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# 1 List of critical issues

## 1.1 Remaining issues for dynamic and configured grant

## Topics highlighted in yellow are the proposal from the FL for discussion in thread #2.

1. Dynamic grant: number of PUCCH resources per grant.
2. Configured grant
   1. Whether to use physical or logical slots.
   2. Type-1: remaining details of frame indexing
   3. Remaining details on HARQ process ID determination
3. Processing times
   1. Whether to support multiple UE capabilities or not and, if so, how many.
4. Any issue related to this AI and the LS from RAN2 in R1-2003256.

## 1.2 DCI aspects

## Topics highlighted in yellow are the proposal from the FL for discussion in thread #2.

1. Contents of DCI format 3\_0:
   * Size of the following agreed fields: Time gap, HARQ process ID, Configuration index, counter SAI (for Type-1 codebook), PSFCH-to-HARQ\_feedback timing indicator
   * Indication of activation/release for Type-2 CG
   * Define the combination of PSFCH-to-HARQ feedback timing indicator and PUCCH resource indicator used to indicate that PUCCH resource is not provided.
   * Whether to include a Resource pool index and, if so, details.
2. Alignment of DCI format 3\_0 with other DCI formats

## 1.3 HARQ reporting to gNB

## Topics highlighted in yellow are the proposal from the FL for discussion in thread #3.

1. Type-1 codebook for reporting in UL-SCH
   * Required changes to the Rel-15 procedures (as agreed) – TS 38.213 Section 9.1.2.2
2. Type-2 codebook for reporting in UL-SCH
   * Required changes to the Rel-15 procedures (as agreed) – TS 38.213 Section 9.1.3.2
3. Collisions between SL HARQ-ACK reports and other Uu UCI.
4. Details in the WA from RAN#100-e for the case of reaching the maximum number of HARQ re-transmissions for a TB.

## 1.4 Processing times

1. PSCCH/PSSCH preparation time.
2. PSFCH to UL report time: working assumption (on N) and FFS (on X) from RAN1#100bis-e.

## 1.5 Miscellaneous

1. Corrections and clarifications to the specification (multiple contributions)

# Company views

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | 1.1: We support FL proposal. In addition, we believe that MCS range restriction should be discussed in this thread. The issue is how to use only one set of sl-MaxMCS-PSSCH-r16 and sl-MinMCS-PSSCH-r16, for multiple MCS tables, This has potential RRC impact.  1.2: We support FL proposal. In addition, ‘Size of the following agreed fields’ should include PSFCH-to-HARQ feedback timing indicator field as well, which is FFS in the agreements at the last e-meeting.  1.3: In our understanding, this thread includes potential RRC impact of betaOffsets and scaling for SL HARQ-ACK multiplexing on PUSCH, and UL DAI issue. If this is correct understanding, we support FL proposal. Regarding third one, which AI is this discussed, in procedure AI or here?  FL reply:  Regarding 1.1, I suggest discussing any issue in that LS that is related to this AI.  Regarding 1.2, I have added the field.  Regarding 1.3, all issues related to reports on PUSCH must be discussed, including beta offset, etc.  For the prioritization, it will be in a single AI. I will try to clarify with Hanbyul. |
| vivo | Agree with FL’s proposal for issue 1.1 and 1.2.    **Regarding 1.3:**  tDAI field exists in UL DCI for single-cell case as long as type2 codebook is configured.  We have agreed to reuse the R15 procedure for SL HARQ reporting in Uu. Although the type-1/2 codebook as well as the SAI were discussed in last meeting, the issue of UL DAT (i.e., tSAI field in UL DCI) has not been discussed and the behaviour is not clear.  We need to clarify how to indicate SAI in UL DCI before discussing the details of SL CB on PUSCH.  So we propose to modify 1.3 as below   1. DCI format 0-1 should indicate SAI when SL HARQ codebook is multiplexed on the scheduled PUSCH    * Details on the SAI indication, e.g., whether to introduce separated SAI field for UL DCI or reuse the R15 DAI in UL DCI to indicate SAI. 2. Type-1 codebook for reporting in UL-SCH    * Required changes to the Rel-15 procedures (as agreed) – TS 38.213 Section 9.1.2.2 3. Type-2 codebook for reporting in UL-SCH    * Required changes to the Rel-15 procedures (as agreed) – TS 38.213 Section 9.1.3.2 4. Collisions between SL HARQ-ACK reports and other Uu UCI.   FL reply:  Regarding 1.3, we need to discuss all details about the reporting on PUSCH. Let us keep the wording as it is. |
| OPPO | * 1. we agree that the highlight part should be discussed. For the one left topic of “remaining details on HPN determination”, we think it is related to both RAN1 and RAN2. We agree in principle to reuse the same mechanism of UL CG, while there is some difference between SL CG and UL CG needs to be clarified. For example, there is up to 3 SL CG resources within a period, while only 1 for UL CG. And whether it is allowed that the slot index of SL CG resource of each SFN period can be different (the same issue have been identified and discussed in IIoT) ? These issues is more suitable to be discussed in RAN1. And considering only 1 meeting left for RAN2, if we don’t discuss them, it is hardly for RAN2 to make progress.   Furthermore, we have made the following agreement in RAN1 #99. While according to the email discussion during RAN1#100b-e, companies have different view on the highlight part. In my view, there are at least 3 different understanding about “the resources provided by the configured grant”:   * + - 1. The resources are within one SL CG period, i.e. up to 3 resources;       2. The resources can across multiple SL CG periods and these SL CG period can correspond to different HPN;       3. The resources can across multiple SL CG periods, while only limit to the SL CG period correspond to same HPN.   We think at least common understanding should be achieved in RAN1. It is also related to how to determine HPN of SL CG resource. RAN1 should clarify it and inform RAN2 about the common understanding so that RAN2 can make progress.  Agreements:   * For dynamic grant, the number of retransmissions of a TB is up to the gNB. * For configured grant, the maximum number of times that a TB can be retransmitted using the resources provided by the configured grant is configured per priority per configured grant.   1. Agree.   2. For the 4th topic (for the case of reaching the maximum number of HARQ re-transmissions for a TB.), we have some FFS in the WA to be solved, for example, how the UE knows whether/when the maximum transmission number is reached or not. Without that, the spec is in-complete. And it may have RAN2 impact. We think it should be discussed in this meeting to address the issue.   FL reply:  Regarding 1.1, let’s try to discuss 2c once again, given that there seems to be quite some interest. I also suggest discussing any issue in that LS that is related to this AI.  Regarding 1.3, the aspects to the WA (behaviour and message contents) should have no ASN.1 impact (in fact, everything in in 38.213 to this date) I suggest to have the discussion later. |
| CMCC | 1.1 we agree that the highlight part should be discussed. For the one left topic of “remaining details on HPN determination”, we share similar view with OPPO and think it is very likely to have impact on RAN2. Moreover, RAN2 sends LS to RAN1 in R1-2003256 to check views on HARQ ID determination for SL CG, RAN1 should clarify it and reply the LS so that RAN2 can make progress.  1.2 Agree  1.3 Agree. We have same question with DCM and wonder which AI will the prioritization/multiplex issue be discussed.  FL reply:  For 1.1.: The point about the LS makes sense  For 1.3: See my reply to DCM |
| CATT | Agree with FL’s proposal on the 3 threads. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. We are generally supportive with this FL proposal. Additionally, whether/how to support CG repetition within a period should be involved in this email thread as well. We had a short discussion but without explicit outcome in the last meeting, and it may have RAN2 spec impact. 2. Support this proposal. 3. Besides the listed issue, the X value for SL HARQ preparation time which is a left FFS from last meeting should be discussed. It is indispensably related to the time restriction for reporting SL HARQ to gNB and PUCCH indicating by gNB, so we think it should be decided in this meeting.   FL reply:  For 1.1: there was no consensus on repetition last time. Given that this is not widely treated and that it received very little interest last time, my proposal is to skip this discussion.  Regarding 1.3, the value of X can be discussed as part of the processing/preparation times. I think this is less urgent given that it has no ASN.1 impact. |
| Fraunhofer | * 1. and 1.2: We agree with the FL’s proposal   1.3: We feel that the 4th topic regarding the UE’s action when reaching the maximum number of HARQ retransmissions has to be addressed. The WA that was confirmed in the previous meeting stated that the content of the report send by the UE and the UE behaviour are FFS, and we feel that they have to be resolved in this meeting.  FL reply:  For 1.3, there is no question that the issue must be addressed. But given that it has very limited impact to RAN1 specs, I suggest not treating it this time. |
| Intel | We are in general fine with the list. In the same time, we have worries that if PSCCH/PSSCH preparation time is not discussed this meeting, there is no chance to introduce different capabilities later, since these changes would be backward incompatible to ASN.1 for UE capability.  In other words, we do see RAN2 and ASN.1 impact in PSCCH/PSSCH preparation time issue, and suggest to find a place to discuss it somewhere within these 3 threads.  FL reply:  My concern is that having a discussion on processing/preparation times may be too much for the thread. But I suggest discussing whether we want to have different capabilities or not. |
| Apple | Thread 1: Issue 1.1. In case capacity allows, the issue “Remaining details on HARQ process ID determination” may also be discussed.  Thread 2: Issue 1.2. One remaining issue of the presence/size of “PSFCH-to-HARQ feedback timing indicator” field in DCI format 3\_0 may also be discussed.  Thread 3: Issue 1.3 with first 3 bullets. The number of PUSCH resources allocated for SL HARQ report (similar to TS 38.213 Section 3) may also be discussed. The applicability of transmission SL HARQ report on PUSCH may also be discussed (e.g., whether to support SL HARQ report piggyback on PUSCH with URLLC data).  FL reply:  For 1.1, see my reply to OPPO.  For 1.2, see my reply to DCM.  For 1.3, I suggest not increasing the scope. We have agreed to reuse Rel-15 procedures. Let us focus on that at this point. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are ok with most parts of FL’s proposal, and would like to have following additional suggestions:  1) Issue 1.4 can be combined into 1.1.  2) The 3rd issue “Collisions between SL HARQ-ACK reports and other Uu UCI” in 1.3 should be handled in PHY-procedure agenda. So far all prioritization issues are handled in PHY-procedure. To discuss them in the same agenda would help to reach better integrity of whole framework.  We further wonder whether RAN1 should try to cover all listed issues except ones in 1.5. Any tried but unsolvable issues can be left for company CR discussion after June plenary.  FL reply:  On 1) see my reply to Intel  On 2) see my reply to DCM |
| Nokia, NSB | The proposed list looks good.  For 1.3, we propose to include issue 4 “case of reaching the maximum number of HARQ re-transmissions for a TB”  FL reply:  For 1.3, see my reply to Fraunhofer |
| Futurewei | We are generally supportive of the three directions. Regarding the newly added 1.1.3 (processing times): in our view, it is difficult to discuss whether we will have a UE capability before we have an idea of what the actual processing time will be. We would be okay with either one of the two options: a) replacing 1.1.3 by a discussion on processing time (although we agree with FL that this would be a very broad scope for a discussion) or b removing it altogether  Also, what is the status of 1.3.3: to be discussed here or in procedures? |