3GPP TSG RAN WG1 Meeting #102-e R1-200xxxx

eMeeting, August 17 – 28, 2020

Agenda Item: 7.2.4.2.1

Source: Moderator (Ericsson)

Title: Resource allocation for NR sidelink Mode 1 – Thread 2

Document for: Discussion, Decision

# 1 List of issues for discussion

[102-e-NR-5G\_V2X\_NRSL-Mode-1-02] Email discussion/approval covering:

* HARQ reporting to gNB
  + Details in the WA from RAN#100-e for the case of reaching the maximum number of HARQ re-transmissions for a TB.
  + Whether there are other exceptional reports to the gNB (e.g., nothing to transmit for DG, etc.) and, if so, how to address them.
  + Editorial corrections and clarifications for HARQ reporting to gNB (if any).
* Processing times
  + Processing time for SL CG type-2.
  + Whether the gNB needs to be aware of SL HARQ RTT (Z = a + b) or alternative assumptions or behaviour, if necessary.
  + Editorial corrections and clarifications for processing times (if any).

By 8/20, followed by potential TPs by 8/25 – Ricardo (Ericsson)

# Discussion

## 1.3 HARQ reporting to gNB

### Issue 1.3-1 Details in the WA from RAN#100-e for the case of reaching the maximum number of HARQ re-transmissions for a TB.

**During the GTW session on 20/8/20, the following was agreed:**

Agreements:

* For CG, when the maximum number of HARQ retransmissions for a TB is reached, the UE reports ACK/NACK based on the contents of PSFCH (i.e., the same behaviour as if the maximum number of retransmissions had not been reached).

The understanding of the FL is that no TP is necessary in this case; the current specification already describes the appropriate behavior.

Please provide your views on the the need for a TP using the table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with FL. TP is unnecessary. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the conclusion |
| Sharp | Agree. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with FL. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Issue 1.3-2 Other exceptional reports to the gNB

**Are there are other exceptional reports to the gNB (e.g., nothing to transmit for DG, etc.)?**

1. **Yes (please provide details).**
2. **No further specification is necessary.**

**(For other answers, please explain)**

**FL summary (19/8/2020):**

* A majority of companies is supportive of not having any further specification.
* The issues described by the companies supportive of specifying further exceptional cases, do not result in a complete breakdown of the system. If they happen, they only result in some inefficient operation. Some of the supporters have even stated that these are optimizations.
* Given these two observations and that we are quite advanced in the maintenance phase, the proposal is not to specify anything.

**FL summary (20/8/2020)**

* Not many comments on this. The proposal remains the same.

**FL summary (24/8/2020)**

* No comments on this. My proposal is to capture the conclusion and discuss again in a later meeting, if necessary.

**FL summary (25/8/2020)**

* Given the situation and the discussion with DCM, I believe that we cannot reach any conclusion or agreement in this meeting. I encourage companies to think about the issue till next meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes  When a dynamic grant is provided to a UE, but if the UE skips the corresponding SL transmission, the UE should report ACK to gNB.  According to RAN2 spec., SL , is possible; hence, we think this exceptional report is needed. For example, a UE sends SR/BSR to gNB and gNB schedules SL grant based on the reported information. BSR includes destination ID/LCG ID/Buffer size. gNB predicts how many grants are necessary. However, SL grant does not include MCS indication/MIMO/DM-RS/CSI-RS/etc. They are determined by the UE itself and actual transmitted TBS is dependent on the parameters (i.e. channel condition/UE capability/etc.). The provided SL grants may be insufficient to transmit the reported buffer or may be sufficient. If sufficient, the UE could not have any transmitted data on one or more of the provided grants. This is feasible case in our understanding. gNB does not know details of actual SL communication.  [DCM2] We do not support the proposal since solving this issue would be essential. Please see the following points:  a. In our understaning, the skip mechanism is captured in 38.321. In section 5.22.1.3.1.3, there is the following description, which comes from Uu description in 5.4.3.1.3. Therefore, the skip situation can occur. Meanwhile, we cannot find RAN2 agreement for this...   |  | | --- | | The MAC entity shall not generate a MAC PDU for the HARQ entity if the following conditions are satisfied:  - there is no Sidelink CSI Reporting MAC CE generated for this PSSCH transmission as specified in clause 5.22.1.7; and  - the MAC PDU includes zero MAC SDUs. |   b. if this situation occurs, i.e. UE skips SL TX on resource provided by DG, of course UE follows current 213. In 16.5 of 213, UE generates HARQ-ACK bit based on the cast-type or feedback option. But when UE does not transmit any on the SL resource, HARQ-ACK bit generation is unclear; especialy whether generated or not. This issue leads to UCI payload size misalignment.  c. Note that we had same discussion for CG case and already specified as ACK generation. The motivation would be the same between CG and DG. Therefore, to follow CG case for DG is so reasonable outcome in our understanding.   |  | | --- | | The UE generates an ACK if the UE does not transmit a PSCCH with a SCI format 1-A scheduling a PSSCH in any of the resources provided by a configured grant in a single period and for which the UE is provided a PUCCH resource to report HARQ-ACK information. The priority value of the ACK is same as the largest priority value among the possible priority values for the configured grant. |   (if our understanding of the above ‘a’ is incorrect, i.e. SL TX skip is not supported in RAN2, the proposal is fine for us.)  FL reply 24/8/2020:  Given the current situation, I think there is very little support for your proposal. I suggest revisiting in a later meeting, if necessary. In this regard the proposal should be harmless in that it says that no additional reports are specified at this point.  [DCM3] Thank you for kind reply. I understand your suggestion and deadline is already passed. So OK not to agree the our proposal in this meeting, if any conclusion is NOT captured in this meeting so that RAN1 can have discussion if necessary. Thanks a lot for your always great work on mode1. |
| Intel | We are not sure if the case mentioned by NTT DOCOMO needs additional handling. For example, it can be similar to the case when a configured grant is not used. If it is not handled by specification, we are supportive that a UE sends ACK in this case. |
| vivo | Option B. No.  In the case of UL, the ability to skip on CG is a mandatory capability, but skipping on DG is an optional capability. Whether the UE can skip on a UL DG depends on the presence of skipUplinkTxDynamic. Specifically, if skipUplinkTxDynamic is configured, the UE can skip on UL grants, if not, the UE cannot skip the grant and should send a MAC PDU with padding.  The gnb may provide a sidelink grant, but the UE has no data available. In this case, if SL grant skipping is allowed, then we may need to discuss whether this behavior is an optional or mandatory capability. Since skipping UL DG is an optional capability, skipping SL DG should also be optional. However, defining such a new capability may introduce new RRC parameters, which should be avoided during this maintenance phase.  Another possibility is that the UE can send a MAC PDU with padding on a predetermined resource, the UE can then report HARQ-ACK based on the PSFCH reception associated with the DG. In this case, the process for determining the HARQ information is the same as if there is SL data to be sent. Therefore, no special reports need to be defined. |
| OPPO | Yes.  In case of dynamic grant, the SL transmission resource is allocated by gNB. While if the allocated resource beyond the PDB of the packet, UE will not use the resource for SL transmission. In that case, UE should report ACK to gNB to terminate gNB’s allocation for re-transmission. |
| LG Electronics | At this moment, it is not clear that the current MAC specification supports the mechanism that a UE skips SL TX on the resources of Mode 1 DG. So, it would not be desirable for RAN1 to discuss/conclude the relevant behaviour of HARQ reporting before RAN2 makes the explicit agreement on whether to support such mechanism in Rel-16 NR V2X. So, our preference is **Option B**. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option B. |
| Sharp | Option A. We are supportive of specifying the case mentioned by NTT DOCOMO. |
| CMCC | We are open to this optimization so option A is slightly preferred. |
| Fujitsu | Yes  We think it is a feasible case where UE has nothing to transmit on the resources allocated by dynamic grant. For example, this case can occur when PUCCH carrying sidelink ACK is dropped due to prioritization. Since PUCCH is not transmitted, gNB will not receive any ACK/NACK and thus may treat it as DTX. For safety, gNB may continue to schedule retransmission by using dynamic grant. However, UE has nothing to transmit since it has been ACKed before. In this case, letting UE report ACK can prevent gNB from keeping scheduling retransmission. Actually, the principle is similar with what has been defined when UE has nothing to transmit on the configured grant resources. |
| CATT | Option B.  Currently, there is not exceptional cases that needs ACK/NACK reported to gNB. in terms of the case mentioned by NTT, the skiping mechanism is not supported now (also mentioned by LGE). UE will perform the transmission and use the resources scheduled by gNB. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option B.  UE acquires the resource based on gNB scheduling, so gNB is aware of the SL transmission requirement, such as the latency, so the gNB could schedule a resource within the PDB. For the SL transmission which scheduled by gNB but skipped by the UE, it is due to the misunderstanding about the buffer status between UE and gNB, but this is similar with NR Uu scenario, which UL grant is skipped as well when no UL data is going to be transmitted. Therefore, we think no special issue in SL needs to be addressed. |
| Samsung | Option B.  Regarding SL skipping, we share similar view with vivo and LGE that RAN1 should not trigger this feature and introduce high layer impact. For the other issues, we consider it can be solved by current mechanism. Therefore, so further specification impact is needed. |
| Fraunhofer | Option A.  We agree with the issue being raised by NTT Docomo. If the UE does not transmit on a resource indicated by a DG, it can respond with an ACK in order to avoid further scheduling of resources by the gNB. This issue is already covered in 38.213 for CG, it can be extended for DG as well. |
| Ericsson | B  At this point, we are not convinced there are other exceptional cases. |
| Futurewei | B  While there could be exceptional cases that could potentially be investigated, we do not see any critical one needed in Rel-16 |
| Nokia, NSB | B |
| Apple | Option B. We do not see the needs to specify the exceptional case in Rel-16. |
| Spreadtrum | Slightly prefer Option A. The cases mentioned by NTT and FUJITSU may need specification. |

### 1.3.3 Other TPs with editorial/minor corrections

#### TP 1.3.3-1

Several contributions (R1-2005668, R1-2005797, R1-2006100, R1-2006263, R1-2006434, R1-2006867) have similar editorial corrections for TS 38.213 Clause 16.5. They are captured in the following TP:

|  |
| --- |
| **-------------------------- Start of Text Proposal for TS 38.213 --------------------------**  **<Unchanged parts omitted>** 16.5 UE procedure for reporting HARQ-ACK on uplink A UE can be provided PUCCH resources or PUSCH resources [12, TS 38.331] to report HARQ-ACK information that the UE generates based on HARQ-ACK information that the UE obtains from PSFCH receptions, or from absence of PSFCH receptions.  For SL configured grant Type 1 or Type 2 PSSCH transmissions by a UE within a time period provided by*sl-PeriodCG*, the UE generates one HARQ-ACK information bit in response to the PSFCH receptions to multiplex in a PUCCH transmission occasion that is after a last time resource, in a set of time resources.  **<Unchanged parts omitted>**  With reference to slots for PUCCH transmissions and for a number of PSFCH reception occasions ending in slot , the UE provides the generated HARQ-ACK information in a PUCCH transmission within slot , subject to the overlapping conditions in Clause 9.2.5, where is a number of slots indicated by a PSFCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field, if present, in a DCI format indicating a slot for PUCCH transmission to report the HARQ-ACK information, or is provided by *sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH-CG-Type1*. corresponds to a last slot for a PUCCH transmission that would overlap with the last PSFCH reception occasion assuming that the start of the sidelink frame is same as the start of the downlink frame [4, TS 38.211].  For a PSSCH transmission by a UE that is scheduled by a DCI format, or for a SL configured grant Type 2 PSSCH transmission activated by a DCI format, the DCI format indicates to the UE that a PUCCH resource is not provided when a value of the PUCCH resource indicator field is zero and a value of PSFCH-to-HARQ feedback timing indicator field, if present, is zero. For a SL configured grant Type 1 PSSCH transmission, a PUCCH resource can be provided by *sl-N1PUCCH-AN-r16* and *sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH-CG-Type1*. If a PUCCH resource is not provided, the UE does not transmit a PUCCH with generated HARQ-ACK information from PSFCH reception occasions.  **<Unchanged parts omitted>**  **------------------------------------ End of Text Proposal ------------------------------------** |

**FL summary (25/8/2020)**

* I have removed the ’-r16’ from the parameter names.

**Please provide your views on the TP using the table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| vivo | vivo-2020/8/24  agree |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the TP |
| Sharp | Agree. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok, support this TP |
| LG Electroincs | Generally, OK. Regarding the higher layer parameter name, “-r16” needs to be removed. The version of higher layer parameter is not present in RAN1 spec.  FL reply 25/8/2020:  I have removed it.  [DCM2] Thank you, but one ‘-r16’ is remaining (last part of the TP). |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### TP 1.3.3-2

Two contributions (R1-2005339, R1-2006558) include corrections to the set in TS 38.213 Clause 16.5.1.1. The following TP addresses the issues. R1-2006867 also has one TP covering part of these corrections.

|  |
| --- |
| **-------------------------- Start of Text Proposal for TS 38.213 --------------------------**  **<Unchanged parts omitted>** 16.5.1.1 Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook in physical uplink control channel **<Unchanged parts omitted>**  The cardinality of the set defines a total number of candidate PSSCH transmission occasions corresponding to the HARQ-ACK information bits. A UE determines HARQ-ACK information bits, for a total number of HARQ-ACK information bits as = HARQ-ACK information bit for candidate PSSCH transmission with index with corresponding PSFCH reception, for , as described in Clause 16.5. If the UE does not transmit a PSSCH in a PSSCH transmission occasion, due to the UE not detecting a corresponding DCI format 3\_0, the UE generates a NACK value for the PSSCH transmission occasion.  **<Unchanged parts omitted>**  **------------------------------------ End of Text Proposal ------------------------------------** |

**FL summary (25/8/2020)**

* I have kept the TP, let’s see if we can have a common understanding on the changes.

**Please provide your views on the TP using the table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| vivo | vivo-2020/8/24  Agree  In 16.5.1.1. of TS 38.213, M\_A is defined as ***a set of candidate PSSCH transmissions*** associated with PSFCH reception occasions***: ‘For the set of slot timing values, the UE determines a set of occasions for candidate PSSCH transmissions with corresponding PSFCH reception occasions according to the following pseudo-code.’***, but the cardinality of the set M\_A is defined as the ***number of PSFCH occasion*** in the current spec, which does not make sense.  There should be N HARQ-ACK bits generated for each PSFCH reception occasion of a pool because the N associated candidate PSSCH trasnmissions may be used for different TBs where N is the PSFCH period.  Hence the definition of the cardinality of the set M\_A should be corrected to the total number of candidate PSSCH transmission corresponding to the codebook. |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK  It seems OK since the update text on definition of M\_A is aligned with 16.5.1 and top of 16.5.1.1. |
| Sharp | * The wording should be aligned with other places describing M\_A where the current spec says “occasions for candidate PSSCH transmissions”. (The “transmission” is a candidate transmission, but the “occasion” is just an occasion, not a “candidate occasion”) * In the last sentence, specification of the priority of the generated NACK value is missing. (Normally the priority value of a HARQ-ACK bit is same as that of the associated PSSCH transmission, but here there is not even any detected DCI, not to mention an associated PSSCH transmission)   FL reply 25/8/2020:  For the first issue, I am not sure I understand what you mean. Can you clarify where else the change is needed and how it should look like?  The second issue is not really related to the rest of the TP. (I did not include it because it was based on a single contribution and strictly speaking, it would require some agreement, not just a correction). Let’s consider it in a later meeting. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree. Based on the logic to generate the Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook, the pseudo code part explains how to determine occasions with PSFCH resources, so it should be the PSFCH reception occasions, rather thant PSSCH occasions.  FL reply 25/8/2020:  As others have replied, 16.5.1 states “ occasions for candidate PSSCH transmissions with corresponding PSFCH reception occasions”. It seems straightforward to say that “The cardinality of the set M\_A defines a total number M of candidate PSSCH transmission occasions” |
| LG Electroincs | We are generally fine with the TP. We’d like to replace following part in the pseudo code to reflect that the case when the number of PSSCH slots associated with a PSFCH slot is smaller than periodPSFCHresource:  if slot belongs to the sidelink resource pool and includes PSFCH resources as indicated by a sidelink resource pool bitmap and *periodPSFCHresource*, where is the *k*-th slot timing value in set  Set – index of a SL slot ~~within~~among PSSCH slots associated with ~~an~~ the PSFCH slot ~~period~~  Set to the number of PSSCH slots associated with the PSFCH slot  while  In the above pseudo-code, the value of can be changed depending on PSFCH slot . According to LTE TDD, the number of DL SF associated with the UL SF can be different, and the HARQ-ACK codebook size can be also changed depending on this HARQ-ACK association set size. Even for the NR Uu link, Type-I HARQ-ACK codebook size could be varying slot-by-slot depending on the time gap between DL BWP switching or PCell UL BWP switching and PUCCH TX timing. Similar approach needs to be employed.  Regarding second comment from Sharp, we do not think that the priority of the NACK for DCI missing needs to be specified. To be specific, when a UE does not receive any DCI for a given PUCCH timing, the UE will not transmit PUCCH. In this case, the priority of the NACK is not necessary. Otherwise, the UE may have at least one priority of valid SL HARQ-ACK feedback, and it will be used to determine the priority of the PUCCH.  FL reply 25/8/2020:  The first issue is not really related to the rest of the TP. Let’s consider it in a later meeting. Please submit it as a TP so that everyone can have a look and think about it. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### TP 1.3.3-3

One contribution R1-2005339 proposes to clarify in the specification that K\_1 value represented by *sl-FeedbackToUL-ACK-CG* for a SL CG type1 shall be one of the values of *sl-FeedbackToUL-ACK-DG*. To this end, they provide a TP:

|  |
| --- |
| **-------------------------- Start of Text Proposal for TS 38.213 --------------------------**  **<Unchanged parts omitted>** 16.5.1 Type-1 HARQ-ACK codebook determination **<Unchanged parts omitted>**  This Clause applies if the UE is configured with *pdsch-HARQ-ACK-Codebook = semi-static*.  If a SL configured grant type 1 is configured for a UE, and a SL configured grant type 2 is configured for the UE or the UE is configured to monitoring DCI format 3\_0 scrambled with SL-RNTI or SL-CS-RNTI, and the UE is provided with a set of slot timing values associated with the SL BWP where is provided by *sl-FeedbackToUL-ACK* for DCI format 3\_0 or by *sl-ACKToUL-ACK*, the *sl-ACKToUL-ACK* shall be one of *sl-FeedbackToUL-ACK*.  **<Unchanged parts omitted>**  **------------------------------------ End of Text Proposal ------------------------------------** |

**FL summary (25/8/2020)**

* I will update the parameter names (as stated in the comments) when the discussion has settled down.
* There are a couple of companies with concerns, but we need to fix this issue. I think the restriction is quite natural.

**Please provide your views on the TP using the table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| vivo | vivo-2020/8/24  Agree with the TP expect the parameter name.  We noticed that the parameter names need to be updated(sl-FeedbackToUL-ACK is replaced by sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH-r16 and sl-ACKToUL-ACK is replaced by sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH-CG-Type1-r16 according to TS 38.331 g10) so the parameter names in the TP need to be updated as below:  If a SL configured grant type 1 is configured for a UE, and a SL configured grant type 2 is configured for the UE or the UE is configured to monitoring DCI format 3\_0 scrambled with SL-RNTI or SL-CS-RNTI, and the UE is provided with a set of slot timing values associated with the SL BWP where is provided by *sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH* for DCI format 3\_0 or by *sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH -CG-Type1*, the *sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH -CG-Type1* shall be one of *sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH*.  ***sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH***  For dynamic grant and configured grant type 2, configure the values of the PSFCH to PUCCH gap. The field PSFCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator in DCI format 3\_0 selects one of the configured values of the PSFCH to PUCCH gap.  ***sl-PSFCH-ToPUCCH -CG-Type1***  This field, for configured grant type 1, indicates slot offset between the PSFCH associated with the last PSSCH resource of each period and the PUCCH occasion used for reporting sidelink HARQ.  According to current spec, the K\_1 set associated with a type codebook may include K\_1-DG for DG and CG type2, and K\_1-CG-type1 for CG type1, if both type1 CG and DCI format 3\_0 are configured/scheduled.  If the PUCCH of a CG type1 and a PUCCH for a DG satisfy the multiplex condition, the HARQ-ACKs for CG type-1 and DG will be multiplexed and transmitted on the same PUCCH simultaneously. The K\_1 set for codebook construction, in this case, is the union of {K\_1-DG, K\_1-CG-type1}. If the collision does not happen, then K\_1 set for PUCCH on DG includes K\_1-DG only.  In other words, the K\_1 value set associated with a type1 codebook varies with multiplexing between CG type-1 PUCCH and DG PUCCH, in this case, resulted HARQ-ACK codebook size changes dynamically which violates the original intention of using type1 HARQ-ACK codebook. An example is shown below:  Case1. K\_1 set related to type1 codebook is (1,2,3,4) due to the multiplexing between HARQ-ACK corresponding to CG type1 and HARQ-ACK corresponding to DG  Case2. K\_1 set related to type1 codebook is (1,2,3) for DG only case    To avoid a dynamically changed type1 codebook size , K\_1-DG for type2 CG and DG should include the K\_1 value represented by K\_1-CG-type1 for type1 CG if UE is configured with CG type1 as well as monitoring of DCI format 3\_0. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are not sure why such restriction is necessary.  Uu does not have such restriction. For SL, the same mechanism should be fine. Or, is there any difference between Uu and SL? In this case, rather than such restriction, SL should follow Uu mechanism with some update to remove the difference, which is previous RAN1 agreement.  FL reply (25/8/2020)  In Uu we do not have this problem because SPS is not configured with RRC only. I honestly do not think that the restriction is that bad given that it means that CG type-1 and CG type-2 share the same values.  [DCM2] I see the intention. Then we are fine with this TP. |
| Sharp | We agree the definition of the set “K\_1” is not fully clear (“ is provided by *sl-FeedbackToUL-ACK* for DCI format 3\_0 or by *sl-ACKToUL-ACK*”) when both DG and CGs are applicable, but the place to fix this should be the place where “K\_1” is defined. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We have sympathy with DCM. In our previous agreement, we designed this part using Rel-15 NR Uu Type-1 codebook as the baseline, and we have not seen any adttional issue beyond NR Uu yet. On the other hand, the CG configuration is up to gNB, it may be configured or not, so the codebook size is not always kept unchanged.  FL reply (25/8/2020):  See my reply to DCM |
| LG Electroincs | We are supportive of this TP. It follows NR Uu link principle. If we do not support this kind of restriction, alternatively, pseudo-code needs to be updated to consider union of K\_1 for CG and K\_1 for DG. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### TP 1.3.3-4

R1-2006694 proposes to clarify that the PUCCH resource used for reporting the multiplexed HARQ-ACKs is determined by the last DCI among all DCIs associated with the reported HARQ-ACKs, and provide the following TP:

|  |
| --- |
| **-------------------------- Start of Text Proposal for TS 38.213 --------------------------**  **<Unchanged parts omitted>** 16.5 UE procedure for reporting HARQ-ACK on uplink **<Unchanged parts omitted>**  For a PSSCH reception by a UE that is scheduled by a DCI format, or for a SL configured grant Type 2 PSCCH reception activated by a DCI format, the DCI format indicates to the UE that a PUCCH resource is not provided when a value of the PUCCH resource indicator field is zero and a value of PSFCH-to-HARQ feedback timing indicator field, if present, is zero. For a SL configured grant Type 1 PSSCH reception, a PUCCH resource can be provided *sl-PUCCH-Config*. If a PUCCH resource is not provided, the UE does not transmit a PUCCH with generated HARQ-ACK information from PSFCH reception occasions.  For a PUCCH transmission with HARQ-ACK information, a UE determines a PUCCH resource after determining a set of PUCCH resources for  HARQ-ACK information bits, as described in Subclause 9.2.1. The PUCCH resource determination is based on a PUCCH resource indicator field [5, TS 38.212] in a last DCI format 3\_0, among the DCI formats 3\_0 that have a value of a PSFCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator field indicating a same slot for the PUCCH transmission, that the UE detects and for which the UE transmits corresponding HARQ-ACK information in the PUCCH where, for PUCCH resource determination, detected DCI formats are indexed in an ascending order across PDCCH monitoring occasion indexes.  A UE does not expect to multiplex HARQ-ACK information for more than one SL configured grants in a same PUCCH.  **<Unchanged parts omitted>**  **------------------------------------ End of Text Proposal ------------------------------------** |

**FL summary (25/8/2020)**

* I have replaced *PUCCH-SL-Config* with *sl-PUCCH-Config*.

**Please provide your views on the TP using the table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| vivo | 2020/8/24  agree with the TP |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree.  This is reuse from text for Uu, in 9.2.3 of 38.213. This aspect was agreed in RAN1#98bis. |
| Qualcomm | Ok with the TP |
| Sharp | Agree. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree. |
| LG Electroincs | We are generally fine with the TP.  *PUCCH-SL-Config* needs to be replaced with *sl-PUCCH-Config.*  Additionally, we want to ask companies whether or how to support multiple PUCCH resource set for NR sidelink. As we know, sl-PUCCH-Config has PUCCH-Config as IE, and in NR Uu link, depending on the HARQ-ACK payload size, different PUCCH resource set could be selected. In other words, for a given PUCCH reousrce indicator value, the final selected PUCCH resource could be different depending on the payload size. If we will support this feature, we needs to capture relevant description which is in 9.2.1. Otherwise, we can simply describe that a UE does not expect to be configured with more than one PUCCH resource set for NR sidelink.  FL reply 25/8/2020:  I updated the name.  [DCM2] We have same view with LGE, that PUCCH resource set for SL should be described. (Or just referring 9.2.1 with some replacing might be OK.) Only one PUCCH group means that up to two HARQ-ACK bits can be multiplexed on a PUCCH. At least type 1 HARQ-ACK CB does not work in this case. We are OK to address this issue in either this meeting or next meeting. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

In addition, at least the following issues are discussed in contributions:

* R1-2005339 proposes a clarification on HARQ reporting for multiple resource pools but no TP is provided.
* R1-2005339 proposes a clarification on HARQ reporting with more than 1 SL CG providing a grant with the same PSFCH reception occasion associated with the same SL HARQ codebook. The FL believes that such clarification is not necessary given that the following agreement made in [98b-NR-13]:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:(from [98b-NR-13] SL HARQ-ACK multiplexing)   * NR supports reporting of multiple SL HARQ-ACKs in a single PUCCH resource.   + The Rel-15 procedures for multiplexing DL HARQ-ACKs are reutilized.   + Reports carry SL HARQ-ACKs for dynamic grants and/or configured grants.     - A UE does not expected to be indicated to transmit SL HARQ-ACK information for more than one SL configured grant in a same PUCCH.     - Note: A UE can be provided with multiple SL CGs with different (non-overlapping) slots for the corresponding PUCCH transmissions for SL HARQ-ACK reporting.   [...] |

* R1-2005339 also discusses HARQ reporting for PSSCH with multiple associated PSFCH. Although the issue may justify a discussion, it cannot be considered an editorial TP. The FL suggests revisiting the issue in a later meeting, if necessary.

## 1.4 Processing times

### Issue 1.4-1 Processing time for SL CG type-2

**The current specification only captures the PSSCH processing time for sidelink dynamic grant (TS 38.214 Clause 8.6) corresponding to the following agreement from RAN1#101-e:**

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For dynamic grant in Mode 1, a UE does not expect to be scheduled to perform a SL transmission earlier than after the end of the scheduling PDCCH.   + - is 10, 12, 23, and 36 for equal to 0, 1, 2, and 3, respectively.       * FFS other values of based on the discussion on capabilities (Q5).     - *µ* corresponds to the one of (*µDL*, *µSL*) resulting in the largest *Tproc.*     - = 1     - (parameters as defined in 38.211) |

**The following agreement was declared on 21/8/2020**

**Agreements:**

* + For SL configured grant type-2 activation, the UE processing time is equal to Tproc (agreed in RAN1#101-e).

#### TP 1.4.1-1

**The preceding agreement is captured in the following TP for TS 38.214**

|  |
| --- |
| **-------------------------- Start of Text Proposal for TS 38.214 --------------------------**  **<Unchanged parts omitted>** 8.6 UE PSSCH preparation procedure time For sidelink dynamic grant and for SL configured grant type 2 activation, if the first sidelink symbol in the sidelink allocation for a PSSCH for a transport block and the associated PSCCH, including the DM-RS and the duplicated symbol, as defined by the slot offset of the scheduling DCI for dynamic grant or the activating DCI for SL configured grant type 2, is no earlier than at symbol *L*, where *L* is defined as the next sidelink symbol with its CP starting after the end of the reception of the last symbol of the PDCCH carrying the DCI scheduling the sidelink transmissions for dynamic grant or activating the SL configured grant type 2, then the UE shall transmit the PSSCH and the associated PSCCH.  *- N2* is based on *µ* of Table 8.6-1, where *µ* corresponds to the one of (*µDL*, *µSL*) resulting with the largest *Tproc*, where the *µDL* corresponds to the subcarrier spacing of the downlink with which the PDCCH carrying the DCI scheduling the PSSCH for dynamic grant or activating the SL configured grant type 2 was transmitted and *µSL* corresponds to the subcarrier spacing of the sidelink channel with which the PSSCH and the associated PSCCH are to be transmitted, and *κ* is defined in Clause 4.1 of [4, TS 38.211].  - *d2,1* = 1.  Otherwise the UE may ignore the scheduling DCI for dynamic grant or the activating DCI for SL configured grant type 2.  **<Unchanged parts omitted>**  **------------------------------------ End of Text Proposal ------------------------------------** |

**Please provide your views on the TP using the table.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| vivo | 2020/8/24  agree with the TP |
| NTT DOCOMO | OK |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the TP |
| Sharp | Agree. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |
| LGE | Agree with the TP |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### Issue 1.4-2 Whether the gNB needs to be aware of SL HARQ RTT (Z = a + b) or alternative assumptions or behaviour, if necessary

**A few contributions (e.g., R1-2005741, R1-2005847) discuss whether it is necessary for the gNB to know the SL HARQ RTT (i.e., Z = a + b in the agreements) for being able to schedule the SL Mode 1 transmissions and to schedule the PUCCH transmissions with SL HARQ reports.**

1. **It is necessary to agree on an assumption on the HARQ RTT.**
2. **It is not necessary to agree on an assumption on the HARQ RTT. In that case,**
   * **How should the UE proceed if the time between two SL transmissions (for the same TB) is shorter than the HARQ RTT?**
   * **How should the UE proceed if the time between the last PSFCH reception and the SL HARQ report to the gNB is smaller than the processing time at the UE?**

**(For other answers, please explain)**

**FL summary (19/8/2020)**

* There is a very clear majority of companies that think that an upper bound on ’b’ should be defined, while leaving the actual value up to UE implementation, as agreed. We can discuss the value but the agreed value for Tproc seems a reasonable starting point.
* For the case that ”the time between the last PSFCH reception and the SL HARQ report to the gNB is smaller than the processing time at the UE”, two companies have expressed the position that this should be left up to UE/NW implementation, while one company proposes to specify some behavior.
* Based on this, my proposal is the following:

**FL summary (20/8/2020)**

* Multiple companies have expressed a preference for using Tprep isntead of Tproc.
* Based on this, I have updated the proposal as follows:

**Proposal:**

* The time between PSFCH reception and next PSCCH/PSSCH retransmission (i.e., ’b’) does not exceed Tprep.
* No additional specification is introduced for the case that the time between the last PSFCH reception and the SL HARQ report to the gNB is smaller than the processing time at the UE.

**During the GTW session on 20/8/20, the following was agreed:**

Agreements:

For Mode 1 when applicable:

* For the same TB, the minimum time between PSFCH reception and next scheduled PSCCH/PSSCH retransmission is Tprep +delta (ms)
  + To conclude the value of delta>=0 during the e-Meeting
  + A UE is not expected to be scheduled consecutive SL transmisions for the same TB such that the minimum time between PSFCH reception and next PSCCH/PSSCH retransmission can not be guaranteed
* FFS the detailed conditions of the applicability

**Regarding applicability:**

The following two options were discussed during the meeting:

* Option A. The gNB provides a grant for transmission in a pool with PSFCH resources.
* Option B. SL HARQ feedback is used (my understanding is that this is the same as TB with HARQ-enabled is transmitted)

My understanding is that the gNB cannot know whether the condition in option B is met or not. The gNB provides resources but the UE is in charge of assembling the TB. Situations like the following may happen:

1. The UE sends a BSR which indicates that it has data belonging to LCH for which SL HARQ FB is not enabled.
2. After the BSR is sent but before the grant is received, a new packet with high priority arrives at the TX buffer.
3. Although the pool contains PSFCH resources, the gNB provides a grant (based on the BSR) with PSFCH-to-PSCCH/PSSCH time smaller than Tprep + delta.
4. The UE finds itself in a situation that it has a packet that requires HARQ feedback but the grant cannot work. This would require that RAN2 introduces new LCP rules, which is highly undesirable at this stage.

For this reason, my proposal would be to go with the first option

Regarding delta, I would appreciate if companies would share views. So far, we have only seen two values: 0 and 0.5 ms. Among these, 0ms seems to have widest support.

**Proposal:**

* Change the first line in the above agreement so that it reads: ”For Mode 1 ~~when applicable~~ when using a pool with PSFCH resources:”
* delta = 0.

Please share your views for the proposal and the value for delta using the new table (the old table can be found in the appendix, for reference).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree FL’s proposal on “For Mode 1 ~~when applicable~~ when using a pool with PSFCH resources:”  Regarding to value of delta, we would like to firstly ask for a clarification of the main bullet in the agreement made in the most recent conference call, i.e. “For the same TB, the minimum time between PSFCH reception and next scheduled PSCCH/PSSCH retransmission is Tprep +delta (ms)”. To our understanding on the original intention of this topic, once the gNB gives the grant (either CG of DG), the UE can do nothing with any modification of the time interval between one PSFCH and the next PSCCH/PSSCH. This is why ZTE commented in the conference call that this main bullet indeed says a gNB behaviour. If this main bullet is considered as UE behavior, the meaning of the whole agreement would be changed in such a way that “In general UE does not expect gNB would give grants that cannot guarantee the minimum time interval, but if gNB indeed does, Tx UE may modify the transmission patterns, such as disabling the PSFCH for a transmission, to guarantee the minimum time interval is not violated”. So here people can have two different understanding:   * If the main bullet in agreement is a restriction to gNB behaviour, delta should be a value knowable to gNB. * If the main bullet in agreement is a UE behaviour, there seems no strong requirement for gNB to know delta, although having the knowledge in gNB is beneficial.   Further, whether the main bullet intends to describe the gNB behavior or UE behavior also impacts how to capture the agreement in TP.  It is not our intention to re-open the agreement. Just need a clarification.  FL reply (21/8/20)  My understanding is that this agreement   * Implies that any UE does the required processing (i.e., process PSFCH, prepare a new PSCCH/PSSCH transmission, etc.) in a time that will not be larger than Tprep + delta (but the UE could do faster than that). * Implies that the UE will not expect the gNB to be scheduled consecutive transmissions of the same TB that are spaced by less than Tprep + delta. * (The conditions when these applies and the exact value of delta are being discussed in this thread and will be part of the spec text.)   I don’t think this is conceptually any different from the following agreement made in RAN1#100bis-e  Agreements:   * A UE does not expect to be scheduled to transmit the UL report corresponding to a PSFCH reception earlier than Tprep after the end of the PSFCH.   + This includes the effect of time advance.   + Tprep = (N+X) ∙ (2048+144) ∙ k ∙ 2 –μ ∙ T\_c where:     - Working assumption: N is 14, 18, 28 and 32 corresponds to the SCS configuration μ of 0, 1, 2 and 3, μ = min(μ\_SL, μ\_UL)     - k = T\_s / T\_c (parameters as defined in 38.211)     - FFS X (including the possibility of value 0)   (Of course we are talking about a SL PSCCH/PSSCH transmission instead of PUCCH in UL, but conceptually the situation is the same). |
| Ericsson | The proposal looks fine.  Regarding the value of delta, we believe that delta = 0 is sufficient. This corresponds to Tprep, which is the minimum PSFCH to UL PUCCH report. According to QC, Tprep > Tproc, which is PDCCH to PSCCH/PSCCH time. In our view, the time of assembling a PUCCH report cannot be larger than the time of assembling a PSCCH/PSCCH transmission. Consequently, delta=0 must be sufficient. |
| Qualcomm | In my understanding of the agreement, the value (Tprep + delta) is a processing timeline, which is defined as a minimum scheduling restriction.  Tprep (PSFCH to PUCCH) = 18 symbols and Tproc (PDCCH to PSCCH/PSSCH) = 12 symbols with 30 kHz SCS. For this proposal, we’re discussing PSFCH to PSCCH/PSSCH, which is more closely related to Tprep because both have the same starting point. I agree with Ericsson that the time to prepare PSCCH/PSSCH is greater than the time to prepare PUCCH and that’s why I think delta should be greater than 0 and proposed 0.5 ms during the call.  I agree with the feature-lead’s assessment that the gNB cannot know when the UE will request feedback.  FL reply 24/8/2020  Given that Tprep > Tproc, it does not seem to be a problem to encode PSCCH/PSSCH, right? If so, delta=0 should work.  [QC2] PDCCH decoding time is different from PSFCH reception time. I don’t think we can make this comparison with Tproc because we need to now see why Tprep was larger than Tproc and assign weights to each of PDCCH decoding, PSFCH decoding, PUCCH transmission, and PSCCH/PSSCH transmission and then combine the pieces together. It is much easier to start from Tprep since it also beings at PSFCH reception. Then the point raised is that PSCCH/PSSCH preparation takes more time than PUCCH preparation, therefore this operation takes longer than Tprep and delta should be > 0. |
| NTT DOCOMO | My understanding is a bit different.  I agree that gNB cannot know whether the condition in option B is met or not. But it does not mean that gNB shall guarantee the time restriction. It is too restrictive that gNB always guarantee the minimum time for any grant, e.g. blind retransmissions of a TB with HARQ feedback disabled. It leads to larger latency of such stransmissions with HARQ feedback disabled.  My suggestion is the following:   * When SL grant provided by gNB does not guarantee the minimum time, UE can transmit data which does not require HARQ feedback on SL (e.g. broadcast), if any; otherwise, UE skips the transmission. * When SL grant provided by gNB guarantee the minimum time, UE can transmit data which either requires or does not require HARQ feedback on SL.   Note that RAN2 agreed the following in RAN2#109-bis:   |  | | --- | | Agreements on MAC:  ...  9: For mode1, if UE only has SL data on LCHs with FB enabled for a SL grant configured without PSFCH, the SL grant is skipped and so not used for transmission. |   FL reply (21/8/20)  The RAN2 agreement that you have copied refers to a “SL grant configured without PSFCH” (i.e., a SL grant for a pool without PSFCH resources). The problem here would be that the pool itself would have PSFCH resources but the very specific grant would not allow the UE to process PSFCH and prepare PSCCH/PSSCH. Certainly RAN2 could add an additional rule like the one above for the case we are discussing, but this is exactly what I think we should avoid so deep in the maintenance phase.  My view is that, unless it is essential, we should avoid any impact to RAN2 spec.  [DCM2] Thank you for kind clarification. OK, you assume that ‘SL grant configured without PSFCH’ means grant for resource pool without PSFCH. I thought the quoted sentence includes our discussing case, i.es. insufficient gap between PSFCH and the next PSSCH. But I checked 321 again and it seems your assumption is valid. We also think that further RAN2 work is not preferable. In that sense, now we are fine with your update above. Thank you. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are generally fine with the FL’s update, but we are curious about the applicability of this proposal.  In our understanding, the prospsal is used to limit the time beteween PSFCH and next PSCCH/PSSCH transmission in order to UE could have enough time to prepare a retransmission in case that it receives NACK on the PSFCH resources. However, this the mechanism is based on HARQ feedback. If the HARQ feedback is disabled, UE does not have the HARQ information and will transmit the TB anyway. For this point, gNB does not need to gurantee the time. Which is unfortunately, the HARQ function enabled/disabled is up to TX UE, gNB is not aware of the function is truned on or off, so it cannot predict whether the timeline should be met or not. But for another point, if gNB configures the PUCCH resource which implies the gNB would like to receive the SL HARQ information and UE needs to enable the HARQ function, so the time condition should be satisfied definitly. Otherwise, if the PUCCH reosurces are not configured which means gNB is not willing to receive SL HARQ information, and the timing may be not gurannteed. To the UE, if the time is enough, the UE could apply retransmission based on HARQ feedback, if not, blind transmission could be selected. Note, in RAN2 it has agreed that PUCCH resource cannot be configured without PSFCH resource. So we think in addition the change update by FL, another condition for applicability can be added for the subbullet:   * + *A UE is not expected to be scheduled consecutive SL transmisions for the same TB such that the minimum time between PSFCH reception and next PSCCH/PSSCH retransmission can not be guaranteed at least the PUCCH resources are configured.*   As the delta value, we do not have strong views on this point, but think the Tprep seems fine due to it is already larger than Tproc.  FL reply 24/8/2020:  The issue with the clarification that you provide is that even if the gNB does not provide PUCCH resources, the TX UE could request SL HARQ feedback, as long as the pool is configured with PSFCH resources. It seems to me that not having PSFCH resources is the only condition that ensure that SL HARQ FB is not used (and, thus, closer retransmissions can be granted).  [HWHiSi\_2] (25/08/2020)  Yes, but somehow having PSFCH resources in a resource pool does not mean SL HARQ-ACK is enabled. It is noted HARQ-ACK function is switched on/off by Tx UE and gNB does not have this switching information, so gNB has no idea the whether the time condition should be guaranteed definitely either. On the contrary, if the PUCCH resource for SL HARQ is configured, at least two conditions are satisfied:   1. PSFCH reosurces are configured: based on RAN2 agreement, the PUCCH reosurces cannot be configured without PSFCH; 2. SL HARQ is enabled: UE needs to report SL HARQ information tp gNB, so the Tx UE should enable the SL HARQ and obtain SL information from Rx UE.   Therefore, we think at least in the case PUCCH resource is indicated/configured, the timeline should be guaranteed by gNB, otherwise, it is better to give some flexibilities for gNB scheduling. For the case the PUCCH resource is not configured, PSFCH resources are configured and the SL HARQ is enabled but the time requirement is not met, UE can handle it by implementation. That is why we think whether PUCCH resource is configured can be as a condition. |
| vivo | Agree with FL that gnb has no idea of whether option B is satisfied.  From the perspective of gnb, when a PUCCH is provided by a DG or CG, it means gnb may expect UE to provide some valid SL HARQ-ACK information to help its scheduling. In this case, gnb should gurantee that the resources scheduled by the DG or CG meet the minimum time requirememnt so that UE can transmit a MAC PDU with HARQ feedback on the scheduled resources and then provides an efficetive HARQ-ACK reporting based on the PSFCH reception. (Of course UE still can choose transmit a PDU which does not require HARQ feedback on the granted resources. But since it is the gnb who wants to get some SL information, it is natural for gnb to ensure the minimum gap if it provides PUCCH. Otherwise UE has to do blind retransmission, which is against the intention of providing a PUCCH.  If PUCCH is not provided and resources in a pool with PSFCH are scheduled by the CG or DG, it can be to UE to decide whether to map MAC PDU which requires HARQ feedback on the granted resources. There can be two cases:   1. When resources provided by gNB does not guarantee the minimum time, UE can transmit MAC PDU which does not require HARQ feedback 2. When resources provided by gnb is no less the minimum time, UE can transmit MAC PDU requiring HARQ feedback or not requiring HARQ feedback.   If we follow option A, as DOCOMO said, the latency of blind transmission in a pool with PSFCH would unnecessarily increase. So the condition could be changed in a way that ‘when PUCCH is provided with a grant’  FL reply 24/8/2020:  Se my replies to DCM and Huawei. Your solution is in principle valid. The problem is that it would need further changes by RAN2 to the LCP procedures. I think that is undesirable at this point. |
| Intel | Regarding the applicability, it is a bit unfortunate that gNB could not exactly know whether the scheduled grant is for feedback-based or blind transmission. In current situation, we accept having the most robust assumption on PSFCH presence. Note, that in Mode-2, RAN2 implemented the HARQ RTT gap in similar way, although there are still debates about consistency with the RAN1 agreement and associated efficiency of blind retransmissions.  If the applicability is not confirmed, then RAN1 & RAN2 need to work out the conditions when a UE can enable or disable feedback even if the LCH is feedback-based.  We are not sure if adding PUCCH resource condition is appropriate. In our assessment, SL HARQ feedback reporting to gNB may not be always enabled since may not bring much benefits.  Regarding the delta, we are fine either way:   * 0 ms * 0.5 ms * 0.5 / 2µ, where µ = 0,1,2,3 for 15,30,60,120 kHz – 7 symbols regardless of numerology   Note, that PSCCH/PSSCH preparation could be done before finishing PSFCH detection, and if ‘NACK’ is confirmed, then the transmission is performend, if ‘ACK’ is confirmed, then the transmission is not performed, since Mode-1 does not allow a UE to start a new TB in these resources due to NDI and HARQ ID control procedures. In that sense, the processing time could not be larger than PUCCH preparation time, where the PUCCH payload/sequence is a function of the PSFCH detection outcome. |
| Apple | In general, we are fine with FL’s proposal on “when using a pool with PSFCH resources”. Since gNB does not know whether PSFCH is triggered or not by UE, gNB does not know exactly when to ensure the minimum time gap between PSFCH and reTx PSCCH/PSSCH. The only criteria to use is when a resource pool with PSFCH resources.  As per the value of delta, we do not have strong position. Considering T\_prep (PSFCH to PUCCH gap) is already larger than T\_proc (PDCCH to PSCCH/PSSCH gap), we think it is probably fine to set delta = 0 for simplicity. |
| LG Electronics | We disagee with FL’s proposal of adding “when using a pool with PSFCH resources”. According the current RAN2 specificaiton, the linkage between “LCH with HARQ FB enabled/disabled” and “Mode 1 CG” is configured by RRC signalling. This means that a UE can know which Mode 1 CG is configured for the purpose of “MAC PDU with HARQ FB enabled” transmission. Also for a resource pool in which PSFCH resource is configured, if gNB is only allowd to configure Mode 1 CG satisfying the minimum time between PSFCH reception and next scheduled PSCCH/PSSCH retransmission for the same TB, it could be difficult to support a service with low latency requirement. Since there is no such restriction for Mode 2, we are not convinced why it should be applied only to Mode 1. In summary, our suggestion is as below. Note that we think that it doesn’t need to specify UE’s behaviour for the error case.   * *For a TB with HARQ feedback enabled, a UE doesn’t expect to receive Mode 1 SL grant such that the minimum time between PSFCH reception and next PSCCH/PSSCH retransmission can not be guaranteed for the same TB.*   FL reply 25/8/2020:  This applies to DG and CG. In general, the gNB cannot know which LCHs will be multiplexed in a TB. Without changes to LCP, I do not see how this can be fixed. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Other comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| vivo | 2020/8/24  Regarding the multiple CG issue mentioned in 1.3, I am afraid if we can not derive that ‘there is only 1 SL CG providing a grant with the same PSFCH reception occasion associated with the same SL HARQ codebook’, from our side the highlighted part in the agreement showed by FL just implies that UE reports HARQ-ACK for up to 1 SL CG in a codebook, it is not expected to report HARQ-ACK for more than 1 SL CG. 38.213 implemented the highlighted part in this way: ***A UE does not expect to multiplex HARQ-ACK information for more than one SL configured grants in a same PUCCH***. Both the agreement and spec have not prevented gnb from configuring multiple SL CG providing grants associated with the same PSFCH occasion targeting the same codebook.  From our understanding, it seems that gnb is still allowed to provide more than 1 SL CG providing a grant with the same PSFCH reception occasion associated with the same SL HARQ codebook, but how to meet the highlighted restriction is not still clear and some rules need to be specified. E.g. only report HARQ-ACK corresponding to SL CG with the lowest index among the SL CG providing a grant associated with the PSFCH occasion. (I also noticed that there is a note mentioned that the restriction can be achieved by assigning different PUCCH slots for different SL CG. However, it may be difficult for gnb to avoid the collision between semi-static PUCCH associated with different SL CG.)  I am not sure how the group understands the agreement. If it is the common understanding in the group that gnb must avoid providing more than 1 SL CG providing a grant with the same PSFCH reception occasion associated with the same SL HARQ codebook, then I think we still need another agreement or conclusion for further clarification.  Agreements:(from [98b-NR-13] SL HARQ-ACK multiplexing)   * NR supports reporting of multiple SL HARQ-ACKs in a single PUCCH resource.   + The Rel-15 procedures for multiplexing DL HARQ-ACKs are reutilized.   + Reports carry SL HARQ-ACKs for dynamic grants and/or configured grants.     - A UE does not expected to be indicated to transmit SL HARQ-ACK information for more than one SL configured grant in a same PUCCH.     - Note: A UE can be provided with multiple SL CGs with different (non-overlapping) slots for the corresponding PUCCH transmissions for SL HARQ-ACK reporting.   FL reply (25/8/2020):  In my view, it is quite clear that if a UE is provided with two different CGs that require the UE to report SL HARQ-ACK to the gNB in the same PUCCH would imply that “the UE has been indicated to transmit SL HARQ-ACK information for more than one SL configured grant in a same PUCCH”. This would be against the highlighted part of the agreement in [98b-NR-13]. It is responsibility of the gNB to avoid it. Note that the spec already states (TS 38.213 Clause 16.5) that “A UE does not expect to multiplex HARQ-ACK information for more than one SL configured grants in a same PUCCH.” |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Appendix: Previous dicussions

## 1.3 HARQ reporting to gNB

### Issue 1.3-1 Details in the WA from RAN#100-e for the case of reaching the maximum number of HARQ re-transmissions for a TB.

**Regarding the following working assumption made in RAN#100-e:**

1. **When the maximum number of HARQ retransmissions for a TB is reached, the UE reports ACK/NACK based on the contents of PSFCH (i.e., the same behaviour as if the maximum number of retransmissions had not been reached).**
2. **When the maximum number of HARQ retransmissions for a TB is reached, the UE reports ACK.**

**(For other answers, please explain)**

**FL summary (19/8/2020):**

* There is a majority of companies supporting option A.
* Some further companies propose not having any additional specification. My understanding is that this is aligned with option A too.

**FL reply (20/8/2020):**

* There is a comment by Nokia on whther there is some misalignment in the RAN2 specs.

**Proposal:**

* When the maximum number of HARQ retransmissions for a TB is reached, the UE reports ACK/NACK based on the contents of PSFCH (i.e., the same behaviour as if the maximum number of retransmissions had not been reached).
* No spec impact is expected.

**During the GTW session on 20/8/20, the following was agreed:**

Agreements:

* For CG, when the maximum number of HARQ retransmissions for a TB is reached, the UE reports ACK/NACK based on the contents of PSFCH (i.e., the same behaviour as if the maximum number of retransmissions had not been reached).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option A.  [DCM2] Support the proposal. |
| Intel | Option A  [Intel2] Support |
| vivo | We have no particular preference for either option. But we have some questions about option A. I understand that setting the maximum retransmission for a TB to some extent is to limit the resources used for a single TB. Since gnb is not aware of where the initial transmission takes place on a CG, it cannot differentiate the HARQ-ACK reporting with/without satisfying the maximum transmission times restriction. So if we go with option A, gnb may assign more resources for retransmission due to the reported NACK, then what is the purpose of setting the maximum retransmission times in this case? It sees this limit has virtually no impact on the number of resources used by a TB. Could the proponents of option A elaborate a bit more of the intention of setting such restriction if option A is adopted?  FL reply (19/8/2020):  My understanding is that the existing restriction limits the number of transmissions a UE can perform in the resources provided by a CG. That is not incompatible with the gNB providing further resources.  [vivo-2020/08/20]  Understand. I was just trying to remember the original intention of introducing a maximum number of transmissions for CG….. it seems that such restriction is totally useless if we follow option A… |
| OPPO | The WA made in RAN1#100-e is as follows:  Working assumption (Q5):  In case of reaching the maximum number of HARQ re-transmissions for a TB, the UE sends one bit on the UL resources for SL HARQ-ACK reporting. The specification will specify the UE behavior (what the behavior is: FFS), and specify the contents of the report (what the content is: FFS).  This WA was partially agreed in RAN1#100bis-e for configured grant:  Agreements:   * The working assumption (as in proposal 3 in the summary) from RAN1#100-e is confirmed.   Proposal 3 (for a working assumption):   * The working assumption from RAN1#100-e is confirmed.   + In case of reaching the maximum number of HARQ re-transmissions for a TB using resources provided by a configured grant, the UE reports ACK to the gNB.     - ~~FFS whether the specification supports that the gNB configures the UE with a maximum number of transmission per TB.~~   While for dynamic grant, there is no agreement till now. @ FL, can you clarify that this issue is only for DG?  On the other hand, one remaining issue regarding the WA is how the UE knows whether/when the maximal number of transmissions is reached.  We have the following agreement in RAN1#99. For DG, the number of re-transmissions is up to gNB. Based on that agreement, how the UE knows when/whether the number of re-transmission is reached. That should be clarified, and some specification is needed. Otherwise, it cannot work.  Agreements:   * For dynamic grant, the number of retransmissions of a TB is up to the gNB. * For configured grant, the maximum number of times that a TB can be retransmitted using the resources provided by the configured grant is configured per priority per configured grant.   FL reply (19/8/2020):  My understanding is that this can only apply to CG. For DG the maximum number is up to the gNB, as shown in the last agreement you copy.  The working assumption was confirmed in RAN1#100bis-e. I am not sure why you are copying Proposal 3 above. That was never agreed. Only the working assumption (as copied at the beginning of your reply) was agreed.  [OPPO2] For the CG case, we have made agreement (Please find Spreadtrum’s comment in the table, I copied the wrong proposal 3, sorry for the confusing).  For DG case, we still prefer option B.  gNB allocates resource to UE for transmission. While UE may not be able to use the allocated reousrce actually if some transmission occasions are dropped because of prioritization. Then the number of transmissions between gNB and UE are misalignment. gNB assume it has allocated maximal number of transmission resources to UE, while UE cannot use all of them if some transmission occasions are dropped. If UE report NACK to gNB based on received PSFCH, gNB will not allocate more transmission resource for the TB if it has allocated maximal number of resources. While UE needs more resource for re-transmission since the actual number of transmission does not reach the maximal number.  If UE reports ACK to gNB in case the maximal number of transmission is reached, gNB will not allocate more resources. Compared to option A, there is no misalignment between gNB and UE.  FL reply (20/8/2020):  For DG, my understanding is that the above confirmed WA does not apply. |
| LG Electronics | First of all, the network can’t exactly know (a) which CG resource (within a period) is used for the initial TX of TB or (b) how many re-TXs of TB have been performed. In other words, only UE can know such information. With Option B, it is possible for the network to avoid allocating unnecessary re-TX resources for the TB that has been already reached to the maximum number of re-TXs. As a result, we are supportive of **Option B**. Furthermore, **when the maximum number of re-TXs for a TB is configured per priority per CG, it can be defined that this value is shared between re-TXs using CG/DG resources for the same TB**.  [LG2] When adopting FL’s proposal, it should be clarified why the parameter of configuring the maximum number of HARQ re-TXs for a TB in CG is necessary?  FL reply (20/8/20):  See my reply to QC. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option A. |
| Sharp | Option A |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Option B  Reporting ACK provides information to the gNB to stop giving grants for this TB. In the case where the UE is not (or cannot be) aware of the maximum number of retransmission, the UE will proceed as normal for any retransmission and provide feedback based on received PSFCH.  [QC2]: It isn’t clear how the proposal would still utilize the parameter for the maximum number of configured grant retransmissions (sl-CG-MaxTransNum).  FL reply:  If the number is reached, do not transmit further on resources granted provided by te configured grant. It is unrelated to reporting. |
| CMCC | We share similar view with OPPO that this issue is only for DG and UE cannot be aware of whether the number of re-transmission is reached. So the same behaviour regardless of whether the maximum number of retransmissions has been reached or not is preferred. And from our perspective, UE does not need to know when/whether the number of re-transmission is reached, so no specification is needed.  FL reply (19/8/2020):  My understanding is that option A entails no further specification |
| Fujitsu | Option A |
| CATT | First of all, how to define the maximum number of the HARQ re-tx for a TB. The maximum number is a number X that should be configured to UE, and . If the maximum number of transmission for a TB is 10, it means this TB can be transmitted and retransmitted no more than 10.   * For **CG type-1 and Type-2**, the maximum number is configured exactly to the UE.   + For CG type-1, the configured grant can configured and indicate the first set of resource for initial transmission and re-transmission, e.g. N\_max=3, then the rest 7 re-transmission will be scheduled by DG. For DG schedule re-transmission, each time DCI can dynamically scheduled N\_max=1/2/3, and at the end of each set of scheduled resources, there will be a PUCCH resource for ACK/NACK reporting.   + For CG type-2, DCI is used to active the first transmission(s), e.g. N\_max=3 indicated in DCI. For each TB, the initial transmission and 2 re-transmissions (3 resources), the resources are indicated by DCI and configured CG period, and the rest 7 re-transmissions are scheduled by other DG if needed.   Therefore, **for CG Type-1, both gNB and UE knows the maximum number that a TB can be transmitted**. gNB should not schedule extra resources for transmission that is exceeds the maximum number (e.g. gNB will not schedule 11-th transmission resources for the TB).  **Q1: How many TX resources are configured for each TB? 10 or only 3?**  **Q2: Can the DG scheduled re-transmissions use CG resources?**  **Q3: Can a TB use resources located in more than one CG period?**   * For **DG**, there is no such a parameter that is configured to UE to indicate the maximum number of transmission. DCI is used for each set of resources for DG transmission. The first set of transmissions indicated by DCI, e.g. N\_max=3, and the rest 7 re-transmissions are scheduled by other DG if needed. **gNB knows the maximum number that a TB can be transmitted but UE does not know**. UE only perform the (re-)transmissions by using the resources scheduled by gNB and indicated.   **With the analysis above, there is no necessary for a UE to act the HARQ-ACK report in case of reaching the maximum Tx number of a TB.**  [CATT2]  Before down selecting from the two options, the unclear part in this mechanism should be clarified. I think other companies also mentioned about it.   * This reporting mechanism in the proposal is intented for CG, but not DG. * Even for CG, the re-transmissions are scheduled by DG. Both gNB and UE knows the maximum re-tx number of a TB, there is no reason that gNB allocate re-tx resources exceeds the maximum allowance configured by itself.   FL reply (20/8/20):  For DG, there is no maximum number. So the agreement cannot apply.  For CG, the agreement we states the following:  Agreements:   * For dynamic grant, the number of retransmissions of a TB is up to the gNB. * For configured grant, the maximum number of times that a TB can be retransmitted using the resources provided by the configured grant is configured per priority per configured grant.   I think the part in yellow is self-explanatory. It does not include resources granted by the gNB using. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We do not have strong preference here, but it should be clarified how the UE know the maximum (re-)transmissions are reached.  According to the agreements in RAN1#99, the number of retransmissions of a TB for dynamic grant is up to the gNB, thus maximum number of HARQ retransmissions has not been specified for dynamic grant so far. To provide more flexibility to dynamic grant, it is also no need to define such maximum number of HARQ retransmissions, thus it seems reasonable to report ACK/NACK based on the contents of PSFCH as the general way. |
| Samsung | We prefer Option B.  In our understanding this issue is for CG, since the retx number of DG is up to gNB. For CG, if Option A is adopted, gNB has no information of how many times one TB is transmitted, thus gNB may schedule resource for retx even if the maximum retx number is reached. Therefore the scheduled resource is wasted. Option B can better reflect the situation of SL transmission.  In addition, since CG could schedule only up to 3 resources per period, we prefer to clarify the number of retx per priority per CG includes both CG-based resource and DG-based resource for retx of CG.  [Samsung2] We also think Option A cannot utilize the parameter *sl-CG-MaxTransNum* and may introduce misalignment between UE and gNB, e.g. gNB schedules resource for retx when UE already release the buffer.  FL reply (20/8/20):  See my reply to QC and Nokia |
| Fraunhofer | Option B.   * In our understanding, the maximum number of HARQ retransmissions in question is **relevant only to CGs**. The maximum number of retransmissions for a TB using resources of the grant is configured per priority per configured grant using the parameter *sl-CG-MaxTransNumList*. * Hence TX UEs are aware of this restriction, and can manage and maintain the number of retransmissions for a given TB. However, as LG stated, the **gNB cannot keep track of the number of retransmissions** a TX UE carries out for a single TB using the resources provided in a given CG. * In the case of option B, if the gNB receives an ACK after the maximum number of retransmissions was reached, it will carry out the same action as when it receives an ACK for a successful transmission. Hence the gNB’s response does not vary between the two events. * In the case of option A, it is important for the gNB to differentiate between a NACK when the maximum number of retransmissions has been reached and when it has not been reached.   + If NACK was sent before the maximum number of retransmissions was reached, the gNB has the option to schedule further resources for retransmission using DG.   + If NACK was sent after reaching the maximum number of retransmissions, the gNB should NOT provide further grants for retransmission. The UE has already attempted to transmit the maximum number of times, given the existing conditions, and has failed to do so successfully. Providing further resources would only result in inefficient resource utilization. * Agree with OPPO that option A would raise the **question of the functionality and purpose of the restriction on maximum number of retransmissions**.   If the value is set to the maximum, the **behaviour of the UE intended by option A can be covered by option B**, where the gNB can continue providing more resources for retransmission, but bound by the maximum upper limit.  [Fraunhofer2] Based on the proposal from the FL, we have the following questions:   * Q1. Can a UE continue retransmissions of a TB in the following CG period? RAN1 has an agreement that only one new TB can be transmitted in a period of a CG, but details regarding retransmissions were left FFS.   + Q2. If the answer to Q1 is yes, and if the UE does not inform the gNB about reaching the maximum limit, and since the gNB does not keep track of the number of times a TB was already retransmitted, how does the gNB possibly limit the number of times the TB is retransmitted?   + Q3. If the answer to Q1 is no, the maximum number of retransmissions for a TB is always set to N\_max. In which case, what is the point of setting the maximum limit per priority? * Q4. If the UE is not to take any action, and if the gNB is unaware, when the maximum number of retransmissions for a TB in a CG is reached, what is the point of this parameter? |
| Ericsson | Option A |
| Futurewei | Option A |
| Nokia, NSB | It seems to us that the fundamental problem is the meaning of “maximum number of HARQ retransmissions for a TB is reached”along with the definition of sl-CG-MaxTransNumList, which reads “maximum number of times that a TB can be transmitted using the **resources provided by the configured grant**” (emphasis added).  If we take the parameter definition as it currently stands then there does not seem to be any reason why this limit on the number of TX **using resources provided by the configured grant** should restrict the number of additional ReTX **using resources provided by dynamic grant**. Hence option A is the obvious answer.  On the other hand one could consider changing the definition of the parameter to e.g. “maximum number of times that a TB whose initial TX uses resources provided by the configured grant can be transmitted in total”. If such a change is made then option B makes sense.  FL reply (19/8/2020):  My understanding is that we are taking definitions as they currently are.  [NOK2]  Fine with the principle, but there may be an inconstancy with 38.321: If sl-CG-MaxTransNum is reached then the HARQ buffer is flushed. If the UE then reports NAK to the gNB and is assigned resources for ReTX using dynamic grant there would be nothing to retransmit.  FL reply (20/8/2020):  That is an interesting point that would need a fix in RAN2. |
| InterDigital | Option B  When the maximum number of HARQ retransmission of a TB is reached, reporting ACK will help the UE stop providing grants for the TB.  For a configured grant, it was agreed that the maximum number of HARQ retransmission can be configured per priority. For the dynamic grant, the maximum number of HARQ retransmission can be configured per priority as well. |
| Apple | For dynamic grant, the number of retransmissions of a TB is up to the gNB. Hence, Option B does not work for dynamic grant as UE does not know the maximum number of retransmissions.  For configured grant, we think both gNB and UE know how many transmissions for a TB based on the configured number of resources in a configured grant. Hence, gNB will not assign additional resources for retransmissions if the maximum number of retransmissions is reached. |
| Spreadtrum | No further specification is necessary.  Firstly, this issue has been solved for CG in RAN1 100bis as shown below. So, it should be clarified that this issue is only for DG.  Proposal 3:   * In case of reaching the maximum number of HARQ re-transmissions for a TB using resources provided by a configured grant:   + ~~Alt 1. The UE reports ACK to the gNB.~~   + ~~Alt 2.~~ The UE reports ACK/NACK based on the corresponding PSFCH reception(s) or absence(s) thereof.   Agreements:   * The working assumption (as in proposal 3 in the summary) from RAN1#100-e is confirmed.   Secondly, for DG, according to the following agreements, UE doesn’t know whether the maximum number of re-transmissions is reached.  Agreements:   * For dynamic grant, the number of retransmissions of a TB is up to the gNB. * For configured grant, the maximum number of times that a TB can be retransmitted using the resources provided by the configured grant is configured per priority per configured grant. |

### Issue 1.4-1 Processing time for SL CG type-2

**The current specification only captures the PSSCH processing time for sidelink dynamic grant (TS 38.214 Clause 8.6) corresponding to the following agreement from RAN1#101-e:**

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:   * For dynamic grant in Mode 1, a UE does not expect to be scheduled to perform a SL transmission earlier than after the end of the scheduling PDCCH.   + - is 10, 12, 23, and 36 for equal to 0, 1, 2, and 3, respectively.       * FFS other values of based on the discussion on capabilities (Q5).     - *µ* corresponds to the one of (*µDL*, *µSL*) resulting in the largest *Tproc.*     - = 1     - (parameters as defined in 38.211) |

**R1-2005339 proposes using the existing preparation time for SL CG type-2 activation. Is the following proposal agreeable?**

**Proposal:**

* For SL configured grant type-2 activation, the UE processing time is equal to Tproc (agreed in RAN1#101-e).

**FL summary (19/8/2020):**

* The proposal is agreeable to everyone.

**FL summary (20/8/2020)**

* No update

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree |
| Intel | Agree. There seems no essential difference. |
| vivo | Agree |
| OPPO | Agree |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree |
| Sharp | Agree. |
| Qualcomm | Agree |
| CMCC | Agree |
| Fujitsu | Agee |
| CATT | Agree. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree.  The processing time for CG type 2 should be the same as dynamic grant. |
| Samsung | Agree. |
| Ericsson | Agree |
| Futurewei | Agree |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree |
| Apple | Agree |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |

### Issue 1.4-2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option A  [DCM2] support the proposal. |
| Intel | Option A.  To us it seems easier to define sidelink HARQ RTT at gNB. In this case it should be the same as in Mode-2 with the only update that ‘b’ component needs to be bounded by specification, otherwise still not possible at gNB to always respect this restriction. In our view, ‘b’ is similar to Tprep, and additional small margin could be added if necessary.  If this restriction is not introduced, then another specification effort is required to introduce a mix of blind and feedback-based retransmissions on SL depending on the size of the gap between granted resources. Or, it can lead to unnecessary resource wastage.  [Intel2] Agree with the direction. However, we think the processing time value needs better reference. In our understanding, Tproc refer to DCI-to-SL-tx time, while a more suitable value is actually Tprep which is the PSFCH-to-PUCCH time. Currently it does not have a name in spec, but can be found in 38.213, section 16.5.  In this case, PSFCH processing is accounted already in Tprep. The only difference is in preparation of PSCCH+PSSCH vs PUCCH. This difference may be ignored, or accounted as additional margin.  Further, besides the definition of ‘b’, the specification needs to state that UE does not expect a schedule from gNB violating a+b. |
| vivo | Option A.  We share the same view as intel that a mix of blind and feedback-based retransmissions should be avoided in mode-1. If the time gap between two adjacent resources provided by a DG/CG is less than ‘a+b’, UE shall map non-HARQ-feedback based MAC PDU on the resources. In this case, UE shall set the ‘SL HARQ enable/disable’ indication in SCI on these resources to ‘disable’, and UE is not expected to be provided with a PUCCH by the DG/CG as there is no associated PSFCH reception.  [vivo-2] Regarding the question: **How should the UE proceed if the time between the last PSFCH reception and the SL HARQ report to the gNB is smaller than the processing time at the UE**, I think this issue can be avoided by NW proper scheduling. For example, even for the async case where NW has no SL timing, NW can provide a conservative K1 so that the gap between PSFCH and PUCCH is always equal or larger than the minimum requirement. We don’t think additional rules are needed for UE side.  [vivo-2020/08/20]  Same view as intel that it is more appropriate to use Tprep as the upper limit of b. RAN1 also needs to specify that UE is not expected to be provided a grant violating a+b if the grant is accompanied with a PUCCH. In other words, if the gap between two adjacent resources provided by a CG/DG is smaller than a+b then PUCCH should not be configured/provided. |
| OPPO | Option B  For the definition of a and b, there is the following agreement. The time of b is based on UE implementation. Different UE may have different UE capability of the processing time. It is not good idea to reopen the discussion of UE capability for PSFCH processing and PSCCH/PSSCH preparing time.  For mode 1, how to promise the time between 2 allocated SL resources is larger than Z is left to implementation. The parameter a is determined by resource pool parameter, which is known by gNB. gNB can allocate SL resources with conservative assumption of b. in case the time gap between 2 resources is less than Z, UE cannot use the 2nd resource for transmission. How to report HARQ-ACK can re-use the mechanism as dropping transmission because of prioritization.  gNB can allocate the resource of PUCCH which has enough timing gap between the last PSFCH and PUCCH.  Agreements:   * In Step 2, a UE ensures a minimum time gap Z = a + b between any two selected resources of a TB where a HARQ feedback for the first of these resources is expected   + ‘a’ is a time gap between the end of the last symbol of the PSSCH transmission of the first resource and the start of the first symbol of the corresponding PSFCH reception determined by resource pool configuration and higher layer parameters of *MinTimeGapPSFCH* and *periodPSFCHresource*   + ‘b’ is a time required for PSFCH reception and processing plus sidelink retransmission preparation including multiplexing of necessary physical channels and any TX-RX/RX-TX switching time and is determined by UE implementation   FL reply (19/8/2020):  This is not about changing the agreement but just having an upper bound that the NW can use to know when to schedule the next transmission.  [OPPO2] Agree with Intel’s proposal. It is more reasonable to resue the minimal timing gap between PSFCH and PUCCH resource descripted in 16.5 here. No necessary to define upper bound of b. |
| LG Electronics | Just to be clear, we reformulated the issues to be discussed/resolved.  Issue 1) How to avoid the case that the time gap between “PSFCH RX resource” and “re-TX resource” is smaller than UE’s capability (i.e., b)?   * Considering an impact on RAN2 specification, it would not be desirable to define new UE capability signalling on “b”. **We think that this issue can be resolved by defining the maximum value of “b” that can be supported by all the UEs**.   Issue 2) How to handle the case when multiple SL HARQ bits are multiplexed in the same PUCCH resource and some of the bits are related to PSFCHs not satisfying the minimum PSFCH-to-PUCCH processing time (i.e., Tprep)?   * This problematic case can occur due to a timing misalignment between gNB and UE’s sync source. In the example of figure below, a UE doesn’t have sufficient processing time to generate SL HARQ bit for the green PSFCH when compared with the red PSFCH. **From our perspective, it can be defined that the UE sets the SL HARQ bit with insufficient UE processing time as NACK state** (i.e., for the green PSFCH). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option A, in light of a simple solution with a specified upper-bound of “b” (even the value of b is an UE implementation issue). From gNB implementation point of view, it is better not to force gNB to do a best-effort guess of b’s upper-bound on a per-UE basis, given the UE implementation does seem to allow a time-varying value of “b”. |
| Sharp | Option A |
| Qualcomm | Is the proposal to convey the exact value of ‘b’ to the gNB or to place an upper limit on ‘b’?  We are supportive of defining an upper bound on ‘b’, but this was discussed in Mode 2 preparation phase for this meeting, but was not prioritized. Our view is that an upper bound on ‘b’ is useful even in Mode 2 and such an upper bound should be applicable there as well.  On the other hand, the exact value of ‘b’ is already agreed to be left up to UE implementation and we don’t see the need to change the agreement.  **How should the UE proceed if the time between the last PSFCH reception and the SL HARQ report to the gNB is smaller than the processing time at the UE?**  The behvaior should be left up to UE implementation as is done when minimum PDSCH-to-PUCCH time (N1) is violated per subclause 5.3 in 38.214, where a valid HARQ-ACK is only required when processing timeline is satisfied. This is a general problem though and not specific to the value of ‘b’  [QC2]: We disagree with the proposal. The maximum value of ‘b’ has significant impact on Mode 2 operation and should be discussed there. For Mode 1 purposes, we can agree that a bound on ‘b’ exists, which is what matters to the gNB, then discuss the bound value in the Mode 2 AI.  Even considering Mode 1 only, I don’t think it is correct to use Tproc. During the time ‘b’, the UE needs to decode all PSFCHs, make a decision on the feedback value, then prepare a transmission based on the feedback result. On the other hand, Tproc is the time to decode a DCI and prepare a sidelink transmission. The operations involved are different in the two scenarios and the former requires more time on the UE side.  FL reply (20/8/20):  I do not think it makes a difference under which AI we make the decision. Could you clarify what the difference would be?  What is your proposal for the time? |
| CMCC | Option A. We share the similar view with intel and vivo that a mix of blind and feedback-based retransmissions should be avoided in mode-1. The time of b is based on UE implementation in mode-2, for simplicity, a definition of upper-bound of “b” can be specified for mode-1 scheduling. |
| Fujitsu | Option A |
| CATT | Option A.  Similar view with Intel and vivo. With knowing the HARQ RTT, mixture transmission of blind and HARQ based will be avoided. Furthermore, resources will not be wasted. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option B  As the previous agreement in mode-2, “b” is implemented by the UE and this value could be varied by different UEs, so we do not see the necessity that the gNB should know the values. For the feedback scheduling of SL to UL that does not satisfy the processing timeline, we think it would be an error case that up to UE implementation. This is also the NR Uu rule. The aim to specify the processing timeline is providing a reference for gNB scheduling, the gNB could guarantee the scheduling to meet the requirement, and the UE behaviour is unnecessary to specify if the timeline is not met.  FL reply (19/8/2020):  The gNB would need to know something about b to schedule the transmissions. For example, an upper bound on ‘b’. The actual value would still be up to UE implementation.  [HWHiSi\_2]  Thanks for reply. Indeed, we still do not see the necessity to have this upper bound. UEs will have different capabilities and a gNB is aware of the capabilities by UE’s capability reporting, so the gNB could schedule the transmission based on the information it receives to satisfy a UE specific “Z”. This is all gNB implementation. As the value of upper bound, I am not sure it is proper to use Tprep. As explained by Intel, it is the processing time to decode PSFCH and preparing PUCCH which may be not comparable for PSFCH preparing PSCCH+PSSCH, because no serious calculation we had before. Hence, I think we do not need to introduce such a bound at late CR phase, especially we do not have enough eavulation about it. |
| Samsung | Option A |
| Fraunhofer | Option A  The gNB needs to be aware of the processing timeline of the UE, in order to schedule the PUCCH accordingly. Otherwise, it is possible that the feedback might not be ready at the UE at the scheduled PUCCH instance, and the behaviour of the UE would be unclear. |
| Ericsson | Option A. We are fine with a clarification. With such clarification, the gNB can avoid problematic cases. |
| Nokia, NSB | Option A – OK to specify an upper bound on b  [NOK2] Fine with the principle, but as others have pointed out T\_proc may not be the appropriate upper bound |
| Apple | Option A. An upper bound on b could be used by gNB for its scheduling. |
| Spreadtrum | Option A.  In mode 2, it has been agreed that‘b’ is determined by UE implementation. So, upper-bound of “b” should be defined to ensure that the SL resource allocated by gNB can satisfy the HARQ RTT. |