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Introduction

In RAN1#103-e meeting, an LS from SA2 was received on new PQI support for PC5 communication [1]. Several related contributions on discussion and draft reply LS were submitted in this meeting [2]-[5]. As guided by the Chairman, this contribution provides a summary of the submitted contributions, discussion points and outcomes of email discussion during this meeting.

[103-e-AI5-LS-04] For LS in [R1-2007514](file:///C:\3GPP\RAN1_Meetings\Tdocs\2020\R1-2007514.zip), a reply LS is necessary – target 11/2 for email approval – OPPO (name TBD)

Discussion points (phase 1 until 28-Oct)

Based on the submitted inputs [2]-[5], the following questions are devised in order to formulate potential answers to SA2’s questions. Companies are encouraged to provide their inputs below.

Question 1 (AS layer support for new standardized PQI values in Table 1):

**Do you agree, at least from RAN1’s perspective, the new standardized PQIs in Table 1 of [1] can be supported using the existing V2X mechanism (i.e. NR sidelink from Rel-16)? If yes, is there any underlaying assumption for this? If no, which of the New Values in Table 1 can be or cannot be supported?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Question 2 (AS layer support for new standardized PQI values in Table 2):

**Do you agree, at least from RAN1’s perspective, the new standardized PQIs in Table 2 of [1] can be supported using the existing V2X mechanism (i.e. NR sidelink from Rel-16)? If yes, is there any underlaying assumption for this? If no, which of the New Values in Table 2 can be or cannot be supported?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Question 3 (Maximum MDBV value AS layer can support in Table 2):

**What is the maximum MDBV value can be supported using the existing V2X mechanism (i.e. NR sidelink from Rel-16)? Is there any underlying assumption for this maximum MDBV value? Is there any further evaluation needed in RAN1 to derive the maximum MDBV value, and if yes, what should be evaluated?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Proposed reply LS answers / outcome (phase 2 until 02-Nov)

TBD, based on outcome of phase 1 discussion.

Summary of contribution inputs

In [2], simulation results were provided for Q1 and Q2. Based on the provided simulation results, the following observations and conclusions are drawn.

***Observation 1: For Public Safety services in Table 1, the most stringent PER requirement of 10-6 in New value #4 can be supported at least when UE is in a good geometric condition (e.g. SNR above 25 and possibly even below).***

***Observation 2: For commercial services in Table 2, the most stringent PER requirement of 10-4 in New value #1 can be supported at least when UE is in a good geometric condition (i.e., SNR=25dB for 16QAM and SNR=30dB for 64QAM).***

***Conclusion 1: Based on the above provided simulation results and observations for performance evaluation of PS and commercial services, it can be concluded that the existing V2X mechanism is able to support these two services with new standardized PQIs over PC5 interface at least in FR1 with maximum bandwidth allocation.***

***Observation 3: It is observed the maximum MDBV value that can be supported by the AS layers using the existing V2X mechanism is when MCS=16 with 64QAM modulation with a maximum of 4 transmissions per TB and 30kHz SCS. The equivalent TB size is 295,176 bits. This translate into a maximum MDBV value of at least 36,897 bytes per 2ms.***

***Conclusion 2: Based on the above provided simulation results and observation, it can be concluded that the maximum MDBV value that can be supported by using the existing V2X mechanism is at least 36,897 bytes per 2ms in FR1 with maximum bandwidth allocation.***

In [3], draft answers were provided as followed.

***Answer (to Q1):*** *From RAN1 perspective, the new Standardised PQI in Table 1 and Table 2 in the LS can be supported using Rel-16 SL. However, it is worth noting that the Rel-16 SL is not optimal from power consumption perspective. RAN1 is developing power saving mechanism for sidelink in Rel-17. In this stage, RAN1 cannot conclude whether the new Standardised PQI in Table 1 and Table 2 can be supported for UEs with battery constraint.*

***Answer (to Q2):*** *From RAN1 perspective, the maximum data rate can be supported using the Rel-16 SL is around 2Gbps for FR1 and 4Gbps for FR2, assuming 256QAM and rank-2 transmission are used. However, the PDB and PER may not be guaranteed in these peak data rates. RAN1 has not yet evaluated the maximum MBDV value that can be supported with the indicated PDB and PER in Table 2.*

In [4], draft answers were provided as followed.

***Answer (to Q1):*** *From RAN1 perspective, the new standardized PQIs for public safety (Table 1 in R1-2007514) can be supported. However, the new PQIs for commercial use cases (Table 2 in R1-2007514) are very challenging from RAN1 perspective. Assuming the largest UE channel bandwidth currently supported in the RAN4 specifications for PC5 bands, i.e. 40MHz, and the most extreme configuration of NR SL (60kHz numerology, 2 layers transmissions, lowest overhead for control signalling and reference signals), the maximum data rate that could be achieved is around 375Mbps. RAN1 notes that delivering such data rate is only possible with deployment scenarios which are practically infeasible (i.e. high SINR requirements of >30dB and dedicating the entire system bandwidth to single user i.e. no more than single user can be active in a cell simultaneously). Therefore, from RAN1 point of view, PQIs for commercial services are quite challenging using a typical NR SL configuration and deployment scenarios (larger cells with multiple users), if not impossible.*

***Answer (to Q2):*** *RAN1 has not yet investigated the maximum MBDV value that AS layer can support. RAN1 will further perform evaluations and it is noted in RAN1 that extreme configurations for NR should not be used for the evaluations and typical deployment scenario will be considered.*

In [5], draft answers were provided as followed.

* ***For question 1:***
  + ***The new standardized PQIs for ‘New value#1’, ‘New value#2’, and ‘New value#3’ in Public Safety Table can be supported in AS layers from Rel-16.***
  + ***The new standardized PQIs for ‘New value#4’, and ‘New value#5’ in Public Safety Table include PERs which are beyond what AS layers in Rel-16 are designed to support.***
  + ***The new standardized PQIs for ’New value#1’, ‘New value#2’ in commercial service Table can be supported in AS layers from Rel-16.***
* ***For question2:***
  + ***The maximum MDBV value AS layers can support is 1.3 Mbytes with a 10ms PDB assumption, and 0.65 Mbytes with a 5ms PDB assumption.***
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Appendix (Questions from SA2 in [1])

SA2 is studying the PC5 direct communication on the SID of 5G ProSe, which is covering Public Safety and commercial cases. SA2 has assumption the existing V2X mechanism is reused, on top of that, the following new Standardized PQIs for Public Safety and commercial in Table 1 and Table 2 are proposed to be introduced for PC5 communication.

**Table 1: New Standardized PQIs for Public Safety**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| PQI  Value | Resource Type | Default Priority Level | Packet Delay Budget | Packet Error  Rate | Default Maximum Data Burst Volume | Default  Averaging Window | Example Services |
| New value#1 | GBR | 1 | 150 ms | 10-2 | N/A | 2000 ms | Mission Critical user plane Push To Talk voice (e.g. MCPTT) |
| New value#2 |  | 2 | 200 ms | 10-2 | N/A | 2000 ms | Non-Mission-Critical user plane Push To Talk voice |
| New value#3 |  | 2 | 200 ms | 10-3 | N/A | 2000 ms | Mission Critical Video user plane |
| New value#4 | Non-GBR | 1 | 120 ms | 10-6 | N/A | N/A | Mission Critical delay sensitive signalling (e.g. MC-PTT signalling) |
| New value#5 |  | 6 | 400 ms | 10-6 | N/A | N/A | Mission Critical Data (e.g. example services are the same as 5QI 6/8/9) |

**Table 2: New Standardized PQIs for commercial service**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PQI**  **Value** | **Resource Type** | **Default Priority Level** | **Packet Delay Budget** | **Packet Error**  **Rate** | **Default Maximum Data Burst Volume** | **Default**  **Averaging Window** | **Example Services** |
| New value#1 | Delay Critical GBR | 5 | 5ms | 10-4 | 20000 bytes | 2000 ms | Interactive service - consume VR content with high compression rate via tethered VR headset |
| New value#2 |  | 6 | 10ms | 10-4 | 20000 bytes | 2000 ms | interactive service - consume VR content with low compression rate via tethered VR headset;  Gaming or Interactive Data Exchanging; |

Q1): SA2 kindly asks RAN1 whether these new Standardised PQIs can be supported in AS layers.

In addition, MDBV values can be changed according to application requirements to override the default MDBV. For Example, for commercial service, to support required data rate of 10Gbps, the maximum MBDV value set by the application can be 12.5M byte.

Q2): SA2 kindly asks RAN1 what is the maximum MBDV value AS layer can support with the indicated PDB and PER in Table 2.