**3GPP TSG RAN Meeting #92-e RP-21xxxx**

**Electronic Meeting, June 14 - 18, 2021**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_Agenda item:** 9.7.1.3

**Source:** LG Electronics (moderator)

**Title:** Email discussion [92-e-10-Sidelink-Progress] on the progress of Rel-17 NR sidelink enhancement WI

**Document for:** Discussion

# **Introduction**

This contribution summarizes the email discussion [92-e-10-Sidelink-Progress] on the progress of Rel-17 NR sidelink enhancement WI. Input contributions covered RP-211272, 1187 (sidelink part).

# **Discussion: 1st round**

On the inter-UE coordination, the moderator proposes to discuss whether this RAN plenary meeting needs to give some guidance to WGs.

Q1: RP-211272 made the following proposal. Do you think RAN guidance is necessary in this meeting to finalize the supported inter-UE coordination schemes/options in the next RAN1 meeting?

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 1: RAN1 finalizes in RAN1#106-e the schemes/options to be supported in Rel-17, which means that those not included in the agreements in RAN1#106-e will not be considered in Rel-17. In an event no options are agreed for a certain scheme, a previous RAN1 agreement of supporting the two schemes is revoked. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Comment |
| LGE | Neutral | The proposal is about the action to be taken in RAN#93, i.e., those not agreed until then will not be considered in Rel-17. This a guidance on this is not strictly necessary in this RAN, and we propose WGs to consider this for the progress. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Leave to RAN1 to handle | It is not appropriate to install an automated revocation of WG agreements. It would be likely to lead to very unstable company handling and discussions in RAN1.  The better way is to more closely base each meeting’s discussion on the preceding agreements, instead of each time starting without such basis in the proposals that are put forward for discussion. That will keep in the bank the progress already made, and avoid circling round previously-discussed points and FFSes, etc. |
| Ericsson | Leave to RAN1 | Although we think that the level of completion for inter-UE coordination is very low, we don't think revoking a RAN1 agreement will be good in terms of progress. |
| CATT | Leave to RAN1 | In the end those not agreed until then will not be considered in Rel-17, this is the procedure used in the past. We should not micro-manage WG progress. |
| Qualcomm | No | RAN1 already agreed on which schemes to support, there’s no need to add any conditional down-selection. Any issues after RAN1 106 could be discussed in RAN 93 per the regular procedure. |
| FUTUREWEI | Leave it to RAN1 | (In all of the questions, do you mean RP-211272?) |
| OPPO | Neutral | No strong view on whether a RAN guidance is needed for the inter-UE coordination schemes/options in this meeting. Given that there are currently 2 schemes and 2 options under each scheme still on the table and only 3 WG meetings remaining for this WI, a top-level guidance may be beneficial as followed:  “For timely completion of the R17 SL enhancement WI, it is recommended to select in RAN1#106-e inter-UE coordination scheme(s) and corresponding option(s) that can be feasibly completed by RAN#94-e (Dec 2021).” |
| Apple | No | Since we still have 3 RAN1 meetings before the end of the Rel-17, we think the current RAN1 discussions could continue. The scope reduction guidance is not necessary in this RAN plenary, but we are open to revisit the work item scope in RAN#93.  By the way, we think the t-doc number is RP-211272. |
| Samsung | Yes | It was reported that the status of Rel-17 eSL WI completion level as 45% meaning “progress behind schedule, may need RAN plenary intervention”. Since face-to-face meetings are impossible for the rest of WI (only three e-meetings left), we need to being realistic. Proposal 1 is a possible option in this situation but we propose to consider down-scoping as suggested in Question 2.  (We have modified the t-doc number.) |
| vivo | Further check at RAN#93 | We agree the observation that the progress is not good, however, it is not a good idea to have a conditional RAN level agreement right now. We can further check the status at RAN#93. |
| MediaTek | Leave to RAN1 | We generally agree with other companies above and think this can be handled at the WG level. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Neutral | Clearly RAN1 should accelerate discussions to conclude this WI in time, but no clear guidance would be necessary. Regardless of whether this guidance is agreed or not, companies will keep this issue in mind. |
| Fujitsu | Leave it to RAN1 | Agree the proposal in principle. However, we think it should be up to RAN1 to determine. |
| Intel | No | We prefer to avoid conditional agreements since it may shift focus from technical debate and may further negatively affect the progress. |
| Fraunhofer | No, leave it to RAN1 | We feel that RAN1 has already finalized 2 schemes to work on, and the remaining meetings can be spent to specify the details of each scheme. |
| Sony | Leave to RAN1 | We also think the progress for the inter-UE coordination is slow. However we think it could be handled in RAN1 at this time |
| Xiaomi | Leave it to RAN1 | We do not think RAN guidance on this would be necessary or helpful. RAN1 should make decision based on technical discussion. But we agree that RAN can decide to downscope if the progress is not satisfying in RAN1#106e. |
| Nokia | Leave it to RAN1 | We do not think RAN guidance on this would be helpful since it may just lead to RAN1 effort being spent on trying to exclude schemes instead of making progress on the schemes.. |
| ZTE | Leave it to RAN1 | In general, we share the views that the progress is low for this topic and constructive behaviors are expected for all companies. W.r.t the RAN-level guidance, there is no need from our side, especially the potential revocation of previous agreement.  This topic can be still handled in RAN1 and if unfortunately, no solid progress is made in future, further down-scoping is needed. |

Q2: RP-211187 made the following proposal. Do you think RAN guidance is necessary in this meeting to down-scope the inter-UE coordination schemes/options?

|  |
| --- |
| Consider downscoping in consideration of slow progress in inter UE coordination (e.g. by restricting the number of inter UE coordination schemes supported in Rel 17 to one) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Comment |
| LGE | No | Considering that RAN1 chair’s suggestion when closing the discussion was to have further analysis until the next RAN1 meeting, no down-scoping seems desirable in this RAN meeting. We propose to consider rule out some candidates in the next quarter as proposed in our answer in Q1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Abandoning work-in-progress would not be good, and terminating technical work with validity and interest among companies is unnecessary. |
| Ericsson | No | Not at this point in time. |
| CATT | No | Similar reason as for Q1. |
| Qualcomm | No | RAN1 already agreed to support two schemes with two variants in each. Down-selection is only listed as a possibility in an FFS in the agreement, yet discussions about it have unnecessarily consumed significant RAN1 time that should have been spent agreeing on details and conditions of the schemes per the RAN1 agreement. |
| FUTUREWEI | No | Constructively focus on progressing the designs and not downselection. |
| OPPO | Neutral | In our view, there is not much difference between Q1 and Q2. Please refer to our response in Q1. |
| Apple | No | There are lots of debates in RAN1 discussions on the inter-UE coordination schemes. The consensus is reached on the support of two inter-UE coordination schemes, where each of these schemes has its application scenarios. We do not think it is necessary to down-scope the inter-UE coordination schemes, which itself will cause lots of debates again. |
| Samsung | Yes | There are four sub-schemes under consideration: Scheme 1 with preferred and non-preferred resources, and scheme 2 with expected/potential conflicts and with detected conflicts. Each of these schemes requires its unique design aspects.  In the last RAN1 meeting, the feature lead tried to find common ground by proposing to agree on schemes and options that have consensus or near consensus, and then by proposing to agree on specifying all schemes and options for inter-UE coordination. However, finally we didn’t have any agreements on inter-UE coordination for either approach even though we try to accept this for progress. Considering this situation, rather than repeating the same discussion in the next meeting, down-scoping/selection guidance from RAN can be a better approach to make progress in the next RAN1 meeting. The down-scoping definitely has reduced specification efforts within limited time of WI and will keep the discussions more focused in RAN1 for better progress.  (We have modified the t-doc number.) |
| vivo | No | Not at this time. We can further check the status at RAN#93. |
| MediaTek | No | We think this issue can be handled in the WG based on the technical analysis already in progress. |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | RAN1’s view informed by LS is that both schemes are beneficial. No guidance of down-scope should be fine from this perspective. In addition, it is quite unclear for us how down-scope is done. By hard decision, i.e. just voting? In RAN or RAN1? If hard decision in RAN, which would not consider evaluation results, we think such a way in spite of presence of several kind evaluations is not reasonable. |
| Fujitsu | No | Similar reason with that of Q1. |
| Intel | No with comments | Considering the progress made on design of inter-UE coordination schemes and other aspects, we observe that the remaining time is very limited and remaining scope is large. There are many important design opens which are left for future discussion and decision. At the same time, we are not so sure that RAN at this stage is in a good position to make a final call. At least, we do not see good basis to make such decision. Having said that, we suggest RAN to take a note on progress and further check the status at the next meeting to see if any adjustments must be made. |
| Fraunhofer | No | Refer to our response in Q1. |
| Sony | No | Down-scoping is not necessary at this time. |
| Xiaomi | No | The progress can be checked at next plenary meeting and potential downscoping can be discussed then if necessary. |
| Nokia | No | Not at this time |
| ZTE | Neutral | As mentioned above, w.r.t the down-scope, if the progress is still low in future, maybe we can try to done it, e.g., in September. |

Q3: RP-211272 made the following proposal. Do you think RAN guidance is necessary in this meeting to clarify whether WI scope includes so called “hierarchical structure” where one UE schedules the transmission of another UE?

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 2: It is clarified that the work scope of the inter-UE coordination is limited to the UE-B operation which includes a resource selection procedure at UE-B. If an operation does not include such resource selection at UE-B, for example, if UE-B receives sidelink grants from UE-A and use them for its own transmission without having some resource selection procedure, it is not included in the work scope. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Comment |
| LGE | Yes | We think this is a useful clarification to avoid a similar discussion repeated in RAN1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | This is not merely a clarification, but a reverting of an agreed WID, the content of which has been considered multiple times. RAN considered inter-UE coordination scope in RAN#90e, and did not change the technical scope of the WID. RAN1 sent evaluations of such schemes to RAN#91e, which RAN considered and did not change the technical scope of the WID. The SRs to several RAN meetings have also indicated agreements in RAN1 relating to these schemes, and RAN has not changed the WID.  It would be wrong for RAN to now retrospectively change the WI, having allowed the work so far, in full knowledge of its existence. |
| Ericsson | Supportive | We think that the clarification is well in line with the original WID wording and it would help in keeping the discussions focused, especially in RAN1. In our view, the original wording of the WID never covered such schemes. Moreover, none of the agreements made by the WGs so far would conflict with the clarification, so from this point of view there would not be any problem. |
| CATT | Yes | It is helpful to clarify this issue, and we support the spirit of proposal. Note during the WG discussion of this issue, some companies already commented this should be discussed and decided in RAN plenary. |
| Qualcomm | Please see comments | As part of preferred resource indication in Scheme 1, UE-A can indicate some resources for use by UE-B. What we observed in evaluations was that UE-B using the resources indicated for an initial transmission by UE-A, while selecting resources from among the retransmission resources indicated by UE-A as needed, improves the system performance significantly. Based on the proposal and the associated discussion, we understand that this forms a selection procedure at UE-B since the retransmission resources are subject to selection, based on different criteria, at UE-B. |
| FUTUREWEI | Leave it to RAN1 | There are important out-of-coverage scenarios for both Public Safety and V2X where the UE-B resources selected for transmission should follow the set of resources sent from UE-A, such as from a site commander or platoon leader. We also do not have any agreement (and likely never will) that all UEs supporting Rel-17 sidelink will have the exact same set of capabilities and behavior. UEs that do not (or are not) sensing still need to select resources for transmission. Any update to the WID that restricts the scope (and usefulness) of the WID is not OK with us. RAN1 can continue designing considering the options in the RAN1 agreements. |
| OPPO | Yes | In recent RAN1 meetings, companies had different understanding on whether "Hierarchical scheme" is included in the WID scope or not, it is desirable to clarify in this RANP. |
| Apple | Neutral | On one hand, we think this scenario is useful (increasing the resource allocation reliability) when UE-B is a power limited UE, which does not perform sensing for the purpose of power saving. On the other hand, this scenario is useful for power saving resource allocation, which is not the main consideration of the corresponding objective.  Considering both pros and cons, we are neutral on the proposal. |
| Samsung | No | We think that this RAN guidance is not necessary. We do not think WI includes “one UE schedules the transmission of another UE” as the inter-UE coordination scheme. However, RAN1 needs to discuss UE-B’s operation further (how UE-B should perform resource selection procedure with coordinating information and its own sensing when available).  (We have modified the t-doc number.) |
| vivo | No | Firstly, this is not a clarification, but a revision of the objective. The behavior of UE-B uses some or all of the resources recommended by UE-A is also one kind of “resource selection”, which means this is definitionally within the work scope.  Secondly, the benefit of this proposal seems tiny or negligible. The removal does not really help to reduce the work load. |
| MediaTek | No | We don’t see that this downscoping is necessary, and as pointed out by Huawei this scope has been multiply discussed in RAN already. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | Same view as LGE. In our understanding, WID does not include hierarchical structure. Even if some company believes included still, concluding it in Rel-17 would be impossible due to lack of remaining time. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | It is necessary and beneficial to clarify whether hierarchical structure is in scope. From previous RAN1 discussions, companies have different interpretations w.r.t. Scheme 1 with preferred resources reported. |
| Intel | Yes | In our view clarification is useful for further progress in R17. Clarification at least precludes design principle when inter-UE coordination feedback is eventually utilized to schedule UE-B’s transmission. Therefore, it is beneficial to reduce amount of time for future RAN1 discussion.  We are supportive of this proposal. In our understanding, this is one of the topics that puts even higher risk on overall WI completion. |
| Fraunhofer | No | We agree with Qualcomm and Vivo that although UE-B uses the resources provided by UE-A, UE-B still carries out resource selection from the coordination information sent by UE-A. Hence, we do not see the need to modify the WI scope. |
| Sony | No | Down-scoping is not necessary at this time. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We agree with other companies that the clarification can help to speed up the discussion. |
| Nokia | Supportive | Would be a good clarification. |
| ZTE | Yes | Clarification on the WI is always needed to give clear guidance on the discussion in WG level. W.r.t the this specific topic, in our view, such additional scheme will lead to unnecessary branches of discussion by assuming different UE capability or other criteria, which will complicate the whole topic. We can focus on the original intention of this WI and try to achieve the progress on basic functionality. |

Q4: RP-211272 made the following proposal. Do you think RAN guidance is necessary in this meeting for the progress in the relation between power efficient resource allocation and sidelink DRX?

|  |
| --- |
| Proposal 3: RAN1 prioritizes completing the power efficient resource allocation that operates in a UE not performing sidelink data reception thus not configured with sidelink DRX. After the power efficient resource allocation design becomes mature, RAN1 considers whether additional work is necessary for a UE configured with sidelink DRX. RAN2 keeps working on completing sidelink DRX design without considering its relationship to sensing until RAN1 responds to the LS. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Comment |
| LGE | Yes | We think this proposal is a natural one as each of power efficient resource allocation and sidelink DRX should work when the other is not used. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not urgent | It’s not urgent for RAN1 to reply to RAN2’s SL DRX LS, as RAN2 are working productively without it, but there also seems no necessity to suspend or cancel RAN1 work on SL DRX. RAN should be reluctant to create a risk that if “additional work” is necessary, it is only discovered too late in the WI to handle it, due to the restriction that would be created by this proposal. |
| Ericsson | Supportive | Additionally, it would be good to clarify that RAN1/RAN2 should reuse DRX procedures for partial sensing (e.g., the TX/RX alignment procedures from DRX can be reused for partial sensing) and the other way around, that is reuse partial sensing procedures for DRX (e.g., the partial sensing mechanisms to deal with the Inactive Time to Active Time transitions). This would avoid duplicating functionality and reduce the amount of work to be carried by the different WGs. |
| CATT | No | At this stage there is no urgent need for RAN to get involved, and we should let WG to work this out. Technically the interaction of sensing and DRX is a critical issue, and we should not separate them by imposing different phases. Note in last RAN1 meeting it was very close to reach agreement (only two companies have different views). |
| Qualcomm | No | We don’t think this proposal is necessary. RAN1 is already progressing on specifying general power saving scheme with mention of DRX, including in FFS, when needed. |
| FUTUREWEI | Leave it to RAN1 |  |
| OPPO | Neutral | Does this proposal mean that in the next RAN1 meeting, we don’t need to further treat or postpone the treatment of the LS on SL DRX from RAN2, which we have been discussed for 3 meetings already? Can other aspects relate to SL DRX and mode 2 resource allocation (e.g., re-evaluation, pre-emption, congestion control) still be treated in the next RAN1 meeting? |
| Apple | Please see comments | The sidelink DRX is already in consideration when RAN1 is designing power saving resource allocation. Hence, we do not need to separate the design of power saving resource allocation and sidelink DRX at this stage.  On the other hand, the LS from RAN2 to RAN1 talks about the possibility of sensing during sidelink DRX inactive time. For this LS, we think it is not urgent for RAN1 to response. |
| Samsung | No | We cannot understand the intension of Proposal 3. In the last meeting, two options were discussed where  Option 1: A UE can perform SL reception of PSCCH and RSRP measurement for sensing during its SL DRX inactive time.  Option 2: A UE is not required to perform SL reception of PSCCH and RSRP measurement for sensing during its SL DRX inactive time.  The concern for Option 1 was that the power saving effect from DRX can be disappeared since UE cannot go into deep sleep. On the other hand, the concern for Option 2 was that performance degradation is expected due to no sensing in SL DRX inactive time. So, in our understanding, sensing aspect needs to be discussed in-depth when SL DRX is performed and this is the reason why RAN2 sent an LS to RAN1. Unfortunately, RAN1 did not reply to RAN2 yet.  (We have modified the t-doc number.) |
| vivo | No | How the UE operates during the DRX off is important for UE power saving, this is why RAN2 sent the LS to RAN1 asking RAN1’s opinion. On the other hand, RAN2 is already working on the DRX having the working assumption, thus this proposal itself is not needed. |
| MediaTek | Neutral | The philosophy of the proposal is reasonable, that RAN2 handles SL DRX and then RAN1 looks at the impact. We could accept some guidance in this direction from the plenary, but we don’t see it as currently blocking progress in the WGs, and the plenary shouldn’t micromanage WG activity. |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | Sensing during DRX inactive time is an important topic. Power saving UE capable of TX/RX would typically be implemented with both power efficient RA and SL DRX; otherwise, power saving gain seems to be quite small.  Of course RAN1/RAN2 should independently complete them for TX-only UE (or RX-only UE?), but no need to deprioritize the important topic. The topic should be solved as early as possible, i.e. in next RAN1 meeting. |
| Fujitsu | No | In RAN#90, DRX impact was added as a RAN1 objective in WID. There is no urgent need to suspend or cancel it now. |
| Intel | Yes | We are supportive. RAN2 already progressed the work on SL-DRX design w/o waiting for RAN1 confirmation of WA. RAN1 was debating LS reply on RAN2 WA w/o any conclusion for a couple of meetings. In our view, allocation of more time for completion of partial sensing design details can benefit the overall progress. Then relationship b/w SL-DRX and partial sensing can be discussed and decided at later stage once UE partial sensing behavior in various scenarios is clear. |
| Fraunhofer | Leave it to RAN1  / RAN2 |  |
| Sony | No | Sidelink DRX has been considered for power saving resource allocation in RAN1. So we don’t think this guidance is necessary at this stage. |
| Xiaomi | No | We do not agree that UE performing sidelink data Tx only should be prioritized. The use cases of UE power saving when performing both Tx and Rx operation are important. Also we agree with other companies that impact of SL DRX on power efficient resource selection is one important enhancement compared with LTE-V power efficient resource selection. The issue shall be discussed and solved. |
| Nokia | Supportive |  |
| ZTE | Leave it to RAN1 | RAN1 had some discussion on SL DRX aspects during RAN1#105-e. It’s preferred that RAN1 could continue the discussion based on the progress made on the functional part of partial sensing. |

Q5: If you think any other RAN guidance is necessary for this section, please specify it.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Qualcomm | RAN1 to work on specifying details of the inter-UE coordination schemes, instead of discussing down-selection, to ensure successful completion of the objective. |
| Intel | WI completion level indicated in SR is higher than expected. At the last RAN1 meeting, group failed to progress objective on inter-UE coordination. Given that inter-UE coordination objective itself has wide scope and requires a lot of discussion/time to converge together with very slow progress on power saving and others, our assessment of progress is 35 ~ 40% which is far below 45% (currently proposed). We propose to reduce completion level to better reflect current situation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | On the flag (by Intel) of the SR:  On the % completion level. The SR reports all WGs, and all objectives. This SR also covers both the meetings of the quarter. The flag seems mostly based on the progress of one objective in one meeting, of one WG. In terms of that one objective, there are important agreements in RAN1 delineating the design in a number of ways. As Qualcomm say above, if the discussions in RAN1 would be based on the previous meeting status more closely, instead of going back over matters already agreed, progress will be faster and the impact of the % achieved will be that much higher. Taking into account the many agreements made across the RAN WGs on all the objectives, we are OK to keep the SR as it is. |
|  |  |

# **Discussion: 2nd round**

Related to Q1, Q2, Q3, Q4, the moderator observes that there is no consensus to take an action in this RAN meeting to give some guidance to WGs. So the moderator proposes to leave WGs to progress without a RAN guidance this time.

If companies have further comment, please specify it.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | On Q3, now no guidance will be agreed. In this case, still RAN1 would discuss whether hierarchical mechanism is supported or not? Companies share views that current progress is not good and acceleration is necessary. However, for hierarchical mechanism, some companies think possible to be supported but others think impossible.  For Q1/Q2/Q4, no guidance would be OK since what we should do is to agree best mechanism based on discussions from performance perspective (power saving, reliability, etc.).  But for Q3, situation is different. The issue is whether such a mechanism is included in WID or not. This will lead to controversial discussions (not technical one but interpretation of WID) in RAN1 and good progress seems to be difficult…  I understand companies’ views are different and situation is difficult, BUT I think hard decision in RAN is better for this question. |
| ZTE | We agree to leave it to WGs this time. However, if the progress is still slow in future, we may revisit it in RAN#93 meeting for further down-scoping. |
| Intel | We can agree on Q1/Q2 since it is indeed RAN1 responsibility to accelerate the progress.  For Q3, it seems that companies have different understanding on WID scope. If it is not clarified then we expect companies can bring arguments that it is beneficial for power saving, and reliability w/o partial sensing results, however our understanding that it is out of scope based on previous discussion. In addition, we should not change fundamental principles of operation defined in R16 by designing from scratch new types of solution – TX based sensing is a baseline solution for resource selection in R17 work. Therefore, we prefer to see some guidance from RAN plenary. In our view, original proposal from moderator is a right direction to accelerate progress.  For Q4, we can accept no guidance as a compromise and believe that group can find a way how to accelerate progress next meeting. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Moderator’s proposal is clearly the evident outcome.  Efforts to revert agreements and WIDs after many meetings where RAN has been well informed of the situation - and has not seen any need to change something – such efforts are not helpful to stability of project management in the WGs nor TSG. |
| FUTUREWEI | OK with the moderator suggestions for no WID revision. RAN1 can continue designing considering the options in the RAN1 agreements. There are multiple scenarios to be covered with the schemes in development and constructive discussion in the WGs should yield progress on all of them. |

The flag on the status report was raised after the start of this email thread, so some companies may not have time to express their view. Please comment on the completion level of this WI in the following table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Supported completion level | Comment |
| ZTE | 40% | For the mode 2 enhancement, two schemes have been agreed. However, the detailed solutions are still under discussion without convergence yet. We need to further discuss the solution details, performance evaluation and down selection of solutions. So we think a lower completion level such as 40% may be appropriate at the moment. |
| Intel | ≤ 35-40% | RAN WG1 is a leading WG for WI and other WGs are dependent on RAN1 progress. We admit that group had a good debate, but unfortunately there was no agreement made last time on inter-UE coordination. Details of inter-UE coordination solutions for both schemes were not agreed and have impact on specification work in other WGs. Partial sensing design was progressed, but also somewhat slowly (considering that many design components were already available / reused from LTE V2X). RAN1 has not provided to RAN2 reply on LS related to WA made for SL-DRX.  Efforts to accelerate RAN1 progress on inter-UE coordination solution such as clarification of objectives seems also controversial this meeting. There are many items that need major progress/decisions to go to the details for each inter-UE coordination scheme design.  Given the situation we are not convinced with the current completion level reported in original SR. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We do not think a progress % is decided by voting or averaging in this way – it’s basically a lottery. It’s better to rely on a rapporteur’s judgement, informed by the views of companies.  We doubt there is any practical difference whatsoever between 45% and 40%.  The SR reports all WGs, and all objectives. This SR also covers both the meetings of the quarter. The flag seems mostly based on the progress of one objective in one meeting, of one WG. In terms of that one objective, there are important agreements in RAN1 delineating the design in a number of ways. If the discussions in RAN1 would be based on the previous meeting status more closely, instead of going back over matters already agreed, progress will be faster and the impact of the % achieved will be that much higher. Taking into account the many agreements made across the RAN WGs on all the objectives, we are OK to keep the SR as it is. |
| MediaTek |  | We tend to agree with Huawei’s comment and suspect that this discussion of the completion figure does not have much impact. Whether the completion level is 40% or 45%, it seems from the first phase of the discussion that there is no consensus to give guidance from the plenary, so the WGs are expected to proceed with their objectives as usual. Thus, we would prefer not to spend a lot of effort on fine-tuning the completion number, and we are OK to keep the SR as submitted. |
| Ericsson | 35-40% | The SR for the SL enhancements WI indicates that progress is 45%. Although it is marked as behind schedule, our impression is that 45% is very optimistic.  In RAN1, progress is much smaller. Only the evaluation assumptions objective is complete. The other two objectives are lagging behind quite a bit.  In RAN2, things are not as bad but it is not that their main objective is half complete. For the other (smaller) objectives that they have, no agreements have been made according to the SR.  In RAN4, their contribution to the entire WI is not huge.  In summary, we agree with Intel. 35% is more accurate, we would say. 40% at the very most |