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# Introduction

This document is to discuss the following issue

* [POST117-e][715][V2X/SL] TP for IUC INFO and IUC REQ MAC CE format (OPPO)

**Scope:** Discuss IUC INFO and IUC REQ MAC CE format according to the latest RAN1 agreements on the fields and each field size that to be included in MAC CE. Provide 38.321 TP for IUC INFO and IUC REQ MAC CE format.

**Intended outcome:** Endorse 38.321 TP for IUC INFO and IUC REQ MAC CE format for 38.321 CR in R2-2203696 and agree discussion summary in R2-2203697 (if needed). Agreed TP will be added into MAC CR in [POST117-e][703].

**Deadline**: Short email discussion (can start it now, end until 3.9 10:00am UTC)

# Discussion

During the online discussion, we have reached the following agreement

R2-2203084 Introduction of IUC MAC CE Samsung Research America discussion

Proposal: RAN2 is asked to discuss container-based IUC MAC CE format (rather than defining each information field and the corresponding size inside of the MAC CE).

* We will design IUC INFO and IUC REQ MAC CE in legacy manner.

Firstly, we need to understand which fields are needed in the MAC-CE. For that, the R1 agreement on the MAC-CE format is copied as follows.

***Agreement***

*For Scheme 1, each bit field size of a SCI format 2-C for an explicit request for inter-UE coordination information is given by following table:*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Field name*** | ***Field size (in bits)*** |
| *Providing/requesting indicator* | *1* |
| *Priority* | *3* |
| *Number of subchannels* | *Where is provided by the higher layer parameter sl-NumSubchannel* |
| *Resource reservation period* | *Where with that is the number of entries in the higher layer parameter sl-ResourceReservePeriodList, if higher layer parameter sl-MultiReserveResoure is configured; otherwise.* |
| *Resource selection window location* | *Where is 0, 1, 2, 3 for SCS of 15kHz, 30kHz, 60kHz, 120kHz, respectively.* |
| *Resource set type* | *1 bit if determineResourceSetTypeScheme1 is set to ‘UE-B’s request’, otherwise, 0 bit* |

* *This agreement does not imply that new field requested by RAN2 cannot be further added.*

***Agreement***

*For Scheme 1, when MAC CE only is used as the container of inter-UE coordination information, each bit field size for inter-UE coordination information is given by following table from RAN1’s perspective, and RAN1 understands that the maximum value of N resource combinations to be conveyed in inter-UE coordination information is bounded so that the total payload size of inter-UE coordination information leads not to exceed the size of TB including the MAC CE*

* *Details (e.g., whether/how to separately indicate the value of N in the inter-UE coordination information, how to put the following fields into MAC CE and the related field sizes in MAC CE) are up to RAN2*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***Field name*** | ***Field size (in bits)*** |
| *Providing/requesting indicator* | *1* |
| *Resource combination(s)* | *Where is provided by the higher layer parameter sl-NumSubchannel,*  *with that is the number of entries in the higher layer parameter sl-ResourceReservePeriodList, if higher layer parameter sl-MultiReserveResoure is configured; otherwise.* |
| *First resource location(s)* | *Where X is provided by the (pre)configured maximum value of slot offset for the case when MAC CE only is used as a container of inter-UE coordination information* |
| *Reference slot location* | *Where is 0, 1, 2, 3 for SCS of 15kHz, 30kHz, 60kHz, 120kHz, respectively.* |
| *Resource set type* | *1* |
| *Lowest subchannel indices for the first resource location of each TRIV* | *Where is provided by the higher layer parameter sl-NumSubchannel.* |

Based on that, moderator tend to ask the following questions, aiming at a minimum set of MAC-CE design to finish the core part of this issue.

Within the fields agreed by R1, moderator understand only the field of “*Providing/requesting indicator*” is not necessary since MAC-CE will use LCID to differentiate (while SCI needs that bit). Otherwise, the other fields are necessary to follow the R1 agreement.

**Q1a: In the field for IUC-info, do you agree only the field of “*Providing/requesting indicator*” can be saved for MAC-CE format design, while the other fields are needed to follow R1 agreement?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comment |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Yes | Agree with rapporteur. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Apple |  | We agree with that “providing/request” is not needed. But we doubt if the parameter set from R1 is sufficient from RAN2 perspective. For example, how to handle concurrent transactions? What if a condition-triggered IUC info MAC CE is to be multiplexed with request-triggered IUC info MAC CE, and how UE B distinguish those two? Do we need transaction ID in each MAC CE? |

**Q1b: In the field for IUC-request, do you agree only the field of “*Providing/requesting indicator*” can be saved for MAC-CE format design, while the other fields are needed to follow R1 agreement?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Disagree | Comment |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Yes | Agree with rapporteur. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |

Secondly, as you can see, the fields in the MAC-CE are of variable length, decided by the related formula, based on the configured value of  (for FRIV, Lowest subchannel indices for the first resource location of each TRIV, Number of subchannels), X (for First resource location(s)), (for Reference slot location, Resource selection window location),  (Resource reservation period). So the issue is how to define the MAC-CE format, i.e., the bit-length for each field, considering the main difficulty of drawing the MAC-CE format figure in MAC-spec.

For this issue, moderator mainly see two solutions:

**Table 1 Min/Max bit length for the field in IUC-Information MAC-CE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Field name** | **Min Bit Length** | **Max Bit length** |
| Providing/requesting indicator | Not need in MAC CE since the LCID can be used to differentiate this | |
| Resource combination(s) | The minimum size is N\*(0+9+0) | The maximum size is N\*(13+9+4) |
| First resource location(s) | The minimum size is (N-1)\*(0) | The maximum size is (N-1)\*(13) |
| Reference slot location | The minimum size is 10+4 | The maximum size is 10+7 |
| Resource set type | 1 | |
| Lowest subchannel indices for the first resource location of each TRIV | The minimum size is N\*0 | The maximum size is N\*5 |
| In total | N\*9+15 | N\*44+5 |

**Table 2 Min/Max Bit length for the fields in IUC-Request MAC-CE**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Field name** | **Min Bit Length** | **Max Bit length** | |
| Providing/requesting indicator | Not need in MAC CE since the LCID can be used to differentiate this | | |
| Priority | 3 | | |
| Number of subchannels | The minimum size is 0 | The maximum size is 5 | |
| Resource reservation period | The minimum size is 0 | The maximum size is 4 | |
| Resource selection window location | The minimum size is 2\*(10+4) | The maximum size is 2\*(10+7) | |
| Resource set type | 1 | | |
| In total | 32 | | 47 |

One is we still define the bit occupation for each field clearly, but only define it based on the maximum value (this is because the max value is anyway has to be supported), e.g., 26-bit (=13+9+4), and then in case not all bits are useful (due to that the  and  are not configured to the maximum value, only parts of the bits are occupied, either MSB or LSB.

It would result into the MAC-CE format figure somehow like follows, if we use IUC-info MAC-CE as an example (please do not comment on the details, I will polish it later ^^)



**Figure 1 Example of IUC-info MAC-CE format of option-1**

The other is that we do not define the bit occupation for each field of variable length clearly, by just use descriptive text to define the order of each field, and the length of each field is exactly decided based on the configured value of , X, , , and one resource set combination after the other, R-bit is inserted in the end just for byte alignment. And it would result into something like the follows (also, the detailed aspect is to be refined in the phase-2, the following figure is just to give an brief view)



**Figure 2 Example of IUC-info MAC-CE format of option-2**

Where seems the former one gives an clear definition of the MAC-CE in the spec yet may lead to some bit waste due to the fixed field length, while the latter may save some bits when the configured value is not of the maximum value, but would lead somewhat unclear figure in the MAC-spec when capturing it.

**Q2: How should we handle the fields which are of variable length depending on the configuration of , X, , ?**

**Option-1: we still define the bit occupation for each field clearly, and thus a clear bit-occupation figure is to be provided in the TP, but only define it based on the maximum value, e.g., 26-bit (=13+9+4), and then in case not all bits are useful (due to that the  and  are not configured to the maximum value), only parts of the bits are occupied, either MSB or LSB. (if this option is selected, please comment if any different view on the max value length as indicated in Table-1/2 above)**

**Option-2: we do not define the bit occupation for each field of variable length clearly, by just use descriptive text to define the order of each field, and the length of each field is exactly decided based on the configured value of , X, , by using the formula provided by R1, and one resource set combination after the other, R-bit is inserted in the end just for byte alignment.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option(s) | Comment |
| OPPO | 1 or 2 | We are fine with either way, option-1 seems a safer one with some inefficiency issue, while option-2 seems to be efficient by somewhat new design, up to companies to pick-up. |
| Huawei HiSilicon | 1 but | Option 2 seems not some kind of legacy manner, so slightly prefer option 1. But we are also fine to follow the majority. |
| CATT | 1 or 2 | No strong view. Consideration on the length of IUC-info MAC CE, we slightly prefer option 2. |
| vivo | 1 | Option-1 is OK to us which is simple. |
| Apple | 1 |  |

**Q2a: if one selects option-1 of Q2, besides the max length, do you think any other length is to be supported?**

**- Yes (in this case, please clarify for which field, which length should be supported)**

**- No**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| OPPO | No | Indeed option-1 has this drawback, we do not see it is realistic to define MAC-CE for all candidate length of each field, so prefer a simple solution. Let’s solve it using a basic design. |
| Huawei HiSilicon | No | Agree with the rapporteur, max length should be adopted. |
| CATT | No | Agree with the rapporteur. |
| vivo | See comments | The min length can also be supported to be specified in the spec. Or, if the majority thinks that only max length is needed, we are also fine. |
| Apple | No |  |

Thirdly, specifically for IUC-info MAC-CE, one left issue is how to decide the maximum length of N in the MAC-CE, i.e., it has to be bounded as addressed in the R1 agreement. So the related details have to be clarified.

According to legacy manner, MAC subheader has the L field to indicate the length, as long as it is of variable length.

[…]

A MAC subheader except for fixed sized MAC CE, padding, and a MAC SDU containing UL CCCH consists of the header fields R/F/LCID/(eLCID)/L.

And thus there is no need to include the N in the MAC-CE, and thus the only left issue is the need of maximum value of N for the MAC-CE. Moderator understand it is not preferred to have a too-long MAC-CE, so suggest to limit the length in for example 4 or 8 level.

**Q3: What is your preference on the maximum value of N for the MAC-CE?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Max values | Comment |
| OPPO | 4 or 8 | We do not see a too-long value is feasible considering the length of each resource set combination is in the level of 4~6 bytes. |
| Huawei HiSilicon | 4 or 8 | We slightly prefer Option 1 in Q2, so in order to avoid too much waste of bits, we also prefer a not too-long value N. |
| CATT | 4 or 8 | Agree with the rapporteur, maximum value of N for the MAC-CE should be specified to avoid too-long MAC-CE. |
| vivo | 11 | In our understanding, the N can be a larger value, so that when the UE-A would like to inform UE-B with a large number of resources information, it doesn’t have to send multiple IUC MAC CEs. E.g. if the N is set to 4 and the UE-A would like to inform non-preferred resources of 8 resource combinations, it has to send two MAC CEs, which is not good considering the latency aspect.  On the other hand, as N is just used to define the UPPER bound of the MAC CE size, it doesn’t mean that the MAC CE will necessarily be that large. To make N a larger number is just to make the UE don’t need to send multiple MAC CEs.  The reason why we indicate 11 here is that, for mode-2, the maximum PSSCH transmission number is 32 (given by *sl-MaxTxTransNumPSSCH-r16* in 38.331), and as one resource combination can indicate three resources (as in Rel-16 38.214 section 8.1.5), it seems that a value larger than 11 would be meaningless for N (11\*3=33).  Therefore, we understand the maximum value of N can be 11. |
| Apple | Determined by the L field of MAC subheader | If the intention is to let UE A to convey all resource sets in one transmission, then we prefer to set a value large enough to avoid artificial segmentation of IUC information. |

# Summary

# Reference