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Introduction

In the latest revised Rel-17 WID for NR sidelink enhancement [1], the objective for enhancing RA to reduce UE power consumption in mode 2 has been updated as followed.

|  |
| --- |
| 2. Resource allocation enhancement:* Specify resource allocation to reduce power consumption of the UEs [RAN1, RAN2]
	+ Baseline is to introduce the principle of Rel-14 LTE sidelink random resource selection and partial sensing to Rel-16 NR sidelink resource allocation mode 2.
	+ Note: Taking Rel-14 as the baseline does not preclude introducing a new solution to reduce power consumption for the cases where the baseline cannot work properly.
	+ This work should consider the impact of sidelink DRX, if any.
 |

This contribution provides a summary of the submitted contributions, email discussion topics and outcomes during RAN1#104-e meeting.

Collection of agreements / conclusion in RAN1#104-e

Agreements**:**

* Random resource selection is applicable to both periodic and aperiodic transmissions
	+ FFS conditions for random resource selection

**Conclusion:**

* PSFCH reception is not included for Type A UE
* S-SSB reception is not included for Type A UE
* SL reception Type B is additionally added
	+ Type B: Same as Type A with an exception of performing PSFCH and S-SSB reception
* Note: the same conditions as in RAN1#103-e regarding the context of the discussion of Type A and Type D still apply (also applicable to type B)

Agreements**:** In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs periodic-based partial sensing, at least when the reservation for another TB (when carried in SCI) is enabled for the resource pool and resource selection/reselection is triggered at slot n, it is up to UE implementation to determine a set of Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where

* FFS condition(s) and timing(s) for which periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UE
* The resource selection window is [n+T1, n+T2]
	+ As a baseline, T1 and T2 are defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4]
	+ Further discuss whether or not to introduce a threshold to re-define T1 and T2 such that
		- T1≥ 0 (subject to processing time constraint Tproc, 1), and T2 ≤ remaining PDB
		- T2-T1 *≤* (pre-)configured threshold
* A minimum value for Y is (pre-)configured from a range of values, FFS details
* FFS any restriction to determine Y candidate slots (including its relationship with SL-DRX)
* FFS whether the resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] should be confined within a set of periodic set of resources and its relationship with SL-DRX
* Note: The terminology “periodic-based partial sensing” is based on the “partial sensing” used in LTE-V and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.

Topics for email discussion

[104-e-NR-R17-SL-01] Email discussion on resource allocation for power saving– Kevin (OPPO)

* 1st check point: Jan 28
* 2nd check point: Feb 2
* 3rd check point: Feb 4

## Topic #1: PSFCH and S-SSB reception for Type A UE

**Background**: In the last meeting RAN1#103-e, there was an FFS item on whether a Type A UE should be capable of performing PSFCH and S-SSB reception as an exception.

|  |
| --- |
| * + Type A: UE is not capable of performing reception of any SL signals and channels, FFS with exception of performing PSFCH and S-SSB reception (aim to conclude in RAN1#104-e)
 |

From reviewing contributions submitted to this meeting,

* Main reasons for not to support PSFCH reception for Type A UEs:
	+ Minimum reception capability, same as PUE in LTE-V
	+ Likely only perform broadcast transmissions as it cannot receive any data, and receiving HARQ feedback is not required in SL broadcast
* Main reason to support PSFCH reception was mainly to improve communication reliability
* The main reason not to support S-SSB reception was that the UE can always sync to network or GNSS timing, same as in LTE-V
* The main reason to support S-SSB reception was that S-SSB transmitted from UE synchronized to eNB/gNB is prioritized over GNSS

### Proposals before 1st check point (Jan 28)

**Proposal 1 (for conclusion):**

* PSFCH reception is not supported for Type A UE
* S-SSB reception is not supported for Type A UE
* SL reception Type B is additionally added
	+ Type B: Same as Type A with an exception of performing PSFCH and S-SSB reception

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Agree |
| Fraunhofer | Agree  |
| Apple | Agree |
| Ericsson | First of all, we would like to remark that the UE Type definition, i.e., A, D (or B), are not related to UE capabilities but just as a reference for evaluation and designing the power saving features.We do not think that having S-SSB reception support but not having PSFCH reception support is justified from a product perspective. If companies think that there should be a UE that is not capable of receiving any signal, we can be fine with an additional UE Type where neither S-SSB nor PSFCH can be received. Therefore, we are OK to define two types of UE, i.e., Type A and Type B as in proposal 1, to be used as a baseline to define and design power saving features. |
| CATT | Since these types are used as the reference for evaluation and designing of SL power saving features in R17, it’s better to add another type( B1 )which supports S-SSB reception but not PSFCH reception. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal and would like to reiterate that these types are only for evaluation and to facilitate discussion but do not define UE capabilities. |
| Lenovo&MM | Agree |
| CMCC | We are basically fine with this proposal. As per the conclusion made in the last meeting, these UE types were defined as the reference for evaluation, and have nothing to do with the UE capability covered by UE feature. From this perspective, we are ok to define Type A UE without any reception capability to obtain the lower bound of the power consumption level and the system performance level. On the other hand, it is mentioned that supporting the reception of PSFCH is beneficial for higher reliability, and supporting the reception of S-SSB allows the UE to synchronized to a cell or other reference UEs when GNSS is not available or reliable. To our understanding, this Type B UE is a special case of Type D UE. It seems optional to us; however, we do not have strong objections to define the Type B UE as a trade-off. |
| NEC | Agree |
| vivo | Agree with FL’s proposal |
| FUTUREWEI | Agree with proposals. The types discussed are for evaluations not for defining UE capabilities. For clarification, is the Type B listed above different from the Type B discussed in the previous meeting? |
| ETRI | Agree only for design of power saving features |
| Panasonic  | Agree with FL’s proposal for the purpose of evaluation.  |
| Sony | Agree with the proposal. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the FL’s proposal, based on discussions in the last GTW session. From actual device perspective, no reception unit seems feasible for a P-UE. |
| CAICT | Agree  |
| Sharp | Agree with FL’s proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| ZTE | Agree with FL’s proposal. |
| LGE | We’re fine with the FL proposal to separate Type A and Type B UE. Type A UE may represent the operation of LTE-V2X P-UE. For Type B UE, continual full S-SSB search may require significant power consumption. So we need to study more how to minimize the power consumption for S-SSB reception. The recommended proposal is as follows.**Proposal 1*** Type A UE supports neither PSFCH nor S-SSB reception
* Type B UE supports both PSFCH and S-SSB reception
	+ FFS whether/how to minimize power consumption for S-SSB reception
 |
| Samsung | Agree with FL’s proposal. |
| Fujitsu | Agree |
| MediaTek | We agree with FL’s proposal. |
| Intel | Agree with the first two bulletsFor the last bullet we disagree that Type-B is the same as Type A. In our opinion type B can also be viewed as a Type D UE that is configured to only receive PSFCH and S-SSB. Therefore we propose to replace the last bullet with the following text:FFS if Type B UE, that is capable to receive only PSFCH and SSB is needed, or this functionality can be considered as a part of Type-D UE operation |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We wish to emphasise that the UE’s here are only “*reference UEs for the purpose of evaluation and design*” as agreed in 103e, and thus are *not* real UEs. The capabilities of real UEs will be decided at the end of the release. What we are discussing here is with reference to what the evaluations and designs will be considered, not what is inside any particular real UE. Thus the word “supported” leads to incorrect understandings. And the statement in the 3rd bullet that these are already SL reception types (seeming to write 38.202 already) leads to similar incorrect understandings. The structure of the proposal should be such as:For reference UEs:* PSFCH reception is not included for Type A UE
* S-SSB reception is not included for Type A UE
* Type B is additionally defined.
	+ Type B: Same as Type A with addition of PSFCH and S-SSB reception

We are OK with the basis of the proposal. Type A refers to the reception type which costs minimal power consumption, i.e. no reception behaviour at all. This serves as a lower bound for power consumption, which is informative. And this is also aligned with LTE-V. Introducing of Type B is fine, although we think Type-D UE has already covered Type-B UE reception behaviour. |
| Convida Wireless | We are generally ok with the FL’s proposal. |
| Bosch | We also see that it should not take us too long to discuss UE capability at this point. For the reference UE (for evaluation purpose), we support the FL proposal. We also prefer Huawei’s suggestion to replace “supported” 🡪 “included”. This will let us clearly focus on the actual role of these reference Types A, B, & D. |
| Nokia, NSB | Ok. |

### Proposals before 2nd check point (Feb 2)

* A conclusion was reached during Wednesday (Jan 27) GTW session for R17 eSL. The conclusion is captured in Section 2.

## Topic #2: Periodic-based partial sensing (determination of Y candidate slots for periodic transmission)

**Background**:



Figure 1

In R14 LTE sidelink, the partial sensing scheme is optimized for periodic traffic type only, where

* UE performs monitoring of subframes in sensing occasions according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{step}}^{SL}$ for a set of Y candidate subframes determined within the resource selection window
* The smallest denominator was set to 100ms for Pstep and 20/50ms reservation periodicities were not taken into consideration.
* Period sensing occasions within the sensing window are determined by the kth bit of the higher layer parameter *gapCandidateSensing*.

From reviewing contributions submitted in this meeting, the above Rel-14 LTE sidelink partial sensing scheme can be taken as the baseline, but some enhancements are needed for a power constrained UE configured with partial sensing to perform periodic transmission in NR sidelink mode 2. First of all, it is aimed to confirm the same principle as in LTE-V that a UE first determines a set of Y candidate slots within the resource selection window when resource selection is triggered in slot n.

### Proposal before 1st check point (Jan 28)

**Proposal 2**: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) from higher layer, it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where

* The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4].
* UE determination of Y candidate slots should exclude slots in which its own SL and UL transmissions occur in the resource selection window.
* Due to integer multiple of resource reservation periods, UE determination of Y candidate slots should exclude slots that would coincide with its own SL and UL transmissions within the corresponding periodic sensing occasions.
* Periodic sensing occasions that correspond to the set of Y candidate slots should align with the SL-DRX ON duration as much as possible (if configured) and/or as early as possible to maximize number of contiguous sensing slots before the resource selection trigger in slot n.
* FFS min and max Y candidate slots should be applied (e.g., a range of Y values per priority level)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We are OK with the 1st sub-bullet. Not support for the other bullets* For the 2nd and 3rd bullet: UE should not exclude the slot that is used for UL transmission. Whether to prioritize between UL and SL is up to UE hardware implementation. If there are two sets of RF, UE can transmit UL and SL (if they are in different carrier) at the same time, in that case, there is no necessary to exclude the slots for UL transmission. In legacy resource exclusion procedure of sensing, only the slots for SL transmission is considered, not for UL transmission. We suggest to follow legacy behaviour.
* For the 4th bullet: the relationship between DRX and sensing is discussing in another email thread [104-e-NR-R17-SL-LS-01], it is not necessary to discuss that here again.
* For the last bullet: in LTE-V2X, only min Y slots was applied. We are not convinced to apply max Y slots. No intension to introduce additional feature unless performance gain can be justified.
 |
| Fraunhofer | For the determination of the selection window for periodic transmissions, we prefer to stick to the same procedure as defined in Rel-16. Exclusions based on UL transmissions can be left out.We agree that the candidate slots should align with the DRX ON duration as much as possible. |
| Apple | We are fine with the main bullet and the first sub-bullet. For the second and third sub-bullets, we share the views from OPPO that only SL transmissions slots should be considered. The prioritization between SL and UL can be handled separately with the existing R-16 rule. For the fourth sub-bullet, we are fine in general. But some clarification is needed, such as how to quantify “as much as possible”, “as early as possible”?For the fifth sub-bullet, we think only the lower bound on Y can be applied, and we do not mention the example that range of Y is per priority level.  |
| Ericsson | We do not see the need to introduce a new scheme for periodic transmissions. We propose to reuse the LTE mechanism (where the 2nd and 3rd sub-bullets do not need to be specified and can be left to UE implementation) and discuss the potential enhancements needed to address the periodicities introduced in NR (see Section 3.3.1) and any other potential issue.We have two comments regarding the sub-bullet on DRX. First, it is probably a good idea to leave the discussion for later, when more about the DRX procedure is known. In general, a wider discussion on the connection between SL DRX and partial sensing has to take place. Besides that, we believe that aspects may be left to UE implementation, like for the other bullets. |
| InterDigital | When SL DRX is not configured, we agree that determination of Y can be UE’s implementation. But when SL DRX is configured, Y should be selected based on the DRX ON duration of the reception UE(s) which is the target of the transmission, instead of the UE itself. * For the 2nd and 3rd, we prefer to reuse the R16 procedure, in which SL Tx slots can be considered but not UL slots.
* We agree with the principle of the 4th bullet that periodic sensing should align with the SL DRX ON duration as much as possible (if configured).
* For the 5th bullet, we do not see the motivation to consider Y max.

We assume that this proposal is applicable to the first TB of periodic traffic.* $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$ should be greater than 0ms.
 |
| CATT | In principle we should reuse Rel-16 procedure as much as possible. For this particular proposal, we don’t agree with the sub-bullet regarding DRX alignment. In fact, it’s more efficient that sensing operation is allowed in SL DRX inaction duration without the restriction of its own SL DRX configuration. We should discuss the details related to DRX issue. |
| Qualcomm | We think that we need to discuss the different scenarios (Tx UE doing power savings, Rx UE doing power savings, or both UEs) and then discuss the general design(s) with evaluation results prior to discussing this level of detail.For example, if the transmitter isn’t receiving data, e.g. P2V-only application, then it isn’t clear why some of the points would apply, e.g. the one about DRX.Similarly, when both UEs are doing power savings, it is more efficient to fully align their DRX and partial sensing windows.We should also consider whether some aspects need to specified or can be left up to UE implementation. |
| Lenovo&MM | Rel-14 LTE sidelink partial sensing scheme can be taken as the baseline and select the resource(s) for periodic transmission. FFS, the sensing scheme for aperiodic transmissionThe relationship between partial sensing and SL DRX on duration should be further clarified such that the partial sensing slots are defined by the partial sensing configuration or SL DRX on duration.  |
| CMCC | We have concerns regarding the 2nd, 4th and last bullets. For the 2nd bullet, in LTE-V, the determination of Y candidate slots is up to UE implementation as long as Y is higher than the (pre-)configured higher layer parameter *minNumCandidateSlot*. The intention of introducing additional rules is not clear to us.For the 4th bullet, regarding the alignment of DRX ON duration and the sensing occasion, we think that the relationship of SL DRX pattern with the sensing window and resource selection window, e.g., whether they are configured and performed independently, or configured independently but the sensing and selection should be performed during ON duration, or aligned as much as possible by configuration, should be separately discussed.For the last bullet, we are ok to discuss per priority level configured Y value, however, we still think that the principle of minimum values should be kept.  |
| NEC | Main bullet: Fine, as the main bullet is reusing the principle of LTE, we are OK with it.* 1st sub-bullet: OK
* 2nd and 3rd sub-bullet: Are the intention to exclude slots that will be used for UE's future transmissions? Besides, as an exclusion set, we think Y should also exclude the resources reserved by hypothetical SCI in non-monitored slots, because these resources will not be excluded if they are selected as candidate slots in legacy Rel.14 partial sensing (step 5 is not performed).
* 4th sub-bullet: we are not sure whether "periodic sensing occasions" will exist in NR partial sensing. Periodic sensing occasions apply to LTE partial because the allowed periods are in periodic manner e.g., 100,200…1000. But for NR, as explained in the background of next topic, if the considered periods include e.g., 99ms, 97ms, etc., the whole sensing occasions will not be periodic.

5th sub-bullet: min Y candidate slots configured from higher layer is enough and we can FFS the details for Y's configuration |
| vivo | 1. Same view as OPPO. UE may perform priority comparison between UL and SL, and may drop the UL transmission in some cases, there is no need to exclude the UL slots from the window in advance.
2. We agree that the periodic sensing occasion should align with the DRX ON duration as much as possible, however, how to achieve this should not be up UE implementation and needs further discussion. so we would like to remove ‘up to UE implementation’ from the main bullet and add a FFS point on the determination of Y
3. minY is to avoid high collision probability, the benefit of setting a maximum value for Y is not clear.

**Proposal 2**: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) from higher layer, ~~it is up to UE implementation to~~ UE should determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where* The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4].
* UE determination of Y candidate slots should exclude slots in which its own SL ~~and UL transmissions~~ occur in the resource selection window.
* Due to integer multiple of resource reservation periods, UE determination of Y candidate slots should exclude slots that would coincide with its own SL ~~and UL transmissions~~ within the corresponding periodic sensing occasions.
* Periodic sensing occasions that correspond to the set of Y candidate slots should align with the SL-DRX ON duration as much as possible (if configured) and/or as early as possible to maximize number of contiguous sensing slots before the resource selection trigger in slot n.
* FFS min ~~and max~~ Y candidate slots should be applied (e.g., a range of Y values per priority level)

FFS how to determine the Y candidate slots |
| FUTUREWEI | * First bullet: ok
* Second bullet: ok. A question about the wording. In 38.214, step 2 of clause 8.1.4 states “…The UE shall monitor slots which can belong to a sidelink resource pool within the sensing window except for those in which its own transmissions occur. …” To be consistent with the spec, perhaps the adjectives “SL and UL” can be removed
* Third bullet: unclear if needed. Its wording effectively encompasses the wording of the second bullet
* Fourth bullet: ok.
 |
| ETRI | We agree with other companies’ concerns, i.e., no need to exclude UL transmission and define max Y. Rel-14 LTE sidelink partial sensing scheme can be reused as much as possible with additional consideration of SL DRX. |
| Panasonic | We agree the main and the 1st sub-bullet. For the 2nd and the 3rd sub-bullets, we think these can up to implementation.For the 4th sub-bullet, we are generally fine with the principle and we think it should be separately discussed. Also, it’s hard to understand how to determine “as much as possible (if configured) and/or as early as possible”For the 5th sub-bullet, we propose to reword as “FFS details of Y candidate slots (e.g., …)” |
| Sony | We think we should reuse the existing scheme for periodic traffic basically. For the 2nd and 3rd sub-bullet, only SL transmission should be excluded from the candidate slots.On the sidelink DRX in 4th sub-bullet, we are basically OK with aligning sensing operation with the sidelink DRX configuration. But “as much as possible” and “as early as possible” are unclear. We need to further discuss the details. |
| NTT DOCOMO | * Main bullet: intention of ‘provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) from higher layer’ is unclear for us. Only for periodic transmission from the UE performing partial sensing? If correct, one comment: $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$ = 0 means aperiodic transmission. Is it OK to include this case?
* 1st bullet: OK
* 2nd bullet: ‘UL’ is unnecessary as some companies mentioned above.
* 3rd bullet: ‘UL’ is unnecessary as some companies mentioned above. In addition, ‘Due to integer multiple of resource reservation periods’ is unclear for us. ‘resource reservation periods’ means resource reservation periods configured to the resource pool, right? This should be clarified. At last, ‘the corresponding periodic sensing occasion’ is completely FFS and discussed in the next section, right? If correct, this FFS should be added as sub-bullet.
* 4th bullet: ‘as much as possible’ is unclear for us. RAN1 will discuss further for this or up to UE? Similarly, ‘as early as possible’ is also. Postponing discussion for DRX is fine for us.
* 5th bullet: range restriction of Y value should be the same as LTE. Different mechanism would be unnecessary.
 |
| CAICT | Generally we agree with the proposal. For the 2nd and 3rd sub-bullets, the prioritization between the SL and UL transmissions should be considered when to exclude the occasions colliding with the candidate resources.  |
| Sharp | In our view it is possible that the use of partial sensing is not “semi-static” (for example, it may depend on whether partial sensing is enabled in the selected resource pool), so the first sentence in the main bullet should simply say “For partial sensing, …”. And this comment applies to other proposals in this document as well.Details in sub-bullets 2, 3, and 4 are premature at the moment. For sub-bullet 5, it may be better to just say “FFS restriction on values of Y”.Besides, considering both pre-emption check and re-evaluation are supported for partial sensing, selecting Y slots only by UE implementation is not enough, the selected Y slots should include at least $(r\_{0},r\_{1},r\_{2},…) $and $(r\_{0}^{'},r\_{1}^{'},r\_{2}^{'},…)$ subject to re-evaluation and pre-emption check respectively, instead of up to UE implementation only. |
| Xiaomi | In LTE V2x partial sensing treats periodic and aperiodic traffic in the same way. Therefore, we would like to clarify why only periodic traffic is considered in the main bullet.In addition, in LTE V2x, the determined Y candidate subframes must satisfy the corresponding sensing requirement, i.e. UE must guarantee that it has sensed in the corresponding subframes for each candidate subframe. However, from the current wording of main bullet, it seems that the Y candidate slots can be arbitrarily selected. Therefore we suggest to clarify this in the main bullet.In subbullet 1 there is n but it is not defined. In main bullet it should state “when resource selection is triggered in slot n, ……”Sub-bullet 2,3,4 propose some additional constraints on determining Y candidate slot. A word “periodic sensing occasion” appears in 3rd and 4th sub-bullet, but it has not been defined in LTE V2x or previous agreement. If it is related to the discussion of what kind of sensing requirement should be satisfied, we suggest to delay the discussion after making decision in that topic, or use some other words to replace it.For subbullet 4, it is not clear whether SL-DRX on duration is of Tx UE or Rx UE. We understand the motivation if it is of Rx UE, but still think it can be discussed after we define the sensing requirement for partial sensing.  |
| ZTE | For the second and third bullet, from our understanding, UE is not capable to know when its uplink transmission scheduling would be when performing sensing. Thus, it is hard for UE to exclude uplink slot during sensing duration. However, the collision between sidelink transmission and uplink transmission should be solved by other approaches. For the forth bullet, we should firstly discuss the relationship between sidelink DRX and partial sensing, and then go into such detailed discussion. |
| LGE | We think the resource selection procedure based on partial sensing can be improved for power saving. For example, if short-term sensing is used for resource re-evaluation or pre-emption checking, the longer interval between the selected resources, the more STS power is consumed due to longer sensing duration. If the intervals between the selected resources are short, the overall STS duration becomes shorter and the power consumption is minimized. Therefore, the adjacent resources are prioritized for resource selection over the distributed resources. For this, the selection window length needs to be (pre-)configured as short.In this sense, the following modifications are proposed for the bullets.* 1st bullet is modified as follows.

The resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] is randomly selected by UE while satisfying:* + T1 ≥ 0 and T2 *≤* remaining PDB
	+ T2-T1 *≤* (pre-)configured threshold
* Clarifications on 2nd and 3rd bullet are need. Any slots not monitored by UE due to SL transmission are excluded from Y candidate slots.
* 4th bullet is removed. DRX operation and sensing are independent operation, and they don’t need to be correlated. According to main sentence, as candidate slots thereby partial sensing slots are determined by UE implementation, the alignment between partial sensing slot and DRX on duration cannot be specified.
* 5th bullet is modified as follows.

FFS whether min and max Y candidate slots are applied (e.g., a range of Y values per priority level) |
| Samsung | For the determination of selection window and candidate slots, we prefer to reuse legacy LTE and NR Rel-16 procedure as much as possible. Therefore 1st bullet seems OK for us, but for 2nd and 3rd bullets, we agree with other companies’ concern on excluding UL transmission.We agree with 4th bullet in principle, but current wording may lead to ambiguity. We suggest to discuss DRX related details as a separate issue. |
| Fujitsu | We think that we need to discuss firstly which is the base to design the sensing scheme: the traffic type that the UE is about to transmit or the traffic type(s) that is ongoing in the resource pool. We prefer to design the sensing scheme based on the ongoing traffic type(s) in the resource pool. To sense other UE’s periodic reservations, Rel.14 LTE partial sensing mechanism can be reused.* For the 2nd and 3rd bullet, it is not necessary to exclude UL slots from the Y candidate slots.
* Regarding the 4th bullet, it is not relevant with the determination of Y candidate slots. It seems that it is overlapped with section 3.3. In addition, clarification of “as early as possible” is needed. For the alignment of sensing occasions and DRX on duration, we share the same view as OPPO that it is under discussion in another email thread [104-e-NR-R17-SL-LS-01], we do not need to discuss it here.
* For the 5th bullet, we are fine to configure min Y values per priority level. In addition of priority level, other factors can also be considered, such as whether HARQ feedback is enabled or disabled.
 |
| MediaTek | We are OK with the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd sub-bullets. NR-SL partial sensing should follow LTE-SL design. We also agree with the 4th sub-bullet in principal.For the 5th sub-bullet, we don’t see a need to include max of Y. As mentioned in the main bullet of the proposal, it’s up to UE implementation to select Y slots. In LTE-SL, UE can select a minimum of Y subframes, but max is not needed. We suggest the following change:**Proposal 2**: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) from higher layer, it is up to UE implementation to determine at least Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where* The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4].
* UE determination of Y candidate slots should exclude slots in which its own SL and UL transmissions occur in the resource selection window.
* Due to integer multiple of resource reservation periods, UE determination of Y candidate slots should exclude slots that would coincide with its own SL and UL transmissions within the corresponding periodic sensing occasions.
* Periodic sensing occasions that correspond to the set of Y candidate slots should align with the SL-DRX ON duration as much as possible (if configured) and/or as early as possible to maximize number of contiguous sensing slots before the resource selection trigger in slot n.
* ~~FFS min and max Y candidate slots should be applied (e.g., a range of Y values per priority level)~~
 |
| Intel | We propose following modifications to FL proposal:**Proposal 2**: If UE ~~is configured to~~ performs partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) from higher layer, ~~it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where~~* The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined and determined by UE in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4].
* ~~UE determination of Y candidate slots should exclude slots in which its own SL and UL transmissions occur in the resource selection window.~~
* In our view the bullet above is a separate discussion topic and procedures defined in Rel.16 can be reused at least as a starting point.
* ~~Due to integer multiple of resource reservation periods, UE determination of Y candidate slots should exclude slots that would coincide with its own SL and UL transmissions within the corresponding periodic sensing occasions.~~
* In our view the bullet above is a separate discussion topic and procedures defined in Rel.16 can be used at least as a starting point.
* ~~Periodic sensing occasions that correspond to the set of Y candidate slots should align with the SL-DRX ON duration as much as possible (if configured) and/or as early as possible to maximize number of contiguous sensing slots before the resource selection trigger in slot n.~~
* We prefer to finalize details of partial sensing operation first and then discuss impact/interaction w/ SL-DRX .
* ~~FFS min and max Y candidate slots should be applied (e.g., a range of Y values per priority level)~~
* In our view, above bullet relates to resource selection window size determination which is not supposed to change comparing to Rel.16
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For the main bullet, it can be understood that if the UE is configured to perform partial sensing in a resource pool, a UE can select resources based on the limited Y sensing slots. However, it is not clear the relationship between the provision of resource reservation interval and monitoring behaviour. A UE cannot predict the service type, aperiodic or periodic, for future packets, and so cannot know which slots would be part of partial monitoring. Although the procedure is not defined yet, this does mean the UE cannot know what to sense in the past for this periodic transmission to select resources. However, this part of the proposals does not seem to depend on needing any knowledge of Prsvp\_TX, so there is no need to use “provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$)) from higher layer” as a condition for monitoring. The first sub-bullet is OK, as mode 2 RA sensing in Rel-16 should be reused as much as possible, and this includes resource selection window.For the second sub-bullet, the candidate slots should be the slots in a resource pool which has already excluded by applying the bitmap. It does not relate to UL transmission. How to choose Y candidate slots can be left to UE implementation, same as in LTE-V, e.g. exclude slots of its own SL transmissions and/or slots would coincide with its own SL transmissions due to resource reservation periods. Hence, both second and third sub-bullets can be up to UE implementation which is already covered by main bullet. These two sub-bullets are not needed.For the fourth sub-bullet, at this stage, RAN1 does not have a clear understanding on SL DRX (re-)configuration, of which design is under RAN2 discussion, as well as the relation between SL DRX and partial sensing configuration. RAN1 should focus on the basic and critical designs for partial sensing first and then consider the coordination of SL DRX and partial sensing. Taking this bullet later would allow a more meaningful agreement than “as much as possible”.We are OK with the fifth bullet. Therefore, the proposal should be modified as follows:**Proposal 2**: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing ~~and provided with a resource reservation interval (~~$P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$~~) from higher layer~~, it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where* The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4].
* ~~The resource selection window~~ $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ ~~is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4].~~
* ~~The resource selection window~~ $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ ~~is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4].~~
* ~~Periodic sensing occasions that correspond to the set of Y candidate slots should align with the SL-DRX ON duration as much as possible (if configured) and/or as early as possible to maximize number of contiguous sensing slots before the resource selection trigger in slot n.~~
* FFS min and max Y candidate slots should be applied (e.g., a range of Y values per priority level)
 |
| Convida Wireless | The same procedure that are defined in Rel-16 should be reused. SL Tx slots can be considered but UL slots may not be considered. In addition, our view is that the candidate slots should align with the DRX ON duration as much as possible. |
| Bosch | We are fine with the main-bullet. If the proposal targets periodic resource /SPS sensing only, then we do not need to repeat Rel-16 sensing procedure again (i.e., Prsvp\_TX). We are also fine to remove this sentence completely to fit periodic and aperiodic sensing: “~~and provided with a resource reservation interval (~~$P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$~~) from higher layer~~” We agree with the 1st and the 5th sub-bullet. We agree with the majority of companies to delete 2nd, 3rd sub-bullets. We would like to postpone 4th sub-bullet until we discuss and agree on DRX design. |
| Nokia, NSB | For main bullet, suggest modification as shown below. *Proposal 2: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing ~~and provided with a resource reservation interval (~~*$P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$*~~) from higher layer~~, it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, …*We support the first sub-bullet and the 5th sub-bullet.We are not agreed with the 2nd, 3rd, and the 4th sub-bullets. For the 2nd and 3rd sub-bullets, there is no need to exclude the UL slots. The DRX issue in the 4th sub-bullet shall be discussed in somewhere else.  |

**Proposal 2’**: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) from higher layer in slot n, it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where

* The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4].
* FFS whether a range of minimum Y values is (pre-)configured per priority level as in LTE-V

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We are fine with main bullet and 1st sub-bullet. For the 2nd sub-bullet, we want to clarify that in LTE-V, the minimum Y is configured as follows, not configured per priority level. The intension to configure minimum Y per priority level is not clear. We prefer to take LTE-V mechanism as baseline. Then we suggest to remove “per priority level” in the sub-bullet.p2x-SensingConfig-r14 SEQUENCE { minNumCandidateSF-r14 INTEGER (1..13), gapCandidateSensing-r14 BIT STRING (SIZE (10)) } OPTIONAL, -- Need OR**Proposal 2’**: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) from higher layer in slot n, it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where* The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4].
* ~~FFS whether a~~ A range of minimum Y values is (pre-)configured ~~per priority level~~ as in LTE-V
 |
| LGE | R16 resource selection can be enhanced for power saving when partial sensing and additional short-term sensing (STS) to avoid collision with aperiodic traffic are used. The problem of R16 procedure to determine Y candidate slots is depicted in Fig 1. UE determines a selection window [n+T1, n+T2] within PDB and Y candidate slots. After identifying the idle resources among the candidate resources based on sensing, the idle resources are reported to MAC layer for final resource selection.If the selection window is chosen as wide, and the candidate resources are determined so that the interval between candidate resources is long (e.g. more than STS window length), the resultant total short-term sensing duration over the selected resources becomes quite long, as shown in Fig 1, which requires high power consumption. This is problematic for power saving UE.This high power consumption due to short-term sensing can be solved at the stage of determining the selection window and the Y candidate resources. If UE choose a shorter selection window, the candidate resources can also be determined within the short selection window. Then the STS windows prior to the selected resources significantly overlap each other, thus the total sensing duration will be very short, as shown in Fig 2. This will greatly save power in performing short-term sensing, compared to that required in the procedure depicted in Fig 1.With the observation above, we strongly recommend the group to consider the power saving benefit of this ‘burst-type’ resource selection for P-UE. Following the claimed advantage, we propose the following and hope FL to capture it for further discussion.**Proposal 2’**: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) from higher layer in slot n, it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where* The resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] is randomly selected by UE while satisfying:
	+ T1 ≥ 0 and T2 *≤* remaining PDB
	+ T2-T1 *≤* (pre-)configured threshold
* FFS whether a range of minimum Y values is (pre-)configured per priority level as in LTE-V
 |
| NEC | Regarding determination of Y, we think if it’s totally up to UE implementation will cause resource collision due to non-monitored slots and thus waste power for partial sensing UE. At this early stage of Rel.17, we have chance to do some enhancements just like want we done for full sensing in step 5.For the non-monitored slots, the specified way in LTE/NR full sensing is to exclude all the possible reserved resources with allowed reservation periods of the resource pool. i.e., step 5 is captured in full sensing to exclude the hypothetical reserved resources. However, step 5 is not performed in Rel.14 partial sensing. The selection of Y candidate resources within the selection window is up to UE implementation in current Rel.14 partial sensing specification. If we reuse the legacy procedure, as a consequence, UE has possibility to select all the slot as the candidate resources and will not exclude the collided slots reserved by others due to the non-monitored slots.Hence, we propose to add one sub bullet as * FFS any restrictions to determine Y candidate slots.

1st sub-bullet: ok2nd sub-bullet: We didn't observe that min Y is configured per priority in LTE-V and propose to delete "~~as in LTE-V~~". In addition, In LTE-V, the min selection window is [n+4,n+20] which contains at least 17 subframes, considering some subframes which the UE cannot monitor, it's feasible to set *minNumCandidateSF* as [1, 13] because even the largest candidate value 13 is less than the minimum resource selection window 17. In NR sidelink, the resource selection window size depends on subcarrier spacing configuration μ, RRC parameter T2\_min, remaining PDB and UE implementation. The minimum window size it’s no longer a fixed value as LTE sidelink. So we think the range of *minNumCandidateSF* in NR should be carefully designed and propose:FFS how to (pre-) configure the range of minimum Y values. e.g., consider priority level, resource selection window size, etc. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. Regarding how to determine Y, it is OK with up to UE implementation. UE can select Y slots so that power saving performance gets better if the UE want to do so. Even in any case of Y slot selection, resource collision is avoided by re-evaluation/pre-emption check. |
| Apple  | We think in LTE V2X, the minimum Y values is (pre-)configured independent of priority level. Here, we prefer to keep the same design as LTE V2X, i.e., removal of “per priority level”. Otherwise, we are fine with the proposal.  |
| ETRI | We prefer Apple’s modification. |
| Qualcomm | The proposal seems too restrictive at such an early stage and could limit communications between two power savings UEs. Evaluations and analysis of different scenarios (Tx/Rx/Interferer, power saving/non-power saving) are needed before agreeing on the scheme. |
| Fujitsu | For the main bullet, we think it is too early to conclude that the Y candidate slots can be determined up to UE implementation. Unlike Rel.14 LTE-V2X, Rel.16 NR-V2X supports HARQ-ACK feedback. When the HARQ-ACK feedback is enabled, the UE should ensure the HARQ RTT related minimum time gap between any two selected resources of a TB. In such circumstance, if the Y candidate slots are determined totally up to UE implementation, it is possible that there are many un-selectable resources considering that the resources within the HARQ RTT minimum time gap cannot be selected. As a result, reliability performance may be impacted due to the limited number of selectable resources.We are fine with the 1st sub-bullet.For the 2nd sub-bullet, we are fine in general. Since per priority configured min Y is not supported in LTE-V2X, we propose to remove “as in LTE-V”. From our understanding, the intention is to FFS whether “a minimum Y value” is (pre-)configured per priority level, but not “a range of minimum Y values” is (pre-)configured per priority level. Therefore, we propose to change “a range of minimum Y values” into “a minimum Y value”.  |
| Xiaomi | Our question on why only periodic traffic is considered is not yet answered. Also we prefer to clearly stating that UE is triggered to perform partial sensing based resource selection in slot n. Except this, we are generally fine with the proposal. We support to remove “as in LTE-V” in the 2nd subbullet FFS. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with the 1st sub-bullet.For the 2nd sub-bullet, we are ok with NEC’s modification.  |
| CMCC | Support. Regarding the 2nd bullet, in LTE-V partial sensing, the parameter is fixed regardless of the data priority and UE by implementation selects Y slots that meets the (pre-)configured minimum parameter, in such a case, it is possible that the determined set of slots may not meet the requirement of remaining PDB, or the number of determined set of slots that satisfy the PDB may be limited, then the data transmission will be interfered and the transmission reliability is decreased. We think that (pre-)configuring the minimum Y values per priority level is one potential solution to solve the problem. |
| Samsung | We’re OK with the main bullet and 1st sub-bullet. For 2nd sub-bullet, we also prefer to remove “pre priority level”. |
| Ericsson | We are supportive of the main bullet and the first sub-bullet. For the second sub-bullet, we think it is too early to include any parameter (priority-level) in order to define the range. We can include an FFS for the parameters to be considered. |
| Sony | We also think that a range of minimum Y values is not (pre-)configured “per priority level” for the second sub-bullet. So we are OK with FL’s proposal with removing “as in LTE-V” in the second sub-bullet. |
| ZTE | Can agree the main bullet and 1st sub-bullet. For 2nd sub-bullet, ‘per priority level’ is removed since the priority is not considered in LTE V2X. On the other hand, the minimum Y values may be related to sub-carrier spacing. So the 2nd sub-bullet is suggested as following:* FFS whether a range of minimum Y values is (pre-)configured per sub-carrier spacing. The (pre-)configuration in LTE-V can be seen as reference.
 |
| Vivo | Regarding how to determine Y, it would be too early to conclude that Y is up to UE implementation as new NR SL features such as DRX on-off can have impact on resource selection process, we share the same view as NEC that restrictions on Y should be studied.We are not convinced to introduce min Y per priority level. We suggest removing ‘per priority level’. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Repeatedly, the ambiguity of timing relationship between a resource reservation interval delivery and Y candidate slots determination has not been clarified by the updated the proposal.As explained by our first round reply, a TB along with a reservation interval is delivered at slot n, if at slot n, a UE starts to determine the candidate slots, which slots are used to monitor before slot n and what sensing results are applied to select resource in the selection window? We note similar comments from other companies in the following proposals.For the second sub-bullet, we do not recall in LTE-V, the minimum number of Y is determined as per priority value, so we suggest to remove “as in LTE-V”. It does seem to make sense to have a range of minimum values without clarification of their use by UE, because the practical minimum would simply be the smallest value in the range.  A further update to the proposal 2’ is as follows:**Proposal 2’**: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing ~~and provided with a resource reservation interval (~~$P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~) from higher layer in slot n~~, it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where* The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4].

FFS whether a ~~range of~~ minimum Y value~~s~~ is (pre-)configured per priority level ~~as in LTE-V~~ |
| Fraunhofer | We agree with the main bullet and first sub-bullet.Regarding the second sub-bullet, we also feel that it is premature to agree to a single parameter to define the (pre-)configured range. |
| Interdigital | Relying purely on UE’s implementation to determine the set of candidate slots Y is risky at this stage since the partial sensing UEs in NR should support HARQ and SL DRX and we haven’t investigated the potential impacts at this point. Therefore, we prefer to check whether a restriction of selecting Y candidate slots is needed or not. In addition, in LTE-V, Y was not configured per priority.We propose the following update of Proposal 2’:**Proposal 2’**: If a UE is configured to perform partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) from higher layer in slot n, the UE determines Y candidate slots within a resource selection, ~~it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window~~, where* The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4].
* FFS whether a range of minimum Y values is (pre-)configured per priority level ~~as in LTE-V~~
* FFS any further restriction of determining Y candidate slots
 |
| CATT | Regarding the second bullet , we think ‘per priority level’ should be removed, and we would prefer the following wording: FFS Restrictions to determine Y candidate slots. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are okay with the main bullet and the 1st sub-bullet.For 2nd sub-bullet, please remove “as in LTE-V” since the per-priority level configuration of minimum Y is not specified before. |

### Proposals before 2nd check point (Feb 2)

FL observations and comments based on inputs received in Sec. 3.2.1:

* Please check the background description in at the beginning of Section 3.2 and also the accompany email sent for discussion before the 2nd check point.
* In short, this proposal targets a scenario where resource (re)selection is triggered by higher layer in slot n for periodic transmission in a resource pool that allows partial sensing and periodic transmission, the UE uses LTE-V like partial sensing for resource (re)selection.
* In this version, a new term (periodic-based partial sensing) is used to aid with the discussion
* Main differences from the last version
	+ An additional option is added based on LGE’s request.
	+ The last FFS is included based on comments mainly from Qualcomm and vivo.

**Proposal 2’’**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE is configured to perform periodic-based partial sensing (i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) by higher layer in slot n, it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where

* Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4]
	+ Option 2: The resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] is randomly selected by UE while satisfying:
		- T1 ≥ 0 and T2 *≤* remaining PDB
		- T2-T1 *≤* (pre-)configured threshold
* A range of minimum Y values is (pre-)configured
* FFS any restriction to determine Y candidate slots
* FFS whether the resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] should be confined within a set of periodic set of resources and its relationship with SL-DRX

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We are OK with the proposal |
| LGE | According to the FL clarification, the resource selection window can depend on the timing of periodic transmission and the number of retransmissions. Therefore we’d like to slightly modify option 2 as below.* + Option 2: The resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] is ~~randomly~~ selected by UE while satisfying:
		- T1 ≥ 0 and T2 *≤* remaining PDB
		- T2-T1 *≤* (pre-)configured threshold

In addition, we need further clarification what “a set of periodic set of resources” means in the last FFT bullet. Does it mean the resources available within SL-DRX on-duration? If it’s the case, we may discuss this topic later and separately as SL-DRX issue.FL: On the first modification, done. On the last FFS bullet, it is more than just the SL-DRX issue. It is also to do study on “evaluations and analysis of different scenarios (Tx/Rx/Interferer, power saving/non-power saving)” as raised by Qualcomm. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | * + - 1. We do not see the reason of using “A range of” in the second sub-bullet. Maybe, “The minimum Y value is (pre-)configured” is better wording.

FL: Corrected.* + - 1. From the main bullet, it reads as “if UE is configured to perform periodic-based partial sensing … in slot n”. Actually, UE has resource selection trigger in slot n, rather than performing sensing in slot n. Maybe, we could modify it as

“… by higher layer, **when UE receives resource selection request from higher layers in slot n**, it is up to UE implementation…” FL: Due to comments from other company that has concerns with resource (re)selection triggering in slot n and whether there will be a triggering at all, let’s make it more general as “… if UE performs periodic-based partial sensing, it is up to UE implementation …”* + - 1. We would like to mention that a UE is configured to perform periodic-based partial sensing is not equivalent to UE itself has periodic traffic. Specifically, UE with aperiodic traffic may still perform periodic-based partial sensing to avoid the resource collision with other UE’s periodic resource reservation. In this sense, we may consider one of the following two options:

Change to “(e.g., at least for the case of provided with a resource reservation interval $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$)” in the main bullet.Change to “(i.e., at least for the case of resource reservation period configured by resource pool including non-zero values)” in the main bullet.FL: On this point, different company has different understanding at this stage of whether periodic-based partial sensing is only perform when UE has periodic packets to transmit. Hence, for now this part is removed and a new FFS point is added as “FFS condition(s) and timing(s) for which periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UE”. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the main bullet and the first three sub-bullets. For the 4th sub-bullet, we share the same view as LGE that the clarification of “a set of periodic set of resources” is needed and the issue related to SL-DRX should be discussed separately.FL: Please refer to my reply comment to LGE. |
| CAICT | We are generally OK with the proposal. Since UE might not know when the resource selection trigger “n” will occur in the partial sensing and need to determine the sensing resources related to the candidate resources in the resource selection window, we suggest to change the wording in the main bullet as “it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window which might be hypothetical”.FL: At this point, I see among the companies there are different understanding/interpretation of LTE-V partial sensing scheme. For some, it may be hypothetical. For others, it may be a real resource selection window based on higher layer trigger/request in slot n. I think it is best just to keep it as it is to align with LTE-V description. |
| vivo | As there is an FFS on restrictions on the determination of Y, ‘up to UE implementation’ in the main bullet should be removed, otherwise the main bullet and the sub-bullet are contradictory.FL: At this stage, some companies have the view that SL slots in which its own transmissions occur should not be selected by the UE. And some thinks the selection should be restricted within SL-DRX. Perhaps it is better to not remove the FFS bullet. If in the end no restriction is needed, it is okay not to have any agreement for this FFS bullet.‘a set of periodic set of resources’ in the last bullet refers, in my understanding, to a set of slots in [n+T1, n+T2] that are **potential** periodic reservations corresponding to slots in periodic sensing window.FL: Please refer to my comment to LGE.Regarding whether to keep the SL DRX in the last bullet, if moderator is **not** planning to have a separate discussion/proposal for SL DRX case this meeting, we prefer to keep the SL DRX thing in the FFS. First of all, TX UE must ensure that the selected resource in within the DRX on duration of the RX UE otherwise the RX UE will miss the transmission, we think it is natural that the SL DRX must have some constraints on [n+T1, n+T2] and/or Y. Originally we expected to discuss the interaction between resource selection/sensing and DRX first, but now the group has moved directly into the details related to resource selection/sensing, we are concerned that making agreements without consideration of DRX (e.g., DRX for TX UE, DRX for RX UE) may result in frequent updates or reversals of agreements already reached in the follow-up meetings or delayed discussion for the case with SL DRX. Thus, we prefer to keep the ‘its relationship with SL-DRX’ if we don’t have time to discuss SL DRX separately in this meeting, companies can further study this aspect and provides their observations in the future meetingFL: Based on all the discussion happened here and for the RAN2’s working assumption on SL-DRX (in RAN2’s LS) during this meeting, it is clear we can’t assess impact of SL-DRX on sensing at this stage until RAN2 defines more details for it. So the last FFS point is kept and your suggested edit below for this FFS bullet is added.**Proposal 2’’**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE is configured to perform periodic-based partial sensing (i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) by higher layer in slot n, ~~it is up to UE implementation to~~ UE determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where* Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4]
	+ Option 2: The resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] is randomly selected by UE while satisfying:
		- T1 ≥ 0 and T2 *≤* remaining PDB
		- T2-T1 *≤* (pre-)configured threshold
* A range of minimum Y values is (pre-)configured
* FFS any restriction to determine Y candidate slots
	+ if no restriction is identified, it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots
* FFS whether the resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] and/or Y should be confined within a set of periodic set of resources and its relationship with SL-DRX
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree proposal for option 1. For option 2, the motivation of ‘randomly selected’ is not clearly. It is better to change the wording to ‘The resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] is selected by UE implementation while satisfying:’In addition, for the main bullet, we suggest to change ‘(i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$)’ to ‘(e.g., provided with a resource reservation interval $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$)’ since it is just one possible example.FL: On the first commet, please refer to LGE’s latest clarification. On the second comment/suggestion, it is now removed to avoid confusion as more discussions are evidently needed. |
| Fraunhofer | We agree with the FL’s proposals.For option 2, we prefer the wording from ZTE.With regards to the DRX, we agree with Vivo, and maybe to simplify it further and alleviate the wording concerns raised by other companies, the last bullet can be phrased “FFS relationship with SL-DRX”, similar to how its done in proposal 5”.FL: On both the first and second points, please refer to LGE’s modification and my comment reply to LGE. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the proposal with Option 1. For Option 2, it is not clear what the “random selection” of selection window means. R16 specified the selection of $T\_{1}$ and $T\_{2}$ is up to UE’s implementation with certain restrictions. Not sure why the random selection of the resource selection window is needed.FL: it is clarified by LGE.For the “slot n” in the main bullet, we need to clarify the slot-n is the time of resource selection trigger, not the time of performing sensing, which may be implied in the current text.FL: It is now removed as different company has different understanding on how/when LTE-V based periodic partial sensing is triggered and performed. |
| Quaclomm | RAN1 hasn’t agreed yet that a UE is configured to perform a specific type of sensing, only that the resource pool is configured to allow certain types of sensing. This can be addressed by removing “is configured to”. In the proposal, it isn’t clear that slot n is where resource (re)selection is triggered:In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs periodic-based partial sensing (i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) and resource (re)selection is triggered by higher layers in slot n, it is up to UE implementation to determine a set Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, whereWe agree with the FL’s wording in the last FFS since isn’t only about DRX. It could also apply to cases where the UEs are both transmitters for example.FL: The condition and timing in which the periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UE is not yet clear to all companies, so this has been removed from the main bullet and a FFS point on this is added. |
| NEC | Fine with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$ does not mean the UE is configured for partial sensing, nor vice-versa. The condition in this main bullet, and of other proposals, is not correct. The periodicity of the reservation is time-varying, provided in trigger-slot n from MAC, and is not known to PHY before that time. Therefore, the UE cannot predict the traffic type of its next transmission, and decide if/how to perform (partial) sensing at any slot before n, based on the knowledge of Prsvp\_TX which is delivered only in slot n. This means “*i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval*$ P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$” and the “*configured to perform periodic-based partial sensing*” is not equivalent, and therefore should be removed.FL: Done. As commented to Qualcomm, this should be further studied and discussed.One thing needs to be emphasized that in LTE-V, the request from MAC received in slot n is only to trigger the resource selection in the PHY layer and ask to report the resource set SB to the MAC layer. The partial sensing is performing continuously once it is configured on the resource pool, rather than starting at the moment of the request reception for the resource selection, i.e. the slot n. We also see other companies, such as Apple and Qualcomm, share the similar views, the slot n is the moment to trigger resource selction, rather than partial sensing.Furthermore, the configuration on UE performing partial sensing RA is intend to detect resource reservations from other UEs, based on reduced number of monitoring slots compared to full-sensing RA. This behaviour, and that it is necessary to perform, does not depend on what traffic type (periodic or aperiodic) is the UE’s own transmission. No matter which traffic type it is, the UE could select the resources based on the sensing results from periodical sensing occasions, once partial sensing is configured, and the short sensing window.For the first sub-bullet, both options are derived based on the Rel-16 resource selection window$[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$, so these options can be merged to a single one with leaving some FFS.FL: As option 2 was proposed by LGE and its definition for T1 and T2 are different from R16. At the moment, I am not clear if these two options can be merged. If LGE is fine with your suggestion, we can try to merge.For the second sub-bullet, it does not seem to make sense to have a range of minimum values without clarification of their use by UE, because the practical minimum would simply be the smallest value in the range.FL: corrected.For the last sub-bullet, the meaning and the necessity to confine resource selection window it is a second level issue, the relevant of which may depend on other details, and can be discussed separately in the future meetingsFL: please refer to Qualcomm’s comments and my reply to LGE.We suggest following changes:In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs ~~periodic-based~~ partial sensing ~~(i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~)~~ ~~by higher layer~~, when resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, it is up to UE implementation to determine Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where* ~~Down select to one:~~
	+ The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4]
		- ~~T1 ≥ 0 and T2~~ *~~≤~~* ~~remaining PDB~~
		- FFS: whether T2-T1 *≤* (pre-)configured threshold
* A ~~range of~~ minimum Y value~~s~~ is (pre-)configured
* FFS any restriction to determine Y candidate slots
* FFS ~~whether the resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] should be confined within a set of periodic set of resources and its~~ the relationship of selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ with SL-DRX,
 |
| Sharp | Agree with QC on removing “is configured to” (and this comment applies to 3’’ and 5’’ as well).FL: Done |
| Spreadtrum | Agree proposal generally.For “in slot n” in the main bullet , we agree with QC, Nokia and Apple. In slot n, UE is triggered to do resource (re)selection instead of being configured to perform periodic-based partial sensing by higher layer. So it canbe modified as “…when resource (re)selection is triggered by higher layers in slot n, …” in the main bullet.FL: This part has been removed as at this stage not all company share the same understanding of the condition and timing in which partial sensing is triggered. |
| Xiaomi | 1. Since selection window is defined by slot n, slot n is the slot that UE is triggered resource selection;FL: Technically agree. As commented to others, the condition and timing in which periodic-based partial sensing is triggered is not yet clear among all companies, this is removed for now and an FFS point is added. This applies to the next point (2).2. We do not think “UE is configured to perform periodic-based partial sensing” has the same meaning as “provided with a resource reservation interval $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$”;3. How UE performs sensing depends on the potential interference it may experience. In a resource pool supporting both perioidic reservation and aperiodic reservation, UE will experience interference from both periodic transmission and aperioid transmission. We are open to discuss whether interference from aperiodic traffic needs to be considered or not when selecting resource for periodic traffic, but we think it may be early to directly write in this way in the main bullet.FL: Handling of interference from aperiodic traffic when selecting resource for periodic traffic is now in Proposal 5. Please check the updated Proposal 2 to see if you are OK.4. given the last sub-bulllet, the 1st subbullet is not needed; the second sub-bullet can be revised to be “FFS the value of Y”.FL: For the last sub-bullet, please check Qualcomm’s comment and my reply to LGE. For the second sub-bullet, please check the updated proposal 2 below. It is now in line with LTE-V. |
| Panasonic | We agree with FL’s proposal for the main bullet and also the first 3 sub-bullets. For the 4th sub-bullet, we share similar view with FH and HW to be refrased as “FFS the relationship with SL-DRX”FL: please refer to Qualcomm’s comments and my reply to LGE. |
| Feature Lead | Based on comments received so far in above, please find updated proposal in the following. Please feel free to continue providing further comments on this updated version.**Proposal 2’’’**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs periodic-based partial sensing ~~(i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~) by higher layer in slot n~~, it is up to UE implementation to determine a set of Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where* FFS condition(s) and timing(s) for which periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UE
* Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4]
	+ Option 2: The resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] is ~~randomly~~ selected by UE while satisfying:
		- T1 ≥ 0 and T2 *≤* remaining PDB
		- T2-T1 *≤* (pre-)configured threshold
* A ~~range of~~ minimum ~~Y~~ value~~s~~ for Y is (pre-)configured from a range of values
* FFS any restriction to determine Y candidate slots
* FFS whether the resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] and/or Y should be confined within a set of periodic set of resources and its relationship with SL-DRX
 |
| Ericsson | We do not agree with the proposal in the current status.* Option 2 does not bring any technical advantage with respect to Option 1. Option 1 leaves up to UE implementation the choice of Y subframes. So, it is possible to achieve Option 2 by UE implementation. Therefore, we propose to delete Option 2.

In our view, the last bullet must be deleted, and this discussion can take place separately once more details regarding the periodic-based partial sensing are agreed.FL: Regarding the Option 2, please find further explanation from LGE below. Since this is the first meeting we touch on this issue, my take is that all options are worth taking further into consideration at least until the next meeting to judge its merits. The same applies to the last FFS bullet unless there is something wrong technically. Is this something that you could reconsider? |
| Sony | We are fine with option 1. For Option 2, we agree that “randomly” should be removed. |
| Lenovo&MM | We agree with FL’s **Proposal 2’’’** |
| Samsung | We agree with FL’s Proposal 2’’’ except last bullet. Regarding the relationship between resource selection window and SL DRX, we prefer to discuss it with a separate topic. So, we suggest to modify last bullet as high level agreement e.g. FFS whether the resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] should additionally depend on SL-DRX.FL: Please refer to my reply comment to Ericsson. In addition, details of SL-DRX in RAN2 are still not fully clear, so the relationship between the resource selection window and SL-DRX can’t be known exactly now. I see there is no harm in keeping this FFS at this stage. |
| Intel | Support Option 1 and do not support Option 2.Option 2 is unclear – why resource selection window duration (T2-T1) should be constrained by threshold? Option 2 is not aligned with Rel.16 definition of resource selection window and strong justification is needed to change it. T2 and T1 values are left up to UE implementation subject to reasonable bounds defined in Rel.16 and thus Option 1 is a superset. We propose to delete Option 2.FL: Please refer to further explanation from LGE below and also my comment to Ericsson. If in the end there is really no benefit of using Option 2, naturally it won’t be selected. |
| vivo | We agree with FL’s Proposal 2’’’. We would like to keep the last bullet as TX UE must ensure the selected resource is within the DRX on of RX UE, besides, WID clearly states that study of power-limited UE should consider the impact of sidelink DRX |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LGE | We’re fine with FL proposal 2’’’ except the last bullet. The meaning is not clear yet and any SL DRX related issue can be discussed in separate proposal.The intention of option 2 is to get power saving from selecting ‘burst type’ of resources, of which the gain was explained in our first response. Limiting the length of selectin window is one solution to achieve this burst type of resources in partial sensing. The differene between option 1 and 2 is whether to let UE implement this power saving or to let UE configured to get the power saving gain. In this sense, we still think the option 2 is preferable in that P-UE has limited freedom in resource selection for power saving. We prefer to keep option 2 for further studay, as in current FL proposal.Regarding the T1 value, T1 is bounded by Tproc1 in Rel.16, but we’re not sure this constraint is needed for P-UE operation. The min T2 value can be included as the configured selection window length.FL: Please refer to my reply comments to Ericsson and Samsung above. At this stage, since it is the first meeting we disuss all these issues, I would like to keep everything open and study a bit further including Option 1 and 2, and the last FFS bullet. Personally, I don’t see the difference of keeping the last bullet here or discussing it in a separate proposal.  |
| MediaTek | We support FL’s **Proposal 2’’’** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | A general comment is for the terminology used in the proposal: periodic partial sensing and contiguous partial sensing. It can be understood that the terminology is used just for discussion and will be not captured in the spec. However, to avoid misleading to have two kind of partial sensing, it is better to have a clarification on the terminology or reusing legacy terminology in LTE-V as much as possible. So two options can be considered:* Option 1: Add notes for each proposal, like: periodic-based partial sensing is equivalent to partial sensing defined in LTE-V/contiguous partial sensing is a short term sensing introduced in Rel-17, periodic-based/ contiguous partial sensing would be used for design and discussion only.
* Option 2: using the terminology: partial sensing and short-term sensing. Partial sensing is exactly the one defined in Rel-14 LTE-V which is sensing periodically. Short-term sensing is introduced in Rel-17 which is having a contiguous sensing within a window.

Either option is fine for us.FL: Thanks for the good suggestion. Please find below an updated Proposal 2’’’’.  |
| CATT | For the subbullet regarding minimum value for Y, we suggest minor modification* A ~~range of~~ minimum ~~Y~~ value~~s~~ for Y is (pre-)configured from a range of values, FFS details

FL: done |
| FUTUREWEI2 | Support option 1 but not option 2. We believe that Opt 2 is not needed because there is no evidence that Opt 1 "cannot work properly".FL: please refer to my replies to Ericsson and Intel. |
| Qualcomm | With the removal of~~i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~),~~ it should be clarified that this only applies when periodic reservations are enabled in the pool.**Proposal 2’’’**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing and reservation for another TB is enabled i.e. sl-MultiReserveResource is enabled for the resource pool, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs periodic-based partial sensing ~~(i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~) by higher layer in slot n~~, , it is up to UE implementation to determine a set of Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, whereWe also share the view that Option 2 is not necessary and the UE can achieve the same goal by its implementation and Option 1.FL: Thanks for the good suggestion, done. For the second comment, please refer to my replies to Ericsson and Intel. |
| Feature Lead 2 | Thanks to everyone for all the further comments! Please find an updated version in the following with newly updated parts in blue text.**Proposal 2’’’’**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs periodic-based partial sensing and reservation for another TB is enabled (i.e., sl-MultiReserveResource is enabled for the resource pool) ~~(i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~) by higher layer in slot n~~, it is up to UE implementation to determine a set of Y candidate slots within a resource selection window, where* FFS condition(s) and timing(s) for which periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UE
* Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: The resource selection window $[n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$ is defined in the same way as in R16 NR-V2X according to step 1 [TS 38.214 Sec. 8.1.4]
	+ Option 2: The resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] is ~~randomly~~ selected by UE while satisfying:
		- T1 ≥ 0 and T2 *≤* remaining PDB
		- T2-T1 *≤* (pre-)configured threshold
* A ~~range of~~ minimum ~~Y~~ value~~s~~ for Y is (pre-)configured from a range of values, FFS details
* FFS any restriction to determine Y candidate slots
* FFS whether the resource selection window [n+T1, n+T2] and/or Y should be confined within a set of periodic set of resources and its relationship with SL-DRX
* Note: The terminology “periodic-based partial sensing” is equivalent to the “partial sensing” used in LTE-V and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.
 |

### Proposals before 3rd check point (Feb 4)

* An agreement was reached during Tuesday (Feb 2) GTW session for R17 eSL. The agreement is captured in Section 2.

## Topic #3: Periodic-based partial sensing (determination of periodic sensing occasions for periodic transmission)

**Background**: Continuation from Topic #2, as it is mentioned that in R14 LTE-V a common divisor was set to 100ms for Pstep and 20/50ms reservation periodicities were not taken into consideration, the R14 partial sensing was based on an assumption that the reservation periodicity of PUE’s transmission will always be in an integer multiple of 100ms. And k (*gapCandidateSensing*) is (pre-)configured according to the set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool. In R16 NR sidelink, the set of up to 16 (pre-)configured possible resource reservation periodicities can be much smaller ([1:99], 0, 100, 200, …, 1000) to cater for wider range of traffic patterns especially ones with short latency requirement. As such, it would be very difficult and dangerous to continue assuming a common divisor can be used in periodic-based partial sensing for NR sidelink. As such, the k value will no longer need to be based on a bitmap which identifies a set of periodic sensing occasions that are integer multiple of 100ms to cover other allowed reservation periodicities in the resource pool.

### Proposals before 1st check point (Jan 28)



Figure 2

**Proposal 3**: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) from higher layer, the UE monitors slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.

* $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool (*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*)
	+ Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset
* k equals to
	+ Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion for a reservation period (k=1)
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions for a reservation period (k = [1, 2])
	+ Option 3: All possible sensing occasions before $n –T\_{0}$
	+ Option 4: FFS others

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments and option selection for** $P\_{reserve}$ **and k** |
| OPPO | We are OK with the proposal in principle. While it needs to clarify that down selection from these options should be considered later.  |
| Fraunhofer | We agree with the proposal as such, with the option to decide on the $P\_{reserve}$ and k values as FFS. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal with modification.For Preserve, we support Option 2. If Option 1 is selected, then the sensing efforts will be large especially with small resource reservation periods. For example, if the resource reservation period is 1 ms, then no power saving gain can be achieved at all. Here, we may configure a resource reservation period threshold, and only apply the configured resource reservation periods which are larger than the threshold. For k, we prefer to add an option that the k is by (resource pool) configuration. Any integer value between 1 and a configured value is used to determine the number of sensing occasions. This is restricted within the sensing window [n-T0, n-Tproc,0). |
| Ericsson | Regarding Preserve, we think that the easiest thing is to have full configurability (from the values in *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*), avoid a fruitless discussion, and focus on more important issues.Moreover, for the values of k only Option 1 should be considered. That is aligned with the procedure in 8.1.4. |
| InterDigital | We are OK with the proposal |
| CATT | We are OK to discuss the selection of $P\_{reserve}$ and k values later. |
| Qualcomm | Similar to Proposal 2, we think we need to consider the general principle prior to discussing the details. |
| Lenovo&MM | For $P\_{reserve}$, option 1 is our preference. For k, option 1 is our preference. |
| CMCC | We are OK with the 2 options, and meanwhile, we would like to add a third option that $P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to the common devisor of all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList.* In our views, by supporting option 3, both options in the proposal can be achieved by setting specific *gapCandidateSensing* bitmap indications, which can be up to implementation. In addition, by supporting option 3, the k value should be modified to be the ratio of sensing window size and the derived $P\_{reserve}$. |
| NEC | **Preserve: Option 1/option 2.** Option 1 is preferred because we should exclude all the reservations. Option 2 contains more flexibility (including option 1) which we can also accept.**K: Option 1.** Concerns: for a small $P\_{reserve}$ and large index of slot y, when we take k = 1, it's possible that y-$P\_{reserve}$ doesn't belong to the sensing window, e.g., later than n-Tproc. K-1 may make the occasion out of sensing window. Or, as alternative, we just define sensing occasions based on k and $P\_{reserve}$ for Rel.17 partial sensing because we're also trying to define additional sensing occasions out of legacy sensing window in other topics.Considering figure 2 above, we think only option 1 is aligned with existing sensing procedure. According to legacy SPS scaling mechanism and spec, only reservation received in the last Preserve will be scaled to the resource selection window. The other reservations (k=2,3,…) except the last one(k=1) will not be scaled according to the legacy method and will have no impact to the resource exclusion in selection window (due to Q = 1 in step 6 (c)). |
| vivo | * Regarding $P\_{reserve}$

We are ok with both options, but option2 is preferred from the perspective of power saving. For example, if two periods are configured in a pool, one period is an integer multiple of the other, $P\_{reserve}$ can be set to the larger one of the two periods, which not only reduces the time instances of periodic sensing but also ensures that the UE can detect packets of both periodicities. We suggest adding a FFS on the conditions on using option1 or option2.* Regarding the value of k

I think we need to discuss some basic principles for determining the location of sensing occasions before choosing one or more options. For example, whether the periodic sensing occasions can be after slot n or $n –T\_{0}$. whether a (pre-)configured bitmap like *gapCandidateSensing* in LTE V2X will be reused to determine the k values. |
| FUTUREWEI | We agree with the proposal. FFS for the values of *P*reserve and k |
| ETRI | We are generally fine with FL’s proposal. Regarding $P\_{reserve}$ and k values, it can be discussed further. |
| Panasonic | We are ok with the proposals.  |
| Sony | We are OK with the proposal and down-selecting later. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal’s direction and prefer option 1 + option 1. |
| CAICT | For $P\_{reserve}$, we prefer option1 since it would lead to a serious conflict between SL TXs if a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList* is configured for partial sensing. Besides, it is hard to determine which subset to configure for option2.For k, we prefer option3 considering it seems to have higher reliability than option1 and option2. |
| Sharp | Regarding the values of k, since the UE cannot predict where slot n is before it comes, it has to monitor the slots in a periodic manner anyway, so it is unclear why restricting the values of k here helps.Besides, we have 2 further clarifications. 1) Considering the topic#4 and #5, we suggest to add “at least the UE monitors…”, since probably in partial sensing, the periodic slots are not the only monitored slots. 2) the issue related to periodic reservation in SCI format 1-A has not been decided yet, thus, $P\_{reserve}$ should be a value with conversion from ‘ms’ to logical slot (of a resource pool), since the terminology $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is used in the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | As shown in Figure 2, the resource selection happens at slot n, and UE sensing behaviour happens before slot n. Y candidate slots are determined at slot n, but not before slot n. Therefore, we suggest to rewording the main bullet such as “When resource selection is triggered in slot n, given a slot in the set of Y candidate slots, UE should have monitored in slots …”.  |
| ZTE | For the first bullet, we agree with option 1. For the second bullet, we understands that all options are under the assumption that the bitmap is set with all “1”, or there is no such bitmap mechanism for sensing indication anymore. But we think firstly, we should discuss whether to reuse legacy bitmap mechanism for partial sensing. |
| LGE | The main sentence of the proposal is generally ok.* For $P\_{reserve}$, option 2 is preferred for power saving purpose. Actually option 1 is a special case of option 2.
* For value k, sensing over multiple slots for the same reservation period is redundant so not necessary. In this sense, sensing only one slot for each reservation period is reasonable. We propose option 4 as follows.
	+ Only one sensing occasion for one reservation period. A value k for a specific sensing occasion is UE implementation. Max value k is (pre-)configured.
 |
| Samsung | We are OK with the proposal if down-selection will be made later. Otherwise we prefer full configurability for both $P\_{reserve}$ and k. |
| Fujitsu | * Regarding $P\_{reserve}$, we prefer option 2. Since the periodicities ranging from 100 ms to 1000 ms are integer multiples of 100 ms, it is not necessary to take all the values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList.*
* Regarding *k*, the earliest sensing occasion should be equal to the maximum periodicity in the current resource pool. On the other hand, for some extreme short periodicities (e.g., 1 ms ~ 3 ms), since the processing time needs to be guaranteed for resource selection, the UE cannot perform sensing for the most recent sensing occasions. Considering the above points, we propose the following for *k.*
	+ For the reservation period ≧a certain value (e.g., 100 ms), *k*=1.
	+ For the reservation period < a certain value (e.g., 100 ms), *k* is the minimum integer which makes $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ falling into the sensing window.
 |
| MediaTek | We are fine with the proposal with $P\_{reserve}$ and k as FFS. Downselection should be done later. |
| Intel | Agree with modification aiming to support coexistence with dynamic transmissions that will require sensing in a window of size max(resource selection window, SCI signaling window) prior to resource reselection time instance.Our preferred option for “Preserve” – make it fully configurableOur preferred option for “k” is k = 1. Other k values seem overcomplicate design and do not serve power saving purpose. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For the main bullet, same comments as that for proposal 2, i.e., “and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) from higher layer” should be removed.Please could the FL clarify if the proposal is to support all the options under Preserve and k, or to down-select now or later? We assume downselection is intended.On $P\_{reserve}$, Option 1. Support all values that were already supported in Rel-16, since it should be backward compatible for Rel-16 design in Rel-17.On k, Option 4 (k is a configurable set). We doubt that all options should be supported individually, but configuration could cover all or most.Unlike in LTE-V where partial sensing deals with periodic traffic only, NR partial sensing would suffer more collisions due to aperiodic traffic, hence restriction on k =1 only would more likely result in un-reliable decision on corresponding candidate slot due to failure of a SCI decoding at a given periodicity, e.g. caused by aperiodic transmission. We do not see much more value in option 2 than option 1. The value of k can be configurable to provide flexibility.  |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the proposal with down selection for options. |
| Bosch | In principle, we are fine with the FL proposal. If we are going to down select, then our preference is to be able to (pre-)configure both P\_reserve and k. |
| Nokia, NSB | We shall agree with some general principles to support various periodicities for partial sensing, before we discuss this detailed proposal. |

**Proposal 3’**: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) from higher layer, the UE monitors slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.

* $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool (*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*). Down select among:
	+ Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset
	+ Option 3: $P\_{reserve}$ is (pre-)configurable from values in *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 4: $P\_{reserve}$ is a common devisor among values in *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
* k equals to (down select to one)
	+ Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion for a reservation period (k=1)
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions for a reservation period (k = [1, 2])
	+ Option 3: All possible sensing occasions after $n –T\_{0}$
	+ Option 4: Only one periodic sensing occasion for one reservation period. The k value is up to UE implementation. Max value for k is (pre-)configured.
	+ Option 5: FFS others

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We support FL’s proposal.  |
| NEC | As they are down-select options, we're ok with current proposal. One clarification for the "down select among" is the intention to down select at least one option for Preserve? We think "down select to one" is applicable to Preserve too. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with the current proposal keeping options for future down-selection. |
| LGE | Support FL’s proposal. For $P\_{reserve}$, option 1 always requires max power consumption. Option 4 is unclear as value 1 is always a common divisor, which means monitoring all slots. From power consumption perspective, a subset of values are preferred. But rather than making a rule for decision by UE, network can (pre-)configured the required values. As a result, option 3 is preferred.For k value, as we commented earlier, sensing over multiple slots for the same reservation period is redundant, so not necessary. In this sense, sensing only one slot for each reservation period is reasonable. Option 4 is preferred as it is a superset including the option 1. |
| Apple | We prefer to add “k is (pre-)configured” as a more reliable sensing option. At this moment, we may include all possible options and down-select later. For $P\_{reserve}$, we think Option 2 covers Option 3, since Option 3 can be considered as one way (i.e., configuration) of determining the subset. |
| ETRI | We support FL’s proposal. As commented by NEC, it might be better to modify into “Down select to one” instead of “Down select among”.  |
| Qualcomm | Similar to our comment on Proposal 2’, it’s too early to restrict the design of the partial sensing scheme. Different combinations of Tx/Rx UEs need to be investigated first. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the main bullet and the 2nd sub-bullet.For $P\_{reserve}$, we think that the FFS in option 2 includes the subset determination methods provided by option 3 and option 4.  |
| Xiaomi | We are generally fine with the intention of the proposal. As our last comment, UE can determine the set of Y slots no earlier than slot n, and UE has already finished sensing operation in the slots corresponding to the Y slots. We prefer to describing the main bullet in a requirement way for example:If UE is configured to perform partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) from higher layer, and determines Y candidate slots in slot n, the ~~UE monitors~~ slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions shall be monitored by the UE, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots. |
| Panasonic | We support FL’s proposals for future down selection.  |
| CMCC | Support the FL’s proposal.For $P\_{reserve}$, let us elaborate more on the intention of Option 4. Option 4 does not indicate to always set 1 as the common divisor, and the value should be dependent on the (pre-)configured reservation period of a given RP. For instance, a RP allows reservation periods of 5ms, 15ms, and 20ms, then the $P\_{reserve}$ = 5ms. Even if we consider some special case that a RP allows reservation periods of 15ms and 16ms, the common divisor is 1; however, it does not intend to monitor all the slots. In such a case, by setting the 15th and 16th bit of the higher layer parameter *gapCandidateSensing* to be 1, and all the other bits to be 0, it would be the same as Option 1 with k=1. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the main bullet and 2nd sub-bullet.For $P\_{reserve}$, it’s unclear for us why Option 4 of using a common divisor have gain compared with Option 2. In addition, Option 3 can be one possible manner of Option 2. However since it’s for down-selection, we can accept the current version.  |
| Ericsson | We support the FL proposal for further down-selection. We would like to get some clarification on whether Option 3 as written includes a pre-configured set or if this can be included in the FFS of Option 2. Moreover, in our view for the second point the value that should be considered is Option 1 which is aligned with the current procedure in 38.314. |
| Sony | We can support the FL’s proposal basically. But regarding the periodicity value, we think option 3 and 4 could be included in the FFS in option 2. |
| ZTE | Agree FL’s proposal.As down-select, for $P\_{reserve}$, we support option 1 and option 3 is acceptable.For k value, suggest to add ‘ from ’ into option 1 and option 2 for more understandable, such as following:* + Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion from  for a reservation period (k=1)
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions from  for a reservation period (k = [1, 2])

As down-select, prefer to option 4. It seems that the resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) is not related to the proposal, so I am wonder whether it can be removed.  |
| vivo | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The main bullet can be corrected as what we suggest in question 2.For the first sub-bullet, option 2 takes the same effect of option 3, once the FFS is resolved. The FFS allows a subset of values are used by (pre-)configuration. So the option 3 can be removed.For the k determination, another option could be added which “k is (pre-) configured”. We also see others have similar understanding.**Proposal 3’**: If UE is configured to perform partial sensing ~~and provided with a resource reservation interval (~~$P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~) from higher layer~~, the UE monitors slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.* $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool (*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*). Down select among:
	+ Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset
	+ ~~Option 3:~~ $P\_{reserve}$ ~~is (pre-)configurable from values in~~ *~~sl-ResourceReservePeriodList~~*
	+ Option 4: $P\_{reserve}$ is a common devisor among values in *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
* k equals to (down select to one)
	+ Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion for a reservation period (k=1)
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions for a reservation period (k = [1, 2])
	+ Option 3: All possible sensing occasions after $n –T\_{0}$
	+ Option 4: Only one periodic sensing occasion for one reservation period. The k value is up to UE implementation. Max value for k is (pre-)configured.
	+ Option 5: k is (pre-) configured
	+ Option ~~5~~6: FFS others
 |
| Fraunhofer | We agree with the FL’s proposal with the option to down-select at a later stage. |
| Interdigital | We support FL’s proposals |
| CATT | For the first bullet, not sure we need all the three options, we think options 3 already incudes option 1 and option2. No need to have the first two to options. |
| Convida Wireless | We support FL’s proposal with down-selection. |
| Nokia, NSB | This proposal is only applied for periodic traffic, and the UE with aperiodic traffic shall use another partial sensing scheme (such as in Proposal 5). Please clarify that we are going to define two partial sensing schemes, one for periodic traffic and anther one for aperiodic traffic. How about mixed traffic?For this proposal, using a parameter $P\_{reserve}$ might resolve the problem to support these periodicities ([1:99], 100, 200, …, 1000)ms. Can we clarify whether $P\_{reserve}$ is UE specific or resource pool specific? Support to keep these options of $P\_{reserve}$ open.For k options, support to add another option “pre-configured” for k. |

### Proposals before 2nd check point (Feb 2)

FL observations and comments based on inputs received in Sec. 3.3.1:

* Please check the background description in at the beginning of Section 3.3, Fig. 2 and also the accompany email sent for discussion before the 2nd check point.
* In short, this proposal targets a scenario where resource (re)selection is triggered by higher layer in slot n for periodic transmission in a resource pool that allows partial sensing and periodic transmission, the UE uses LTE-V like partial sensing for resource (re)selection.
* In this version, a new term (periodic-based partial sensing) is used to aid with the discussion.

**Proposal 3’’**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE is configured to perform periodic-based partial sensing (i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) by higher layer, the UE monitors slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.

* $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool (*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*). Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination, whether to include all values)
	+ Option 3: $P\_{reserve}$ is a common divisor among values in *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
* k equals to (down select to one)
	+ Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion for a reservation period (k=1)
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions for a reservation period (k = [1, 2])
	+ Option 3: All possible sensing occasions after $n –T\_{0}$
	+ Option 4: Only one periodic sensing occasion for one reservation period. The k value is up to UE implementation. Max value for k is (pre-)configured.
	+ Option 5: k is (pre-)configured
	+ Option 6: FFS others

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We are OK with the proposal |
| LGE | Option 1 of the second bullet is a special case of option 4 in that only one (the most recent) periodic sensing occasion per reservation period is selected. We can merge two options like this.* + Option 1: Only one periodic sensing occasion for one reservation period.
		- FFS whether the one occasion is the most recent one, UE implementation, or (pre-)configuration
		- FFS whether max k value is (pre-)configured

FL: It seems reasonable, but it may be different from the original Option 4. I think it is OK to keep all options on the table for now, since this is the first meeting we start discussing this. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal in general.For $P\_{reserve}$ , it seems that in Option 2, “whether to include all values” covers Option 1. Hence, we wonder if Option 1 could be removed, as it already merged to Option 2? FL: Similar reply to LGE, it may seem one option is already covered by another, but there is still some differences. I think it is OK to keep all options for now as they are without merging.As our comment in Proposal 2’’, a UE is configured to perform periodic-based partial sensing is not equivalent to UE itself has periodic traffic. Specifically, UE with aperiodic traffic may still perform periodic-based partial sensing to avoid the resource collision with other UE’s periodic resource reservation. In this sense, we may consider either one of the options:Change to “(e.g., at least for the case of provided with a resource reservation interval $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$)” in the main bullet.Change to “(i.e., at least for the case of resource reservation period configured by resource pool including non-zero values)” in the main bullet.FL: this is fixed in the same way as in Proposal 2. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal in general.For option 1 and option 2 of *k*, considering that UE can only perform sensing within the sensing window, the most recent sensing occasion refers to the most recent periodic occasion that falls into the sensing window. If *k* is restricted to 1 or [1,2], some determined periodic occasion may be outside the sensing window and cannot be sensed. Hence, we propose to remove k=1 and k=[1,2] from option 1 and option 2, respectively.* Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion for a reservation period ~~(k=1)~~
* Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions for a reservation period ~~(k = [1, 2])~~

FL: Good point and removed. It is also additionally clarified that the sensing occursions are within sensing window. |
| CAICT | For Option5, it is better to clarify that whether multiple k can be pre-configured or not.FL: Thanks, it is now clarified in the updated version below.  |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal in principle.UE configured with periodic sensing also needs to do continuous sensing to exclude aperiodic reservation from other UE from the candidate resource set, so UE should ‘at least’ perform the periodic sensing on the periodic occasions.FL: Technically it is true and I agree. But since this proposal is dealing sorely on periodic-based partial sensing, the monitoring slots considered here should be related to this type of sensing. Also, without adding this “at least”, the proposal itself does not preclude us from performing contiguous partial sensing in Proposal 5.Besides, we have a similar comment as that we made last Friday and in 3.2.2, we would like to add FFS points on the SL DRX in case SL-DRX might affect the sensing slot.FL: Good point. Qualcomm’s description seems to be more general, I hope it is OK with vivo.**Proposal 3’’**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE is configured to perform periodic-based partial sensing (i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) by higher layer, the UE monitors slots ~~of~~ at least including a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.* $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool (*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*). Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination, whether to include all values)
	+ Option 3: $P\_{reserve}$ is a common divisor among values in *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
* k equals to (down select to one)
	+ Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion for a reservation period (k=1)
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions for a reservation period (k = [1, 2])
	+ Option 3: All possible sensing occasions after $n –T\_{0}$
	+ Option 4: Only one periodic sensing occasion for one reservation period. The k value is up to UE implementation. Max value for k is (pre-)configured.
	+ Option 5: k is (pre-)configured
	+ Option 6: FFS others
* FFS$ $Interaction between k and/or $P\_{reserve}$ with SL-DRX
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the second bullet to define k, we think one more option should be added, which is to use legacy bitmap to configure.FL: Added. |
| Fraunhofer | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | This proposal defines perodic sensing occations for partial sensing. We are fine with the main bullet and the 1st sub-bullet. For the 2nd sub-bullet on k, we are also okay to keep all options open. Suggest to delete “(down selection to one)”, because some of the options can be combined together.FL: Although we may merge some options together (which can be part of “FFS others”), in the end only one scheme should be used. I think it is OK to keep “down select to one”. |
| Qualcomm | We have the same comment about sensing type and configuration as Proposal 2’’. We also propose to use the wording “UE shall monitor” from LTE SL spec instead of “UE monitors” to avoid any confusion about causality:In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs periodic-based partial sensing (i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$) by higher layer, the UE shall monitor~~s~~ slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.We also share vivo’s view on introducing an FFS for DRX* FFS relation relationship between sensing occasions and SL-DRX

FL: Done. Not sure if adding “shall” will have different meaning.  |
| NEC | We're agree with the proposal to down select. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Same comment for the main bullet as Question 2.The RP-level allowed/dis-allowed (pre-)configuration (RRC signalling) on periodic reservation is NOT same as $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$/$P\_{rsvp\\_TX}=0$ in slot n, where the latter is provided by MAC layer and is time-varying in different slot “n” per UE. Hence the provision of resource reservation interval in the parentheses in the main bullet should be removed as follows: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs ~~periodic-based~~ partial sensing ~~(i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~)~~ by higher layer, the UE monitors slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.FL: Done. As explained earlier, using the term “periodic-based partial sensing” is for adding our discussion for now and it does not necessarily to be captured in the spec later. If everything is just referring as partial sensing, which I tried before, it tends to be more confusing to some. For the sake of our discussion, let’s use the new terminologies for now.For determination, it seems there is an overlap between option 1 and option 2, using all values or a subset of values are different considerations for design at this stage and can be down select in future meeting, “whether to include all values” is better to be removed in the FFS of FFS.* + Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination~~, whether to include all values~~)

FL: doneWe are ok for the sub bullets which aim to down-select to one in future meetings. |
| Spreadtrum | We are OK with the FL’s proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We have the similar comments as the last round. As shown in Figure 2, the resource selection happens at slot n, and UE sensing behaviour happens before slot n. Y candidate slots are determined at slot n, but not before slot n. Therefore, we suggest to rewording the main bullet such as “When resource selection is triggered in slot n, given a slot in the set of Y candidate slots, UE should have monitored in slots …”.FL: I see your point. As commented above, it seems not all company share the same understanding as when periodic-based partial sensing would be performed. An FFS point is added in Proposal 2 and the relavent description here in Proposal 3 is also updated below. Please check if this is OK with you. |
| Panasonic | We support FL’s proposal.  |
| Feature Lead | Based on comments received so far in above, please find updated proposal in the following. Please feel free to continue providing further comments on this updated version.**Proposal 3’’’**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs periodic-based partial sensing ~~(i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~) by higher layer~~, the UE monitors slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.* $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool (*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*). Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination~~, whether to include all values~~)
	+ Option 3: $P\_{reserve}$ is a common divisor among values in *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
* k equals to (down select to one)
	+ Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion within sensing window for a reservation period ~~(k=1)~~
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions within sensing window for a reservation period ~~(k = [1, 2])~~
	+ Option 3: All possible sensing occasions after $n –T\_{0}$
	+ Option 4: Only one periodic sensing occasion for one reservation period. The k value is up to UE implementation. Max value for k is (pre-)configured.
	+ Option 5: k is (pre-)configured, including multiple values
	+ Option 6: (pre-)configuration of a bitmap, same as in LTE-V
	+ Option 7: FFS others
* FFS relation relationship between periodic sensing occasions and SL-DRX
 |
| Ericsson | We think that it would be good to limit the number of options already now. In the first bullet Option 3 can be configured using Option 2, so we propose to remove it. For the second bullet, Option 1 is the only behavior aligned with the current specification. No need to discuss further. For the sake of progress, if the group as a whole thinks that the discussion has to take place on all the options, we will not oppose the agreement.FL: Technically agree and thank you for the understanding to make progress. Let’s aim to do the down selection in the next meeting. |
| Sony | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo&MM | We agree with FL’s **Proposal 3’’’** |
| Samsung | We are OK with Proposal 3’’’ |
| Intel | Thanks for efforts and revision of proposal. We have the following comments:1. Suggest to reword “periodic-based partial sensing” to “partial sensing for periodic transmission” or “partial sensing for semi-persistent reservations”
2. Regarding Preserve – Option 2 is a superset and thus is a preferred one
3. Regarding ‘k’ – we prefer to see k = 1. We do not expect noticeable gains for other options.
	1. We can accept proposal as it is, if proponents plan to bring performance data comparing agreed options with a baseline option (k = 1), which needs to be encouraged by FL

FL: Regarding the first comment, in some company view, periodic-based partial sensing is not just for periodic transmission or reservations. Please refer to comments from HW and Apple. On the other hand, some companies do share with your view. So in terms of wording, I have added a note to clarify this new terminology (same as in Proposal 2). I hope you are OK with this. Regarding the second and third comments, a note is added at the end to encourage company to show performance data for the down selection. |
| vivo | We agree with FL’s Proposal 3’’’.  |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LGE | I see FL’s points to leave the issues open for further discussion. We’re fine with FL proposal 3’’’. |
| MediaTek | We are OK with FL’s **Proposal 3’’’** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | The update proposal 3’’’ is generally fine with us. A comment is the option 1 and option 2 for k to down select are restricted within sensing window, but in LTE-V partial sensing, there is no sensing window defined. In NR-V, it seems RAN1 has not discussed the definition of sensing window for partial sensing. So can you clarify what this sensing window refers to?FL: In R16 NR-V2X, a sensing window is configured per resource pool “*sl-SensingWindow*”. This is the sensing window that I refer to.  |
| CATT | If $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set, then it is not right that ‘$P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values’, it should be the configured set. Therefore we suggest change * + Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination~~, whether to include all values~~)

To:* + Option 1: The configured set corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: The configured set corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination~~, whether to include all values~~)

Option 3 can stay unchanged.FL: “*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*” is the configured set of up to 16 resource reservation intervals for a resource pool. So $P\_{reserve}$ should be taken from this configured set. I think the existing description is right, no? |
| Qualcomm | With the removal of~~i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~),~~ it should be clarified that this only applies when periodic reservations are enabled in the pool. It would also be good to add an FFS similar to the one from the last proposal on the timing of partial sensing. **Proposal 3’’’**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing and reservation for another TB is enabled i.e. sl-MultiReserveResource is enabled for the resource pool, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs periodic-based partial sensing ~~(i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~) by higher layer~~, the UE monitors slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.* FFS timing(s) for which periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UE

FL: All done. |
| Feature Lead 2 | Thanks to everyone for all the further comments! Please find an updated version in the following with newly updated parts in blue text.**Proposal 3’’’’**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs periodic-based partial sensing ~~(i.e., provided with a resource reservation interval~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$~~) by higher layer~~, the UE monitors slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.* $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool (*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*). Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination~~, whether to include all values~~)
	+ Option 3: $P\_{reserve}$ is a common divisor among values in *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
* k equals to (down select to one)
	+ Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion within sensing window for a reservation period ~~(k=1)~~
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions within sensing window for a reservation period ~~(k = [1, 2])~~
	+ Option 3: All possible sensing occasions after $n –T\_{0}$
	+ Option 4: Only one periodic sensing occasion for one reservation period. The k value is up to UE implementation. Max value for k is (pre-)configured.
	+ Option 5: k is (pre-)configured, including multiple values
	+ Option 6: (pre-)configuration of a bitmap, same as in LTE-V
	+ Option 7: FFS others
* FFS relation relationship between periodic sensing occasions and SL-DRX
* FFS timing(s) for which periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UE
* Note: The terminology “periodic-based partial sensing” is equivalent to the “partial sensing” used in LTE-V and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.
* Note: companies are encouraged to show performance data for the down selections.
 |

### Proposals before 3rd check point (Feb 4)

FL observations and comments based on inputs received in Sec. 3.3.2:

* Based on some of the updates reached during the last GTW session for P2, Proposal 3’’’’ from the preceding section is revised below with the same sentences and wordings (in blue text) since these two proposals are related to each other.
* In the preceding section, there were comments related to how some options for $P\_{reserve}$ and k could be removed, merged or one is a superset of another. Since this is the first meeting we start this discussion and proposals are directly proposed by some companies, if we start merging or removing it may change the meaning/intention of the original proposal. Unless there is something incorrect technically that should be modified or removed, let’s keep them as they are and we can do the down selection in the next meeting.

**Proposal 3 (round VI)**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs periodic-based partial sensing, at least when the reservation for another TB (when carried in SCI) is enabled for the resource pool and resource selection/reselection is triggered at slot n, the UE monitors slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.

* $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool (*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*). Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination)
	+ Option 3: $P\_{reserve}$ is a common divisor among values in *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
* k equals to (down select to one)
	+ Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion within sensing window for a reservation period
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions within sensing window for a reservation period
	+ Option 3: All possible sensing occasions after $n –T\_{0}$
	+ Option 4: Only one periodic sensing occasion for one reservation period. The k value is up to UE implementation. Max value for k is (pre-)configured.
	+ Option 5: k is (pre-)configured, including multiple values
	+ Option 6: (pre-)configuration of a bitmap, same as in LTE-V
	+ Option 7: FFS others
* FFS relation relationship between periodic sensing occasions and SL-DRX
* FFS timing(s) for which periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UE
* Note: The terminology “periodic-based partial sensing” is based on the “partial sensing” used in LTE-V and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17
* Note: companies are encouraged to show performance data for the down selections

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Fine with the propoal |
| Xiaomi | Suggest to revise “the UE mornitors …” to “the UE shall monitor at least …”. From our understanding, this is rather a requirement to be satisfied when selecting Y candidate resources, as sensing behaviour performs before resource selection. Also, it is not precluded if the UE is willing to sense more.FL: Thanks for the suggestion. As I replied to Qualcomm who made the same suggestion earlier, I am not sure in terms of meaning it would make a difference by adding “shall” in the sentence. Also, this can be related to the timing(s) for which periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UE, which is listed as a FFS item in the proposal. As for adding “at least”, I see this is related to P5. Although P5 is not yet formally agreed, by not adding “at least” does not preclude us from introducing contiguous sensing in P5. If I see there is also desire from other company, I can add this “at least”. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As the FL’s answer for the question in our previous reply, the sensing window introduced in the option 1 and option 2 for k value determination is said to be the sensing window in Rel-16 NR-V which is specified for full sensing. This seems to be a misunderstanding of LTE-V, because **there is no sensing window used for partial sensing in LTE-V**, so the phrase does not have meaning here even with the addition of the first “Note”. There has been no agreement yet to define any sensing window for NR partial sensing, and discussion would be needed before doing so. The options for k cannot be written assuming its existence. Referring to TS 36.213, the sensing window for full sensing is specified via:14.1.1.6 (…)(…)If partial sensing is not configured by higher layers then the following steps are used:(…)2) The UE shall monitor subframes ,, …,  except for those in which its transmissions occur, (…)where Pstep is defined earlier in section 14.However, when partial sensing is configured, also in section 14.1.1.6, there is no reliance on the sensing window:If partial sensing is configured by higher layers then the following steps are used:(…)2) If a subframe  is included in the set of subframes in Step 1, the UE shall monitor any subframe  if k-th bit of the high layer parameter *gapCandidateSensing* is set to 1. (…)It is seen that LTE-V partial sensing has no sensing window, and uses only the bitmap to set which subframes are sensed in $ t\_{y-k×P\_{step}}^{SL}$ and resources are selected based on sensing results in each indicated subframe. The principles to perform sensing for these two schemes are different, and there is no necessity and motivation to introduce such sensing window for full sensing to periodic-based partial sensing. Given that, option 1 and option 2 for k value do not work in the framework of the proposal, and need to be reformulated as follows:* + Option 1: k = 1, refers to ~~Only~~ the most recent sensing occasion determined by$ t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ with respect to $t\_{y}^{SL}$ ~~within sensing window for a reservation period.~~
	+ Option 2: k = 1 and 2, refers to ~~T~~the two most recent sensing occasions determined by$ t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL} $with respect to $t\_{y}^{SL}$ ~~within sensing window for a reservation period~~.

FL: Please refer to my comments in the reply email or below. |
| Apple | For $P\_{reserve}$, it may be some combination of Options eventually. For example, in Option 2, $P\_{reserve}$ is pre-configured which includes one configuration equal to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList,* i.e., Option 1. It is unclear in Option 2, whether a “subset” includes the case of all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList.*  Hence, we may add one option of “others”, since we are going to down select only one option in a later meeting.FL: As explained previously, it is not so essential whether one option already include another option. All these details will be clearer by the next meeting, once all companies have more time to consider. For the proposal, I can add one more option of FFS others. |
| Feature Lead | Based on the comments received from HW/HiSi and Apple, Proposal 3 is now updated in the following. Basically, we should also consider the case [k=1] or [k=1,2] may fall after the resource (re)selection trigger in slot n due to small periodicity P\_reserve and the position of Y candidate slots are selected.Please feel free to provide further comments based on the following **Proposal 3 (round VII)**. Differences to the last version are in red text.**Proposal 3 (round VII)**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs periodic-based partial sensing, at least when the reservation for another TB (when carried in SCI) is enabled for the resource pool and resource selection/reselection is triggered at slot n, the UE monitors slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.* $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool (*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*). Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination)
	+ Option 3: $P\_{reserve}$ is a common divisor among values in *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 4: FFS others
* k equals to (down select to one)
	+ Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion ~~within sensing window~~ for a reservation period before the resource (re)selection trigger
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions ~~within sensing window~~ for a reservation period before the resource (re)selection trigger
	+ Option 3: All possible sensing occasions after $n –T\_{0}$
	+ Option 4: Only one periodic sensing occasion for one reservation period. The k value is up to UE implementation. Max value for k is (pre-)configured.
	+ Option 5: k is (pre-)configured, including multiple values
	+ Option 6: (pre-)configuration of a bitmap, same as in LTE-V
	+ Option 7: FFS others
* FFS relation relationship between periodic sensing occasions and SL-DRX
* FFS timing(s) for which periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UE
* Note: The terminology “periodic-based partial sensing” is based on the “partial sensing” used in LTE-V and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17
* Note: companies are encouraged to show performance data for the down selections
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | Generally fine with the above. Two comments:* For clarification, could I ask what is the difference between option 5 and option 6 of k? I feel they are same and only either is fine..

FL: In Option 5, k can be configured as {1, 3, 5, 10}. With Option 6, the same set of values will be expressed in LTE-V way as [1 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 0 1] and we would need to define length of the bitmap.* On FFS, we prefer to use same wording as we agreed for topic 2, i.e.

FFS condition(s) and timing(s) for which periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UEFL: Yes, it is good to align with the agreement from Topic #2 since they are related. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Suggest to adopt the following modification in the main bullet: the UE monitor slots of at least a ~~set of~~ periodic sensing occasion~~s~~, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.Since down selection of the $ P\_{reserve}$ option is not done yet, whether a periodic sensing occasion or multiple sensing occasions shall be monitored is not decided yet.FL: If only one periodic sensing occasion is monitored by the UE, this means there is only one $P\_{reserve}$ value and one k value. Although I have not heard of any such proposal, but I guess it is one of the possibilities. OK, it is updated. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the FL’s proposal. |
| Vivo2 | Regarding the updated P3 by FL* + Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion ~~within sensing window~~ for a reservation period before the resource (re)selection trigger
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions ~~within sensing window~~ for a reservation period before the resource (re)selection trigger

My understanding is that k is used to determine the period in which a set of periodic sensing occasions are located, but the above description may lead to the misinterpretation that the set of periodic sensing occasions consist of the last one or the last two sensing occasions in a given period. How about changing it like this?* + Option 1: ~~Only the most recent~~ sensing occasion ~~within sensing window~~ corresponding to only the most recent reservation period before the resource (re)selection trigger
	+ Option 2: ~~The two most recent~~ sensing occasions ~~within sensing window~~ corresponding to the two most recent reservation period before the resource (re)selection trigger

FL: The way I read/wrote it (and interpret it) is that k is used to determine the sensing occasion (a set of Y slots) that corresponds to a given reservation periodicity (one of the possible values configured for a pool, e.g. 200ms). Maybe I can update the description for Option 1 as “Only the most recent sensing occasion for a given reservation periodicity before the resource (re)selection trigger”, and do the similar change in Option 2. Hopefully this can resolve the confusion. Let’s see if any one else also has the same issue. |
| NEC | Regarding **Proposal 3 (round VII)**, thank you for the updates. Maybe the concern is similar with Huawei's. For the k value bullet, we have comments on option 1 and option 2 basically on the monitor occasions after trigger n. We will have posibble three cases of sensing occasions: 1. Occasions before slot n in this proposal; 2. Occasions after slot n derived from small P\_reserve and k; 3. Occasions discussed in proposal 5 within [n+TA, n+TB]. Cases derived from small P\_reserve and k = 1/2 also satisfy coditions set in the main bullet, while they are excluded by current options 1/2. Even in proposal 5, the intention is to design sensing for aperiodic transmission, which will neither hande these small P\_reserve and k = 1/2 occasions for periodic reservations in our views. Hence, we prefer add "before the resource (re)selection trigger" before "the UE monitors slots of a set of periodic sensing occasions" in the main bullet and delete the phrases in option 1 and 2, the intention is to clarify that we will discuss the sensing occasions/behaviours after resource (re)selection trigger slot n.FL: If I understand your concern correctly, I think the case you are referring to is when some of the periodic sensing occasions may fall in between slot n (resource (re)selection trigger timing) and slot n+TB (the timing just before resource (re)selection is performed) when TB is a positive value for proposal 5. I think for this case it is more related the discussion for proposal 5. Please refer to my reply on your comment in Section 3.5.3. |
| Nokia, NSB | Okay with the latest proposal (round VII). Just a minor remark on the 1st Note. This note has been agreed in the Proposal 2, which defines the term “periodic-based partial sensing”. There is no need to repeat this.FL: Good point, done. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with FL’s latest proposal (round VII) |
| Fujitsu | In the legacy Rel.16 NR-V2X sensing procedure, the processing time (i.e., $T\_{proc,0}$) is required before resource (re)seclection is triggered at slot n. Such processing time restriction should be reused in Rel.17 partial sensing. Hence, we propose to reword option 1 and option 2 of *k* in the updated proposal as follows: * Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion ~~within sensing window~~ for a reservation period before ~~the resource (re)selection trigger~~ $n-T\_{proc}^{sensing}$, where $T\_{proc}^{sensing}$ is the time required for processing sensing results

Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions ~~within sensing window~~ for a reservation period before ~~the resource (re)selection trigger~~ $n-T\_{proc}^{sensing}$, where $T\_{proc}^{sensing}$ is the time required for processing sensing resultsFL: Technically I agree with you. The intention of listing different options here (including $P\_{reserve}$) is to give a top-level only description. I worry if we start go into very detail and accurate description for some cases, then others will want to do the same for other options. I think all these details can happen in the next meeting once everyone has done some studies and considerations. I hope it is OK with you that we do the refining of the exact timing later once we agreed on the principle/direction. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the FL’s proposal.  |
| LGE | Considering FL’s suggestion to capture all possible options, we’re ok with Proposal 3 with the following comments.As the proposal is for defining when the periodic partial sensing occurs in terms of $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$, FFS in the fourth bullet is not clear.FL: As proposal 3 is tightly related to proposal 2 (which is already agree), there was a suggestion to match this sub-bullet with proposal 2. More specifically, some of the conditions can be related to slots in which UE’s own SL transmission occur, and the timings can be related to whether periodic-based partial sensing is performed all the time (including aperiodic transmissions) or only when UE has periodic transmissions to save more power. |
| Sony | We are fine with FL’s proposal with a minor typo in the third bullet that “relation” can be removed.FL: Thanks! |
| CATT,GOHIGH | Several places in the proposal needs further work to avoid confusion.If $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set, then it is not correct to say ‘$P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values’, the subject should be the configured set. Therefore, we suggest change * + Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination~~, whether to include all values~~)

To:* + Option 1: The configured set corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: The configured set corresponds to a subset of values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination~~, whether to include all values~~)

For k, in our view option1/2 are not necessary and should be removed to speed up the discussion.Also,the description is not correct . It should be * k is selected that (down select to one)
	+ Option 1
	+ Option 2
	+ …

FL: Thanks for the suggestions. Please check updated description below. As for the options for k, let’s not get into debate of what is necessary and what is not necessary. Since this is the first meeting, we need to do more studies and considerations. |
| Ericsson | We are OK with the current version (round VII) of the FL’s proposal. |
| Feature Lead 2 | **Proposal 3 (round VIII)**: In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs periodic-based partial sensing, at least when the reservation for another TB (when carried in SCI) is enabled for the resource pool and resource selection/reselection is triggered at slot n, the UE monitors slots of at least one ~~a set of~~ periodic sensing occasion~~s~~, where a periodic sensing occasion is a set of slots according to $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.* $P\_{reserve}$ is a periodicity value from the configured set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool (*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*). Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from the configured set *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from the configured set *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
		- FFS how to determine the subset (e.g., by (pre-)configuration, UE determination)
	+ Option 3: $P\_{reserve}$ is a common divisor among values in the configured set *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 4: FFS others
* k ~~equals to~~is selected according to (down select to one)
	+ Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion ~~within sensing window~~ for a given reservation periodicity before the resource (re)selection trigger
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions ~~within sensing window~~ for a given reservation periodicity before the resource (re)selection trigger
	+ Option 3: All possible sensing occasions after $n –T\_{0}$
	+ Option 4: Only one periodic sensing occasion for one reservation period. The k value is up to UE implementation. Max value for k is (pre-)configured.
	+ Option 5: k is (pre-)configured, including multiple values
	+ Option 6: (pre-)configuration of a bitmap, same as in LTE-V
	+ Option 7: FFS others
* FFS ~~relation~~ relationship between periodic sensing occasions and SL-DRX
* FFS condition(s) and timing(s) for which periodic-based partial sensing is performed by UE
* ~~Note: The terminology “periodic-based partial sensing” is based on the “partial sensing” used in LTE-V and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17~~
* Note: companies are encouraged to show performance data for the down selections
 |
| Samsung | We agree with FL’s latest proposal with some editorial change:* $P\_{reserve}$ is ~~a~~ one or more periodicity values from the configured set of possible resource reservation periods allowed in the resource pool (*sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*). Down select to one:
	+ Option 1: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to all values from *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList*
	+ Option 2: $ P\_{reserve}$ corresponds to a subset of values from the configured set *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList* (including the possibility of one value)

In addition, the size of sensing window in Rel-16 is independent of numerologies since power consumption was not critical issue. In NR partial sensing, we hope to clarify whether the number of sensing slots depends on numerology or not. Therefore we suggest to add the following sub-bullet:* FFS whether $P\_{reserve}$ and k depend on numerology

FL: Thanks for the editorial suggestions. Regarding the first one, for the equation/expression $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$, each time $P\_{reserve}$ is suppose to be just one value, but the number of values that can be applied in the equation/express could be up to all values from the configured set of possible reservation periods allowed in the resource pool. Regarding the second one (FFS bullet), since the unit for entries in *sl-ResourceReservePeriodList* is in millisecond and k is suppose to be an integer value, in my understanding they would not be dependent on numberology used for the sidelink BWP. It is only when they are converted in number of slots, it would then be dependent on the numerology. Please let me know if you have further concern with this. |
| LGE | We’re fine with FL proposal. |
| Fraunhofer | We are fine with the FL’s proposal (VIII).We had a question for clarification regarding “at least when the reservation for another TB (when carried in SCI) is enabled for the resource pool”. Any reason why the proposal is limited to only this scenario when the reservation for another TB is enabled?FL: If a resource pool is not (pre-)configured with the reservation for another TB enabled (meaning only aperiodic traffic is allowed in the resource pool), then there is no reason why to perform LTE-V like (periodic-based) partial sensing. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | Actually, the time reference “before the resource (re)selection trigger” for option1 and option 2 of K determination should be modified or deleted. Considering the proposal 3 and proposal 5 together, a sensing procedure for partial sensing should take into account both periodic sensing and continuous sensing on determination of the set S\_A. Hence the sensing does not need to be restricted before slot n, rather it should before the set of Y candidate resource slots so that the UE is able to report the set S\_A on time subject to processing time. In another word, the most recent 1 or 2 occasions before Y candidate resources could occur after slot n, shown as the figure below.With this regard, we suggest to have following changes on the option 1 and option 2:* + Option 1: Only the most recent sensing occasion ~~within sensing window~~ for a given reservation periodicity before ~~the resource (re)selection trigger~~ Y candidate slots subject to processing time restriction.
	+ Option 2: The two most recent sensing occasions ~~within sensing window~~ for a given reservation periodicity before ~~the resource (re)selection trigger~~ Y candidate slots subject to processing time restriction.

FL: For periodic transmission, I am not sure the contiguous partial sensing window (short-term sensing window) is between the resource (re)selection trigger slot n and n+T1. Perhaps we should first align on the timing in which L1 determines the set SA.  |
| Bosch | We are Fine with the feature lead proposal. However, we support Option 1 for P\_reserve and Option 5 for k. |

## Topic #4: Contiguous-based partial sensing (when $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$ is provided by higher layer) – re-evaluation and pre-emption checking for periodic transmission

**Background**: Continuation from Topic #3, partial sensing for a periodic transmission in a resource pool that allows aperiodic transmissions (which is all SL Tx pools), should also take into consideration of resource reservation by aperiodic transmissions. In various submitted contributions to this meeting, it is proposed that an additional sensing (short-term sensing/extended partial sensing) should be performed by the UE for periodic transmissions to take into account of aperiodic resource reservations.

Furthermore, it was agreed in the last meeting (RAN1#103-e) that “re-evaluation and pre-emption checking are supported by UEs that perform sensing”, it is also proposed in contributions that the additional sensing can also be used for the purpose of re-evaluation and pre-emption checking.

### Proposals before 1st check point (Jan 28)



Figure 3

**Proposal 4:** If UE is configured to perform partial sensing and provided with a resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) from higher layer, the UE additionally monitors slots

* Option 1: from slot ty0 -32, where ty0 is the first slot in the set of Y candidate slots, until $m –T\_{3}$ before the last transmission for the TB, except for slots in which its own SL and UL transmissions occur
* Option 2: from slot n-32 until $m –T\_{3}$ before the last transmission for the TB, except for slots in which its own SL and UL transmissions occur

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1, 2 or others** | **Comments** |
| OPPO |  | Firstly, it needs to clarify in the main bullet that this proposal targets for period traffic. For aperiodic traffic, UE cannot predict the arriving time of the packet so that it cannot sense the slots before slot n (packet arrival time). In our view, considering the aperiodic traffic in the RP, UE should do short term sensing (e.g., 32 slots) before slot n. furthermore, UE should do short term sensing (e.g., 32 slots) before each selected resource for re-evaluation/pre-emption check. For option 1 and 2, as we commented in proposal 2, UL transmission should be removed. Furthermore, for option 1, whether the UE should monitor from ty0 -32 depends on whether the time position of the corresponding slot is before or after slot n. For option 2, if the time gap between slot n and the first selected resource is > 32 slots, UE does not need to sense the slots between [n+1, ty0 -32]. |
| Fraunhofer |  | We prefer to retain the procedure used in Rel-16 for re-evaluation/pre-emption. Based on the proposal, exclusions based on UL transmissions can be removed. |
| Apple |  | We have the following comments about the proposal:1. We assume this is for resource re-evaluation and pre-emption checking. We may mention it in the proposal.
2. Why “resource reservation interval” is mentioned in the main bullet? Do you intend to mean the periodic resource reservation? Note that for aperiodic resource reservation, the resource reservation interval of 0 ms is also provided by higher layer.
3. In the figure, why a UE starts the contiguous-based sensing for resource re-evaluation before n (slot for resource selection) in the case of partial sensing? A UE is not supposed to perform sensing for resource re-evaluation until the resource is selected. Here, is the slot n the initial periodic data arrival time or the data arrival time after one period?
4. We should consider another option that the sensing for resource re-evaluation could start from m-32 until m-T3 to avoid collision with aperiodic reservation from another UE, where m is the slot of the selected resource.
 |
| Ericsson |  | We do not agree with this proposal. First, we should anchor the behaviour of the sensing mechanism for aperiodic transmissions (see 3.5) and once it has been agreed, we can revisit the issue defined in this proposal.  |
| InterDigital |  | For resource (re)selection, the UE should perform short-term sensing before slot n. For pre-emption and re-evaluation, the UE should perform short-term sensing from slot n+1 to m-T3. |
| CATT |  | The intended use case of the proposal should be further clarified. Also, we think It’s better to discuss this proposal after detail mechanism of sensing has been decided. |
| Qualcomm |  | We prefer to discuss this issue after Proposals 4 and 5 are settled. |
| Lenovo&MM | Option 1 | Option 1 is acceptable to us. |
| CMCC |  | The intention of this proposal is not quite clear to us:* Does this proposal intend to solve the case when a resource pool which is shared by both periodic and aperiodic transmissions, and to introduce an additional sensing window on top of the partial sensing slots to avoid the potential collision caused by the aperiodic transmissions?
* Or, it is intended to study the re-evaluation and pre-emption mechanism for the partial sensing?
 |
| NEC | Option 1 | If this proposal is intended for UE’s periodic traffic, $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}=0$ should be excluded.Partial sensing cares about candidate resources Y, so we think ty0 -32 could be the starting sensing time in this proposal. |
| Vivo | Option1 | 1. UL transmission should be removed.
2. Option2 may introduce unnecessary sensing occasion compared with option1 when n-32< ty0 -32
 |
| ETRI |  | We slightly prefer option 1. However as mentioned by several companies, this proposal should be limited for periodic traffic. |
| Sony |  | We need to make agreement for the other topics and then we can revisit this topic later. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 1 with update | * UL transmission is unnecessary.
* Option 2 includes unrequired slot for sensing for aperiodic reservation.
* Option 1 should be updated as ‘ty0 -31’ since SCI in ty0 -32 cannot reserve resource in ty0.
 |
| CAICT |  | It is better to separate the issues on sensing to avoid the conflict with aperiodic traffic and sensing for pre-emption and re-evaluation apart. 1. To avoid the conflict with aperiodic traffic, slots from ty0-32 to ty0 shall be sensing, except the slots for its own SL/UL transmissions.
2. For pre-emption and re-evaluation, slots from n-32 until $m –T\_{3}$ before the last transmission for the TB shall be sensing, except the slots for its own SL/UL transmissions.
 |
| Sharp |  | We agree with Ericsson and Qualcomm that the issue is discussed after proposal 5 concluded. |
| Xiaomi | Option1 | The sensing behaviour before n and after n should be distinguished. From our understanding, what we are discussing in the behaviour of resource selection, which happens at slot n. Sensing before slot n cannot be determined at slot n, as you cannot go back to sense; you can only determine whether sensing requirement is satisfied or not. But sensing after slot n can be determined at slot n. Therefore, sensing before slot n should be discussed together with sensing requirement issue; while sensing after slot n can be discussed in pre-emption and pre-evaluation issue. |
| ZTE | neither | Firstly, we share the same view with OPPO that if n is defined as packet arrival time, it is not capable for UE to predict the packet arrival timer. Then if n is defined as resource (re-)selection trigger time indicated by MAC, we think the example shown in proposal 5 is a more reasonable solution that short term sensing is triggered after n. So firstly, we should give a clear definition of n. |
| LGE | See comments | We need to separate two operations.* + - 1. short-term sensing (STS) for resource (re)selection

Before resource (re)selection, STS is performed over [n-TA, n–Tproc,0] to detect any possible periodic traffic, where TA = max interval between reserved resources that can be indicated by a SCI.We didn’t make any decision on the content of SCI, so it’s safer at this stage to say TA is based on the SCI content. If Rel.16 SCI rule is reused, TA is 31 slots.* + - 1. STS for resource re-evaluation/pre-emption checking

After resource (re)selection, STS is performed over [STSk, mk-T3] for k=0,…,K, where mk is the timing of the k-th reserved resource and K is the number of reserved resources, and STSk is determined as max(n+1, mk – TA).If the candidate slots are apart from each other more than 31 slots, sensing over a duration exceeding 31 slots is not performed for power saving. |
| Samsung |  | We also prefer to clarify the intention of this proposal. If that’s common understanding that resource reservation interval provided by higher layer corresponds to periodic traffic, then we’re fine. In addition, UL transmission should be removed similarly as in topic#3.We slightly prefer option 1. |
| Fujitsu |  | There should be two windows with different functions. One is short sensing window which is defined as $[t\_{y0}-32,t\_{y0}-T\_{proc,0}]$. It is used for sensing aperiodic reservations. The other is defined as re-evaluation/pre-emption sensing window, used for re-evaluation/pre-emption check. If pre-emption is disabled in current resource pool, the re-evaluation/pre-emption sensing window is from the slot $t\_{y0}-T\_{proc,0}$ until $m –T\_{3}-T\_{proc,0}$ before the first-in-time selected resource. If pre-emption check is enabled in current resource pool, the re-evaluation/pre-emption sensing window is from the slot $t\_{y0}-T\_{proc,0}$ until $m –T\_{3}-T\_{proc,0}$ before the last-in-time selected resource. |
| MediaTek |  | We do not support this. Sensing for re-evaluation/pre-emption can be performed separately from the sensing for aperiodic traffic detection in the pool. That is, sensing can be performed in [n-32,n] and [m-32, m-T3]. We should also add this as another option. |
| Intel |  | We prefer Option 2 but are open to discuss it later. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon  | Principles of option 1, but needs modifications  | First of all, it seems the current proposals ignore an essential issue when a UE will report SA to the high layer and how to use the sensing results in the short sensing window by the UE to detect aperiodic reservations from other UEs.Before ty0, a short sensing window is defined for the purpose to handle aperiodic reservations from other UEs, and therefore the sensing results obtained from the short sensing window and partial sensing slots can be used to determine and report the candidate resources set SA to the high layer. Considering the largest gap resource reservation by a single SCI and UE processing time, the time interval should be from ty0 – 31 to ty0 – tproc,0 –T1 to cover the most relevant 32 slots.After ty0, if the re-evaluation is triggered based on specific conditions for the selected resource by MAC, additional slots can be monitored for re-evaluating the resources. If the re-evaluation is not triggered, no more monitoring is needed after ty0.Thus the problem in the proposal is that there is no distinction between sensing before ty0 and re-evaluation after ty0. This structure needs to be reflected in the proposal before it is possible to consider the whole procedure.The SL and UL part should be deleted, as mentioned above for proposal 2. Similar with other proposals, the dependence on Prsvp\_TX needs to be removed, because the UE is performing this procedure to detect traffic from other UEs, without depending on the periodic or aperiodic nature of its own traffic. |
| Convida Wireless |  | The proposal 4 could be discussed later. |
| Bosch |  | In our understanding, if “resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$)” is stated in the main bullet, then we are targeting periodic reservation. In this case, option 2 works well. However, we are open for discussions. |
| Nokia, NSB |  | This proposal can be discussed later after we made some progress on the design. |

### Proposals before 2nd check point (Feb 2)

FL observations and comments based on inputs received in Sec. 3.4.1:

* No longer needed. This topic is merged into Topic #5.

## Topic #5: Contiguous-based partial sensing (when $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$ is NOT provided by higher layer) – re-evaluation and pre-emption checking for aperiodic transmission

**Background**: For UE with aperiodic traffic, data packets could arrive at any time for SL transmission without any prior knowledge. Therefore, it is not possible for a power constrained UE to predict and perform monitoring of slots before the resource selection trigger. From reviewing the contributions submitted to this meeting, in general, there are two partial sensing schemes, but both based on sensing in a contiguous manner.

### Proposals before 1st check point (Jan 28)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Option 1 | Option 2 |

**Proposal 5:**

* When resource selection is triggered in slot n and resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) is NOT provided from higher layer,
	+ Option 1: In slot n, UE performs random resource selection
		- For a UE that performs sensing and for the purpose of re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, the UE monitors slots starting from n+1 until $m –T\_{3}$ before the last transmission for the TB, except for slots in which its own SL and UL transmissions occur
	+ Option 2: In slot $n+T\_{A}-T\_{proc,1}^{SL}$, UE reports a set of candidate single-slot resources (*SA*) to the higher layer after performing resource exclusion based on sensing results obtained during $[n+1,n+T\_{A}-T\_{proc,1}^{SL}-T\_{proc,0}^{SL}]$ for resource selection within the resource selection window $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{2}]$.
		- Alt. 1: $T\_{A}=32$ is fixed
		- Alt. 2: $T\_{A}$ is dependent on the remaining PDB
		- Alt. 3: FFS $T\_{A}$
		- Alt. 4: $T\_{A}$ is based on received HARQ feedback
		- For re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, the UE monitors slots starting from n+1 until $m –T\_{3}$ before the last transmission for the TB, except for slots in which its own SL and UL transmissions occur
* Option 1 and Option 2 are both supported, or only one option is supported
	+ FFS how UE selects Option 1 or 2 when both are supported

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1, 2 or both** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Option 1 and option 2 | We are OK with these two options in principle. While we suggest to discuss the details later.  |
| Fraunhofer | Both | We are fine with the proposal, since both option 1 and 2 are possible actions that can be done by type D UEs.  |
| Apple | Both with modifications | In both options, the sensing for resource re-evaluation could be starting from m-32 to m-T3 just to avoid the collision with aperiodic resource reservation. Specifically, In Option 1, the sensing does not start at n+1, rather start from m-32. In Option 2, the sensing for resource selection is from n+1 to n+TA-Tproc,1 and the sensing for resource re-evaluation is from m-32 to m-T3. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 and Option 2 | We are OK to support both options and the conditions to trigger each of them when supported by the UE, but at this point further discussion on $T\_{A}$ is necessary. Thus, our proposal is to include Alt. 4 in in the Proposal 5. (Alt. 4: T\_A is based on received HARQ feedback) |
| InterDigital | Both | We are ok with the proposal and support both options. |
| CATT | Both (but details needs to further modified) | Details needs to be further discussed. Particularly, for option 1 we think it should be FFS on whether to support re-evaluation and pre-emption for UEs perform sensing but operate random selection. This incurs more power consumption with no performance gain. |
| Qualcomm | Both options | We observed that both schemes provide significant performance for the power saving UE over random selection only. We also note that Option 1 could be viewed as a special case of Option 2 where TA = 0.We share the view that details should be discussed later and suggest a more general proposal to agree on the principle without yet defining the precise timeline. That discussion would also include what can be left up to UE implementation.  |
| Lenovo&MM | Both options | Both options should be considered at this stage. |
| CMCC | Both | We are ok with both options.  |
| NEC | Both are ok | Firstly, in the main bullet, for aperiodic traffic, $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$ may be provided by higher layer with 0ms. Secondly, in the first option, the monitoring window can be FFS between [n-1, m-T3] or [m-32, m-T3], because if the first selected resources m is in later of the selection window, it’s possible that m-32 > n – 1, then UE can start to monitor from m-32 to save power. |
| Vivo | Both (but needs more discussion and clarifications on details) | Just to make sure if we understand correctly. Option1 is to perform resource selection first and then re-evaluate the resources being selected. Option 2 is to do sensing first, use the sensing results for resource selection, and possibly also re-evaluate the selected resources. If so, then we are fine with the principle of two options. But more clarifications on the start/end of sensing and details such as the value of $T\_{A}$ are needed.‘UL’ transmission should be removed. |
| ETRI | OK with Both | At this point, we are OK with both. Details should be discussed further. |
| Panasonic | Both |  |
| Sony | Both options | We are OK with both options. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 1 as random selectionOption 2 as partial sensing | We are OK with directions of both options. Two comments below.* Option 1 does random selection first and then re-evaluation/pre-emption check will be performed, right? If correct, this option 1 is one of random selection mechanism, not partial sensing in my understanding based on the agreements at the last meeting. Clarification is preferred.
* For option 2, Alt 3 is preferred. In this meeting, details can be FFS.
 |
| CAICT | Option1 and Option2 | Both options can be supported and FFS the details of the two options. |
| Sharp | Both | Basically, we share similar view as vivo. Besides, the last transmission seems not clear enough to us, since MAC layer provides the selected SL grant and the UE is not able to know which resource within the grant would be the last transmission when doing the re-evaluation/pre-emption check. Thus, we propose to define m as the last resource within a period. |
| Xiaomi |  | From our point of view, if T2 is large enough, e.g. 100ms, UE can change the start of selection window to T+32. Any collision from aperiodic traffic can be thus avoided. |
| ZTE | Option 2 | We agree with option 2 but we think re-evalution/pre-emption is an independent issue which is irrespective to short term sensing discussion. |
| LGE | Option 2 with modification | Option 2 is generally ok, but the following modifications are necessary.* TA = max interval between resources that can be indicated by a SCI.

We didn’t make any decision on the content of SCI, so it’s safer at this stage to say TA is based on the SCI content. If Rel.16 SCI rule is reused, TA is 31 slots.* TA < T2 < remaining PDB
	+ Otherwise resource re-evaluation and pre-emption checking are not performed.
* Short-term sensing is performed over [mk-TA, mk-T3] for k=0,…,K, where mk is the timing of the k-th reserved resource and K is the number of reserved resources.

If the selected resources are apart from each other more than TA, sensing over a duration exceeding TA is not performed for power saving. |
| Samsung | Both | We are OK with both options at high level and the details can be discussed later. We agree with QC’s comment that use a more general proposal to agree on principle without touch exact timing. |
| Fujitsu | Option 2 | For re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, as we commented in proposal 4, the range of sensing slots depends on whether pre-emption is enabled or not in current resource pool. |
| MediaTek | Option 2 | We support Option2. |
| Intel | Please see comments | In our understanding, RAN1 needs to decide on start time for partial sensing window (e.g. time instance ‘n+1’) and end time of partial sensing window that may be dependent on ether time instance of last retransmission or HARQ ACK feedback. Other details are already covered by Rel.16 procedure for resource selection. Separately RAN1 can discuss whether min bound on partial sensing window size needs to be introduced or can be left up to UE implementation.In addition, in resource pools with disabled semi-persistent reservations UE may still have periodic traffic with predictable arrival time and thus resource reselection trigger time instances. In such cases UE can start partial sensing at time instance [n-32] i.e. before resource reselection trigger. **We ask feature lead to add this option for RAN1 discussion/consideration**. |
| Huawei,HiSilicon | Both options could work with modifications. Only one of them would be chosen. | For the main bullet, similar as our comments above in proposal 2, a UE cannot predict the next transmission is periodic or aperiodic before a TB reception in PHY. So the provision of resource reservation interval which is transported along with the TB cannot be a judgement for traffic type, periodic or aperiodic.The proposal should have an applicability to partial sensing being configured.For option 1 and option 2, it should be clarified what the scenario is under discussing. The whole issue of 3.5 is under partial sensing agenda which means all the options should take the partial sensing procedure into account. Specifically, for option 1, we think the random selection is different from what is defined in Rel-14. Considering the partial sensing procedure which Y candidate slots are selected in PHY as SA and reported to MAC, MAC would only randomly select a set of resources among the reported SA and instruct the PHY to re-evaluate the set of resources. So the starting point of sensing window would not relate to slot n+1 only but involve ty0, the first candidate resource. That is the window should start from max (ty0-31, n+1) to $m –T\_{3}$.Similarly, for option 2, the windows for resource selection and re-evaluation should be designed separately. A UE in PHY needs to report candidate resource set to MAC before the first slot among Y candidate slots. Therefore, the window for resource selection should start from max (ty0-31, n+1) until ty0 – tproc,0 –T1.Option 2 has a problem that sensing from before the defined interval appears not to be considered. On the other hand, as we explained in other questions, it is no need to consider UL transmission to determine candidate slots, and SL transmission impact can be handled by UE implementation. Therefore, we suggest two options are changed as following.* + Option 1: In slot n, UE performs random resource selection
		- For a UE that performs sensing and for the purpose of re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, the UE monitors slots starting from ~~n+1~~ max (ty0-31, n+1) until $m –T\_{3}$ before the last transmission for the TB, except for slots in which its own SL and UL transmissions occur
	+ Option 2: In slot $n+T\_{A}-T\_{proc,1}^{SL}$, $t\_{y0}-T\_{1} $UE reports a set of candidate single-slot resources (*SA*) to the higher layer after performing resource exclusion also taking into account ~~based on~~ sensing results obtained during $[n+1,n+T\_{A}-T\_{proc,1}^{SL}-T\_{proc,0}^{SL}]$ $[max⁡(t\_{y0}-31,n+1),t\_{y0}-T\_{proc,0}^{SL}-T\_{1}]$ for resource selection within the resource selection window $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{2}] [n+T\_{1},n+T\_{2}]$.
		- For re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, the UE monitors slots starting from ~~n+1~~ $t\_{y0}$ until $m –T\_{3}$ before the last transmission for the TB, except for slots in which its own SL and UL transmissions occur
 |
| Convida Wireless | Both options 1 and 2 | We are fine with both option 1 and option 2. |
| Bosch | Both, Option 1 & 2 | We are also fine with both options. |
| Nokia, NSB | Both options | Both option 1 and option 2 shall be supported in general for partial sensing. We shall agree the general principle and then work out the details, especially for option 2.  |

**Proposal 5’:**

* When resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n and resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) is NOT provided from higher layer,
	+ Option 1: In slot n, UE performs random resource selection
		- For re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, the UE monitors slots after the random resource selection
			* FFS details of the monitoring, including timing, duration and exceptions
	+ Option 2: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+1,n+T\_{A}]$ and performs resource selection based on sensing results.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$ and remaining details
		- For re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, the UE monitors additional slots.
			* FFS details of the additional monitoring, including timing, duration and exceptions
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ FFS which one or multiple option(s) to be supported

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We support FL’s proposal. |
| NEC | We support the proposal 5’ with following suggestions.* Resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) = 0 ms is preclude in 3.2, 3.3 and 3.5, we think $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$ = 0 ms is the aperiodic case and should added in the main bullet of this proposal.

In Option 1: For re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, the UE monitors slots after the resource selection trigger. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal with update in main bullet as* When resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n and resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) is NOT provided from higher layer or resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) = 0 is provided from higher layer,
 |
| LGE | We support FL’s proposal and both options.Option 1 can be used as a random resource selection if e.g. remaining PDB is not sufficient for constructing a sensing window [n+1, n+TA] followed by a resource selection window.If the remaining PDB is sufficient, option 2 can be used rather than random resource selection as it guarantees the sensing duration [n+1, n+TA] before resource (re)selection. |
| Apple | We think this proposal discusses two different parts: resource selection and resource re-evaluation/pre-emption checking. Option 1 and Option 2 are differentiated at resource selection, while the sub-bullets of Option 1 and Option 2 are targeted for resource re-evaluation/pre-emption checking. We suggest removing the resource re-evaluation/pre-emption checking part in this proposal (i.e., sub-bullet of Option 1 and the second sub-bullet of Option 2) to make the proposal focusing on resource selection only. A separate proposal could be made on resource re-evaluation/pre-emption checking.  |
| ETRI | We support FL’s proposal with including ‘0 ms’ case. |
| Qualcomm | We support the general direction and would like to propose the following change to Option 2 so that it remains general at this point, similar to Option 1:* + Option 2: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+1T\_{B},n+T\_{A}]$ and performs resource selection based on sensing results.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ and remaining details
		- For re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, the UE monitors additional slots.
			* FFS details of the additional monitoring, including timing, duration and exceptions

For re-evaluation and pre-emption checking in Option 1, we agree with the feature-lead’s wording of sensing after resource selection.We’d like to add a sentence to clarify that these options are in addition to random selection without any sensing or re-evaluation/pre-emption checking:* + FFS which one or multiple option(s) to be supported
	+ These options are in addition to random selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking.
 |
| Fujitsu | We are generally fine with the proposal but with the following concerns:For option 2, if both periodic and aperiodic traffics are ongoing in the resource pool, the UE also needs to monitor the slots in the sensing occasions corresponding to the Y candidate slots. Otherwise, collision(s) between the UE’s aperiodic transmission and other UE’s periodic transmission may happen.  |
| Xiaomi | We support the changes proposed by QC. |
| Panasonic | We support FL’s proposals.  |
| CMCC | Support the FL’s proposal. |
| Samsung | We agree with the proposal in principle. In addition, we have similar view with QC on modifying n+1 to n+TB. |
| Ericsson | We are supportive of the current proposal from the FL and our position is to support both Option 1 and Option 2 and study the conditions that trigger them. |
| Sony | We support FL’s proposal. |
| ZTE | Agree FL’s proposal with another option added.We think the re-evaluation and pre-emption checking is independent of the short term based monitoring. After resource (re)selection based on short term sensing, whether perform re-evaluation and pre-emption checking can be based on (pre-)configuration or up to UE implementation. So we suggest to add option 3 as following: * + Option 3: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+1,n+T\_{A}]$ and performs resource selection based on sensing results.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$ and remaining details
 |
| Vivo | support the changes proposed by Qualcomm |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | First of all, the proposal should have an applicability to partial sensing being configured, and then a UE can perform this RA for resource selection based on either options. Both options can work, However, specification does not necessarily need to define two options in parallel.On the other hand, the proposal should separate resource selection and revaluation/pre-emption checking. We have the sympathy with others that RAN1 could focus the resource selection design, because it is still under FFS on conditions(s) in which re-evaluation and pre-emption checking can be performed, i.e. a UE with reduced-sensing RA may not always perform re-evaluation/pre-emption checking. The specification should aim to have a unified solution for a UE performing partial sensing RA regardless of its own traffic is aperiodic or periodic, because the sensing procedure is intended to detect other UE’s resource reservation, which can be aperiodic and/or periodic. The short sensing window, which was introduced to cover aperiodic reservation made by other UEs, should be same for both aperiodic and periodic service. For option 2, the starting point of the short sensing window may be not always slot n+1. Considering partial sensing, a UE should report the candidate resource set to MAC layer before $t\_{y0}$, and first resource for transmission might be $t\_{y0}$ . To cover the most relevant 31 slots just before $t\_{y0}$, the starting point could be $t\_{y0}-31$. In addition, the ending point may be not only associated with slot n, but also with $t\_{y0}$. Therefore, we suggest the proposal is changed as following.**Proposal 5’:** * If UE is configured to perform partial sensing, and when resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n ~~and resource reservation interval (~~$P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$~~) is NOT provided from higher layer~~,
	+ Option 1: In slot n, UE performs random resource selection in physical layer
		- ~~For re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, the UE monitors slots after the random resource selection~~
			* FFS details of the monitoring (if any), including timing, duration and exceptions
	+ Option 2: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[max⁡(n+1, t\_{y0}-31),n+T\_{A}]$ and performs resource selection based on sensing results, $t\_{y0}$ is the first slot in the set of Y candidate slots.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$ and remaining details
		- ~~For re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, the UE monitors additional slots.~~
			* ~~FFS details of the additional monitoring, including timing, duration and exceptions~~
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ FFS which one or multiple option(s) to be supported
 |
| Fraunhofer | We support the FL’s proposal. |
| Interdigital | We are ok with the proposal and support both options. |
| CATT | For option 1, we are not sure if ‘re-evaluation and pre-emption checking’ is needed here. From our evaluation, it does not have much gain and is negative for power consumption. We would prefer to remove the corresponding words:Option 1: In slot n, UE performs random resource selection FFS details of monitoring |
| Convida Wireless | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We support Option 1 and Option 2 in principle. Suggest removing the “re-evaluation and pre-emption checking” part for both Option 1 and Option 2. We shall focus on the resource selection in this proposal. The “re-evaluation and pre-emption check” can be another proposal for further discussion.On QC’s proposal to modify the sensing window from $[n+1, n+T\_{A}]$ to $[n+T\_{B}, n+T\_{A}]$ for Option 2, not sure whether this is necessary. If power saving is a concern to limit the sensing window, UE can choose Option 1 with random selection. |

### Proposals before 2nd check point (Feb 2)

FL observations and comments based on inputs received in Sec. 3.5.1:

* Please check the background description in at the beginning of Section 3.5 and also the accompany email sent for discussion before the 2nd check point.
* In short, this proposal targets a scenario where resource (re)selection is triggered by higher layer in slot n for aperiodic transmission in a resource pool that allows partial sensing and/or random resource selection, where
	+ resource pool is (pre-)configured for either periodic + aperiodic, or aperiodic transmissions only,
	+ resource pool is (pre-)configured with partial sensing and/or random resource selection

The UE performs contiguous partial sensing and/or random resource selection for resource (re)selection.

* This version is based on the latest text we discussed during Friday’s GTW session (Jan 29), and a new term (contiguous partial sensing) is added to aid with the discussion.
* During the last Friday GTW session,
	+ A comment was made on not needing any other partial sensing scheme beside a LTE-V like partial sensing for aperiodic traffic. Do you think the above is a valid operating scenario that requires a contiguous partial sensing solution for aperiodic transmission?
	+ There was a hint of suggestion or wish to combine the discussion between contiguous partial sensing for periodic transmission and contiguous sensing for aperiodic transmission. Do you agree to combine the discussion together or to discuss separately?

**Proposal 5’’:**

* In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing and/or random resource selection, if UE is configured to perform contiguous partial sensing (i.e., at least for the case of resource reservation interval is NOT provided or $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}=0$) by higher layer, when resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on sensing results.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero) and remaining details
			* When both $T\_{A}$ and $T\_{B}$ are equal to zero, random resource selection is performed
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Firstly, We would like to add a sub-bullet as follows since the re-evaluation and pre-emption checking should be combined with the contiguous partial sensing. Especially for the case of $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ equal to 0, in that case, random resource selection is performed and re-evaluation and pre-emption checking is the only way to avoid collision. * + FFS re-evaluation and pre-emption checking in addition to the contiguous partial sensing

Secondly, we would like to clarify that the resource (re)selection is based on all available sensing results. * + Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results.

The sensing results can include the contiguous partial sensing and periodic-based partial sensing. If the RP allows periodic and aperiodic traffic, the UE can do periodic-based partial sensing for periodic transmission all the time. If an aperiodic traffic arrives at slot n, the UE can additionally do contiguous partial sensing. Then the resource selection can be based on all the available sensing results.FL: For the first comment, in the last meeting we already have an FFS item “FFS details and any conditions(s) in which re-evaluation and pre-emption can be performed”. I think the proposed FFS here is already covered.For the second comment, it is a fair comment and good suggestion. As it is also agreed by others, it will be adopted in the updated version. |
| LGE | We agree with OPPO’s second point. As we commented on Friday GTW, UE can have both periodic traffic and aperiodic traffic depending on the services of UE interest. In this case, UE can perform in parallel the periodic-based partial sensing for periodic traffic, and the contiguous partial sensing for aperiodic traffic. At slot n, when UE is triggered to transmit an aperiodic traffic, UE can perform contiguous partial sensing as in Proposal 5”. But at the time of resource (re)selection, there could be available periodic-based partial sensing results due to other periodic transmission. Then, it’s reasonable to use those periodic-based partial sensing results if available, in addition to the contiguous partial sensing results. In this way, UE can avoid any collision with periodic traffic allowed in resource pool, for its aperiodic transmission. Therefore, we propose the following modification for option 1.* + Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ ($T\_{A}\geq 0$, $T\_{B}\geq 0$) and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results at the time of resource (re)selection.
		- When both $T\_{A}$ and $T\_{B}$ are equal to zero,
			* if there is no available sensing results at all, random resource selection is performed
			* otherwise, resource (re)selection is performed based on the available sensing results
		- FFS whether all or part of $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ is used for contiguous partial sensing
		- FFS remaining details

In this sense, as long as UE is capable of sensing, even if $T\_{A}$ and $T\_{B}$ are equal to zero, resource (re)selection can be based on periodic-based sensing results if available. If there are no sensing results available at all for UE, UE can do random selection.Clarification added for TA and TB, which can be positive or zero.FL: From reading comments so far from other company, it seems there is a preference to extend this proposal to cover the case when UE is performing periodic transmission, which I think is fair to consider these scenarios jointly. As such, TA and TB values could be negative. Based on this and further thinking if periodic-based partial sensing results could also be used in resource (re)selection for aperiodic transmissions, then could we still call it as “random resource selection” from L1 point of view? Or is it just that there would be no resource excluded in L1 and a set of SA is still reported to higher layer. In this case, I don’t want to mix random resource selection procedure with UE performing contiguous partial sensing, if this is OK with you. |
| NTT DOCOMO | * Regarding OPPO’s second point and relative LGE’s comment,

we think their point is that:some other sensing results may be available, may not. If available, the results should also be used. The FL’s proposal is made under the assumption that periodic-based partial sensing for aperiodic transmission is impossible since UE cannot know when the traffic comes. Under the assumption, the UE may do periodic-based partial sensing for other periodic traffic, or may do contiguous partial sensing for other aperiodic traffic in the past. In this case, the sensing results (if any) can be used as well.If the above is correct understanding, we are OK with the direction but mandatory/optional should be mentioned clearly. In my understanding, the sensing results of $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ is mandatorily used but other sensing results are up to UE since the monitoring is up to UE. For example, * + Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on at least the sensing results.
		- If other sensing results are available, UE can use the results for resource (re)selection.

FL: Logically I agree with you. But since there are some suggestions to leave this mandatory or optional part is up to UE implementation. Maybe at this stage we can leave it as “all available sensing results” and discuss further details in the next meeting.* Regarding OPPO’s first comment, we agree with it. At least FFS for re-evaluation/pre-emption should be added; otherwise, TA=TB=0 is completely same as just random selection, which has already been agreed.

FL: Please refer to my comment to OPPO.* For limitation of aperiodic traffic to be transmitted from the UE, we think it is reasonable one. For periodic traffic, UE should monitor slots before slot n even for contiguous partial sensing, while for aperiodic traffic, n=0 or after is possible only for contiguous partial sensing.

If still joint discussion is preferable, minus values of TA, TB can be used: for example, (update from FL’s proposal for easy discussions,)* In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing and/or random resource selection, ~~if UE is configured to perform contiguous partial sensing (i.e., at least for the case of resource reservation interval is NOT provided or~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}=0$~~) by higher layer,~~ when resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on sensing results.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero or minus) and remaining details
			* When both $T\_{A}$ and $T\_{B}$ are equal to zero, random resource selection is performed
			* $T\_{A}<0$ is applicable only when resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n and resource reservation interval ($P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$) is provided from higher layer and $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}\ne 0$

FL: On the last sub-bullet, technically again I agree with you. But at this stage, I see some are not ready to mandate certain behaviour only for periodic transmissions and other behaviour for aperiodic transmission. Let’s further discuss this in the future. As a FFS point has been added. |
| Apple | Overall, we are fine with this proposal, i.e., contiguous partial sensing is needed to avoid the collision from aperiodic resource reservation. We have two clarification questions related to “contiguous partial sensing”: Can a UE be configured with “contiguous partial sensing” and “periodic-based partial sensing” simultaneously? We know a resource pool is configured to support “partial sensing”, “full sensing” and “random selection”. How could UE’s configuration of “contiguous partial sensing” or “periodic-based partial sensing” be aligned with resource pool’s configuration?FL: For Q1, right now it is not clear if we will use both terms (“contiguous partial sensing” and “periodic-based partial sensing”) in the spec, or just simply saying “UE is configfured partial sensing” in which both functionalities will be performed by the UE depending on the condition(s) and traffic type.For Q2, there are two separate configurations in my view, one is for the resource pool which is network configured or pre-configured and the other one is configured by higher layer. In LTE-V spec, “If partial sensing is configured by higher layers then the following steps are used:” |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal in general with some concerns regarding the first sub-bullet.* For the first sub-bullet, we share the similar view as OPPO and LGE. The current wording sounds like that resource (re-)selection for aperiodic transmission is purely based on sensing results of the monitored slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$. However, if both periodic and aperiodic traffics are configured to be transmitted in the same resource pool, the sensing results of periodic occasions should also be taken into account. We are fine with the wording suggested by OPPO.

FL: Done |
| CAICT | We are OK with the proposal in general. In our understanding, if this type of continuous partial sensing is co-existing with LTE-V based partial sensing where slots before “n” might have been sensed, resource selection can be carried out based on the available sensing results in the sensing window *[t-T0, t]* where *t* stands for the starting time of the resource selection window. There is no necessity to include all the available sensing results and we think the sensing window definition in the full sensing scenario can be re-used here. FL: Surely, if all available sensing results includes results from periodic-based partial sensing, which I believe that is the intention from many companies, then the sensing window would be the same as full sensing scenario. |
| Vivo | We share a similar view as DOCOMO that if the resource (re)selection is triggered for aperiodic TX at slot n, the sensing results of contiguous partial sensing within $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ should be mandatorily used. If there are other available sensing results for other periodic/aperiodic TX purposes, whether to use these sensing results can be up to UE implementation. We suggest some refinements on top of DOCOMO’s wording.* In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing and/or random resource selection, if UE is configured to perform contiguous partial sensing (i.e., at least for the case of resource reservation interval is NOT provided or $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}=0$) by higher layer, when resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on at least the sensing results within $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$.
		- If other sensing results are available, it is up to UE implementation to ~~UE can~~ use the results for resource (re)selection.

FL: Please refer to my comments to DCM.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with this proposal except the last bullet, we suggest to change to:* + FFS for random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking

FL: The original bullet was proposed by Qualcomm to ensure that we are not replacing one of the agreements from the last meeting. But a similar note from what is suggested here is now added as “FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1” as it is just pure random selection. |
| Fraunhofer | We are supportive of the proposal in general, and agree with LG and and Docomo that the UE should be able to use any sensing information available for resource (re-)selection.FL: added. |
| Nokia, NSB | To the FL’s question on the need of continuous partial sensing for aperiodic traffic, we think that there is need. A UE may have periodic/aperiodic traffic. The aperodic traffic may use the perodic sensing and the continuous partisl sensing.We are generally fine with this proposal with some minor suggestions. I) support companies’ proposal to add “all available” before the “sensing results in Option 1. Ii) When $T\_{A}=0$ and $T\_{B}=0$, random selection is performed when there is no other resource sensing results. FL: Done. On the last point ii), it is not yet fully clear to me that “random resource selection” would be performed. It may be the case that L1 still needs to go through the resource exclusion procedure (even there are no sensing results available) and report a full set of SA to higher layer.  |
| Qualcomm | We propose the same change about sensing and configuration and we agree with OPPO’s addition on using all available sensing information. Finally, T\_A and T\_B could be negative and we’d like to clarify this. This is for the case when a packet arrives and the UE has to base its transmission on prior sensing results only, e.g. due to PDB constraints or DRX considerations.In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing and/or random resource selection, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs contiguous partial sensing (i.e., at least for the case of resource reservation interval is NOT provided or $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}=0$) by higher layer, when resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:* Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results.
	+ FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero or negative values) and remaining details
		- ~~When both~~ $T\_{A}$ ~~and~~ $T\_{B}$ ~~are equal to zero, random resource selection is performed~~

We also think it’s important to capture that re-evaluation checking is still FFS and hasn’t been precluded:* FFS Applicability and details of re-evaluation checking.

FL: All implemented. For the last FFS addition, same as replied to OPPO that we already have a FFS in the last meeting to work out details for re-evaluation and pre-emption checking. |
| NEC | 1. We are OK to add the re-evaluation checking for FFS.2. For the ompany sensing results for periodic transmission, we’re fine to add FFS point like “FFS usage of other avaible sensing results besides results from [n+TA, n+TB]”, in other words, details can be FFS next meeting.FL: On the second comment, since the usage of additional sensing would be always beneficial for power saving UE with limited sensing results from contiguous partial sensing, I think we should make use of them if they are ready available without any additional effort. Of course, in a resource pool that only allows aperiodic transmissions, there would not be any additional sensing results available from periodic-based partial sensing. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | First of all, we suggest to focus on the partial sensing functionality in this proposal. As commented in the last GTW, whether/how to perform random selection when partial sensing is configured should have more investigations, and the necessity or conditions of switching between partial sensing and random selection is not clear and needs further discussion. So the sub-bullet “*When both T\_A and T\_B are equal to zero, random resource selection is performed*” in option 1 should be removed.FL: Agree, done. And since this proposal is now more focus on contiguous partial sensing, I have also removed the case when the resource pool is configured with ransom resource selection.For the main bullet, same as our comments for proposal 2’’ and proposal 3’’, the condition assuming different $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}$ values in slot n can trigger how/when to perform partial sensing is not correct. It is not reasonable to clarify the resource allocations schemes by the traffic type, a unified design, which no matter which traffic type it is, the UE could select the resources based on the sensing results in slots $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ and the short sensing window should be adopted. At this point, we share the similar views with OPPO, LGE and others, all ompanye sensing results can be used for resource selection regardless of its traffic type and the content in the parentheses needs to be removed.FL: Done. Since there is no common understanding among some companies on how LTE-V partial sensing is triggered and performed, let’s leave this for further study.As DCM explained, the sensing results from the sensing window is mandatory to be used, however, it is not necessary. Sensing results from both the short sensing window and periodic sensing oaccassions can be used for resource selection, how to use them can be up to UE implementation, not need to specify which part is mandatory. Since a uniform design and common sensing procedure for both aperiodic and periodic traffic, it is not necessary either to define the window starting from slot n, as others comments, T\_A and T\_B may be negative values. For simplicity, window size could define as $[T\_{A},T\_{B}]$, how to define T\_A and T\_B including reference starting point can be discussed in the next meeting.FL: Technicall agree, but I think at this stage we can just say “…resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results …”, and leave room for company to think more about this point until the next week since TA and TB can be negative as well.We suggest the proposal to have following changes:* In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing ~~and/or random resource selection~~, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs ~~contiguous~~ partial sensing ~~(i.e., at least for the case of resource reservation interval is NOT provided or~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}=0$~~) by higher layer~~, when resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on sensing results from $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if any.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ ~~(including the possibility of equal to zero)~~ and remaining details
			* ~~When both~~ $T\_{A}$ ~~and~~ $T\_{B}$ ~~are equal to zero, random resource selection is performed~~
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ ~~This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking~~

FL: This bullet was added from Qualcomm to ensure that we are not replacing one of the agreements from the last meeting. |
| Sharp | To answer FL’s questions above, we think contiguous partial sensing solution for aperiodic transmission is needed and we support to consider contiguous partial sensing for aperiodic and periodic transmission together, as HW commented during GTW and the above.We are fine with OPPO’s second point that sensing results on periodic reservation are also considered. On top of that, we share similar view as Docomo and Qualcomm that $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ can be negative and should be clarified. Regarding the re-evaluation and pre-emption check, since in our understanding, , $T\_{B}$ is related to both, we propose to add both re-evaluation and pre-emption check as OPPO commented for the first point.FL: Done. Please also refer to my comment to OPPO’s point. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with some ompany’s comments for adding “all available” in the first sub-bullet. It canbe modified as the following:* + Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero) and remaining details
			* When both $T\_{A}$ and $T\_{B}$ are equal to zero and there are no other resource sensing results, random resource selection is performed

FL: On the first edit, done. On the second edit, please refer to my comment to Nokia. |
| Xiaomi | We agree with other companies that 1) all the sensing results should be counted when resource selection, 2) the value of TA, TB can be negative; 3) do not need to discuss random resource selection in this proposal.FL: All done |
| Panasonic | We support FL’s proposal in general with some modifications to capture “all available” and “zero or negative values for TA/TB”FL: Done. |
| Feature Lead | Taking into account of all the comments so far (above), I have updated the proposal to the following. Please feel free to continue commenting on this updated one.**Proposal 5’’’:** * In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing ~~and/or random resource selection~~, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs contiguous partial sensing ~~(i.e., at least for the case of resource reservation interval is NOT provided or~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}=0$~~)~~ by higher layer~~, when~~ and resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results at the time of resource (re)selection.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero, positive or negative) and remaining details
			* ~~When both~~ $T\_{A}$ ~~and~~ $T\_{B}$ ~~are equal to zero, random resource selection is performed~~
	+ FFS condition(s) in which contiguous partial sensing is performed by UE
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
		- FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1
 |
| Ericsson | We think the following modifications are needed for the proposal:* We agree with OPPO that re-evaluation and pre-emption should be enabled for the case of partial sensing with sensing window=0, i.e., TA= TB=0. The proposed wording by OPPO is OK for us. But clearly this can only be the case if TA=TB=0 for the initial selection (otherwise, this is just random selection). Different mechanisms can be used for different transmissions, e.g., different TA and TB. We need to discuss how to change for the different transmissions and the associated conditions. Therefore, we would like to add one bullet at the end:
	+ FFS conditions to change between the different options when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change.
* We propose to delete the FFS for the relationship with DRX and potentially have a dedicated discussion regarding the impact of DRX and RA in RAN1 (this is similar to our comment on the last bullet for P2’’, see above. The issue of the relationship between SL DRX and partial sensing must be treated separately).

FL: For the first comment, done. For the second comment, as also replied for P2’’’, some companies see there is a relationship / interaction between partial sensing and SL-DRX. To make it clearer, we may not see there must be a interaction with SL-DRX, so this sub-bullet is updted. |
| Sony | We agree that a UE can use all available sensing results for a resource selection for aperiodic traffic. We are fine with docomo and vivo’s updates. |
| Lenovo&MM | To consider the background description on Topic#5, ‘Therefore, it is not possible for a power constrained UE to predict and perform monitoring of slots before the resource selection trigger’. We suggest only discussing that both TA and TB are positive or zero.FL: The discussion has evolved a bit since I wrote the background email. Since the contiguous partial sensing can / should also be used in conjunction with periodic-based partial sensing for periodic transmissions, it is good that we have a unified design and combined discussion. So that’s why TA and TB can now be negative values. I hope this is fine with you. |
| Samsung | * We think current P5’’’ cannot reflect the possibility of with sensing window=0, UE performs random selection, thus we prefer not to remove the sub-bullet. In addition, we hope to support re-evaluation and pre-emption check is this case. We can accept it either as a separate option in parallel with option 1, or as a sub-bullet of option 1.
* We prefer to also study the possibility of LTE-like partial sensing window thus suggest to also study the following option:
	+ Option 2: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ if $t\_{y}^{SL}$ is included in the set of Y candidate slots.
		- FFS : y, k, $P\_{reserve}$
* We are fine of using all available sensing results, but specify it may introduce very complicated details. In LTE partial sensing the case is also possible but no specification work was adopted. Therefore, we prefer that whether or not to additionally use other available sensing result is up to UE implementation.

FL: For the first comment, please refer to my comment reply to Nokia/NSB and OPPO above. For the second comment, this has been addressed by adding “… performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results …”. I think this is the best wording now, as it is not yet clear that LTE-like partial sensing should always perform by UE even for aperiodic transmission. For the third comment, regarding UE implementation, I think if UE has other additional sensing results then it should use it because it can only be beneficial. But it is not mandated that it must have other additional sensing results. If the group strongly feels that this should be up to UE implementation, I am fine with it. |
| Intel Corporation | On P5’’’ we have following comments:1. We suggest to remove “at least” and “contiguous” and “by higher layer”
	1. Words look redundant
2. We suggest to start the main bullet from “For aperiodic traffic/transmissions…”
	1. Given that Topic# 5 touches only aperiodic transmissions
3. We suggest to remove FFS w/ DRX since it is a separate topic for discussion and can be concluded after partial sensing operation.

FL: Regarding the first comment, the “at least” means a resource pool can also be configured with e.g. full sensing, random resource selection. For “contiguous’, a note is added to clarify the meaning and intention. For “by higher layer”, yes this is now removed in the next version. For the second comment, the discussion has evolved a bit. Now it also cover the case of performing this contiguous partial sensing for periodic transmission. And hence TA and TB values could be negative values. For the third comment, some prefer to keep it and others prefer to remove. I think until the details of SL-DRX are clear in RAN2, keeping the FFS is OK. |
| Vivo | We agree with FL’s Proposal 5’’’. We would like to keep the last bullet. The interaction betweenDRX/other details mentioned by Qualcomm(Tx/Rx/Interferer, power saving/non-power saving) and sensing should be clarified.  |
| LGE | Our updated response [LGE2] in v219 was not answered and considered for Propoal 5’’’. I copy them below for your convenience. In my understanding, this proposal was targeted for aperiodic transmission? Otherwise, I worry the discussion may diverge. In the main sentence of FL proposal, ‘partial sensing’ is not defined. We propose the following as proposal 5’’’.[LGE2]Considering comments from companies, it would be better to focus on a limited topic for discussion than including all related topics together, to make a progress. We share the view with Huawei/HiSilicon that the sensing should be based on the traffic type allowed in the resource pool, rather than the traffic type that UE wants to transmit.As one way, we suggest to focus on the case where UE starts sensing only after the resource (re)selection triggering in slot n, which seems to be the original intension of FL proposal. Other cases may be discussed separately. We suggest to modify the proposal as follows.**Proposal 5’’’:** * When UE did not perform any sensing before the resource (re)selection triggering in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on sensing results
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ ($T\_{A}\geq 0$, $T\_{B}\geq 0$ ~~including the possibility of equal to zero~~) and remaining details
			* When both $T\_{A}$ and $T\_{B}$ are equal to zero, random resource selection is performed
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX
	+ FFS the case where UE performed sensing before the resource (re)selection triggering in slot n
	+ ~~Other options are not precluded~~
	+ ~~This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking~~

FL: Please refer to my reply comments to Lenovo/MM and Intel. Basically, since the last proposal 5’’’, it already covered the case when UE is performing periodic transmission, since the contiguous partial sensing could / should also be used. So strickly speaking, some sensing could be done before before the resource (re)selection trigger in slot n. |
| Sharp | Regarding the main bullet, we share similar view with Intel that “at least” “contiguous” ”by higher layers” are not needed. Furthermore, resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, somehow “at the time of resource (re-)selection” is not clear enough, we suppose the moment corresponds to a moment after slot n.FL: Please refer to my reply comment to Intel for your first comment. For the second comment, “at the time of resource (re-)selection” it is intended to be slot n. |
| MediaTek | We are overall OK with FL’s **Proposal 5’’’.** One comment: we don’t think that negative values are feasible for $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$. How can UE predict the (re)selection trigger point ‘n’ beforehand? We suggest removing the wording “negative”* + Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results at the time of resource (re)selection.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero~~,~~ or positive ~~or negative~~) and remaining details

FL: This is to cover the case when contiguous partial sensing is used for periodic transmissions. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | The option 1 claims “resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results at the time of resource (re)selection”, but it is not clear how to judge which sensing results are available. For example, if the sensing results are derived at slot n-10,000, the results are still available? So could you also elaborate the meaning of “all available sensing results”?FL: It is now clarified in the updated proposal 5 that all available sensing results should be confined within the sensing window for the resource pool. |
| CATT | For the last sub-bullet:* This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
	+ FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1

First of all the wording needs some modification. It seems to us that ‘this option’ here refers to the main bullet, if this is the case then it’s better to clearly differentiate from ‘option 1’. Secondly, ‘without sensing or evaluation and pre-emption checking’ is ambiguous. We suggest the following wording:* This is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing (without re-evaluation and pre-emption checking)
	+ FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1

FL: I thought the intention of this sub-bullet is clear. It is intended for the case when UE does not perform any sensing. So re-evaluation and pre-emption checking are also excluded.  |
| Qualcomm | We support the proposal and have the following editorial change: to remove “by higher layer”Regarding the negative values of T\_A and T\_B, they aren’t about predicting where a packet would arrive. They allow the UE to select resources based on existing, prior sensing results.FL: Done |
| Feature Lead 2 | Thanks to everyone for all the further comments! Please find an updated version in the following with newly updated parts in blue text.**Proposal 5’’’’:** * In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing ~~and/or random resource selection~~, if UE ~~is configured to~~ performs contiguous partial sensing ~~(i.e., at least for the case of resource reservation interval is NOT provided or~~ $P\_{rsvp\\_TX}=0$~~) by higher layer, when~~ and resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results within sensing window at the time of resource (re)selection.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero, positive or negative) and remaining details
			* ~~When both~~ $T\_{A}$ ~~and~~ $T\_{B}$ ~~are equal to zero, random resource selection is performed~~
			* FFS conditions to change between the different options when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change
	+ FFS condition(s) in which contiguous partial sensing is performed by UE
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX, if any
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
		- FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1
	+ Note: The terminology “contiguous partial sensing” is equivalent to the “short-term sensing” and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.
 |

### Proposals before 3rd check point (Feb 4)

FL observations and comments based on inputs received in Sec. 3.5.2:

* Based on the comments and discussions in the preceding section, the scope and intention of P5 is to cover both periodic and aperiodic transmissions. Hence, *TA* and *TB* could be both in negative values.
* After further reading of Proposal 5’’’’, it is realized that all available sensing results should also cover a short window after slot n (when *TA* and *TB* are positive values), so an update is included in the following P5 (round VI) in red text. Otherwise, everything else is the same as before.
* Again, please do not refer to the figures at the beginning of Section 3.5.1 anymore.

**Proposal 5 (round VI):**

* In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs contiguous partial sensing and resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results at least within sensing window at the time of resource (re)selection.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero, positive or negative) and remaining details
			* FFS conditions to change between the different options when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change
	+ FFS condition(s) in which contiguous partial sensing is performed by UE
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX, if any
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
		- FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1
	+ Note: The terminology “contiguous partial sensing” is equivalent to a “short-term sensing” and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Vivo | ‘at the time of resource (re)selection’ in the first sub-bullet is bit unclear to us. Does it refer to slot n? if so, the sensing results in the sensing window $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ with positive $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ cannot be available at slot n, right? If there is no other prior sensing results for other TX, UE has to always perform random selction based on the above option1, I am afraid this is not aligned with the original intetion of option2 we discussed in the first round. If ‘at the time of resource (re)selection’ refers to other slot, could feature leader elaborate more on its definition in the proposal?BTW, is it the correct understanding that ‘sensing window’ refers to only the short sensing window $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$? If so, we suggest below changes to make it clearer, otherwise one may interpret the text as it also includes periodic sensing window.* + Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results at least within sensing window $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ at the time of resource (re)selection.

FL: Please refer to my comments in the reply email or below. |
| Xiaomi | We are generally fine with FL proposal.However, we are not sure what is the exact meaning of the 2nd last bullet, and suggest to remove it. It seems this subbulet has little relationship with partial sensing.FL: This was raised by Qualcomm, because in this proposal there is a possibility that TA and TB could be both zero. In this case, if the reservation for another TB is disabled in the resource pool (i.e., no periodic-based partial sensing results), then UE would perform random resource selection. But this could still be different to the case for Type A and B UEs without any PSCCH monitoring or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking. So this sub-bullet was added to clarify this. But I see this is only meant to be a note. So I have updated accordingly below. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar to our comment for prospoal 3-VI, the reliance on Rel-16 NR-V sensing window for periodic-based partial sensing RA is without any basis in LTE-V, and has not been agreed for use in NR-V partial sensing. It is not correct to use it here, as it is undefined in the context of partial sensing. As explained in our previous reply and also many other companies’ understanding, the resource selection triggered in slot n can be based on the sensing results from $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ after slot n and sensing occasions before slot n, With this regard, we suggest to modify the option 1 as below: * Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results ~~at least~~ within $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ in addition to the sensing occasions determined by $t\_{y-k×P\_{reserve}}^{SL}$ ~~sensing window at the time of resource (re)selection~~.

FL: Please refer to my comments in the reply email or below.  |
| Apple | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| Feature Lead | Based on the comments received in the above from 3 companies, Proposal 5 is now updated in the following. Basically, we need to clarify the timing when the actual resource (re)selection is performed by UE, which can be different from the slot n when it is triggered, and the meaning of “all available sensing results” which should include also periodic-based partial sensing results whenever applicable.Please feel free to provide further comments based on the following **Proposal 5 (round VII)**. Differences to the last version are in red text.**Proposal 5 (round VII):** * In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs contiguous partial sensing and resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection in slot $n+T\_{C}$ based on all available sensing results ~~at least within sensing window~~, including periodic-based partial sensing results (if applicable).
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$, $T\_{C}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero, positive or negative) and remaining details
			* FFS conditions to change between the different options when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change
	+ FFS condition(s) in which contiguous partial sensing is performed by UE
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX, if any
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ Note: This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
		- FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1
	+ Note: The terminology “contiguous partial sensing” is equivalent to a “short-term sensing” and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | - Suggest to adopt the following modification for the main bullet in option 1:For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and in MAC layer performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results at least within sensing window at the time of resource (re)selection.From our understanding, the description after ‘and’ is to describe the actual resource selection time, where the resource selection should be performed in MAC layer.- Suggest to delete the below FFS:~~FFS conditions to change between the different options when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change~~Since so far there is no other options, we can naturally go back to discuss the conditions if more options are figured out.FL: Regarding the first suggestion of adding “in MAC layer”, I am not sure whether we want to have a very ‘layer’ specific description in the agreement. Based on R16 spec, even the MAC layer does not perform resource (re)selection based on sensing results. The MAC layer only performs random selection according to a set of reported resources (SA) and it does not have any information about sensing, and nor it does any resource exclusion. I think at this stage, it is OK just to leave it as “UE” performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results.Regarding the second suggestion to delete the sub-bullet of option 1, which was proposed by Ericsson, I think the “options” referred here is about different cases of TA and TB values (e.g. being zero, negative or positive). Let me use the word “cases” instead of “options” to avoid confusion. |
| Qualcomm | Depending on the values of TA and TB, and whether the UE can transmit during the entire interval or not, the UE might not have to perform contiguous sensing in the entire interval. To capture this case, we propose to add an FFS under Option 1:* FFS Whether only a subset of slots could be monitored

FL: True, there may be other transmissions occur during TA and TB. Added. |
| Vivo2 | Regarding the updated P5 by FL * Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between *[n+TA,n+TB]* and performs resource (re)selection in slot *n+TC* based on all available sensing results ~~at least within sensing window~~, including periodic-based partial sensing results (if applicable).

Slot n that triggers resource selection has been defined since R16, but I don't think we have ever defined the time at which UE performs resource selection. I am not sure if it is appropriate to introduce n+TC as it seems to imply that such timing needs to be explicitly defined, whereas in R16 it is entirely up to the MAC layer to decide when to make resource (re)selections. Or if we can simply remove it from the proposal and add an FFS on the availability of sensing results if companies have concerns on the meaning of “available sensing results”.* Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between *[n+TA,n+TB]* and performs resource (re)selection ~~in slot~~ *~~n+TC~~*based on all available sensing results ~~at least within sensing window~~, including periodic-based partial sensing results (if applicable).
	+ FFS the availability of sensing results

FL: In R16, the triggering and the actual UE performing of resource (re)selection are all assumed to be in the same slot (n). For contiguous partial sensing in R17 targeting aperiodic transmissions, however, we may want to separate the two timings. Especially when a TB has sufficiently large PDB and it may be good for avoiding collisions if the actual resource (re)selection is postponed (e.g. by 32 slots). But considering similar comments and preference raised by Sharp, Nokia, NSB, Panasonic, Fujitsu, OPPO, I have rolled back to the original description from round VI, as it is preferred by the most. |
| Sharp | We share similar view as vivo that we don’t define the moment for performing resource (re-)selection, instead, it is up to MAC layer. Since we once had an agreement in RAN1#98 that the procedure actually is identification of candidate resources, then, how about the following option?* + Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs ~~resource (re)selection~~ identification of candidate resources in slot $n+T\_{C}$ based on all available sensing results ~~at least within sensing window~~, including periodic-based partial sensing results (if applicable).

FL: I am fine with this suggestion, if we want to be specific about L1 and MAC layer behaviour in this proposal. Also rolled back to the description without Tc from round VI |
| NEC | Similar concerns as the comments in proposal 3, does the added sentence "including periodic-based partial sensing results (if applicable)" means the sensing results from current proposal 3? i.e., sensing results from the occasions before resource selction trigger n. How to hande the possible sensing results from occasions after slot n derive by small small P\_reserve and k which may not fully aligned with [n+TA, n+TB].FL: If there are sensing occasions that fall within [n+TA, n+TB] before the resource (re)selection is performed then UE can still take that into consideration by the term “if applicable” in the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We’d like to support the previous round VI version, instead of the latest round VII version. The purpose of this proposal is to define “contiguous partial sensing” with a sensing window or slots. The new added $n+T\_{c}$ for resource selection is not directly related to “partial sensing”. It would be better not to touch this.FL: done  |
| Panasonic | We also prefer FL’s proposal in round VI instead of updated proposal in round VII. Similar as some companies metioned, the n+TC would be up to MAC layer and should be removed. FL: done |
| Fujitsu | We share similar view as some companies that slot $n+T\_{c}$ is not the instant to preform (re)selection, but to determine the subset containing candidate resources. The modification suggested by either vivo or Sharp is fine to us.FL: Rolled back to round VI as suggested by the most. |
| OPPO | Similar view as many other companies about the slot n+Tc. We also prefer the proposal in round VI. The UE is triggered to do resource (re)selection at slot n, UE can do contiguous partial sensing after slot n. when the UE needs to do resource selection after contiguous partial sensing is up to implementation, there is no necessary to define the time n+Tc. FL: done |
| LGE | Let’s categorize UE sensing operations when UE performs contiguous partial sensing as follows. Random resource selection without any sensing is not considered. Resource re-evaluation and pre-emption checking are FFS.FL: Since the comments are very long and they are all linked together, please allow me to provide my reply in a section by section manner. For the above case of random resource selection without any sensing is not completely ruled out. At least it can happen in the case when TA and TB are zero chosen by the UE (e.g. for aperiodic transmission with short PDB), and the reservation for another TB is disabled in the resource pool. For re-evaluation and pre-emption checking, based on earlier comments in the first round, many wished to discuss this aspect separately. Anyway, we already have a FFS point for re-evaluation and pre-emption checking in the last meeting, for which we can always furher discuss in the future. For this proposal, it really just focus on CPS for resource (re)selection.Abbreviation for convenience:PPS – Periodic-based Partial SensingCPS – Contiguous Partial SensingProposal 5 seems that CPS is only used for aperiodic resource selection. However, CPS is also needed in addition to PPS for periodic resource reservation, becasue both periodic and aperiodic resource selection/reservation are allowed in a resource pool. Therefore we need to separately discuss two cases.**Case 1)** When resource (re)selection for aperiodic resource reservation is triggered in slot n, UE performs CPS only.**Case 2)** When resource (re)selection for periodic resource reservation is triggered in slot n, UE performs CPS in addition to PPS.* In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs contiguous partial sensing and resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection in slot $n+T\_{C}$ based on all available sensing results ~~at least within sensing window~~, including periodic-based partial sensing results (if applicable).
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$, $T\_{C}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero, positive or negative) and remaining details
			* FFS conditions to change between the different options when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change

FL: Yes, in general the cases you described above are now covered by this proposal during the course of the discussion. And we seem to be able to address them here at the same time in Proposal 5 without too lengthy description (just the above). This is mainly due to companies wishes to have a more “unified” partial sensing design between periodic and aperiodic transmissions. Then we basically control different cases/scenarios with different TA and TB values, and also depending on whether PPS results are available and applicable or not.According to the operation scenario above, Proposal 5 needs to be modified as follows. We agree with vivo that we don’t need to introduce Tc for resource selection timing. It’s up to UE implementation as in Rel.16 V2X. We also agree with QC that FFS is needed whether to use a full or a part of $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ for CPS.FL: Those are reflected in the updated Proposal 5 (round VIII) below.**Proposal 5 (round VI):** * **Case 1)** In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least both periodic-based partial sensing and contiguous partial sensing, if UE performs contiguous partial sensing and resource (re-)selection for aperiodic transmission is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results from the contiguous partial sensing in $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and the periodic-based partial sensing for other periodic resource reservation if any ~~in slot~~ $n+T\_{C}$.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$~~,~~ $T\_{C}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero or positive ~~or negative~~) and remaining details
			* FFS conditions to change between the different options when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change
* **Case 2)** In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least both periodic-based partial sensing and contiguous partial sensing, if UE performs contiguous partial sensing in addition to the periodic-based partial sensing and resource (re-)selection for periodic resource reservation is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[t\_{yk}-T\_{A},t\_{yk}-T\_{B}]$ prior to each candidate slot $t\_{yk}$ (k=0,…,Y-1), and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results from both periodic-based partial sensing and contiguous partial sensing ~~in slot~~ $n+T\_{C}$.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$~~,~~ $T\_{C}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero, positive ~~or negative~~) and remaining details
			* FFS conditions to change between the different options when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change

FL: Thanks for the above proposal to separate the cases. Unfortunately, some companies prefer to have an unified partial sensing design regardless of periodic or aperiodic transmissions, since CPS is needed in both cases. Furthermore, as clarified in earlier discussions, both PPS and CPS are used here only for design and discussion of partial sensing in R17. We may not need to separate them in the end for the specification. So the wording of “a reousrce pool is (pre-)configured with at least both periodic-based partial sensing and contiguous partial sensing “ would not be OK for some companies. And also may be no distinction between periodic and aperiodic transmissions at this stage, as I have tried earlier with no success. These will be all part of FFS condition(s) in which contiguous partial sensing is performed by UE bullet. Then the different between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and $[t\_{yk}-T\_{A},t\_{yk}-T\_{B}]$ can still be control by defining TA and TB as positive or negative value.The remaining part of the original Proposal 5 is common to all the cases above.* + FFS condition(s) in which contiguous partial sensing is performed by UE
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX, if any
	+ FFS Whether only a subset of slots could be monitored in $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ or $[t\_{yk}+T\_{A},t\_{yk}+T\_{B}]$
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ Note: This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
		- FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1
	+ Note: The terminology “contiguous partial sensing” is equivalent to a “short-term sensing” and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.

We still prefer to discuss each issue in a separate proposal, but in case group wants to discuss all the issues together in one proposal, we need to categorize the cases so as not to be confused in a mixed way.FL: Give the above explanation and consideration of different company’s views/position/preferences, I hope you can be fine to go with this direction / formulation of Proposal 5. |
| Sony | What does “the different options” refer to in the sentence of “FFS conditions to change between the different options when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change” in option 1? Since we have only one option, the sentence can be removed.FL: please refer to my reply to ZTE/Sanechips in above. |
| CATT,GOHIGH | For the note, not sure what ‘this option’ is referring to. In fact this note is not necessary and should be removed. Also, there is no need to specify the time at which UE performs resource selection and we don’t want to introduce $T\_{C}$ in the agreement.FL: Please check the updates below and also refer to my reply to ZTE/Sanechips above for the sub-bullet. I believe both concerns are addressed. |
| Ericsson | In our view, the modification to introduce Tc is not needed and we prefer the version in (round VI). Regarding the round VI version we propose the following modifications:**Proposal 5 (round VI):** * In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs contiguous partial sensing and resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs resource (re)selection based on all available sensing results at least within sensing window at the time of resource (re)selection.
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$ (including the possibility of equal to zero, positive or negative) and remaining details
	+ FFS conditions to change between the different options when enabled (including change in T\_A and T\_B values) and conditions/parameters to trigger this change
	+ FFS condition(s) in which contiguous partial sensing is performed by UE
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX, if any
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
		- FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1
	+ Note: The terminology “contiguous partial sensing” is equivalent to a “short-term sensing” and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.

We propose to promote the bullet marked in yellow to be at the same level as the other which include any FFS conditions and introduce a further modification in red for clarification.Moreover, some companies propose to modify this bullet since now we have only Option 1. In our view this point is still valid since the last but one bullet (“This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking”) includes another option and conditions between both options should be studied. Moreover, we have a bullet “Other options are not precluded” where different options could be possible to this FFS point should be kept.FL: TC is removed and the yellow highlighted sub-bullet are updated below.  |
| Feature Lead 2 | **Proposal 5 (round VIII):*** In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs contiguous partial sensing and resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs ~~resource (re)selection~~ identification of candidate resources based on all available sensing results ~~at least within sensing window~~, including periodic-based partial sensing results (if applicable).
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$(including the possibility of equal to zero, positive or negative) and remaining details
		- FFS whether only a subset of slots could be monitored
	+ FFS conditions to change between different options and cases (including change in TA and TB values) when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change
	+ FFS condition(s) in which contiguous partial sensing is performed by UE
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX, if any
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ Note: This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
		- FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1
	+ Note: The terminology “contiguous partial sensing” is equivalent to a “short-term sensing” and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.
 |
| Samsung | We also prefer removing the resource selection timing of slot $n+T\_{c}$. The latest version (round VIII) seems better for us.In addition, we prefer at least in current stage, all possible options should be listed for further evaluation. However, current wording seems cannot explicitly reflects all options, and we also observe from other company’s reply, there exist ambiguity on whether P5 supports UE performing random selection. We consider this should be explicitly supported since it could reduce packet delayWe understand FL’s intention as using unified description at high level and allow different options by defining values of $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$, but we prefer to intuitively list candidate options with less uncertainty. We prefer to modify P5 as below:* In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs contiguous partial sensing and resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, ~~support the following option~~ select one or more of the following options in RAN1#104-e-bis:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs ~~resource (re)selection~~ identification of candidate resources, after slot $n+T\_{B}$, based on all available sensing results ~~at least within sensing window~~, including periodic-based partial sensing results (if applicable).
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$~~,~~ $T\_{C}$ ~~(including the possibility of equal to zero, positive or negative)~~ and remaining details
		- FFS whether only a subset of slots could be monitored
	+ Option 2: Resource (re)selection is performed in slot n based on prior sensing results.
	+ Option 3: Resource (re)selection is performed in slot n based on random selection.
	+ FFS conditions to change between different options and cases (including change in TA and TB values) when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change
	+ FFS condition(s) in which contiguous partial sensing is performed by UE
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX, if any
	+ Other options are not precluded and different options may be used in combination
	+ Note: This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
		- FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1
	+ Note: The terminology “contiguous partial sensing” is equivalent to a “short-term sensing” and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.

FL: Thanks for expanding I think just about all the options that can derived from the original Option 1. On one hand, it may be good to list out all of them. But on the other hand, it may not be necessary since it is already stated that TA and TB values have the possibility of equal to zero, positive or negative. In itself, these include the listed Option 2 and 3. If we want to expand them, then we should also clearly state which option would take on zero, positive or negative values. At the same time, the description for option 2 and 3 should align with option 1 and use the same terminology. To do this, in itself will be a long debate I feel. Can we keep the original form as it seems to be OK for others? But having said these, some of the suggested modifications seem reasonable. |
| LGE | Thank you for detailed response to our previous comment. To avoid any misunderstanding, we didn’t intend to exclude random selection or re-evaluation/pre-emption checking in Proposal 5. I just meant those were not used as a reference for our categorization into case 1) and 2) ☺The reference timing of CPS used for aperiodic resource selection can be n, as in current Proposal 5. But for periodic resource reservation, as mentioned in our previous comment, the reference timing should candidate slot $t\_{yk}$ instead of n. Moreover, multiple CPS windows can be used because CPS is done prior to each candidate slot. FL: In my understanding, even for periodic transmission with resource (re)selection trigger in slot n and Y candidate slots starting in slot $t\_{y0}$, the reference timing can be still based on n. The slots in which UE monitors $\left[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}\right]$ in this case could be defined as $T\_{A}=-t\_{y0}+32$ and $T\_{B}=-T\_{Proc,0}$. Furthermore, I am not quite sure why multiple CPS windows are needed, one for each candidate slot. In my understanding, only one CPS window $\left[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}\right]$ is needed for the resource (re)selection purpose. All the sensing and results should be ready by resource (re)selection trigger. If you are thinking re-evaluation and pre-emption checking for selected or reserved resources, yes, I agree multiple sensing windows are possible.If we want unified description for CPS, Proposal 5 needs to capture all possibilities. This can be done through generalization of CPS window simply as [TA, TB]. With FFS over TA and TB, they could be defined based on triggering time n or candidate slot $t\_{yk}$.We propose the following modification.**Proposal 5 (round VIII):*** In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs contiguous partial sensing and resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots ~~between~~ in one or multiple windows $[T\_{A},T\_{B}]$ and performs ~~resource (re)selection~~ identification of candidate resources based on all available sensing results ~~at least within sensing window~~, including periodic-based partial sensing results (if applicable).
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$(including the possibility of value offset to triggering slot n or candidate slot $t\_{yk}(k=0,…,Y-1)$ ~~equal to zero, positive or negative~~) and remaining details
		- FFS whether only a subset of slots could be monitored
	+ FFS conditions to change between different options and cases (including change in TA and TB values) when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change
	+ FFS condition(s) in which contiguous partial sensing is performed by UE
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX, if any
	+ Other options are not precluded
	+ Note: This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
		- FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1

Note: The terminology “contiguous partial sensing” is equivalent to a “short-term sensing” and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.FL: As explained in the above, multiple CPS windows are not needed in periodic transmissions. And only one window is needed counting from $t\_{y0}$, but not from all $t\_{yk}$ candidate slots. Based on the suggested modification (the second yellow highlight), it is not clear whether the value offset can include zero, positive or negative. I think many people rely on this piece of information to differentiate different options/cases. Would it be OK to keep the original description since the majority is fine with it? |
| Fraunhofer | We are generally fine with the FL’s proposal (VIII).In sub-bullet 2, it is unclear as to which of the “different options” the text is referring to.For the last note, “equivalent to” could be replaced with “based on”, similar to previous proposals.FL: Regarding the first question, please refer to my reply comments to ZTE/Sanechip and Samsung. And also some explanation from Ericsson in the above. Regarding the second comment, the reason why “based on” was used in the agreement and in Proposal 3 because they were really based on the LTE-V partial sensing scheme. For this case, since there has not been any short-term sensing defined in the past (but common understood by everyone), so the term “equivalent to” is used here. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | The second FFS for the option 1 is not clear.* + - FFS whether only a subset of slots could be monitored

Within window $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ , a UE would perform contiguous sensing and the window size, i.e. the values of $T\_{A}$ and $T\_{B}$ is still undecided. If a quite short term sensing window is needed, $T\_{A}$ and $T\_{B}$ can be configured or defiend properly. It is uncessrary to introduce a subset of slots within the contiguous sensing window. Therefore, this FFS should be deleted.FL: Please refer to the explanation from Qualcomm in above.  |
| Bosch | We agree with the Feature lead proposal. |
| Feature Lead 3 | **Proposal 5 (round IX):*** In a resource pool (pre-)configured with at least partial sensing, if UE performs contiguous partial sensing and resource (re-)selection is triggered in slot n, support the following option:
	+ Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs ~~resource (re)selection~~ identification of candidate resources, after slot $n+T\_{B}$, based on all available sensing results ~~at least within sensing window~~, including periodic-based partial sensing results (if applicable).
		- FFS $T\_{A}$, $T\_{B}$(including the possibility of equal to zero, positive or negative) and remaining details
		- FFS whether only a subset of slots could be monitored
	+ FFS conditions to change between different options and cases (including change in TA and TB values) when enabled and conditions/parameters to trigger this change
	+ FFS condition(s) in which contiguous partial sensing is performed by UE
	+ FFS interaction with SL-DRX, if any
	+ Other options are not precluded and different options may be used in combination
	+ Note: This option is in addition to random resource selection only without sensing or re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
		- FFS if we need to do anything for this case in RAN1
	+ Note: The terminology “contiguous partial sensing” is equivalent to a “short-term sensing” and it is intended to be used for the design and discussion of partial sensing in Rel-17.
 |
| Qualcomm | If TB = 0, then identification of the candidate resources could take place in slot n. We propose the following change:Option 1: For the purpose of resource (re-)selection, the UE monitors slots between $[n+T\_{A},n+T\_{B}]$ and performs ~~resource (re)selection~~ identification of candidate resources, in or after slot $n+T\_{B}$, based on all |

Contribution summary

## Partial sensing for periodic transmissions

* Selection of Y candidate slots
	+ LTE-V based selection of Y ≥ min candidate slots according to Tx priority, CBR level, HARQ enabling, subcarrier spacing or re-evaluation/pre-emption enabling: [2][5][8][9][14][17][20][21][22, multiple sets of Y][25][29]
	+ Same as resource selection window, which size is left up to UE implementation, subject to T2min constrain on minimum size [13]
	+ If HARQ feedback is enabled, HARQ RTT related timing restriction should be considered when determining the candidate slots [17]
* Determination of sensing slots
	+ Slots that belong to (y – k\*reservation period), where y is included in Y candidate slots [2][3][4][8][11][12][13][14][28][22][25][29][34][35][6]
		- K=1, multiple, or by configuration
		- Reservation period according to the configured set of periodicity in the resource pool, or a subset
* X% of candidate resources is based on the total number candidate resources only within the Y candidate slots [2][25]
* X% for partial sensing UE is separately configured from that for full sensing UE [9]
* A short-term / extended sensing / continuous sensing (e.g., 32 slots) to account for aperiodic traffic [2][3][4][6][10][11][12][13][17][18][19][21][22][24][25][27][28][30][33][34][35][29]
	+ Option 1: before 1st candidate slot
	+ Option 2: before the resource selection in slot n
* Introduce reduced adaptive sensing windows with varying sensing intervals across time to enhance the UE's capability to save power as well as achieve adequate sensing results [16]

## Partial sensing for aperiodic transmissions

* Scheme 1: At packet arrival in slot n, UE performs random selection as well as sensing for re-evaluation and pre-emption checking until the last retransmission of a TB [2][9][10][13][14][22][32]
* Scheme 2: At packet arrival in slot n, UE performs sensing for a short period (e.g., 32 slots), then select resources based on sensing results. UE continue sensing for re-evaluation and pre-emption checking until the last retransmission of a TB [2][4][9][12][13, UE implement][14][29][32][35]
* Selection between scheme 1 and 2 (or adaptive sensing window) is based on HARQ feedback [14][30]

## Random resource selection

* When random selection is performed, re-evaluation and pre-emption checking is disabled [3][5]
* Higher priority is assigned to the resources which is randomly selected by a UE, to preserve these selected resources from being pre-empted by UEs performing sensing [6][12]
* When a resource is randomly selected, the same resource is reused periodically based on the SPS resource reservation procedure [9]
* Random resource selection should be applicable to both periodic and aperiodic transmissions [13]
	+ random resource selection is applied for initial transmission and all retransmissions of a TB
* Conditions in which random resource selection can be applied
	+ Random resource selection is enabled in a SL resource pool [13][22]
	+ One of the following criteria is met [13]:
		- UE does not have sidelink RX chain to perform sensing (i.e. sidelink TX only UE)
		- Battery level is below preconfigured threshold [22]
	+ Tx priority is within a preconfigured range of values [24]
	+ Sensing accuracy [22]
	+ Selection between random resource selection and partial sensing according to the system load [7]
	+ Selection between random resource selection and partial sensing based on a pre-configured condition, such as SL congestion, packet reliability [12][22][27]
* UE performing random resource selection should respect PSSCH to PSFCH HARQ time gap, if UE monitors PSFCH and requests for sidelink HARQ feedback, otherwise the gap can be ignored [13]
	+ UE ensures a minimum time gap Z between any two selected resources of a TB where a HARQ feedback for the first of these resources is expected
* Random resource selection preserves sidelink resource reservation signalling principle as defined for sidelink transmissions in Rel.16 [13]
	+ Maximum distance in logical slots for the first and last sidelink transmissions in a SCI is less than 32
* For random resource selection, the resources are selected among the partial sensing slots [9]
* PSFCH resources associated with the randomly selected resources are separately configured from those for full/partial sensing based selected resources [9]
* Pseudo-random frequency hopping for periodic reservation based on CRC bits of the associated PSCCH [10]
* The frequency that a UE performs random resource selection should be restricted [27]
* For random resource selection, consider partitioning of candidate SL resources to reduce collision probability [28]
* Enhancements for random resource selection [35]:
	+ Option 1: Restrict priority level for transmissions
	+ Option 2: sensing UE excludes random selection UE’s reserved resources regardless of priority
	+ Option 3: random selection based on a resource pattern

## Re-evaluation and pre-emption checking

* For the UE performing sensing, support re-evaluation for random selection resources [24] [29]
* Conditions for performing re-evaluation and pre-emption checking
	+ When multiple NACKs are received [3]
	+ ACK/NACK ratio is below a threshold [9]
	+ Re-evaluation or pre-emption checking is (pre-)configured [9]
	+ Number of partial sensing slots before resource (re)selection triggering is below a threshold [9]
	+ TX priority value is higher than the pre-emption priority value [9][24]
	+ Interference/congestion level is above a threshold [9]
* Re-valuation/pre-emption is configurable for Type D UEs [8]
* The pre-emption priority used by power saving UE is separately (pre-)configured from that used by full-sensing UE [9]
* When performing resource re-evaluation or pre-emption, burst type of resources are prioritized in resource (re)selection [9]
* The transmission resources reserved by power saving UEs are not pre-empted. Transmission resources reserved for transmissions destined to power saving sidelink UEs are not pre-empted [11]
* Due to re-evaluation and pre-emption, UE can re-select resources in noncandidate slots if aperiodic resource sensing is performed [2]
* For semi-persistent reservation, the UE can skip pre-emption for certain reservation periods. The number of skip periods is (pre-)configured per priority [24]
* UE is only required to sense in the slots in which the SL transmission may reserve a resource overlapping with the resource to be pre-empted or re-evaluated [27]
* Re-evaluation and pre-emption is based on reduced sensing performed between the UE’s resource selection time and resource re-evaluation/pre-emption checking time [29]
* Supports re-evaluation and pre-emption at least on subsequent periods [30]

## Type A UE performing PSFCH and S-SSB reception

* PSFCH (no) / S-SSB (no): [3][6][15][21][26]
	+ Reasons: maximum power saving, same as in LTE-V,
* PSFCH (no) / S-SSB (yes): [7][35]
	+ Reasons: support only broadcast which does not require HARQ feedback, S-SSB from UE synchronized to eNB/gNB is prioritized over GNSS
* PSFCH (yes) / S-SSB (yes): [9][12][14][22, S-SSB not considered][31]
	+ Reasons: reliable communication, power saving from less retransmissions, essential for communicating with others,

## Impact of SL-DRX on partial or full sensing

* SL-DRX parameters should be exchanged between Tx and Rx UEs for the purpose of aligning resource selection of Tx UE and the DRX ON period of Rx UE [2][5][6][9][11][18][27][29][30]
* If sensing is limited within DRX ON period, sensing accuracy and resource collision will be affected [2][3]
* PSCCH monitoring for sensing should be allowed during SL-DRX inactive period [2][3][5]
* DRX may increase latency for full sensing UEs [7]
* SL DRX and partial sensing are independent operation. SL DRX and partial sensing operation are specified separately from each other in Rel.17 [9][21][24]
* If the sensing is not restricted by DRX operation, then there will be no impacts on the resource selection [10]
* The full-time SL sync search should be avoided during SL DRX operation for power saving [12]
* The design of SL DRX cycle needs to ensure that UE partial sensing behavior is respected (i.e. UE wake up time intervals for the purpose of partial sensing need to be aligned with On duration intervals, as well as traffic characteristics) [13][17][21][22]
* No separate TX/RX alignment procedure is specified in RAN1 for partial sensing [14]
* The (partial) sensing operation and the resource selection performed by a UE takes into account the active time defined by SL DRX configuration, if (pre-)configured [14][16][17][20][21][29][30]
* The very initial transmission should be within the current “Active Time” of the Rx UE [17]
* It should be left to the UE’s implementation to decide whether sensing is limited to its DRX active time interval or it can also be performed outside of the active time [32]
* Consider PSCCH is used to align sidelink DRX wake-up time between TX UE and RX UE(s) [28]
* Sensing slots corresponding to selection target shall be included in DRX on-duration of the TX-UE [35]
	+ If a sensing slot is not included in DRX on-duration, the corresponding selection target is excluded from identified resource set of the resource allocation
	+ If a selection candidate is not included in DRX on-duration of RX-UE, the candidate is excluded from identified resource set of the resource allocation
	+ If PSFCH occasion corresponding to a selection candidate is not included in DRX on-duration of PSCCH/PSSCH TX-UE, the candidate is excluded from identified resource set of the resource allocation
* UE can perform sensing during the part of sensing window within the DRX active time only, in case of periodic traffic with PDB ≥ 100ms [38]

## Resource pool configuration with mixed RA

* A priority threshold is configured for a resource pool, at which reduced sensing UEs can select resources in a pool configured for mixed types of RA [3]
* Power constrained UEs occupy a sub-pool of the shared resource pool [7][11]
* Separation of resources is (pre-)configured where a specific portion of resource pool is allocated for each resource allocation mechanism (e.g., smaller bandwidth/frequency resource) [14][15][16][20][24]
* Different RSRP thresholds or increased RSRP threshold value is (pre-)configured for different resource selection scheme [25][29]
* UE reports whether one candidate resource overlaps with resources reserved by random resource selection UE to higher layer for further resource selection [25]
* A non-sensing UE sharing a resource pool with sensing UEs shall select/reserve resources for consecutive transmissions with a separation/gap large enough so that the sensing UE can react accordingly if a collision happens [14][24]
* Resource pool should not be shared among random selection UE and UEs configured with other RA schemes, unless random selection UE can reserve resources by sending reservation indication [21]

## Wake-up / go-to-sleep signals for SL-DRX

* Introduce wake up / go to sleep indication on sidelink (or keep sleep / keep awake indication) signals/triggers for UE power saving management [2][12][13][18][23]
	+ Reuse the existing R16 WUS/GTS principle [2]

## Congestion control for partial sensing

* CBR could be measured with fewer OFDM symbols in a slot to save power [3]
* Calculation of CBR/CR should take the reception time (e.g., DRX ON duration) into account [6][22]
* For UE with no PSCCH/PSSCH reception capability or number of sensing slots is less than a threshold, a (pre-)configured CBR value is used for PHY parameter selection [9]
* CBR measurement calculation is based on number of sub-channels of the partial sensing slots within the measurement window [9]
* Restriction of transmission parameter based on the CBR measurement is performed per active period of a DRX cycle [18]
* The evaluation of CR and the definition of CR\_limit for power saving resource allocation schemes reuse the design for full sensing resource allocation schemes [29]

## Inter-UE coordination for power saving

* Inter-UE coordination should be used for power saving as well, where a UE selects resources based on coordination / assistance information from another UE [3][7][16][18][19][20][22][31]
* Inter-UE signaling to negotiate sidelink resources (e.g. PSCCH monitoring intervals) where UE(s) are expected to monitor PSCCH resources and perform sensing for sidelink communication [13]
* The resource allocation for power saving considers new aspects introduced in Rel-17 NR sidelink such as inter-UE coordination, sidelink DRX and so on [28]
* Support a UE informing other UEs of its reception and transmission availability [32]

## Indication of power-saving UE transmissions

* Using a reserved bit in SCI to indicate the type of UE or RA scheme [9][10][11][24]

## Other techniques for power saving

* Power control
	+ SL pathloss based OLPC for PSFCH [6]
* UL/SL prioritization procedure
	+ A (pre)configured offset value can be added to the priority value of P-UE’s SL TX to avoid the frequent dropping [9]
* SL processing and transmission capability
	+ Support of PSSCH TX with 2 layers, high modulation order, and SL-SSB TX can be reduced [9]
* Power saving in SL data reception
	+ A monitoring interval and a retransmission interval in a period are (pre-)configured. The first transmission of a TB is always limited in the monitoring interval. Only the retransmissions of a TB are allowed in the retransmission interval. Thus, a receiving UE only receives/decodes PSCCHs/PSSCHs in the monitoring interval and then determines whether to turn on in the retransmission interval [10]
* Longer PSFCH period for power limited UE [6][4]
* The CSI reporting procedure and HARQ-ACK based (re)transmission should be enhanced to ensure that the CSI report/retransmission can be received by the CSI requesting UE with discontinuous reception [6]
* Reserved bits of SCI format 1-A can be used to transmit some bits of the destination ID (shortened destination ID) [7][16]
* The second stage SCI contains a field to indicate when the UE is expected to receive the next transmission [7]
* NR supports adaptation(switching) of sidelink power saving resource allocation schemes in time (i.e. b/w random, partial or full sensing-based resource selection) [13][12][22][8]
* Introduce the notion of sidelink power saving states / modes and associate with these states / modes certain set of sidelink power saving features developed in Rel.17 [13]
* Sidelink bandwidth / slot adaptation for transmission / reception is supported as a power saving feature [13]
* To utilize the geographical location of group UEs and destination-L2 ID, as the reference parameters for partial sensing, in the application layer connection-less group. And to utilize the destination-L2 ID, as the reference parameter for partial sensing, in the application layer managed group [17]
* Cross-slot scheduling enhancement for power saving purpose [18]
* Dedicated BWP can be configured for power saving UEs and S-SSB BW should be (pre-)configured within the dedicated BWP [21]
* Reduced max number of retransmission per TB for power saving UEs [22]
* Support different initial RSRP thresholds for resources reserved by PUE [24]
* An upper limit of the number of RSRP threshold increments or the maximum value of increased RSRP threshold can be configured. When the upper limit or the maximum value is reached, UE increases the number of determined set of slots [25]
* Support an adaptive frequency search space based on the channel activity, VRU traffic conditions [30]
* Support sidelink cross-slot scheduling allowing only decoding 2nd and/or 3rd retransmission(s) after a minimum configured time gap [30]
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Appendix (past meeting outcomes)

## RAN1#103-e (26/Oct – 13/Nov 2020)

**Conclusion**

* SL reception Type A and Type D should be used as the reference for evaluation and designing of SL power saving features in R17.
	+ Type A: UE is not capable of performing reception of any SL signals and channels, FFS with exception of performing PSFCH and S-SSB reception (aim to conclude in RAN1#104-e)
	+ Type D: UE is capable of performing reception of all SL signals and channels defined in R16. It does not preclude UE to perform reception of a subset of SL signals/channels
	+ If there are evaluations with assumptions other than the above reference, the detailed assumptions need to be reported
	+ Note: the types and the associated capability defined here are not intended to be defined as Rel-17 UE features as is.

Agreements**:**

* Partial sensing based RA is supported as a power saving RA scheme
	+ FFS details
* Random resource selection is supported as a power saving RA scheme
	+ FFS any changes or enhancement
	+ FFS on conditions to apply random resource selection

Agreements:

* In R17, a SL Mode 2 Tx resource pool can be (pre-)configured to enable full sensing only, partial sensing only, random resource selection only, or any combination(s) thereof
	+ FFS details, including usage, potential restrictions, whether/how any enhancement or condition is needed for the coexistence of full sensing and power saving RA scheme(s) in a same resource pool, etc.

Agreements:

* Re-evaluation and pre-emption checking are not supported by UEs that do not perform any sensing (i.e. PSCCH reception)
* Re-evaluation and pre-emption checking are supported by UEs that perform sensing
	+ FFS details and any conditions(s) in which re-evaluation and pre-emption can be performed
* FFS whether/how re-evaluation and pre-emption can be supported by UEs performing random resource selection that do perform sensing
* Note: details about sensing in this context, including when it is performed, are not decided yet.

Agreements:

* Further study congestion control based on CBR and CR for power saving RA schemes
	+ Identify necessary changes from R16 CBR/CR (if any), including transmission resource selection and transmission parameters that can be adjusted and applicable to power savings RA schemes
	+ Note: this is not intended to require all UEs to perform sensing for the purpose of CBR measurement