration is per-BWP as we explained in round 1 |
| Lenovo | Ok |  |
| Apple |  | Sorry would FL or proponents of the proposal share the related regulation text? Current 38.331 says, “Presence of this field indicates absence on a long-term basis (e.g. by level of regulation) of any other technology sharing the carrier”. It is not clear what is other technology (i.e., whether Uu is considered same or other technology), and how to define long term (hour, day, forever etc).  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Fraunhofer | OK | Also, OK to configure this per-BWP. |
| JHUAPL | Support |  |
| NEC  | Yes  |  |
| QC | Ok | @ DCM: if the feature is supported in NR-U, anyway it is a valid motivation due to the WID scope being “reuse NR-U channel access”. Furthermore, it has already been showed by companies results (e.g., QC and Ericsson contributions) that the SL-U system benefits from longer COTs, whenever possible. In the unlicensed spectrum accessing and maintaining the use of the medium is the major factor to determine performance, other factors are secondary. Under the assumption that throughput is the target KPI, we do not believe that if a UE determines that a COT can be longer will create a large degradation for other UEs (e.g. that have higher priority and are not using this COT). Moreover, if that longer COT is shared it is possible that other UEs with high priority can still use it (higher priority TXs are allowed over a COT when shared).@ LGE: we understand that when a gNB wants to configure *absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology-16* for NR-U (e.g. set to TRUE), then it intends that in the BWP there are no other technologies, including SL-U. When the gNB wants to configure the new parameter (e.g. *absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology-18*)for SL-U (e.g. set to TRUE), then it intends that in the BWP there are no other technologies, including NR-U. That is to say, when the gNB has the information of what technologies may be in any BWP, and configure the parameter accordingly.Considering our response to LGE above, we also think that VIVO’s consideration of the parameter being associated to the SL-BWP is preferred.  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Panasonic |  | We are OK to support “absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology”. However, we don't support “absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology” is used for the MCOT length is extended from 6ms to 10ms for SL transmissions with CAPC value p = 3 and 4. When COT initiating UE with CAPC value p = 3 or p = 4 get 10ms COT, other UE has PSCCH/PSSCH transmission to other than COT initiating UE cannot get new COT for 10ms even if the UE has higher priority. |
| Samsung | OK | To be more precise, the second FFS should be reworded to be consistent with the main bullet* + FFS: whether relaxation of the energy detection threshold can be applied when the higher layer parameter is provided
 |
| Spreadtrum | OK |  |
| CATT/GH |  | We share the similar view with LGE and Apple. As mentioned in round 1, the validity of the scenario (absence of any other technology) needs to be accepted first, then we can talk about this proposal. |
| Transsion | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Futurewei |  | This configuration variable was defined in the context of NR-U for the UL channel access for two purposes, the control of maximum COT and the control of the EDT threshold. In a centralized approach as in cellular coverage, this configuration maybe strictly controlled. In the SL however due to mobility would be hard to know when the boundary is crossed, and the configuration is no longer valid.We could agree to support it if:* the configuration variable “absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology” is by default false, and
* when the configuration is set to true in mode 2 (out of coverage) triggers an expiration timer. When the timer expires, the variable is reset to its default value false.
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We are generally fine with the proposal. For second FFS, detailed design already captured in NR-U, which can be reused directly, and no FFS is needed. Given as follow, and copied from TS 37.213.

|  |
| --- |
| 4.2.3.1 Default maximum energy detection threshold computation procedureIf the higher layer parameter *absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology-r14* or *absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology-r16* is provided- where - is Maximum energy detection threshold defined by regulatory requirements in dBm when such requirements are defined, otherwise  |

 |
| Sharp | Yes |  |

**Proposal 1-3 (I):**

* The existing NR-U EDT procedures for uplink transmissions is taken as the baseline for SL-U in Rel-18.
	+ FFS: details for S-SSB and PSFCH transmissions (e.g., EDT determination based on PC,MAX and/or network configured EDT, value for TA), if needed

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 3 discussion

FL summary of Round 2 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 1-1 (II), supporting a higher layer parameter “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” in Rel-18 for SL transmissions in unlicensed bands (e.g., by level of regulation)?
	+ Support (21): LGE (not together with same parameter for NR-U), CMCC, ZTE, vivo, Lenovo, Intel, Franuhofer, JHUAPL, NEC, QC, OPPO, Panasonic, Samsung, Spreadtrum, Transsion, ETRI, xiaomi, Futurewei (default faulse, add expiration timer), Huawei/HiSilicon, Sharp
	+ Not support (4): DCM (at this stage), Apple, CATT/GH,
* FL:
	+ @DCM, LGE, Apple, CATT, this parameter was introduced in NR-U. It is clear from the spec that this parameter is provided if the absence of any other technology sharing the channel can be guaranteed on a long term basis (e.g. by level of regulation). If the regulation can guarantee, then it can be used in my understanding. Please also refer to QC’s response for more answers.
	+ @Samsung, please refer to Huawei’s reply on EDT for “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*”.

**Proposal 1-1 (III):**

* A higher layer parameter “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” is supported in Rel-18 for SL transmissions in unlicensed bands (e.g., by level of regulation).
	+ This is per BWP (pre-)configuration
	+ ~~FFS: whether relaxation of the energy detection threshold can be applied in absence of incumbent technology~~
	+ This parameter for is not expected to be provided together with “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” for NR-U at the same time in the same BWP.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| QC | Yes |  |
| LGE | OK for progress | In the last bullet, it seems that “SL transmissions in unlicensed bands” is missing after “This parameter for”.  |
| CATT/GH | OK with modification | Based on the clarification provided by the FL and QC, we think we are on the same page that SL-U and NR-U are considered as different technologies. Then, we are generally ok with this proposal and the following modification is suggested for clarification.**Proposal 1-1 (III’):*** A higher layer parameter “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” is supported in Rel-18 for SL transmissions in unlicensed bands (e.g., by level of regulation).
	+ This is per BWP (pre-)configuration
	+ ~~FFS: whether relaxation of the energy detection threshold can be applied in absence of incumbent technology~~
	+ This parameter for is not expected to be provided together with “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology-r14*” or “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology-r16*” for NR-U at the same time in the same BWP.

BTW, we also think there may be missed something after “This parameter for”, maybe FL can clarify it. |
| Intel | Yes | As for the last sub-bullet, we would prefer to have it as a note. We share same view as other companies and FL, and that this parameter would not be used when there would be another incumbent, whether this is wi-fi or NR-U. Also small typo: “This parameter ~~for~~ is not expected to be” or correction as suggested by LGE. |
| Vivo | Yes | In last bullet, “in the same BWP” means SL BWP and UL BWP is overlapped.* + This parameter for is not expected to be provided together with “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology*” for NR-U at the same time if the SL BWP and the UL BWP are overlapped.
 |
| OPPO | Support | OK with LGE/Intel and CATT’s suggested edits. |
| Futurewei | OK |  |

## [ACTIVE] Topic #2: Type 2 SL channel access procedure

**Background**:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement*** Type 2A/2B/2C SL channel access procedures
	+ Type 2A channel access procedure is applicable to the following case:
		- Transmission(s) by a UE following transmission(s) by another UE for a gap ≥ 25μs in a shared channel occupancy
		- FFS any other transmission by a UE (e.g., other than COT sharing)
		- FFS whether Type 2A is used also for the case of short control signalling transmission
	+ Type 2B channel access procedure is applicable to the following case:
		- Transmission(s) by a UE following transmission(s) by another UE at least when the gap is 16μs in a shared channel occupancy
		- FFS the case when the gap is between 16 and 25us
		- FFS any other transmission by a UE (e.g., other than COT sharing)
	+ Type 2C channel access procedure is applicable to the following case:
		- Transmission(s) by a UE following transmission(s) by another UE for a gap ≤ 16μs in a shared channel occupancy and the duration of the corresponding transmission is at most 584us.
		- FFS any other transmission by a UE (e.g., other than COT sharing)
		- FFS whether Type 2C is used also for the case of short control signalling transmission
	+ FFS under which conditions (other than the gap) UEs can apply the Type 2A/2B/2C SL channel access procedures
	+ FFS under which conditions Type 2B or Type 2C is applied in case of a gap of 16 μs

**Agreement*** Type 2A channel access procedure is applicable for S-SSB transmissions from a UE without a shared channel occupancy, when the following constraints are met:
	+ Time duration is at most 1ms per transmission
	+ The duty cycle of the S-SSB transmissions is at most 1/20
	+ FFS: details of EDT
	+ FFS: whether/how to define observation period, including whether or not observation period would be captured in the specifications if defined
* FFS: Type 2A applicability for PSFCH without a shared channel occupancy and further limitations for combined transmissions of both S-SSB and PSFCH using Type 2A channel access procedure
 |

* Apply Type 2B or 2C when transmission gap is 16us

According to the existing agreement for Type 2B and Type 2C channel access procedures for SL-U (also in NR-U), both can be applied by a SL TX UE when the transmission(s) by the UE following transmission(s) by another UE when the transmission gap is 16μs in a shared channel occupancy. And it is FFS under which condition(s) Type 2B or Type 2C should be applied by the UE. According to the agreement, the applicability of Type 2C is further conditioned that the duration of the corresponding transmission is at most 584µs. So, it means that if a UE is transmitting a PSCCH/PSSCH or S-SSB that is longer than 584µs in a shared channel occupancy when SCS is 15kHz, only Type 2B LBT should be applied. In all other cases, PSFCH transmissions in all SCSs and all SL transmissions in 30kHz and 60kHz, Type 2C could be used by the UE without performing any LBT sensing. In FL’s understanding, this is quite beneficial as the potential TX/RX switching and RX/TX switching times will not need to be considered / no impact on the channel access procedure.

According to contributions submitted to this meeting, besides the existing agreed condition for the corresponding transmission to be less than 584µs, no company has proposed any additional condition. As such, FL proposes that it is up to UE implementation to perform either Type 2B or Type 2C channel access procedures in a shared channel occupancy when the transmission gap is 16us and the duration of the corresponding transmission is at most 584µs in Proposal 2-1 below.

* Whether Type 2A can be applied for PSFCH without a shared channel occupancy

One of the remaining issues for Type 2A channel access procedure is related to whether Type 2A can be applied for PSFCH transmissions without a shared channel occupancy. According to an existing agreement, this feature is allowed for UE transmitting S-SSB since synchronization burst is considered as a high priority and allowed by regulation. Similarly, the PSFCH control signalling can be also considered as a high priority transmission (CAPC p=1 is agreed for PSFCH) and skipping PSFCH / SL-HARQ feedback will cause unnecessary retransmission of SL TBs in the system (i.e., higher congestion, longer latency and degraded performance).

Based on Tdoc review outcome in this meeting, there is a clear majority to support this feature also for PSFCH transmissions. Therefore, the FL proposes to support this in Proposal 2-2 below and adopt a combined limitation / restriction as S-SSB.

* Whether/how to define observation period for S-SSB when Type 2A is applied without a shared channel occupancy

Since the applicability of whether Type 2A can be applied for PSFCH transmissions without a shared channel occupancy in Proposal 2-2, the decision on whether to define an observation period for S-SSB transmissions when Type 2A is applied without a shared channel occupancy should be postponed at least in Round 1 discussion.

### FL Proposal for round 1 discussion

**Proposal 2-1 (I):**

* When the gap between the transmission(s) by a UE following transmission(s) by another UE is 16μs and the duration of the corresponding transmission is at most 584µs in a shared channel occupancy, it is up to UE implementation to perform either Type 2B or Type 2C channel access procedures.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM | OK |  |
| LGE | Yes | As in NR-U, it is up to implementation.  |
| InterDigital | OK |  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | YES |  |
| Lenovo | No, it should be specified | In case of 16us gap, UE applies Type 2C channel access if the corresponding transmission is at most 584µs; otherwise UE applies Type 2B |
| Apple | OK |  |
| CableLabs | No | 37.213 clearly specifies the 584us interval for Type 2C |
| QC | Yes | Since the TX max duration is enforced while using Type 2C, no additional rules are needed. |
| Intel | Yes with comments | We are generally OK with the direction of the proposal and to leave up to implementation on what type of LBT to use. However, if the time constrain of 584us is kept, this will imply in our understanding that for 15 kHZ SCS S-SSB could never be transmitted with type 2C defeating the purposeof sharing a COT for S-SSB and contrary of what happens in the Wi-fi design, where control information are actually transmitted with no LBT. Therefore, we would like to better understand if RAN1 is OK with such a restriction.  |
| vivo | yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| JHUAPL | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | OK in principle | We do not see a strong reason for a UE to prefer Type 2B over Type 2C, but OK for the progress of the discussion |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Panasonic | Yes |  |
| Sharp | OK |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| WILUS | No, it should be specified | Rather than leaving on UE implementation to select one of two, as mentioned by Lenovo, it should be specified as in NR-U that UE applies Type 2C channel access if the corresponding transmission is at most 584µs; otherwise UE applies Type 2B. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Transsion | Yes |  |

**Proposal 2-2 (I):**

* Type 2A channel access procedure is applicable for PSFCH transmissions from a UE without a shared channel occupancy, when the following constraints are met
	+ Time duration is at most 1ms per transmission
	+ The combine number of S-SSB and PSFCH transmissions by the UE shall be equal to or less than 50 within an observation period of 50ms

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM | OK |  |
| LGE | No | Considering both channel types, it would not be helpful to simplify LBT operation for S-SSB transmission. Regarding the proposal itself, since the PSFCH resource period is defined in logical slot domain while the S-SSB period is defined in physical slot domain, when the observation period is 50ms, it would be unclear whether the condition is met or not. If it is allowed the simplified LBT for both S-SSB and PSFCH, the observation period should be resource pool period (i.e., 10240ms), and then the duty cycle will be checked according to the following agreement. **Agreement*** Type 2A channel access procedure is applicable for S-SSB transmissions from a UE without a shared channel occupancy, when the following constraints are met:
	+ Time duration is at most 1ms per transmission
	+ The duty cycle of the S-SSB transmissions is at most 1/20
	+ FFS: details of EDT
	+ FFS: whether/how to define observation period, including whether or not observation period would be captured in the specifications if defined
* FFS: Type 2A applicability for PSFCH without a shared channel occupancy and further limitations for combined transmissions of both S-SSB and PSFCH using Type 2A channel access procedure
 |
| InterDigital | Support |  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | YES (see comments) | We propose slight clarifications to the conditions:* Time duration of each PSFCH transmission is at most 1ms
* The combined number of S-SSB and PSFCH transmissions by the UE using Type 2A LBT shall be equal to or less than 50 within an observation period of 50ms
* The duty cycle of the S-SSB and PSFCH transmissions by the UE using Type 2A LBT is at most 1/20
 |
| Lenovo | See comments | We support that Type 2A is applicable for PSFCH transmissions without shared channel occupancy. But the second constraint is unsuitable and not acceptable: The constraint needs to take the overall usage time for S-SSB/PSFCH within an observation period into account; the number of transmissions by itself is irrelevant (for example, if we adopted the number as suggested, the usability becomes SCS-specific, which doesn’t make sense to us). |
| Apple | No | In LAA/eLAA and NR-U, PDCCH (ACK/NACK for CG-PUSCH) and PUCCH transmission are subject to type 1 CCA when transmitted outside of shared COT. We do not see any reason why SL ACK/NACK transmission should be prioritized over Uu link ACK/NACK transmission.  |
| CableLabs | No | DL Type 2A is clearly specified by 37.213 in section #4.1.2. This behavior qualifies as *“Type 2A channel access procedures as described in clause 4.1.2.1 are only applicable to the following transmission(s) performed by an eNB/gNB:**- Transmission(s) initiated by an eNB including discovery burst and not including PDSCH where the transmission(s) duration is at most ”*Also it is not clear the meaning of the conditions ‘without a shared channel occupancy’ in the context of 37.213. |
| QC | No | We prefer that S-SSB access is simplified, and a joint use of Type 2A for S-SSB and PSFCH would complicate UE’s implementations. We also believe that to improve the reliability of PSFCH transmission, the relaxation of conditions to share the COT is the way to go, which can be discussed in Topic #5. |
| Intel | No | We are not OK to apply the short control exemption to PSFCH as well, and agree with LG’s comments. If we apply type 2A to PSFCH, this would complicate quite a bit the design, and furthermore we may need to discuss a lot more details as for instance any priority rules UE behaviour when in an observation period we have both S-SSB and PSFCH transmissions.  |
| Vivo | Yes with comment | One more subbullet should be added:The total duration of the S-SSB and PSFCH should also be clarified, i.e., less than 2500us within 50ms |
| CMCC | No | It may need more workload to discuss when one of S-SSB, PSFCH cannot fulfil the limitation, which one should be transmitted with Type 2A channel access procedure, or only partial occasions of PSFCHs can be transmitted with Type 2A; we prefer to do not support Type 2A channel access procedure for PSFCH to avoid more complexity.  |
| Sony | Yes | We support that Type 2A channel access procedure is applicable for PSFCH transmissions from a UE without a shared channel occupancy. We prefer to remove the second sub-bullet but it is OK for the progress. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| JHUAPL | Yes | Support |
| Futurewei | No | We prefer not to cumulate PSFCH and S-SSB duty cycles. It may create additional corner cases (thus implementation and spec complexity) when the conditions of the short control exemption are not satisfied.  |
| Samsung | No | We feel hesitate to simply support Type 2A for PSFCH before carefully discussing how to calculate its duty cycle and time duration in combination with S-SSB. |
| NEC  | No  |  |
| ETRI | No | Agree with LG’s comments |
| Panasonic | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi  | Yes | We support the main-bullet, but we think the constraints of the 2nd bullet is too limited and suggest to relax it if there has a consensus.  |
| ZTE |  | In NR-U, the discovery burst duty cycle is at most C:\Users\10217598\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml7676\wps3.jpg for Type 2A channel access procedures without a shared channel occupancy and no observation period is specified. Similarly, it is suggested that it is up to UE implementation for determining the observation period of Type 2A channel access procedure of S-SSB/PSFCH transmissions. |
| WILUS | No | We prefer not to apply Type 2A for PSFCH transmissions without shared channel occupancy. It would result on complicate UE’s implementation to calculate combined number of S-SSB and PSFCH and the duty cycle for both S-SSB and PSFCH. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not support | We do not support the proposal. First, the proposal is not clear, especially the second the sub-bullet. The sub-bullet defines an observation period of 50ms to count the total number of S-SSB and PSFCH, however, for S-SSB transmission itself, only duty cycle and maximum time duration is defined, so why a new observation period is needed? Second, in NR-U, short control signalling is applicable for DRS alone or multiplexed with non-unicast data. HARQ feedback conveyed in PUCCH or PUSCH is not taken into account. Thus, we do not think Type 2A channel access procedure is applicable for PSFCH transmissions without a COT. |
| CATT/GH | Yes with comments | Since PSFCH occasions are determined, allowing quick channel access of PSFCH transmissions is beneficial for the reliability of sidelink system. Therefore, when there is no available COT that can be used for PSFCH transmission, PSFCH may also be transmitted as discovery burst using Type 2A channel access procedure.Regarding the constraints, using a similar description as we did for S-SSB is preferred in this stage and the modification is suggested as follows.By the way, if the constraints are defined as proposal 2-2(I), the duty cycle may be at most 1?**Proposal 2-2 (I’):** * Type 2A channel access procedure is applicable for PSFCH transmissions from a UE without a shared channel occupancy, when the following constraints are met
	+ Time duration is at most 1ms per transmission
	+ The ~~combine number~~ duty cycle of S-SSB and PSFCH transmissions is at most 1/20 ~~by the UE shall be equal to or less than 50 within an observation period of 50ms~~
	+ FFS: whether/how to define observation period, including whether or not observation period would be captured in the specifications if defined
 |
| MediaTek | No | We do not support to use Type 2A channel access procedure for PSFCH transmission outside of shared COT. |
| Transsion | Yes |  |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 2 discussion

FL summary of Round 1 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 2-1 (I), up to UE implementation to perform either Type 2B or Type 2C when the gap between the transmission(s) by a UE following transmission(s) by another UE is 16μs and the duration of the corresponding transmission is at most 584µs in a shared channel occupancy?
	+ Support (28): OPPO, DCM, LGE, IDC, Nokia/NSB, Apple, QC, Intel, vivo, CMCC, Sony, Spreadtrum, JHUAPL, Futurewei, Samsung, NEC, ETRI, Panasonic, Sharp, xiaomi, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT/GOHIGH, MediaTek, Transsion
	+ Not support (3): Lenovo (2B), CableLabs (584us interval), WILUS (2B)
	+ FL: @CableLabs, the NR-U restriction of 584us for Type 2C is kept, as per RAN1 agreement in the past. @lenovo, WILUS, I think we should keep the same behavior as used in NR-U for transmission burst/MCSt.

Since there is a clear majority of companies who supported this proposal, the same proposal will be put up for email endorsement over the RAN1 reflector.

* On Proposal 2-2 (I), on support of Type 2A for PSFCH transmission from a UE without a shared channel occupancy, a summary is provided in the following.
	+ Support (16): OPPO, DCM, IDC, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, vivo, Sony, Spreadtrum, JHUAPL, Panasonic, xiaomi, ZTE, CATT/GOHIGH, Transsion
	+ Not support (14): LGE, Apple, CableLabs, QC, Intel, CMCC, Futurewei, Samsung, NEC, ETRI, WILUS, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek
	+ FL: this issue/topic has been discussed over several meetings and still no clear majority support. It is felt continue discussion on this topic will not change non-supporters’ opinions. This proposal will not be pursued any longer in this meeting. Hopefully the proposal 5-3 can be accepted to allow PSFCH transmission more freely to improve system performance, instead of relying UE performing Type 1 LBT.

**Proposal 2-1 (I):**

* When the gap between the transmission(s) by a UE following transmission(s) by another UE is 16μs and the duration of the corresponding transmission is at most 584µs in a shared channel occupancy, it is up to UE implementation to perform either Type 2B or Type 2C channel access procedures.

## [ACTIVE] Topic #3: CP Extension (CPE)

**Background**:

All of the CPE related agreements that have been reached so far in this WI are listed below with remaining FFSs are highlighted in yellow. We will try to address as many of these remaining FFSs as possible in this meeting.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement*** CP extension (CPE) is supported for NR sidelink operation in a shared channel.
	+ FFS all remaining details including applicable scenarios, usage, PHY structure, etc.

**Agreement*** A CPE is transmitted from a CPE starting position before SL transmission within a COT, select one or both of the two options:
	+ Option 1: within the symbol just before the next AGC symbol
	+ Option 2: within at most 1, 2 or 4 symbols just before the next AGC symbol for 15, 30 or 60 kHz SCS, respectively
	+ FFS: whether Option 1 and Option 2 are both applicable and the conditions (e.g., Option 1 in case of COT sharing and Option 2 in case of initiating a COT)
	+ FFS: which channel access type(s) is applicable for option 1 and option 2
	+ FFS: other details
* A single CPE starting position for PSFCH
	+ FFS CPE starting position and whether it should be (pre-)configured in each RP, pre-defined or indicated
	+ FFS other details (e.g., indication granularity)
	+ Note: value 0 is a candidate
* At least one CPE starting position for S-SSB
	+ FFS CPE starting position should be (pre-)configured, pre-defined or indicated
	+ FFS: Whether multiple CPE starting positions should be (pre-)configured, pre-defined or indicated
	+ FFS CPE starting positions for the R16 S-SSB and the additional S-SSBs
	+ Note: value 0 is a candidate
* One or multiple CPE starting positions can be (pre-)configured in each resource pool for PSSCH/PSCCH
	+ When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured,
		- FFS whether/how to define a criteria for selecting a default CPE starting position (e.g., according to partial/full RB set allocation, resource reservation information, within or outside of a COT, etc.)
		- FFS criteria for selecting one of the multiple CPE starting positions (e.g., according to priority level (e.g., CAPC or L1), selected randomly by UE from the (pre-)configured set of CPEs, selected by the UE based on channel access result, determined based on indication from the COT initiating UE, etc.)
	+ FFS other details

**Agreement**A CPE can be transmitted from a CPE starting position before SL transmission for the following two options:* Option 1: within the symbol just before the next AGC symbol
* Option 2:
	+ within the symbol just before the next AGC symbol for 15 kHz SCS
	+ within at most 2 symbols just before the next AGC symbol for 30 or 60 kHz SCS
* FFS applicable scenario(s), condition(s) and channel type(s) to apply Option 1 or Option 2
 |

Based on reviewing submitted Tdocs in this meeting, there are a couple of high level questions brought up by some and we should probably address those first.

* Clarification on the CPE transmission is restricted within the SL symbols in a slot or any symbol within a slot (due to the starting symbol for PSCCH/PSSCH may not be the first symbol in a slot)

It is brought up in [5] that since it has been agreed in the PHY agenda that the starting symbol for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission in a slot for SL-U may be (pre-)configured to be, for example, not the first symbol in a slot. Then it is questioned that whether the existing agreements for CPE (i.e.., a CPE can be transmitted from a CPE starting position within “the symbol” or “at most 2 symbols“ just before the next AGC symbol for an intended SL transmission), the symbol(s) for transmitting CPE is part of SL symbols or physical symbols in a slot. It is at least to FL’s understanding, the CPE symbol(s) is/are physical symbols before the next AGC symbol of the intended SL transmission to ensure occupancy continuity of the channel for SL transmission. Maybe it is worthwhile to clarify this point using Question 3-1 below to get everyone’s understanding on this issue.

* Clarification on the need to consider UE TX/RX switching time and RX/TX switching time in LBT sensing and CPE transmission, respectively.

It has been pointed by several papers whether the UE TX/RX and RX/TX switching times (i.e., 13µs in one direction) should be taken into account of as part of LBT sensing and/or CPE transmission. While most of the paper brought up this issue have the view that these switching times do not need to be considered (as also the case in NR-U), since the actual switching time can be account for as part of the LBT sensing slot duration, it is good to have a common understanding on this topic/issue (or even make a conclusion). Please indicate your view on this for Question 3-2 below.

* Selection of time window for CPE transmission (Option 1 and Option 2)

In the last RAN1#112 meeting, a time window for CPE transmission was agreed for 15kHz, 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs (let’s denote this as a “CPE window”), where the CPE window is always 1 symbol length for 15kHz SCS, and up to 2 symbols for 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs before the next AGC symbol of the intended SL transmission. One of the remaining FFS points is how to select/determine whether Option 1 (1-symbol length) or Option 2 (2-symbol length) should be used by a SL TX UE in 30 and 60kHz SCSs.

Based on the Tdoc review in this meeting (summary provided in Section 4.5), a clear majority of company thinks the selection/determination should be based on whether the UE is initiating a COT or sharing a COT from another UE (same as NR-U). Specifically, when UE is initiating a COT for an intended SL transmission, since the additional LBT that needs to be performed (43us, 55us, …) is longer than a symbol length in 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs (35.7us, 17.9us), Option 2 (2-symbol length) would be required. And since the LBT sensing time / transmission gap requirements for Type 2A/2B/2C channel access procedures are 25us, 16us, and up to 16us, respectively, generally Option 1 (1-symbol length) would be sufficient. Alternatively, the selection / determination could be based on availability of the channel (e.g., whether there is SL / WiFi transmission in the prior symbols). When the channel is idle in the prior symbols, the additional LBT could be performed and CPE is transmitted within the CPE window using Option 2. When the channel is busy (e.g., SL transmission in symbol #12), the additional LBT will always fail. The same could be said for the COT initiating/sharing approach. So, it is FL understanding, both approaches can work and the end result is the same. As such, the simplest way in FL’s view is to go with the majority to adopt the NR-U approach. A corresponding proposal is listed in Proposal 3-3 below.

* When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH (selecting a default CPE)

For another one of the remaining FFS points from RAN1#111, when multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, whether/how to define a criterion for selecting a default CPE starting position. From reviewing the contributions in this meeting, the majority is split between the two following criteria.

* Whether the intended SL transmission has a partial or full RB set allocation.

Companies who preferred this approach were mainly due to firstly it aligns with NR-U mechanism, and secondly it always allows FDMing of concurrent transmissions in a slot for partial RB set allocation. That is, when it is a full RB set allocation, the chances of a SL collision could be high when there is no existing reservation. However, other companies think that even for partial RB set allocation and there is no existing reservation, this approach does not offer collision resolution.

* Whether there is an existing reservation of resources in the slot of the intended SL transmission (including own reservation).

For this approach, whenever there is an existing reservation (including own reservation) in the slot of the intended SL transmission, the CPE starting position should always be aligned among all SL TX UEs (based on a default/common starting position) to allow FDM of concurrent transmissions in the same slot. TX collision resolution for both partial RB set and full RB set allocations is based on the existing SL sensing and reservation (including re-evaluation and pre-emption checking) mechanism. When there is no existing reservation, then one of the multiple (pre-)configured CPE starting position should be selected to achieve collision resolution.

Since there is no clear majority of preference from the Tdoc review (summary in Section 4.5), FL would like to collect company views in the first round of discussion using Question 3-4 below.

* When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH (selecting a starting position)

For another one of the remaining FFS points from RAN1#111, when multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, what is the criteria for selecting one of the multiple CPE starting positions when the default CPE position is not selected. From reviewing the contributions in this meeting, the majority is split between the two following approaches.

* Priority based (CAPC or L1 priority)

The reason(s) behind this approach is quite straight forward. High priority transmission would transmit longer CPE (earlier CPE starting point) than a lower priority one.

* Random selection based

Companies who preferred this approach were mainly due to firstly it is aligned with NR-U approach and secondly it is intended for full RB set allocation. However, companies who are not in favour of this approach concern about a low priority transmission could transmit a longer CPE and block a high priority transmission UE who select a shorter CPE length. Hence, this may not be a fair approach.

* Indication based

Companies who preferred this approach were mainly due to it is aligned with NR-U approach However, companies who are not in favour of this approach concern about the COT initiating UE has no knowledge about the transmission priority of the COT sharing UE, since SL transmissions are not scheduled by another UE.

Based on the Tdoc review in this meeting, FL propose to go with the priority-based approach since there is a clear majority. The corresponding proposal is provided in Proposal 3-5 below.

* Handling of the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt

One of the topics that has been brought up by some companies is the treatment / handling of the GP symbol(s) between the slots of MCSt. While it is mentioned by several papers that the CPE starting position between the slots in MCSt should be 16µs (to be the same as the transmission burst in NR-U), some also expressed a concern that this would block channel access for UEs that perform Type 1 LBT (especially in 15kHz SCS) and MCSt should still allow FDM of different transmissions in a slot. Furthermore, there is also an opinion/view that the GP symbol(s) could be used for PSSCH transmission, but this would impact RX UEs who rely on the GP symbol to perform RX/TX switching in order to transmit SL in the following slot.

To this end, the FL would like to gather views/opinions from all companies (in Question 3-6 below) on this topic/issue of firstly whether CPE or PSSCH should be transmitted in the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt and secondly how to resolve inter-UE blocking if a 16µs transmission gap is always applied. Note, this discussion is not intended for the GP symbol just before the start of a MCSt.

### FL Proposals/questions for round 1 discussion

**Question 3-1 (I):**

For the CPE agreements reached so far in this agenda, the 1 or at most 2 symbols just before the next AGC symbol for CPE transmission is/are SL or physical symbol(s)?

* Note, when the starting PSCCH/PSSCH symbol in a slot is (pre-)configured to be not the first symbol in a slot, it is assumed the symbols not to be used for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission are not SL symbols.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **SL / physical symbol(s)** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Physical symb | The intention of CPE transmission is to start early channel occupation (up to 2 OFDM symbols) just before the SL transmission. If CPE is transmitted only in configured SL symbols, then CPE transmission duration could be much longer than 2 OFDM symbols. |
| DCM | Physical |  |
| LGE | Physical symbols |  |
| InterDigital | Physical symbol | Our understanding of the CPE agreements is that CPE to be applied to the physical symbols before the next AGC.  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  | In our view, this may not be a relevant issue for SL-U Rel-18 assuming that all symbols and slots are configured for SL, given that Uu is in licensed. So either approach is fine, without any specific solution needed. |
| Ericsson | Physical | SL symbols do not make sense from the perspective of channel access. |
| Lenovo | physical symbols | We understood all existing agreements to refer to the nominal slot duration with regular CP duration, i.e. depending only on the numerology but not considering the additional extension of cyclic prefix. |
| Apple |  | When starting symbol is not the 1st symbol in a slot, it still starts with AGC symbol. Then the previous agreement applies. When the starting symbol is the 1st symbol in a slot, the CPE is in the last symbol of previous slot.  |
| CableLabs | Physical symbols | Not clear what is the meaning of SL symbols |
| QC | Physical |  |
| Intel | Physical symbol | As other companies commented, our understanding is that CPE, regardless of option 1 or 2, would be applied to the physical symbols right before the AGC symbol. |
| Vivo | PHY symbol | The starting symbol of SL is configurable, if CPE is confined within SL symbol only, there may be gap between CPE and SL transmission, which is not preferred. |
| CMCC | physical symbol(s) |  |
| Spreadtrum | Physical symbols |  |
| JHUAPL | Physical |  |
| Futurewei | Physical |  |
| Samsung | Physical | We think the CPE symbols should be in adjacent to AGC symbol in physical manner to avoid gap between CPE symbol and starting PSCCH/PSSCH symbol.  |
| NEC  | Physical  |  |
| ETRI | Physical |  |
| Panasonic | Physical symbols |  |
| Sharp | Physical symbol(s) |  |
| xiaomi | physical symbol |  |
| ZTE | physical symbol |  |
| WILUS | Physical |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Physical symbols | Only physical symbol is meaningful for the usage of CPE. |
| CATT/GH | Physical symbols |  |
| MediaTek | Physical symbols |  |
| Transsion | Physical symbols |  |

**Question 3-2 (I):**

For the definition of CPE starting position(s) within a CPE window (1 to 2 symbols before the next AGC symbol of the intended SL transmission), is it necessary to take into account of the UE TX/RX and/or RX/TX switching times? If yes, how?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes / No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO |  | We are OK to follow how it is handled in NR-U and/or follow the majority view. |
| DCM | YES | This discussion includes a case where UE-A transmits a TX at slot n and UE-B transmits a TX at slot n+1 with applying CPE. Then UE-A should be possible to receive UE-B’s TX. |
| LGE | No | According to TS 38.211, for FR1, the TX-RX switching time and the RX-to-TX switching time are the same as 13us for both NR SL and NR Uu link as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4.3.2 Slots<…>A UE not capable of full-duplex communication is not expected to transmit in the uplink earlier than after the end of the last received downlink symbol in the same cell where is given by Table 4.3.2-3. A UE not capable of full-duplex communication is not expected to receive in the downlink earlier than after the end of the last transmitted uplink symbol in the same cell where is given by Table 4.3.2-3.<…>**Table 4.3.2-3: Transition time and**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Transition time** | **FR1** | **FR2** |
|  | 25600 | 13792 |
|  | 25600 | 13792 |

 |
| 8.2.3.2 SlotsThe slot structure for sidelink transmission is defined in clause 4.3.2. |

Meanwhile, according to TS37.213, the basic unit for channel sensing is a sensing slot with a duration of 9 us, and the actual channel sensing duration for the LBT operation within the sensing slot is just 4 us, and its location is up to UE implementation. In this case, it is understood that the switching time from the RX for LBT operation to the TX after LBT operation is up to UE implementation and is already covered in the sensing slot or LBT duration. |
| InterDigital | No | Similar to NR U, no need to consider switching time. |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No | In NR-U there was no specific consideration related to the RX/TX switching, and we see no need for that here either.  |
| Ericsson | No | It is up to UE implementation how to handle it. |
| Lenovo | No | In our understanding NR-U does not explicitly consider switching time, so we see no strong motivation to deviate from there. |
| Apple | No.  | Rx to Tx switching is included in the sensing slot.  |
| CableLabs | No | Similar to NR-U, not clear why required to consider the switching time |
| QC | No | Two cases to be considered:1. if a UEA wants to keep transmitting, it cannot have a gap larger than between two consecutive transmissions (it might be needed to agree on a definition of a TX burst to clarify this). In that case, UEA does not perform any channel access, which means that it remains in TX state (**no switching at all for MCSt**).
2. Conversely when a COT is shared, but also in general when a UEB is receiving something from UEA and want to transmit after receiving, there will be a single Rx/Tx switching, and as highlighted by LGE, **an NR-U capable UE is intended to have enough time to perform this switching, the measurement, and send a gate-off signal for TX if LBT fails, within the minimum gap of** .
 |
| Intel | Yes with comments | We believe that the UE TX/RX and/or RX/TX switching times needs to be indeed taken into consideration when discussing CPE as the switching time may create a gap between two consecutive transmissions which may require LBT to be performed even within a shared COT. In order to minimize any LBT failure and LBT overhead, RAN1 should aim to fill these gaps when possible so that to aim for an LBT free design, without violating any regulatory requirements, as per RAN4 requirements the actual duration needed for TX/RX and RX/TX switching should be at most 13 us in FR1, which would allow to use type 2C LBT in many case. One example could be the one depicted in the following figure where both transmissions fall within a shared COT: for 15 kHz SCS, the gap between PSSCH/PSCCH and PSFCH would be sufficiently long to require type 2A before PSFCH, while by simply applying a CPE would be possible to use instead type 2C making the PSFCH more reliable and unconditional to any LBT when this occur back to back with another SL transmission. |
| Vivo | No | Reuse NR-U principle is sufficient, where switching time is not additionally defined. |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No | There is no need to consider TX-RX switching time in SL-U additionally. |
| Futurewei | No | Prefer a similar approach as in NR-U |
| Samsung | No | Since the issue was not specifically handled in NR-U, SL-U can keep a similar manner.In addition, we don’t need a concept of “CPE window”. |
| NEC | No |  |
| ETRI | No | It is up to UE implementation. |
| Panasonic | No | In NR-U, switching time is included in the sensing duration. |
| xiaomi | No | We also think the actual switching time can be account for as part of the LBT sensing slot duration. |
| ZTE | NO |  |
| WILUS | No | The necessity of introducing switching time is not clear as in NR-U. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | In NR-U, the UE TX/RX and/or RX/TX switching times are not considered for CPE. We are wondering the why and how to take them into account for CPE design in SL-U |
| CATT/GH |  | Open for discussion |
| MediaTek | No | The RX to TX switching time is already considered in sensing slot. We don’t see the need to handle this issue additionally to NRU. |
| Transsion | No | Similar view as LGE |

**Proposal 3-3 (I):**

For 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs, a SL TX UE uses Option 1 (1-symbol length) for CPE window when the UE performs Type 2 channel access procedure and Option 2 (2-symbol length) for CPE window when the UE performs Type 1 channel access procedures.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | OK | Follow majority view. |
| DCM |  | Is this proposal mean that there are two sets of multiple starting positions? Our view is that at least the default starting position should be aligned regardless of type 1 or type 2. If this is ensured, we are fine with this proposal. That is, the default position is common for type 1/type 2 LBT, and additional position can be multiple (option 1 for type 2 LBT and option 2 for type 1 LBT).**Proposal 3-3 (I):** For 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs, a SL TX UE uses Option 1 (1-symbol length) for CPE window when the UE performs Type 2 channel access procedure and Option 2 (2-symbol length) for CPE window when the UE performs Type 1 channel access procedures. * Note: default starting position is the same regardless of type of channel access procedure.
 |
| LGE | No | In case of UE-to-UE COT sharing, due to the processing time for decoding PSCCH/PSSCH containing COT sharing information, it is possible that the time gap between PSCCH/PSSCH including COT sharing information and initial SL transmission utilizing the shared COT. In this situation, even though the UE performs Type 2 channel access procedure, Option 1 (1-symbol length) for CPE window can be used to minimize the time gap. Otherwise, the shared COT can be interrupted by other RAT or other UE. Simply, we can say that the transmissions within a MCSt except for the earliest transmission, Option 1 (1-symbol length) is used while the earliest transmission uses Option 2 (2-symbol length).  |
| InterDigital |  | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | See comments | For Proposal 3-5, the CPE is determined based on L1 priority; then whether the CPE is within one symbol or two symbol duration does not need extra discussion.  |
| Apple | No | We assume the proposal is about multiple CPE starting position. If this one is about single starting position, we can discuss the CPE length directly without one or two symbol option discussion. Multiple CPE starting position is to introduce intentional mutual blocking. When FDM transmission is enabled, mutual blocking is not desirable. Therefore, we do not see the reasoning to separate one symbol (less starting positions, i.e., less choices to mutual blocking) versus two symbols (more starting positions, i.e., more choices to mutual blocking) based on type 2 versus type 1 LBT. In fact, when type 2 LBT is used (COT sharing and S-SSB transmission), we do not see the value of multiple CPE starting position. One common starting position (default one or dynamic signaled one by SCI in shared COT) should be used. The default CPE value is to fill in the gap left after 25us LBT. Since 60KHz SCS one OFDM symbol length is shorten than 25us, the CPE length is 2 OFDM symbol – 25us. For 30KHz SCS, it is one OFDM symbol length – 25us. For type 1 LBT, multiple starting position is used with fullBW transmission for intentional mutual blocking.  |
| CableLabs | See comments | Not clear why Type 1 access may require CPE. Perhaps the question needs to be re-phrased? |
| QC | Ok | We believe that FL version is a simple solution that achieves the objective of using as much as collision resolution when accessing a channel to initiate the COT, and limiting the positions in a shared COT to gap symbol (so that Type 2A/2B/2C does not fail if another SL TX occupies the target slot). That is:* Two sets of CPEs are pre-configured, one based on Option 1 and one based on Option 2, which one to use is based on COT initiation vs. COT sharing

On LGE version: thanks for your input. there may be some error cases to be avoided (UE incurs in unnecessary UE blockage due to try using Option 2 in a shared COT), e.g. in Case1 the UE is trying to TX the CPE in same slot (after initiator’s TX) it may need to restrict CPEs to Option 1. In Case2, if the UE is trying to do TX the CPE after another third UE had the chance to use the shared COT the problem is the same. **In general the UE should assume that the slot is occupied until the end of symbol 12**.To DCM, thanks for your input. we should definitely define the default starting position for both COT sharing and COT initiation, it may be the next discussion point. In fact the default starting position may change due to the different needs in COT initiation and shared COT. This is related to how many CPE position are available in each of those cases, which is also tied to how many collision resolution capability we need. As discussed before, Option 1 limit the # of CPE positions, and provide less collision resolution capability, while Option 2 provide more CPEs and more collision resolution capability. So we believe that the conditions and the location of the default CPE can be discussed in parallel (Question 3-4 from FL), under the principle that when a UE does not need to resolve collisions, then can use default CPE (to transmit concurrently with other UEs) |
| Intel | OK |  |
| Vivo | No | In later proposal, we discuss the CPE selection rule, once the CPE starting position is determined, the CPE may locate either in 1 or 2 symbol.Therefore, the LBT type is not used for option 1 or option 2 selection. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Futurewei |  | Not clear why CPE necessary and how it would be used for the Type 1 channel access, as CableLabs pointed out.  |
| Samsung | OK with comment | If the proposal clarifies Type 2 channel access procedure in COT sharing case, then it’s ok. |
| NEC  | Yes  |  |
| Panasonic | Yes |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| WILUS | No | It is not clear to us to use either option 1(1-symbol) or option 2(2-symbol) selection for CPE window depending on LBT type. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | We support the proposal.The intention to support option 2 is help UE to access the channel which uses Type 1 channel access and initialize a COT. As comments from Apple, even a single CPE starting position is agreed to use for sharing a COT and performing type, the single one can be derived from multiple positions based on option 1. For example, in 60kHz SCS, the CPE starting position could be one OFDM symbol length – 16us.  |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| MediaTek | Support |  |
| Transsion | Support |  |

**Question 3-4 (I):**

When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, which one of the following selection criteria should be used by a SL TX UE for selecting a default CPE starting position?

Partial/full RB set allocation based

Existing resource reservation based

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | For the simplest way, we still prefer to use Mode 1 / Mode 2 RA to decide when to use the default CPE starting position. In Mode 2, a single default CPE starting position can be (pre-)configured within the CPE window and all UEs use the same CPE starting position to achieve FDM transmissions among different UEs. In Mode 1, multiple CPE starting positions are configured within the CPE window and the gNB indicates which one of the configured positions to be used by the UE. |
| DCM | Prefer 1.For 2, we do not think this option is meaningful since what is addressed here is resource conflict due to initial TX. If there is resource reservation, then the TX UE should avoid resource conflict by selecting appropriate resource in R16/17 mechanism. |
| LGE | According to NR-U design, for the partial RB set allocation, a single CPE is used. In that point of view, for simplicity, partial RB set allocation uses the default CPE starting position. We think that existing resource reservation also needs to be used to determine the usage of the default CPE even for full RB set allocation. According to NR SL resource (re)selection, if the UE detects the existing resource reservation, and if it is overlapping with its own TX resources, and if the RSRP measurement is above threshold, the UE may reselect its TX resource to avoid the resource collision. If the UE detects the existing resource reservation, and if it is overlapping with its own TX resources, and if the RSRP measurement is below threshold, the UE may not reselect its TX resource. If the UE detects the existing resource reservation, and if it is not overlapping with its own TX resources, the UE may not reselect its TX resource regardless of whether and if the RSRP measurement is above or below threshold. In this case, if the different CPEs are used, one of them would be unnecessarily blocked due to LBT failure.  |
| InterDigital | We think 2 can be used as criteria to select CPE starting position. Based on the existing resource reservation, the UE selects the CPE starting position to align with the reserved resource’s priority to enable FDM in the same slot. |
| Ericsson | Both |
| Lenovo | Partial/full RB set allocation should be considered., but see also Proposal 3-5 to use the L1 priority |
| Apple | Option 1. For mode-1 with dynamic grant, the CPE can be signalled in DCI, same as Uu link for PUSCH transmission. For mode-1 with configured grant, and for mode-2 with resource selection procedure, similar as NR-U CG-PUSCH transmission, depending on FDM case or TDM case, single or multiple CPE can be used. When option 1 is used (FDM or fullBW), the resource selection procedure is assumed as well.  |
| QC | Prefer 2In our view the CPE method (from NR-U) and the reservation/re-evaluation check method (from NR SL) that can lead to reselection are nicely complementary for solving the collision issue. Furthermore, the NR SL method is effective when a reservation is provided (if there is no reservation, the UE don’t have a chance to avoid collision via reselection when re-evaluation check is performed T3 before the transmission). So if we adopt a harmonized strategy we can reap the benefits of both.To DCM: Thanks for your view. On your comment on 2, it is exactly because “If there is resource reservation, then the TX UE should avoid resource conflict by selecting appropriate resource in R16/17 mechanism” that NR SL mechanism can solve collisions and therefore the default CPE can be used. When this is not available (e.g. first TX) then the collision resolution via CPE is used. In our view going for 1, means that partial RB sets transmissions cannot benefit from collision resolution for 1st TX.To Apple: Thanks for your view. For mode 2 operation, we agree with you that FDM or TDM case is a relevant partition, but the way in which FDM or TDM is determined, is via resource reservations and the related re-evaluation and pre-emption check. FDMing cannot be assessed based only on partial RB set allocation (there is no gNB that ensure it). Conversely, concurrent transmissions can coexist if their mutual RSRP level is acceptable, which again can be assessed from a received reservation.  |
| Intel | As long as the resource reservation are sufficiently spaced from the candidate resources, the selection of the CPE should only depend on partial/full RB set allocation. However, some specific exclusion rules may need to be defined first in this sense.  |
| vivo | Default CPE is used to achieve FDM. Reservation signalling can help to detect whether FDMed transmission exist or not. So, at least reservation signalling should be considered. Of course, FDMed transmission exist only when there is partial RB set transmissionboth of the factors can be considered. |
| CMCC | The 2nd one;For the 1st one, even the UE occupy full RB set, the resource can also be selected by other UEs based on RSRP measurement, but this may cause the LBT failure. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer the 1st one. |
| Samsung | Partial/full RB set allocation based |
| ETRI | We prefer the first one. |
| Panasonic | Option 1. For mode 1 configured grant and mode 2, CPE length should be aligned when partial RB set is used. The collision could be avoided by resource sensing other than first TX.  |
| Sharp | Support Option 2.Option 2 is preferred to achieve simultaneous transmission and resolve the collision. A UE can know the resource where other UE performs transmission on reserved resource. And, when a UE performs transmission where other UE’s reservation exists, applying default CPE starting position for both UEs will achieve simultaneous transmission.But a UE cannot know the resource where other UE performs initial transmission. If some UEs select the same resource for initial transmission, the collision will occur. So, when a UE performs initial transmission where other UE’s reservation does not exist, the UE should apply multiple CPE starting positions to avoid collision. |
| xiaomi | To solve the inter-UE blocking issue, we prefer the option1. |
| ZTE | We prefer the first criteria. |
| WILUS | We prefer to have Partial/full RB set allocation based |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think both options can be combined together. Both of them are used to identify whether FDMed with others is needed and then to determine the CPE staring position which is based on the principle of protecting high L1 priority transmission. * If no reservation is detected in one slot, FDMed transmissions “requirement” are not identified at this stage. In order to avoid transmission collision, UE selects one CPE starting position based on its own L1 priority regardless of partial or full RB set is occupied, where the higher priority transmission will be protected.
* If reservation is detected and when UE selects resource with partial RB set, to align with others transmission, UE selects a CPE starting position depend on the existing resource reservation with the highest priority. It should be noted, R16 resource allocation procedure is still performed and pre-emption is not considered currently. So, for the full RB set case, UE may or may not use this slot based on the comparing with RSRP threshold.

Therefore, we suggest to have following proposal to move forward.***Proposal: When use one of multiple CPE starting positions to initiate a COT for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission:**** ***If existing reservation is detected, for partial RB set allocation, the CPE starting position is determined based on the highest priority among the reservations.***
* ***If no existing reservation is detected, for full/partial RB set allocation, the CPE starting position depends on priority of its own transmissions.***
 |
| CATT/GH | We support 3. transmission within a COTFrom our perspective, at least partial/full RB set allocation based selection should be excluded. For a UE using partial RB set, selecting a default CPE starting position is indeed beneficial for the FDMed design in NR sidelink. However, if it is allowed to use different CPE starting position when full RB set is allocated for another UE, inter-UE blocking will also occurred between the UE using partial RB set and the UE using full RB set.In order to reduce the impact of inter-UE blocking issue, the same CPE starting position should be used as far as possible, especially for the case that more UEs intend to perform FDMed or full-overlapped transmission, such as transmitting within a COT. Since only Type 2 channel access procedures are required to perform when a UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE, the transmission resources may be filled by different transmissions. If multiple CPE starting positions are adopted, critical inter-UE blocking issue may be caused among the transmissions which could have been transmitted at the same time. Therefore, the default CPE starting position should be selected for transmissions within a COT. |
| MediaTek | Option2 is preferredFirstly, NR SL resource selection method with reservation information is already beneficial to solve FMD based resource collision issue and allows transmission with frequency reuse. A default preconfigured CPE starting position can be used when the resource reservation information is available on the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission slot. Secondly, if none of the resource reservation exists on the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission slot (i.e., the TX UE transmits an initial transmission on the slot without any reservation), then UE selects a CPE starting position based on CAPC value and random selection will be beneficial to solve initial transmission collision issue. |
| Transsion | Option 1 |

**Proposal 3-5 (I):**

When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, when a default CPE starting position is not selected by the UE, one of the (pre-)configured multiple CPE starting position is selected based on the priority of the intended PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.

* FFS whether the priority is based on CAPC or L1 priority

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM |  | Whether default starting position is used or not should be determined by priority. We do not understand why ‘when a default CPE starting position is not selected by the UE’ is necessary here. |
| LGE | No | If the intention of this proposal is to avoid resource collision, why don’t we handle the resource collisions with the same priority? With this proposal, resource collision between SL transmissions with the same priority cannot be resolved. For a sake of progress, we can accept that the CPE is selected randomly selected among the multiple CPE starting position (pre)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.  |
| InterDigital | Support |  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support with corrections | We suggest the following edit:When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, when a default CPE starting position is not selected by the UE, one of the (pre-)configured multiple CPE starting position is selected based on the access level ~~priority~~ of the intended PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.* FFS whether the access level ~~priority~~ is based on CAPC or L1 priority, or a semi-persistent transmission, or a retransmission.

That is to also consider the transmission type, such as semi-persistent transmissions and retransmissions for determining the CPE in addition to priority. |
| Ericsson |  | It is OK in addition to any of the options in Proposal 3-4(I). |
| Lenovo | Yes | For the FFS, L1 priority is preferred. We think that it will never be possible to avoid all collisions, but priority-based CPE reduces the problem. |
| Apple | No | We think multiple CPE is used with type 1 CCA. For type 2 CCA, we do not see why multiple CPE is needed. For type 1 CCA, the priority is already handled by the CAPC value. For low CAPC class, the type 1 success rate is already low. In addition, due to transmission from previous slot, for example, in 30KHz SCS with one gap symbol in previous slot, an earlier CPE does not give higher chance of transmission since it can collide with the transmission from previous slots. Therefore, it is not clear whether a large CPE or a smaller CPE should be given to high priority traffic. Random selection like NR-U can service the purpose of interference randomization. The traffic prioritization is handled by CAPC and resource selection procedure. Larger/smaller CPE does not indicate higher/lower transmission probability and further complicate the design.  |
| QC | Yes | We also see LGE point, and when possible, some randomization within a priority level could be beneficial. Unfortunately, this may not be possible in all cases (e.g., in 30KHz, with Option 1, only 3 CPE positions are possible, and there are 4 CAPC levels). This could be anyway added as FFS point, e.g., **FFS: random CPE position within a given priority level and related details.**In general, we are anyway open to random selection for progress. |
| Intel | No | We agree with LG and we do not think such enhancement is needed compared to NR-U, as it is unjustified.  |
| vivo | Yes | We suggest to add another FFS: FFS whether the UE only uses the selected CPE starting position or later CPE starting position(s) than the selected one.One case is that, if 2 symbol used for CEP, 1 symbol in prior PSSCH and 1 gap symbol. If UE determines to use the 1 st CPE starting position based on TB priority, this CPE is overlapped with prior slot, then there is high probability for the UE to fail the channel access. In this case, we should allow smart UE implementation to select a later CPE confined within the gap for channel access.Another case is that, if UE failed channel access using the selected CPE, UE tries a later CPE again for channel access based on deferred LBT rule.  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | We can defer this discussion after knowing how “default” CPE starting position is selected |
| NEC  | Yes  |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Panasonic |  | Randomized CPE stating positions like NR-U is useful to avoid collision. We also accept LGE's proposal. |
| Sharp | Support |  |
| xiaomi | Yes  |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| WILUS | No | Random selection like NR-U within a priority level could be beneficial |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support with comment | Generally fine with the proposal, to cover companies questions like how to select a CPE from multiple with same priority or other cases, an FFS can be added:**Proposal 3-5 (I):** When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, when a default CPE starting position is not selected by the UE, one of the (pre-)configured multiple CPE starting position is selected based on the priority of the intended PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.* FFS the applicable scenarios.
* FFS whether the priority is based on CAPC or L1 priority
 |
| CATT/GH | Support | CAPC is preferred. |
| MediaTek | Yes with modifications | We generally support this proposal with some modifications. It is possible that there is a subset of CPE starting positions with same priority under the set of the (pre-)configured multiple CPE starting positions. In this case, a random selection can be performed to the subset of CPE starting position to determine one CPE starting position **Proposal 3-5 (I):** When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, when a default CPE starting position is not selected by the UE, one of the (pre-)configured multiple CPE starting position is selected based on the priority of the intended PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.* FFS whether the priority is based on CAPC or L1 priority
* FFS if multiple CPE starting position candidates remain after the selection based on the priority, random selection is used to determine one CPE starting position.
 |
| Transsion | No |  |

**Question 3-6 (I):**

Please provide your view on

* whether a CPE or PSSCH should be transmitted in the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt?
* how to resolve inter-UE blocking if a 16µs transmission gap is always applied (especially when SCS = 15kHz).

Note, this discussion is not intended for the GP symbol just before the start of a MCSt.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | When one UE is transmitting MCSt in a RB set, it should be allowed for others to access the channel and transmit in the same slot(s) in a FDM manner. This is not possible if PSSCH is transmitted in the GP symbol(s), causing inter-UE blocking. Therefore, CPE should be transmitted instead of PSSCH (rate matching).It is desirable to always apply a 16us transmission gap between the slots in MCSt. In 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs, since the GP symbol is always smaller than the additional LBT sensing duration in Type 1 channel access procedures, a UE can never successfully complete the additional LBT sensing if there is a SL transmission in the preceding symbols (regardless of the CPE starting symbol). But in 15kHz, Type 1 UE will have to take a hit when there is an on-going MCSt transmission. We are open to good solutions. |
| DCM | Even for MCSt, the signal structure should be the same as normal TX. Longer TX for MCSt degrades FDM performance in SL. |
| LGE | For the 1st question, our answer is yes. For the 2nd question, when we design CPE starting position, if there is no CPE starting position making the transmission gap less than 16us, there is no inter-UE blocking issue at least for the MCSt. According to TS 37.213, at least for DL or UL transmission burst, the transmission gap between transmission within the burst is no greater than 16us, and then the gNB or UE can skip sensing in the middle of the TX burst, and there is no restriction on the TX duration as in Type 2C.

|  |
| --- |
| TS 37.213 Section 4.0- A *DL transmission burst* is defined as a set of transmissions from an eNB/gNB without any gaps greater than . Transmissions from an eNB/gNB separated by a gap of more than are considered as separate DL transmission bursts. An eNB/gNB can transmit transmission(s) after a gap within a *DL transmission burst* without sensing the corresponding channel(s) for availability.- A *UL transmission burst* is defined as a set of transmissions from a UE without any gaps greater than . Transmissions from a UE separated by a gap of more than 16s are considered as separate UL transmission bursts. A UE can transmit transmission(s) after a gap within a *UL transmission burs*t without sensing the corresponding channel(s) for availability. |

With the above assumption, the UE will not perform sensing for the transmission in the middle of MCSt, so UE will not drop the transmissions of MCSt.  |
| InterDigital | We think CPE to be used in the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt.  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | RAN1 can define rules for determining whether GP should be disabled or enabled (i.e., applying a transmission gap in the GP symbol) during a MCSt of a Tx UE, e.g., depending on whether it expects other SL UE transmission allocations overlapping in time with its MCSt allocation. If there is no other transmission expected to be FDMed with the MCSt of the Tx UE the GP can be disabled. Otherwise, if there is a resource reservation of another UE which overlaps in time with an allocation of its MCSt, the Tx UE should enable the GP on the MCSt slot prior to detected reserved resource. When the Tx UE enables the GP, it may enable a partial GP filling (i.e. only stop its transmission in a fraction of the GP symbol in order to achieve a certain gap duration, then it can start CPE for the upcoming slot), in order to reduce the possibility of losing the COT while allowing other SL-U UE to access the channel simultaneously, e.g. with Type 2A/2B LBT, for FDMed transmissions. It can also be defined that GP can be enabled to facilitate FDM for SL-U Ues, in case there is no other RAT using the channel, as there is less risk to lose the COT in the middle of a MCSt. |
| Ericsson | PSSCH should be used.If MCSt is used, there is no gap between transmissions. There will be inter-UE blocking, but this should not be a problem. A UE transmitting MCSt will have a large TBS and it should select many sub-channels. So blocking is beneficial because it avoids collisions by others. Once the UE grabs the channel, it transmits. |
| Lenovo | For MCSt, there should be no gap symbol between two contiguous transmissions so that the spectrum efficiency can be improved and the risk of losing the channel is avoided. |
| Apple | For 1st bullet, when PSSCH transmission in gap symbol, this means UE will transmit continuously in MCSt, and TB match to the last symbol of each slot other than the last slot of MCSt? For 2nd bullet, CPE should allow 25us gap, to enable FDM transmission for each slot with MCSt.  |
| CableLabs | There are 2 questions asked here. Concerning GP used for MCSt: due to the GP length, the GP can’t be part of a COT spanning multiple slot. |
| QC | On the first bullet, MCSt requires gaps smaller or equal than 16 us. That is: we need the short gap for a UE to keep transmitting, o.w. the COT is lost. It is our view that currently the behavior of a UE stopping TX, and resuming via a Type 2A LBT is not supported. Therefore we propose to allow use of CPE and PSSCH rate matching to fill the gap (at least partially in the case of CPE) in symbol 13.The discussion of how to allow other transmissions to FDM if a UE is doing an MCSt, this topic has no evident easy solution. When a UE1 is doing MCSt for PSSCH, it might be difficult for a UE2 to FDM during UE1’s MCSt. For PSFCH and S-SSB concurrent transmissions to UE1 can be discussed. |
| Intel | For better spectral efficiency, PSSCH should be used. As per MCSt in FDM, we agree with Ericsson comments: as a UE transmitting in MCSt may have a large TB to transmit this would be likely associated many sub-channels, and therefore blocking may be indeed beneficial to avoid collisions . |
| vivo | Transmitting PSSCH in the GP is beneficial for resource efficiency, RAN1 can consider to optimize this feature for the case when RX UE can identify the MCSt. Regarding how to resolve inter-UE blocking, our preference is not to optimize the inter-UE blocking issue for MCSt case. |
| CMCC | PSSCH should be transmitted in the GP symbol(s).We do not think the Rx UE need to switch to perform transmission before the end of MCSt if it has decided to receive the TB(s) transmitted by Tx UE; and for how to achieve FDM b/w UEs, UE can prioritize select the resource which is FDMed with other UE’s reservation, which is the first slot of potentially transmitted MCSt. |
| Spreadtrum | CPE should be used in the GP symbol between the slots in MCSt. |
| Futurewei | PSSCH may be used with no gaps in transmission, the blocking should not be problem as long the transmitting UE keeps the channel for MCSt (same comment as Ericsson) |
| Samsung | Regarding whether a CPE or PSSCH should be transmitted in the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt, we prefer yes to avoid the risk of channel loss. In order to reduce blind detection from Rx UE side, two behaviours can be further considered: a) RX UE determines whether PSSCH are transmitted on PSSCH or not according to whether the PSSCH is transmitted within a MCSt; or b) PSSCH mapped on GP symbol is duplication of one another symbol e.g. similar as generation of AGC symbol.We are open to further discuss how to resolve the inter-blocking issue e.g. further enhancement on LBT with intra-system compensation or further enhancement on resource allocation procedure. |
| NEC | We prefer to use CPE to fill the GP symbol between slots in MCSt. |
| ETRI | PSSCH. Agree with Ericsson’s comments |
| Panasonic | CPE is used and gap is smaller than 16us in the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt. |
| xiaomi | It is necessary to separately discuss the GP symbol at the end of the slot and GP symbol before the PSFCH resources. For the GP symbol at the end of the slot, we support PSSCH should be transmitted in the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt, since this has benefit on the resource efficiency. For the inter-UE blocking issue, applicable scenarios that the PSSCH transmission occupy the full RB set or the all RB of resource pool can be designed to avoid the inter-UE blocking issue. |
| ZTE | It is suggested that CPE should be transmitted in the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt.For MCSt, inter-UE blocking can be resolved by triggering resource re-selection and COT sharing. In COT sharing, UE with high CAPC priority can use a shared COT initialized by one UE with MCSt. |
| WILUS | The CPE should be transmitted in the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Comments given as follow, * For the 1st question, PSSCH should be used to fill the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt, which can improve resource utilization efficiency.
* For the 2nd question, other UE cannot access the channel with Type 1 LBT except COT sharing with Type 2 LBT, thus the inter-UE blocking issue does not exist.
 |
| CATT/GH | For the first bullet, we think CPE should be transmitted. As mentioned by the FL, transmitting PSSCH in the GP symbol may have impacts on the RX UEs, and this is not preferred.For the second issue, further consideration and discussion may be required. |
| MediaTek | CPE should be transmitted in the GP symbols within MCSt. |
| Transsion | The CPE should be transmitted in the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 2 discussion

FL summary of Round 1 inputs and comments:

* On Question 3-1 (I), it seems like all companies have the same understanding that the 1 or at most 2 symbols just before the next AGC symbol for CPE transmission is/are the physical symbol(s). FL proposes to clarify the previous agreement in Proposal 3-1 below. But since this would be an easy agreement (hopefully no surprises), I will put up this proposal for email endorsement over the reflector to save time.
* On Question 3-2 (I), the need to take into account of TX/RX and/or RX/TX switching times for the CPE starting position(s):
	+ Yes: DCM, Intel
		- DCM: Earlier UE should receive later UE’s transmission
		- Intel: TX/RX, RX/TX switching time would be part of Type 2 LBT sensing time.
	+ No (24): LGE, IDC, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Lenovo, Apple, CableLabs, Qualcomm, vivo, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, Samsung, NEC, ETRI, Panasonic, xiaomi, ZTE, WILUS, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek, Transsion
	+ Follow NR-U handling: OPPO
	+ Open for discussion: CATT/GOHIGH

It is observed, a clear majority of company think the TX/RX and/or RX/TX switching time can be handled/treated in the same manner as in NR-U (which is not specifically taken into account in LBT sensing). But knowing that the LBT sensing operation could already absorb the required switching time by the UE as pointed out by LGE and QC. I think this is inline with Intel’s comment and resolve DCM’s concern. FL proposes to close this issue by making a conclusion that the TX/RX and RX/TX switching time of a UE is not specifically handled in SL-U. And I will also put up this proposal for email endorsement over the reflector to save time.

* On Proposal 3-3 (I), CPE window Option 1 is for COT sharing UE and Option 2 is for COT initiating UE.
	+ Support/OK (16): OPPO, IDC, Qualcomm, Intel, CMCC, Samsung, NEC, Panasonic, xiaomi, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT/GOHIGH, MediaTek, Transsion
		- Type 2 channel access procedure in COT sharing case.
	+ Not support (4): DCM, LGE, Apple, vivo
		- DCM: default starting position should be the same regardless of type of channel access procedure.
		- LGE: transmissions within a MCSt except for the earliest transmission, Option 1 (1-symbol length) is used while the earliest transmission uses Option 2 (2-symbol length).
		- Apple: Directly discuss the multiple CPE starting position
		- vivo: once the CPE starting position is determined, the CPE may locate either in 1 or 2 symbol
		- FL: Firstly, please refer to Qualcomm and Huawei’s comments in Round 1 for clarification. In general for 30kHz and 60kHz, we need the CPE window to be 2-symbol length for UE initiating a COT and it is not advisable to configure/allow COT sharing UEs to use the 2-symbol length CPE window since the initiating UE’s transmission in symbol #12 before responding’s UE’s CPE transmission in symbol #13.
	+ No decision is needed to select between Option 1 and Option 2: Lenovo
		- CPE is determined based on L1 priority; then whether the CPE is within one symbol or two symbol duration does not need extra discussion
	+ Why Type 1 access may require CPE (2): CableLabs, Futurewei
		- FL: This is inline with CPE transmission in NR-U for CG PUSCH to randomize interference. In SL operation, when UE is performing an initial transmission (Type 1 LBT), there could be transmission collision between multiple UEs without reservations. Then CPE is used to achieve mutual blocking to avoid collision, just as in NR-U.
	+ FL: Given there is a clear majority support of the original proposal 3-3, I will keep the same proposal and address Samsung’s comment in Proposal 3-3 (II) below.
* On Question 3-4 (I), a summary of preferences is provided as followed.
1. Partial/full RB set allocation based (12): DCM, LGE, Lenovo, Apple, Intel, Spreadtrum, ETRI, Panasonic, xiaomi, ZTE, WILUS, Transsion
2. Existing resource reservation based (5): IDC, Qualcomm, CMCC, Sharp, MediaTek
3. Mode 1/Mode 2 based: OPPO
4. Both (4): Ericsson, vivo, Huawei/HiSilicon
5. Transmission within a COT: CATT/GOHIGH
	* FL: There was a suggestion / possibility of combining both criteria for a SL TX UE to select a default CPE starting position. And it seems like there are some preferences to go with this direction. For Round\_2 discussion, let’s see if this is more acceptable to everyone.
* On Proposal 3-5 (I), a summary of preferences is provided as followed.
	+ Support (based on at least the priority / access level) (20): OPPO, IDC, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, LGE, vivo, CMCC, Spreadtrum, NEC, ETRI, Sharp, xiaomi, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT/GOHIGH, MediaTek, Lenovo
	+ Not support (or randomization per priority level) (7): LGE, Apple, Intel, Samsung, Panasonic, WILUS, Transsion
	+ FL: There was also a suggestion to combine priority and random based selection of a CPE starting position (as a compromise). Let me try this approach for the next round of discussion. Additionally, let me merge proposals 3-4 and 3-5 to keep the whole solution in one picture.
* On Question 3-6 (I):
	+ What should be transmitted in the GP symbol(s) between the slots of MCSt?
		- CPE (10): OPPO, IDC, QC, Spreadtrum, Samsung, NEC, Panasonic, ZTE, MediaTek, Transsion
		- PSSCH (rate matching) (12): Ericsson, Lenovo, QC, PSSCH, vivo, CMCC, FW, Samsung, ETRI, xiaomi (full RB set allocation), Huawei/HiSilicon
		- Disabled/enabled depending on SL reservation: Nokia/NSB,
	+ How to resolve inter-UE blocking if a 16µs transmission gap is always applied
		- The gap is 25us to allow FDM: Apple
		- Allow blocking from MCSt / no optimization: Intel, vivo, Ericsson, FW, ETRI, Panasonic
		- FFS: Samsung
		- No inter-UE blocking issue: Huawei/HiSilicon
	+ FL: On the question of whether CPE or PSSCH (with rate matching) should be transmitted in the GP symbol(s) between the slots of MCSt, there are two “in-between” proposals made. One is based on existing SL reservation and another one is based on whether or not full RB set allocation for the MCSt. Firstly, we can try to go with one of the “in-between” proposals. For the one based on existing SL reservation, there is always a risk of another UE performing initial transmission in one or more MCSt slots. It seems safer to transmit PSSCH if MCSt is full RB set allocation to avoid collision by blocking channel access to others. Therefore, FL would like to give this a try.

**Proposal 3-1 (I) for email endorsement:**

For the CPE agreements reached so far in this agenda, the 1 or at most 2 symbols just before the next AGC symbol for CPE transmission is/are physical symbol(s).

**Proposal for conclusion 3-2 (I) for email endorsement:**

The TX/RX and RX/TX switching time of a UE is not specifically handled in SL-U.

**Proposal 3-3 (II):**

For 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs, a SL TX UE uses Option 1 (1-symbol length) for CPE window when the UE performs Type 2 channel access procedure for sharing a COT and Option 2 (2-symbol length) for CPE window when the UE performs Type 1 channel access procedures for initiating a COT.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| DCM | No | Still I do not understand exact configuration. For type 1 LBT and type 2 LBT, the default starting symbol can be different? In our view, default symbol shall be aligned in any case since some UE may perform type 1 LBT and at the same time other UE may perform type 2 LBT e.g., due to near-far issue or hidden-node issue or no COT sharing case, etc.If the configuration parameter set is a kind of the following, we do not accept this proposal.* For type 1 LBT
	+ Default: 0 <= X <= 2 symbols
	+ Additional: 0 <= X <= 2 symbols
* For type 2 LBT
	+ Default: 0 <= X <= 1 symbol
	+ Additional: 0 <= X <= 1 symbol

If the configuration parameter set is a kind of the following, we accept that way.* Default: 0 <= X <= 1 symbol
* For type 1 LBT
	+ Additional: 0 <= X <= 2 symbols
* For type 2 LBT
	+ Additional: 0 <= X <= 1 symbol
 |
| LGE | No | It seems that there are pros and cons for two approaches case-by-case. Considering that the channel estimation for 2nd SCI uses PSSCH DMRS, in general, the first TX utilizing the shared COT will not happen right after the slot where the PSCCH/PSSCH containing the COT sharing information is transmitted. Meanwhile, when we check the NR-U spec especially CPE for CG PUSCH, there is no restriction on the maximum CPE length depending on the TX within COT or TX outside COT. For compromise, it can be considered to borrow the same approach used in CPE for CG PUSCH in NR-U. Whether the CPE window is 1 or 2 symbol for TX within COT or TX outside COT is up to (pre)configuration. To be specific, CPE starting position candidates will be (pre)configured separately between TX within COT and TX outside COT (like cg-StartingFullBW-InsideCOT/cg-StartingFullBW-OutsideCOT or cg-StartingPartialBW-InsideCOT/ cg-StartingPartialBW-OutsideCOT in NR-U)Then, it is up to (pre)configuration whether the each candidate set will include CPE associated with Option 1 or CPE associated with Option 2. * For 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs, the sets of CPE starting candidate(s) for PSCCH/PSSCH are (pre)configured separately between TX within COT and TX outside COT.
	+ Note: It is up to (pre)configuration whether each set of CPE starting candidate(s) associated with Option 1 (1-symbol length) for CPE window or Option 2 (2-symbol length) for CPE window
 |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| Vivo | No | Do not agree that only option 1 (1-symbol length) is used for COT sharing case. if SL starting symbol is the 2nd symbol, there would be 2 non-SL symbols between adjacent slots, then option 2 (2-symbol length) can be also used for COT sharing case.Do not agree that only option 2 (2-symbol length) is used for COT initiating case. Again, if SL starting symbol is the 2nd symbol, there would be 2 non-SL symbols between adjacent slots, UE leave the first non-SL symbol + some duration in the second non-SL symbol for deferred LBT, and select CPE only in the 2nd non-SL symbol for channel access.Another way to finalize this topic is leave the option to UE implementation, we do not see shortcoming for UE implementation based solution. |
| InterDigital | OK |  |
| Lenovo | No | Firstly, we still think CPE is determined based on L1 priority. As long as the L1 priority is determined, then a corresponding CPE is further determined. It doesn’t matter whether the CPE length is within one or two symbols. Secondly, following R16 NR-U design principle, two sets of CPE values can be configured for SL-U, one for full bandwidth transmission and Tx UE randomly selects one value from the set; another for partial bandwidth transmission and Tx UE selects one default CPE value for possible FDM among multiple UEs.Thirdly, considering below Proposal 3-4/5, we think it is better to discuss P3-4/5 before P3-3. If P3-4/5 is agreed in RAN1, maybe we don’t need discuss P3-3 any more. |
| Apple | No | The proposal is not clear and Proposal 3-4/5 should be discussed and agreed first. If we are discussing the potential value of the default CPE position, and possible value of multiple CPE location, we can revise the proposal to * Default value for type 1 and type 2 CCA is a value within one symbol. FFS exact value
* When multi-starting position is allowed (depends on 3-4/5), CPE range can be within 2 symbol.
 |
| Intel | No | We prefer prior version of the proposal, and we do not see any motivation in decoupling the behaviour for Type 2 when inside or outside a COT similarly as in NR-U. Also the “for sharing a COT”, implies that this is targeted for S-SSB , and in this case a COT acquired with a S-SSB could be shared, which we believe it is infeasible.  |
| Fraunhofer | OK |  |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| QC | Ok | In general, we think that this high level proposal is fine due to providing a general principle to follow. As we already explained in previous reply:* When initiating a COT (Type 1) it is good practice that a UE assumes that no other UE is using the slot before (and specifically the 2 symbols preceding the target slot)
* When sharing a COT (Type 2) it is good practice that the UE assumes that the slot before is occupied until symbol #12 (so only the last symbol is free)

Regarding LGE’s compromise suggestion we also proposed it in out doc and we are ok with it since it provides flexibility and allows to attain to the principles above.@ LENOVO: on your first point, we believe this discussion should not be on how to select CPEs (e.g. according to priority, or default, etc..). On your second point, we note also that in NR-U there are actually 4 sets: Outside-COT-fullRBset, Outside-COT-partialRBset, Inside-COT-FullRBset, Inside-COT-PartialRBset, where the sets for partial RB set are single values, and the other for full RB set are up to 7 values. Anyway, (as per your third point) we are also ok to focus on the other proposals that cover those details first if our explanation above is the common understanding.@ DCM: our response to your question “For type 1 LBT and type 2 LBT, the default starting symbol can be different?” can be discussed under Proposal 3-4/5, and your idea of preconfiguring those to be the same is possible. Nevertheless, it is not necessary to mandate that the default CPEs between Type 1 and Type 2 are the same, because of the explanation we provide above.@ LGE: we also see pros and cons, though on your first point “Considering that the channel estimation for 2nd SCI uses PSSCH DMRS, in general, the first TX utilizing the shared COT will not happen right after the slot where the PSCCH/PSSCH containing the COT sharing information is transmitted”, we note that instead this can definitely happen and actually it is the way a good implementation should work, that is: initiator signals COT-SI early enough in the COT and keep occupying until the signaled shared region starts, so that the responder can be prepared and try to use Type 2C or 2B with tight gap. @ VIVO: on the first we believe though that it is a corner case and should not optimize for it, on the second we are not sure we understand the case you bring up but anyway as we explain above a Type 1 accessor should be allowed to use 2 symbols for the CPE window since it should assume that the symbols before are free (it is doing Type 1 anyway), on your third point we can get by on and we could support a compromise solution as LGE and us. |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| Panasonic | Yes | Even in option 2 for Type 1 channel access procedures for initiating a COT, when (pre-)configured values of CPE length are within 1 symbol, option 1 like behaviour could be supported.  |
| Samsung | OK |  |
| Spreadtrum | No | For option 1 (1-symbol length) for Type 2 channel access procedure for sharing a COT, the case mentioned by vivo should be considered.For type 1 channel access procedures for initiating a COT, we think there is no difference between option 1 and option 2. When the channel is idle in the prior symbols, the additional LBT could be performed and CPE can be transmitted using Option 2 or option 1(we don’t see the difference.). Different UE can be (pre-) configured different CPE length within 1 or 2 symbol(s) to avoid collision. When the channel is busy, the additional LBT will fail in both option 1 and option 2. So, the intension of distinguishing between option1 and option 2 for within-COT or outside-COT is unclear.We also think whether the CPE window is 1 or 2 symbol for TX within COT or TX outside COT is up to (pre)configuration. |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| Transsion | Support |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We support the proposal in general, and a further question is whether to consider the case that UE uses S-SSB to initialize a COT and performs Type 2A channel access. If yes, the option 2 could be applied as below: …Option 2 (2-symbol length) for CPE window when the UE performs Type 1/Type 2 channel access procedures for initiating a COT. @DCM, we think it is very difficult to perform FDMed transmissions when two UEs perform Type 1 and Type 2 LBT respectively, even it is required default symbol is within 1 symbol for both Type 1 and Type 2 LBT. Illustrated as below, for Type 1, at least 34us gap is needed and for Type 2, at most 25us gap can be left which result in different CPE starting position. Thus, we think it is hardly to have a common default CPE starting position for both option 1 and option 2.@LGE, we also find UE cannot apply option 2 exactly to share a COT, since only one gap symbols between transmissions. So, even we propose it is up to (pre-)configuration to determine the starting position associated with option 1 and 2, the results could be similar. |

**Proposal 3-4/5 (I):**

When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission,

* For partial RB set resource allocation, when at least an existing reservation is detected or when a reservation is transmitted, the UE selects a CPE starting position according to one of the followings (to be down-selected)
	+ A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position
	+ The highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations
* For the case of full RB set resource allocation and the case of partial RB set allocation with no existing reservation is detected and no transmitted reservation by the UE, a CPE starting position is randomly selected among the multiple CPE starting positions (pre-)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.
	+ FFS whether the priority is based on CAPC or L1 priority, or a semi-persistent transmission, or a retransmission.
	+ FFS details of (pre-)configuration of multiple CE starting positions per priority level.
	+ FFS whether the UE uses only the selected CPE starting position or a later CPE starting position(s) than the selected one (if failed) could be also used.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| DCM | Comment | We can accept this way with the first sub-bullet (default position), but let me ask one question for clarification.What is UE behavior 1) for partial RB set allocation when no reservation by the UE and other UEs and 2) for full RB set allocation when there is reservation by the UE or other UEs? It seems that these cases are not covered. To be discussed later? Our preference is the following:**Proposal 3-4/5 (I):** When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, * ~~For partial RB set resource allocation, when at least an existing reservation is detected or when a reservation is transmitted, the UE selects a CPE starting position according to one of the followings (to be down-selected)~~
	+ ~~A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position~~
	+ ~~The highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations~~
* For the case of full RB set resource allocation and the case of partial RB set allocation with no existing reservation is detected and no transmitted reservation by the UE, a CPE starting position is randomly selected among the multiple CPE starting positions (pre-)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.
	+ FFS whether the priority is based on CAPC or L1 priority, or a semi-persistent transmission, or a retransmission.
	+ FFS details of (pre-)configuration of multiple CE starting positions per priority level.
	+ FFS whether the UE uses only the selected CPE starting position or a later CPE starting position(s) than the selected one (if failed) could be also used.
* In any other cases, the UE selects a (pre-)configured default CPE starting position
 |
| LGE | OK | For a sake of progress, we can accept it. |
| CMCC | Comments | First, is this proposal only applicable for a UE which performs Type 1 channel access procedure? For a UE which performs Type 2 channel access procedure, maybe it can depend on the COT sharing information indicated by the COT initiating UE.Second, we are not so clear whether the following case is valid to be considered:* Even a first UE reserved a full RB set reservation, a second UE still select an overlapped resource due to the RSRP measurement result is below the threshold, however, the LBT result may not be “idle” b/w them.

If this is a case, even for full RB set resource allocation, when at least an existing reservation is detected or when a reservation is transmitted, the UE also need to adjust the CPE value to the (pre-)configured default value or according to the highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations. |
| ZTE | Yes | For partial RB set resource allocation, we support default CPE starting position to mitigate the issue of inter-UE blocking.  |
| vivo |  | Comment to 1st bullet:1.Inter-UE blocking should be avoided for FDMed case, so only when UE detects FDMed transmission, CPE alignement is needed. 2. what is the meaning by “a reservation is transmitted”, does it mean that the partial RB set transmission uses a reserved resource? In our understanding, for any transmission resource (reserved or initial transmission), UE determines CPE before the transmission by a predefined interval.3. energy measurement should be considered as well, only when the energy measurement on the detected resource is higher than EDT, there would be inter-UE blocking, and then CPE alignment is expected4.we prefer “A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position” in the subbullet* For partial RB set resource allocation, when at least an existing reservation is detected which is not overlapped with the partial RB set transmission, ~~or when a reservation is transmitted~~, the UE selects a CPE starting position according to one of the followings (to be down-selected)
	+ A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position
	+ The highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations
* FFS other condition including comparison of EDT and the measured energy associated the existing reservation

Comment to 2nd bullet: 1.“no transmitted reservation by the UE” is also not clear for us.2. energy measurement should be considered as well.* For the case of full RB set resource allocation and the case of partial RB set allocation with no existing reservation is detected ~~and no transmitted reservation by the UE~~, a CPE starting position is randomly selected among the multiple CPE starting positions (pre-)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.
	+ FFS whether the priority is based on CAPC or L1 priority, or a semi-persistent transmission, or a retransmission.
	+ FFS details of (pre-)configuration of multiple CE starting positions per priority level.
	+ FFS whether the UE uses only the selected CPE starting position or a later CPE starting position(s) than the selected one (if failed) could be also used.
* FFS other condition including comparison of EDT and the measured energy associated the existing reservation
 |
| InterDigital | Yes | For partial RB set resource allocation, we think CPE starting position of the highest priority among the detected reservations. For partial RB set resource allocation with no detected reservation, priority based on CAPC or L1 priority can be used to select CPE starting position. |
| MediaTek | No | We understand other companies’ intention on using Partial/full RB set transmission to define the case to apply FDM/TDM based transmission. However, it will be more reasonable to directly reuse SL resource reservation information to identify if the UE is going to transmit with other UE in the same slot. By considering the existence of SL resource reservation information on the transmission slot, we are able to benefit the frequency reuse/FMD resource transmission/pre-emption that is supported in legacy SL with a (pre)configured CPE starting symbol. Under full RB set resource allocation case, the frequency reuse might be sacrificed if multiple UE reserving their transmission based on SL RSRP threshold on same slot cannot start their transmission on the same preconfigured CPE starting position, and finally block each other. |
| Lenovo | Ok |  |
| Apple | Comment | First of all, the second bullet is for type 1 UE initiated COT, not for COT sharing. We would like to clarify that. Second, for partial RB set without detected reservation, we think it should still use default. Considering SL-U is commercial bursty traffic, many initial transmission will not have reservation. This is quite different comparing to the periodic traffic model used in previous SL design. Given the long and random type 1 CCA required before transmission, if the UE is blocked for initial transmission due to lack of researvation, the UE will restart the type 1 CCA again. We do not think this is helpful. Suggestted change:  When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, * For partial RB set resource allocation, ~~when at least an existing reservation is detected or when a reservation is transmitted,~~ the UE selects a CPE starting position according to one of the followings (to be down-selected)
	+ A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position
	+ The highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations
* For the case of full RB set resource allocation with UE initiated COT ~~and the case of partial RB set allocation with no existing reservation is detected and no transmitted reservation by the UE,~~ a CPE starting position is randomly selected among the multiple CPE starting positions (pre-)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.
	+ FFS whether the priority is based on CAPC or L1 priority, or a semi-persistent transmission, or a retransmission.
	+ FFS details of (pre-)configuration of multiple CE starting positions per priority level.
	+ FFS whether the UE uses only the selected CPE starting position or a later CPE starting position(s) than the selected one (if failed) could be also used.
 |
| Intel | Yes | To move forward, we can accept this proposal. However, we agree with DCM’s comments and rather prefer their version.  |
| QC | Ok | We can compromise to this for progress, even though we note that a full RB set accessor is prevented from using the default CPE, which may be not-desirable. That full RB set accessor could still have concurrent transmissions with other UEs based on RSRP thresholding in the case where it sends a reservation (and inform UEs of its presence) or detect a reservation (and assess if concurrent transmission can be tolerated). Anyway we can resolve this when discussing the next step details and we can add an FFS. Also VIVO’s third point is very good point since a UE that receives a reservation but determines via RSRP that LBT won’t be blocked, that UE does not need to align the CPE (it will normally determine re-selection as needed via re-evaluation and pre-emption check, and keep/not-keep the current selection via exclusion rule). Therefore we support VIVO’s FFS point but moved under the default CPE bullet. About CMCC comment, we believe it should be good to clarify in the proposal that this is for initiating a COT (Type 1).**Proposal 3-4/5’ (I):** When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, for initiating a COT:* For partial RB set resource allocation, when at least an existing reservation is detected or when a reservation is transmitted, the UE selects a CPE starting position according to one of the followings (to be down-selected)
	+ A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position
	+ The highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations
	+ FFS other condition including comparison of EDT and the measured energy associated the existing reservation
	+ FFS whether the behaviour should be allowed for full RB set resource allocation, when at least an existing reservation is detected or when a reservation is transmitted
* For the case of full RB set resource allocation and the case of partial RB set allocation with no existing reservation is detected and no transmitted reservation by the UE, a CPE starting position is randomly selected among the multiple CPE starting positions (pre-)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.
	+ FFS whether the priority is based on CAPC or L1 priority, or a semi-persistent transmission, or a retransmission.
	+ FFS details of (pre-)configuration of multiple CE starting positions per priority level.

@ DCM: On your first question that case is covered by the second bullet “…and the case of partial RB set allocation with no existing reservation is detected and no transmitted reservation by the UE…”. On your second question it is also covered by the second bullet “For the case of full RB set resource allocation…” (that is a full RB set accessor will use one of the multiple according to a non-default CPE selection criterion). On this second point we also believe that we are leaving some reuse on the table (since a full RB set TX could be concurrent to another TX based on RSRP level), and even it is not our preferred way we are open to this for compromise (as described above “but we can resolve this when discussing the next step details”). On your modified proposal, we do not see substantial differences with the FL versin, besides eliminating the case where the default CPE is dynamically determined (leader/follower paradigm) as in “The highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations”, for which we ask if other companies and FL have the same understanding.@ VIVO: On your first question we believe that when a UE detects a reservation, it will keep the selected resource only if FDM or if partial overlap with low RSRP, so in practice when concurrent transmission is accepted in re-evaluation or pre-emption check (we should assume that this CPE decision is after that check). According to FL version, we are already limiting the use of the default CPE to a UE that has partial RB set allocation, and there is no reason to further limit to non-overlapping subchannels. On your second question “reservation is transmitted” is needed, because it is natural that a UE that receives a reservation will try to align to the same CPE if can tolerate concurrent transmission, but also we should ensure that the UE that performed the transmission will be there (at the default CPE), otherwise there is no alignment, so yes, as you say “for any transmission resource (reserved or initial transmission), UE determines CPE before the transmission by a predefined interval”, but the intention is to say that a UE that transmitted a reservation is actually signaling that can be met at the default CPE location (if concurrent transmission can be tolerated buy the UE that receives the reservation). @ MTK: our understanding is fully aligned with yours, and if other companies can think more about the spirit of using reservations as a benchmark to assess if a concurrent transmission is tolerable (harmonizing NR-U and SL collision resolution methods under a clear framework for max reuse under needed collision resolution) would be great. Anyway, with our added FFS this may be tackled in next steps and hopefully can be in general acceptable to you.@ APPLE: in our understanding this proposal is entirely to initiate a COT, which should be clarified in main level of the proposal. |
| OPPO | Support | We understand this updated proposal is meant for compromise between partial/full RA based and existing reservation based approaches. It is not our original preference, but we think this is the best way forward. |
| Panasonic | Yes | For partial RB set, we support A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position to avoid inter-UE blocking. |
| Samsung | No | We can understand some companies have preference on option 2 but we don’t think that using combination of both methods is a good way to compromise. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |  |
| CATT/GH | Comments | We can accept this proposal if it is entirely to initiate a COT as mentioned by Qualcomm.For transmissions within a COT, a default CPE starting position should always be used. Since only Type 2 channel access procedures are required to perform when a UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE, the transmission resources may be filled by different transmissions. If multiple CPE starting positions are adopted, critical inter-UE blocking issue may be caused among the transmissions which could have been transmitted at the same time. This is not expected. |
| Transsion | Support |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We support the proposal.For the partial RB set with reservation detected case, we think it has benefits to resolve the potential collision between partial RB set and full RB sets transmissions. If the default CPE is used for partial RB set transmission, a lower priority transmission span over the whole RB set might be start earlier than the default CPE starting position and block the higher priority transmission. If the CPE corresponding to the highest priority reservation, then at least the highest priority transmission is protected.For the case of full RB set resource allocation and the case of partial RB set allocation with no existing reservation, if multiple CPE starting positions correspond to single priority, it is possible that low priority transmission has an earlier starting position than high priority transmission and block the higher priority transmission. For example, L1 priority 1 is configured with starting positions #1, #2, #3, and priority 2 is configured with starting position #2, #3, #4. The transmission of priority 1 may randomly select #3 which is later than #2 selected by priority 2.Thus, we think only one CPE starting position per priority still needed, and further limitation to have multiple positions per priority should be further studied.* For the case of full RB set resource allocation and the case of partial RB set allocation with no existing reservation is detected and no transmitted reservation by the UE, a CPE starting position is randomly selected among the one or multiple CPE starting positions (pre-)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.
	+ FFS whether the priority is based on CAPC or L1 priority, or a semi-persistent transmission, or a retransmission.
	+ FFS details of (pre-)configuration of multiple CE starting positions per priority level, including the limitations.
	+ FFS whether the UE uses only the selected CPE starting position or a later CPE starting position(s) than the selected one (if failed) could be also used.
 |
| Sharp | comment | We understand companies want to avoid other resource transmission overlapping to full RB set transmission. However, we again want to remind that, according to resource (re)selection procedure of RA Mode 2, full RB set transmission by a UE can coexist together with other reserved partial/full RB set transmission by another UE as long as RSRP is lower than threshold. So, in this case, transmission on full RB set should apply default CPE starting position even when other UE’s reservation exists. To us, frequency reuse is an important design principle of resource (re)selection procedure of RA Mode 2. We are fine with either Docomo's modifications or Qualcomm's modifications to move forward. |

**Proposal 3-6 (I):**

When PSCCH/PSSCH transmission is a full RB set allocation for all slots of a MCSt, rate-matching based PSSCH isymbol transmitted in the GP s(s) between the slots in MCSt; Otherwise, CPE is transmitted.

* FFS when CPE is transmitted, is the CPE starting position always 16us from the start of a GP symbol?
	+ Inter-UE blocking issue can be considered

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| DCM | Question | Although we can accept this way of using differentiation between full RB set allocation and partial RB set allocation, UE behavior for the following case is unclear:1. If MCSt is performed for a single TB e.g., at slot n and slot n+1, rate-matching is performed for TX at slot n? or for TX slot n+1? We do not support TX of MCSt as a single TX. If this proposal implies that MCSt is done as a single TX, we do not support this proposal.
2. If MCSt is performed for two TBs e.g., at slot n and slot n+1, rate-matching is performed for TX at slot n? or for TX slot n+1?
 |
| LGE | No | It would be better to use CPE resulting 16us time gap. Or, for compromise, it can be considered to use CPE resulting no time gap. When we go with this proposal, we need to further discuss following issues:* PSSCH DMRS pattern for l\_d=14 (the current maximum value of l\_d is 13).
* How to ensure the same TBS between TX without using GP symbol and TX with using GP symbol.

Whether or how to change min-PSSCH-to-PSFCH timing |
| CMCC | No | We think the logic may be confusing. The question is, even the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission is **NOT** a full RB set allocation for all slots of a MCSt, how to achieve FDM b/w UEs when at least one of them is transmitting an ongoing MCSt without performing COT sharing? We agree with HW’s comment in the first round that the inter-UE blocking issue does not exist.Next, if the COT is shared to another UE in next slot, certainly the CPE should be transmitted in current slot’s GP symbol, so we prefer the following revised version:**Proposal 3-6 (I):** When PSCCH/PSSCH transmission is ~~a full RB set allocation for all slots of~~ a MCSt, rate-matching based PSSCH is transmitted in the GP symbol(s) between the slots for a same UE’s transmission in MCSt; ~~Otherwise~~ if the COT is shared to another UE in next slot, CPE is transmitted in the GP symbol in current slot.* ~~FFS when CPE is transmitted, is the CPE starting position always 16us from the start of a GP symbol?~~
	+ ~~Inter-UE blocking issue can be considered~~
 |
| ZTE | No | If different TBs are supported for MCSt, from the receiver’s perspective, a RX/TX switching gap should be kept between two adjacent slots, so CPE should be transmitted in the GP symbol(s) between the slots in MCSt, instead of a PSSCH symbol. |
| Vivo | Ok |  |
| InterDigital | OK |  |
| MediaTek | No | We support to transmit CPE.Rate-matching based PSSCH may result in many uncertain issues as follows* For MCSt occupied by multiple UEs (TDM)
	+ It is confused which UE should perform the RM based PSSCH (e.g., the UE in the former slot? Or the UE in the later slot?)
	+ As mentioned by some other companies, it may impact RX UEs who rely on the GP symbol to perform RX/TX switching in order to transmit SL in the following slot.
* For MCSt occupied by one TB
	+ It is confused which part of the TB is RM based (e.g., the part is the former slot? Or the part in the later slot?)
* For MCSt occupied by multiple TBs
	+ It is confused which TB is RM based (e.g., the TB in the former slot? Or the TB in the later slot?)

Additionally, before the agreement on TBS determination, we think it is too early to say rate-matching based PSSCH has higher spectrum efficiency.As for the inter-UE blocking issue in MCSt, it can be de-prioritized. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Apple | OK with comment | Agree with the main bullet. For FFS, the CCA gap and CPE transmission is to allow other FDMed UE to have CCA chance and start transmission. A 25us CCA gap is needed for this purpose. 16us is not long enough for type 2A CCA.  |
| Intel | No | We find the proposed procedure rather confusing and unclear, and we are OK with CMCC approach. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes with comment | We support that CPE or PSSCH is transmitted in the GP symbol(s) to retain the channel. Further we believe that PSFCH needs to be addressed in case of MCSt. |
| NEC | No |  |
| QC | Yes | Can be fine as compromised solution@ DCM: we understand that this proposal targets MCSt across (at least) 2 TBs over 2 slots. In that case the rate matching PSSCH would be for the first PSSCH in slot n (and not of the following PSSCH in slot n+1)@ CMCC: we believe this proposal targets the MCSt from the perspective of the UE that is occupying the COT, so it is about how to fill the gap between its own consecutive transmissions@ ZTE: we do not understand why any Rx/Tx gap is to be considered here, the proposal targets how to fill the gap between 2 consecutive TXs from a single UE, so any UE that is receiving in slot n, can receive in slot n+1 without switching, and from the TX UE point of view there is no switching (it is only transmitting, and it does not have to perform ANY channel access procedure between the two slots, that is why we try to make the gap short or absent).@ MTK: on your first point as per our response to CMCC, we are not targeting COT sharing (other discussion). On your second point it seems that multi TTI transmission of a single TB is not discussed yet, so that case is not targeted here. On your third point it should be understood that the rate matching is the tail of slot n (previous slot)@ APPLE: even if the gap for CPE is FFS, we would like to share our view that according to the definition of a TX burst in NR-U, a COT is lost if there is a larger gap (e.g. 25 us) between any 2 transmissions of a single UE. COT resuming via Type 2 LBT after an interruption has not been discussed yet in RAN1 (only in tdocs), and should have a separate section. An agreement in that sense could unlock considering 25 us in this Proposal, o.w., we do not see how that could be allowed. |
| OPPO | OK | Not ideal, as it makes the design more complicated and more specification work involved. But OK to accept as a compromise. |
| Panasonic | No | In hidden node issue, when the last symbol in slot n-1 is used for rate-matching based PSSCH transmission, the symbol might be interfered from other UE's CPE for slot n. We think CPE is transmitted for both full RB set and partial RB set is preferable and it is lower specification impact. |
| Samsung | Yes with comments | There should be a further condition that the MCSt are within the COT. If the transmissions are in different COTs, the proposal doesn’t make sense. Also, this proposal seems didn’t discuss the case what if PSSCH – PSFCH – PSSCH are transmitted by the same UE in consecutive slots. This case can be added as an FFS bullet.  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Transsion | OK |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | General fine with the proposal, but we are not sure for the case the duration of gap is only 16us gap within consecutive slots, why there still exist inter-UE blocking issue. |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for Week 1 Thursday GTW

FL summary of Round 2 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 3-3 (II), it seems like LGE’s suggested version could work. Let me try for the next round of discussion.
* On Proposal 3-4/5 (I), FL response to some of the questions raised.
	+ @DCM: For the two cases that you asked, they are covered by the 2nd main bullet. That is, the intention is to apply contention resolution using priority to select one of the (pre-)configured CPE starting positions. For all other cases, which is partial RB set allocation with reservation by the UE or other UEs, I fully understand your preference. But since there are proposals to use the highest priority among the reservations, we can decide on this as the next step. I think at this stage we can only take one step at a time and decide next level of details in the next meeting. It is very difficult to have the final design in one meeting.
	+ @CMCC, CATT/GH: The intention is to use this mechanism for both COT initiation and COT sharing. Regardless if a UE is initiating a COT or sharing a COT from another UE, its transmission still needs to FDM with others (e.g., when there is an existing reservation) or contention resolution should apply based on its priority (e.g., when no reservation or full RB set allocation). If rely on indication from the COT initiating UE (since it is not a scheduler like NR-U gNB), which does not know any reservation information at the COT sharing UE, it becomes unreliable and FDM will be lost. For the case when a first UE reserved a full RB set and a second UE selects an overlapped resource due to the RSRP measurement result is below the threshold, this means they are far apart. Even though when one is transmitting CPE earlier than the other, due to LBT EDT the later UE may not be blocked by the earlier one and hence no inter-UE blocking.
	+ @vivo, “a reservation is transmitted” means a SL TX UE already has a prior resource reservation in the slot where it intends to transmit PSCCH/PSSCH. I hope this is clear. In the previous version I used “including own reservation” and that was not clear to some companies. For the energy measurement, I can include it in the updated proposal. For the added part “which is not overlapped with the partial RB set transmission”, I think this is not necessary as it will naturally be taken care of by the mode 2 resource exclusion step. If the overlapping will happen when there is an existing reservation, it is naturally allowed by mode 2 RSRP threshold (i.e., measured RSRP threshold is lower than the threshold).
	+ @MediaTek, please refer to my response to CMCC. Due to LBT EDT, the inter-UE blocking can be avoided even for full RB set allocation.
	+ @Apple, please refer to my previous response to CMCC above. The whole proposal is intended for both COT initiating and COT sharing UEs. For initial transmissions without reservation and partial RB set allocation, SL TX collision could still happen. In this case, both UE’s transmitted data will not be decodable at a RX UE. It is better to apply contention resolution, where at least the higher priority transmission will get through and lower priority transmission will re-select its resource. In case when the detected energy is low (they are far apart), their CPE will not block each other and both transmit (SL TX collision is not an issue as well because they are far apart).
* On Proposal 3-6 (I), summary of comments/concerns for rate matching PSSCH:
	+ Whether rate matching of PSSCH in the GP symbol is done for the current slot or next slot.
	+ How to achieve FDM if MCSt is not full RB set and PSSCH is transmitted in the GP symbol
	+ If different TBs are supported for MCSt, from the receiver’s perspective, a RX/TX switching gap should be kept between two adjacent slots
	+ Issues with single TB, multiple TBs, multiple UEs/MCSt, PSFCH gap, hidden node
	+ Further work needed on PSSCH DMRS pattern, TBS calculation between TX with/without GP symbol, min-PSSCH-to-PSFCH timing.
	+ FL: At least the above concerns and issues should be considered and addressed until the next meeting. We haven’t considered all these issues before; I think it is worthwhile to study further how to handle the GP symbols between the slots in MCSt until the next meeting. Let’s have an agreement to further study these issues.

**Proposal 3-3 (II):**

For 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs, a set of CPE starting candidate position(s) for PSCCH/PSSCH is (pre-)configured separately for transmission within COT and transmission outside COT.

* Note: It is up to the (pre-)configuration whether each set of CPE starting candidate position(s) associated with Option 1 (1-symbol length) for CPE window or Option 2 (2-symbol length) for CPE window

**Proposal 3-4/5 (I):**

When multiple CPE starting candidate positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission,

* For partial RB set resource allocation, when at least an existing reservation is detected or when a reservation is transmitted, the UE selects a CPE starting position according to one of the followings (to be down-selected)
	+ A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position
	+ The highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations
	+ FFS other condition including comparison of EDT and the measured energy associated the existing reservation
	+ FFS whether the behavior should be allowed for full RB set resource allocation, when at least an existing reservation is detected or when a reservation is transmitted
* For the case of full RB set resource allocation and the case of partial RB set allocation with no existing reservation is detected and no transmitted reservation by the UE, a CPE starting position is randomly selected among the one or multiple CPE starting positions (pre-)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.
	+ FFS whether the priority is based on CAPC or L1 priority, or a semi-persistent transmission, or a retransmission.
	+ FFS details of (pre-)configuration of multiple CE starting positions per priority level, including the limitations.
	+ FFS whether the UE uses only the selected CPE starting position or a later CPE starting position(s) than the selected one (if failed) could be also used.

**Proposal 3-6 (I):**

FFS until the next meeting (RAN1#113), how to handle the GP symbols between the slots in MCSt. The following aspects should be considered.

* Whether rate matching of PSSCH in the GP symbol is done for the current slot or next slot.
* How to achieve FDM if MCSt is not full RB set and PSSCH is transmitted in the GP symbols
* If different TBs are supported for MCSt, from the receiver’s perspective, a RX/TX switching gap should be kept between two adjacent slots
* Issues with single TB, multiple TBs, multiple UEs/MCSt, PSFCH gap, hidden node
* Further work needed on PSSCH DMRS pattern, TBS calculation between TX with/without GP symbol, min-PSSCH-to-PSFCH timing.
* If CPE is applied, how to handle the inter-UE blocking between 16us and 25us transmission gaps.

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 3 discussions

FL summary for Round 3 discussion:

* On Proposal 3-3, it is the same from Section 3.3.3. Let’s try LGE’s suggested version.
* On Proposal 3-4/5, the merged proposal version (I) from Section 3.3.3 discussed during the Thursday GTW session was meant to be a compromised way forward between partial/full RB set allocation based and existing reservation based methods. During the GTW discussion, there were some preferences to go with just the partial/full RB allocation based while others to go with just the resource reservation based method. It is observed that if we adopt just one of them, the proposal falls apart. The only way forward I see is to accommodate both in deciding the CPE starting position. We all need to keep this mind otherwise we cannot achieve progress. As the GTW discussion evolved, the session chair had a proposal for working assumption that basically still try to keep both methods in the proposal. I think that version is something we can work on a bit further. But if we start down-grading one method over the other, it falls apart again. Let’s try that version for the next round of discussion, and we should keep the note and not try to down-grade the note to a “FFS”. I polished the proposed WA a little bit to make it logical technically.
* On Proposal 3-6, it is the same from Section 3.3.3.

**Proposal 3-3 (II):**

For 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs, a set of CPE starting candidate position(s) for PSCCH/PSSCH is (pre-)configured separately for transmission within COT and transmission outside COT.

* Note: It is up to the (pre-)configuration whether each set of CPE starting candidate position(s) associated with Option 1 (1-symbol length) for CPE window or Option 2 (2-symbol length) for CPE window

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| QC | Fine | As a compromised solution |
| LGE | OK  | We do not need to spend more time for pros and cons for each approaches. Approach in NR-U could be simply reused.  |
| CATT/GH | Comment | Actually, we prefer the previous version, i.e., Proposal 3-3 (II) in section 3.3.2, which is more clear and more simple. But for progress, we can compromise based on this version with the following modification. The configuration of single/multiple CPE starting position within/outside a COT should be discussed separately.**Proposal 3-3 (II):** For 30kHz and 60kHz SCSs, a set of CPE starting candidate position(s) for PSCCH/PSSCH is (pre-)configured separately for transmission within COT and transmission outside COT.* Note: It is up to the (pre-)configuration whether each set of CPE starting candidate position(s) associated with Option 1 (1-symbol length) for CPE window or Option 2 (2-symbol length) for CPE window and whether each set of CPE starting position(s) include one or multiple starting position(s)
 |
| Intel | OK |  |
| Vivo | No | option 1 and option 2 does not depend on in-COT/out-of-COT case as we discuss in previous round. Again, we assume that UE implementation to decide option 1 or option 2, and the discussion can be postponed after the CPE determination proposal. |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| Futurewei | OK |  |

**Proposal for working assumption 3-4/5 (II):**

When multiple CPE starting candidate positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, at least for the case of initiating a COT

* For partial RB set resource allocation, the UE selects a CPE starting position according to one of the followings (to be down-selected)
	+ A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position
	+ The highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations
	+ Note: the exact condition and how to use reservation information needs to be decided
	+ FFS whether the behavior should be allowed for full RB set resource allocation
* For the case of full RB set resource allocation, a CPE starting position is randomly selected among the one or multiple CPE starting candidate positions (pre-)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.
	+ Note: the exact condition and how to use reservation information needs to be decided
	+ FFS whether the behaviour should be allowed for partial RB set resource allocation

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| QC | Fine, with edits | We can accept this direction for the sake of compromise. As the FL comments, we should not try to put on a higher level full/partial RB set criteria over criteria based on additional information (resource reservations) as there are 2 camps that may want two different things.We suggest to keep the FFS as mentioned by vivo for the first subbullet (i.e., the UE may consider based on RSRP and EDT information, that concurrent transmissions with different CPEs may result in both UEs transmitting concurrently, and this might be ok depending on the outcome of a re-evaluation/pre-emption check that anyway is going to be performed by the UE)We propose **the following amendment** to capture it:**(Suggested modification) Proposal for working assumption 3-4/5’ (II):** When multiple CPE starting candidate positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, at least for the case of initiating a COT* For partial RB set resource allocation, the UE selects a CPE starting position according to one of the followings (to be down-selected) according also to reservation information
	+ A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position
	+ The highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations
	+ Note: the exact condition and how to use reservation information needs to be decided
	+ FFS whether the behavior should be allowed for full RB set resource allocation
	+ FFS other condition including comparison of EDT and the measured energy associated the existing reservation
* For the case of full RB set resource allocation, a CPE starting position is randomly selected among the one or multiple CPE starting candidate positions (pre-)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission according also to reservation information.
	+ Note: the exact condition and how to use reservation information needs to be decided
	+ FFS whether the behaviour should be allowed for partial RB set resource allocation
 |
| Samsung | N | We still want the technical discussion first before drawing the conclusion, since the proposal uses different principle than NR-U, which is essential for fair coexistence, and no one shows evaluation results on the fair coexistence aspect.  We guess the most controversial part is the case of partial RB set allocation with no existing reservation is detected and no transmitted reservation by the UE, and in our understanding two options are on the table: * Option 1: determine one CPE starting position either by pre-configuration or based on priority
* Option 2: random select from a set of CPE starting positions

For NR-U, there is no reservation information, so this case doesn’t branch out from a general case of partial RB set allocation, which also implies Option 1 was used generally for partial RB set allocation. We want to understand for SL-U, how the reservation information can help here, especially, what’s the benefit of Option 2 over Option 1 in the focused case? |
| LGE | OK for progress | In CG-PUSCH in NR-U, PUSCH resources are configured by gNB, and gNB can configure multiple partial RB set resource allocations, and they will be FDMed. However, in NR SL Mode 2, resource allocation will be done in distributed manner, partial RB set allocations does not imply that they will be FDMed. What I want to say is situation is quite different from NR-U. From our side, it is straightforward, if UE detect reserved resources, and if it decide not to exclude the overlapping candidate resources, it would be useful to protect it from inter-UE blocking by using the same CPE. Otherwise, some SCI will be dropped, and it will degrade the Mode 2 performance. Alternatively, we can agree the part of the proposal in this meeting, and we can further discuss when it is applied. When multiple CPE starting candidate positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, at least for the case of initiating a COT, following CPE starting position selection mechanisms are supported:* the UE selects a CPE starting position according to one of the followings (to be down-selected)
	+ A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position
	+ The highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations
* a CPE starting position is randomly selected among the one or multiple CPE starting candidate positions (pre-)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.
* FFS: When each of CPE starting position selection mechanism is applied.
 |
| CATT/GH | Comments | We can accept this proposal for the case of initiating a COT.For the case of COT sharing, we want to have a chance to response to FL’s comments in section 3.3.3 (as we did during the GTW session).In NR-U, max LBT EDT is given by the following formula if there may have other technologies sharing the channel:- Under 20MHz bandwidth, the value may be -62 dBm, which is a per-band value. While in NR SL, RSRP threshold is a per RE value, and increase is always allowed if remaining candidate resources in SA are not enough. Therefore, we think it is arbitrary to say that there is no inter-UE blocking between two UEs who select an overlapped resource due to the RSRP measurement result is below the threshold.Since more transmissions may be performed FDMed/overlapped within a COT, selecting a single/default can avoid the inter-UE blocking issue and NR SL design can thus be respected. Therefore, we suggest the following modification of the main bullet:**Proposal for working assumption 3-4/5 (II):** When multiple CPE starting candidate positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, ~~at least~~ for the case of initiating a COT |
| Intel | OK | We can accept this compromised solution as is. |
| Vivo | Yes with comment | 1.we are fine with QC’s modification to include reservation information in the 1st bullets. For the 2nd bullet, since the reservation information is associated with partial RB set transmission, which is already in FFS. We prefer to keep FL version on the 2nd bullet.2.we suggest to add back the FFS from last round, since there is no major concern on those FFS bullet, it is more constructive to include those FFS for progress.When multiple CPE starting candidate positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, at least for the case of initiating a COT* For partial RB set resource allocation, the UE selects a CPE starting position according to one of the followings (to be down-selected) besides the reservation information.
	+ A (pre-)configured default CPE starting position
	+ The highest priority among the detected and the transmitted reservations
	+ Note: the exact condition and how to use reservation information needs to be decided
	+ FFS whether the behavior should be allowed for full RB set resource allocation
	+ FFS other condition including comparison of EDT and the measured energy associated the existing reservation
* For the case of full RB set resource allocation, a CPE starting position is randomly selected among the one or multiple CPE starting candidate positions (pre-)configured per priority of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission.
	+ Note: the exact condition and how to use reservation information needs to be decided
	+ FFS whether the behaviour should be allowed for partial RB set resource allocation
	+ FFS whether the UE uses only the selected CPE starting position or a later CPE starting position(s) than the selected one (if failed) could be also used.
 |
| OPPO | OK for progress |  |
| Futurewei | OK |  |

**Proposal 3-6 (I):**

FFS until the next meeting (RAN1#113), how to handle the GP symbols between the slots in MCSt. The following aspects should be considered.

* Whether rate matching of PSSCH in the GP symbol is done for the current slot or next slot.
* How to achieve FDM if MCSt is not full RB set and PSSCH is transmitted in the GP symbols
* If different TBs are supported for MCSt, from the receiver’s perspective, a RX/TX switching gap should be kept between two adjacent slots
* Issues with single TB, multiple TBs, multiple UEs/MCSt, PSFCH gap, hidden node
* Further work needed on PSSCH DMRS pattern, TBS calculation between TX with/without GP symbol, min-PSSCH-to-PSFCH timing.
* If CPE is applied, how to handle the inter-UE blocking between 16us and 25us transmission gaps.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| LGE |  | It would be good for discussion plan up to FL, and it may not need to be agreed.  |
| CATT/GH |  | OK for further study. |
| Intel |  | Agree with LGE. There is no actual need to agree on this proposal as the whole proposal is an FFS. |
| Vivo | See comment | Both the 2nd and last bullet try to address inter-UE blocking, shall we merge the two bullets. Moreover, in the last bullet, why the blocking “between 16us and 25us” is emphasized.What is the intention to capture “multiple UEs/MCSt” in the 4th bullet. |
| OPPO | Support | We see some value in agreeing this proposal, so to guide the discussion and design of MCSt for the GP symbol between the slot(s) in MCSt. So far, it is evident not all aspects have been considered in the past discussions. |

## [ACTIVE] Topic #4: Contention window (CW) adjustment

**Background**:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement*** CW adjustment
	+ NR-U DL CW adjustment mechanism is used as the baseline for SL-U when SL-HARQ feedback is enabled in SCI for unicast
		- FFS any necessary update for SL-U operation
	+ FFS: how to determine CW size when SL-HARQ feedback is disabled in SCI
	+ FFS the case of groupcast option 1 (NACK-only) and groupcast option 2

**Agreement*** RAN1 is to study the definition of a “SL reference duration” following the NR-U principle and RAN1 is to agree on the definition before down-selection to an option for CW adjustment for SL HARQ-ACK feedback enabled/disabled and each cast type
* In Type 1 SL channel access procedure, further study the following cases and options. Other options are not precluded.
	+ CW adjustment when SL-HARQ feedback is disabled (at least if all transmissions within the latest SL reference duration have SL-HARQ feedback disabled):
		- Option 1: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
		- Option 2: CW is adjusted according to number blind retransmissions of the TBs within a COT.
		- Option 3: CW is adjusted according to CR/CBR measurement, if CR/CBR is supported for SL-U
		- Option 4: If a is consecutively used times for generation of , is updated for each priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- Option 5: If a collision indicator is received, increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
	+ CW adjustment for groupcast option 2 with SL-HARQ feedback enabled (at least In case only groupcast option 2 PSSCH(s) is (are) transmitted within the latest SL reference duration):
		- Option 1: Based on a (pre-)configurable ratio of received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks in the latest SL reference duration, is reset to for every priority class , otherwise increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
			* FFS: whether the ratio of the received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks is ‘ACK’, ‘NACK’ or ‘ACK+NACK’
			* FFS: how to calculate the ratio
			* FFS: the (pre-)configuration ratio values
		- Option 2: If at least a ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.
	+ FFS whether groupcast option 1 (NACK-only) with SL-HARQ feedback enabled can be supported for SL-U. If supported, further study the following options (at least if all transmissions within the latest SL reference duration are groupcast option 1 transmissions)
		- Option 1: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
		- Option 2:
			* If ‘NACK’ or a collision indicator (IUC scheme 2) is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
			* When neither ‘NACK’ nor a collision indicator (IUC scheme 2) is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration,
				+ Option A: is reset to for every priority class .
				+ Option B: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
		- Option 3: An ACK-only procedure is used instead of a NACK-only procedure. In this case, if at least a ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class , otherwise is increased
		- Option 4: CW is adjusted according to CR/CBR measurement, if CR/CBR is supported for SL-U
		- Option 5 (option 3+legacy): ACK feedback is performed when a TB is successfully decoded in addition to the legacy NACK-only procedure. In this case, if ACK only is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration then ,  otherwise is increased.
	+ CW adjustment for unicast with SL-HARQ feedback enabled (at least in case only unicast PSSCH(s) is (are) transmitted within the latest SL reference duration):
		- Option 2: If at least one ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.
* FFS the case when UE is operating with different SL-HARQ feedback schemes (e.g., UE has concurrent broadcast transmission + unicast with SL-HARQ enabled, or GC option 1 + GC option 2, etc in the SL reference duration).

**Agreement*** SL reference duration is defined as a duration corresponding to a channel occupancy initiated by the UE including transmission of PSSCH(s), starting from the beginning of the channel occupancy initiated by the UE including transmission of PSSCH(s), until either (one option to be selected later):
	+ Option 1a:
		- the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted
		- Note, SL reference duration is not used if PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled cannot be found in the latest COT
		- FFS: Whether to support another ending timing is FFS, e.g for MCSt if needed
	+ Option 1b:
		- the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted
		- Note, SL reference duration is not used if PSSCH with HARQ-ACK enabled cannot be found in the latest COT
		- FFS: Whether to support another ending timing is FFS, e.g for MCSt if needed
	+ Option 2a:
		- the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with HARQ-ACK enabled if it is transmitted, otherwise until the end of the channel occupancy
		- FFS: Whether to support another ending timing is FFS, e.g for MCSt if needed
	+ Option 2b:
		- the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with HARQ-ACK enabled if it is transmitted, otherwise until the time when UE updates the CW
		- FFS: Whether to support another ending timing is FFS, e.g for MCSt if needed

**Agreement*** If , the next higher allowed value for adjusting is .
* If the is consecutively used times for generation of , is reset to only for that priority class for which is consecutively used times for generation of . is selected by UE from the set of values {1, 2, …,8} for each priority class .

**Agreement**The end timing for the definition of reference duration in the contention window adjustment procedure for SL-U is defined as follows:* Option 1a
	+ the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted
	+ Note, SL reference duration is not used if PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled cannot be found in the latest COT
	+ FFS: Whether to support another ending timing is FFS, e.g. for MCSt if needed
	+ Whether/how to adjust CWS for groupcast option 1 NACK-only case and whether/how to define reference duration for groupcast option 1 NACK-only case can still be discussed
 |

* whether/how to define reference duration for groupcast option 1 NACK-only case

In the last RAN1#112 meeting in Athens, RAN1 made an agreement on the definition of reference duration specifically targets ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled case only. That is, for the case of NACK-only, it was excluded. But leaving the option open to further discussion if there is a strong need/essentiality due to adjustment for groupcast option 1 NACK-only case.

Based on the Tdoc review this time, more companies think there is no need to define / modify the existing reference duration definition for the groupcast option 1 NACK-only case. Only two companies preferred to have a new reference duration definition. In most Tdocs, there was no opinion expressed, and the FL thinks this issue are not important for them. Therefore, the FL will not pursue with any proposal/question on this FFS issue.

* Whether the reference duration ending time needs to change for the case of MCSt

Based on the submitted contribution in this meeting, it seems there is some preference from 9 companies who think the existing reference duration definition could be updated to accommodate the case of MCSt. Some think it can be updated in the same manner as adopted in NR-U for the transmission burst. Therefore, the FL proposes in the following Proposal 4-1 below accordingly.

* CW adjustment for unicast with SL-HARQ feedback enabled during the reference duration

From reviewing the contributions, all companies proposed / are fine to go with Option 2 from the previous agreement. Therefore, the FL proposes accordingly in the following Proposal 4-2 below (reusing existing NR-U spec description as much as possible).

* CW adjustment when SL-HARQ feedback is not available for all SL transmission(s) during the latest COT

From reviewing the contributions, for the case of explicit HARQ-ACK feedback is not associated with SL transmission, CW adjustment option 1 and option 3 have the most support. Therefore, these two options are down-selected firstly. Please indicate your preference between these two options in the following Question 4-3 below.

* CW adjustment for groupcast option 2 (ACK/NACK feedback) during the reference duration

From reviewing the contributions, for the case of SL groupcast option 2, CW adjustment option 1 and option 2 have the most support. Therefore, these two options are down-selected firstly. Please indicate your preference between these two options in the following Question 4-4 below.

* CW adjustment groupcast option 1 during the latest COT

When discussing CW adjustment options for groupcast option 1, at that time, it was assumed that there will be a reference duration for this SL-HARQ feedback option. According to the reference duration definition agreed from the last two meeting and lack of contributions in this meeting to introduce a reference duration for it, it seems we need to re-discuss / further study the CW adjustment options for groupcast option 1. To this end, let’s take the 5 options as a starting point and make necessary updates to them. Please express your view(s) on how to modify the CW adjustment option(s) that you prefer. E.g., if you are only interested in Option 2 and 3, you only need to propose changes for these options. In the end, for option(s) that requires changes but no one propose any modification for it, I will consider it is eliminated. Please expressed your views for Question 4-5 below.

* Any change necessary to the reference duration definition to take care of the case when partial slot transmission is in the first slot of a COT, where it could be a high chance/probability that this partial slot transmission is a NACK

It is brought up in [30] that if PSSCH is transmitted in a partial slot (i.e., from the 2nd starting symbol), due to the same TBS and a smaller number of available SL symbols are used, there is a higher chance that the RX UE will report a NACK. Since this is not a typical SL transmission and thus should be excluded from the CW adjustment procedure as such. FL would like to gather more views/opinions on this issue from others. Please indicate in Question 4-6 below whether a PSSCH transmission from the 2nd starting symbol should be excluded from the definition of reference duration if a such transmission occurs in the first slot where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted in a channel occupancy initiated by the UE.

### FL Proposal for round 1 discussion

**Proposal 4-1 (I):**

* The existing SL reference duration definition is updated according to the following to accommodate the case of MCSt.
	+ SL reference duration is defined as a duration corresponding to a channel occupancy initiated by the UE including transmission of PSSCH(s), starting from the beginning of the channel occupancy initiated by the UE including transmission of PSSCH(s), until the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted, or until the end of the first MCSt transmission by the UE that contains PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled, whichever occurs earlier.
		- Note, SL reference duration is not used if PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled cannot be found in the latest COT

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM | NO | MCSt should be treated as separate multiple TXs. No need to use ‘MCSt’ for any definition.  |
| LGE | No | It is redundant because the SL MCSt is not within a slot, and then “the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted” always occurs earlier than “the end of the first MCSt transmission by the UE that contains PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled”. If we remover “whichever occurs earlier”, then the redundant issue will be resolved. However, since the UE may need to wait the corresponding SL HARQ-ACK feedback to determine the contention window size, the Type 1 channel access procedure at the UE side could be also delayed. It will results that the UE fails to access the channel before its own transmission due to the lack of time for LBT operation. In this point of view, it is not preferable to further delay the ending time of the reference duration for CWS adjustment. |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | The first slot seems enough. There is no need to introduce optimizations with respect to NR-U. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Apple | No | For MCSt, the difference is referring to a full slot when the 1st transmission starting symbol is not the 1st symbol. If multi-slot transmission is enabled, reference duration is from the starting point until the 1st full slot where PSSCH transmission happens, or burst end, whichever comes first (i.e., only partial slot transmission happens).  |
| CableLabs | No | Same view as LGE |
| QC | Yes, with mods | We follow up to Apple comment, since we have a similar view.We believe there is a case for extension to “end of MCSt” (same as burst end), that is the case where the first transmission is a partial-slot TX (starting from 2nd starting symbol). In case TBS is determined according to a large number of symbols that TX may be prone to failure (and lead to unnecessary CW double). To remove the redundancy and capture this case we propose the following wording:* The existing SL reference duration definition is updated according to the following ~~to accommodate the case of MCSt~~.
	+ SL reference duration is defined as a duration corresponding to ~~a~~ the latest channel occupancy initiated by the UE including transmission of PSSCH(s), starting from the beginning of the channel occupancy ~~initiated by the UE including transmission of PSSCH(s)~~, until the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted from the 1st starting symbol, or until the end of the first MCSt transmission by the UE that contains at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled transmitted from the 1st starting position, whichever occurs earlier.
		- Note, SL reference duration is not used if PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled cannot be found in the latest COT
 |
| Intel | Yes | In addition with comments already provided by other companies, we would like to highlight to companies opposing to this proposal that this exactly reflects the NR-U behaviour with the distinction that we are now using different terminologies: burst -> MCSt. |
| vivo | no | We think the first MCSt transmission contains PSSCH with A/N is the same as the PSSCH with A/N in the first slot. No need to update the agreement. |
| CMCC | No | We share the same view with LGE, we are also not clear about why we need to further delay the ending time of the reference duration. |
| Spreadtrum | No | For MCSt, the current definition that the first transmission slot is enough. There is no need to introduce another definition. |
| Futurewei | No | First slot should be sufficient ( as LGE pointed out) |
| Samsung | No | For the MCSt transmission containing PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled, end of SL reference duration can be depending on the position of ACK/NACK enabled PSSCH within the MCSt-based transmission burst, then the existing SL reference duration definition can be simply used for MCSt case. We don’t see strong need to introduce new definition here. |
| NEC | No  |  |
| ETRI | No | It is not necessary to have an additional definition for MCSt. |
| Panasonic | No | The first slot is enough. |
| xiaomi | Yes | The MCSt in SL-U is equal to the transmission burst in NR-U, so NR-U similar design shall be reused to SL-U. |
| ZTE | No | The duration of the MCSt should not exceed the duration of COT, and the latest definition of reference duration in RAN1 # 112b-e meeting can be used even if MCSt is used, and no need to redefine reference duration for MCSt. |
| WILUS | No | We have similar views with Apple and QC. If the first slot is consisted of partial slot, where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted, the next slot of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted should be further included in the SL reference duration. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | From ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK perspective, either single transmission and MCSt is the same, no need to define other ending point.The TBS is determined based on a (pre-)configured reference number, which takes both first and second starting positions into account, so we do not think any motivation to have another ending point |
| CATT/GH | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | No | We don't see the difference between "the end of first slot with enabled A/N" and "the end of the first MSCt containing PSSCH with enabled A/N" with the assumption of "whichever occur earlier". Thus it is unnecessary to update the ending position of reference for the case of MSCt |
| Transsion | Yes |  |

**Proposal 4-2 (I):**

* The ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to the PSSCH (for SL unicast) in the reference duration for the latest SL channel occupancy for which ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback is available is used as follows:
	+ If ‘ACK’ is received, for each priority class , ; otherwise is increased to the next allowed value.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM | OK | (Our understanding is that this was already agreed..) |
| LGE | Yes with modification. | We prefer to reuse the same description of TS 37.213. In other words, “each” needs to be replaced with “every”.

|  |
| --- |
| TS 37.213 Section 4.1.4.24) Increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.5) For every priority class *,* maintain as it is; go to step 2. |

 |
| InterDigital | Support |  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes  |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | LG’s modification looks ok. |
| Apple | Support | Agree with LGE’s comment.  |
| CableLabs | Yes with modifications | Agree with LGE proposal |
| QC | Yes with mods | “If at least one 'ACK' is received”Also agree with LGE suggestion. |
| Intel | Yes | Also OK with LG’s modification. |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | OK |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Since the intention of UE behaviour in sub-bullet is for unicast only, the bracket in “~~(~~for SL unicast~~)~~” should be removed to make the proposal clear. |
| NEC | Yes | “If *at least one* ACK is received, “ |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Panasonic | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Support |  |
| xiaomi |  Yes | NR-U similar design shall be reused to SL-U. |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| WILUS | Yes with modification | “If at least one 'ACK' is received” and also agree with LGE suggestion that “each” needs to be replaced with “every” according to TS 37.213. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |  |
| CATT/GH | Yes with comments | Agree with LGE and Qualcomm’s modification. |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Transsion | Yes |  |

**Question 4-3 (I):**

* If a UE performs SL transmission using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class on a channel and the SL transmission is not associated with explicit HARQ-ACK feedback by the corresponding UE(s), please indicate which one of the following options is preferred for the CW adjustment.
	+ Option 1: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
	+ Option 3: CW is adjusted according to CR/CBR measurement, if CR/CBR is supported for SL-U.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1 or 3** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 |  |
| DCM | Option 1 |  |
| LGE | Option 1 | In NR-U, any measurement-based CWS adjustments was not considered.  |
| InterDigital |  | We are fine with both options |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 1 |  |
| Ericsson | Option 1 | The use of SL transmissions without HARQ-ACK should be avoided except for S-SSB, etc. |
| Lenovo | Option 3Also see suggested modification to Option 1. | We cannot accept any solution that would allow the indefinite use of the latest value such as Option 1.We can support a modified Option 1 as a compromise, if necessary:Option 1a: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class . After using the latest for *K = {1,2,4}* times, is increased to the next higher allowed value. |
| Apple | Option 1 |  |
| CableLabs | Option 1 | Per 37.213 specs |
| QC | Option 1 |  |
| Intel | Option 1 |  |
| Vivo | Option 1 |  |
| CMCC | Option 1 |  |
| Sony | Option 1 |  |
| Spreadtrum | Option 1 |  |
| Futurewei | Option 1 |  |
| Samsung | Option 3 | Compared with NR-U, blind retransmission in SL is more general case so some specific solution is needed to keep system performance. We think CR/CBR based CW adjustment is a simple solution and could assist UE appropriately modify CW length. |
| NEC | Option 3 | As sidelink CR/CBR presents the ratio of sidelink channels being occupied, CW adjustment based on CR/CBR may provide more precise determining. |
| ETRI | Option 1 |  |
| Panasonic | Option 1 |  |
| Sharp | Option 1 with modification | We have similar opinion with Lenovo. Option 1 is needed for modification.In some case, minimum is the latest and minimum is kept to used. For example, SL UE which performs only broadcast transmission with minimum . It gives rise to the risk of the unfair channel access. some limitations are necessary for option 1 to achieve a fairer channel access in the SL-U. At least for broadcast type, should be updated. In NR-U, if maximum CW size is consecutively used *K* times, the CW size is reset to the minimum CW size. Similar principle can be reused. If is consecutively used *K* times, is updated.We support option 1with modification.Option 1: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .* **At least for broadcast type, CWp is updated if the CWp is consecutively used *K* times.**
 |
| Xiaomi  |  | We follow the majority view. |
| ZTE | Option 1 |  It is suggested that the CW adjustment mechanism without HARQ feedback in NR-U should be reused as much as possible, and option 1 should be supported. |
| WILUS  | Option 1 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 |  |
| CATT/GH | Option 1 |  |
| MediaTek | Option 1 |  |
| Transsion | Option 1 |  |

**Question 4-4 (I):**

* The ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to the PSSCH (for SL groupcast option 2) in the reference duration for the latest SL channel occupancy for which ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback is available is used according to one of the follows:
	+ Option 1: Based on a (pre-)configurable ratio of received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks in the latest SL reference duration, is reset to for every priority class , otherwise increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- FFS: whether the ratio of the received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks is ‘ACK’, ‘NACK’ or ‘ACK+NACK’
		- FFS: how to calculate the ratio
		- FFS: the (pre-)configuration ratio values
	+ Option 2: If at least a ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1 or 2** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 |  |
| DCM |  | If Option 1 includes (pre-)configurability of 100% ACK RX, we are fine with the Option 1. |
| LGE | Option 2 | For compromise, it can be considered that the Option 2 is default behaviour for the case when no ratio is (pre)configured.If the ratio is (pre)configured, Option 1 is used. Moreover, to cover the case where CWS is reset only if the TX UE receives ACK from all the RX UEs, the ratio value can be 100%.  |
| InterDigital | Option 2 |  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 2 |  |
| Ericsson | Option 2 |  |
| Lenovo | Option 1 |  |
| Apple |  | We can support either option 1 or option 2.  |
| CableLabs | Option 2 |  |
| QC | Option 2 | Support LGE suggestion |
| Intel | Option 2 | As option 1 will fragment the design, and may prioritize groupcast option 2 transmissions over unicast transmissions depending on how the ratio is pre-configured. |
| Vivo | Option 1 | Option 1 can reflect the channel condition more precise than option 2. |
| CMCC | Option 2 |  |
| Sony | Option 2 |  |
| Spreadtrum | Option 1 |  |
| Futurewei | Option 2 |  |
| Samsung | Option 1 |  |
| NEC | Option 1 |  |
| ETRI | Option 1 |  |
| Panasonic | Option 1 |  |
| Xiaomi  |  | We follow the majority view. |
| ZTE | Option 1 | In Option 2, as long as one among multiple RX UEs feedback the ACK, the C:\Users\10217598\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml7676\wps4.jpg will be reset to C:\Users\10217598\AppData\Local\Temp\ksohtml7676\wps5.jpg. We think it is too aggressive and not friendly to other technologies such as WIFI, and thus we prefer option 1. |
| WILUS | Option 2 with modification | Option 2 with modification that “each” needs to be replaced with “every” according to TS 37.213. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option2 with modification | For Option 2, it should be updated as at least one ACK for “every UE”. Consider from multiple receiver perspective. If only one ACK is received, it does not stand for each receiver is in a good channel situation. Tx UE still needs perform retransmission. So, it should consider each UE report at least one ACK, then .**Question 4-4 (I):** * The ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to the PSSCH (for SL groupcast option 2) in the reference duration for the latest SL channel occupancy for which ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback is available is used according to one of the follows:

…* + Option 2: If at least a ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions from each RX UE within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.
 |
| CATT/GH | Option 1 |  |
| MediaTek | Option 2 |  |
| Transsion | Option 1 |  |

**Question 4-5 (I):**

* CW adjustment for groupcast option 1, please indicate how to modify your preferred option(s) below to be in line with the fact that the latest definition of reference duration does not consider groupcast option 1 (NACK-only feedback).
	+ Option 1: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
	+ Option 2:
		- If ‘NACK’ or a collision indicator (IUC scheme 2) is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- When neither ‘NACK’ nor a collision indicator (IUC scheme 2) is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration,
			* Option A: is reset to for every priority class .
			* Option B: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
	+ Option 3: An ACK-only procedure is used instead of a NACK-only procedure. In this case, if at least a ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class , otherwise is increased
	+ Option 4: CW is adjusted according to CR/CBR measurement, if CR/CBR is supported for SL-U
	+ Option 5 (option 3+legacy): ACK feedback is performed when a TB is successfully decoded in addition to the legacy NACK-only procedure. In this case, if ACK only is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration then ,  otherwise is increased.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 (no modification is required) |
| DCM | Support Option 1 as it is. |
| LGE | Option 2 with Option A is supported. What is the UE behaviour, when the UE receives NACK for its unicast PSSCH transmission within a reference duration? The answer is that the UE will increase its CWS since it is part of the case when the UE does not receives the explicit ACK. In case of GC option 1, at least explicit NACK is supported. Then, it is consistent that UE increases CWS if the UE receives NACK for the groupcast PSSCH with HARQ-ACK feedback option 1. Unlike unicast, in groupcast HARQ-ACK feedback option 1, since the absence of PSFCH can include ACK or DTX, Option B would be conservative approach. If we support Option 2, then the reference duration also needs to be updated to include the PSSCH with GC option 1.  |
| Lenovo | We can support Option 4 and a modified Option 1:Option 1a: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class . After using the latest for *K = {1,2,4}* times, is increased to the next higher allowed value. |
| Apple | Option 1.  |
| CableLabs | Option 2 coupled with the subsequent Option A |
| QC | Option 1. There still seems to be no good way to assess channel conditions when only GC option 1 PSSCH(s) are transmitted over a COT, and we suggest that RAN1 does not optimize for this case. |
| Intel | We actually do not think that groupcast option 1 transmissions may be proper for unlicensed design unless some fundamental changes are made since all the options above would not properly reflect the congestion level due to the fact that an LB failure may be reflected as a ‘ACK’. For this reason, we think that groupcast option 1 may not be allowed. If RAN1 consider this as an essential component of the design, we are OK to compromise with option 1 or option 1a as proposed by Lenovo. |
| vivo | Option 1 or option 2 can be further discussed. option 3/5 incur large spec. effort w/o strong motivation. |
| CMCC | Option 1 |
| Sony | Option 1 |
| Spreadtrum | Option 1 |
| Futurewei | Option 1 |
| Samsung | Option 2 |
| ETRI | Option 2 with Option A. Also agree with LG’s proposal for the definition of the reference duration for groupcast option 1. |
| Panasonic | Option 1 |
| Sharp | Support Option 2 and option B with modification.SL reference duration is not defined for groupcast option 1. So, CW adjustment for groupcast option 1 is performed when groupcast option 1 was transmitted within the latest COT.And collision indicator is not necessary for groupcast option 1. If higher layer parameter *sl-IUC-scheme2* is enabled and Tx UE’s transmission is overlaps with other UE’s reserved resource or Rx UE’s transmission slot, Rx UE sends collision indicator to Tx UE. And Tx UE excludes the resource from reselected resource. IUC scheme 2 is not appropriate to reflect the channel environment. It is preferred to remove the collision indicator (IUC scheme2) from option 2.* + Option 2:
		- If ‘NACK’ ~~or a collision indicator (IUC scheme 2)~~ is received related to any transmissions within the latest ~~SL reference duration~~ COT, increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- When ~~neither~~ ‘NACK’ ~~nor a collision indicator (IUC scheme 2)~~ is not received related to any transmissions within the latest ~~SL reference duration~~ COT,
			* Option A: is reset to for every priority class .
			* Option B: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
 |
| Xiaomi  | We follow the majority view. |
| ZTE | We support option 5.In option 5, the latest definition of reference duration in the RAN1 #112 meeting can be reused, and the contention window can be adjusted based on the latest definition of reference duration. |
| WILUS | Option 2 with Option A is supported with removing the collision indicator. According to the regulation, if the UE retransmits, then the CWS should be increased. Otherwise, the UE does not retransmit, then CWp should be reset to CWmin,p. This is aligned with SL groupcast option-2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support Option 1 |
| CATT/GH | Option 6: GC option 1 (NACK-only) is not supported in SL-UThis issue has been discussed for several meetings, but we still haven’t see a reasonable solution of “how GC option 1 can be supported in SL-U”.Actually, if HARQ NACK-based feedback is applied, the Tx UE cannot distinguish whether the Rx UE successfully receives the data or fails to send NACK. In case that the NACK was lost or delayed due to channel access failure, the Tx UE may assume that the data was successfully received and will no longer send retransmission(s), which will lead to reliability decrease.Therefore, we propose to not support GC option 1(NACK-based HARQ feedback) in SL-U. |
| MediaTek | Option 1 is preferrable |
| Transsion | Option 2 |

**Question 4-6 (I):**

* Do you think it is necessary to modify / update the existing reference duration definition to exclude / not consider a PSSCH transmission from the 2nd starting symbol if such transmission is the first slot where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted in a channel occupancy initiated by the UE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes / No** | **Comments** |
| OPPO |  | This is not an essential issue in our view.  |
| DCM | NO | TX UE can determine MCS/TBS to solve the concern. |
| LGE | No | It is still open that the TX UE selects low MCS conservatively for the case when the PSSCH starts from the 2nd starting symbol. As mentioned before, delaying the CWS determination will delay the Type 1 channel access procedure, and it is not preferable.  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No |  |
| Lenovo | Postpone | The answer is dependent on the TBS determination. It can be discussed after the conclusion of TBS determination. |
| Apple | Yes | See comments related to proposal 4-1.  |
| CableLabs | No |  |
| QC | Yes | Our reasoning is tied to the one in Proposal 4-1, we briefly repeat here, please check the reply to Proposal 4-1 for the proposed updated wording:We believe there is a case for extension to “end of MCSt”, that is the case where the first transmission is a partial-slot TX (starting from 2nd starting symbol). In case TBS is determined according to a large number of symbols that TX may be prone to failure (and lead to unnecessary CW double). That is, we need to revise the reference duration definition to capture this. |
| Intel | No | We also agree that this is not an essential component. |
| vivo |  | In NR-U, the transmission on all the allocated symbol is considered in the reference duration. Similar description can be used for SL. The *reference duration* corresponding to a channel occupancy initiated by the UE including transmission of PUSCH(s) is defined in this clause as a duration starting from the beginning of the channel occupancy until the end of the first slot where at least one PUSCH is transmitted over all the resources allocated for the PUSCH, or until the end of the first transmission burst by the UE that contains PUSCH(s) transmitted over all the resources allocated for the PUSCH, whichever occurs earlier. If the channel occupancy includes a PUSCH, but it does not include any PUSCH transmitted over all the resources allocated for that PUSCH, then, the duration of the first transmission burst by the UE within the channel occupancy that contains PUSCH(s) is the *reference duration* for CWS adjustment. |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Sony | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| Futurewei | No  | Not essential. |
| Samsung | No | This is over-optimization in our understanding.  |
| NEC |  No  |  |
| ETRI | No |  |
| Panasonic | No | We also think this is not an essential issue. |
| xiaomi  | No | The motivation of excluding a PSSCH transmission from the 2nd starting symbol is not reasonable, and it is clear that a PSSCH transmission from the 1st starting symbol and the 2nd starting symbol based are both considered based on current agreement |
| ZTE | NO | If a suitable TB size is used, the above issues will not occur. |
| WILUS | Yes | Same comment below related to proposal 4-1If the first slot is consisted of partial slot, where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted, the next slot of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted should be further included in the SL reference duration. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| CATT/GH | Comments | We share the similar view with Lenovo.This discussion should be postponed. |
| MediaTek | Yes | We are open to discuss the exclusion of PSSCH transmission from 2nd starting symbol from the reference duration consideration |
| Transsion | No |  |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 2 discussion

FL summary of Round 1 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 4-1 (I), whether to update the existing reference duration definition to include MCSt, a summary of preferences is provided as followed.
	+ Yes (10): OPPO, Nokia/NSB, Lenovo, QC (further updates), Intel, xiaomi, CATT/GOHIGH, Transsion
	+ No (18): DCM, LGE, Ericsson, Apple, CableLabs, vivo, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, Samsung, NEC, ETRI, Panasonic, ZTE, WILUS, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek
	+ FL: according to the comments that do not think the definition of reference duration needs to be updated for MCSt, the main reason was they don’t expect much of a difference. And hence the current version (just the first slot) would be sufficient. Technically, both can work but keeping it unchanged would be simpler for CWS adjustment procedures. Therefore, I don’t see there is a strong necessity to update the definition. This proposal will not be pursued anymore in this meeting. If a strong need is identified later, we can rediscuss again.
* On Proposal 4-2 (I), all companies are supportive and some with small updates. This seems to be stable and I am put this up for email endorsement over the reflector, too.
* On Question 4-3 (I), when SL transmissions are not associated with explicit HARQ-ACK feedback, a summary of preferences is provided as followed.
	+ Option 1 (27): OPPO, DCM, LGE, IDC, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Apple, CableLabs, QC, Intel, vivo, CMCC, Sony, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, ETRI, Panasonic, Sharp, ZTE, WILUS, Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT/GOHIGH, MediaTek, Transsion
	+ Option 3 (4): IDC, Lenovo, Samsung, NEC
	+ FL: It is clear the majority wants to go with Option 1 due to alignment to NR-U and simplicity. There was a suggestion from two companies to increase the CWp to the next higher allowed value after it has been used for several times. It is not clear the reason why it needs to be done. Also, if CWp keeps on increasing and never reset. This is perhaps not the way to go. I will also put this up for email endorsement over the reflector.
* On Question 4-4 (I), CWS adjustment for groupcast option 2, a summary of preferences is provided as followed.
	+ Option 1 (14): OPPO, DCM, Lenovo, Apple, vivo, Spreadtrum, Samsung, NEC, ETRI, Panasonic, ZTE, CATT/GOHIGH, Transsion
	+ Option 2 (16): LGE/QC (when ratio is not configured), IDC, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Apple, CableLabs, Intel, CMCC, Sony, Futurewei, WILUS, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek
	+ FL: Technically, at least to FL’s understanding, Option 2 can be a subset of Option 1, where the (pre-)configurable ratio can be set to achieve one ‘ACK’. I think LGE is proposing a compromise that I think it is worth trying. For Huawei’s suggestion “from each RX UE”, to FL’s understanding, this is equivalent to 100% ‘ACK’. I don’t think this is the intention from companies who supported Option 2.
* On Question 4-5 (I), CWS adjustment for groupcast option 1, a summary of preferences is provided as followed.
	+ Option 1 (15): OPPO, DCM, Lenovo (modified), Apple, QC, Intel, vivo, CMCC, Sony, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, Panasonic, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek
	+ Option 2 (8): LGE/CableLabs/ETRI/WILUS (Option A), vivo, Samsung, Sharp (Option B), Transsion
	+ Option 3:
	+ Option 4: Lenovo
	+ Option 5: ZTE
	+ Option 6 (GC Option 1 is not supported in SL-U): Intel, CATT/GOHIGH
	+ FL: For simplicity, it is clear the majority preferred Option 1 (and there is no need to update the description and/or the definition of the reference duration). As for the modification to increase CWp to the next higher allowed value, the same technical concern as before. The CWp always seem to go up but never come down. Given the situation, let me try proposing Option 1 as the solution for the GC option 1 case.
* On Question 4-6 (I), modify / update the existing reference duration definition to exclude / not consider a PSSCH transmission from the 2nd starting symbol, a summary of preferences is provided as followed.
	+ Yes (4): Apple, QC, WILUS, MediaTek
	+ No (20): OPPO, DCM, LGE, Nokia/NSB, CableLabs, Intel, CMCC, Sony, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, Samsung, NEC, ETRI, Panasonic, xiaomi, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, Transsion
	+ Postponed (3): Lenovo, CATT/GH
	+ FL: We can come back to this in the future, if there is a need (e.g., after TBS determination discussion in the PHY structure agenda).

**Proposal 4-2 (II):**

* The ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to the PSSCH ~~(~~for SL unicast~~)~~ in the reference duration for the latest SL channel occupancy for which ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback is available is used as follows:
	+ If at least one ‘ACK’ is received, for every priority class , ; otherwise is increased to the next allowed value.

**Proposal 4-3 (I):**

* If UE performs SL transmission using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class on a channel and the SL transmission is not associated with explicit HARQ-ACK feedback by the corresponding UE(s), the following option is selected for the CW adjustment.
	+ ~~Option 1:~~ For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .

**Proposal 4-4 (I):**

* The ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to the PSSCH ~~(~~for SL groupcast option 2~~)~~ in the reference duration for the latest SL channel occupancy for which ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback is available is used according to Option 2 when the ratio in Option 1 is not (pre-)configured; otherwise Option 1.
	+ Option 1: Based on a (pre-)configurable ratio of received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks in the latest SL reference duration, is reset to for every priority class , otherwise increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- FFS: whether the ratio of the received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks is ‘ACK’, ‘NACK’ or ‘ACK+NACK’
		- FFS: how to calculate the ratio
		- FFS: the (pre-)configuration ratio values (including 100%)
	+ Option 2: If at least a ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| DCM | NO | If configurability of 100% is agreed (not FFS), we are fine with this proposal.Note that this CW adjustment is intended for confirming no LBT issue at both TX side and RX side. For GC option 2, if 100% ACK is not ensured, it may mean that inter-system blocking occurs at some UEs. |
| LGE | OK | For progress, we can accept it. For DCM’s concern, we are OK to say “(pre)configuration ratio value include at least 100%). |
| CMCC | Yes with comments | Even though we think a single solution b/w option 1 and option 2 is better, we can accept the current version for progress. |
| ZTE | Support | We think Option 1 has more benefit than Option 2, but we can accept the proposal for progress. Regarding Option 2, we’d like to clarify that at least a 'ACK' means at least a ACK from every group members or at least a ACK from any members? btw, according to the agreed reference duration definition, only the first/one transmission with ACK/NACK feedback is considered for CW adjustment, so 'any transmissions' should be changed to 'the transmission' |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | OK |  |
| Apple | OK |  |
| Intel | No | We are not OK with the proposal and once again we do not think it is a good idea to fragment the design of this procedure, but RAN1 should rather aim for a unified solution. We actually do not see any clear advantages in utilizing Option 1 instead of option 2, but rather the disadvantage that in the end PSSCH for SL groupcast option 2 would become more advantageous from channel access perspective compared to other type of transmissions.  |
| Fraunhofer | OK |  |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| QC | Yes | Thanks to Lenovo for identifying this good solution for compromise.@ DCM: we believe that for understanding what is the channel condition is different from determining a GC Opt2 success from internal UE perspective, so the 100% would not be strictly necessary for CW adjustment (but one should be sufficient). Anyway we are open to compromise and transform the FFS on 100% ack in a note that 100% is a possible value.@ ZTE: our understanding and our intention is “at least one Ack from any UE”.  |
| OPPO | Support | We can accept this proposal for progress. |
| Panasonic | Yes | We are also OK to support the candidate of (pre-)configuration ratio values include 100%. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| Transsion | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| xiaomi |  | We follow the majority view. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | We are ok for this way to move forward, if the ratio of 100% is guaranteed. We share the views from DCM that if not all the ACK is received from every UE in groupcast, the system still has blocking for dedicated UEs, reset the contention window size might be not helpful in this situation. So we have following suggestion on the proposal.* + Option 1: Based on a (pre-)configurable ratio of received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks in the latest SL reference duration, is reset to for every priority class , otherwise increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- FFS: whether the ratio of the received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks is ‘ACK’, ‘NACK’ or ‘ACK+NACK’
		- FFS: how to calculate the ratio
		- ~~FFS:~~ the default (pre-)configuration ratio value~~s~~ is ~~(including~~ 100%~~),~~ FFS other values.

… |

**Proposal 4-5 (I):**

* If UE performs SL transmission using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class on a channel and the SL transmission is associated with groupcast option 1 for SL-HARQ feedback by the corresponding UE(s), the following option is selected for the CW adjustment.
	+ ~~Option 1:~~ For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| DCM | Support |  |
| LGE | No | As mentioned before, for the same or similar situation, we need to have consistent behaviour.According to Proposal 4-2(II), when the UE receives NACK for its unicast PSSCH transmission, it will increase its CWS. We think that when the UE receives NACK for its groupcast PSSCH transmission with HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1, the UE behaviour should be the same. In other words, in this case, the UE should increase its CWS as in unicast. For progress, we are open for the case when the UE does not receive any PSFCH for its groupcast PSSCH transmission with HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1. |
| CMCC | Support |  |
| ZTE | No | We still think Option 5 is a good way to go from performance perspective. Based on Option 5, agreed ACK/NACK based CW adjustment can be reused, and the adjustment could be more suitable. |
| Vivo  | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | No, see comment for suggested compromise | We re-iterate (as for Proposal 4-3 (I)) that we object to a proposal that allows an indefinite use of the latest CWp, as it results in unfair advantages for channel access. As stated in our contribution and earlier discussion, a safeguard is neede to increase CWp if the latest has been used times (we are open to discuss the values further, if necessary). We expect that as in NR-U the CWp is reset to the lowest value after using the highest CWp K times. |
| Apple  | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | For the sake of progress, we are OK with the proposal as comprise solution. |
| Fraunhofer | No | Same reason as stated by LGE. We still think that Option 2 would be the way to go in case the UE receives any PSFCH or a collision indicator (IUC scheme 2), otherwise, we are ok to support Option 1. |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| Panasonic | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | Option 1 cannot utilize received NACK information thus is inefficient. If go with option 1, CW will never be adjusted even if NACK is explicitly received and that doesn’t make sense. In UC and GC option 2 receiving NACK will trigger a CW increase, the same principle should be used for NACK-only case here.We are fine with either option A or option B and slightly prefer option B. Option A is more consistent with other options and NR-U. Option B is more conservative to against the risk of PSCCH miss detection, so in our view it is a compromised solution by partially follow option 1 behaviour in the case of no PSFCH received. The only difference between option 1 and option 2+B is how to handle received explicit ‘NACK’ or collision indicator, and utilizing this information to increase CW is a straightforward solution. Compared with either Option 2+A or 2+B, option 1 is a worse choice. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CATT/GH | No | After going through the response from companies and FL, we still cannot find a solution that how ACK/DTX ambiguous issue caused by LBT failure can be solved in SL-U when groupcast option 1 is supported. In case this issue hasn’t been adequately discussed, we cannot agree with this proposal. |
| Transsion | No | Share the same view as LGE |
| ETRI | No | Agree with LGE |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |  |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 3 discussion

FL summary of Round 2 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 4-4 (I), for groupcast option 2, DCM and HW would like to have more certainty that 100% ACK is included as one of the (pre-)configured values in Option 1.
	+ @ZTE, “at least a ACK” is intended for any members. Otherwise, it would be 100%.
	+ @Intel, If Option 2 is actually more advantage in the end, then the ratio would not be (pre-)configured. This is a compromised way forward.
* On Proposal 4-5 (I), for groupcast option 1,
	+ Support (11): DCM, vivo, IDC, Apple, Intel, OPPO, Panasonic, Spreadtrum, Huawei/HiSilicon, Lenovo (increase CWp if the latest has been used K∈{1,2,4} times)
	+ Option 2 (5): LGE, Fraunhofer, Samsung, Transsion, ETRI
	+ Option 5: ZTE
	+ Option 6 (GC Option 1 is not supported in SL-U): CATT/GOHIGH
	+ FL: Besides the majority support for Option 1 (use latest ), Lenovo insists on safeguarding an indefinite use of the latest CWp and CATT/GOHIGH would like to discuss how ACK/DTX ambiguous issue caused by LBT failure can be solved. Initially, from the Tdoc review, there is a large majority directly discuss the solution options, hence I interpreted almost everyone want to continue supporting this feature in SL-U. While the safeguarding issue is being discussed for Proposal 4-3 over the email endorsement, let’s use this chance to discuss CATT/GH’s question for this round of discussion.

**Proposal 4-4 (II):**

* The ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to the PSSCH ~~(~~for SL groupcast option 2~~)~~ in the reference duration for the latest SL channel occupancy for which ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback is available is used according to Option 2 when the ratio in Option 1 is not (pre-)configured; otherwise Option 1.
	+ Option 1: Based on a (pre-)configurable ratio of received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks in the latest SL reference duration, is reset to for every priority class , otherwise increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- FFS: whether the ratio of the received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks is ‘ACK’, ‘NACK’ or ‘ACK+NACK’
		- FFS: how to calculate the ratio
		- FFS: the (pre-)configuration ratio values (100% is the default value)
	+ Option 2: If at least a ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| QC | Fine, with edit | We think this may be a good compromise. To address DCM’s point of having the 100%, we think it should be allowed to have it but not necessarily the 100% as default since it can be preconfigured. **We suggest it is a note on allowed value**.**(Suggested modification) Proposal 4-4’ (II):** * The ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback corresponding to the PSSCH ~~(~~for SL groupcast option 2~~)~~ in the reference duration for the latest SL channel occupancy for which ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK feedback is available is used according to Option 2 when the ratio in Option 1 is not (pre-)configured; otherwise Option 1.
	+ Option 1: Based on a (pre-)configurable ratio of received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks in the latest SL reference duration, is reset to for every priority class , otherwise increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- FFS: whether the ratio of the received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks is ‘ACK’, ‘NACK’ or ‘ACK+NACK’
		- FFS: how to calculate the ratio
		- ~~FFS: the (pre-)configuration ratio values (100% is the default value)~~
		- Note: the (pre-)configuration ratio values of 100% is a valid candidate
	+ Option 2: If at least a ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.
 |
| LGE | OK for progress | Either way is fine between put 100% inside FFS as in the proposal, and put 100% outside FFS.  |
| CATT/GH |  | We think the version provided by QC is better. |
| Intel | Comments | We are still not OK with the proposal. We understand this is a compromise solution, but we still do not think it is a good idea to fragment the design of this procedure, but RAN1 should rather aim for a unified solution: the current procedure is rather cumbersome and complicated with no clear advantage in utilizing Option 1 instead of option 2. If we are the only company opposing, we would be OK but only if 100% is agreed as a candidate value for the issues highlighted in our prior set of comments. |
| Vivo | OK | Also fine with QC version |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| Futurewei | OK |  |

**Question 4-5 (II):**

* Should SL-HARQ feedback using groupcast option 1 (NACK-only) continue to be supported in SL-U in Rel-18? If yes, is there a need to resolve the ACK/DTX ambiguity issue caused by LBT failure in SL-U? If there is a need, what should be the solution?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support GC option 1?** | **Need to solve the ACK/DTX ambiguity issue?** | **Comments** |
| QC | Fine to keep | No | We re-iterate our position, that is: GC Opt 1 can be supported in SL-U but there is no need to address its optimization due to its flaws in the unlicensed spectrum. |
| LGE | Yes | No | GC option 1 can be supported for fallback mode for GC option 2 when the number of PSFCH resources are not sufficient for a very large size of group. Meanwhile, it is not necessarily modify the ACK/DTX ambiguity issue.  |
| CATT/GH | Prefer not | Yes if GC option 1 is supported | Thanks FL for considering our question.As we emphasis before, ACK/DTX ambiguity issue may cause serious loss of reliability in SL-U, since the Tx UE may assume that the data was successfully received when there is no feedback detected, and thus, retransmission(s) will no longer be sent. Based on this understanding, we propose the following two possible approaches for this question:1. RAN1 conclude that groupcast option 1 is not supported in SL-U.
2. RAN1 further study the solution of ACK/DTX ambiguity issue under groupcast option 1 and postpone other related discussions of groupcast option 1 (e.g., CW adjustment) until the solution is found.

Actually, we can accept either way forward. But for approach 2, redefining groupcast option 1 as a ACK-only procedure may not be a good solution, since the issue will thus become a NACK/DTX ambiguity issue. |
| Intel | Prefer not | Yes | We actually do not think that groupcast option 1 transmissions may be proper for unlicensed design unless some fundamental changes are made since all the options above would not properly reflect the congestion level due to the fact that an LB failure may be reflected as a ‘ACK’. For this reason, we think that groupcast option 1 may not be allowed. If RAN1 consider this as an essential component of the design, we are OK to compromise with option 1. Otherwise, we would prefer not to support it in Rel.18. |
| Vivo | Yes | Open |  |
| OPPO | Yes | No | In CW adjustment, we think GC option 1 should be treated same as the transmission without explicit HARQ feedbacks. |
| Futurewei | OK |  |  |

## [ACTIVE] Topic #5: UE-to-UE COT sharing

**Background**:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement*** UE-to-UE COT sharing is supported in NR sidelink operation in a shared channel (SL-U).
	+ FFS applicable SL channels and signals (e.g., PSCCH/PSSCH, PSFCH, S-SSB) for shared COT access and any restrictions (e.g. whether the COT can be shared with a single UE or multiple UEs)
	+ FFS all other details in compliance with the regulatory requirements

**Agreement*** For UE-to-UE COT sharing, continue considering the following alternatives:
	+ Alt. 1: A responding SL UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE when the responding SL UE is a target receiver of the at least COT initiating UE’s PSSCH data transmission in the COT.
		- When the responding UE uses the shared COT for its transmission has an equal or smaller CAPC value than the CAPC value indicated in a shared COT information
		- FFS any additional conditions
	+ Alt. 2: A responding SL UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE when the responding SL UE is a target receiver of the COT initiating UE’s transmission in the COT.
		- When the responding UE uses the shared COT for its transmission has an equal or smaller CAPC value than the CAPC value indicated in a shared COT information
		- FFS how to determine a SL UE is a target receiver
		- FFS: details of the channel type of the COT initiating UE’s transmission
		- FFS any additional conditions
	+ For Alt1 and Alt2: When a responding UE uses a shared COT for its transmission(s), the COT initiating UE is a target receiver of the responding UE’s transmission(s).
		- FFS: details of the channel type of the responding UE’s transmission(s)
* gNB relaying/forwarding a UE initiated COT to another UE is not supported in Rel-18
* FFS whether a Mode 1 UE can report a COT or related information to gNB for aiding Mode 1 RA

**Agreement**For UE-to-UE COT sharing,* When performing S-SSB transmission(s), a responding UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE (using type 1 channel access) when the responding UE is intended to transmit S-SSB within RB set(s) corresponding to the shared COT.
* When performing PSFCH transmission(s), a responding UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE at least when at least one of the responding UE’s PSFCH transmissions in a symbol/slot within RB set(s) corresponding to the shared COT is intended for the COT initiating UE.
	+ FFS: whether a responding UE can transmit PSFCH(s) to UE(s) other than the initiator
* When performing PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s), a responding UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE at least when the responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to the shared COT is intended for the COT initiating UE
	+ FFS whether to support the case if a responding UE transmits PSSCH/PSCCH to destination ID other than the source ID of the COT initiating transmission, where the destination ID of the responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) can be different from the source/destination IDs of COT initiating UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission when sharing the COT information.
		- FFS: how to determine / what are the restrictions to the destination ID of the responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) to utilize the COT shared by the initiating UE.
		- FFS whether the responding UE can utilize the COT when at least the responding UE’s PSCCH transmission in the reserved resources within the shared COT or MCSt is intended for the COT initiating UE and what are the restrictions (e.g., priority, etc.) and indication to the responding UE.
* FFS: UE forwarding/relaying information about a COT initiated by another UE.

**Agreement*** A responding UE over a shared COT can be:
	+ a receiving UE, which is the target of a PSCCH/PSSCH transmission of a COT initiator
		- In the case of unicast from the COT initiator, within the same COT when the source and destination IDs contained in the COT initiator’s SCI match to the corresponding destination and source IDs relating to the same unicast at the receiving UE
		- In the case of groupcast and broadcast, when the destination ID contained in the COT initiator’s SCI match to a destination ID known at the receiving UE
	+ a UE identified by ID(s), if additional IDs are supported in the COT sharing information (in addition to the source and destination IDs of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission), when additional IDs are included in the COT sharing information from the COT initiator
		- FFS Limitations on what additional IDs may be included and how they may be indicated

**Agreement**A responding UE’s SL transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted when the CAPC value(s) of the SL transmission(s) have an equal or smaller CAPC value than the CAPC value indicated in the COT sharing information.**Agreement**A responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT is intended for the COT initiating UE when,* In the case of unicast from the responding UE, when the source and destination IDs contained in the responding UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH match to the destination and source IDs from a COT initiator’s unicast transmission that included COT sharing information, or match to the additional ID(s) included in the COT sharing information (if supported)
* In the case of groupcast or broadcast from the responding UE, when the destination ID contained in the responding UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH matches to the destination ID from a COT initiator’s groupcast or broadcast transmission that included COT sharing information, or matches to the additional ID(s) included in the COT sharing information (if supported)
* FFS: all other details and additional restrictions
 |

* UE forwarding / relaying a COT shared by another UE

There is an overwhelming majority still has the opinion that a UE (even a responding UE) cannot forward / relay COT sharing information from the COT initiating UE. This may even violet regional regulations relating to COT sharing. FL proposes to close this FFS issue in this meeting with the following Proposal 5-1.

* PSFCH (Proposal 8-3)

In RAN1#112 meeting, a proposal 8-3 was made by FL to support the case where “**a responding UE’s PSFCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted to UEs other than the COT initiator without requiring that at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator**”. The main motivations were [4, 6]:

* More transmissions ensuring continuity of transmissions over the COT (e.g., the initiator may lose the COT due to large gap if there is a slot in the COT with PSFCH symbols and the initiator neither expects to receive PSFCH nor has a PSFCH to transmit).
* More chances to deliver HARQ feedback for all UEs (a UE that wants to transmit a PSFCH to another UE (not an COT initiator UE) may not be able to complete Type 1 channel access procedure within the gap in symbol #10 but it is in proximity of a COT initiator UE). Even it is able to complete the Type 1 LBT, the additional LBT sensing length would be different to other UEs who are sharing the COT. In this case, they would have different CPE starting position and cause blocking to Type 1 LBT UEs. Subsequently, more SL retransmissions are needed and increase system load, channel occupancy and traffic congestion.
* There won’t be any damage in terms of collision if we allow more UEs to send PSFCH.
* As per regulation, only the responding UE receiving the grant from the COT initiating UE can use a shared resource for its transmission, thus for the case PSFCH transmitted within shared COT, only the resource indicated by COT initiating UE, the shared UE can use the resource for PSFCH transmission. However, there should be no limitation that at least one responding UE’s PSFCH transmissions should be intended for the COT initiating UE. Based on the regulation, any UE can share the COT once a grant is received from COT initiating UE.

Based on reviewing the contributions submitted to this meeting, there is a very clear majority who want to support this feature. Therefore, FL is proposing accordingly in Proposal 5-2 below.

* Additional ID(s)

The usage and benefits of supporting additional ID(s) are extensive discussed in the last RAN1#112 meeting and in the submitted contributions this time. The main benefits at least to FL’s understanding include 1) allowing more SL UEs to access the channel and utilize the resources within the COT duration which will anywhere be used for SL transmissions; 2) to improve resource usage efficiency and reduced system load/congestions due to less UEs performing Type 1 channel access; 3) the additional ID(s) are intended for the COT initiating UE as such it does not violet the regulations.

Based on Tdoc review summary provided in Section 4.6, there is a very clear majority who wants to / can accept to introduce the additional ID(s) as part of the COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE. There was one concern on the payload for this additional ID(s) field, especially when it is carried in SCI (which is the majority preference for the COT sharing container). So, FL proposes to support the inclusion of the additional ID(s) as part of the COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE and FFS on the number of additional ID(s) / payload size and the container.

* Contents of COT sharing information

Based on the submitted contributions in this meeting (the same has been observed over the last few meeting), the following contents of COT sharing information are supported by majority of companies. Therefore, FL proposes to include at least these information fields and FFS others.

* COT length (remaining COT duration)
* Existing L1 source and destination IDs
* CAPC level
* Sensed RB sets
* Container for COT sharing information

As for the container to carry the COT sharing information, according to submitted contributions, all companies think SCI (1st and/or 2nd stage) should be used. Given the above discussion on the payload for the additional ID(s), FL proposes to FFS whether MAC CE could be additionally used to carry some COT sharing information (e.g., additional ID(s)).

### FL Proposal for round 1 discussion

**Proposal 5-1 (I):**

* UE forwarding/relaying information relating to a COT initiated by another UE is not supported in Rel-18.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM | YES |  |
| LGE |  | UE forwarding/relaying information related to COT sharing is not supported |
| InterDigital | Support | We support the proposal (not to support UE forwarding the information related to a shared COT) |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Support |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | We don’t see COT forwarding as a fundamental feature in Rel-18. |
| Apple | Support |  |
| CableLabs | Yes | Since the proposal is backed by a negation and to avoid any misunderstanding: UE to UE COT forwarding is not supported in Rel 18 |
| QC | Yes | We support the FL proposal (forwarding is NOT supported) |
| Intel | No | As the SL UEs suffer half-duplexing issue, we believe that the responding devices able to decode the COT sharing information could also redundantly provide some information about the shared COT information. In fact, considering that the group of beneficiaries of a shared COT is quite limited, and the COT sharing information may be transmitted by the initiating device in the first symbols of the COT, it may be possible that some UEs may miss this information due to half-duplexing, which may lead to unutilized resources, and increased congestion either among SL UEs or incumbent technology. As we also believe that the shared COT information may need to be indicated in stage 1st stage SCI as this is a time sensitive information, if this is not provided by all UEs regardless of whether they are initiating or responding UEs, this may increase complexity at the RX since blind decoding may be required as effectively a UE may expect two SCI types with different payload in 1st stage. For this reason, we may prefer to conclude on this topic soon after we conclude on the detail of the container of the COT sharing information.  |
| Vivo | Agree  |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| NEC | No | As the COT sharing related SCI from the initial UE may be not detected by some UEs, and the initial UE may not repeat the SCI on each slot within the CO, the relevant information of the SL CO should be relayed during the CO by other UEs. |
| ETRI | Agree | We support the FL’s proposal |
| Panasonic | Support | We support the proposal (Forwarding/relaying is not supported.) |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| xiaomi | Yes | It might cause the resource collision, because more than one UEs use the same COT. |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| WILUS | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Transsion | Yes |  |

**Proposal 5-2 (I):**

* A responding UE’s PSFCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted to UEs other than the COT initiator without requiring that at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support | For the same reasons cited in the background section. |
| DCM |  | If this is allowed from regulation perspective, we are fine with this proposal. |
| LGE | No | According to TS 37.213, the above proposal is not aligned with NR-U:

|  |
| --- |
| If a gNB shares a channel occupancy initiated by a UE using the channel access procedures described in clause 4.2.1.1 on a channel, the gNB may transmit a transmission that follows a UL transmission on scheduled resources or a PUSCH transmission on configured resources by the UE after a gap as follows:- The transmission shall contain transmission to the UE that initiated the channel occupancy and can include non-unicast and/or unicast transmissions where any unicast transmission that includes user plane data is only transmitted to the UE that initiated the channel occupancy.  |

In NR-U, double COT sharing which is that the node A utilize a COT initiated by node B for its transmission to node C is not supported. Moreover, with this understanding, we also does not support Proposal 5-1. However, this proposal 5-2 itself tries to support this **double COT sharing**. It should not be supported.  |
| InterDigital | Support | It can maximize the COT usage and it does not violate the regulation.  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No | If there is no PSFCH towards COT initiator, the UE transmitting PSFCH needs to either perform Type 1 LBT or Type 2A LBT if SCSt channel access is supported for PSFCH. |
| Lenovo | Yes; see comment | (1) S-SSB transmission should be allowed for UEs regardless of whether the COT initiator is a recipient or not.(2) If periodic PSFCH is configured, the COT may be interrupted by the periodic PFSCH occasions. It is noted that the periodic PSFCH occasions may be used by a Rx UE to transmit PSFCH corresponding to PSSCHs transmitted by the COT initiator UE or other UEs other than the COT initiator UE (e.g., a UE sharing the COT for transmitting PSSCHs). Therefore, it is required that a responding UE can transmit periodic PSFCH(s) in a COT to UE(s) other than the COT initiator UE. |
| Apple  | No | Agree with LGE’s comments.  |
| CableLabs | No | For a few reasons:* Not clear what is the use case
* Perform Type 1 LBT

Not compliant with 37.213 |
| QC | Yes | Agree with FL background description |
| Intel | No | We believe that, as no regulatory constraints exist, within a shared COT a responding UE can indeed perform PSFCH and PSSCH/PSCCH meant to other devices. However, a responding device should transmit at least one transmission within a shared COT to the initiating device, as this is a condition necessary to ensure re-transmissions or PSFCH transmissions from other device rather than the initiating and responding device would be somewhat limited during a shared COT so that to limit potential blocking and interference.  |
| Vivo | No | We prefer to use the same principle for PSSCH and PSFCH COT sharing, i.e., at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator |
| CMCC | No | We agree with LGE’s comments. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Spread rum | Yes | There is no PSFCH resources collision between different UEs. Without requiring that at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator can improve the utilization of COT and reduce the risk of COT interruption. |
| JHUAPL | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes | If the UE that transmits PSFCH is sharing the COT. For instance, when a SL UE (other than the COT initiator) transmits a multicast (which is allowed because the COT initiator is among receivers) are the other SL UEs that share that COT allowed to send a ACK/NACK? |
| Samsung | Yes | OK with the proposal if such UE behaviour can be allowed by regulation |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| ETRI | Yes | It should be supported. |
| Panasonic |  | Same view with DCM. If it is allowed by regulation, we support the proposal. |
| Sharp | No |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Support | Considering more channel access opportunities of PSFCH transmission in COT sharing, we agree with the above proposal. |
| WILUS | No | We prefer to apply the same principle for PSSCH to PSFCH COT sharing, i.e., at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended to the UE that initiated the channel occupancy. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | PSFCH does not have such a restriction and explanations are given as follow,* Based on the regulation, any UE can share the COT once a grant is received from COT initiating UE.
* PSFCH is a kind of controlling signalling and in NR-U design, there is no limitation that at least one of the transmissions shall be transmitted to the UE initiating the channel occupancy. This also can resolve LGE and Apple’s concern.
* If PSFCH can be transmitted to UEs other than the COT initiator, thus one PSFCH position is used by multiple UEs, which can improve system performance.
 |
| CATT/GH | Support | Allowing a responding UE to transmit PSFCH to the UE other than the initiator can provide more opportunity to the responding UE to transmit PSFCH. |
| MediaTek | OK |  |
| Transsion | No |  |

**Proposal 5-3 (I):**

* Additional ID(s) can be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ FFS the payload size / number of additional ID(s) can be included
	+ FFS the additional ID(s) are L1 ID(s) or layer 2 logical ID(s)
	+ FFS the container for the additional ID(s) (e.g., SCI or MAC CE)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM |  | Before agreeing this proposal, usage of additional ID(s) should be clarified in detail. Even when a UE is not destination UE of the COT initiating UE’s TX, the first UE can use the COT if additional ID is matched? If YES, is this allowed in regulation? |
| LGE | No | To decide this, some clarification on the benefits is needed. It is necessary to check whether or how the COT initiator UE will know when the UE associated with the additional ID will have data to the COT initiator UE. If the COT initiator UE does not know this situation and the UE associated with the additional ID does not have data to the COT initiator UE, it just waste the SCI fields or transmission resources for indicating the additional ID. In this case, the additional ID is useless. The possibility that TX UE provide data to be transmitted to the RX UE is under the discussion in RAN2. Depending on the outcome of the discussion, the additional ID may or may not be needed.  |
| InterDigital | Support | Allowing COT sharing to a list of additional IDs sent by the COT initiator UE will increase the COT sharing efficiency. |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No | In our view, the benefit of supporting Additional IDs is not so clear, and the specification effort may be quite high.Firstly, in case additional IDs are added for identifying UEs which can use the COT, but do not have a transmission response towards the COT initiator, that should not be supported as it goes against the definition of “a responding UE” in regulations. Additionally, if additional IDs are only for restricting who can use a COT, such restriction can already be achieved by CAPC, i.e., only UEs with same or lower CAPC value can use the COT. Otherwise, there is no clear benefit of restricting a UE with higher priority transmission to use the COT. |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| Lenovo | Yes; see comment | (1) We think SLSS IDs (plus Iic) needs to be included to support S-SSB transmission in a shared COT.(2) Source ID and destination IDs are transmitted in every slot, which can be leveraged for the indicating the additional IDs , Hence the following mechanism can be investigated. * Support additional IDs transmission to the COT recipient in the same COT implicitly

For (2), we suggest to add the following to the proposal:* Further investigate the following: Implicit indication of additional ID, explicit indication of additional ID, truncated additional ID, logical ID

Whether transmitted as part of the COT sharing information or in every PSSCH/PSSCH in the channel occupancy duration  |
| Apple  | No | There are many issues with the additional ID: * The COT initiating UE does not know the traffic condition of other UEs, since there is no SR or BSR sent to the COT initiating UE.
* The additional ID are overhead in the SCI. But the UEs indicated by the additional ID may or may not transmit using the shared COT. Therefore, the benefit is not clear.
* There can be multiple COT initiating UEs (FDMed transmission). This will result in many UEs to share the COT, increasing collision probability.
* UEs with additional ID transmit with COT sharing might not meet regulation requirement.
 |
| CableLabs | No | No clear use case |
| QC | Yes | To DCM questions: Yes, per our understanding of past agreements and regulationsTo LGE “It is necessary to check whether or how the COT initiator UE will know when the UE associated with the additional ID will have data to the COT initiator UE”: in our view this is not necessary, the initiator UE can open the COT sharing to some other UEs (electing them as potential responders). Those UEs still to pass the ID check for their new transmission (needs to be towards the initiator). It is our understanding that using some bits in SCI to allow (not necessarily guarantee) cross-cast COT sharing is beneficial. On RAN2 engagement, our agreements should not depend on it, besides the responder having data for the initiator, the initiator could open up the shared COT region to more UEs to maximize the COT utilization. |
| Intel | No | While we understand that supporting additional IDs may allow a slightly better utilization of the shared COT, on the other hand this may require a very significant specification impact as this may require additional procedures to allow the initiating UE to properly select the group of UEs with who to share the COT without causing blocking and collisions across UEs.  |
| Vivo |  | Due to large overhead, we prefer not to support the additional ID. COT length is usually short, e.g., few ms. If the additional ID is included in MAC CE, then the COT may be passed after UE decoding the MAC CE. |
| CMCC | Yes with comments | Additional ID can be supported only when the additionally indicated responding UE’s transmission includes the initiating UE. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| JHUAPL | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| NEC  | Yes  |  |
| ETRI | Yes | It should be supported for better COT utilization. |
| Panasonic | Yes | The COT is shared when only a responding UE has transmission to the COT initiating UE. For COT is shared by multiple UEs and multiple cast types, COT initiating UE can inform the destination IDs for multiple links as additional IDs. |
| Sharp | No |  |
| xiaomi | Support  | We add a FFS, so we make the following revision:* Additional ID(s) can be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ FFS the payload size / number of additional ID(s) can be included
	+ FFS the additional ID(s) are L1 ID(s) or layer 2 logical ID(s)
	+ FFS the container for the additional ID(s) (e.g., SCI or MAC CE)
	+ FFS the additional ID(s) is source ID /destination ID
 |
| ZTE | NO | Considering the signaling overhead of additional IDs (s) is significant, it is suggested that additional ID(s) is not supported. If additional ID(s) are supported, the signaling overhead of additional ID should be reduced:- For unicast, additional ID should only include the source ID of the initiating UE- For broadcast/groupcast, the additional ID should only include the destination ID |
| WILUS | No |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | The additional ID(s) are introduced to support COT sharing between UEs with multiple unicast links and different cast types. Specifically, when UE-1 and UE-2 have two unicast links with destination/source ID pairs 1 and 2. UE-1 can initiate a COT by a PSSCH/PSCCH transmission with ID pair 1 and share the COT to UE-2 with ID pair 2, if additional ID(s) cannot be supported, such kind of COT sharing cannot be supported either.To LGE, Apple:COT initiating UE can know the traffic from responding UEs reservations. Illustrated by following figure, UE 2 has reserved the resources in blue boxes and UE 1 knows UE2’s reservation when it initiates a COT. So, UE 1 share the COT to UE2, and UE2 can also know whether this COT is shared to it or not based on the COT sharing information. Thus, the COT is also maintained by UE2 and no waste on SCI fields. As per the resource collusion caused by COT sharing, we think it can be handled by indicating a responding UE properly. For unicast transmission, only one UE is indicated to share a COT and no collision will happen. For groupcast/broadcast, a dedicated UE can be also indicated by the additional ID(s), so no resource collision will happen as well.To Intel:Additional IDs can be source/destination IDs, and the framework to generate them reuses the procedure in Rel-16, no spec impact. Furthermore, how to select an ID pair is up to UE implementation, so no spec impact either. The only specification change is to introduce additional ID(s) and allow such kind of COT sharing. |
| CATT/GH | Comments  | We think it is too early to support carrying additional ID(s) in COT sharing information before the group has a clear understanding of what addition ID really means. |
| MediaTek | No | Considering the additional spec efforts and the issue mentioned by other companies, we do not support to introduce additional ID(s) as part of COT sharing information |
| Transsion | No |  |

**Proposal 5-4 (I):**

* Beside the additional ID(s), at least the following information should be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ CAPC level of the COT initiator UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH transmission
	+ Remaining COT duration (FFS it is an absolute time length in ms or in number of slots)
	+ Applicable RB set(s) for which the indicated COT can be used
	+ Existing / legacy R16/17 L1 source and destination IDs
	+ FFS other(s)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM | OK |  |
| LGE |  | The intention of the applicable RB set(s) seems that the COT initiator UE can partition its frequency resources; one is for its own transmission and the other is for COT sharing with others. In this case, on top of the remaining COT duration, the starting time of the shared COT also needs to be included. Otherwise, within a COT, COT initiator UE’s transmission can be collided with the COT responding UE’s transmission. If it is assumed that once the COT initiator UE shares its COT to another UE, then the COT initiator UE does not use remaining resources within the COT, neither the starting time of the shared COT nor applicable RB set(s) are needed.  |
| InterDigital | OK |  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes, with edits | The part “Beside the additional ID(s),” should be removed from the proposal, as that should be discussed separately. |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | COT sharing information should indicate the starting slot and the number of shared slots as well as the remaining COT duration to enable identification whether a UE has been a recipient in a shared COT before the COT sharing information is transmitted.  |
| Apple | Support | Additional information related Tx power/CCA power used to acquire to COT. Related to EDT discussion in 3.1 |
| CableLabs | No |  |
| QC | Yes with mods. | As pointed by LGE, also in our understanding the start of a shared COT region should be added in COT-SI |
| Intel | OK with comments | As highlighted by Nokia, “Beside the additional ID(s),” should be removed from the proposal. |
| Vivo |  | In NR-U the COT duration and starting offset is used. To reuse NR-U design, starting offset for the COT sharing should be captured in the content. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| JHUAPL | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | OK with comments | We think that is necessary to indicate whether the additional PSFCH occasions are disabled during the COT. Not clear whether a S-SSB transmission is allowed by default as COT sharing, when the S-SSB transmitter is not a destination for COT initiator. If not, this may need indication. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Panasonic | Yes |  |
| Sharp |  | We don’t see the point to include “applicable RB set(s)”. If the intention is as LGE mentioned that the COT initiator partitions its frequency resources, there would be an impact on how the COT initiator’s channel access procedure is performed (e.g. the channel access is NOT based on the RB set(s) of the intended SL transmission?) |
| xiaomi | Comment | “Applicable RB set(s) for which the indicated COT can be used” is not necessary, because the receiver UE can obtain this by decoding the “frequency resource assignment” in the first stage SCI. The applicable RB set(s) shall be the same as the RB set(s) occupied by the PSSCH transmission associated with the SCI. |
| ZTE |  | Excluding RB set, we supports other bullets.It is suggested that the applicable RB set (s) corresponding to shared COT should be consistent with the RB set (s) corresponding to SL resource allocation. By indicating resource allocation, the applicable RB set (s) in COT sharing can be derived. Applicable RB set(s) does not need to be indicated additionally for COT sharing. |
| WILUS | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | General fine with CAPC, remaining COT, L1 ID,For RB set, compared with time-frequency resource, the granularity of RB set is too large, and if only partial resources are shared by COT initiating UE, the specific time-frequency resource locations need to be indicated. |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| MediaTek | No | We think it will be too early to discuss on the content of signalling. It should be deprioritized until we have more progress on how responding device uses the shared COT and how to achieve availability of COT and FDM transmission once it is shared to the responding UE. |
| Transsion | Yes |  |

**Proposal 5-5 (I):**

* The container for carrying the COT sharing information from a COT initiator UE includes at least the SCI.
	+ FFS 1st and/or 2nd stage SCI
	+ FFS whether MAC CE can be additionally used (e.g., to carry additional ID(s))

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support | 1st **and** 2nd stage SCI |
| DCM | OK |  |
| LGE | Yes | One clarification on the 2nd FFS. Only the data destination UE will try to decode PSSCH, and then the MAC CE is applicable to only the data destination UE. Then, how it work when the MAC CE is used to carry the additional ID(s).  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | OK | Remove the last FFS. It makes no sense to share a COT with signalling in MAC CE. |
| Lenovo | Yes | Support 1st or 2nd Stage SCI2nd FFS can be removed and can be discussed separately.  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| CableLabs | Yes with comments | Remove the last FFS |
| QC | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | 1st stage SCI is preferred. |
| Vivo | Yes | SCI is preferred |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| JHUAPL | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | OK |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes  | The COT sharing information should be with a dedicated SCI. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Panasonic | Yes |  |
| Sharp | OK | Remove the last FFS. |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | It is suggested that COT sharing information should be indicated in 1st and/or 2nd stage SCI.If the additional ID (s) is included in the MAC CE, considering the more latency of obtaining the COT sharing information, it means that there is little or even no remaining shared COT. |
| WILUS | Yes | We support this proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| CATT/GH | Support | Ok with remove the 2nd FFS. |
| MediaTek | OK |  |
| Transsion | Yes |  |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 2 discussion

FL summary of Round 1 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 5-1 (I), UE forwarding / relaying a COT shared by another UE, a summary of preferences is provided as followed.
	+ Yes (29): OPPO, DCM, LGE, IDC, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Lenovo, Apple, CableLabs, QC, vivo, CMCC, Sony, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, Samsung, ETRI, Panasonic, Sharp, xiaomi, ZTE, WILUS, Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT/GOHIGH, MediaTek, Transsion
	+ No (2): Intel, NEC
	+ FL: This is the second time we have discussed this issue in this WI. It is observed the situation has not changed. The result is clear. FL will put this up for email endorsement over the reflector, with further clarification such that it can be captured in the spec.
* On Proposal 5-2 (I), a summary of preferences is provided as followed.
	+ Support (20): OPPO, DCM/Samsung/Panasonic (subject to regulation), IDC, Lenovo, QC, Sony, Spreadtrum, JHUAPL, FW, NEC, ETRI, xiaomi, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT/GOHIGH, MediaTek
	+ Not support (11): LGE, Nokia/NSB, Apple, CableLabs, Intel, vivo, CMCC, Sharp, WILUS, Transsion
	+ FL: Based on some comments, the regulation allows such behavior for control signalling. Given that there is a strong preference to support this COT sharing behavior for PSFCH and the negative impact to system performance and COT initiator UE continue to access the channel, the benefits seem to outweigh NR-U behavior, FL recommends ‘non-supporting’ companies to reconsider this proposal. If there is a constructive compromise can be formulated, please feel free to suggest. For now, I kept the proposal unchanged and invite compromise proposals.
* On Proposal 5-3 (I) for supporting additional ID(s) in the COT sharing information, a summary of preferences is provided as followed.
	+ Support (16): OPPO, IDC, Lenovo, QC, CMCC Sony, Spreadtrum, JHUAPL, Samsung, NEC, ETRI, Panasonic, xiaomi, Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE (restricted IDs)
	+ Not support (13): LGE, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Apple, CableLabs, Intel, vivo, Sharp, ZTE, WILUS, MediaTek, Transsion
	+ FFS: CATT/GOHIGH
	+ FL:
		- To answer DCM’s question, yes it is allowed, because responding UE’s transmission is still intended for the COT initiating UE.
		- To answer comments/questions related to knowing when the UE associated with the additional ID will have data to the COT initiator UE, this is also unknown for the case when a responding UE is a target receiver UE of initiator UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH transmissions. In a unicast between UE1 and UE2, when UE1 initiates a COT and share it with UE2, UE1 does not know whether/when UE2 will have data to UE1. In this case, the COT sharing information in SCI may be wasted. If additional ID(s) are included, there is higher chance / probability that the shared COT will be used by others associated with additional ID(s). This actually improves the situation.
		- The responding UE’s transmission that corresponds/matches to the additional ID(s) always targets the COT initiator UE, as per last meeting agreements. So, there is no regulation issue.
		- For Lenovo’s source and destination IDs are transmitted in every slot, this is already possible without additional agreement.
		- For comment related to other UE’s traffic condition, the same situation also exist for COT sharing based on existing source / destination IDs.
		- For comment related to sharing a COT to more UEs will cause more collision, we have not agreed (or even discuss) that SL resource selection should take into account of an available shared COT. SL resource (re-)selection is based on either gNB scheduling in mode 1 (no collision) or sensing/reservation mechanism with re-evaluation and pre-emption checking in mode 2 (collision is minimized). By COT sharing, it will not increase collision probability.
		- There is no clear majority at this stage. Hopefully, the above explanations / clarification together with comments from QC and Huawei are sufficient to resolve some concerns. Let’s continue this discussion in the next round. I have not changed the proposal. Please note, ZTE’s proposed simplification could be one way to move forward.
* On Proposal 5-4 (I) for the contents of COT sharing information, a summary of preferences is provided as followed.
	+ Support (26): OPPO, DCM, LGE/Sharp/QC/xiaomi/ZTE/Huawei/HiSilicon (no RB sets), Apple, Nokia/NSB/Intel (remove besides additional ID), CMCC, Sony, Spreadtrum, JHUAPL, Futurewei, Samsung, NEC, ETRI, Panasonic, WILUS, CATT/GOHIGH, Transsion
	+ Not support (2): Ericsson, CableLabs
	+ Postponed: MediaTek
	+ FL:
		- First of all, this topic/issue should not further postpone. We have had COT sharing discussions for quite long time. It is now towards the end of the WI. Even after we agree on these details, there is still a lot of work remaining for SCI-1 and SCI-2 design for SL-U. If we don’t move forward now, there is a serious risk of not completing the SCI design to finish the WI by August (4 months away).
		- Starting offset in NR-U is for gNB scheduling/indicating a UE. In SL, since resource allocation is determined by the UE itself, and there is no concept of one UE schedules another UE, the remaining COT duration would be sufficient.
		- In the updated proposal, I have removed “besides additional ID” and “applicable RB sets” according to multiple company comments. For all other suggestions by just one company, we can further study those.
* On Proposal 5-5 (I) for the container to carry COT sharing information, all companies are fine to go with 1st and/or 2nd stage SCI and many prefer to remove the second FFS. The proposal is now updated accordingly. Since no other point is raised, I will put up the updated proposal for email endorsement over the reflector.

**Proposal 5-1 (I):**

* UE forwarding/relaying information relating to a COT initiated by another UE is not supported in Rel-18. That is, only a COT initiating UE can transmit COT sharing information for its own initiated COT.

**Proposal 5-2 (I):**

* A responding UE’s PSFCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted to UEs other than the COT initiator without requiring that at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments (including compromise proposal)** |
| DCM | Support | Given companies comment that this is allowed in regulation. |
| LGE | No | In the current formulation of this proposal is exactly trying to support double-COT sharing which is abandoned in NR-U discussion. Instead, we suggest the followings considering NR-U behaviour and principles:A responding UE’s PSFCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted to UEs other than the COT initiator without requiring that at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator only if the responding UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH transmission within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT is transmitted to the COT initiator in the same NR SL slot. |
| CMCC | Support |  |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| Vivo | No | We check the NRU agreement for COT sharing of control signalling (the spec. has been cited by LGE in Round 1). It is clear that at least the destination of the control signalling should contain the initiator. NRU Agreement: Sharing of a UE-initiated channel occupancy (either CG-PUSCH or scheduled UL) with gNB is supported, such that the gNB is allowed to transmit control/broadcast signals/channels for any UEs as long as the transmission contains transmissions for the UE that initiated the channel occupancy and/or DL signals/channels (PDSCH, PDCCH, reference signals) meant for the UE that initiated the channel occupancy. |
| InterDigital | Support | We understand the NR-U limitation but as FL mentioned the benefits outweigh the NR U behaviour.  |
| Lenovo | Yes | We think this is the reasonable way to support periodically configured PSFCH occasions as legacy. |
| Apple | No | Agree with LGE’s comment.  |
| Intel | No | Actually, we do not agree that there would be such benefits with this behaviour since limiting transmission of PSFCH to other UEs only when the responding device transmit back to the initiator device would limit the transmissions/overlapping and collisions with other UEs compared to transmissions from the responding device, which is the intended user of the COT would be prioritized over re-transmissions or PSFCH transmissions from other device. In principle, this would lead to what LGE is arguing and that this would eventually allow to support multiple COTs. In this sense, we agree and support LG’s modified proposal. |
| Fraunhofer | Support |  |
| JHUAPL  | Support |  |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| QC | Yes | It is critical to allow more PSFCHs in shared COT. The net benefit is huge, the impact on other SL-U UEs is negligible (in terms of interference across PSFCHs), also the impact on other RATs is negligible (only 2 symbols transmission). Besides that, ETSI regulation allows this behavior if the initiator UE “grants” to the responder that the COT can be shared for this transmission (Note that we already agreed that a UE needs to be target of COT-SI to identify itself as an eligible responding UE):[ETSI EN 301893][4.2.7.3.2.6]The *Channel Access Engine* may grant an authorization to transmit on the current *Operating Channel* toone or more *Responding Devices*. If the *Initiating Device* issues such a transmission grant to a*Responding Device*, the *Responding Device* shall operate according to the procedure described inclause 4.2.7.3.2.7.[4.2.7.3.2.7]Clause 4.2.7.3.2.6, step 6) b) describes the possibility whereby an *Initiating Device* grants an authorization to one ormore associated *Responding Devices* to transmit on the current *Operating Channel.* A *Responding Device* that receivessuch a grant shall follow the procedure described in step 1) to step 3):We ask if this is acceptable to companies based on ETSI regulations, and the critical benefits for PSFCH.@ VIVO, LGE: even if in NR-U the transmission of control to other UEs than the initiator was prevented if the initiator cannot make use of it, in SL-U we have the need of better supporting PSFCH transmissions. This is not against regulations (see above) in our opinion (the responder UE is anyway indicated that can share the COT from the initiator UE, similar to a scheduling). @ LGE: In our view, this cannot be considered a double COT sharing, COT sharing happens one time between initiator and responder. We are discussing only what response can be allowed from the one responder.@ LGE: on your modification in RED, if a UE is responding with PSFCH as a first (maybe the only) transmission in the shared region, we wander how could it transmit PSSCH in the same slot, since the PSFCH occasion comes after. |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| Panasonic | Yes |  |
| Samsung | OK | We prefer adding the condition of at least one of PSFCH TX is intended for the COT initiator. However, if majority considers the condition is unnecessary, and responding UE transmitting PSFCH to other UEs is a feasible solution that allowed by regulation, we are OK to follow majority. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| Transsion | Support  | We can support it for the sake of the progress. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | We are fine with principle to move forward, but we are wondering how to share the COT to the UE with PSFCH transmissions? Based on the regulation, a grant should be received from COT initiating device, then responding UE can share the COT, so we suggest to add an FFS to further clarify what grant should be received from COT initiating UE, for example, additional IDs in PSSCH/PSCCH COT sharing.**Proposal 5-2 (I):** * A responding UE’s PSFCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted to UEs other than the COT initiator without requiring that at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator.
	+ FFS: what grant is received from COT initiating UE, e.g. additional ID.
 |
| Sharp | No | Agree with LGE. |

**Proposal 5-3 (I):**

* Additional ID(s) can be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ FFS the payload size / number of additional ID(s) can be included
	+ FFS the additional ID(s) are L1 ID(s) or layer 2 logical ID(s)
	+ FFS the container for the additional ID(s) (e.g., SCI or MAC CE)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments (including compromise proposal)** |
| DCM | Question | I saw FL’s reply: ‘yes it is allowed, because responding UE’s transmission is still intended for the COT initiating UE’But my previous question is that even when a UE is not an intended UE (i.e., not a destination UE) for the COT initiating UE’s TX, whether the UE can be a responding UE or not. Not related to transmission target of a responding UE. In our original understanding is that only a destination UE of the COT initiating UE’s TX can be a responding UE in regulation. If any other UE is allowed to be a responding UE in regulation, we are fine with the direction, while why we had so much discussion on which UE can be a responding UE so far… |
| LGE | Postpone | As mentioned before, depending on the RAN2’s discussion on whether TX UE provide data to be transmitted to the RX UE, the necessity of the additional ID could be discussed.  |
| CMCC |  | We think DCM’s question should be clarified first.We are also wondering the agreements in last meeting below means the responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) is mandatorily intended for the COT initiating UE? We are not sure about this.**Agreement**A responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT is intended for the COT initiating UE when,**…** |
| ZTE | Comment | Considering the overhead and concerns in 1st round discussion, we prefer not to have additional ID(s). If additional ID(s) are to be supported, the signalling overhead of additional ID should be reduced as below:- For unicast, additional ID should only include the source ID of the initiating UE- For broadcast/groupcast, the additional ID should only include the destination ID |
| vivo | No | If we ensure all the COT sharing cases between two nodes, the initiator would convey a list of IDs (e.g., multiple unicast ID, multiple group ID/broadcast ID), the overhead would be extremely large. If we only ensure a few cases for the COT sharing, we have done it based on existing agreements, any other optimization is not preferred considering almost half of the companies are against this optimization. |
| InterDIgital | Support |  |
| MediaTek | No | We share the same concern with others. Introducing additional ID is not necessary if we only consider the mandatory COT sharing case which is in the agreement. It’s not essential at this stage to spend the effort on designing extra COT sharing schemes. |
| Lenovo | Yes, with addition | We think additional IDs need to cover SLSS ID (plus Iic) for S-SSB transmissions, and would like to confirm that this is in scope of the proposal; otherwise, the second FFS should ne expanded to mention SLSS ID + Iic explicitly.We leverage source id and destination id transmitted in every slot to provide additional IDs, the additional IDs are only providing extra information about the COT initiator to the COT recipient. Since the COT initiator is transmitting in every slot, hence the source ID and destination id transmitted in every slot can be leveraged, no need to transmit those IDs again as additional IDs. Hence one bit in the SCI can be included in every slot to inform the COT recipient whether the source ID and destination ID transmitted in that slot can be provided to the COT recipient.  |
| Apple | No | Larger overhead with non-clear benefit.  |
| Intel | No | Unfortunately, we are not convinced that no further enhancements would be needed to properly allow an efficient share of the COT when additional IDs are indicated. As we argued in the first round, the proper selection of these IDs is primordial to make sure no further collisions would occur across responding UEs, and efficient use of the shared COT would be ultimately achieved. As the initiating device 1. won’t know the buffer occupancy of such UEs or the resources in which they may intend to transmit,
2. Won’t know the location of such UEs, and in fact won’t know whether they may actually receive the COT sharing information and in reality make use of the COT,

we do not think such selection can be left up to implementation, and eventually some assisted procedure would be needed.Also, we agree with Apple’s comment that the overhead deriving from such indication may not be negligible and this may highly impact coverage. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |
| JHUAPL | Support |  |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| QC | Yes | @ DCM, CMCC: in our RAN1 #112 agreement we already identified that a UE is a responder when is targeted by IDs (in general target of COT-SI) and not necessarily destination of the actual payload. That is where the additional IDs come handy, so that some UEs can be target of COT-SI w.o. the need of being target of the payload.@ LGE: RAN2 is not involved in this, the initiator UE does not need to have BSR information. Opening up the shared region to more potential responders with adding IDs in COT-SI, is in the interest of the initiator to make the most out of the shared region. If this is not possible the other UEs have to do Type 1 anyway, so we do not see how the medium utilization is better if additional IDs are not supported. It should be considered also that we already have in place an agreement to check if the PSSCH response from an eligible responder UE can be transmitted (second ID checking at the responder side).@ ZTE: we are not sure if we can support what you propose for the sake of “overhead reduction”. It seems to us that a single source ID cannot identify a unicast link (or a UE in general). Actually, (physical) UEs are not identified by logical IDs in general, but only logical connections are.@ VIVO: we do not see the need of a long list, but having a field to at least enable cross-cast COT sharing would be useful. Btw, according to RAN1 #112 agreement on allowed responder UE’s transmissions, cross-cast COT sharing would be supported only if additional IDs are.@ Lenovo: in our understanding the S-SSB case is not captured, and currently not the scope. We are open to discuss it, and we could add an FFS.@ Intel: in our understanding even if in theory more collisions could take place, we have the following considerations for two UEs to potentially collide in a shared COT region (it is not trivial at all that this occurs): a) they have selected the same starting slot, b) they have data for PSSCH towards the initiator, c) they have not transmitted SCI-1 reservation (if any of the two UEs have, then re-evaluation and preemption will take care of collisions). For these three conditions to be verified concurrently is non trivial, so we don’t think it is a major concern.@ Intel: as also HW has mentioned, on the “why an initiator should signal open COT sharing to more UEs”, the initiator may have detected reservations from different UEs, that impact different parts of the COT, so the initiator may have already some supporting information (in existing reservations) to share the COT with those UEs even if BSR-like messages are not supported in SL-U. This would increase the likelihood that at least some UE makes some use of the shared region. |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| Panasonic | Yes | The COT initiating UE can monitor SCI from other UEs in sensing duration and decide candidates of additional IDs within COT. The different cast types could share the COT by additional IDs. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CATT/GH | Postpone | As mentioned in the last round, we think it is too early to support carrying additional ID(s) in COT sharing information before the group has a clear understanding of what addition ID really means. |
| Transsion | Support |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| xiaomi | Yes | We think additional ID shall be supported to improving the efficiency of COT sharing. To obey the regulation that responding UE’s transmission is intended for the COT initiating UE, whether the addition ID includes the source ID /destination ID for different cast types needs be discussed.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | The additional ID(s) are introduced to support COT sharing between UEs with multiple unicast links and different cast types. For unicast, the pair ID may be different if there are multiple unicast links between two UEs, and the additional IDs can be used to indicate the specific unicast link.For groupcast, the additional ID is at least to indicate the specific UE within the group that can use the shared resource.On the concerns of payload size of additional IDs, it can be next step for discussion, companies can provide solutions to shorten the size, such as the number of COT sharing UE, from our understanding, the number would not be too large.  |
| Sharp | No | Not convinced by explanation on overhead (e.g. if it is assumed that such indication is “implicit”, we would have a same question as DCM on clarification of definition of “responding UE”). Also not convinced by explanation on collision (e.g. it is true that re-evaluation/pre-emption can be used to \*resolve\* collision but it also means collision was already there and a UE has to re-select to other resources probably not in the shared COT, wasting the previous effort by the UE to use the shared COT). |

**Proposal 5-4 (II):**

* ~~Beside the additional ID(s),~~ At least the following information should be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ CAPC level of the COT initiator UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH transmission
	+ Remaining COT duration (FFS it is an absolute time length in ms or in number of slots)
	+ ~~Applicable RB set(s) for which the indicated COT can be used~~
	+ Existing / legacy R16/17 L1 source and destination IDs
	+ FFS other(s)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments (including compromise proposal)** |
| DCM | OK |  |
| LGE | OK | We can discuss further the necessity of the applicable RB set(s) and starting offset together. Regarding the starting offset, in NR-U, it is part of CG-UCI, so, it is selected by the COT initiating UE, but not gNB. In addition, like SL mode 2 UE, resource allocation is determined by the gNB itself.  |
| CMCC | OK |  |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| vivo | See comment | [FL] Starting offset in NR-U is for gNB scheduling/indicating a UE. In SL, since resource allocation is determined by the UE itself, and there is no concept of one UE schedules another UE, the remaining COT duration would be sufficient.[vivo] regarding the start offset, we has different view as FL. In NR-U UE can indicate the COT starting offset to gNB as well, this has nothing to do with gNB scheduling. In our opinion, the initiator may perform its own transmission at the beginning of the COT, it needs to share COT to others after its own transmission, so starting offset is necessary besides the remaining COT duration. |
| InterDIgital | OK |  |
| MediaTek | OK | We can compromise to make progress. However, we still think it will be more efficient to discuss on the content of signalling once we make the responding UE’s behaviour using shared COT clear.  |
| Lenovo | See comments | We think COT sharing information should indicate the shared resources by jointly indicating starting slot and the number of shared slots.Only remaining COT duration can’t indicate which slots in remaining COT are shared. |
| Apple | OK | Response to Lenovo: CAPC indicate mCOT as well, starting position can be derived by mCOT – remaining slots.  |
| Intel | OK |  |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | The modifications seem ok. What is the benefit of including the CAPC class since the remaining COT duration is included? |
| JHUAPL | Yes |  |
| NEC  | Yes  |  |
| QC | Ok, with modifications | UE-to-UE COT sharing has no scheduling, so the responder should have an indication of where the start of the shared region is. We cannot just assume that is from the slot after the COT-SI is transmitted. This was already supported in NR-U UL-to-DL COT sharing (where the UE does not schedule the gNB, but can indicate the offset of the start of the shared region).In our view we need to support also the offset to the start of the shared region (related to a given COT-SI).In this way it would be possible to provide COT-SI early enough (potentially repeat the indication) so that the responder UE can be ready when the shared region starts (and potentially closely follow with a tight gap and a Type2B or 2C access).Additionally different COT-Sis (each one on a different PSCCH/PSSCH) could indicate different sharable regions, potentially to different UEs, use the shared region even more efficiently**Proposal 5-4’ (II):** * ~~Beside the additional ID(s),~~ At least the following information should be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ CAPC level of the COT initiator UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH transmission
	+ Remaining COT duration (FFS it is an absolute time length in ms or in number of slots)
	+ Offset to the start of the shared region
	+ ~~Applicable RB set(s) for which the indicated COT can be used~~
	+ Existing / legacy R16/17 L1 source and destination IDs
	+ FFS Applicable RB set(s) for which the indicated COT can be used
	+ FFS other(s)
 |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| Panasonic | OK |  |
| Samsung | No | We don’t think applicable RB set(s) should to be removed, otherwise it’s unclear how could UE transmit if no frequency domain resource of shared COT is indicated. We are not sure if people’s intention is that applicable RB set(s) are the RB set(s) in which COT sharing information being received, if so, we think this should be clearly captured in the proposal, otherwise people may have different understanding on how to perform it (e.g. follow RB set(s) of PSCCH and/or PSSCH? 1st/2nd stage SCI?). If not, then the removed sub-bullet should be kept in the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support |  |
| CATT/GH | Yes with comments | We suggest putting the third sub-bullet back.Regarding the intention of applicable RB set(s), we have different views with the opponent. Instead of partitioning the frequency resources, the intention should be indicating the index of LBT sub-bands where Type 1 channel access is performed. If there is still concern of this information, putting a FFS in the front of the third sub-bullet is also acceptable for us. |
| Transsion | OK |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Comments | Beside existing information, we think time-frequency resource location is needed, whether it is indicated explicitly and implicitly. Otherwise, how the shared UE can determine which resources can be used? So, suggest to have following modification in green font.**Proposal 5-4 (II):** * ~~Beside the additional ID(s),~~ At least the following information should be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ CAPC level of the COT initiator UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH transmission
	+ Remaining COT duration (FFS it is an absolute time length in ms or in number of slots)
	+ ~~Applicable RB set(s) for which the indicated COT can be used~~
	+ Time-frequency location of shared resource
	+ Existing / legacy R16/17 L1 source and destination IDs
	+ FFS other(s)
 |
| Sharp | OK |  |

**Proposal 5-5 (II):**

* The container for carrying the COT sharing information from a COT initiator UE includes at least the SCI.
	+ FFS 1st and/or 2nd stage SCI

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 3 discussion

FL summary of Round 2 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 5-2 (I), it seems like LGE’s suggestion is acceptable to those who opposed to this proposal earlier. Although it is much more restrictive, I will try if this is acceptable to everyone.
	+ @HW, in the last meeting we have an agreement who can be a responding UE (i.e., data receiving UE from the COT initiator) and FFS on the additional ID(s). I don’t think we need to add the FFS on additional ID(s) here again.
	+ After receiving comments on the RAN1 reflector, version (II) is updated in version (III). Please comment directly on version (III) below.
	+ One thing came to mind (worth considering) is a PSSCH transmission from a COT initiator could be received in one RB set but the corresponding PSFCH resource could be located in a different RB set (depending on PSFCH resource configuration) for which the PSFCH responding UE does not receive a shared COT information from the initiator, but it received another COT from a different COT initiator’s transmission for the PSFCH RB set. For example, UE1 (initiator 1) transmit PSSCH to UE2 in RB set 1 and shared its COT for RB set 1. The corresponding/associated PSFCH resource is located in RB set 2, for which UE2 received a COT from another initiator UE3. It would be beneficial for the responding UE2 to transmit PSFCH in RB set 2 using the shared COT from the initiator UE3.
* On Proposal 5-3 (I), please check detailed response comments from QC and HW. They provided answers to many questions/concerns raised.
	+ FL: one thing I would like to add is currently mode 2 resource selection / allocation in both L1 and MAC layer does not take into account of COT sharing information. This means, when an initiator UE shares its COT (with limited duration e.g., 3ms) to a data receiver UE (responder), if the responder has no reserved or selected resource within the remaining COT duration, the COT is not utilized (wasted). This could happen quite often and the benefits from COT sharing in SL-U are not utilized. Hence, the additional ID(s) would open up the COT shared regions to more UEs, as long as the responding PSCCH/PSSCH transmission targets the COT initiator UE.
	+ To reduce the concern on the payload size, let me propose to include only 2 additional ID(s). E.g., they can be used for one source/destination ID-pair for a unicast session, or two destination IDs for groupcast/broadcast use.
	+ After receiving comments on the RAN1 reflector, version (II) is updated in version (III). Please comment directly on version (III) below.
* On Proposal 5-4 (II), the following parameters are raised during the 2nd round discussion. My thinking towards these parameters is as followed.
	+ Applicable RB set(s) – frequency domain parameter: There were suggestions during round 1 discussion that applicable RB set(s) are the RB set(s) in which COT sharing information is received. This is an implicit indication mechanism and I think this is a reasonable to avoid defining a field in the SCI. Since there are still questions raised on the need of an explicit indication, let’s further study this.
	+ Starting offset/slot – time domain parameter: In addition to the remaining COT duration parameter, this is a second time domain parameter if it is included as part of COT-SI. According to vivo, the initiator may perform its own transmission at the beginning of the COT, it needs to share COT to others after its own transmission. My thinking is, there can be two scenarios and both of which do not really require a starting offset. But we can further discuss the necessity of this parameter.
		- 1) if the initiator intends for a responder to share the COT only after its own transmission(s), then the initiator could share the COT at a certain processing time gap before the responder’s transmission. We can further study how long should the processing time to decoding COT-SI (e.g., if COT-SI is transmitted in slot n, the earliest time for a responder to utilize the COT is at slot n+1 or n+2).
		- 2) the initiator shares its COT at the beginning of the COT, it is up to the responder to decide when to start using the COT, since the responder selects resources on its own according to mode 2 RA and the initiator cannot schedule SL transmission to the responder. There can be a case of concurrent transmission between the initiator and the responder.

@Qualcomm, the indication of a sharable region is also not quite clear to me, since SL transmissions can be FDM’ed. Once the initiator is ready to share its own, the COT-SI can be transmitted at a time taking into account of the responder processing time of COT-SI. If the initiator wishes to send early and repeats the COT-SI, SL transmissions can be performed concurrently. Different shared regions for different UEs, since a SL UE cannot schedule another SL UE and mode 2 UE selects its own resources without considering COT-SI, it is unclear is there a benefit of scheduling shared regions to different UEs.

* + Number of shared slots – time domain parameter: in my understanding this parameter may not be needed (on top of the remaining COT duration). If the initiator transmits COT-SI, it means the COT (the remaining portion) is ready to be used by the responder for the remaining duration, otherwise the initiator does not need to provide COT-SI. Once the responder UE obtains COT-SI, it should be able to use the COT for the remaining duration. It is not yet clear whether this parameter is necessary, but we can list this for further study.
	+ @Fraunhofer, we already have an agreement that a responder’s CAPC value needs to be equal or smaller than the CAPC value indicated in the COT sharing information. So, we have agreed this field needs to be included.
	+ Time-frequency location of shared resource: I assume this is related to the above additional frequency and time domain parameters. And we should further study those.
	+ Considering the above, an updated proposal is listed below.

**Proposal 5-2 (II):**

* A responding UE’s PSFCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted to UEs other than the COT initiator without requiring that at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator only if the responding UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH transmission within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT is transmitted to the COT initiator in the same NR SL slot.

**Proposal 5-2 (III):**

* When receiving a grant/indication to use a PSFCH occasion in a shared COT, a responding UE’s PSFCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted to UEs other than the COT initiator without requiring that at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator.
	+ FFS: details on the grant/indication to use a PSFCH occasion in a shared COT

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| QC | Yes | The new version is a good compromise according to ETSI regulation and the concerns about SL-U system performance. |
| LGE | No | It seems like to follow that gNB indicate Type 2 channel access for PUCCH transmission. However, the situation itself is quite different. To be specific, in case of NR-U, for DL-to-UL COT sharing, PUCCH only targets gNB who is the COT initiator. However, in SL-U, even though such indication is introduce, the fairness issue is not resolved. From our side, these transmissions are on the shared spectrum, and all the RAT should not be selfish. We should follow the spirit of sacrifice of gNB. To be specific, for UL-to-DL COT sharing, gNB does not control to UE other than COT initiator if the gNB does not have transmission to the COT initiator UE in TDM or FDM manner. Considering fairness, like NR-U, performing SL transmission, UE can utilize the shared COT only if it has SL transmission to the COT initiator UE whatever in FDMed manner or TDMed manner (if the TX to the COT initiator is not dropped). In that point of view, we are fine with Proposal 5-2 (II), but not Proposal 5-2(III).  |
| CATT/GH | Comments | We think it is really unclear what “a grant/indication to use a PSFCH occasion in a shared COT” means. It should be clarified before we agree this proposal instead of just saying FFS details.We prefer Proposal 5-2(I) to give more chance for PSFCH transmissions to access the channel. Proposal 5-2(II) is too restrictive. |
| Intel | Yes | We have same comment as CATT/GH regarding what “a grand/indication” may be. Could for instance this be implicit and based on a logic (e.g. based on whether that UE has already performed a transmission to the initiating device)? |
| vivo |  | Since PSSCH COT sharing has followed NR-U principle based on WID guidance, we still prefer to use NR-U COT sharing principle for PSFCH. However, considering the progress, we can compromise to support one configurable behavior, or the proposal 5-2(II)* when (pre-)configured, a responding UE’s PSFCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted to UEs other than the COT initiator without requiring that at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator.
	+ ~~FFS: details on the grant/indication to use a PSFCH occasion in a shared COT~~
	+ Otherwise, a responding UE’s PSFCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted to UEs other than the COT initiator ~~without~~ requiring that at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator.
 |
| OPPO | Support | Agree with QC |
| Futurewei | OK |  |

**Proposal 5-3 (II):**

* Up to 2 additional ID(s) can be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ ~~FFS the payload size / number of additional ID(s) can be included~~
	+ A source/destination ID-pair for a unicast or two destination IDs for groupcast/broadcast.
	+ FFS the additional ID(s) are L1 ID(s) or layer 2 logical ID(s)
	+ FFS the container for the additional ID(s) (e.g., SCI or MAC CE)

**Proposal 5-3 (III):**

* ~~Up to 2~~ Additional ID(s) can be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE to support COT sharing across sessions and across cast types.
	+ ~~FFS the payload size / number of additional ID(s) can be included~~
	+ ~~A source/destination ID-pair for a unicast or two destination IDs for groupcast/broadcast.~~
	+ FFS details on additional IDs, e.g., the number and the nature of additional IDs
	+ FFS the additional ID(s) are L1 ID(s) or layer 2 logical ID(s)
	+ FFS the container for the additional ID(s) (e.g., SCI or MAC CE)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| QC | Yes |  |
| LGE | Decide later | In the previous round, I’d like to clarify my intention. If RAN2 decide that TX UE can report BSR-like information to the RX UE for a given unicast link, but not other links, we do not need to think about the additional ID. On the other hand, if RAN2 decide that TX UE can report BSR-like information of another links to the RX UE via unicast link, it would be straightforward to introduce the additional ID.Without this information, I worried about that UE just use so many bits to indicate additional ID(s) unnecessarily. Regarding the proposal itself, I have some clarification questions. First, it seems that the cast type indicator also needs to be included as part of additional ID(s), is it correct? For the container, when the additional ID is contained in MAC CE, is it common understanding that it will be allowed that the non-destination of data transmission should try to decode a TB?  |
| CATT/GH | OK with comments | We suggest adding a “or” in the main bullet to leave more space for further discussion.**Proposal 5-3 (III’):** * ~~Up to 2~~ Additional ID(s) can be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE to support COT sharing across sessions and/or across cast types.
 |
| Intel | No | Unfortunately, we are still not convinced about this enhancement, which in our view it is still an optimization and not an essential component. Also as we have been arguing since the first round, the proper selection of these IDs is primordial to make sure no further collisions would occur across responding UEs, and efficient use of the shared COT would be ultimately achieved. As the initiating device 1. won’t know the buffer occupancy of such UEs or the resources in which they may intend to transmit,
2. Won’t know the location of such UEs, and in fact won’t know whether they may actually receive the COT sharing information and in reality make use of the COT,

we do not think such selection can be left up to implementation, and eventually some assisted procedure would be needed. Furthermore, the overhead deriving from such indication, even if only a constrained number of IDs are carried, may not be negligible and this may severely impact coverage. |
| vivo | Compromise with comment | 1.Regarding cross unicast session COT sharing, if supported, we think the agreement from last meeting should be modified (we are not sure whether there is copy-paste mistake or not for following RAN1 112 agreement). Responder UE can use any unicast source ID to transmit to initiator if the PSSCH’s destination ID is matched with initiator’s source ID or additional ID (assuming additional ID is one of the initiator’s source ID) **112 Agreement**A responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT is intended for the COT initiating UE when,* In the case of unicast from the responding UE, when the ~~source and~~ destination IDs contained in the responding UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH match to the ~~destination and~~ source IDs from a COT initiator’s unicast transmission that included COT sharing information, or match to the additional ID(s) included in the COT sharing information

2.The additional ID is derived from unicast source ID of initiator, groupcast destination ID of initiator or broadcast destination ID of initiator. We do not think destination ID of initiator can be additional ID3. Since many companies have concern on the overhead and non-efficient use of additional ID, we suggest to support a possibility to include 0 additional ID in COT sharing information.To support COT sharing across sessions and across cast types COT sharing* Additional ID(s) can be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ The additional ID is derived from unicast source ID of initiator, groupcast destination ID of initiator or broadcast destination ID of initiator
	+ FFS number of additional ID in the COT sharing information, note that RAN1 supports a case to include 0 additional ID in the COT sharing information.
	+ …
* The agreement from RAN1#112 meeting is modified as following

**112 Agreement**A responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT is intended for the COT initiating UE when,In the case of unicast from the responding UE, when the ~~source and~~ destination IDs contained in the responding UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH match to the ~~destination and~~ source IDs from a COT initiator’s unicast transmission that included COT sharing information, or match to the additional ID(s) included in the COT sharing information |
| OPPO | Support | @LGE/Intel, for unicast links, besides BSR-like information, the usefulness of using additional ID(s) includes the case when the initiator UE detects transmission/reservation for another/different unicast link that it is also involved with. This can be also extended to groupcast and broadcast connection / service that the initiator is also involved with. |
| Futurewei | OK |  |

**Proposal 5-4 (II):**

* ~~Beside the additional ID(s),~~ At least the following information should be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ CAPC level of the COT initiator UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH transmission
	+ Remaining COT duration (FFS it is an absolute time length in ms or in number of slots)
	+ ~~Applicable RB set(s) for which the indicated COT can be used~~
	+ Existing / legacy R16/17 L1 source and destination IDs
	+ FFS applicable RB set(s), starting offset/slot, number of shared slots, and any other(s) including their usage, necessity and whether they can be derived implicitly to reduce payload.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| QC | Fine, with edits | If there is still some degree of mismatch opinion across companies on the time domain parameters in COT-SI, we could go for a more general bullet, and keep the refinement of time domain indications as FFS. **See edits below**.@ FL’s reply to our comment on COT shared regions and their indication (potentially different COT-Ss transmissions over different PSSCHs in the initiator’s TX burst in its own COT), it might be beneficial for the initiator UE to repeat the COT-SI over different slots, in that case parameters for time domain shared region existence may need to be updated (according to relative index) in each Cot-SI transmission. In this regard sending COT-SI only one time (and therefore rely that the receiver UE can understand the start of the shared region according to processing time) is unreliable for both the receiver acquiring this information, and the UE understanding when the shareable part begins. We remark that in UL-to-DL sharing, the UE provides in CG-UCI the offset of the shareable region part, and the duration of that shareable region to the gNB (and potentially update these indexes across different slots where CG-UCI can be repeated). This design should still be on the table while we agree that an indication of the existence of the shared COT in time domain has to be part of COT-SI. Companies can still think on which time indication is more suitable:* DL-to-UL sharing type of time domain indication (just the remaining COT duration is indicated, which relies on the scheduling that the gNB has sent to the UE)
* UL-to-DL sharing type of time domain indication (index of start and duration of an indicated shared region as in CG-UCI)

**(Suggested modification) Proposal 5-4’ (II):** * ~~Beside the additional ID(s),~~ At least the following information should be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ CAPC level of the COT initiator UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH transmission
	+ ~~Remaining COT duration (FFS it is an absolute time length in ms or in number of slots)~~
	+ Time domain parameters of the shared COT
		- FFS: starting offset, number of slot, remaining COT duration, or a combination of them
	+ ~~Applicable RB set(s) for which the indicated COT can be used~~
	+ Existing / legacy R16/17 L1 source and destination IDs
	+ FFS applicable RB set(s), ~~starting offset/slot, number of shared slots,~~ and any other(s) including their usage, necessity and whether they can be derived implicitly to reduce payload.
 |
| LGE | Yes with comment | We can remove examples. If not possible, at least “necessity and whether they can be derived implicitly to reduce payload” should be removed. It is not aligned with SCI format design. SCI format size cannot be dynamically changed since it will have huge impact on the UE complexity/implementation.  |
| CATT/GH | OK | As a compromise. |
| Intel | OK with the following edits | As RAN1 will need to eventually discuss how to make sure the SCI payload may be the same between initiating and responding device while the content may be different, we suggest to also include in the FFSs a possible indication on how to discern the payload and information from the initiating or responding device, which is highlighted in light green:**Proposal 5-4 (II):** * ~~Beside the additional ID(s),~~ At least the following information should be included as part of COT sharing information from the COT initiator UE.
	+ CAPC level of the COT initiator UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH transmission
	+ Remaining COT duration (FFS it is an absolute time length in ms or in number of slots)
	+ ~~Applicable RB set(s) for which the indicated COT can be used~~
	+ Existing / legacy R16/17 L1 source and destination IDs
	+ FFS applicable RB set(s), starting offset/slot, number of shared slots, indication on whether a UE is operating as initiating or responding device, and any other(s) including their usage, necessity and whether they can be derived implicitly to reduce payload.
 |
| Vivo | Fine with comment | We support the proposal with QC’s following comment.* + Time domain parameters of the shared COT
		- FFS: starting offset, number of slot, remaining COT duration, or a combination of them

Let me show an example whether starting offset is needed. Initiator send COT sharing in formation in slot n, and slot n/n+1/n+2 is initiator’s own transmission, then initiator indicates that the COT is shared to responder from slot n+3. |
| OPPO | Support | @LGE, the intention of the FFS is not to dynamically change the SCI format design / size, but to guide the design itself. If we can identify something that can be derived implicitly, then we don’t need to include the parameter as part of the COT-SI. |
| Futurewei | OK |  |

## [ACTIVE] Topic #6: Channel access procedures for SL multi-channel transmission(s)

**Background**:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**Channel access procedures for transmission(s) on multiple channels are supported for NR sidelink operation as defined by TS37.213 for NR-U (wherever applicable)* FFS whether the downlink, uplink and/or semi-static multiple channel access procedure(s) (if supported) from NR-U should be used as a baseline and whether/how they are applied in SL mode 1 and mode 2 operation

**Agreement**For dynamic channel access mode with multi-channel case in SL-U, NR-U UL channel access procedure is considered as baseline for transmission on multiple channels* FFS: whether transmission of PSFCH and/or S-SSB on a subset of RB sets is supported (using the NR-U DL channel access procedure as baseline)
* FFS any necessary enhancement and modification for the SL-U operation

**Agreement*** For dynamic channel access mode with multi-channel case in SL-U, use NR-U DL (Type A or Type B) multi-channel access procedure as the baseline for multiple PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels, where each PSFCH transmission is confined within one LBT channel
	+ FFS: the case for S-SSB if agreed to transmit S-SSB (or S-SSB can be (pre-)configured) in more than one RB set
	+ FFS: whether type A or type B or both will be supported for this case for PSFCH
	+ FFS: whether multiple PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels after performing the multi-channel access procedure is limited to contiguous RB sets
 |

* PSCCH/PSSCH

Currently in NR-U channel access procedures for UL multiple-channel transmission(s), the spec (TS 37.213) described cases (scheduling and configured grant) that are under the gNB control in Section 4.2.1.0.4.

|  |
| --- |
| If a UE - is scheduled to transmit on a set of channels , and if the UL transmissions are scheduled to start transmissions at the same time on all channels in the set of channels , or- intends to perform an uplink transmission on configured resources on the set of channels , and if UL transmissions are configured to start transmissions at the same time on all channels in the set of channels , … |

In SL, these corresponds to Mode 1 resource allocation. However, the case for Mode 2 RA, where resources are autonomously selected by the UE should also be captured. Hence, FL proposes to include such case in Proposal 6-1 below.

* PSFCH

There are two remaining issues on multi-channel access for PSFCH as captured as FFS points in the latest agreement.

1. Whether type A, type B or both should be supported for PSFCH transmissions on multiple shared channels; According to the existing NR-U DL multi-channel access procedures, the gNB is required to perform Type 1 LBT and count-down of a random value *N* for each channel that the gNB intends to transmit under Type A multi-channel access procedures. Under Type B, to transmit on channel , , the gNB senses the channel for at least a sensing interval immediately before transmitting on channel , and the gNB may transmit on channel immediately after sensing the channel to be idle for at least the sensing interval .

According to contributions submitted in this meeting, there is more preference to support both Type A and Type B multi-channel access procedures for PSFCH than only supporting Type A. Some companies expressed that at least Type A should be supported. Therefore, FL proposes to support both in Proposal 6-2 below.

1. Multi-PSFCH transmissions are limited to contiguous RB set; Based on the Tdoc review (summary in Section 4.7), most of the companies has an opinion that there should not be such a limitation, as a RX UE may need to transmit individual SL-HARQ feedback to multiple TX UEs in a same slot but on different channels. And often these transmissions are not on contiguous/adjacent channels. There is also a view to send a LS to RAN4 asking their opinion. But FL thinks this may not be necessary since in R16 multiple PSFCH transmissions are allowed to be in non-contiguous PRBs in a resource pool. If there is a strong need, of course we can do so. For now, FL proposes a conclusion that multi-PSFCH transmissions are not limited to contiguous RB sets in Proposal 6-3 below.
* S-SSB

Still need to wait for a decision/outcome whether the legacy S-SSB should be transmitted in all RB sets where the UE has channel occupancy, and whether the additional S-SSB is transmitted inside/outside a resource pool and multiple RB sets. Until these aspects/decisions are made, it is unclear whether a multi-channel access procedure is needed for S-SSB.

### FL Proposal for round 1 discussion

**Proposal 6-1 (I):**

Channel access procedures for SL multi-channel transmission(s) should include the following case for SL Mode 2 operation (which is not described in TS37.213 for NR-U UL transmission).

* If a UE intends to perform a sidelink transmission on selected resources on the set of channel , and if SL transmissions are to start at the same time on all channels in the set of channels .

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM | NO | At first we should focus on what is the exact behavior for SL. No need to discuss CR-like proposal now. NOTE that UL-like mechanism has not been agreed yet; just ‘baseline’ was agreed. |
| LGE | OK |  |
| Apple | OK |  |
| CableLabs | No | The differentiation between the SL-U UE acting as a gNB or as a UE should be agreed on before having this discussion |
| QC | Ok |  |
| Intel | No | Agree with DCM. We also believe that we should first focus on behaviour and only later discuss CR-like proposals. |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| CMCC | OK |  |
| Sony | OK |  |
| Spreadtrum | OK |  |
| JHUAPL | Support |  |
| Futurewei |  | It can wait for more clarification on multi-channel behaviour. |
| Samsung | OK |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| Panasonic | OK |  |
| Sharp | Support |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| WILUS | OK |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | With lower priority, can be discussed later. |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| MediaTek | OK |  |
| Transsion | Yes |  |

**Proposal 6-2 (I):**

* For dynamic channel access mode with multi-channel case in SL-U, both NR-U DL Type A and Type B multi-channel access procedure are supported for multiple PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM | NO | At first we should discus how to consider COT sharing for multi-channel access. In our understanding, NR-U multi-channel access does not consider COT sharing and thus type 1 LBT is mandatory for multi-channel access at least in an RB-set.Or if NR-U multi-channel access procedure considers COT sharing, please share which spec text explains it. |
| LGE | OK |  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support | Both or at least Type A multi-channel access can be supported for PSFCH. |
| Ericsson | OK |  |
| Apple | OK |  |
| CableLabs | OK |  |
| QC | Ok |  |
| Intel | OK |  |
| Vivo |  | At least type A is supported. Type B has a demerit that once the type-1 LBT fails, all the PSFCHs are dropped, while Type A only drops the PSFCH of the LBT channel that LBT fails.If both types are supported, how the UE select one type, based on implementation or configuration? |
| CMCC | OK |  |
| Sony | OK |  |
| Spreadtrum | OK |  |
| JHUAPL | Support |  |
| Futurewei | OK |  |
| Samsung | OK |  |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| ETRI | OK |  |
| Panasonic | OK |  |
| Sharp | Support |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| ZTE |  | In addition to Type A and Type B, it is suggested to also support independent Type 1/2 LBT on each LBT channel.Considering that the PSFCHs sent on different LBT channels are usually independent with each other, it is suggested that a UE can perform independent Type 1/2 LBT on each LBT channel.  |
| WILUS | OK |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |  |
| CATT/GH | Yes with comments | Share the similar view with vivo. How the UE select Type A or Type B should be clarified. |
| MediaTek | Support | We support this proposal. The difference between Type A and Type B DL multi-channel access is the channel access type performed on each channel. • For Type A DL multi-channel access, Type 1 channel access is performed on each channel. • For Type B DL multi-channel access, only one channel is selected to perform Type 1 channel access, while for the other channels, it is required to sense the channel for at least a sensing interval of 25 ms immediately before the transmission.  • For SL-U, if the CAPC value for PSFCH transmission is agreed to be always set as 1, the difference between Type A and Type B multi-channel access is marginal. And both can be supported. |
| Transsion | Yes |  |

**Proposal for conclusion 6-3 (I):**

* PSFCH transmissions across multiple shared channels are not limited to contiguous RB sets.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| DCM |  | We are fine with the direction, but meaning of ‘multiple shared channels’ is unclear. |
| LGE |  | It is up to RAN4. Some feasibility study including the impact on the maximum number of simultaneous PSFCH transmissions in a slot would be needed.  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support | We are fine with asking RAN4 also, if needed. |
| Ericsson | OK | In our view, the is already clear. But we are fine with a clarification. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Apple | OK | OK to ask RAN4 as well.  |
| CableLabs | No | Not clear what is the RAN4 impact. This discussion should take place after a RAN4 decision |
| QC | Support |  |
| Intel | NO | We agree with LG and this is a RAN4 subject matter which may require a feasibility study. In this sense, an LS to RAN4 would be advisable.  |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| CMCC | OK |  |
| Sony | OK |  |
| Spreadtrum | OK |  |
| JHUAPL | Support |  |
| Futurewei | OK | OK to ask RAN4 too |
| Samsung | No | For UL, whether it’s contiguous or non-contiguous is decided by RAN4. It needs to discuss whether SL follows the same principle, e.g. sending LS to RAN4 |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| ETRI | Support |  |
| Panasonic | OK |  |
| Sharp | OK |  |
| xiaomi |  | We prefer to send a LS to RAN4 asking their opinion. |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| WILUS |  | We are fine to ask RAN4.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |  |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| MediaTek |  | We agree with LG |
| Transsion | Support |  |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 2 discussion

FL summary of Round 1 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 6-1 (I), the majority of company is supportive/OK to agree to support the case when SL transmission resources are selected by the UE (Mode 2 operation) for SL multi-channel transmission(s).
	+ FL: The only reason to not agree on this proposal seems to be “too early”, but yet this proposal has no impact to the SL multi-channel access procedure and we have already agreed since the beginning of the WI to support both SL Mode 1 and Mode 2 RA schemes. We are coming close to the end of this WI (only 4 months left). There are still many technical details to be finalized, including RRC parameter list and UE feature list are due to start from the next meeting (besides the normal technical contents for RAN1). Since it is supported by many companies, I will put up this proposal for email endorsement over the reflector. Hopefully, we can make significant progress in the remaining time for Rel-18.
* On Proposal 6-2 (I), the majority of company is supportive/OK to agree to support both NR-U DL Type A and Type B multi-channel access procedure for PSFCH.
	+ FL: For the COT sharing case brought up by DCM and how a UE selects Type A or B by vivo, this can be further discussed. The proposal has updated by adding FFS bullets for these points. It is encourage to share your views on these two FFS bullets in the next round of discussion.
* On Proposal 6-3 (I), the majority of company is supportive/OK to agree to support PSFCH transmissions across multiple shared channels not limited to contiguous RB sets, while some would like to seek RAN4’s opinion / confirmation on this.
	+ FL: Since there are 11 companies would like to ask RAN4’s opinion on this issue, the proposal is updated accordingly.

**Proposal 6-1 (I):**

Channel access procedures for SL multi-channel transmission(s) should include the following case for SL Mode 2 operation (which is not described in TS37.213 for NR-U UL transmission).

* If a UE intends to perform a sidelink transmission on selected resources on the set of channel , and if SL transmissions are to start at the same time on all channels in the set of channels .

**Proposal 6-2 (II):**

* For dynamic channel access mode with multi-channel case in SL-U, both NR-U DL Type A and Type B multi-channel access procedure are supported for multiple PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels.
	+ FFS: the case when UE has a shared COT in one or more RB set(s) for PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels
	+ FFS: how to determine Type A or Type B multi-channel access procedure should be performed by the UE for PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| DCM | DCM | We are fine with this proposal if the first FFS is kept. Besides, our view is that this issue exists in PSCCH/PSSCH case. What is FL’s plan for PSCCH/PSSCH? |
| LGE | Yes | On how a UE selects Type A or B, in our understanding, in NR-U, it is up to gNB’s implementation. Similar approach can be reused.  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Comment | In addition to Type A and Type B, it is suggested to also support independent Type 1/2 LBT on each LBT channel for PSFCH. |
| Vivo | Ok |  |
| Apple | OK |  |
| Intel | OK |  |
| JHUAPL | Yes | Leave UE determination of Type A or Type B access for implementation |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| QK | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Panasonic | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| Transsion | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | For the second bullet, we think it can be left to the UE implementation. |
| Sharp | OK |  |

**Proposal 6-3 (II):**

* Send LS to RAN4 seeking their views on whether PSFCH transmissions across multiple unlicensed channels should / should not be limited to contiguous RB sets. The following draft LS text is proposed. Suggestions/modifications are welcome.
	+ RAN1 has discussed the scenario where a RX UE needs to transmit PSFCHs across multiple unlicensed channels in a same slot. RAN1 would like to seek RAN4’s opinion on the following questions.
		- Question 1: Whether the transmission of multiple PSFCHs should be limited to contiguous RB sets?
		- Question 2: If multiple PSFCHs can be transmitted over non-contiguous RB sets, is there a limitation(s) on e.g., number of RB sets, max. frequency separation between the RB sets, etc?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| DCM | OK |  |
| LGE | Yes with comments | It would be better to know the assumption on the PSFCH transmission. At this moment, it would be better to focus on the Rel-16/17 PSFCH format 0. If possible, we can ask RAN4 for each candidate PSFCH formats (it might not be possible)  |
| CMCC | OK |  |
| ZTE | Support |  |
| Vivo |  | Shall we changed the wording of question 1: whether multiple PSFCHs can be transmitted over non-contiguous RB sets. |
| Lenovo | See comments | Some background info may be needed, e.g., whether those PSFCH transmissions are repetition of one HARQ-ACK bit |
| Apple | Support | OK with vivo’s comment |
| Intel |  | We agree with Vivo, and that question 1 should rather be more direct and ask in a straightforward manner whether non-contiguous RB-set transmission of multiple PSFCHs is feasible or not.  |
| JHUAPL | Yes | Support Vivo's comment |
| NEC | Yes  |  |
| QC | Yes |  |
| OPPO | OK |  |
| Panasonic | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CATT/GH | OK |  |
| Transsion | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |  |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for Thursday GTW

FL summary of Round 2 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 6-2 (I), let me also include the case for PSCCH/PSSCH in the first FFS. Moreover, let’s also try leaving to UE implementation to perform either Type A or Type B multi-channel access for PSFCH (like in NR-U).

**Proposal 6-2 (III):**

* For dynamic channel access mode with multi-channel case in SL-U, both NR-U DL Type A and Type B multi-channel access procedure are supported for multiple PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels.
	+ It is up to UE implementation to perform either Type A or Type B multi-channel access procedure.
* FFS: the case when UE has a shared COT in one or more RB set(s) for PSFCH and/or PSCCH/PSSCH transmissions on multiple channels
	+ ~~FFS: how to determine Type A or Type B multi-channel access procedure should be performed by the UE for PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels~~

Outcome of Thursday GTW:

**Agreement**

For dynamic channel access mode with multi-channel case in SL-U, both NR-U DL Type A and Type B multi-channel access procedure are supported for multiple PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels.

* FFS: It is up to UE implementation to perform either Type A or Type B multi-channel access procedure.
* FFS: whether this can initiate a shared COT
* FFS: whether there is any special handling needed for transmission in a shared COT on one or more of the channels

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 3 discussion

FL summary of Round 2 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 6-3 (II),
	+ first of all, to answer to Lenovo’s question, when multiple PSFCHs are transmitted over multiple RB sets, these SL-HARQ feedbacks are each intended for a received PSSCH according to R16/17 SL-HARQ feedback / PFSCH procedure. For example, when UE receives 4 PSSCH transmissions the UE will need to transmit corresponding 4 PSFCHs, which could be spread across multiple RB sets depending on PSFCH resource configuration. So, these PSFCH transmissions are not repetition of one HARQ-ACK bit. So far in SL, there is no PSFCH repetition behavior within a PSFCH symbol.
	+ Since the comments in Round 2 discussion are related to wording issues, I will provide directly a draft LS for endorsement using email reflector.

## [ACTIVE] Topic #7: Multi-consecutive slots transmission (MCSt)

**Background:**

In RAN1#110bis-e, the following agreement is made on the topic of MCSt.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**On the support of MCSt operation in SL-U, following options are to be further studied and one or more of the following options will be selected in future meetings.* When L1 is triggered for reporting a subset of candidate resources for MCSt,
	+ Option 1: Only one set of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) is provided for the resource selection procedure in L1
		- Note, this is applicable for transmission of a single TB and multiple TBs
		- FFS: whether this is the same or different than Rel-16
	+ Option 2: one or multiple sets of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) are provided for the resource selection procedure in L1
	+ FFS: any further information needs to be provided to L1 for MCSt
* When L1 reports a subset of candidate resources for MCSt,
	+ Option A: L1 reports candidate multi-slot resources in *SA* where a candidate multi-slot resource consists of a set of single-slot resources that are consecutive in time
		- FFS whether the set of single-slot resources within a candidate multi-slot resource can have different sizes
	+ Option B: L1 reports candidate single-slot resources in (*SA*) as in Rel-16
		- It is up to the higher (MAC) layer to select a set of single-slot resources that are consecutive in logical slots
	+ Option C: L1 reports consecutive single-slot candidate resources in *SA*
		- FFS whether the consecutive single-slot candidate resources can have different sizes
	+ FFS: any further information needs to be reported to MAC layer, provided to L1 or utilized for MCSt
	+ FFS: whether/how to consider the additional LBT time in SL resource allocation
 |

From reviewing the contributions (summary in Section 4.9), the majority of companies are in favour of Option 1 and Option A. The main reasons cited are to minimize the UE processing from triggering L1 resource selection procedure multiple times (as in Option 2) and to guarantee resources from consecutive slots can be selected for MCSt to occupy an initiated COT. Furthermore, for Option 1, the set of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) provided by the higher layer is the same as Rel-16. And one additional information needed from the higher layer is number of slots for the MCSt.

It should be noted that as per above cited agreement for MCSt, Option 1 is applicable for transmission of a single TB case and multiple TBs case. Maybe it is worth to clarify that when only one set of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) is provided to L1 for resource selection, this set of parameters is used for generating a set of candidate resources to be reported to the higher layer. It is up to the higher layer to select resources from the reported set for multiple TBs. That is, only one set of parameters will be used for resource selection of multiple TBs.

Considering all the comments received in last meeting’s discussion, an updated proposal (from the last meeting) is now provided in Proposal 5 below.

### FL Proposal for round 1 discussion

**Proposal 7 (I):**

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement**On the support of MCSt operation in SL-U, following options are to be further studied and one or more of the following options will be selected in future meetings.* When L1 is triggered for reporting a subset of candidate resources for MCSt,
	+ Option 1: Only one set of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) is provided for the resource selection procedure in L1
		- Note, this is applicable for transmission of a single TB and multiple TBs
		- FFS: whether this is the same or different than Rel-16
	+ Option 2: one or multiple sets of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) are provided for the resource selection procedure in L1
	+ FFS: any further information needs to be provided to L1 for MCSt
* When L1 reports a subset of candidate resources for MCSt,
	+ Option A: L1 reports candidate multi-slot resources in *SA* where a candidate multi-slot resource consists of a set of single-slot resources that are consecutive in time
		- FFS whether the set of single-slot resources within a candidate multi-slot resource can have different sizes
	+ Option B: L1 reports candidate single-slot resources in (*SA*) as in Rel-16
		- It is up to the higher (MAC) layer to select a set of single-slot resources that are consecutive in logical slots
	+ Option C: L1 reports consecutive single-slot candidate resources in *SA*
		- FFS whether the consecutive single-slot candidate resources can have different sizes
	+ FFS: any further information needs to be reported to MAC layer, provided to L1 or utilized for MCSt
	+ FFS: whether/how to consider the additional LBT time in SL resource allocation
 |

For the above agreement made in RAN1#110bis-e,

* When L1 is triggered for reporting a subset of candidate resources for MCSt, Option 1 is selected
* When L1 reports a subset of candidate resources for MCSt, Option A is selected.
	+ Note, a candidate multi-slot resource reported in the set *SA* can be used for transmitting a single TB or multiple TBs
	+ FFS the calculation of interference RSRP level in resource exclusion (e.g., same as R16 or update is needed)
	+ FFS at which step in 8.1.4 of TS 38.214 the concept of candidate multi-slot resource is applied and whether candidate single-slot resources should still/also be reported to the higher layer (as in R16)
* Additional information needed from the higher layer is “number of slots for MCSt”.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support / not support** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support with comment | We support to adopt option 1 and option A. But for multiple TBs transmission, multiple L1 resource selection triggers are necessary. In each trigger, it targets only one single TB. To achieve multiple TBs transmission, after reporting multiple candidate resource sets, it is up to the MAC layer to find consecutive groups of MCSt. |
| DCM | NO | Why PHY spec impact is necessary for resource identification of MCSt is unclear. Option 1 per TB and Option A per TB as in Rel-16/17 are sufficient. MAC layer can support enhanced selection for MCSt. |
| LGE | No | So, with the above proposal, when the set S\_A is used for multiple TB, is it correct understanding that only one set of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) for multiple TBs? Otherwise, if the multiple TBs have different set of parameters, the MCSt will not be supported? We think that we can make a single set of multi-slot resources by using multiple S\_A,i for TB#i with the same or different parameters. Or, to make a single set of multi-slot resources, one representative parameter set could be determined based on multiple parameters for the set S\_A,i for TB#i. |
| InterDigital | Support |  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Support | We are fine with the proposal including the FFS points.  |
| Ericsson | Option 1 – YesOption A – Yes with comments | For Option A, it is clear that the same Rel-16 procedure for RSRP calculation cannot be used as it consists of multiple RSRP values. |
| Apple | Support |  |
| QC | Support | To LGE, thanks for your view. In our understanding an agreement as per FL proposal, would mean that for multiple TBs with “similar parameters” (e.g. same prioTX value) a multi-slot resource selection is supported. In our view when a file is generated it will require the transmission of several TBs, therefore each single resource selection instance could target transmitting a part of that file (TBs with same prioTX).We believe that RAN1 could still discuss how MAC finally select a candidate, for this purpose, it could use the information of previously selected resources to select the next one consecutively. In this case, it would still be possible to select consecutive resources across resource selection triggers, that is useful when there are TBs with different prioTX values. |
| Intel | Support | We are fine with the proposal including the FFS point. |
| Vivo | support |  |
| CMCC | Support |  |
| Sony | Support |  |
| Spreadtrum | Support |  |
| Futurewei | OK |  |
| Samsung | Yes with comments | When L1 is triggered for reporting a subset of candidate resources for MCSt, it needs to clarify whether the parameters are for single TB or multiple TB at first. We can understand the intention of supporting Option 1 to reduce complexity. As a compromise, we can accept option 1 but would like to explicitly show it can be applied to both single TB and multi-TB case in the proposal.We are OK with option A. |
| NEC | Yes with option 1 | For the second bullet, option B is preferred, and whether to select consecutive slots should be determined by MAC. |
| ETRI | Support | Even though we prefer Option B, we can live with Option A. |
| Panasonic | Support | For option 1, the set of parameters could be common for multiple TBs when set of parameters are similar among multiple TBs. When multiple TBs have different parameters, single slot transmission can be used for each TB. |
| Sharp | Support |  |
| xiaomi | No | We have different understanding with FL on option 1 for multiple TB cases. From our understanding, for multiple TBs case, a set of parameter will be provided for each TB, and a separate candidate resource set will be generated for each TB as well. It can up to MAC layer to select resource for actual transmissions which located in consecutive slots. If a common set of parameters is used for multiple TBs, and different TB may have different priority, subchannel size, etc, the resource selection may not be efficient enough.Therefore, for single TB case, we support option 2 + option A/B; but for multiple TB case, we support option 2 + option B.  |
| ZTE | Support the 1st bullet.Don’t support the 2nd and 3rd bullet. | We prefer that Option B is selected and “number of slots for MCSt” is not indicated from the higher layer.If Option B is selected, the interference level of candidate resources in SA in Option A is higher than that of in Option B if the RSRP level is taken as the average or a larger value over the multi slot resources. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No, see comments | For the option 1, we want to clarify the proposal is applied for each TB, which is aligned with R16 design, it is unfeasible if one set of parameters used for indicating multiple different parameters set.* + Option 1: Only one set of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) is provided for the resource selection procedure in L1 for each TB (same as Rel-16)

For Option A, it is not applicable based on current MAC layer procedure. * When resource exclusion is triggered in PHY, MAC has not constructed a packet and is not clear how many TBs are going to be transmitted, neither the exact parameters. So, MAC layer cannot provide accurate number of slots for MCSt.

For “number of slots for MCSt”, In legacy MAC layer, no matter Uu or SL, grant (resource) is obtained first, then generate MAC PDU for that grant, i.e. MAC PDU is generated after PHY reports resource set S\_"A”, which means, the length of multi-slot resources being indicated by MAC layer before MAC obtains the grant is unfeasible. |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| MediaTek | Support |  |
| Transsion | Support |  |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 2 discussion

FL summary of Round 1 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 7 (I), a summary of inputs is provided in the following.
	+ Support (20): OPPO (multiple triggers for multiple TBs), IDC, Nokia/NSB, Ericsson, Apple, QC, Intel, vivo, CMCC, Sony, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, Samsung (for both single and multiple TBs), [NEC (option B)], Panasonic, Sharp, CATT/GOHIGH, MediaTek, Transsion
	+ Not support (6): DCM/LGE (one trigger and one SA report per TB), xiaomi (single TB: 2+A/B; multiple TBs: 2+B), ZTE (1+B), Huawei/HiSilicon (1+B)
	+ FL:
		- Regarding Option 1 is for single TB or multiple TBs, there has been a split opinion. Some said it is possible that multiple TBs can share a same/similar set of parameters (due to large packet being split into multiple TBs), while others pointed out this is not aligned with existing R16 design (infeasible one parameter set indicates multiple different parameter sets).
		- Regarding Option A, one company thinks it is infeasible for the higher layer to provide “number of slots for MCSt” due to MAC PDU could be generated only after PHY reports candidate resource set *SA*. In FL’s understanding, the existing R16 resource selection trigger is based on the assumption that the MAC PDU is generated from a certain logical channel and the set of parameters to trigger L1 procedure is provided correspondingly to obtained a SL grant. When the SL grant does not match with the final generated MAC PDU (e.g., due to merging of multiple MAC PDUs for transmission), a resource re-selection is triggered; otherwise, the initially selected SL grant is used. This means, the final MAC PDU for transmission may not always different from the initially selected (if different the SL grant is re-selected). As such, the MAC layer could still provide “number of slots for MCSt” for the initial resource selection. If re-selection is triggered due to the final MAC PDU is different from the initial one, the “number of slots for MCSt” can still be provided.
		- Considering the above comments received in Round 1, the proposal is updated as followed to minimize changes to the existing L1 and MAC layer procedures.

**Proposal 7 (II):**

* When L1 is triggered for reporting a subset of candidate resources for MCSt,
	+ ~~Option 1:~~ Only one set of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) is provided for the resource selection procedure in L1 for each TB (same as Rel-16)
		- Note, this is applicable for transmission of a single TB and multiple TBs (resource selection is triggered independently for each TB)
		- ~~FFS: whether this is the same or different than Rel-16~~
	+ Additional information needed from the higher layer is “number of slots for MCSt”.
* When L1 reports a subset of candidate resources for MCSt,
	+ ~~Option A:~~ L1 reports candidate multi-slot resources in *SA* where a candidate multi-slot resource consists of a set of single-slot resources that are consecutive in time
		- A reported set of candidate multi-slot resources in *SA* is used for resource selection of one TB.
		- It is up to the higher layer to select consecutive candidate multi-slot resources across resource selection triggers for transmission of multiple TBs.
			* FFS how to select a candidate multi-slot resource for a TB with no existing candidate multi-slot resources already selected/reserved for MCSt (e.g., randomly, first available, or based on other criteria)
		- FFS the calculation of interference RSRP level in resource exclusion (e.g., same as R16 or update is needed)
		- FFS at which step in 8.1.4 of TS 38.214 the concept of candidate multi-slot resource is applied and whether candidate single-slot resources should still/also be reported to the higher layer (as in R16)
		- ~~FFS whether the set of single-slot resources within a candidate multi-slot resource can have different sizes~~

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| DCM | [NO] | For S\_A generation, what is the motivation to make multi-slot resources in S\_A in PHY spec?If the motivation is to ensure multi-slot resources to be used, it means that RSRP threshold may be quite larger and thus interference from other UE perspective could quite larger. This aspect can be ignored? Our view is that this is not preferable and thus S\_A determination should follow the existing PHY spec, and then from the candidates, MAC can select consecutive slots as many as possible.Or we miss some other motivation? |
| LGE | OK | For multiple TBs, we can add “consecutive candidate single-slot resources or” before the “consecutive candidate multi-slot resources” since all the information will be available at the higher layer, and whether/how to use it is up to higher layer.  |
| CMCC | No | We think this kind of combination proposal may bring more confusion and ambiguity among companies. If resource selection is triggered independently for each TB and it is up to the higher layer to select consecutive candidate multi-slot resources, why L1 needs to report candidate multi-slot resources in SA, the two operations seems duplicated. In our view, it should be done in physical layer to guarantee enough multi-slots candidate resources.From our point of view, considering the condition, we think maybe we can focus the MCSt transmission for single TB in Rel-18, then the original Option 1 and Option A can work without so many complexity. |
| ZTE | No | We have the same concern with DCM. So we prefer that Option B is selected and “number of slots for MCSt” is not indicated from the higher layer. |
| vivo |  | 1.MAC trigger resource selection when there is data in LCH. We do not need to mention per TB based selection, we just reuse Rel-16 trigger condition.* + ~~Option 1:~~ Only one set of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) is provided for the resource selection procedure in L1 ~~for each TB~~ (same as Rel-16)

2.if we limit that the consective slots are used for one TB, only blind TB transmission can be mapped on the MCSt. This is really not efficient way. We assume that more than one TB can be mapped on MCSt. * + L1 reports candidate multi-slot resources in *SA* where a candidate multi-slot resource consists of a set of single-slot resources that are consecutive in time
		- ~~A reported set of candidate multi-slot resources in~~ *~~S~~~~A~~* ~~is used for resource selection of one TB.~~
 |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | No | We think adding “a reported set of candidate multi-slot resources in SA is used for resource selection of one TB” brings confusion.From our point of view, actually, before we have a detailed design on the MCSt, we had better identify the use cases for MCSt in advance especially like one MCS is used for one TB, or multiple TBs, or both. Before that, it is hard to get consensus on “Whether a candidate multiple slot resource is used for resource selection of one TB”. Instead, from our side, it is obviously unreasonable to restrict a candidate multi-slot resource (e.g., multiple consecutive single-slots) only used for the transmission one TB. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Support | We think the FFS (i.e., FFS how to select a candidate multi-slot resource for a TB with no existing…) is not needed and propose to remove it. If there is no existing SL grant, it means that no other TBs are transmitted by the UE. |
| Panasonic | Yes | We preferred the set of parameters could be common for multiple TB in option 1. However, for progress, we can accept modified proposal. |
| Samsung | No | The intention of MCSt becomes more unclear after adding the updates. Under the first bullet, if resource selection is triggered independently for each TB, then how could MCSt work for multi-TB if each TB choose candidate resources non-contiguous with other TB (that means high layers are not able to choose consecutive candidate multi-slots at all)? We think current proposal have no principal different with not supporting MCSt-based multi-TB transmission and it make MCSt becoming a meaningless manner. We cannot support the current version. |
| Spreadtrum | No | For the current proposal, some issues should be clarified.* Firstly, MCSt can be applicable for transmission of a single TB only when HARQ is disabled. When HARQ is enabled, MCSt cannot meet the requirements of HARQ RTT unless we support a hybrid method of blind retransmission and HARQ-based retransmission in SL-U firstly. But this is a new feature that requires additional workload for RAN1 and RAN2.
* Secondly, It should be clarified that the parameter "number of slots for MCSt" provided by higher layer refer to the number of slots for a TB not multiple TBs. If it’s for the multiple TBs, and the MCSt resources for multiple TBs are determined by the MAC layer, how is the number of slots determined for a TB in L1 resource exclusion procedure.

**Proposal 7 (II):** * When L1 is triggered for reporting a subset of candidate resources for MCSt,
	+ ~~Option 1:~~ Only one set of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) is provided for the resource selection procedure in L1 for each TB (same as Rel-16)
		- Note, this is applicable for transmission of a single TB and multiple TBs (resource selection is triggered independently for each TB)
		- Note, this is applicable for transmission of a single TB only when HARQ is disabled.
		- ~~FFS: whether this is the same or different than Rel-16~~
	+ Additional information needed from the higher layer is “number of slots for MCSt of one TB”.
 |
| CATT/GH | Support |  |
| Transsion | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| QC | Comments | We understand that with this proposal the following behaviour would be supported:* Across multiple TBs: trigger sequentially the resource selection and allow final selection of one candidate in MAC that is consecutive to other previously selected candidates (in another RS trigger)
* Within each trigger (for single TB): enhance PHY procedure to allow selection of a multi-slot candidate

We are open to discuss this approach, although in our view it is unclear what is the benefit of enhancing PHY procedure if this does not guarantee a selection of a multi-slot candidate (guarantee MCSt) for multiple TBs (in practice under this proposal MCSt is guaranteed only for blind reTX of a single TB). To make a decision on a procedure it might be better to clarify first what is the approach to follow: For this reason we propose the following decision point first on how to deal with MCSt for multiple TBs:* If RAN1 decides to go with the approach of enhancing PHY procedure for selecting a multi-slot candidate, then RAN 1 could go all the way through and allow selection of multi-slot candidates for multiple TBs (multiple TBs – single trigger – multi-slot resource).
* If RAN1 decides that a “best-effort” solution for MCSt in case of multiple-TBs is sufficient, then we could just leave unmodified the PHY procedure, and enhance only the MAC layer (final selection in MAC allow to select consecutively to a previously selected resource). In this case RS for single-slot resource will be triggered for each TB, and allow to concatenate across triggers (across TBs). This in our understanding is aligned with DCM view.
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | NO | For the part to generate candidate resource set with multi-slot resources, does it mean one single TB candidate resource would occupy multiple consecutive slots? If yes, how to understand the UE behaviour here, UE transmits one repetition in each slot, or UE transmit on transmission spans over multiple slots? Further clarification is needed. On the top of that, we think the motivation to support single TB MCSt still needs to be justified, if it only intends to support blind retransmissions, Rel-16 spec already supported that.Beside the comments of DCM, we think “number of slots for MCSt” is indicated by MAC layer is still unfeasible in RAN2, RAN1 should figure out whether it can work or not and LS can be sent to RAN2 to check, if necessary. |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 3 discussion

FL summary of Round 2 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 7 (II), after two rounds of discussions (plus my explanation at the end of the first round), it is clear not everyone has the same understanding about the proposal and/or even how R16 RS trigger and selection work (maybe including also me). From what I can gather, MCSt for multiple TBs can be achieved using one of the following 3 RS trigger and selection approaches.
	+ Approach 1: “best effort for multiple TBs”
		- Step 1: Higher layer triggers L1 resource selection for one TB with one set of parameters (R16/17 behavior).
		- Step 2: L1 report a set of candidate single-slot resource (*SA*) according to existing L1 resource allocation procedure (R16/17 behavior).
		- Step 3: Higher layer selects a set of resources either randomly (R16/17 behavior) or according to a consecutive-slots criterion (new behavior) to achieve MCSt.
		- Step 4: Repeat Step 1-3 for different TB.
			* When MAC selects randomly in Step 3, MCSt for multiple TBs is achieve by chance / probability could be low.
			* When MAC selects according to a consecutive-slots criterion in Step 3, MCSt for multiple TBs is achieved based on a “best effort” manner. There is no guarantee that the higher layer can achieve MCSt for multiple TBs.
	+ Approach 2: “guarantee MCSt for single TB and best effort for multiple TBs”
		- Step 1: Higher layer triggers L1 resource selection for one TB with one set of parameters + “number of slots for MCSt” which can be derived based on CAPC of the logical channel/TB.
		- Step 2: L1 report a set of candidate multi-slot resource (*SA*) according to most of the existing L1 resource allocation procedure (FFS: RSRP calculation / threshold may need to change)
		- Step 3: Higher layer selects a candidate multi-slot resource either randomly (R16/17 behavior) or according to a consecutive-slots criterion (new behavior).
		- Step 4: Repeat Step 1-3 for different TB.
			* When MAC selects randomly in Step 3, MCSt is always achieved for a single TB. MCSt for multiple TBs is achieved by chance / probability could be low.
			* When MAC selects according to a consecutive-slots criterion in Step 3, MCSt for multiple TBs is achieved based on a “best effort” manner. There is no guarantee that the higher layer can achieve MCSt for multiple TBs.
	+ Approach 3: “guarantee MCSt for multiple TBs”
		- Step 1: Higher layer triggers L1 resource selection one time for multiple TBs with one set of parameters + “number of slots for MCSt” which can be derived based on CAPC of the multiple TBs.
		- Step 2: L1 report a set of candidate multi-slot resource (*SA*) according to most of the existing L1 resource allocation procedure (FFS: RSRP calculation / threshold may need to change)
		- Step 3: Higher layer selects a candidate multi-slot resource randomly (R16/17 behavior) for the multiple TBs.
			* MCSt for multiple TBs is always guaranteed.
* According to FL’s understanding and assessment,
	+ Approach 1 has the least specification impact to MAC layer selecting resources according to a consecutive-slots criterion (compare to approach 2 and 3) and no change to L1 procedure. But relies on a best effort manner.
	+ Approach 2 has a slightly more specification impact to determine “number of slots for MCSt” based on CAPC value and selecting candidate resources according to a consecutive-slots criterion in Step 3. L1 specification changes on updating to candidate multi-slot resources in step 4, SL-RSRP calculation and threshold determination (if necessary).
		- In my understanding, I have not seen proposal to perform a single TX of one TB across the multiple slots of one MCSt.
	+ Approach 3 has a significant specification impact to MAC layer resource selection and re-selection trigger procedure. The current spec is structured based on a per-process framework. To change this to support multi-process framework will require spec structure change in my understanding. In addition, “number of slots for MCSt” based on CAPC values among the multiple TBs.
	+ In my understanding, to go with approach 3 (or maybe approach 2 as well) will best require some assessment and confirmation from RAN2. But firstly, we can discuss these approaches in RAN1, then if necessary send an LS to RAN2 for their confirmation.
* For Round 3 discussion, FL suggests that we discuss about these 3 approaches and determine what is the majority preference. Then if necessary, we can send an LS to RAN2 for confirmation.

**Proposal 7 (III):**

* Based on the above description of 3 approaches of designing a MCSt for single TB and multiple TBs. Please indicate which approach(s) is your preference. Or indicate if you have a different approach in mind.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Approach?** | **Comments** |
| QC | 3 best, 1 for compromise | We see 1 as a low cost solution that can to some extent allow the main target, that is MCSt for multiple TBs, while 3 is the guaranteed version for the main target.Approach 2 instead, is the in between approach that has the workload burden of approach 3, but the more work is towards a case with unclear benefits (blind ReTx). We can discuss under approach 3 if the N slots for the multi-slot resource can be used to “map on the fly” different, or same TBs as needed. With this less-rigid coupling between a slot and a TB/HARQ ID, the blind reTX case (i.e., MCSt of same TB) can be captured. |
| LGE | 1, 2 | To be honest, we think that it is optimization, and even though we go with Alt 1, system is not broken. If possible, we prefer to use IUC-preferred resource-like approach, that is MAC layer prioritize some resources to make MCSt for the same TB or multiple TBs.  |
| CATT/GH | 2 | At least our original thinking of supporting Option1 +Option A is similar to what Approach 2 intends. That is, multi-consecutive slots are selected for one TB. For other TB(s), different L1 procedures should be triggered (as in R16).Approach 1 may not actually implement MCSt, from our perspective, since PHY always perform resource exclusion based on single slot and MAC may find there is not any consecutive slot that can be selected in SA.Regarding Approach 3, we share the similar view with FL that multi-process resource selection may have significant impacts on MAC spec which is not preferred. |
| Intel | Approach 3 |  |
| vivo | Approach 3  | In step 3 of option 3, it is also possible for the MAC layer to pick some single-slot resource from MCSt for one TB firstly and if there are multiple TBs, MAC selects resource for othe TB(s),similar as approach 1/2. |
| OPPO | Approach 2 | In our understanding, the approach 2 achieves the benefit of MCSt by ensuring the contiguous transmissions for single TB and restricts the specification impact of both PHY and MAC layer. Simultaneously, we can also accept the above approach 1 as a compromise to minimize the changes for current specification. In addition, we have a strong concern for the approach 3 which is not aligned with current framework and procedure of Mode 2 RA and will result in the large effort for standardization work of several WGs. |
| Futurewei | 2,1 |  |

## [ACTIVE] Topic #8: Type 1 LBT blocking issue

**Background:**

On the problem of one UE performing a Type 1 LBT procedure for using its own selected/reserved resource(s) is blocked by another UE’s SL transmission at least in a slot preceding to the selected/reserved resource and causing the LBT to fail, we have discussed this topic in the last RAN1 meeting but without any conclusion/progress. In this meeting, besides numerous contributions discussing this topic/issue again, RAN1 also received an LS from RAN2 [44] informing RAN1 the following RAN2 agreements:

* RAN2 understands L1 handles LBT impact to/from other UEs’ reserved resources in SL candidate resource selection (inter-UE case).
* RAN2 will study how MAC performs resource (re)selection with the consideration of LBT impact to its own candidate resource (intra-UE case).

So, it seems there is a need to continue discussing this topic/issue in RAN1. The list of solution options in Proposal 8 below have been updated according to comments received in the last RAN1 meeting with additional ones such as Option X (no solution needed). Let’s use this as a starting point for discussion in this meeting.

### FL Proposal for round 1 discussion

**Proposal 8 (I):**

* To resolve the Type 1 LBT blocking issue, where one UE performing a Type 1 LBT procedure for using its own selected/reserved resource(s) is blocked by another UE’s SL transmission at least in a slot preceding to the selected/reserved resource and causing the LBT to fail, please provide comments and indicate any additional option(s) should be added to the list (for the first round of discussion).
	+ Option 1:
		- UE avoid selection of a resource before a reserved resource with high priority when the transmitting symbols of the selected resource overlap with Type 1 LBT of the reserved resource.
		- UE avoid selection of a resource with high priority after a reserved resource when the transmitting symbols of the reserved resource overlap with LBT of the selected resource.
		- FFS: the avoidance should be performed by L1 exclusion or L2 MAC selection
		- FFS: whether / how to achieve this in RA mode 1
	+ Option 2:
		- UE prioritizes/selects resource(s) for transmission in slot(s) after a reserved resource when transmission of the selected resource is able to share the initiated COT of the reserved resource (i.e., the selected resource(s) is within the COT duration of the reserved resource and the CAPC value of the selected resource(s) is equal to or higher than that of the reserved resource).
		- UE prioritizes/selects resource(s) for transmission in slot(s) before a reserved resource when transmission of the selected resource is able to share its initiated COT with the reserved resource (i.e., the reserved resource is within the CAT duration of the selected resource(s) and the CAPC value of the selected resource(s) is equal to or smaller than that of the reserved resource).
		- FFS whether / how to achieve this in RA mode 1.
	+ Option 3: UE selects extra / more resources than required for transmitting a TB (i.e., overbooking) to accommodate potential Type 1 LBT failures.
	+ Option 4: LBT duration is determined firstly, then resource selection takes into account of the LBT duration is performed.
	+ Option 5: At MAC layer, selection of resource(s) among the reported set of candidate resources from L1 is up to UE implementation in mode 2 for SL-U, instead of random selection.
	+ Option 6: UE excludes frequency resources (if any) previously reserved via SCI by other SL UEs in the corresponding slot, when estimating the detected power within a sensing slot duration in Type 1 channel access.
	+ Option 7: SL UE deems channel busy only if the UE detects transmission other than SL transmission occupying the channel (e.g., exceeding the energy detection threshold), i.e., the energy detection for EDT checking in LBT procedure does not take into account the energy from SL transmissions.
	+ Option X: No solution is needed. To avoid inter-UE blocking from performing Type 1 LBT can be handled based on UE implementation (e.g., as the start timing to perform LBT sensing is determined by each UE).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Preferred option(s)** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Option 2 and X | We do not support and have strong concern on Option 1. If UE avoids selection of a resource just one slot before a reserved resource and one slot after the reserved resource, this means 50% of the slots in SL are unusable. If UE avoids two slots before and after a reserved resource, then 66.67% of slots are unusable in the system. |
| DCM | 1/2/7 |  |
| LGE | Option 1, Option 2 | It would be necessary to consider the case of insufficient resources. Moreover, since the total LBT duration for Type 1 channel access procedure, the exact LBT duration may not be used. In this point of view, rather than saying “avoid selection”, “deprioritize” could be used in Option 1. In Option 2, for the COT sharing condition, its transmission should be intended to the COT initiator UE. If at least one condition is not met, Option 2 need to fallback to Option 1.  |
| InterDigital | Option 1 and 3 |  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Option 1 and/or Option 2 | Option 1 should be preferable, as well as Option 2 which can also be supported together. Option 3 should not be supported as it arises resource efficiency issues while it is not clear what benefits it has compared to existing repetition and retransmission mechanisms. Option 4 should be up to implementation if supported, and finally, Option 5 alone may not be sufficient to avoid inter-UE blocking because MAC layer does not know of other UEs reservations.Option 6 is not clear, seems not so different than Option 1.Option 7 should not be allowed by regulatory requirements. |
| Ericsson | Avoid fragmentation in time. See comments. | We think that:* Selecting resources with a frequency-first approach is the best way to minimize this issue.
* The GP should be respected when the UE intends to finish a transmission in one slot. That should give some chance to other UEs to clear LBT.
 |
| Lenovo |  | The motivation is clear to us. However, since UE can’t predict the LBT duration, it is not possible for UE to determine how many slots before the reserved resource in Option 1 or after the reserved resource in Option 2. It is necessary for a UE to have a rough estimation on the possible LBT duration.  |
| Apple | Option 4 (with comments) | Start of CCA time is up to UE implementation. Therefore whether the slot right before resource selection or two slots before are reserved will have similar impact to the UE’s CCA success if type 1 CCA starts 3 slots before. Note max CW is 1023, with 9us slot duration, it is more than 9ms even all slots are idle. When some slots are busy, the overall CCA time is random. Therefore we do not see the linkage of the slot before/after made key difference. Therefore option 1 and option 2 are not preferred. We support basic idea of option 4, with modification that the exact CCA time is unknown, but min/average CCA time can be calculated. And resource selection window can be adjusted. We also see option 4 is a general solution not only applies to inter-UE, also applies to WiFi transmission caused CCA delay.  |
| QC | Option X for this issue, other options can still be discussed to solve other issues. | We believe that there is no systematic way to ensure that a UE will/ will not transmit on a reserved resource. So there are no good way to address this issue (which may not be an issue at all) given the LBT uncertainty of the reserving UEsOption 3 could be still supported in RS enhancements for MCSt (e.g. MAC could trigger resource selection for N1 TBs by asking PHY to identify multi-slot resources of length N2, with N2>N1)Option 4 could still be supported towards making sure that RS is effectiveOption 5 could still be supported towards facilitating MCSt across RS triggers (especially when each RS is triggered based on one set of parameters, e.g. single priority prioTX) |
| Intel | Option 1 and 2  | * Option 1 is preferred. While option 1 per se decreases the set of candidate slots, these exclusions rules could be applied decoupling the resources within and outside a shared COT, as for inside a COT having back-to-back transmissions may be beneficial.
* We would be OK with Option 2 if combined with option 1
* Option 3 could be supported by implementation but by default it may cause high loss of spectral efficiency as commented by other companies.
* Option 4 can be supported by implementation.
* Option 5 may not actually solve alone the issue as higher layer may not be aware of other UEs’ reserved resources.
* Option 6 seems to be meant for FDM, where we do not think there would be any inter-UE blocking if transmissions across RB-sets are aligned.
* Option 7 implies modifications to the LBT procedure, and it is not clear how a UE may be able to discern during sensing between a SL and an incumbent technology.

If RAN1 converges that inter-UE blocking is indeed an issue, we are not sure how this could be solved by implementation. Perhaps, companies supporting this option could clarify. |
| Vivo | Option 1 and option 2 and option 7can be further discussed | Option 1 and Option 2 can be prioritized. Since this 2 options discuss inter-UE cases, implementation may not be good direction considering system performance. Option 7 is more straightforward and efficient to address blocking issue.Regarding whether LBT first or resource selection first, no need to have a clear order for this, i.e., option 4. UE implementation can handle this issue.The spec. impact of option 3 is not clear.Option 6 and option 1 can be merged. |
| CMCC | Option 1, Option 2, or Option X | Option 3 may cause redundant resource selection;For option 4, we think resource selection should be done first, then LBT should be based on the selected resources;For option 5, we think the randomness for resource selection should not be broken;Option 6 and option 7 will bring unfairness to other RATs;We are also fine with option X to reduce the complexity and workload. |
| Sony | Option 1, 2 |  |
| Spreadtrum | Option X |  |
| Futurewei | Option X | Not clear to us when resource selection is done whether a SL UE can know if that transmission would be in a shared COT or independent COT. It looks like an unnecessary fragmentation of resources where each transmission may be in a separate COT (due to gaps longer than 25 us).  |
| Samsung | Option 2,4 | Our first preference includes option 2 and 4, second preference includes option 1 and 3. So we can also accept Option 1 and 3 if majority prefer.The other options are not stable or have uncertain gain in our view. |
| ETRI | Both Option 1 and Option 2 | In case of Option 2, COT sharing should be guaranteed, and its applicability will be limited. Therefore, it can be a complement of Option 1. |
| xiaomi | option 2 |  |
| ZTE | Option3 +Option X | Considering 2 candidate starting symbols are supported for PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, in Option X, One UE can delay 1st starting symbols to the 2nd starting symbol in order to avoid inter-UE blocking from performing Type 1 LBT . |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1, first bullet of Option 2, and Option 4 | For Option 1,* Consider to protect the high priority transmission and avoid high priority transmission LBT procedure, sufficient time gap before transmission should be left. However, to avoid being blocked by other transmissions, the other transmissions do not have to be with high priority.
* Besides, if the avoidance is performed by MAC layer, the L1 layer need to report the additional resource set to inform other UE reservations, which introduce unnecessary procedure and specification impact. Thus, avoidance performed in L1 layer is preferred.

Based on the above discussions, the updated option 1 is shown as follows:* + Option 1:
		- UE avoid selection of a resource before a reserved resource with high priority when the transmitting symbols of the selected resource overlap with Type 1 LBT of the reserved resource.
		- UE avoid selection of a resource ~~with high priority~~ after a reserved resource when the transmitting symbols of the reserved resource overlap with LBT of the selected resource.
		- ~~FFS:~~ the avoidance should be performed by L1 exclusion ~~or L2 MAC selection~~
		- FFS: whether / how to achieve this in RA mode 1

For Option 2,* For first bullet, if there is reservation with higher priority, UE can select resource(s) for transmission in slot(s) before a reserved resource, which can improve the resource efficiency and protect the transmission with higher priority.
* For second bullet, if resource selected within the COT of other UE, whether the resource is shared by other UEs cannot be ensured, thus the enhancement is not necessary.

Based on the above discussions, Option 2 can be modified as follows:* + Option 2:
		- UE prioritizes/selects resource(s) for transmission in slot(s) after a reserved resource with higher priority when transmission of the selected resource is able to share the initiated COT of the reserved resource (i.e., the selected resource(s) is within the COT duration of the reserved resource and the CAPC value of the selected resource(s) is equal to or higher than that of the reserved resource).
		- ~~UE prioritizes/selects resource(s) for transmission in slot(s) before a reserved resource when transmission of the selected resource is able to share its initiated COT with the reserved resource (i.e., the reserved resource is within the CAT duration of the selected resource(s) and the CAPC value of the selected resource(s) is equal to or smaller than that of the reserved resource).~~
		- FFS whether / how to achieve this in RA mode 1.
 |
| CATT/GH | Option 7 or Option X | Among the options, our preference is Option 7, which can accurately avoid the impact of other sidelink UEs on the Type 1 channel access procedure.However, if it is hard to reach a consensus, we also support Qualcomm’s suggestion, i.e., conclude this issue with Option X and discuss other options for solving other issues. |
| MediaTek | 2/3/4/6 | We propose to modify option4 as following* + Option 4: The expected LBT duration is determined firstly, then resource selection takes into account of the expected LBT duration is performed.

The expected LBT duration can be preconfigured based on system loading or CAPC priority and the expected LBT duration can be also predicted by UE. |
| Transsion | Option X |  |
| ETRI | Option 1 and 2 |  |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 2 discussion

FL summary of Round 1 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 8 (I), a summary of solution preference is provided in the following.
	+ Option 1 (12): DCM, LGE, IDC, Nokia/NSB, Intel, vivo, CMCC, Sony, ETRI, Huawei/HiSilicon
	+ Option 2 (15): OPPO, DCM, LGE, Nokia/NSB, Intel, vivo, CMCC, Sony, Samsung, ETRI, xiaomi, Huawei/HiSilicon (1st bullet), MediaTek
	+ Option 3 (3): IDC, ZTE, MediaTek
	+ Option 4 (5): Apple, Samsung, Huawei/HiSilicon, MediaTek
	+ Option 5:
	+ Option 6 (1): MediaTek
	+ Option 7 (4): DCM, vivo, CATT/GOHIGH,
	+ Option X (11): OPPO, Ericsson, Lenovo, QC, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Futurewei, ZTE, CATT/GOHIGH, Transsion
	+ FL: As the results indicate, we should eliminate options that have only a handful of support or no support, so that we can have more focused study until the next meeting. At this stage, I think we don’t need to modify the down-selected options and companies can think more about how each option should work until the next meeting.

**Proposal 8 (II):**

* To resolve the Type 1 LBT blocking issue, where one UE performing a Type 1 LBT procedure for using its own selected/reserved resource(s) is blocked by another UE’s SL transmission at least in a slot preceding to the selected/reserved resource and causing the LBT to fail, down-select to one or a combination of the following options in a future meeting.
	+ Option 1:
		- UE avoid selection of a resource before a reserved resource with high priority when the transmitting symbols of the selected resource overlap with Type 1 LBT of the reserved resource.
		- UE avoid selection of a resource with high priority after a reserved resource when the transmitting symbols of the reserved resource overlap with LBT of the selected resource.
		- FFS: the avoidance should be performed by L1 exclusion or L2 MAC selection
		- FFS: whether / how to achieve this in RA mode 1
	+ Option 2:
		- UE prioritizes/selects resource(s) for transmission in slot(s) after a reserved resource when transmission of the selected resource is able to share the initiated COT of the reserved resource (i.e., the selected resource(s) is within the COT duration of the reserved resource and the CAPC value of the selected resource(s) is equal to or higher than that of the reserved resource).
		- UE prioritizes/selects resource(s) for transmission in slot(s) before a reserved resource when transmission of the selected resource is able to share its initiated COT with the reserved resource (i.e., the reserved resource is within the CAT duration of the selected resource(s) and the CAPC value of the selected resource(s) is equal to or smaller than that of the reserved resource).
		- FFS whether / how to achieve this in RA mode 1.
	+ Option X: No solution is needed. To avoid inter-UE blocking from performing Type 1 LBT can be handled based on UE implementation (e.g., as the start timing to perform LBT sensing is determined by each UE).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| DCM | OK |  |
| LG | OK |  |
| CMCC | OK  | We should estimate the workload also the progress of other essential issues, if RAN1 found time is limited in a future meeting, Option X should be naturally selected. |
| ZTE | OK | Option X is preferred. |
| Vivo | Keep Option 7 | We have simulation to show option 7 can increase system performance significantly.  |
| InterDigital | OK | We are fine to remove Option 3 for the sake of progress. Small correction to Option 2:* + Option 2:
		- UE prioritizes/selects resource(s) for transmission in slot(s) after a reserved resource when transmission of the selected resource is able to share the initiated COT of the reserved resource (i.e., the selected resource(s) is within the COT duration of the reserved resource and the CAPC value of the selected resource(s) is equal to or higher than that of the reserved resource).
		- UE prioritizes/selects resource(s) for transmission in slot(s) before a reserved resource when transmission of the selected resource is able to share its initiated COT with the reserved resource (i.e., the reserved resource is within the ~~CAT~~ COT duration of the selected resource(s) and the CAPC value of the selected resource(s) is equal to or smaller than that of the reserved resource).
		- FFS whether / how to achieve this in RA mode 1.
 |
| MediaTek | No, Option3/4 should be considered | 1. For a UE performing Type1 LBT procedure and fail to transmit on selected/reserved resource, one of the reasons is that the resource is selected/reserved to a time-slot that leaves too little time budget for UE to perform Type1 LBT
	* Case1 : Upon packet arrival T0, UE selects a resource on T1. Type1 LBT cannot be finished within (T1-T0)
	* Case2: UE finished a SL transmission on T0 and another UE’s transmission is reserved at T1. Type1 LBT cannot be finished within (T1-T0)

Both Option1 and 2 may not solved the issue mentioned in these cases, therefore we propose Option4, an estimated/predicted LBT duration to be considered in resource selection to solve the potential insufficient LBT sensing time issue.1. We have strong concern on Option1. There is no need to leave one slot offset between resources since 2 starting symbol configuration allows UE to transmit even Type1 LBT does not success on symbol#13 before the transmission slot. Plus, Option1 also causes resource efficiency issue.
2. Some companies mentioned that Option3 reduces resource efficiency. We think it won’t be a critical issue when the number of extra selected resources is preconfigured/predetermined considering system loading or other conditions. We suggest to make it clear for option3

*Option 3: UE selects extra / more resources than required for transmitting a TB (i.e., overbooking) to accommodate potential Type 1 LBT failures. FFS how to determine/preconfigure the number of extra selected resources.*With Option3, a UE has flexible slots margin to perform Type1 LBT and combat to the uncertainty of time duration of Type1 LBT. With a reasonable number of extra selected resources, Option3 can naturally achieve the design benefit of Option1. Case3 gives an example:* + Case3 : UE1 selects 2 slots where 1 slot is overbooked, the 2 selected slots (slot0, slot1) are right after a reserved resource of UE2. When performing type1 LBT starting from the ending time of UE2’s transmission symbol, slot0 is the flexible margin for UE1 to finish LBT sensing. Design goal of Option1/bullet2 is achieved.
1. Although some companies mentioned that considering the timeline of type1 LBT triggering time and resource selection time is not essential, but if UE keeps selecting/reserving resources without being able to perform SL transmission, the SL resource efficiency is sacrificed. We suggest to pursue solutions to improve SL-U performance.
 |
| Lenovo | See comments | We are wondering how Option 1 and Option 2 work since UE has no idea that how long the LBT duration is. How can UE estimate how many slots before/after the reserved resource should be excluded from candidate resource set? |
| Intel | OK |  |
| OPPO | Support |  |
| Panasonic | OK |  |
| Samsung | OK |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CATT/GH | Keep option 7 | Both option 1 and option 2 are selecting resources based on “a reserved resource”. However, in NR SL design, there are many trigger conditions for a UE to reselect resources, as listed by the FL in topic 9. Since the reserved resource is not always reliable, we don’t think option 1/2 are good solutions to resolve Type 1 LBT blocking issue. As we will not down-select among these options in this meeting, we can live with the above options and we think keeping option 7 is fair in this stage. The detected energy is always reliable, at least. |
| Transsion | OK |  |
| xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with modifications | For the second bullet of option 1, we think it is not necessary to emphasize the resource to be selected must have high priority, the key is to avoid being blocked by other transmissions on the reserved resource. Since the UE attempts to successfully transmit its transmission anyway, the principle should be applied for the transmissions regardless of the priority.* + Option 1:
		- UE avoid selection of a resource before a reserved resource with high priority when the transmitting symbols of the selected resource overlap with Type 1 LBT of the reserved resource.
		- UE avoid selection of a resource ~~with high priority~~ after a reserved resource when the transmitting symbols of the reserved resource overlap with LBT of the selected resource.

On the first bullet of option 2, we are feeling the benefits cannot be guaranteed. Whether the UE reserved resource can indicate the COT and share the resource to the resource selected UE are not ensured, even COT sharing conditions are satisfied, thus the transmission might not be protected. |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 3 discussion

FL summary of Round 2 inputs and comments:

* On Proposal 8 (II), as indicate by some, this is not the most essential work to complete in SL-U in Rel-18, as shown by 11 companies selecting Option X in the 1st round. If we keep many options on the table, then companies have to spend so much time to evaluate and discuss about them. This is surely not a good way to spend our time and energy. I strongly suggest that we go with Option 1, 2, and X for evaluation until the next meeting. For one of the options, I am not sure whether it is allowed by regulation by ignoring transmissions within the same RAT in EDT checking.
* @Lenovo, I guess in option 1 and option 2, when CAPC level of a reserved resource is known, the LBT sensing time can be estimated / MCOT duration can be derived.
* Let me try one more time to see if Proposal 8 is agreeable to everyone, with some updates to Option 1 and 2 according to comments.

**Proposal 8 (III):**

* To resolve the Type 1 LBT blocking issue, where one UE performing a Type 1 LBT procedure for using its own selected/reserved resource(s) is blocked by another UE’s SL transmission at least in a slot preceding to the selected/reserved resource and causing the LBT to fail, down-select to one or a combination of the following options in a future meeting.
	+ Option 1:
		- UE avoid selection of a resource before a reserved resource with high priority when the transmitting symbols of the selected resource overlap with Type 1 LBT of the reserved resource.
		- UE avoid selection of a resource ~~with high priority~~ after a reserved resource when the transmitting symbols of the reserved resource overlap with LBT of the selected resource.
		- FFS: the avoidance should be performed by L1 exclusion or L2 MAC selection
		- FFS: whether / how to achieve this in RA mode 1
	+ Option 2:
		- UE prioritizes/selects resource(s) for transmission in slot(s) after a reserved resource when transmission of the selected resource is able to share the initiated COT of the reserved resource (i.e., the selected resource(s) is within the COT duration of the reserved resource and the CAPC value of the selected resource(s) is equal to or higher than that of the reserved resource).
		- UE prioritizes/selects resource(s) for transmission in slot(s) before a reserved resource when transmission of the selected resource is able to share its initiated COT with the reserved resource (i.e., the reserved resource is within the COT duration of the selected resource(s) and the CAPC value of the selected resource(s) is equal to or smaller than that of the reserved resource).
		- FFS whether / how to achieve this in RA mode 1.
	+ Option X: No solution is needed. To avoid inter-UE blocking from performing Type 1 LBT can be handled based on UE implementation (e.g., as the start timing to perform LBT sensing is determined by each UE).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Support?** | **Comments** |
| QC |  | Not essential |
| LGE | OK with some comments | For option 1, we can remove “with high priority” in the 1st bullet as well. Instead, we can just add “FFS: condition when it is applied”For Option 2, we also need to add “FFS: condition when it is applied”. The condition for utilizing COT might be considered including EDT, target UE on top of CAPC.  |
| CATT/GH | No | We still have concern about Option 1/Option 2.As mentioned in the last round, “reserved resource”-based resource selection is not reliable, since reselection may be triggered by many conditions. Type 1 LBT blocking issue can not be effectively resolved with either option, while only reductant resource selection procedures are added.From our perspective, if we need to resolve this issue, Option 7 is a better choice. Regarding FL’s comments that it is not clear whether this option is allowed by regulation, further checking may be required before precluding it. |
| Intel | Yes | OK with the proposal and to further discuss/conclude in the next meeting. |
| Vivo |  | Considering option 7 cannot be achieved by implementation, we suggest to keep it. Regarding whether option 7 follows the regulation or not, we cite some regulation from ETSI N\_301.893 “Load based Equipment shall implement a Listen Before Talk (LBT) based Channel Access Mechanism to detect the presence of other RLAN transmissions on an Operating Channel.”In our understanding, when UE performs CCA, UE can use all or some of the RLAN transmission for energy comparison with EDT. |
| OPPO | Support | Although we have concerns with Option 1 as commented in the previous round, we can accept this down-selection proposal for progress. In the end, we are fine with Option X, if the group cannot agree on a solution quickly. Agree with QC, this is not an essential issue that we need to spend too much time on. |
| Futurewei | OK |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support | We support the proposal and think such enhancements as option 1 and option 2 are beneficial with system performance.Unlike NR-U system, which every transmission is under gNB control and the Type-1 LBT blocking issue can be avoided by gNB scheduling, SL-U is a distributed system and resources are sensed and achieved by UE itself in mode 2. If no solution is adopted to resolve blocking issue, the system performance would suffer with dramatically loss. Take option 2 as an example, we simulated related scheme in our contribution R1-2208448 in RAN1 #110bis, if resources are selected considering potential COT sharing, the UPT can be increased by 83%.@CATT, we disagree the point that “reserved resource”-based resource selection is not reliable. Every specific design of mode 2 RA relies on the reservation, if reservation cannot be treated reliable, how does whole mode 2 scheme work? On the option 7, we are open for discussion.For the comments from other companies in last round, we have a short reply respectively here.@MTK, the second starting symbols provides one more opportunity for UE to access the channel, but for some transmissions with lower CAPC, the symbols before the 2nd starting symbols still not sufficient for UE performing Type-1 channel access. For example, assume CAPC = 3 and use minimum CWS = 15 for a transmission, 178us, nearly 5 symbols at 30kHz SCS, are used for Type 1 LBT, however, only 4symbols are left if the second starting symbols begin at symbol 3.@Lenovo, as per the length of time gap, we think FL has provided a clear response which can be estimated when CAPC level of a reserved resource is known. Since SL is scheduled per slot, we think one slot gap could be suitable for most cases.  |

## [CLOSED] Topic #9: RAN2 LS on SL resource (re)selection (R1-2302278)

**Background [36-43]:**

An LS from RAN2 [36] informing RAN1 the following understandings/agreements:

* UE triggers resource (re)selection upon receiving an LBT failure indication from PHY for a PSSCH transmission
* It is FFS whether such new resource (re)selection trigger is also applicable for the multiple consecutive slots transmission (MCSt) case

Action to RAN1: RAN2 kindly asks RAN1 to take the above information into consideration and to provide feedback, if there are any concerns with such behaviour.

Several discussion papers / draft LS replies are submitted in this meeting [37-43], and they are summarised in the following.

[37/vivo]: Seeking clarification from RAN2 on the UE behaviour for “upon receiving an LBT failure indication from PHY, the resource (re)selection is triggered only for the PSSCH transmission that triggers the LBT failure indication report, or for all the (remaining HARQ retransmission) resources of the SL grant/HARQ process, or for all the SL grants in the resource pool?”

[38, 39/Ericsson]:

* The LBT failure situation is regarded as equivalent to the resource (re)selection trigger by the re-evaluation or pre-emption of the resources according to the existing (Rel-16/17) procedures.
* In the case of MCSt, it may not be advantageous to treat all the slots together when the LBT failure is received. In case of LBT failure at the beginning of MCSt, the UE may transmit a fraction of the slots belonging to the MCSt if the channel becomes available at a later point within the selected/reserved resources of MCSt.

[40/MediaTek]:

* Regarding LBT failure indication for the case of MCSt, whether it can be used as a new trigger for resource (re)selection depends on the MCS is used for one TB transmission and/or multiple TB transmissions.
* It should be clarified by RAN2 the resource (re)selection is for different resource within the same RB set for which LBT failure is indicated; and/or for different RB set for which LBT failure has not been indicated.
* It should be clarified by RAN2 the accumulation method of LBT failure counter if the resource (re)selection is aiming for different RB set.

[41/ZTE, SC]: from RAN1’s perspective, there is no concern on the UE behaviour that UE triggers resource (re)selection upon receiving an LBT failure indication from PHY for a PSSCH transmission. And RAN1 also thinks the similar behaviour for pre-emption and re-evaluation in Rel-16 can be applied to MCSt case.

[42/Qualcomm]: RAN1 considers that RAN2’s assumption might be premature. In fact, RAN2 indicated "FFS" (i.e., conditions for diverging from the made assumption) only for the MCSt case but there is another case under discussion in RAN1 that, if supported, would invalidate RAN2’s assumption:

* RAN1 study case: Multiple consecutive resources can be selected to provide more transmission occasions (e.g., N slots) for a single TB, that is, some LBT failures (e.g., up to N-1) can occur before triggering resource (re)selection.

This case is not within the MCSt subject, but it is currently under discussion in RAN1 and, if supported, it would render invalid RAN2’s original assumption.

[43/HW, HiSi]: There is no concern from RAN1 perspective that UE triggers resource (re)selection when receiving an LBT failure indication from PHY for a PSSCH transmission. For the multiple consecutive slots transmission (MCSt), it is still under discussion in RAN1 and RAN1 will notify RAN2 once there is agreement.

Based on the provided inputs (summary above), FL has the following comments.

* The LBT failure indication from PHY is for a PSSCH transmission. When higher triggers a resource (re)selection, the PHY reports a set of candidate resources (*SA*). It is up to MAC layer (RAN2 to decide) whether the re-selection is just for the PSSCH transmission that has the LBT failure or for all the (remaining HARQ retransmission) resources of the SL grant/HARQ process, or for all the SL grants in the resource pool. It’s FL’s understanding, it is more reasonable to re-select just the PSSCH transmission that has LBT failure.
* Currently, RAN1/2 has not agreed to support overbooking of resources for either single-TB or multiple-TB transmissions. Perhaps we should not make assumption/decision for something that has not been agreed. In this sense, higher layer trigger resource re-selection for single or multiple-TB cases should be fine (aligning with re-selection trigger due to LBT failure indication for the non-MCSt case).
* According to existing R16 resource re-selection behaviour, a resource can be selected from anywhere within the resource pool (confining within a resource selection window). If a SL-U resource pool spans over multiple RB sets, due to random selection among the reported candidate resources, a re-selected resource could be in the same RB set for which LBT failure is indicated or a different RB set (unless RAN2 changes this ransom selection behaviour in R18 SL-U).
* The received LS from RAN2 is not related to how LBT failure counter is accumulated for the purpose of consistent LBT failure declaration. The PHY layer is only responsible for reporting a set of candidate resources within a resource pool. How the MAC layer (re-)selects resources and how to take into account of consistent LBT failure in an RB set can be decided by higher layer (e.g., RAN2).
* It is unclear, besides the case of MCSt, RAN1 is studying the case where some LBT failures (e.g., up to N-1) can occur before triggering resource (re)selection for a single TB transmission.
* Based on the above comments and inputs from companies, it is unclear there is a serious concern on RAN2’s agreements in the received LS [36] and that RAN1 needs provide a reply LS (since details of MCSt are not finalized in RAN1).

### FL Proposal for round 1 discussion

**Question 9 (I):**

* Based on the above summary of inputs and FL comments, is there still a concern regarding RAN2’s agreements in the received LS [36] that RAN1 should inform RAN2 about? If yes, please elaborate the concern(s) in detail.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | No concern on RAN2’s LS |
| InterDigital | No concern |
| Ericsson | There is no concern, but it may be good to explicitly agree that “The LBT failure situation is regarded as equivalent to the resource (re)selection trigger by the re-evaluation or pre-emption of the resources according to the existing (Rel-16/17) procedures” and indicate it to RAN2. |
| Lenovo | We agree with FL’s analysis and don’t have a concern. |
| Apple | No concern |
| CableLabs | No concerns |
| QC | We suggest to inform RAN2 of the still ongoing discussions in RAN1.Regarding FL’s comment “It is unclear, besides the case of MCSt, RAN1 is studying the case where some LBT failures (e.g., up to N-1) can occur before triggering resource (re)selection for a single TB transmission” we believe that Option 3 in Proposal 8 actually introduces the case we are talking about. So it is premature that RAN2 assumes that the “exit case” from their assumptions is only multi-consecutive slots TRANSMISSIONS, it could also be multi-consecutive slot SELECTION for transmitting a TB a single time. Even Under MCSt, anyway, there is the case where more slots N2 can be requested compared to the number of TBs N1 (N2>N1), even in that case, triggering re-selection for every single LBT failure may be not correct. |
| Intel | No - We do not have any concerns.  |
| vivo | We basically share the view with FL that “It is up to MAC layer (RAN2 to decide) whether the re-selection is just for the PSSCH transmission that has the LBT failure or for all the (remaining HARQ retransmission) resources of the SL grant/HARQ process, or for all the SL grants in the resource pool”. Our understanding is that RAN2 sending LS asking RAN1’s opinion on RAN2’s agreement, but RAN can hardy provide such evaluation without further details. If RAN2 does expect RAN1’s feedback, further details are needed.Alternatively, we may wait until RAN2 provides more information in the future LS. |
| CMCC | No concern |
| Sony | No concern |
| Spreadtrum | No concern |
| Samsung | No concern |
| ZTE | We share similar understanding with FL, and have no concerns on RAN2’s LS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No concern. Further progress on MCSt in RAN1 can inform RAN2 later once it is made. |
| CATT/GH | No concern |
| MediaTek | We think the MCSt can be further discussed as following 2 cases, where MCSt for a single TB case should be further clarified for LBT failure triggering condition and corresponding resource (re)selection behavior.-MCSt corresponding to each slot for different TB, then resource (re)selection should be triggered for multiple TBs-MCSt corresponding to all slots for the same TB, we should further clarify how the same TB is mapped onto the slots of MCSt |
| Transsion | No concern |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 2 discussion

FL summary of Round 1 inputs and comments:

* On Question 9 (I), a summary of opinion is provided in the following.
	+ No concern on RAN2’s LS (19): OPPO, IDC, Ericsson, Lenovo, Apple, CableLabs, Intel, vivo, CMCC, Sony, Spreadtrum, Samsung, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT/GOHIGH, MediaTek, Transsion
	+ A response LS to RAN2:
		- Ericsson: “The LBT failure situation is regarded as equivalent to the resource (re)selection trigger by the re-evaluation or pre-emption of the resources according to the existing (Rel-16/17) procedures.”
		- QC: “It is premature that RAN2 assumes that the “exit case” from their assumptions is only multi-consecutive slots TRANSMISSIONS, it could also be multi-consecutive slot SELECTION for transmitting a TB a single time. Even Under MCSt, anyway, there is the case where more slots N2 can be requested compared to the number of TBs N1 (N2>N1), even in that case, triggering re-selection for every single LBT failure may be not correct.”
	+ FL: In R16, there could be different reasons to trigger a resource (re)selection, e.g., transmission dropping due to priority, UL transmission, half-duplex issue, MAC PDU change, re-evaluation, pre-emption checking. Regardless the reason a resource is re-selected, the process/procedure to trigger L1 to report a subset of candidate resources and the MAC layer selection is the same. In SL-U, we will have a new condition to re-select a resource, due to LBT failure. It is not expected that the re-selection process will be any different. If RAN1 has an agreement that it should be different, we can inform RAN2 accordingly.

Right now, we have not agreed to support overbooking of resources in SL-U. Once RAN1 has made an agreement to support this feature in the resource selection, we can inform RAN2 accordingly.

Based on the inputs, it seems no response LS to RAN2 is necessary. Hence this topic/issue will not be pursued anymore in this meeting.

## [CLOSED] Topic #10: RAN2 LS on LBT and SL resource (re)selection (R1-2302283)

**Background [44-46]:**

An LS from RAN2 [44] informing RAN1 the following RAN2 agreements:

* RAN2 understands L1 handles LBT impact to/from other UEs’ reserved resources in SL candidate resource selection (inter-UE case).
* RAN2 will study how MAC performs resource (re)selection with the consideration of LBT impact to its own candidate resource (intra-UE case).

Action to RAN1: RAN2 respectfully asks RAN1 to take the agreements into account in their related work and provide feedback if any concern.

One draft reply LS [45] and one discussion paper [46] are provided in this meeting, and they are summarised in the following.

[45/CATT, GH]: It is RAN1’s understanding that LBT impact on SL candidate resource selection and resource (re)selection should be considered together. In fact, RAN1 has already discussed these aspects during several RAN1 meetings. Therefore, RAN1 respectfully asks RAN2 to reconsider these agreements and leave the resource (re)selection procedures for RAN1 to discuss.

[46/ZTE, SC]: To balance advantages and disadvantages, also considering there are quite a few essential issues to be addressed under the remaining Rel-18 budget, we think the LBT impact for inter-UE cases should not be considered during sensing and resource selection procedure, and the following proposal is given:

* The LBT impact for inter-UE cases should not be considered during sensing and resource selection procedure.

Based on the provided inputs (summary above), FL has the following comments.

* The comments and proposals in both [45][46] seemed reasonable. And special thanks to [46] for providing such detailed analysis. Unless a resource (re-)selection issue only exists in the higher layer (for which L1 has no knowledge about), e.g., consistent LBT failure detection (including the timer and counter), RAN1 has discussed and decided in the past SL resource allocation and procedure issues.
* For the inter-UE case, this issue is treated in Topic #8 of this FL summary in this meeting. We can further discuss whether this inter-UE case should be handled in RAN1 under the Topic #8, based on the analysis provided in [46].
* In [45], a draft response to RAN2 is provided. We can further discuss whether we should respond to RAN2 accordingly.

### FL Proposal for round 1 discussion

**Question 10 (I):**

* According to [45], a draft response is provided as followed. Should RAN1 respond to RAN2’s LS according to [45]? Or a modification on the wording / meaning is needed?
	+ It is RAN1’s understanding that LBT impact on SL candidate resource selection and resource (re)selection should be considered together. In fact, RAN1 has already discussed these aspects during several RAN1 meetings. Therefore, RAN1 respectfully asks RAN2 to reconsider these agreements and leave the resource (re)selection procedures for RAN1 to discuss.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We are open to send LS according to [45] (no strong view) and OK to follow the majority view |
| DCM | OK since we prefer to discuss resource selection including intra-UE case in RAN1. |
| LGE | We think that RAN1 should respect RAN2’s agreement as in other RAN2 agreements. We do not need to have reply LS to RAN2 for this purpose.  |
| NOKIA, Nokia Shanghai Bell | We don’t see the immediate need for the LS.We understand there is still work in progress in RAN1 to define LBT impact on SL candidate resource selection.But we don’t think there is any urgency to send LS to RAN2 to prevent them to study MAC resource (re)selection impact. |
| Lenovo | We agree with the intention of [45], though the detailed text could be reviewed. |
| QC | We agree with the spirit of the response. |
| Intel | As other companies, we do not see the need to respond right away to the LS as there is no urgency from RAN2, while RAN1 is still discussing and making progress.  |
| Vivo | we agree this is RAN1 issue. |
| CMCC | We agree with the spirit of the response. |
| Futurewei  | No urgency |
| Samsung | We are open to respond LS and OK to follow majority view |
| ZTE | We are open to send LS according to [45], and OK to have a conclusion on intra-UE case in RAN1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK, and both inter-UE case and intra-UE case should be discussed in RAN1. |
| CATT/GH | The intention of sending a reply LS is to inform RAN2 that RAN1 has already discussed LBT impact on SL candidate resource selection and resource (re)selection (both inter-UE case and intra-UE case). It would be beneficial for RAN1 and RAN2 to further progress on the resource selection issues with this LS reply. |
| MediaTek | OK |

### FL summary, comments and proposals for round 2 discussion

FL summary of Round 1 inputs and comments:

* On Question 10 (I), a response LS according to [45]?
	+ Yes/OK (11): DCM, Lenovo (review text), QC, vivo, CMCC, ZTE, Huawei/HiSilicon, CATT/GOHIGH, MediaTek
	+ Not necessary/no urgency (5): LGE, Nokia/NSB, Intel, Futurewei
	+ FL: Although in the past, we have been making most of the resource (re)selection decisions that are related to L1, as LGE pointed out, we should try to respect agreements made in RAN2. In this regard, instead of asking RAN2 to reconsider the agreements they had already made in the last meeting, we could kindly ask them to inform us once agreement(s) are made on how MAC performs resource (re)selection with the consideration of LBT impact to its own candidate resource (intra-UE case).

**Proposal 10 (I):**

* A draft response could be reply to RAN2 according to the following:
	+ RAN1 kindly ask RAN2 to inform us once agreement(s) are made on how MAC performs resource (re)selection with the consideration of LBT impact to its own candidate resource (intra-UE case).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| DCM | OK |
| LGE | We are open on whether or not to send LS to RAN2 with the above contents.  |
| CMCC | OK |
| ZTE | OK |
| Vivo | It seems the LS does not contain essential information, then we are also fine not to send anything to RAN2 |
| Intel | Agree with Vivo. We think that this LS draft does not contain any information that would either help us or RAN2 to make progress, and we are also OK not to send anything to RAN2  |
| OPPO | Same view as LGE and vivo, it is better not to send with the above contents as we can always obtain RAN2 agreements by ourselves. |
| Samsung | OK |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT/GH | We agree with the intention of proposal 10 and suggest the following modification:* + RAN1 kindly inform RAN2 that RAN1 is also discussing LBT impact to UE’s own candidate resource (intra-UE case) and will inform RAN2 once agreements are made. RAN1 also kindly ask RAN2 to inform us once agreement(s) are made on how MAC performs resource (re)selection with the consideration of LBT impact to its own candidate resource (intra-UE case).

As mentioned before, the main information of this reply LS should be informing RAN2 that RAN1 is also discussing LBT impact to UE’s own candidate resource (such as redefine T1) and will inform RAN2 once agreements are made. This may let RAN2 understand the situation better. |
| xiaomi | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |

FL summary of Round 2 inputs and comments:

* FL:
	+ If we go with CATT’s latest version, then it is not good that both WGs are working on the same issue/topic. It will be like who is faster in coming up with a solution. Since there are multiple companies have a view that the current draft reply LS does not contain essential information. I think it is better not to send a reply LS and respect RAN2’s decision.
	+ I propose to close this discussion.

Contribution summary for channel access mechanism

## Regulation aspects (for easy reference)

* **Short control signalling transmission (SCSt)**
	+ According to European regulation (ETSI EN 301 893), The use of *Short Control Signalling Transmissions* is constrained as follows:
		- within an observation period of 50 ms, the number of Short Control Signalling Transmissions by the equipment shall be equal to or less than 50; and
		- the total duration of the equipment's Short Control Signalling Transmissions shall be less than 2 500 µs within said observation period.

## Type 1 channel access procedures

* **Remaining details of CAPC table, and p and value for S-SSB and PSFCH**
	+ Support of RRC parameter “*absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology-r16*” or similar for SL-U
		- [2/Nokia, NSB] (performance gain provided), [7/OPPO], [10/Intel]
		- FFS: [9/CATT, GH]
* **Energy detection (ED) threshold setting**
	+ [5/vivo]:
		- No enhancement on the UE-to-UE ED threshold is needed.
		- SL UE deems channel busy only if the UE detects transmission other than SL occupying the channel (e.g., exceeding the energy detection threshold) during the LBT duration, i.e., the energy detection in LBT procedure does not take into account the SL transmissions.
	+ [10/Intel]:
		- The Rel.16 NR-U EDT calculation should be used as a baseline for SL-U.
		- For S-SSB transmissions:
			* for a UE without a shared channel occupancy, within the calculation of the EDT threshold a UE should apply TA = 5 dBm as in NR-U;
			* for a UE within a shared channel occupancy, within the calculation of the EDT threshold a UE should apply TA = 10 dBm as any other type of transmission.
	+ [13/LGE] For SL transmission, energy detection threshold is determined as follows:
		- If a UE does not share its COT duration to another UE(s),
			* + ;
				+ is the single channel bandwidth in MHz;
				+ ;
				+ *Down-select one of followings for :*

*Alt 1-1: 10 dB for all the cases*

*Alt 1-2: 5 dB at least for S-SSB or 10 dB otherwise*

*FFS: Other SL channel(s)*

* + - * + *Down-select one of followings for :*

*Alt 2-1:* PCMAX\_H,*c**for a given SL channel type and/or a given resource pool (if applicable)*

*Alt 2-2: (Pre)configured value*

* + - If a UE shares its COT duration to another UE(s), the energy detection threshold is set to one of followings:
			* Alt 3-1: (Pre)configured value
			* Alt 3-2: Value indicated by COT sharing information
		- FFS: ED threshold and/or its offset can be (pre)configured or PC5-RRC configured.
	+ [16/CableLabs]: The EDT procedure, defined by NR-U specs [2], section #4.1.5 (downlink) applies to S-SSB.
	+ [25/Transsion]: The EDT determination method for NR-U/LAA uplink can be used as a starting point for the study of EDT determination method for sidelink unlicensed access system.
	+ [27/Apple]: Type 1 EDT determination can use UL EDT as starting point. Consider both NW configured EDT and UE autonomously determined EDT based on PC,MAX.

## Type 2 channel access procedures

* **General aspects:**
	+ [10/Intel]:
		- If an initiating UE may pause its SL transmission and resume it within its own COT so that the following burst may fall within the MCOT, before transmission Type 2A LBT may be applied if the gap before any prior transmission may be larger than 25 us and the pause may be larger than 100 us.
	+ [13/LGE]: For Type 2A/2B/2C SL channel access procedure, a time gap to decide the type is measured according to one or more of followings:
		- Recently received PSCCH/PSSCH of which source ID and destination ID are the same as those of PSCCH/PSSCH conveying COT sharing information.
		- Recently received PSFCH in response of PSSCH transmission to the COT initiator UE.
	+ [15/xiaomi]: Type 2A and type 2B channel access is also applicable to the case of multi-slot transmissions from the same UE.
	+ [16/CableLabs]: DL Type 2B/2C communication, as specified by #4.1.2.2 and #4.1.2.3 [2] do not apply to the SL-U case.
	+ [22/Lenovo]: Support separate channel access procedure for uplink and sidelink in Rel-18 i.e., uplink and sidelink does not share the same UE initiated COT.
	+ [24/MediaTek]: If a UE determines the duration in time domain and the location in frequency domain of a remaining COT initiated by COT initiator, the UE may switch from Type 1 channel access procedures to Type 2A channel access procedures for its corresponding SL transmissions within the determined resources of the remaining COT.
	+ [27/Apple]: Type 2A/2B/2C SL channel access can be used for the COT initiating UE to resume transmission after gap within the COT, based on gap length.
* **Type 2A channel access procedure**
	+ When Type 2A is used for S-SSB without a shared COT
		- EDT:
			* Same as NR-U (max TX power and bandwidth): [2/Nokia, NSB], [4/HW, HiSi], [17/Samsung, 26/ZTE, SC] (=5 dB), [20/Intel]
			* FFS: [22/Lenovo]
		- Observation period:
			* Needed: [8/Spreadtrum],
				+ 50ms (SCSt regulation): [7/OPPO] (when 2A is used for PSFCH), [10/Intel], [30/QC], [35/WILUS]
				+ 160ms (S-SSB cycle): [9/CATT, GH], [17/Samsung]
				+ Up to UE implementation: [26/ZTE, SC]
			* Not needed: [4/HW, HiSi]
	+ Type 2A is used for PSFCH without a shared COT
		- Support: [5/vivo], [7/OPPO], [8/Spreadtrum], [9/CATT, GH], [11/Sony], [14/IDC], [18/Panasonic], [22/Lenovo], [25/Transsion], [26/ZTE, SC] (some PSFCH occasions), [31/NEC]
		- Not support: [3/FW], [4/HW, HiSi], [20/ETRI], [24/MediaTek]
		- Postpone: [21/CMCC] (after PHY structure)
	+ [14/IDC]: When the constraints are not met to transmit using Type 2A without shared channel occupancy, S-SSB and PSFCH can be transmitted using Type 1 or Type 2 channel access procedure in case of COT sharing.
* **Type 2B channel access procedure**
	+ [10/Intel]: The gap associated to a type 2B LBT is extended up to 25 us.
* **Type 2C channel access procedure**
	+ FFS under which conditions Type 2B or Type 2C is applied in case of a gap of 16 μs
		- Up to UE implementation: [4/HW, HiSi], [7/OPPO], [10/Intel], [15/xiaomi], [17/Samsung], [21/CMCC]
		- Subject to Tx duration at most 584us: [5/vivo], [22/Lenovo]

## Contention window adjustment procedures

* **Reference duration definition**
	+ Whether / how to define new reference duration or ending time for groupcast option 1
		- Yes: [13/LGE], [17/Samsung], [20/ETRI]
		- No: [5/vivo], [7/OPPO], [8/Spreadtrum], [13/LGE] (same ending time as existing one), [32/DCM]
	+ When MCSt is used in the latest COT,
		- No new ending time for the reference duration definition
			* [4/HW, HiSi], [17/Samsung], [23/E///]
		- the end of the first MCSt transmission that contains at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled
			* [2/Nokia, NSB], [5/vivo], [7/OPPO], [9/CATT, GH], [10/Intel], [25/Transsion], [34/ITL]
		- until the 1st full slot where PSSCH transmission happens, or burst end, whichever comes first:
			* [27/Apple]
* **SL-HARQ feedback is disabled in the latest COT / no PSFCH resource in RP (e.g., all cast types, S-SSB, PSFCH):**
	+ Option 1: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
		- [5/vivo], [9/CATT, GH], [10/Intel], [8/Spreadtrum], [7/OPPO], [13/LGE], [14/IDC], [18/Panasonic], [20/ETRI], [26/ZTE, SC], [30/QC], [32/DCM], [33/Sharp], [34/ITL], [35/WILUS]
	+ Option 2: CW is adjusted according to number blind retransmissions of the TBs within a COT.
		- [4/HW, HiSi], [17/Samsung]
	+ Option 3: CW is adjusted according to CR/CBR measurement, if CR/CBR is supported in SL-U.
		- [2/Nokia, NSB], [14/IDC], [17/Samsung], [19/CAICT], [22/Lenovo], [29/Fraunhofer], [31/NEC]
	+ Option 4: If a is consecutively used times for generation of , is updated for each priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- [17/Samsung], [22/Lenovo]
	+ Option 5: If a collision indicator is received, increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- [29/Fraunhofer]
* **Unicast (ACK/NACK):**
	+ Option 2: If at least one ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.
		- [2/Nokia, NSB], [4/HW, HiSi], [7/OPPO], [10/Intel], [17/Samsung], [18/Panasonic], [29/Fraunhofer], [30/QC], [31/NEC], [13/LGE], [35/WILUS]
* **Groupcast option 1 (NACK-only):**
	+ Option 0: Not to be supported in SL-U
		- [9/CATT, GH], [14/IDC], [23/E///] (including BC)
	+ Option 1: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
		- [4/HW, HiSi], [5/vivo], [7/OPPO], [18/Panasonic], [32/DCM], [34/ITL]
	+ Option 2:
		- If ‘NACK’ or a collision indicator (IUC scheme 2) is received, increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- When neither ‘NACK’ nor a collision indicator (IUC scheme 2) is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration,
			* Option A: is reset to for every priority class .
			* Option B: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
		- [2/Nokia, NSB, 20/ETRI, 25/Transsion, 29/Fraunhofer] (option A), [8/Spreadtrum], [19/CAICT], [13/LGE, 17/Samsung, 33/Sharp] (option B)
	+ Option 3: An ACK-only procedure is used instead of a NACK-only procedure. In this case, if at least a ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class , otherwise is increased.
		- [10/Intel]
	+ Option 4: CW is adjusted according to CR/CBR measurement, if CR/CBR is supported in SL-U.
		- [22/Lenovo]
	+ Option 5 (option 3+legacy): ACK feedback is performed when a TB is successfully decoded in addition to the legacy NACK-only procedure. In this case, if ACK only is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, then ,  otherwise is increased.
		- [26/ZTE, SC] (if ACK supported)
	+ Option 6: [35/WILUS]
		- If no NACK feedbacks are received from the other SL UEs, CWS should be reset for the next PSSCH transmission,
		- Elseif, all NACK feedbacks are received from the other group of SL UEs, CWS should be increased to the higher allowed CWS value,
		- Else, one or more NACK feedbacks except all NACK feedbacks are received, CWS should be reset for the next PSSCH transmission since it can be considered that at least one of groups of SL UEs successfully received PSSCH with groupcast transmission.
	+ Option 7: [31/NEC]
		- If receiving power on the associated PSFCH is lower than a threshold, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.
* **SL groupcast option 2 (ACK and NACK) within the last SL reference duration:**
	+ Option 1: Based on a (pre-)configurable ratio of received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks,
		- If the ratio of ACK received is above the (pre-)configured value, is reset to for every priority class , otherwise increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- [5/vivo], [7/OPPO], [9/CATT, GH], [17/Samsung], [18/Panasonic], [20/ETRI], [22/Lenovo], [26/ZTE, SC], [29/Fraunhofer], [31/NEC], [32/DCM], [34/ITL]
	+ Option 2: If at least a ‘ACK’ is received, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.
		- [4/HW, HiSi] (from each RX UE), [10/Intel], [13/LGE], [14/IDC], [19/CAICT], [23/E///], [30/QC] (same as NR-U), [35/WILUS]
	+ Option 3: If 100% ACK (i.e., neither NACK nor DTX) is detected related to at least one TB transmission within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.
		- [8/Spreadtrum], [32/DCM]
* **Mixed case (UE with different SL-HARQ feedback schemes) within the last SL reference duration:**
	+ [5/vivo]: UE adjusts the CWS based on the transmission with feedback enabled, where the unicast has the highest priority.
	+ [23/E///]: For MCSt, the CW is reset if at least one SL HARQ-ACK feedback for the TB(s) within the ‘reference duration’ is ‘ACK’.
* **Others:**
	+ [5/vivo]: The PSFCH or S-SSB within the reference duration cannot be used for CWS adjustment.
	+ [22/Lenovo]:
		- The uplink contention window size update procedure cannot be directly applied to sidelink.
		- To avoid priority-based dropping of HARQ-ACK associated with a CWS reference window, a Tx UE includes a 1-bit field to indicate if the corresponding PSFCH falls within the TX UE’s reference window. If so, an Rx UE uses the lowest priority value for the corresponding PSFCH priority determination (instead of the 3-bit field in the SCI).
	+ [23/E///]: SL-U transmissions without associated SL HARQ FB are not supported in Rel-18.
	+ [30/QC]:
		- For the reference duration, only PSCCH/PSSCH transmissions starting from the 1st starting symbol can be considered.
	+ [31/NEC]:
		- Contention window adjustment should be determined per priority, i.e., the same value and adjustment steps of the contention window should be used for each priority and all cast types with the same priority.

## CP extension (CPE)

* **Background information (variable**  **for CPE with configured grants in NR-U)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| index  |  |
| 0 |  |
| 1 |  |
| 2 |  |
| 3 |  |
| 4 |  |
| 5 |  |
| 6 |  |

* **Selecting between Option 1 (1-symbol) and Option 2 (2-symbol) CPE window**
	+ For PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, motivation/criteria to select CPE starting position between Option 1 (1 symbol) and Option 2 (2 symbols) before the next AGC symbol in 30kHz and 60kHz
		- Option 1 (COT initiation)/Option 2 (COT sharing): [4/HW, HiSi], [9/CATT, GH], [18/Panasonic], [20/ETRI], [25/Transsion], [30/QC], [31/NEC], [34/ITL]
			* Not support: [15/xiaomi]
		- Option 1 (SL transmission in prior symbols)/Option 2(channel is idle / no prior SL or WiFi transmission): [7/OPPO], [13/LGE]
		- Option 1 (non-reserved resource)/Option 2 (reserved resource): [24/MediaTek]
		- Option 1/Option 2 (based on pre-configuration): [5/vivo]
* **When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH**
	+ Criteria for selecting a default CPE starting position
		- Partial/full RB set allocation: [2/Nokia, NSB], [8/ Spreadtrum], [10/Intel], [17/Samsung], [18/Panasonic], [21/CMCC], [27/Apple], [32/DCM] (partial, full RB set inside a COT, full RB set and high priority outside a COT)
		- Resource reservation (in the slot of the intended SL transmission): [4/HW, HiSi, 14/IDC] (highest reservation priority), [5/vivo] (RSRP threshold, partial RB set), [7/OPPO], [12/Fujitsu], [13/LGE] (RSRP threshold), [24/MediaTek], [30/QC] (RSRP threshold), [33/Sharp]
		- Mode 1 DG/CG or RA mode1/2: [7/OPPO] (Mode 2), [18/Panasonic]
		- COT sharing: [9/CATT, GH]
		- Always try the default CPE position first: [26/ZTE, SC]
	+ Criteria for selecting one of the multiple CPE starting positions
		- Priority level (e.g., CAPC or L1): [4/HW, HiSi] (full RB set, COT initiating, L1), [7/OPPO], [9/CATT, GH] (CAPC), [13/LGE], [26/ZTE, SC], [5/vivo] (CAPC), [12/Fujitsu] (existing reservation), [22/Lenovo], [31/NEC], [14/IDC], [30/QC], [33/Sharp] (CAPC), [24/MediaTek] (CAPC)
		- Random selection: [21/CMCC] (full RB set), [18/Panasonic] (full RB set), [27/Apple] (full RB set), [30/QC]
		- Indication from the COT initiating UE: [6/NSC], [15/xiaomi], [17/Samsung], [27/Apple]
			* Not support: [30/QC], [7/OPPO]
		- Indication from the gNB (Mode 1): [7/OPPO], [22/Lenovo]
	+ Candidate (pre-)configuration values for multiple CPE starting positions
		- Value 0 (earliest CPE starting position): [7/OPPO], [13/LGE]
		- Value (latest CPE starting position): [4/HW, HiSi], [5/vivo], [7/OPPO] (RX/TX switching time should be considered), [30/QC]
		- Value (16µs, 25µs, 34µs, 43µs, 52µs, 61µs, …) for 2-symbol CPE window: [4/HW, HiSi], [5/vivo], [7/OPPO], [13/LGE], [30/QC]
		- Value (16µs, 25µs) for 1-symbol CPE window: [4/HW, HiSi], [5/vivo], [30/QC]
		- Value (0, 16µs, 25µs, ) for 1-symbol CPE window: [7/OPPO],
* **For MCSt**
	+ The gap symbol should be used for
		- CPE transmission: [5/vivo] (earliest=16µs), [7/OPPO], [13/LGE] (16µs)
		- PSSCH transmission (rate matching):
		- FFS: [4/HW, HiSi]
* **For S-SSB**
	+ Only a single CPE starting position: [4/HW, HiSi], [7/OPPO], [6/NSC], [9/CATT, GH], [31/NEC], [32/DCM], [34/ITL]
	+ Multiple CPE starting positions: [2/Nokia, NSB], [26/ZTE, SC] (legacy), [24/MediaTek], [30/QC] (2)
	+ CPE starting position should be
		- (Pre-)configured: [2/Nokia, NSB], [4/HW, HiSi], [7/OPPO], [30/QC], [32/DCM]
		- Pre-defined: [10/Intel] ( within a shared COT)
	+ CPE starting positions for the additional S-SSBs
		- FFS (PHY agenda): [4/HW, HiSi], [5/vivo], [26/ZTE, SC], [30/QC]
		- Same as legacy: [7/OPPO],
* **For PSFCH**
	+ CPE starting position should be
		- (Pre-)configured: [2/Nokia, NSB], [4/HW, HiSi], [7/OPPO], [26/ZTE, SC], [9/CATT, GH], [21/CMCC], [30/QC], [32/DCM], [34/ITL] (16µs and 25µs)
		- Pre-defined: [2/Nokia, NSB], [3/FW] (16µs), [26/ZTE, SC], [6/NSC], [10/Intel] ( within a shared COT)
		- Indicated: [21/CMCC] (COT sharing)
* [2/Nokia, NSB]:
	+ Support CPE starting position within one symbol before the AGC for any subcarrier spacing (Option 1). Option 2 should be only considered if RAN1 assumes that SL CG transmissions or SL semi persistent transmissions from different UEs may occur on same PSSCH resources.
	+ The allowed CPE starting position for PSFCH should be discussed after deciding whether PSFCH can be transmitted to any UE during a shared COT and after deciding if PSFCH can use SCSt with Type 2A.
* [5/vivo]:
	+ RAN1 should clarify whether the CPE starting position can be transmitted in SL symbol only, or in any symbol before the next AGC symbol.
	+ The Tx/Rx and Rx/Tx switching time can be absorbed by the time gap for CPE based on the Table 5.3.1-2 in TS 38.214.
	+ When single CPE starting positions is configured for the resource pool, the CPE is at least used to fill the gap(s) between the consecutive SL transmissions in the same COT, and the CPE starts within 16us after the prior transmission, and ends until the ACG symbol of a following transmission.
	+ For LBT for Rel-18 S-SSB occasion within a resource pool, the following options can be considered for CPE determination:
		- Option 1: the CPE is the same as the R16 S-SSB occasion.
		- Option 2: the CPE is determined in the same way as PSSCH/PSCCH in the same resource pool.
		- Option 3: If the LBT for the corresponding R16 S-SSB occasions failed, the longest CPE, or the CPE associated with the highest priority should be used for S-SSB transmission.
		- Option 4: the CPE is configured for the resource pool.
	+ For consecutive S-SSB transmissions in a COT, a short enough CPE is used for the leading S-SSB to avoid being blocked by prior transmission, and a long enough CPE is used for other S-SSB to occupy the channel.
* [6/NSC]: Only Type 2 LBT is applicable for Option 2 CPE within at most 1, 2 symbols just before the next AGC symbol for 15, 30 and 60 kHz SCS, respectively.
* [9/CATT, GH]:
	+ Partial/full RB set allocation is not considered as a criterion for selecting a default CPE starting position.
	+ When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured for PSCCH/PSSCH, the default CPE starting position is selected for transmissions within a COT.
* [10/Intel]:
	+ For UEs operating in RA mode 2 with full RB allocation, a pseudo-random CP extension may be applied just before the next AGC symbol using the same design principles used for CG design in Rel.16 NR-U and whose length may be 1 symbol for 15 kHz SCS and 2 symbols for 30 or 60 kHz SCS (Option 2). Details are FFS.
	+ For a UE operating in RA mode 1 transmitting PSSCH/PSCCH within a shared COT, it is left up to UE’s implementation to append a CPE of maximum length of one OFDM symbol before the next AGC symbol.
* [23/E///]:
	+ Timing offsets are used for preventing inter-UE blocking of high-priority transmissions and transmissions on reserved resources.
	+ A TX UE avoids using the first starting point in a slot if it expects a PSFCH transmission by another UE.
	+ CPE offsets are used for preventing inter-UE blocking of Mode-1 UEs and other UEs.
* [24/MediaTek]:
	+ Multiple CPE starting positions are supported outside and inside of a COT.
	+ Only support multiple CPE starting positions can be (pre-)configured in each resource pool for PSSCH/PSCCH transmission.
	+ Single CPE starting position can be achieved by the indication of COT initiating UE inside a COT.
* [17/Samsung]:
	+ Support dynamic indication of CP extension in SCI for CO sharing, wherein the candidate values for indication include T\_ext = 0, 1 symbol – 25 us, and 1 symbol – 16 us, and the symbol duration is subject to the SCS of SL transmissions;
	+ Support (pre-)configured CP extension to align the transmission starting time, wherein the candidate values for (pre-)configuration include T\_ext = 0, 1 symbol – 16 us, 1 symbol – 25 us, 1 symbol – 34 us, 1 symbol – 43 us, 1 symbol – 52 us, 1 symbol – 61 us, and the symbol duration is subject to 15 kHz.
	+ Multiple CP extension values can be (pre-)configured, taking into account whether all the RB-sets are utilized, and whether the transmission is within a CO.
* [30/QC]
	+ When a set of multiple CPE starting positions is pre-configured for PSCCH/PSSCH, UE selects the CPE starting position for its transmission over a given starting slot as follows:
		- Case 1: if (1) the transmission has not been reserved by the UE (e.g., first transmission of the TB) and (2) the UE has not received SCI-1 reservations for transmissions within the same starting slot, UE selects a CPE starting position from the set of multiple CPE starting positions without any attempt to FDM with other UEs (down-select one):
			* Alt A: priority-based selection (e.g., CAPC)
			* Alt B: random selection
		- Case 2: if one of the two conditions in Case 1 does not hold, UE selects a CPE value that is common to all transmissions by other UEs that use the same starting slot, i.e., UEs are FDM’ed.
			* The CPE value for this case is (down-select one)
				+ Alt 1: a default CPE value that is pre-configured,
				+ Alt 2: a default CPE dynamically selected among those indicated in SCI-1 reservation(s) that reserved a transmission with this starting slot (e.g., the indicated CPE value is selected similarly to Case 1)

FFS: details (e.g. rule to determine the default CPE dynamically according to reservations, e.g. highest priority in local reservations.)

* + - * FFS: additional conditions to be satisfied for Case 2 to hold (e.g., reservation(s) with RSRP < threshold, partial RB set allocation for the transmission and/or other UE(s) reservation(s), FDMed allocation with other UE reservation(s))
				+ FFS: the behavior when Case 2 does not hold due to the additional conditions (e.g., default to selection as in Case 1)
* [13/LGE]:
	+ For PSFCH transmissions using COT, the channel access type is determined based on the minimum time gap among PSFCH transmission(s) within the RB set.
	+ The RX-TX switching time for Uu link is the same as the RX-TX switching time of SL, and the RX-TX switching time is not considered for CPE and LBT operation in NR-U. RAN1 does not pursue to modify LBT operation or CPE mechanism to consider the TX-RX or RX-TX switching time of 13µs.
	+ For Option 1 for CPE starting position, the CPE length candidate is given by
		- For 15kHz SCS
		- For 30kHz SCS
		- For 60kHz SCS
	+ When Option 2 for CPE starting position is enabled, the CPE length candidate is given by one of following alternatives:
		- Alternative 1:
			* For 30kHz SCS
			* For 60kHz SCS
		- Alternative 2:
			* For 30kHz SCS
			* For 60kHz SCS
			* When a UE detects another SL transmission in the previous slot, UE uses Option 1 instead of Option 2
* [25/Transsion]:
	+ For COT sharing, the TA values of both the COT initiating UE and the responding UE should be considered when calculating CPE (except for MCSt).
* [27/Apple]: For 60KHz SCS, to allow 25us CCA, extend the gap symbol to 2 symbol length.
* [32/DCM]:
	+ For single CPE starting symbol for PSCCH/PSSCH, the position is (pre-)configured per RP and within the symbol just before the next AGC symbol.
	+ UE can use an additional CPE starting position (pre-)configured per RP and within at most 2 symbols just before the next AGC symbol for PSCCH/PSSCH with full RB set allocation and with a priority value smaller than a (pre-)configured value when type 1 LBT is performed.
* [33/Sharp]: In SL-U, and in Resource Allocation Mode 1, a UE autonomously determines presence or length of CPE in the same way as in Resource Allocation Mode 2.
* **Topics for further study**
	+ FFS if more than one symbol for SL configured grant and semi persistent transmissions
	+ FFS extending the CP duration up to 1 OFDM symbol for CP extension
	+ FFS symbol repetition of the previous or following SL transmission
	+ FFS backward symbol extension, e.g., to avoid non-aligned SL transmission starting locations

## UE-to-UE COT sharing

* **When performing PSFCH transmission(s)**
	+ A responding UE can utilize a shared COT to transmit PSFCH(s) to UE(s) other than the initiator UE without requiring at least one of PSFCH transmissions is intended for the COT initiator.
		- Yes: [4/HW, HiSi], [8/Spreadtrum], [7/OPPO], [6/NSC], [9/CATT, GH], [20/ETRI], [21/CMCC], [14/IDC], [24/MediaTek] (pre-configured PSFCH), [26/ZTE, SC], [30/QC], [31/NEC], [32/DCM], [34/ITL]
		- No: [5/vivo], [13/LGE], [23/E///], [25/Transsion]
* **When performing PSCCH/PSSCH transmission(s)**
	+ Additional ID(s) can be supported (as part of COT sharing information)
		- Yes: [2/Nokia, NSB] (only targets COT initiating UE), [4/HW, HiSi], [6/NSC], [7/OPPO], [8/Spreadtrum], [9/CATT, GH], [13/LGE], [14/IDC], [15/xiaomi] (only one), [17/Samsung], [18/Panasonic], [19/CAICT], [20/ETRI], [21/CMCC], [22/Lenovo], [26/ZTE, SC], [29/Fraunhofer], [30/QC], [31/NEC], [32/DCM], [34/ITL], [35/WILUS]
			* IDs acquired from SL sensing: [4/HW, HiSi] (higher priority/lower CAPC), [19/CAICT],
			* IDs that are provided by UE higher layer (logical IDs): [7/OPPO]
			* PC5-RRC configuration / group management: [13/LGE]
			* RSRP or distance threshold: [15/xiaomi]
			* L1 ID: [7/OPPO], [18/Panasonic], [30/QC]
			* Minimize signalling overhead: [26/ZTE, SC]
		- No: [5/vivo], [10/Intel], [23/E///], [27/Apple]
* **Applicable channels / operation / receiver / cast types**
	+ [3/FW]:
		- UE forwarding/relaying information about a COT initiated by another UE should not be supported.
		- A S-SSB transmission cannot initiate a COT because the S-SSB slot format soes not support COT sharing information.
		- A PSFCH transmission alone cannot initiate a COT. To be part of the COT transmission initiation the PSFCH transmission should follow a PSCCH/PSSCH transmission in the same slot which carries COT sharing information.
	+ [5/vivo]:
		- For a set of consecutive slots configured for R16 S-SSB occasion, if UE intends to transmit S-SSB on one or multiple of the slot, and it detects no SCI indicating a shared COT that is overlapped with the one or multiple slots but detects S-SSB on at least one slot in the set of consecutive slots.
			* It assumes that there is a 2ms shared COT starting from the first detected S-SSB
			* If the assumed COT is overlapped with its occasion for S-SSB transmission, it can share the COT to transmit S-SSB.
		- When a UE only has S-SSB to transmit and it accesses the R16 S-SSB occasion with Type-1 LBT successfully, the reserved bits in MasterInformationBlockSidelink is used to indicate the shared COT information, e.g., whether the COT can be shared for S-SSB, and/or the start of the COT.
			* FFS: whether a responding UE can transmit PSFCH(s) to UE(s) other than the initiator
		- UE forwarding/relaying information about a COT initiated by another UE is not supported.
		- If more than one COT is identified by a COT sharing UE, the responding UE should determine which COT to share according to the COT sharing information.
		- No enhancement on the UE-to-UE ED threshold is needed.
	+ [8/Spreadtrum]: A minimum time gap between COT sharing indication and transmission of shared UE should be introduced.
	+ [9/CATT, GH]
		- The following conditions should be introduced under which UE can perform COT sharing:
			* UE has data to transmit.
			* The remaining COT is larger than a (pre-)configured threshold ~~or the channel access priority value is larger than a (pre-)configured value~~.
		- UE-to-UE COT sharing started with S-SSB or PSFCH transmission is not supported.
		- The cast type should be considered for COT sharing operation:
			* For unicast, the COT sharing duration between the unicast pair can be determined as that in NR-U, and the restriction of the absolute duration of the COT can be up to the regulation of each country.
			* For groupcast or broadcast, the COT sharing ending time for all the COT sharing UEs is an absolute time, i.e., determined by the absolute duration from the starting occasion of COT sharing.
	+ [10/Intel]:
		- A responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) within an RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted to UEs other than the COT initiator when at least one PSSCH/PSCCH transmission is intended for the COT initiator.
		- Together with the initiating device, any responding UEs within a shared COT may redundantly carry the COT sharing information. [31/NEC]
		- There is no technical motivation for a Mode 1 UE to report to the associated gNB its COT sharing information.
	+ [12/Fujitsu]
		- For COT sharing, the RSRP or distance between UE-A and UE-B should be considered to determine whether UE-A can share a COT initiated by UE-B.
		- For COT sharing, it should be studied how to determine which COT to share if more than one COT is identified by a COT sharing UE.
	+ [13/LGE]: For utilizing the COT initiated by the COT initiating UE, the COT responded UE should use the transmit power in determining the resulting energy detection threshold which is used by the COT initiating UE to initiate the COT for UE-to-UE COT sharing.
		- FFS: Whether energy detection threshold to initiate the COT for UE-to-UE COT sharing is (pre)configured or indicated by the COT sharing information.
	+ [17/Samsung]
		- Support mode 1 UE report COT related information to gNB for aiding mode 1 RA.
			* Study if new/existing UCI format(s) in NR-U can be used to providing channel occupancy information from SL UE to gNB
			* FFS other details e.g., conditions and procedure.
	+ [19/CAICT]:
		- Limit the number of responding UE to share COT, considering the greater number of nodes to which COT is shared, the problem of COT interruption due to hidden node issue could be more serious.
	+ [21/CMCC]:
		- Do not support UE-to-UE COT sharing started with S-SSB or PSFCH from the initiator in SL-U.
		- Distance based COT sharing mechanism can be considered in SL-U:
			* If the distance between a pair of UEs is less than or equal to the threshold, COT sharing can be performed between them;
			* Otherwise, SL transmission can only be performed after successfully initializing a new COT by Type 1 channel access procedure.
	+ [22/Lenovo]
		- In order to support efficient transmissions of S-SSB in a shared COT, we think one of the following mechanisms should be adopted:
			* Option A: A responding UE over a shared COT for purposes of S-SSB transmissions can be any UE receiving the COT sharing indicator
			* Option B: The ‘additional ID’ functionality with the COT sharing indicator is supported and indicates one or more SLSS IDs + Iic to identify which synchronisation reference UE is allowed to use the shared COT for transmissions of S-SSB
			* Note: Neither of the proposed options are meant to allow such a UE to transmit signals/channels other than S-SSB, unless the UE is a target of a PSCCH/PSSCH transmission by a COT initiator.
		- RAN1 needs to study mechanism for COT recipient to select one COT sharing indicator/COT donor.
	+ [23/E///]
		- In the UE-to-UE COT sharing for the case of PSSCH/PSCCH, the receiver UEs of the transmission from the responder UE are restricted, e.g., based on a group belonging or based on specific service, while always including the initiator UE.
		- COT information is not shared or forwarded for any type of transmissions between different UEs.
		- The responding UE needs to ensure that the PSFCH transmission for the initiator UE is transmitted during the PSFCH occasion under the COT sharing mechanism, i.e., by means of re-prioritization of resources if needed.
		- For the case of PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, the responding UE needs to ensure that the transmission intended for the initiator UE and the UEs belonging to the IDs indicated in the COT sharing are transmitted within the COT sharing, i.e., by means of re-prioritization of transmissions.
	+ [26/ZTE, SC]: Before supporting additional ID (s) for COT sharing, the following two issues should be confirmed with RAN2:
		- For a transmission of one link from one UE, whether the source and destination IDs corresponding to other links associated with the UE are also available for this link
		- Whether a link can be identified by the truncated source/destination ID
	+ [27/Apple]: When the responding UE transmit within the shared COT, the resource selection window should be within the remaining COT length indicated in the initiating UE’s SCI.
	+ [29/Fraunhofer]:
		- The destination ID of the responding UE can be different to the source ID of the COT-initiating UE.
		- We propose that with regards to the channel types for the responding UEs transmissions using the shared COT, the responding UE should be capable of using the shared COT to transmit over PSCCH/PSSCH in the following time slot(s), or over the PSFCH in the same time slot.
		- The responding UE should be capable of using the shared COT to transmit over PSCCH/PSSCH in the following time slot(s), or over the PSFCH in the same time slot.
		- Use CPE and extended transmissions on guard symbols in order to retain the COT when sharing it across time slots and within the same time slot, respectively.
	+ [32/DCM]:
		- Send an LS to RAN2/SA to ask whether which UE (UE-ID) is included in a group of groupcast is known to each UE or not, and if the answer is YES, what is the condition if any
		- COT can be initiated by any SL channel/signal TX and can be shared to responding UE(s).
	+ [35/WILUS] At least for the unicast/groupcast SL transmission with HARQ-ACK enabled, UE-to-UE COT sharing should be supported in Rel-18 to guarantee PSFCH transmission opportunity to a receiver UE.
		- The UE-to-UE COT sharing may be desirable to be applied from PSCCH/PSSCH transmission to the nearest PSFCH transmission after channel access with a minimum period for UE-to-UE COT sharing.
* **COT sharing information contents for dynamic channel access (LBE)**
	+ COT length (starting offset and/or remaining): [4/HW, HiSi], [5/vivo], [9/CATT, GH], [10/Intel], [7/OPPO], [8/Spreadtrum], [22/Lenovo], [11/Sony], [27/Apple], [32/DCM], [30/QC], [26/ZTE, SC], [24/MediaTek], [18/Panasonic], [34/ITL], [31/NEC], [29/Fraunhofer]
	+ COT structure information (time and frequency resources): [4/HW, HiSi], [11/Sony], [30/QC]
	+ L1 ID (source ID/destination ID): [4/HW, HiSi], [5/vivo], [8/Spreadtrum], [9/CATT, GH], [7/OPPO], [22/Lenovo], [11/Sony], [32/DCM], [30/QC], [26/ZTE, SC], [24/MediaTek], [34/ITL], [29/Fraunhofer], [18/Panasonic]
	+ CAPC (priority): [4/HW, HiSi], [5/vivo], [8/Spreadtrum], [10/Intel], [9/CATT, GH], [7/OPPO], [22/Lenovo], [11/Sony], [27/Apple], [32/DCM], [30/QC], [26/ZTE, SC], [24/MediaTek], [18/Panasonic], [34/ITL], [31/NEC]
	+ Sensed LBT sub-bands / RB sets: [7/OPPO], [8/Spreadtrum], [9/CATT, GH], [11/Sony], [18/Panasonic], [32/DCM], [24/MediaTek], [34/ITL], [31/NEC]
	+ Initial Tx within the COT (e.g., PSFCH/S-SSB): [32/DCM]
	+ Channel access / LBT type: [4/HW, HiSi], [14/IDC], [27/Apple], [24/MediaTek], [29/Fraunhofer]
	+ CP extension: [27/Apple] (CPE index), [24/MediaTek]
	+ EDT: [27/Apple]
	+ Communication range: [21/CMCC]
	+ Responding UE’s transmission: [24/MediaTek]
	+ Whether the COT is allowed to be shared: [31/NEC]
	+ Whether source UE is the COT initiating or the responding UE: [18/Panasonic]
* **Container**
	+ SCI (1st and/or 2nd stage): [2/Nokia, NSB] (FFS), [4/HW, HiSi], [5/vivo], [9/CATT, GH], [10/Intel], [7/OPPO], [11/Sony], [22/Lenovo], [32/DCM], [30/QC], [29/Fraunhofer], [17/Samsung], [18/Panasonic], [15/xiaomi] (1st stage), [31/NEC], [34/ITL]
	+ MAC CE: [2/Nokia, NSB] (FFS)
* **Topics for further study**
	+ [13/LGE]: RAN1 conclude whether or how to support the case when a single PSCCH/PSSCH occupies multiple RB sets and a subset of the allocated RB sets belongs to the shared COT.
		- FFS: Whether or how to consider the shared COT in resource (re)selection
		- FFS: Whether or how to utilize the shared COT for the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission
	+ [17/Samsung]
		- For additional restrictions of responding UE transmitting PSSCH/PSCCH intended for the COT initiating UE, if a responding UE transmits PSSCH/PSCCH to destination groupcast ID with initiating UE as group member, study further conditions including HARQ option(s) of the groupcasted PSCCH/PSSCH.
		- In the case that a responding UE transmits PSSCH/PSCCH to destination groupcast ID with initiating UE as group member, further study:
			* Whether other receiver(s) of the groupcasted PSCCH/PSSCH can transmit PSFCH in the COT
			* How could the responding UE determine HARQ status in this case
	+ [30/QC]:
		- A method for grouping all the logical IDs related to communications with a COT initiating UE can be beneficial to support cross-cast and cross-session COT sharing.
		- RAN1 studies new COT sharing ID in COT sharing information, to signal COT sharing associated to a set of links (logical IDs)
			* FFS mapping of COT sharing ID to logical IDs (e.g., unicast source/destination ID, or destination ID for groupcast and broadcast).

## Multi-channel access

* **NR-U DL Type A and/or Type B multi-channel access (independent Type 1 or 2 LBT in each channel)**
	+ S-SSB
		- Support: [5/vivo], [7/OPPO], [15/xiaomi], [18/Panasonic] (Type A and B), [25/Transsion], [26/ZTE, SC]
		- Not support: [2/Nokia, NSB], [4/HW, HiSi], [9/CATT, GH], [24/MediaTek]
		- NR-U UL multi-channel access: [21/CMCC]
	+ PSFCH
		- Type A and/or Type B
			* Type A only: [2/Nokia, NSB], [5/vivo], [17/Samsung], [26/ZTE, SC], [35/WILUS] (at least)
			* Type B only: [9/CATT, GH]
			* Both Type A and Type B: [2/Nokia, NSB], [4/HW, HiSi], [6/NSC], [18/Panasonic], [31/NEC], [33/Sharp]
		- Multi-PSFCH transmissions are limited to contiguous RB set
			* Yes: [14/IDC], [35/WILUS]
			* No: [4/HW, HiSi], [7/OPPO], [6/NSC], [17/Samsung], [21/CMCC], [31/NEC], [33/Sharp]
			* Ask RAN4: [26/ZTE, SC]
* **Others**
	+ [3/FW]:
		- The maximum duration of multi-channel transmission on any channel , , shall not exceed , where the value of is determined using the Type 1 channel access parameters used to access channel .
		- Define conditions for SL-U multi-channel COT initiating and sharing.
	+ [5/vivo]:
		- The design of wideband operation in SL-U should support direct communication between a UE operating in multiple RB sets and another UE can only operate in one or subset of the RB sets. The SL UE transmits SCI in every allocated RB set and avoid to reserve resources in RB set other than the RB sets of the receiver.
		- In mode 2 resource selection, the number of the allocated RB sets should be limited as much as possible, especially when the TB size is small.
		- When determine whether to perform wideband transmission and the number of selected channels in wideband transmission, the information other than TB size, e.g. transmission priority or CBR measurement result, should be considered.
	+ [14/IDC]:
		- Support the COT initiator UE can maintain a subset of the acquired RB sets
		- Support COT sharing of all, or a sub-set of the RB sets acquired by the initiator UEs.
	+ [17/Samsung]: For PSCCH/PSSCH using multi-channel access, support transmitting corresponding PSFCH on a subset of RB sets. Further consider the following options:
		- Option 1: RX UE transmits PSFCH on the RB set with lowest index
		- Option 2: RX UE select a subset from RB set(s) of multi-channel access to transmit PSFCH, according to detected interference on each RB set, e.g., according to LBT result or CBR measurement
		- Option 3: RX UE select a subset from RB set(s) of multi-channel access to transmit PSFCH, according to pre-defined mapping rule
	+ [22/Lenovo]: Before discussing relaxations of channel access behaviour for SL-U in case of multiple TB transmissions on a carrier, RAN1 needs to have the technical discussion and agreement whether such a new transmission behaviour will be supported. This may involve RAN4's feedback on the feasibility and corresponding constraints.
	+ [24/MediaTek]: The CAPC value of PSFCH may have impact on the utilization of Type A/Type B NR-U DL multi-channel access for PSFCH transmission.
	+ [32/DCM]:
		- S-SSB and a PSFCH are not mapped across multiple RB sets.
		- For multi-channel access, support LBT type determination per channel based on whether COT is obtained/shared for each channel.
		- When a PSCCH/PSSCH is transmitted across multiple RB-sets, for how to perform LBT at each channel,
			* At channels where COT has not been initiated/shared, DL type A (type 1 at each channel) or type B (type 1 at a random channel and type 2 at the remaining channels) or UL mechanism (type 2 if condition is met; otherwise, type 1 at each channel) is reused.
			* At channels where COT has been initiated/shared, type 2 LBT is applied as in COT sharing procedure for a PSCCH/PSSCH transmission at a single RB-set.
* **Topics for further study**
	+ [9/CATT, GH]: For multiple channel access procedure,
		- How to identify initial contention window counter Ninit
		- How to perform COT sharing
		- The impact of half duplex

## Multi-consecutive slots transmission (MCSt)

* **Multi-Consecutive Slots transmission (MCSt)**
	+ When L1 is triggered for reporting a subset of candidate resources for MCSt,
		- Option 1: Only one set of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) is provided for the resource selection procedure in L1
			* [4/HW, HiSi] (for each TB), [5/vivo], [7/OPPO, 9/CATT, GH, 10/Intel, 21/CMCC, 30/QC] (number of slots), [8/Spreadtrum], [14/IDC], [18/Panasonic], [20/ETRI], [23/E///], [24/MediaTek] (CAPC, number of slots), [25/Transsion], [26/ZTE, SC], [27/Apple], [31/NEC], [32/DCM], [33/Sharp]
		- Option 2: one or multiple sets of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) are provided for the resource selection procedure in L1
			* [4/HW, HiSi] (multiple sets are provided independently), [15/xiaomi] (number of slots), [17/Samsung]
	+ When L1 reports a subset of candidate resources for MCSt,
		- Option A: L1 reports candidate multi-slot resources in *SA* where a candidate multi-slot resource consists of a set of single-slot resources that are consecutive in time
			* [5/vivo], [7/OPPO], [8/Spreadtrum], [9/CATT, GH], [10/Intel], [14/IDC], [15/xiaomi], [17/Samsung], [18/Panasonic], [21/CMCC], [23/E///], [24/MediaTek], [25/Transsion], [27/Apple], [29/Fraunhofer], [30/QC], [33/Sharp]
		- Option B: L1 reports candidate single-slot resources in (*SA*) as in Rel-16
			* [4/HW, HiSi] (for each TB), [15/xiaomi], [20/ETRI], [26/ZTE, SC], [31/NEC], [32/DCM]
		- Option C: L1 reports consecutive single-slot candidate resources in *SA*
			* [15/xiaomi]
	+ Multi-consecutive slots transmission as a single transmission of a TB is not supported:
		- [5/vivo], [7/OPPO], [32/DCM]
	+ The guard symbol between two adjacent slots in MCSt is filled-in such that there is no gap or the gap is less than 16 us (Type 2C or no LBT is needed) between the two slots by:
		- Option 1: Repeating the last PSSCH symbol of the earlier slot
			* [21/CMCC]
		- Option 2: Transmitting PSSCH / rate matching
			* [4/HW, HiSi] (FFS conditions), [12/Fujitsu], [22/Lenovo]
		- Option 3: Transmitting CPE
			* [5/vivo], [7/OPPO], [15/xiaomi], [30/QC], [32/DCM]
	+ [2/Nokia, NSB]
		- Regarding when L1 is triggered for reporting a subset of candidate resources for MCSt, both Option 1 or Option 2 are unclear how L1 determines the number of consecutive slots. When L1 is triggered for reporting a subset of candidate resources for MCSt, in case L1 should report candidate multi-slot resources (or consecutive single-slot candidate resources), RAN1 should consider another information for L1 to know the number of consecutive slots. Otherwise, the acquisition of candidate resources in consecutive slots should be based on implementation.
		- Regarding when L1 reports a subset of candidate resources for MCSt, RAN1 may discuss: (i) in case Option A/C is supported, how should L1 know about the number of consecutive slots for reporting (ii) in case Option B is supported, is up to MAC to select consecutive resources based on implementation instead of random selection (iii) MCSt only supported by implementation.
		- RAN1 can define rules for enabling/disabling GP during a MCSt, e.g., depending on whether it is expected different SL UE transmissions overlapping in time with a MCSt allocation.
	+ [4/HW, HiSi]
		- Option 1 and option 2 agreed in RAN1 #110bis-e agreement are not exactly the same as Rel-16 per TB-based resource selection procedure in L1, where multiple sets of parameters is provided for the resource selection procedure in L1 for the corresponding TBs, and the procedure is independently performed multiple times with multiple sets of parameters for multiple TBs.
		- In legacy sidelink design, the number of TBs and corresponding parameters are finally decided after receiving reported *SA* from PHY layer, it is unfeasible that number of consecutive slots indicated by MAC layer. If the length of multi-slot resources needs to be indicated by MAC layer, LS should be sent to RAN2 to check whether number of candidate TBs can be indicated before reporting candidate resource set.
		- L1 additionally reports resources to be shared to other UEs to higher (MAC) layer including corresponding L1 priority, CAPC and source/destination ID.
			* MAC layer shall select multi-consecutive slots resources for multiple TBs and resources to be shared if any.
	+ [5/vivo]:
		- One TB repetition and multi-TBs mapping over multiple slots are preferred for the scenarios of the multi-consecutive slot transmission in SL-U.
		- Additional ending loop condition in resource selection step 7) is required to ensure consecutive single-slot resources reported to higher layer.
	+ [8/Spreadtrum]: The consecutive single-slot candidate resources cannot have different sizes.
	+ [9/CATT, GH]:
		- For unicast and groupcast, HARQ feedback is transmitted after the whole MCSt transmission is finished and the mapping of PSFCH resource is based on the last resource of the MCSt.
		- Higher layer ensure that the CAPC level of a MCSt is a certain value.
	+ [10/Intel] Multi-UEs multi-consecutive slot transmission is supported by implementation by its procedure is not supported by design.
	+ [13/LGE]:
		- On the support of MCSt operation in SL-U, it is necessary to clarify whether the set S\_A is associated with a single TB/grant or can be associated with multiple TBs/grants.
		- On the support of MCSt operation in SL-U, if the set S\_A can be associated with multiple TBs/grants, it is necessary to further discuss which parameters (e.g., prio\_TX, L\_subCH, P\_rsvp\_TX) will be used to define candidate resource and to generate the set S\_A according to Mode 2 RA operation.
		- For MCSt for the different TBs or different SL grants of a UE, it is necessary to carefully investigate the case when the UE reselect or drop PSCCH/PSSCH transmission in the middle of MCSt due to resource collision or success of the TB.
	+ [14/IDC]
		- Support initial transmission and re-transmissions of a TB within a COT.
		- Study re-transmissions of a TB in a different COT than the one including the initial transmissions.
	+ [15/xiaomi]: Type 2A and type 2B channel access is also applicable to the case of multi-slot transmissions from the same UE.
	+ [17/Samsung]: How to handle the case that part of selected multi-slot resources become unavailable e.g., due to LBT failure or pre-emption/re-evaluation.
	+ [18/Panasonic]: Each slot has SCI and SCI indicates resource allocation of each slot.
	+ [20/ETRI] The higher layer triggers L1 resource selection procedures for MCSt one by one with the parameter set corresponding to each TB
		- If the higher layer cannot trigger L1 resource selection procedure sequentially due to almost same TB generation timing, it drops the resource selection procedure for some of TBs on a priority basis
	+ [21/CMCC]:
		- MCSt should be achieved by a single UE in Rel-18 SL-U.
		- Further study two options for the frequency domain resources in consecutive slots:
			* Option 1: The frequency domain resources are same among the consecutive transmitted slots;
			* Option 2: The frequency domain resources can be different among the consecutive transmitted slots.
		- For mode 1, enhancements on both DG and CG can be considered to allocate consecutive time domain resources, the design of DCI format 0\_1 and CG configuration in NR-U can be a reference.
	+ [22/Lenovo]
		- Multiple PSSCHs scheduled by a single SCI is supported for sidelink transmissions in FR1 unlicensed spectrum.
	+ [23/E///]
		- When a UE triggers MCSt, it performs the resource reservation procedure ensuring the allocation of consecutive resources for multiple TBs. In case there are not contiguous slots available to the already reserved ones, the UE might trigger resource reselection for all the TBs.
		- L1 reports candidate single-slot resources in (SA) as in Rel-16:
			* Selection of the first resource in a MCSt follows the legacy procedures.
			* For the subsequent resources, the TX UE disregards the reservations (FFS exceptions, based on priority).
		- Re-use the legacy procedure where one SCI reserves up to two resources for further transmissions.
		- Resources reserved by PSCCH scheduling one TB can be used for (re)transmission of a different TB.
	+ [26/ZTE, SC]: In order to avoid the interruption due to PSFCH symbols, the occupying signals should be allowed to transmit on a PSFCH occasion within the continuous SL slots.
	+ [27/Apple]:
		- Multi-slot transmission should prioritize multi-TB transmission.
		- For model 1 RA with CG and mode 2 RA, multi-slot transmission is enabled only for full BW transmission where all the resource blocks within an RB set is configured.
	+ [29/Fraunhofer]: Study the impact of multi-slot transmissions in SL-U, including aspects related to single TB transmissions across slots, and its effect on Mode 2 sensing and resource selection procedures.
	+ [30/QC]:
		- MCSt for multiple TBs is supported in SL-U for both Mode 1 and Mode 2 operation.
		- Mode 1:
			* Introduce multi-TTI grant to support MCSt in mode 1 SL-U. RAN1 should study details regarding
				+ TDRA indication for multiple slots
				+ HARQ ID and NDI for multiple TBs
				+ SCI-1 optimizations across multiple slots
				+ Utilization of gap symbol for data
		- Mode 2: one of the following alternatives is selected for enhancing the resource selection procedure:
			* Alt1: Resource selection is triggered independently for each TB/SL process. The legacy resource selection is reused as much as possible except for the selection of candidate resources in MAC, where the selection can take into account previously selected resources to select a contiguous one (not at random) as much as possible.
				+ Note: for each TB, in in the case where resources are selected for retransmissions, the minimum gap between any pair a resources still need to be ensured (as in R16/17 NR SL).
			* Alt2: Resource selection can be triggered for a set of TBs/SL processes. The steps of the R16/17 resource selection procedure are enhanced to guarantee selecting a multi-slot resource for the set of TBs/SL processes.
* **Issues that should be further studied:**
	+ FFS: how to enable MCSt when the slots are in more than one COT due to MCOT limitation.
	+ FFS: whether the number of multiple consecutive allocations should be dynamic or (pre)configured, and the impact on resource selection procedure, e.g., to prevent disrupting LBT of reserved resources.
	+ FFS: whether resources reserved by PSCCH scheduling one TB can be used for (re)transmission of a different TB.
	+ FFS: whether frequency resources are same or can be different among the slots.
	+ FFS: how to signal the number of consecutive slots in the UE’s initial slot transmission.
	+ FFS: details regarding TDRA indication for multiple slots, HARQ ID and NDI for multiple TBs, SCI-1 optimizations across multiple slots, and utilization of gap symbol for data.

## Resource allocation enhancements in SL-U

* **Type 1 LBT blocking solutions:**
	+ [2/Nokia, NSB], [4/HW, HiSi], [5/vivo], [11/Sony], [17/Samsung], [20/ETRI], [22/Lenovo]
		- Resource allocation procedure should avoid selection of a candidate resource before a reserved resource in case the transmitting symbols of candidate resource overlap with LBT of the reserved resource.
		- Resource allocation procedure should avoid selection of a candidate resource after a reserved resource in case the transmitting symbols of the reserved resource overlap with LBT of candidate resource.
	+ [5/vivo]
		- SL UE deems channel busy only if the UE detects transmission other than SL transmission occupying the channel (e.g., exceeding the energy detection threshold), i.e., the energy detection for EDT checking in LBT procedure does not take into account the energy from SL transmissions.
	+ [7/OPPO], [4/HW, HiSi], [17/Samsung], [20/ETRI], [22/Lenovo]
		- In order to utilize a shared COT from another UE in Mode 2 RA, in addition to the existing set *SA*, all received and usable COT information should be separately reported to the higher layer for resource selection.
		- To avoid inter-UE blocking in performing Type 1 LBT (i.e., one UE’s transmission is blocking another UE from performing a Type 1 LBT)
			* Prioritize / select a resource just after an existing reservation, where the COT initiated from the existing reservation can be shared with the selected resource.
			* Prioritize / select a resource just prior to an existing reservation, where the COT initiated from the selected resource can be shared with the existing reservation.
	+ [8/Spreadtrum]
		- No solution needed to address the insufficient time issue to perform Type 1 LBT before a selected resource.
	+ [17/Samsung], [24/MediaTek]
		- UE selects extra / more resources than required for transmitting a TB (i.e., overbooking) to accommodate potential Type 1 LBT failures.
	+ [17/Samsung], [32/DCM]
		- LBT duration is determined firstly, then resource selection takes into account of the LBT duration is performed.
	+ [19/CAICT]
		- For LBT contention back-off with inter-UE blocking or intra-UE blocking, the contention back-off continues in a slot if the SL UE can successfully decode the SCI transmitted from other UEs in the slot, or the SL UE sends its own data in the slot. Otherwise, the contention back-off is frozen in the slot.
	+ [32/DCM]:
		- LBT mechanism is modified
			* back-off count is skipped during the duration overlapped with a TX by another UE in a different COT
			* energy detection is skipped during the duration overlapped with a TX by another UE in a different COT
	+ [33/Sharp]:
		- When estimating the detected power within a sensing slot duration in Type 1 channel access, the UE excludes frequency resources (if any) previously reserved via SCI by other SL UEs in that slot.
* **Mode 1 RA**
	+ Indication of LBT failure to gNB
		- Reporting HARQ-NACK: [7/OPPO] (when SL-HARQ enabled), [30/QC] (additional bit in PUCCH for LBT failure)
		- Other means: [7/OPPO] (when SL-HARQ disabled)
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Appendix (outcomes of past meetings)

## RAN1#109-e (09 – 20 May 2022)

**Agreement**

Type 1 and Type 2 (2A/2B/2C) channel access procedures, transmission gap and LBT sensing idle time requirements specified in TS37.213 for NR-U are taken as baseline for NR sidelink operation in a shared channel.

* FFS conditions for the actual channel access type(s) used for each SL channel and signal transmitted, and based on COT sharing conditions (if supported)
* FFS whether UL CAPC or DL CAPC or both should be used as the baseline,
	+ FFS how the channel access priority classes apply to each SL channel and signal
	+ FFS sidelink priority levels (PQI or L1 priority), channel and signal mapping to the 4 channel access priority classes. The discussion may involve other WGs.

**Agreement**

* UE-to-UE COT sharing is supported in NR sidelink operation in a shared channel (SL-U).
	+ FFS applicable SL channels and signals (e.g., PSCCH/PSSCH, PSFCH, S-SSB) for shared COT access and any restrictions (e.g. whether the COT can be shared with a single UE or multiple UEs)
	+ FFS all other details in compliance with the regulatory requirements
* CP extension (CPE) is supported for NR sidelink operation in a shared channel.
	+ FFS all remaining details including applicable scenarios, usage, PHY structure, etc.

**Agreement**

Channel access procedures for transmission(s) on multiple channels are supported for NR sidelink operation as defined by TS37.213 for NR-U (wherever applicable)

* FFS whether the downlink, uplink and/or semi-static multiple channel access procedure(s) (if supported) from NR-U should be used as a baseline and whether/how they are applied in SL mode 1 and mode 2 operation

**Agreement**

* The existing sidelink mode 1 RA including dynamic grant, Type 1 and Type 2 configured grants are supported as a baseline for sidelink operation in a shared carrier, subject to applicable regional regulations. At least in dynamic channel access, SL UE performs Type 1 or one of the Type 2 LBTs before SLtransmission using the allocated resource(s), in compliance with transmission gap and LBT sensing idle time requirements specified in TS37.213.
	+ FFS whether/how mode 1 resource allocation ~~selection~~ procedure needs to be updated / enhanced due to shared spectrum channel access
* The existing sidelink mode 2 RA schemes are supported as a baseline for sidelink operation in a shared carrier, subject to applicable regional regulations. At least in dynamic channel access, SL UE performs Type 1 or one of the Type 2 LBTs before SL transmission using the selected and/or reserved resources, in compliance with transmission gap and LBT sensing idle time requirements specified in TS37.213.
	+ FFS whether/how mode 2 resource selection procedure needs to be updated / enhanced due to shared spectrum channel access
* FFS whether/how multi-consecutive slots transmission can be supported for NR sidelink operation in unlicensed spectrum, including the following aspects
	+ channel access, resource allocation and PHY channel design
* FFS whether/how enhancement is needed between the end of the LBT procedure and the start of the SL transmission to retain channel access
* RAN1 to strive for a common solution for channel access for Mode 1 and Mode 2

## RAN1#110 (22 – 26 August 2022)

**Agreement**

The following evaluation scenario can be used for evaluating performance of SL-U designs, resource allocation schemes, and coexistence study with another RAT in a shared channel.

* Scenario 1 (commercial use cases) – recommended:
	+ Evaluation methodology baseline is NR-U from TR 38.889 with the following updates.
	+ Indoor layout
		- Option 1: a pairs topology for SL-U from R1-2205033 – recommended



* + - * a = 20m, b = 60m, c = 20m, d = 80 m
			* There are two operators to model two RATs at a time. The red one is SL-U UE, the blue one is Wi-Fi or NR-U.
			* For NR-U / Wi-Fi, the same number of UEs / Wi-Fi STA as the total number of SL-U devices are dropped in the area. The NR-U UE / Wi-Fi nodes are dropped uniformly per gNB/AP per 20 MHz.
				+ Companies should report if they used a different number of UEs / Wi-Fi STA as the total number of SL-U devices, as an additional evaluation scenario.
			* For evaluation of unicast traffic, the topology of SL-U is pair topology and the SL-U UEs are dropped uniformly at random in the area.
				+ Companies should report how SL-U UEs are paired
				+ 6 SL-U pairs and 4 NR-U UEs / Wi-Fi nodes per gNB/AP per 20 MHz
			* For evaluation of groupcast traffic, SL-U UEs are dropped uniformly at random in the area, SL-UEs form groupcast UE group based on TX-RX UE distancing, the distance is provided by each company.
				+ Companies should report how SL-U UEs form a group
				+ 12 SL-U UEs and 4 NR-U UEs / Wi-Fi nodes per gNB/AP per 20 MHz
			* For evaluation of broadcast traffic, SL-U UEs are dropped uniformly at random in the area.
				+ 12 SL-U UEs and 4 NR-U UEs / Wi-Fi nodes per gNB/AP per 20 MHz
		- Option 2: SL UE clusters (R1-2203146)

****

* + - * Indoor layout and UE dropping model with N = 3 or 6 clusters and each with M=5 UEs
			* Each cluster is a circle, with a central point and radius Rmax = 15 or 10m and Rmin = 5 or 1m
			* No overlapping among the N clusters
			* For coexistence, there are two operators to model two RATs at a time, where the red one is Wi-Fi AP or NR-U gNB. NR-U UE / Wi-Fi STA are dropped uniformly per gNB/AP.
			* Simulation bandwidth can be larger than 20MHz (e.g., 80MHz)
	+ Channel model follows NR InH Mixed Office model used in NR-U (TR38.889)
	+ Traffic model
		- Option 1: R17 sidelink commercial traffic model with periodic model 3 with packet size reduced by a factor of (high: 1; mid: 5; low: 10)
			* FFS whether/how the PDB requirement can be captured
		- Option 2: FTP model 3 with arrival rate satisfying one of the followings:
			* BO Low load: 10%~25%
			* BO Mid load: 35%~50%
			* BO High load: above 55%
		- Option 3: XR cloud gaming model in TR38.838
			* FFS whether/how the PDB requirement can be captured
		- It is up to each company to use either Option 1 or 2 or Option 3 or mixed of them
	+ Interference model:
		- Layout option 1: Explicit modelling of NR-U / WiFi transmissions (as per TR38.889)
		- Note, for the interference traffic model:
			* The same or equivalent traffic model setting as SL-U should be used as much as possible to achieve equal load (e.g., SL-U RAT offered load equal the interfering RAT’s offered load).
			* The same number of traffic flows should be used between SL-U and the interfering RAT (e.g., 10 UEs with 10 flows, and 5 STAs with 2 flows each, one for DL and one for UL)
				+ Companies should report if they used a different assumption, as an additional evaluation scenario.
	+ Performance metric: UPT, latency, and PRR which regards the packet whose delay exceeding the remaining PDB as transmission failure.
		- FFS: UE satisfaction/system capacity as section 7.2 in TR 38.838 for XR traffic evaluation
		- FFS for groupcast and broadcast
	+ Fair coexistence criterion between SL-U and the interfering RAT (e.g., according to NR-U TR38.889)

**Agreement**

* CW adjustment
	+ NR-U DL CW adjustment mechanism is used as the baseline for SL-U when SL-HARQ feedback is enabled in SCI for unicast
		- FFS any necessary update for SL-U operation
	+ FFS: how to determine CW size when SL-HARQ feedback is disabled in SCI
	+ FFS the case of groupcast option 1 (NACK-only) and groupcast option 2

**Agreement**

* Type 2A/2B/2C SL channel access procedures
	+ Type 2A channel access procedure is applicable to the following case:
		- Transmission(s) by a UE following transmission(s) by another UE for a gap ≥ 25μs in a shared channel occupancy
		- FFS any other transmission by a UE (e.g., other than COT sharing)
		- FFS whether Type 2A is used also for the case of short control signalling transmission
	+ Type 2B channel access procedure is applicable to the following case:
		- Transmission(s) by a UE following transmission(s) by another UE at least when the gap is 16μs in a shared channel occupancy
		- FFS the case when the gap is between 16 and 25us
		- FFS any other transmission by a UE (e.g., other than COT sharing)
	+ Type 2C channel access procedure is applicable to the following case:
		- Transmission(s) by a UE following transmission(s) by another UE for a gap ≤ 16μs in a shared channel occupancy and the duration of the corresponding transmission is at most 584us.
		- FFS any other transmission by a UE (e.g., other than COT sharing)
		- FFS whether Type 2C is used also for the case of short control signalling transmission
	+ FFS under which conditions (other than the gap) UEs can apply the Type 2A/2B/2C SL channel access procedures
	+ FFS under which conditions Type 2B or Type 2C is applied in case of a gap of 16 μs

**Agreement**

Multi-consecutive slots transmission (MCSt) is supported for Mode 1 and Mode 2 resource allocation in SL-U.

* FFS details

**Agreement**

* For UE-to-UE COT sharing, continue considering the following alternatives:
	+ Alt. 1: A responding SL UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE when the responding SL UE is a target receiver of the at least COT initiating UE’s PSSCH data transmission in the COT.
		- When the responding UE uses the shared COT for its transmission has an equal or smaller CAPC value than the CAPC value indicated in a shared COT information
		- FFS any additional conditions
	+ Alt. 2: A responding SL UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE when the responding SL UE is a target receiver of the COT initiating UE’s transmission in the COT.
		- When the responding UE uses the shared COT for its transmission has an equal or smaller CAPC value than the CAPC value indicated in a shared COT information
		- FFS how to determine a SL UE is a target receiver
		- FFS: details of the channel type of the COT initiating UE’s transmission
		- FFS any additional conditions
	+ For Alt1 and Alt2: When a responding UE uses a shared COT for its transmission(s), the COT initiating UE is a target receiver of the responding UE’s transmission(s).
		- FFS: details of the channel type of the responding UE’s transmission(s)
* gNB relaying/forwarding a UE initiated COT to another UE is not supported in Rel-18
* FFS whether a Mode 1 UE can report a COT or related information to gNB for aiding Mode 1 RA

## RAN1#110bis-e (10 – 19 October 2022)

**Agreement**

* Type 1 SL channel access procedure is applicable to the following transmissions by a UE:
	+ PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) scheduled or configured by a gNB in SL Mode 1 resource allocation.
	+ PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) from the UE in SL Mode 2 resource allocation.
	+ Other SL transmissions including S-SSB and PSFCH transmissions from a UE
		- FFS: how to set CAPC for S-SSB and PSFCH
	+ Note: Type 1 can be used to initiate a COT
* A UE uses a channel access priority class applicable to the sidelink user plane data multiplexed in PSSCH for performing the Type 1 channel access procedures to transmit transmission(s) including PSSCH with user plane data and its associated PSCCH.
	+ Note: how to set CAPC for MAC CE multiplexed in PSSCH is up to RAN2
* A UE shall not transmit on a channel for a Channel Occupancy Time that exceeds the maximum COT duration where the channel access procedures are performed based on a channel access priority class *p* associated with the UE transmissions, as given in CAPC table for SL.

**Agreement**

On the support of MCSt operation in SL-U, following options are to be further studied and one or more of the following options will be selected in future meetings.

* When L1 is triggered for reporting a subset of candidate resources for MCSt,
	+ Option 1: Only one set of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) is provided for the resource selection procedure in L1
		- Note, this is applicable for transmission of a single TB and multiple TBs
		- FFS: whether this is the same or different than Rel-16
	+ Option 2: one or multiple sets of parameters (, remaining PDB, and ) are provided for the resource selection procedure in L1
	+ FFS: any further information needs to be provided to L1 for MCSt
* When L1 reports a subset of candidate resources for MCSt,
	+ Option A: L1 reports candidate multi-slot resources in *SA* where a candidate multi-slot resource consists of a set of single-slot resources that are consecutive in time
		- FFS whether the set of single-slot resources within a candidate multi-slot resource can have different sizes
	+ Option B: L1 reports candidate single-slot resources in (*SA*) as in Rel-16
		- It is up to the higher (MAC) layer to select a set of single-slot resources that are consecutive in logical slots
	+ Option C: L1 reports consecutive single-slot candidate resources in *SA*
		- FFS whether the consecutive single-slot candidate resources can have different sizes
	+ FFS: any further information needs to be reported to MAC layer, provided to L1 or utilized for MCSt
	+ FFS: whether/how to consider the additional LBT time in SL resource allocation

**Agreement**

For dynamic channel access mode with multi-channel case in SL-U, NR-U UL channel access procedure is considered as baseline for transmission on multiple channels

* FFS: whether transmission of PSFCH and/or S-SSB on a subset of RB sets is supported (using the NR-U DL channel access procedure as baseline)
* FFS any necessary enhancement and modification for the SL-U operation

**Agreement**

In Type 1 SL channel access procedure, the following table is adopted for channel access priority class (CAPC) for SL.

* FFS: the applicability and usage of NOTE1 in the table
* FFS: whether ***mp****=1* can be used with ***p=1***, and applicable cases

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Channel Access Priority Class (*p*) | *mp* | *CWmin,p* | *CWmax,p* | *Tslmcot,p* | allowed *CWp* sizes |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 7 | 2 ms | {3,7} |
| 2 | 2 | 7 | 15 | 4 ms | {7,15} |
| 3 | 3 | 15 | 1023 | 6ms [or 10 ms]  | {15,31,63,127,255,511,1023} |
| 4 | 7 | 15 | 1023 | 6ms [or 10 ms] | {15,31,63,127,255,511,1023} |
| [NOTE1:   For*p*=3,4, *Tslmcot*,*p*=10*ms* if the higher layer parameter absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology-r14 or absenceOfAnyOtherTechnology-r16 is provided, otherwise,*Tslmcot*,*p*=6*ms*.]NOTE 2:   When *Tslmcot*,*p*=6*ms* it may be increased to 8*ms* by inserting one or more gaps. The minimum duration of a gap shall be 100*μs*. The maximum duration before including any such gap shall be 6*ms*.  |

**Agreement**

* RAN1 is to study the definition of a “SL reference duration” following the NR-U principle and RAN1 is to agree on the definition before down-selection to an option for CW adjustment for SL HARQ-ACK feedback enabled/disabled and each cast type
* In Type 1 SL channel access procedure, further study the following cases and options. Other options are not precluded.
	+ CW adjustment when SL-HARQ feedback is disabled (at least if all transmissions within the latest SL reference duration have SL-HARQ feedback disabled):
		- Option 1: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
		- Option 2: CW is adjusted according to number blind retransmissions of the TBs within a COT.
		- Option 3: CW is adjusted according to CR/CBR measurement, if CR/CBR is supported for SL-U
		- Option 4: If a is consecutively used times for generation of , is updated for each priority class to the next higher allowed value.
		- Option 5: If a collision indicator is received, increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
	+ CW adjustment for groupcast option 2 with SL-HARQ feedback enabled (~~i.e.~~, at least In case only groupcast option 2 PSSCH(s) is (are) transmitted within the latest SL reference duration):
		- Option 1: Based on a (pre-)configurable ratio of received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks in the latest SL reference duration, is reset to for every priority class , otherwise increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
			* FFS: whether the ratio of the received SL HARQ-ACK feedbacks is ‘ACK’, ‘NACK’ or ‘ACK+NACK’
			* FFS: how to calculate the ratio
			* FFS: the (pre-)configuration ratio values
		- Option 2: If at least a ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.
	+ FFS whether groupcast option 1 (NACK-only) with SL-HARQ feedback enabled can be supported for SL-U. If supported, further study the following options (at least if all transmissions within the latest SL reference duration are groupcast option 1 transmissions)
		- Option 1: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
		- Option 2:
			* If ‘NACK’ or a collision indicator (IUC scheme 2) is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, increase for every priority class to the next higher allowed value.
			* When neither ‘NACK’ nor a collision indicator (IUC scheme 2) is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration,
				+ Option A: is reset to for every priority class .
				+ Option B: For every priority class ,use the latest used for any SL transmissions on the channel using Type 1 channel access procedures associated with the channel access priority class .
		- Option 3: An ACK-only procedure is used instead of a NACK-only procedure. In this case, if at least a ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class , otherwise is increased
		- Option 4: CW is adjusted according to CR/CBR measurement, if CR/CBR is supported for SL-U
		- Option 5 (option 3+legacy): ACK feedback is performed when a TB is successfully decoded in addition to the legacy NACK-only procedure. In this case, if ACK only is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration then ,  otherwise is increased.
	+ CW adjustment for unicast with SL-HARQ feedback enabled (at least In case only unicast PSSCH(s) is (are) transmitted within the latest SL reference duration):
		- Option 2: If at least one ‘ACK’ is received related to any transmissions within the latest SL reference duration, for each priority class ; otherwise is increased.
* FFS the case when UE is operating with different SL-HARQ feedback schemes (e.g., UE has concurrent broadcast transmission + unicast with SL-HARQ enabled, or GC option 1 + GC option 2, etc in the SL reference duration).

## RAN1#111 (14 – 18 November 2022)

**Agreement**

* Type 2A channel access procedure is applicable for S-SSB transmissions from a UE without a shared channel occupancy, when the following constraints are met:
	+ Time duration is at most 1ms per transmission
	+ The duty cycle of the S-SSB transmissions is at most 1/20
	+ FFS: details of EDT
	+ FFS: whether/how to define observation period, including whether or not observation period would be captured in the specifications if defined
* FFS: Type 2A applicability for PSFCH without a shared channel occupancy and further limitations for combined transmissions of both S-SSB and PSFCH using Type 2A channel access procedure

**Agreement**

* Performance metric, company to report which one of the following options is evaluated in their simulation results.
	+ Option 1:
		- For GC and BC, a device within the range (a, b) from the TX can be a receiver, and the UPT/latency/PRR can be calculated by average. The packet whose delay exceeding the remaining PDB as transmission failure.
	+ Option 2:
		- For GC, UPT and latency for a packet is measured from the perspective of the worst-case RX (i.e., the one with the longest transmission time).
		- For BC, UPT and latency for a packet are measured for each RX separately.
	+ Option 3:
		- For GC and BC, UPT, latency and PRR are measured from the perspective of each RX UE

**Agreement**

* For dynamic channel access mode with multi-channel case in SL-U, use NR-U DL (Type A or Type B) multi-channel access procedure as the baseline for multiple PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels, where each PSFCH transmission is confined within one LBT channel
	+ FFS: the case for S-SSB if agreed to transmit S-SSB (or S-SSB can be (pre-)configured) in more than one RB set
	+ FFS: whether type A or type B or both will be supported for this case for PSFCH
	+ FFS: whether multiple PSFCH transmissions on multiple channels after performing the multi-channel access procedure is limited to contiguous RB sets

**Agreement**

* SL reference duration is defined as a duration corresponding to a channel occupancy initiated by the UE including transmission of PSSCH(s), starting from the beginning of the channel occupancy initiated by the UE including transmission of PSSCH(s), until either (one option to be selected later):
	+ Option 1a:
		- the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted
		- Note, SL reference duration is not used if PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled cannot be found in the latest COT
		- FFS: Whether to support another ending timing is FFS, e.g for MCSt if needed
	+ Option 1b:
		- the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted
		- Note, SL reference duration is not used if PSSCH with HARQ-ACK enabled cannot be found in the latest COT
		- FFS: Whether to support another ending timing is FFS, e.g for MCSt if needed
	+ Option 2a:
		- the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with HARQ-ACK enabled if it is transmitted, otherwise until the end of the channel occupancy
		- FFS: Whether to support another ending timing is FFS, e.g for MCSt if needed
	+ Option 2b:
		- the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with HARQ-ACK enabled if it is transmitted, otherwise until the time when UE updates the CW
		- FFS: Whether to support another ending timing is FFS, e.g for MCSt if needed

**Agreement**

* A CPE is transmitted from a CPE starting position before SL transmission within a COT, select one or both of the two options:
	+ Option 1: within the symbol just before the next AGC symbol
	+ Option 2: within at most 1, 2 or 4 symbols just before the next AGC symbol for 15, 30 or 60 kHz SCS, respectively
	+ FFS: whether Option 1 and Option 2 are both applicable and the conditions (e.g., Option 1 in case of COT sharing and Option 2 in case of initiating a COT)
	+ FFS: which channel access type(s) is applicable for option 1 and option 2
	+ FFS: other details
* A single CPE starting position for PSFCH
	+ FFS CPE starting position and whether it should be (pre-)configured in each RP, pre-defined or indicated
	+ FFS other details (e.g., indication granularity)
	+ Note: value 0 is a candidate
* At least one CPE starting position for S-SSB
	+ FFS CPE starting position should be (pre-)configured, pre-defined or indicated
	+ FFS: Whether multiple CPE starting positions should be (pre-)configured, pre-defined or indicated
	+ FFS CPE starting positions for the R16 S-SSB and the additional S-SSBs
	+ Note: value 0 is a candidate
* One or multiple CPE starting positions can be (pre-)configured in each resource pool for PSSCH/PSCCH
	+ When multiple CPE starting positions are (pre-)configured,
		- FFS whether/how to define a criteria for selecting a default CPE starting position (e.g., according to partial/full RB set allocation, resource reservation information, within or outside of a COT, etc.)
		- FFS criteria for selecting one of the multiple CPE starting positions (e.g., according to priority level (e.g., CAPC or L1), selected randomly by UE from the (pre-)configured set of CPEs, selected by the UE based on channel access result, determined based on indication from the COT initiating UE, etc.)
	+ FFS other details

**Agreement**

For UE-to-UE COT sharing,

* When performing S-SSB transmission(s), a responding UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE (using type 1 channel access) when the responding UE is intended to transmit S-SSB within RB set(s) corresponding to the shared COT. When performing PSFCH transmission(s), a responding UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE at least when at least one of the responding UE’s PSFCH transmissions in a symbol/slot within RB set(s) corresponding to the shared COT is intended for the COT initiating UE.
	+ FFS: whether a responding UE can transmit PSFCH(s) to UE(s) other than the initiator
* When performing PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s), a responding UE can utilize a COT shared by a COT initiating UE at least when the responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to the shared COT is intended for the COT initiating UE
	+ FFS whether to support the case if a responding UE transmits PSSCH/PSCCH to destination ID other than the source ID of the COT initiating transmission, where the destination ID of the responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) can be different from the source/destination IDs of COT initiating UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission when sharing the COT information.
		- FFS: how to determine / what are the restrictions to the destination ID of the responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) to utilize the COT shared by the initiating UE.
		- FFS whether the responding UE can utilize the COT when at least the responding UE’s PSCCH transmission in the reserved resources within the shared COT or MCSt is intended for the COT initiating UE and what are the restrictions (e.g., priority, etc.) and indication to the responding UE.
* FFS: UE forwarding/relaying information about a COT initiated by another UE.

**Agreement**

* If , the next higher allowed value for adjusting is .
* If the is consecutively used times for generation of , is reset to only for that priority class for which is consecutively used times for generation of . is selected by UE from the set of values {1, 2, …,8} for each priority class .

## RAN1#112 (February 27th – March 03rd, 2023)

**Agreement**

The CAPC level that should be used for S-SSB transmissions:

* Option 1: CAPC value (p) should be set to 1 when UE performs Type 1 channel access procedure for S-SSB transmission

**Agreement**

The CAPC level that should be used for PSFCH transmission, CAPC value (p) should be set to 1 when UE performs Type 1 channel access procedure for PSFCH transmission

**Agreement**

The end timing for the definition of reference duration in the contention window adjustment procedure for SL-U is defined as follows:

* Option 1a
	+ the end of the first slot where at least one PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled is transmitted
	+ Note, SL reference duration is not used if PSSCH with ACK/NACK HARQ-ACK enabled cannot be found in the latest COT
	+ FFS: Whether to support another ending timing is FFS, e.g. for MCSt if needed
	+ Whether/how to adjust CWS for groupcast option 1 NACK-only case and whether/how to define reference duration for groupcast option 1 NACK-only case can still be discussed

**Agreement**

A CPE can be transmitted from a CPE starting position before SL transmission for the following two options:

* Option 1: within the symbol just before the next AGC symbol
* Option 2:
	+ within the symbol just before the next AGC symbol for 15 kHz SCS
	+ within at most 2 symbols just before the next AGC symbol for 30 or 60 kHz SCS
* FFS applicable scenario(s), condition(s) and channel type(s) to apply Option 1 or Option 2

**Agreement**

* A responding UE over a shared COT can be:
	+ a receiving UE, which is the target of a PSCCH/PSSCH transmission of a COT initiator
		- In the case of unicast from the COT initiator, within the same COT when the source and destination IDs contained in the COT initiator’s SCI match to the corresponding destination and source IDs relating to the same unicast at the receiving UE
		- In the case of groupcast and broadcast, when the destination ID contained in the COT initiator’s SCI match to a destination ID known at the receiving UE
	+ a UE identified by ID(s), if additional IDs are supported in the COT sharing information (in addition to the source and destination IDs of the PSCCH/PSSCH transmission), when additional IDs are included in the COT sharing information from the COT initiator
		- FFS Limitations on what additional IDs may be included and how they may be indicated

**Agreement**

A responding UE’s SL transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT can be transmitted when the CAPC value(s) of the SL transmission(s) have an equal or smaller CAPC value than the CAPC value indicated in the COT sharing information.

**Agreement**

A responding UE’s PSSCH/PSCCH transmission(s) within RB set(s) corresponding to a shared COT is intended for the COT initiating UE when,

* In the case of unicast from the responding UE, when the source and destination IDs contained in the responding UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH match to the destination and source IDs from a COT initiator’s unicast transmission that included COT sharing information, or match to the additional ID(s) included in the COT sharing information (if supported)
* In the case of groupcast or broadcast from the responding UE, when the destination ID contained in the responding UE’s PSCCH/PSSCH matches to the destination ID from a COT initiator’s groupcast or broadcast transmission that included COT sharing information, or matches to the additional ID(s) included in the COT sharing information (if supported)
* FFS: all other details and additional restrictions