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# Introduction

This contribution summarizes the discussion of the following offline discussion:

* [AT119bis-e][504][V2X/SL] Consistent SL LBT failure (vivo)

**Scope:** Discuss SL LBT Failure:

Q1: Need of SL LBT Failure indication from PHY?

Q2: Need of consistent SL LBT failure declaration in MAC?

Q3: How to declare consistent SL LBT failure?

Q4: UE behaviour when MAC declares consistent LBT failure?

Q5: Consistent SL LBT Failure detection granularity?

**Intended outcome:** Discussion summary in R2-2210935.

**Deadline:** 10/13 10:00 (UTC), will be handled in R18 SL session.

The discussion is organized based on companies’ contributions focusing on this topic as listed in the Reference Section.

# Need of SL LBT Failure indication from PHY

In NR-U, the consistent LBT failure detection and recovery procedure is based on the LBT indication from PHY. So, whether in SL-U we still need/have an SL-specific LBT failure indication from PHY is the basis for further discussion on the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection and recovery procedure.

**Question 1-1:**  Do companies agree that as in NR-U, the SL-specific LBT failure indication from PHY is needed for the consistent LBT detection procedure in the MAC in SL-U?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments if any** |
| CATT | Yes | It had better follow the same principle as NR-U. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes, but... | We prefer to reuse NR-U mechanism. However, we think the information included in "SL-specific LBT failure indication from PHY" needs further discussion or RAN1 input. For example, whether the indication from PHY also includes the corresponding resource pool ID or RB set ID. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes with comments | Just to clarify the LBT failure indication is not only used for consistent LBT failure detection procedure. In NR-U, some counters will not be incremented and some timers will not be started/restarted if LBT failure indication is received from PHY. So for SL-U, we should not limit the usage of LBT failure indication to consistent LBT failure detection only. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Agree with Xiaomi, this indicator can be used for any MAC procedures. It can indicate whether recent LBT operation is successful or failed. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |

[Rapporteur’s Summary]

* Yes: 21
* No: 0

All companies participating in the offline discussion confirm the need of having SL-specific LBT failure indication from the PHY. Some pointed out that whereas it is for sure needed for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection procedure, it may also be needed for other purposes. This is true. Considering that the scope of the offline discussion is limited to SL-specific consistent LBT failure, Rapporteur proposes to confirm the need of SL-specific LBT failure indication at least for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection purpose, and leave it as FFS on for what other purposes it is needed.

**Proposal 1 (21/21): SL-specific LBT failure indication from PHY is needed for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in the MAC. How/whether it is used for other purposes can be further discussed.**

# Need of consistent SL LBT failure declaration in MAC?

Nearly all companies in their contributions proposed to support the SL-specific LBT failure detection and recovery procedure for SL-U. So below is to confirm the support of SL-specific LBT failure detection and recovery procedure. Note, details on the SL-specific LBT failure detection and recovery procedure are to be discussed in later Sections.

**Question 2-1:**  Do companies agree that the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection and recovery procedure needs to be supported in the MAC in SL-U?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments if any** |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes | Same issue of consistent LBT in NR-U may happen in SL-U. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | It is worth noting that this question may also depend on outcome of Q3-1, if UE cannot perform autonomous switch to other frequency regions/segments upon detection of consistent LBT failure in a frequency region/segment, this mechanism would be not that useful in this release. In that case, UE would have to declare RLF. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |

[Rapporteur’s Summary]

* Yes: 21
* No: 0

All companies participating in the offline discussion agreed to support SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection and recovery in SL-U. Among companies’ input, one company commented that the details on how the SL-specific consistent LBT failure should be recovered should further depend on the conclusion on the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection granularity. Rapporteur thinks that details related to this granularity aspect can be further looked into based on the conclusion to be reached in later meetings, and the need to introduce an SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection and recovery procedure can now be confirmed as a general principle as the basis for future discussion, based on companies’ input to this question. Note also that some more specific proposals regarding the procedure design are going to be given based on the later proposals towards Q4-X/5-X.

**Proposal 2 (21/21): Support SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection and recovery procedure in the MAC for SL-U.**

# Consistent SL LBT failure detection granularity

In NR-U, the consistent LBT failure is detected per UL BWP at the UE side, as specified in TS 38.321, subclause 5.21.1. Basically, the consistent LBT detection is tightly related the resource configuration granularity.

In SL-U, the PHY channel structure design is still under the discussion in RAN1. The related RAN1 agreements on resource configuration granularity can be found in RAN1 #109e minutes, as follows. So, such agreements from RAN1 need be fully considered when we determine the granularity for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in SL-U. Considering such RAN1 agreements, plenty of contributions were also proposing the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in various operational granularity [2][3][4][8][10][14][18].

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement  SL BWP, SL resource pool in R16/R17 NR SL and RB set in R16 NR-U are reused for SL-U as baseline   * Only one SL BWP is (pre-)configured within a carrier * The SL BWP is (pre-)configured to include one or multiple SL resource pools |

**Question 3-1:**  In which operational granularity should SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection be performed (from *resource configuration* perspective)?

1. Per SL BWP
2. Per SL-U carrier
3. Per resource pool
4. Per RB set
5. Per LBT subband
6. Ask RAN1 for clarification.
7. Others. If this option is selected, please elaborate the solution you propose.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option selection** | **Comments if any** |
| CATT | F | Since LBT is performed in PHY layer, it had check with RAN1. |
| OPPO | F | This issue essentially depends on for which granularity, the LBT failure are relevant / irrelevant, so that some check to R1 would be necessary. |
| Apple | F first (need to understand granularity of SL LBT failure indication from PHY) | We think RAN2 need to first ask RAN1 on the granularity of SL LBT failure indication from PHY because the granularity of consistent SL LBT in MAC can only be larger than granularity of SL LBT failure indication from PHY. For example:   * If granularity of SL LBT indication from PHY is per BWP, then consistent SL LBT failure in MAC can only be per BWP. * If granularity in PHY is per resource pool, RAN2 can further discuss whether it is per BWP or per resource pool. |
| vivo | F (preferred) or C | According to the current RAN1 progress, it seems that RAN1 guys intend to make Resource pool in SL-U play a similar role as UL BWP in NR-U, so we think perhaps C is the most promising operational granularity for the SL-specific consistent LBT detection. However, since this is anyway related to the channel/resource structure design for SL-U, which is right under the discussion in RAN1, we also think the safest way is to directly seek for the answer from RAN1.  Also, we think it is quite straightforward that operational granularity of the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection should just be the same as the granularity of the SL-specific LBT failure indication from the PHY. Otherwise, it is unclear how the consistent LBT failure is detected based on an LBT failure discussion with a different granularity… |
| Xiaomi | C or F | Regarding Apple’s comments, if we understand correctly, they propose to check with RAN1 on the granularity of LBT procedure itself? i.e., whether a LBT procedure is performed per BWP or per RP? Actually based on our understanding LBT is performed per 20MHz, which is the same size as a RB set.  However the granularity of SL LBT failure indication itself should be per SL transmission, including PSSCH/PSCCH/PSFCH, any SL transmission on SL unlicensed spectrum. For each SL transmission, if LBT fails, PHY should deliver LBT failure indication to MAC. This is also aligned with NR-U, in NR-U, the granularity of LBT failure indication is per UL transmission.  For the granularity of consistent LBT failure detection, as listed by Rapp, it can be per RP per BWP, etc. This means when UE counts the LBT failure, all the LBT failure indications corresponding to the SL transmissions carried on this RP/BWP are counted and UE detects consistent LBT failure based on this counting.  In NR-U, consistent LBT failure is detected per BWP since multiple BWPs are supported on a single carrier. But for SL-U, since RAN1 already agreed only one BWP is allowed to be (pre)configured, it is not reasonable to detect consistent LBT failure per BWP. So we think resource pool is a more suitable granularity since multiple RPs are supported on this single BWP.  We are also fine to check with RAN1 if this is majority view but we think we need to make the question clear. |
| ZTE | F or C | We tend to support SL resource pool as granularity of consistent LBT failure detection, but checking with RAN1 is needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | F | Agree to check with RAN1, since LBT is performed in PHY layer. |
| Lenovo | C, D, G | At least per SL BWP and per SL-U carrier could be excluded since currently SL UE support only one SL BWP and carrier. If consistent LBT failure is declared for the whole SL BWP or carrier, all SL transmissions will be blocked which we think is not so necessary. Additionally, besides options listed in above, we also support “per destination” and “per unicast connection” options, and the reason is provided in next question. |
| Qualcomm | F | LBT procedure is conducted per LBT-subchannel (i.e., 20MHz), but LBT failure may be claimed for a transmission. It’s better to check with RAN1 on the LBT failure indication provided by PHY. |
| Intel | F | In our understanding, this is in RAN1 scope, so it is better to wait for their input. |
| InterDigital | F | We think that C, D, and E are all feasible options, but in the end RAN1 will decide. |
| Sharp | F | RAN1’s input could be helpful. |
| ASUSTeK | F |  |
| LG | F | Since LBT is performed in PHY layer, it had check with RAN1. |
| NEC | F |  |
| Ericsson | F | Better to ask RAN1 for clarification, especially for wideband operation.  From RAN2 perspective, it is preferred that the granularities can include at least one of C, D or E to make the mechanism (i.e., LBT failure detection and recovery) to be useful. Based on RAN1 feedback, RAN2 can further determine whether UE can directly declare RLF or (first declare consistent LBT failure per frequency region, after declaring consistent LBT failure in all frequency regions, then declare RLF). |
| Fraunhofer | F |  |
| MediaTek | F |  |
| Nokia, NSB | D, F | LBT is performed at the RB set level, so that should be the granularity. However RAN1 should be consulted. |
| Spreadtrum | F or C |  |
| Samsung | F first (need to understand granularity of SL LBT failure indication from PHY) | We agree with Apple |

[Rapporteur’s Summary]

* Option A: 0
* Option B: 0
* Option C: 5
* Option D: 2
* Option E: 0
* Option F: 20
* Option G: 1 (related to Q3-2)

It is clear that a clear majority of companies (20 out of 21) regards it as necessary to enquire RAN1 on what the proper granularity should be for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection to be conducted. Moreover, regarding what should actually be asked to RAN1, Rapporteur has the following observations after reviewing companies’ comments provided above carefully:

* Per what some companies pointed out, as in NR-U, SL-specific LBT procedure should be performed by the PHY for each SL transmission, and when an SL-specific LBT failure indication is determined by the PHY for a given SL transmission and notified to the MAC, it is first necessary to determine in which resource granularity such SL-specific LBT failure instance is considered as being indicated, e.g. whether the LBT failure instance can be considered as being detected per resource pool, per SL BWP, per RB set, etc. This could also be related to the granularity for the resource allocation in SL-U, e.g. whether the SL resources are allocated/selected by Resource pool, per SL-BWP, per subband, etc. So, the key point that is most relevant to RAN1 is what a proper resource granularity should be for the SL-specific LBT failure **indication,** when it is received from the PHY.
* Then, dating back to the discussion history of NR-U, Rapporteur found that the granularity of consistent LBT failure **Detection** procedure (i.e. per UL BWP) seemed to have been determined by **RAN2**, based on the LBT operation designed by RAN1 and how the UL resources are scheduled in NR-U.

To this end, Rapporteur suggests that RAN2 can consult RAN1 about this resource granularity issue, but ask only the most relevant aspect regarding the resource granularity of the SL-specific LBT failure **indication**. Then, based on the feedback from RAN1, RAN2 can later decide the granularity for SL-specific consistent LBT **detection** procedure by ourselves, in a similar way as NR-U.

**Proposal 3-1: Send LS to RAN1 asking the granularity of the SL-specific LBT failure indication, when received from PHY, e.g. “When an SL-specific LBT failure indication is notified for an SL transmission by the PHY, in which resource granularity the SL-specific LBT failure instance can be considered as being indicated (e.g. per Resource Pool, per RB set, per SL BWP, etc.)?”.**

**Proposal 3-1a: Based on the feedback from RAN1, RAN2 to further decide in which granularity the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection is performed for SL-U.**

In addition, some companies proposed to consider the SL-specific natures and thus are considering also the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in a per DST, per unicast connection or a per cast type manner (e.g. in [4][10][18]). Since the DST/unicast connection/cast type are typically regarded as RAN2-level factors, whether such operational granularity needs to be supported should be looked into by RAN2. However, the motivation/rationale of supporting such per DST/per unicast link/per cast type consistent LBT failure detection in SL need be fully clarified before introducing it as a brand new feature.

**Question 3-2:**  Do companies agree to support SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection at a per DST/per unicast link/per cast type level?

1. Yes, SL-specific consistent LBT failure can be detected per DST.
2. Yes, SL-specific consistent LBT failure can be detected per unicast link.
3. Yes, SL-specific consistent LBT failure can be detected per cast type.
4. No, do not support any form of per DST/per unicast link/per cast type consistent LBT failure detection in SL-U.
5. Should be studied further

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option selection** | **Please specify the rationale/motivation, if an option with “Yes” is selected.** |
| CATT | D | LBT is only corresponding Tx UE behavior, it is not related to DST/unicast link/cast type. |
| OPPO |  | Do not get the point / difference between Q3-1 and Q3-2, is Q3-2 also for granularity issue? |
| Apple | D | LBT is performed per radio resource (either BWP/Resource Pool/RB set) rather than per logical link (either DST/link/cast-type). |
| vivo | D | Per our reading of companies’ contribution, this seems to be another granularity/dimension, in addition to the resource granularity discussed in Q3-1, so the question is listed here just to collecting companies’ thinking.  From our perspective, note that in NR SL the resource configuration is common to all cast types/DSTs/unicast links since Rel-16 (where this issue was intentionally discussed) which is a principle highly likely to be inherited to SL-U. From this perspective, there is no clear motivation/logic to take consistent LBT failure detection as a cast-type/DST/unicast link specific operation, while still keeping the resource configuration common to all of them. On the other hand, such per cast-type/per DST/per unicast may also requires the PHY to submit the LBT failure indication in the corresponding granularity, which may lead to further complication to L1 and further burden to RAN1 discussion on its feasibility. |
| Xiaomi | A | We think A is also feasible considering SL is for the transmission between UEs. For this option, UE counts LBT failure for all SL transmissions targeted at a certain destination no matter in which resource pool/RB set the SL transmission is performed, and upon the counter reaching the maximum configured value, consistent LBT failure is triggered for this destination. This applies to unicast, groupcast and broadcast. With this operation, the impact caused by consistent LBT failure detection is minimized compared with per RP/BWP solution since if consistent LBT failure is detected on a RP/BPW then all the SL transmissions carried on this RP/BWP will be impacted. But with this option, only the destination is impacted. |
| ZTE | D | LBT is detected per radio resource rather than per link. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | D | Agree with Apple and vivo. |
| Lenovo | A, B | For different destination or unicast connection, the experienced sidelink channel quality may be quite different also considering the different directions/locations of the peer UEs, and failure of one connection should not impact other connections. |
| Qualcomm | D w. comment | A, B and C have some overlapping. This can be decided based on RAN1’s feedback on LBT failure indication (Question 3-1). |
| Intel | D | Same comments as Apple and vivo |
| InterDigital | D | Given there is no directional transmission in SL, we don’t think it is necessary to have different LBT failure procedures per unicast link or L2 ID. |
| Sharp | D | Agree with Apple and vivo. |
| ASUSTeK | A,B | Too early to rule out these possibilities. Can wait for RAN1 decision and clarification. |
| LG | comment | The granularity of LBT detection is related to Q3-1, and the link/cast type is related to whether consistent LBT failure reporting is performed for each cast type/unicast link or whether it is performed in common regardless of the cast type. |
| NEC | D | Share Apple’s view. |
| Ericsson | E (new option) | We prefer to have further study this issue, it is too early to make such a decision. RAN2 can first focus on the basic aspects of the mechanism. Whether the mechanism needs to be further distinguished between destinations or cast types can be further discussed, to give companies more time to study. |
| Fraunhofer | D | Agree with Apple |
| MediaTek | D |  |
| Nokia, NSB | D | There is no clear motivation to make the consistent LBT failure detection be dependent on the destination, cast type, etc. |
| Spreadtrum | D |  |
| Samsung | D |  |

[Rapporteur’s Summary]

* Option A: 3
* Option B: 2
* Option C: 0
* Option D: 15
* Option E: 1
* No selection: 2

There is a clear majority of companies (15 out of 21) disagree to support SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection procedure at any of the per cast type/per unicast link/per DST level. Specifically, some companies pointed out that the LBT failure indication/detection should inherently be done at a per radio resource level, and the higher-layer factors/dimensions like cast type, connection or destination are irrelevant. By contrast, the proponents were with the comments that a different DST/unicast link may experience different radio quality, by which a per DST/unicast link handling may be motivated. There were also some other companies that thought more time may be needed to check the feasibility/motivation of this aspect with this being the very first meeting in RAN2.

Considering that the conclusion of this question may have essential impact to future discussions, and also considering the situation on the clear majorities’ views vs. very early stage of this WI, Rapporteur proposes RAN2 to further discuss whether it is possible to make a working assumption based on the clear majority’s view, functioning as the baseline for future discussions. In later meetings, the per DST/per unicast link/per cast type consistent LBT failure handling is also allowed to be considered, but one may need sufficient motivation to justify its necessity/benefits in order to introduce it.

**Proposal 3-2 (15/21): RAN2 to discuss whether to make the working assumption that SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection at per cast type/per DST/per unicast link level is not supported in Rel-18 SL-U.**

# How to declare consistent SL LBT failure

In NR-U, the consistent LBT failure is detected and declared by the MAC entity, and the related procedure is specified in TS 38.321. Specifically, the general idea is to rely on an LBT failure detection counter to record the accumulated LBT failure instances indicated by the PHY and judge whether a maximum count threshold is reached, and rely on an LBT failure detection timer to judge whether the LBT failure is autonomously recovered in the PHY.

There is a majority of contributions proposing to reuse this NR-U design also to SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection procedure, at least as the baseline [1][2][3][5][6][7][8][9][15][18]. So below questions are to check to which extent the NR-U consistent LBT detection mechanism in the MAC can be reused for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection/declaration operation.

**Question 4-1:**  Do companies agree to introduce the following parameters/variables for the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection procedure, as in NR-U? [[1]](#footnote-1)

1. An SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER)
2. An SL-specific maximum LBT failure instance count threshold (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureInstanceMaxCount*)
3. An SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option selection** | **Please specify the reason, if you think any of option A/B/C is not needed.** |
| CATT | A, B, C | Similar solution as NR-U. |
| OPPO | A,B,C | We understand the 3 are all to mimic NR-U behavior. |
| Apple | ABC, but... | We prefer to reuse same mechanism of NR-U. So. all these 3 parameters are required.  However, if RAN2 agree the granularity of consistent LBT failure is per resource pool or RB set, we may need multiple sets of parameters. This can be FFS. |
| vivo | A, B, C | Yes, if needed, we may further discuss the need of any other SL specific enhancement, following later RAN1/2 progress. |
| Xiaomi | A, B, C | Reuse NR-U solution. |
| ZTE | A, B, C | Follow NR-U solution. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A,B,C | Prefer to reuse legacy mechanism in NR-U. |
| Lenovo | A,B,C |  |
| Qualcomm | A, B, C w. comment | All these are needed based on NR-U. But this may also base on the granularity of consistent LBT failure. |
| Intel | A, B, C | Reuse NR-U solution |
| InterDigital | A, B, C | We think we will need multiple such parameters given the discussion on granularity. |
| Sharp | A, B, C |  |
| ASUSTeK | A, B, C |  |
| LG | A, B, C |  |
| NEC | A, B, C | Follow NR-U mechanism. |
| Ericsson | A, B, C | We should use the above parameters/variables as the baseline |
| Fraunhofer | A, B, C |  |
| MediaTek | A, B, C |  |
| Nokia, NSB | A, B, C | Reuse NR-U principles. |
| Spreadtrum | A, B, C |  |
| Samsung | A, B, C |  |

[Rapporteur’s Summary]

* Option A: 21
* Option B: 21
* Option C: 21

Proposals are to be given for Q4-1/4-2/4-2a together.

Below questions further discuss which of the NR-U operations on the COUNTER and TIMER handling for consistent LBT failure detection can be reused in SL-U.

**Question 4-2:** Do companies agree that the COUNTER and TIMER handling for consistent LBT failure detection in NR-U can be reused as the baseline for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in SL-U?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Please specify the reason, if “No” is selected.** |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes, but.. | We prefer to reuse same mechanism of NR-U.  However, if RAN2 agree the granularity of consistent LBT failure is per resource pool or RB set, maybe RAN2 need to specify some new rules on whether counter is reset or continued after switching resource pool. Or multiple sets of timers/counter are run in parallel. This can be FFS. |
| vivo | Yes | This question aims to derive a high-level principle, whereas the next question further strives for which functional operation in NR-U can be actually reused in SL-U on the basis of this principle |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes | We can agree to this with the understanding that this may require multiple timers, counters, depending on further discussion on granularity. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | This question is overlapping with Q4-1. They can be merged. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |

[Rapporteur’s Summary]

* Yes: 21
* No: 0

Proposals are to be given for Q4-1/4-2/4-2a together.

**Question 4-2a:** If “Yes” is selected to Q4-2, which of the following operations for consistent LBT failure detection in NR-U can be reused for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection procedure in SL-U? Please select ALL the operations you agree to support.

1. As in NR-U, if an SL-specific LBT failure indication is received from the lower layer, the SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER) is incremented by one.
2. As in NR-U, if an SL-specific LBT failure indication is received from the lower layer, start or restart the SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*)
3. As in NR-U, if the SL-specific LBT failure indication counter value is equal to or larger than the SL-specific maximum LBT failure instance count threshold (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureInstanceMaxCount*), consistent LBT failure is triggered/declared by the MAC entity[[2]](#footnote-2).
4. As in NR-U, if the SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*) expires, the SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER) is reset to 0.
5. As in NR-U, if the maximum LBT failure instance count threshold (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureInstanceMaxCount*) or SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*) is reconfigured, SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER) is reset to 0.
6. Others. If this option is selected, please elaborate the solution you propose.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option selection** | **Comments if any** |
| CATT | A, B, C ,D , E |  |
| OPPO | A-E | We understand the behavior here are all to mimic NR-U behavior. |
| Apple | ABCDE, but.. | We prefer to reuse same mechanism of NR-U.  However, if RAN2 agree the granularity of consistent LBT failure is per resource pool or RB set, maybe RAN2 need to specify some new rules on whether counter is reset or continued after switching resource pool. Or multiple sets of timers/counter are run in parallel. This can be FFS. |
| vivo | A, B, C, D, E | Of course, more Stg.3 details can be further discussed in future meetings, if the options listed have not exhausted all necessary detailed behaviors in SL-U. |
| Xiaomi | ABCDE | Reuse NR-U solution. |
| ZTE | ABCDE |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | A, B, C ,D , E |  |
| Lenovo | All options (A~E) |  |
| Qualcomm | A~E w. comment | Baselined on NR-U. But it’s not clear if any impact from the granularity of consistent LBT failure. |
| Intel | A-E |  |
| InterDigital | A-E |  |
| Sharp | A-E |  |
| ASUSTeK | A, B, C, D, E |  |
| LG | A-E |  |
| NEC | A, B, C, D, E |  |
| Ericsson | A~E | As mentioned, can use as baseline. Agree with Qualcomm, depending on outcome of previous question on LBT operational granularity, the counter and timer may be configured per operational granularity |
| Fraunhofer | A-E |  |
| MediaTek | A-E |  |
| Nokia, NSB | A, B, C, D, E |  |
| Spreadtrum | A-E |  |
| Samsung | A-E |  |

[Rapporteur’s Summary]

* A: 21
* B: 21
* C: 21
* D: 21
* E: 21

Based on companies’ input to Q4-1/4-2/4-2a, Rapporteur’s observation is as follows:

* From input to Question 4-1, all companies agreed to introduce the parameters and variables (i.e. timer, counter and counter threshold) as in NR-U for the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection procedure as the baseline.
* From input to Question 4-2, all companies agreed to reuse NR-U consistent LBT failure detection procedure, specifically the related TIMER and COUNTER handling, as the baseline.
* From input to Question 4-2a, reuse of the related MAC behaviors on TIMER and COUNTER handling in NR-U is confirmed by companies for SL-U, as the baseline.

Some companies commented that although NR-U consistent LBT failure detection procedure can be taken as the baseline, there are some potential SL-specific aspects that need to be further investigated. Rapporteur shares the view, and thought that if there is any, companies can bring contributions in future meetings for discussion.

**Proposal 4-0 (21/21): As the general principle, reuse the consistent LBT failure detection procedure in NR-U as the baseline for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in SL-U.**

**Proposal 4-1 (21/21): As in NR-U, introduce the following parameters and variables for the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in SL-U as the baseline:**

* **An SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER);**
* **An SL-specific maximum LBT failure instance count threshold (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureInstanceMaxCount*);**
* **An SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*).**

**Proposal 4-2 (21/21): Reuse the following MAC behaviors on TIMER/COUNTER handling in NR-U for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection procedure in SL-U:**

* **As in NR-U, if an SL-specific LBT failure indication is received from the lower layer, the SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER) is incremented by one.**
* **As in NR-U, if an SL-specific LBT failure indication is received from the lower layer, start or restart the SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*)**
* **As in NR-U, if the SL-specific LBT failure indication counter value is equal to or larger than the SL-specific maximum LBT failure instance count threshold (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureInstanceMaxCount*), consistent LBT failure is triggered/declared by the MAC entity.**
* **As in NR-U, if the SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*) expires, the SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER) is reset to 0.**
* **As in NR-U, if the maximum LBT failure instance count threshold (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureInstanceMaxCount*) or SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*) is reconfigured, SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER) is reset to 0.**

# UE behaviour when MAC declares consistent LBT failure

Regarding the SL-specific consistent LBT failure recovery procedure, several companies in their contributions explore the differentiated handling for Mode-1 and Mode-2.

For a Mode-1 UE, several contributions mentioned to report the occurrence of SL-specific consistent LBT failure to the gNB and rely on gNB’s configuration for the recovery [1][2][3][4][6][7][8][9][14][15][18], which is following the same design logic of NR-U. Some companies also proposed even further details on the signaling type for the reporting (e.g. MAC CE or RRC message).

For a Mode-2 UE, companies are proposing some ways for UE autonomous recovery from SL-specific LBT failure, e.g. switching SL BWP/resource pool/SL carrier, etc. [1][2][3][18], instead of making it reported to the gNB. This is somewhat like the autonomous UL BWP switching for the Spcell consistent LBT failure recovery in NR-U.

**Question 5-1:**  Do companies agree that as in NR U, a **Mode-1** UE can indicate the SL-specific consistent LBT failure (if triggered and not cancelled) to the gNB?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment if any** |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | While we understand this Q5-1 is not to exclude the reporting for RRC\_CONNECTED mode-2 UE reporting, but just to conclude on mode-1 first? Or? |
| Apple | Yes | It follows general principle of recovery in NR. Upon reception of the failure indication, t is up to gNB implementation how to perform recovery (e.g. reconfiguration of resource pool, handover the UE to another cell, *etc*.). |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | See comments | We have similar concern as OPPO, we think mode 2 UE operating in RRC CONNECTED mode may also be allowed to report to the network. We should not limit the reporting to mode 1 at this early stage. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes | We have the same comment as OPPO. |
| Sharp | Yes | It would be benefit for the gNB to get the LBT failure information. |
| ASUSTeK | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | RAN2 can assume Mode 1 reporting as the baseline, FFS mode 2. We have sympathy with OPPO and xiaomi, reporting of consistent LBT failure and/or LBT statistics may be considered as a general reporting means for UE in unlicensed operation, to assist the gNB to have a good picture on congestion status of the unlicensed carrier. it is worth noting that UE may perform different RRM mode (i.e., one UE is in Mode 1 while another UE is in Mode 2). Reporting of one UE may be helpful for the gNB to understand congestions status of other UEs. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |

[Rapporteur’s Summary]

* Yes: 21
* No: 0

All companies agreed that at least some form of UE to gNB reporting is needed, in case SL-specific consistent LBT failure is triggered. Whereas no companies doubt the applicability of this mechanism to a mode-1 UE, the main left-over issue here is whether such reporting should also be supported for a mode-2 UE in RRC\_CONNECTED. So below proposal is given.

**Proposal 5-1 (21/21): Support the mechanism that a mode-1 UE can indicate the SL-specific consistent LBT failure (if triggered and not cancelled) to the gNB. FFS whether this mechanism is also supported for a mode-2 UE in RRC\_CONNECTED**.

**Question 5-1a:**  If “Yes” is selected to Q5-1, which signaling should be used for such SL-specific consistent LBT failure indication to the gNB?

1. MAC CE
2. RRC message
3. Others. If this option is selected, please elaborate the solution you propose.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option selection** | **Comments if any** |
| CATT | A |  |
| OPPO |  | In NR-U, the MAC-CE is used to report LBT issue in a per-cell manner, so we understand now the decision between MAC-CE/RRC is coupled with the conclusion of granularity (Q3-1, Q3-2), i.e., we can evaluate the feasibility of MAC-CE design depending on the dimension(s) to take care. |
| Apple | Prefer A,  B is acceptable | Note that NR-U used MAC-CE while Rel-16 NR V2X has supported to use SUI to convey failure information in case of SL RLF. We think both solution can work.  Among them, we slightly prefer A (i.e. MAC-CE) because consistent LBT failure should be expected to be faster than SL RLF. |
| vivo | At least A | We want to reuse MAC CE based way as in NR-U as much as possible. Regarding RRC signaling, we might further justify the use case of using it, before agreeing to support it. We also share OPPO’s comment, as how the signaling should be designed is tightly depend on the granularity of consistent LBT detection in SL. |
| Xiaomi | See comments | We think both can work and the detailed design of this report may depend on the conclusion of the granularity of consistent LBT failure detection. So seems too early to conclude on this issue. |
| ZTE | A | We think the reporting way in NR-U can be reused. However, since the granularity of consistent LBT failure may be different from NR-U, the field in MAC CE may be different. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Too early to decide | It can be FFS, e.g. we can further discuss this after the granularity for consistent LBT failure is determined. |
| Lenovo | A,B | Both A and B are fine to us. Consistent LBT failure could be indicated via RRC message like SL-RLF indication. However, in order to align it with NR-U, MAC CE based solution would be slightly preferred. |
| Qualcomm | Comment | Too early to decide |
| Intel | A or B | We prefer using the NR-U way (MAC CE), but B can also work. |
| InterDigital | A | We prefer to stay as close to NR-U design as possible. |
| Sharp | A |  |
| ASUSTeK | A |  |
| LG | Too early to decide | Agree with OPPO |
| NEC | Comment | It depends on the granularity of consistent LBT failure detection, prefer to further discuss it later. |
| Ericsson | A, B | Reuse NR-U signaling alternatives for SL-U, i.e., MAC CE is used for signaling LBT failures on a resource pool, RB set or LBT subband if it is feasible (i.e., depending on the operational granularity). RRC is used for signaling of RLF. NR-U has adopted such signaling alternative aimed for 1) UE can fast switch/recover from consistent LBT failure in a frequency region, if there are other frequency regions available for the UE 2) same as Uu RLF reporting, UE reports SL RLF via RRC. |
| Fraunhofer | A |  |
| MediaTek | Too early to decide |  |
| Nokia, NSB | At least A |  |
| Spreadtrum | A |  |
| Samsung | A or B |  |

[Rapporteur’s Summary]

* Option A: 14
* Option B: 4
* Too early to decide: 7

This question is related to specific signaling type which is more related to Stg3 details. Among the companies participating in this discussion, there is a majority (14 out of 21) proposing to at least reuse the MAC CE based reporting, following NR-U logic. Some companies also wanted to consider the possibility of using RRC based reporting. There are also several companies commenting that the specific signaling design depends on the granularity on consistent LBT failure detection, so it is too early to decide the signaling type before above Q3-1 can be concluded.

Considering this situation, Rapporteur would like to make an attempt on whether we can first agree to reuse at least the related NR-U design, i.e. MAC CE based signaling, and leave RRC based signaling as FFS.

**Proposal 5-1a: RAN2 to discuss whether the MAC CE based signaling can be supported to signal the SL-specific consistent LBT failure (if triggered and not cancelled) to the gNB. FFS whether RRC-based signaling is also needed. FFS more details on the signaling design (e.g. content).**

**Question 5-2:**  Do companies agree that for a Mode-2 UE, when the consistent LBT failure is triggered on a “set of resources”, the UE can autonomously switch to another “set of resources” where consistent LBT failure is not triggered for further transmission?

* *Note that the granularity of such “set of resources” depends on the granularity for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in Q3-1/3-2.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment if any** |
| CATT | See comment | It is too early to discuss this since the set of resources is unclear now. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Apple | Wait conclusion of granularity | This solution can only work when both below conditions are met:   * If granularity of consistent SL LBT failure is agreed to be per resource pool or RB sets. * If more than 1 resource pools are configured for a Mode-2 UE. So, if per-BWP granularity is agreed, this solution can't work (i.e. total number of "set of resources" is 1).   Meanwhile, how to reselect resource pool is within RAN1 expertise. So, we suggest RAN2 to wait for conclusion of granularity first. |
| vivo | Yes | Regarding this “set of resources”, just as an example, if RAN1/RAN2 decides that the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection is per resource pool, then the mode-2 UE needs to perform resource pool switching/reselection once the consistent LBT failure detection is triggered on one of the resource pools.  We are also fine to put this discussion on-hold, until the granularity of the SL specific consistent LBT failure is determined. |
| Xiaomi | See comments | We agree with CATT and Apple. Too early to discuss this issue. |
| ZTE | Yes | Tend to agree. But it depends on granularity of consistent LBT failure. Maybe we can discuss it after granularity is confirmed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | Mechanism where UE autonomously recover from the consistent LBT failure should be introduced, similar to mechanism for SpCell in NR-U. For example, UE may switch to a resource pool that uses different LBT subband compared to the RP for which consistent LBT failure was declared, in case granularity is resource pool. Additionally, problematic resource pool should be blocked for resource (re)selection until the consistent LBT failure is recovered on that RP.  Also notice that in some cases this cannot happen e.g. if granularity is for the whole SL-BWP. |
| Qualcomm | Comment | Too early to decide. |
| Intel | Comment | We need to check with RAN1 on the granularity of the LBT failure and whether autonomously reselecting resources can really resolve the problem |
| InterDigital | Yes | We anyway think that RAN1 will decide on the granularity of a set of resources (regardless of what that is). And furthermore, this is consistent with change in BWP in NR-U. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | Yes | Details can be further discussed after decision on granularity. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| NEC | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Comment | We also think it is too early to decide without the understanding on granularity |
| Fraunhofer | Comment | Too eraly to decide |
| MediaTek | Comment | Too early to decide |
| Nokia, NSB | See comments | We agree with Apple’s comments. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Samsung | See comment | Agree with Apple. |

[Rapporteur’s Summary]

* Yes: 11
* No: 0
* Too early to decide: 10

It can be seen that a number of companies thought perhaps it is too early to decide how the mode-2 UE should autonomously recover from SL-specific consistent LBT failure, if detected, as this has dependency on the granularity discussion for consistent LBT failure detection. However, from companies’ comments/input, nobody ever denied the necessity to introduce a UE autonomous recovery mechanism as a general principle, regardless of the later designs on how it works in detail. Also, Rapporteur understands, even if a “direct-RLF” based solution is needed, it is still some forms of “recovery” that needs to be performed by the UE.

Therefore, Rapporteur proposes to support a recovery mechanism for mode-2 UE, but leave all the details as FFS (pending perhaps granularity conclusion as well)

**Proposal 5-2: Confirm that an autonomous SL-specific consistent LBT failure recovery mechanism is needed for a mode-2 UE in SL-U. Details are FFS.**

In NR-U, there is an exceptional case where all the UL BWPs configured with PRACH occasions are experiencing the consistent LBT failure for the SpCell. In this case, MCG/SCG RLF will be declared in RRC. Some companies also mentioned this case for SL-specific consistent LBT failure, and mentioned PC5 RLF for unicast as an analogy. Whether such an operation is needed can also be confirmed among companies.

**Question 5-3:**  Do companies agree that when SL-specific consistent LBT failure has been triggered for ALL the “set of resources” configured for transmission, PC5 RLF can be triggered for unicast?

* *Note that the granularity of such “set of resources” depends on the granularity for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in Q3-1/3-2.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment if any** |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO |  | Even though we are open to this direction, we feel it is too early to discuss this, we may need to see the output of granularity first to progress on this aspect. |
| Apple | No | This proposal doesn't make sense at least for Mode-1 UE case (in Q5-1). If this proposal is agreed and Model-1 UE is agreed to report LBT failure info to gNB, then it will mean consistent SL LBT failure == SL RLF. We believe the intention of Mode-1 UE reporting LBT failure info is to allow gNB to recover its failure in AS layer (e.g. handover to another cell) instead of declaring PC5 RLF directly.  For Mode-2 UE, we have similar view of Q5-2 that we should wait for conclusion of granularity. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | See comments | Agree with OPPO. We should wait until we have conclusion on the granularity of the consistent LBT failure detection. |
| ZTE | See comments | Agree with OPPO. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | Too early to decide. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Comment | Too early to decide |
| Intel |  | Agree with OPPO comment |
| InterDigital | No | Agree with Apple. In any event, it is too early to make this conclusion for any mode. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ASUSTeK | Maybe yes | For mode-2, it’s related to outcome of Q5-2. Details can be further discussed after decision on granularity. |
| LG |  | Agree with OPPO |
| NEC | Comment | It seems too early to discuss it. |
| Ericsson | Comment | It is worth noting that this is same as in NR-U. this question doesn’t depend on the operational granularities.  If UE cannot perform LBT failure detection and recovery per (e.g., resource pool, RB set), UE will immediately declare RLF after detection of consistent LBT failure.  If UE can perform LBT failure detection and recovery per frequency region, UE will declare RLF after declaring consistent LBT failure in all regions |
| Fraunhofer | No | Agree with Apple and Interdigital. It is too early to agree on that. |
| MediaTek | Comment | Too early to decide |
| Nokia, NSB | See comments | Too early to decide. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Too early to decide. |
| Samsung | See comment | Agree with OPPO and Apple |

[Rapporteur’s Summary]

* Yes: 5
* No: 3
* No selection (too early, not clear about motivation, etc.): 13

Since companies’ views are rather scattered to this question, we can postpone the discussion, until earlier questions/proposals (e.g. P5-1/5-2, P3-1, etc.) are concluded. No proposal is given for this question, as a result.

# Conclusions

Thanks to all companies participating in this offline discussion. Based on companies’ input, proposals are listed as follows.

**Proposals for easy agreements**

*(Note that per online discussion situation, if needed, P2 can be discussed/confirmed before discussing any other proposals)*

**Proposal 1 (21/21): SL-specific LBT failure indication from PHY is needed for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in the MAC. How/whether it is used for other purposes can be further discussed.**

**Proposal 2 (21/21): Support SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection and recovery procedure in the MAC for SL-U.**

**Proposal 4-0 (21/21): As the general principle, reuse the consistent LBT failure detection procedure in NR-U as the baseline for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in SL-U.**

**Proposal 4-1 (21/21): As in NR-U, introduce the following parameters and variables for the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection in SL-U as the baseline:**

* **An SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER);**
* **An SL-specific maximum LBT failure instance count threshold (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureInstanceMaxCount*);**
* **An SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*).**

**Proposal 4-2 (21/21): Reuse the following MAC behaviors on TIMER/COUNTER handling in NR-U for SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection procedure in SL-U:**

* **As in NR-U, if an SL-specific LBT failure indication is received from the lower layer, the SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER) is incremented by one.**
* **As in NR-U, if an SL-specific LBT failure indication is received from the lower layer, start or restart the SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*)**
* **As in NR-U, if the SL-specific LBT failure indication counter value is equal to or larger than the SL-specific maximum LBT failure instance count threshold (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureInstanceMaxCount*), consistent LBT failure is triggered/declared by the MAC entity.**
* **As in NR-U, if the SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*) expires, the SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER) is reset to 0.**
* **As in NR-U, if the maximum LBT failure instance count threshold (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureInstanceMaxCount*) or SL-specific LBT failure detection timer (e.g. *sl-LBT-FailureDetectionTimer*) is reconfigured, SL-specific LBT failure indication counter (e.g. SL\_LBT\_COUNTER) is reset to 0.**

**Proposal 5-1 (21/21): Support the mechanism that a mode-1 UE can indicate the SL-specific consistent LBT failure (if triggered and not cancelled) to the gNB. FFS whether this mechanism is also supported for a mode-2 UE in RRC\_CONNECTED**.

**Proposals for further discussion**

**Proposal 3-1: Send LS to RAN1 asking the granularity of the SL-specific LBT failure indication, when received from PHY, e.g. “When an SL-specific LBT failure indication is notified for an SL transmission by the PHY, in which resource granularity the SL-specific LBT failure instance can be considered as being indicated (e.g. per Resource Pool, per RB set, per SL BWP, etc.)?”.**

**Proposal 3-1a: Based on the feedback from RAN1, RAN2 to further decide in which granularity the SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection is performed for SL-U.**

**Proposal 3-2 (15/21): RAN2 to discuss whether to make the working assumption that SL-specific consistent LBT failure detection at per cast type/per DST/per unicast link level is not supported in Rel-18 SL-U.**

**Proposal 5-1a: RAN2 to discuss whether the MAC CE based signaling can be supported to signal the SL-specific consistent LBT failure (if triggered and not cancelled) to the gNB. FFS whether RRC-based signaling is also needed. FFS more details on the signaling design (e.g. content).**

**Proposal 5-2: Confirm that an autonomous SL-specific consistent LBT failure recovery mechanism is needed for a mode-2 UE in SL-U. Details are FFS.**
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