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# Introduction

This contribution summarizes the Phase-1 discussion on open issue list review of the following email discussion:

* [POST116bis-e][707][V2X/SL] Open issues on IUC (LG)

**Scope:** 1st phase: Make an open issue lists with the proposed candidate options or rapporteur suggestion. Open issue lists can include pre-identified issues (e.g. FFS, not decided or skipped from previous offline/email discussion) and new issues raised in company contributions at RAN2#116bis. For new issues that have not discussed before, rapporteur can collect companies’ inputs (e.g. whether it is essential issue that need to be considered and closed in Rel-17) and based on that, determine whether to be included in the open issue list or not.

2nd phase: email discussion on the identified open issues with collecting companies’ inputs on the candidate options or rapporteur’s suggestion.

**Intended outcome:** Open issue list with the proposed candidate options or rapporteur’s suggestion from 1st phase (in R2-2201807). Discussion summary for the identified open issues from 2nd phase.

**Deadline:** 1st phase (1/21 – 1/28 UTC), 2nd phase (2/9 – 2/14 UTC)

The discussion is focusing on the open issue list (i.e., IUC issues RAN2 starts discussion) identified in [2] and missing RAN2 specific IUC issues not discussed in the #116b-e meeting.

**Contact list**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | E-mail |
| Ericsson | Min Wang | min.w.wang@ericsson.com |
| InterDigital | Martino Freda | martino.freda@interdigital.com |
| Xiaomi | Xing Yang | Yangxing1@xiaomi.com |
| vivo | Jing Liang | liangjing@vivo.com |
| CATT | ShiJie | shijie@catt.cn |
| Huawei,HiSilicon | Li Zhao | zhaoli8@huawei.com |
| ZTE | Weiqiang Du | [du.weiqiang2@zte.com.cn](mailto:du.weiqiang2@zte.com.cn) |
| Intel | Ansab Ali | ansab.ali@intel.com |
| Lenovo | Jie Hu | hujie14@lenovo.com |
| Qualcomm | Qing Li | qinli@qti.qualcomm.com |

# Review on open issue list for IUC

The identified “RAN2 specific IUC issues” in [2] are needed to be discussed for WI completion. Companies are invited to provide views on the suggested way of treatment/handling for each of them (i.e. Company input into Pre117-e-offline, Company tdocs invited, CR rapporteur handled issue, Other [1]).

* **#116b-e agreements:**

Agreement on resource allocation enhancements RAN2 scopes:

1: Inter-UE coordination (IUC) issues RAN2 mainly relies on RAN1:

- HARQ retransmission number for inter-UE coordination information

- Information and length of information of IUC MAC CE. The information indicated in RAN1 LS should be taken into account as baseline.

- UE-B procedure (e.g. final selection of resources) to the (non-)preferred resource set in IUC

- Scheme 2 inter-UE coordination design

- Condition for the UE-A to transmit IUC

- Signaling design and trigger conditions for the request from UE-B to UE-A

- Cast types (UC/GC/BC) of inter-UE coordination

- Transmission of inter-UE coordination MAC CE on dedicated resource

- L1 parameters/configurations for IUC in Uu RRC (including L1 configurations per resource pool)

- Whether UE-A can be in mode1 or mode2 (interested companies are invited to raise/discuss the issue directly in RAN1)

2. IUC issues RAN2 starts discussion:

- LCP for inter-UE coordination MAC CE, support for standalone inter-UE coordination MAC CE/multiplex MAC CE and MAC SDU in a MAC PDU

- Timer to handle latency bound for inter-UE coordination

- Priority value/priority order of inter-UE coordination MAC CE. RAN1 progress can be taken into account in phase-2 discussion.

- HARQ feedback option of inter-UE coordination MAC CE

3. IUC in SL DRX is deprioritized in Rel-17 from RAN2 point of view

## Issue 1. LCP for inter-UE coordination MAC CE, i.e., support for standalone inter-UE coordination MAC CE/multiplex MAC CE and MAC SDU in a MAC PDU

RAN2 should discuss whether the MAC CE for reporting IUC information can be multiplexed with the MAC SDU or whether it should be transmitted alone. Following this decision, the HARQ Feedback option for MAC CE can be discussed as a follow-up issue.

**Q1. If any, please comment if you have any missing issues or any suggestions for handling phase 2 discussion on this issue.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments, if any (missing issues or suggestions for handling this issue)** |
| **Ericsson** | The UE should be able to transmit the MAC CE alone using a grant without any data from any LCH. In one case, there is no data available from any LCH. In another case, there is data in some LCHs, however, due to the LCHs not matching the LCP restrictions associated with the grant, that data is not selected to be transmitted together with the MAC CE using the grant. |
| **InterDigital** | This issue seems very similar to the discussion of CSI report MAC CE, and DRX Command MAC CE. Is there any reason to have a different conclusion for these questions? |
| **Xiaomi** | **Same handling as other SL MAC CE.** |
| **vivo** | Suggest to detail the issue(s) in a more specific form, lest people have different understanding on what specific issues to be discussed during Phase-2. Suggestions as follows, and **up to the Rapp on how/where to handle this issue**.  Issue A. Do companies agree that IUC MAC CE can be transmitted in a stand-alone manner (e.g. when there is no data)?  Issue Aa. If “yes” is selected to Issue A, do companies agree that HARQ FB should be disabled (as CSI reporting MAC CE)? |
| **CATT** | RAN1 has agreed that IUC MAC CE can be multiplexed with other MAC SDU.   |  | | --- | | * For inter-UE coordination information transmission in Scheme 1,   + Inter-UE coordination information can be multiplexed with other data only if the source/destination ID pair is the same     - Retransmission of the TB carrying inter-UE coordination information is supported | |
| **OPPO** | vivo’s suggestion is fine for us. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | Considering we also have other MAC CEs, i.e., CSI MAC CE and DRX MAC CE, different cases for the LCP for IUC MAC CE can be listed and discussed as below. In addition, we need to discuss the HARQ attribute for different cases in the follow-up question.  A: Standalone IUC MAC CE  B: CSI MAC CE and/or DRX MAC CE + IUC MAC CE  C: IUC MAC CE + MAC SDU  D: CSI MAC CE and/or DRX MAC CE + IUC MAC CE+ MAC SDU |
| **ZTE** | We first agree with CATT’s comments.  And we should also discuss whether more than one IUC MAC CE can be multiplexed into one MAC PDU. Since we do not have limitation on how many combinations are included in this MAC CE, then the IUC MAC CE may exhaust all SL grant, which cause SL-SCH can not be multiplexed into the MAC PDU. SL-BSR like mechanism can be used as shown in following:  - MAC CE for SL-BSR prioritized according to clause 5.22.1.6;  - MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding;  - Single Entry PHR MAC CE or Multiple Entry PHR MAC CE;  - MAC CE for the number of Desired Guard Symbols;  - MAC CE for Pre-emptive BSR;  - MAC CE for SL-BSR, with exception of SL-BSR prioritized according to clause 5.22.1.6 and SL-BSR included for padding; |
| **Intel** | If we follow RAN1 discussion, it does seem like the question of whether the IUC MAC CE can be sent in a standalone way or not has been addressed therein. Therefore, the main question left is regarding the priority, for which we think we can follow CSI MAC CE design. |
| **Lenovo** | Follow RAN1’ conclusions, IUC MAC CE can be multiplexed with other MAC SDU. |
| **Qualcomm** | RAN1 supports both standalone (SCI 2C + MAC CE) and multiplexed with data. |
| **Fraunhofer** | Same as Qualcomm, we propose to follow RAN1. |
| **LG** | The purpose of following RAN1agreement is to resolve the conflict between NR SL (IUC and request related) and UL/LTE SL from the PHY point of view, and when IUC and request related messages are standalone and MUX with other data, the priority that is finally taken on SCI was the purpose of the decision.  So, in issue 1, RAN2 determines the priority order of IUC and request and HARQ characteristics of ICU and request from the LCP point of view (for example, Feedback Disabled in case of standalone like SL CSI, and feedback option of data in case of other data MUX). And then, RAN2 needs to finish the MUX behaviour with other data.   * *Agreement:*   + *For inter-UE coordination information triggered by an explicit request in Scheme 1, the priority value of the inter-UE coordination information is (pre)configured priority value if it is provided by (pre)configuration. Otherwise, the priority value is the same as indicated by UE-B’s explicit request.*     - *For the case when inter-UE coordination information is transmitted together with other data, the priority value of the multiplexed sidelink transmission is determined by the smallest priority value between the inter-UE coordination information and data* * *Agreement:*   + *For inter-UE coordination information triggered by an explicit request in Scheme 1, the priority value of explicit request is (pre)configured priority value if it is provided by (pre)configuration. Otherwise, the priority value is the same as that of a TB to be transmitted by UE-B.*     - *For the case when the explicit request is transmitted together with other data, the priority value of the multiplexed sidelink transmission is determined by the smallest priority value between the explicit request and data* * *Agreement:*   + *For inter-UE coordination information triggered by a condition other than explicit request reception in Scheme 1, the priority value of the inter-UE coordination information is (pre)configured priority value if it is provided by (pre)configuration.*      - *FFS: Otherwise, the priority value is determined by UE-A’s implementation.*     - *For the case when inter-UE coordination information is transmitted together with other data, the priority value of the multiplexed sidelink transmission is determined by the smallest priority value between the inter-UE coordination information and data* * *Agreement:*   + *For Scheme 1, a resource pool level (pre-)configuration can enable one of the following alternatives:*     - *(Working assumption) Alt1: MAC CE and 2nd SCI are used as the container of an explicit request transmission from UE-B to UE-A*       * *A single format SCI 2-C is used for inter-UE coordination information and request*         + *1 bit in format 2-C is used to indicate whether the SCI is used for request to coordination information or for conveying coordination information*       * *SCI 2-C is UE RX optional*       * *It is up to UE implementation to additionally use 2nd SCI (for UE-B).*     - *Alt2: MAC CE is used as the container of an explicit request transmission from UE-B to UE-A* |

**[Summary] As the companies commented, RAN1 has agreed to support both standalone and multiplex with other MAC SDU for IUC MAC CE (both UE-A’s IUC information and UE-B’s explicit request). The meaning of “can be” in the RAN1 agreement below means that it is assumed that standalone is supported in RAN1 by default. Also, since RAN1 agreed on the ICU MAC being multiplexed with other MAC SDU, Issue 1 has already been resolved and there seems to be no further issues. Therefore, RAN2 can start with the discussion of HARQ feedback option for standalone and MUX with other MAC SDU. The discussion of the BSR-like mechanism suggested by ZTE seems to be an issue of whether IUC sets the priority lower or higher than the STCH. Thus, these issues of priory order are discussed in the phase-2 discussion of issue 3.**

* *Agreement:*
  + *For inter-UE coordination information transmission in Scheme 1,* 
    - *Inter-UE coordination information can be multiplexed with other data only if the source/destination ID pair is the same*
      * *Retransmission of the TB carrying inter-UE coordination information is supported*
  + *For explicit request transmission in Scheme 1,* 
    - *Explicit request can be multiplexed with other data only if the source/destination ID pair is the same*
      * *Retransmission of the TB carrying request is supported*

## Issue 2. HARQ feedback option of inter-UE coordination MAC CE

RAN2 should determine the HARQ feedback option (i.e. enabled or disabled) for IUC MAC CE (reporting message). Also, HARQ feedback option for standalone MAC CE and HARQ feedback option for MAC CE multiplexed with MAC SDU should be discussed.

**Q2. If any, please comment if you have any missing issues or any suggestions for handling phase 2 discussion on this issue.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments, if any (missing issues or suggestions for handling this issue)** |
| **Ericsson** | For standalone MAC CE, it is straightforward to use HARQ disabled mode. While in case IUC MAC CE is multiplexed with data, HARQ enabled mode may be used, i.e., depending on whether *sl-HARQ-FeedbackEnabled* is set to *enabled* or disabled for the highest priority logical channel . |
| **InterDigital** | Same comment for the previous question – can we use the same conclusions as for other MAC CEs? |
| **Xiaomi** | **Feedback disabled.** |
| **vivo** | See above comments for Issue 1. |
| **CATT** | RAN1 has agreed that IUC MAC CE supports retransmission.   |  | | --- | | * For inter-UE coordination information transmission in Scheme 1,   + Inter-UE coordination information can be multiplexed with other data only if the source/destination ID pair is the same     - Retransmission of the TB carrying inter-UE coordination information is supported | |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | See comments above. We think we need to discuss the HARQ attribute for different cases listed as below.  A: Standalone IUC MAC CE  B: CSI MAC CE and/or DRX MAC CE + IUC MAC CE  C: IUC MAC CE + MAC SDU  D: CSI MAC CE and/or DRX MAC CE + IUC MAC CE+ MAC SDU  In addition, in Rel-16, there is no associated HARQ attribute for CSI MAC CE (reporting message), so not sure if we need to discuss the HARQ attribute for IUC MAC CE (reporting message). We are fine to follow the majority. |
| **ZTE** | We can mimic CSI report MAC CE. |
| **Intel** | Given the transitory nature of the IUC information, we do not think HARQ feedback for standalone IUC MAC CE is needed. Assuming we support multiplexing of IUC MAC CE with other SL data, we agree with Ericsson that it depends on the HARQ FB attribute for the associated logical channel. |
| **Lenovo** | Suggest to handling the IUC MAC CE as other SL MAC CE, e.g., CSI report MAC CE. |
| **Qualcomm** | RAN1 supports retransmission of the IUC MAC CE with data, e.g., with the same MAC CE content (same TB).  **Agreement**   * For inter-UE coordination information transmission in Scheme 1,   + Inter-UE coordination information can be multiplexed with other data only if the source/destination ID pair is the same     - Retransmission of the TB carrying inter-UE coordination information is supported * For explicit request transmission in Scheme 1,   + Explicit request can be multiplexed with other data only if the source/destination ID pair is the same     - Retransmission of the TB carrying request is supported |
| **Fraunhofer** | We support the retransmission of IUC MAC CE with data. |
| **LG** | Same view as Ericsson. |

**[Summary] For standalone MAC CE and multiplexed MAC CE with other MAC SDU, HARQ feedback option (i.e. enabled or disabled) is discussed in the phase-2 discussion. Furthermore, HARQ feedback option for both MAC CEs for UE-A’s IUC information and UE-B’s explicit request is discussed in the phase-2.**

## Issue 3. Priority value/priority order of MAC CE for inter-UE coordination information

It has been decided to support MAC CE for IUC information report in RAN1. According to the RAN1 decision, RAN2 should determine the priority order/priority value of IUC MAC CE for logical channel prioritization and discuss this issue.

**Q3. If any, please comment if you have any missing issues or any suggestions for handling phase 2 discussion on this issue.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments, if any (missing issues or suggestions for handling this issue)** |
| **Ericsson** | In our view, it is sufficient to let inter-UE coordination MAC CE to share the same priority order as CSI reporting MAC CE, since both MAC CEs are associated with latency bound. The UE can apply similar treatment for both MAC CEs without further differentiation between them in terms of priority order. |
| **Xiaomi** | **Priority could be higher than other SL MAC CE.** |
| vivo | No technical issue and is just about companies’ preference.  Suggest to be ‘**Company input into Pre117-e-offline’**. |
| CATT | Some agreements on priority of IUC MAC CE were made in RAN1:   |  | | --- | | **Agreement**  For inter-UE coordination information triggered by an explicit request in Scheme 1, the priority value of the inter-UE coordination information is (pre)configured priority value if it is provided by (pre)configuration. Otherwise, the priority value is the same as indicated by UE-B’s explicit request.   * For the case when inter-UE coordination information is transmitted together with other data, the priority value of the multiplexed sidelink transmission is determined by the smallest priority value between the inter-UE coordination information and data   **Agreement**  For inter-UE coordination information triggered by an explicit request in Scheme 1, the priority value of explicit request is (pre)configured priority value if it is provided by (pre)configuration. Otherwise, the priority value is the same as that of a TB to be transmitted by UE-B.   * For the case when the explicit request is transmitted together with other data, the priority value of the multiplexed sidelink transmission is determined by the smallest priority value between the explicit request and data   **Agreement**  For inter-UE coordination information triggered by a condition other than explicit request reception in Scheme 1, the priority value of the inter-UE coordination information is (pre)configured priority value if it is provided by (pre)configuration.   * FFS: Otherwise, the priority value is determined by UE-A’s implementation. * For the case when inter-UE coordination information is transmitted together with other data, the priority value of the multiplexed sidelink transmission is determined by the smallest priority value between the inter-UE coordination information and data |   RAN2 can discuss this issue based on above agreement. |
| OPPO | We don’t have strong view on the exact priority value, but our understanding is the **priority value of 2 different MAC CE can not be the same** unless there is no chance to transmit them in the same time. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | As we commented during the online session, RAN1 has already discussed about this and achieved several agreements. See below.  **Agreement**  For inter-UE coordination information triggered by an explicit request in Scheme 1, the priority value of the inter-UE coordination information is (pre)configured priority value if it is provided by (pre)configuration. Otherwise, the priority value is the same as indicated by UE-B’s explicit request.   * For the case when inter-UE coordination information is transmitted together with other data, the priority value of the multiplexed sidelink transmission is determined by the smallest priority value between the inter-UE coordination information and data   Based on our understanding, priority value and priority value is what indicated in SCI for the other UEs to monitor and refers to LCP priority value, priority value is the LCP priority value determined by RAN2.  So the priority value marked with different color refers to the same one, i.e., LCP priority value. Actually this is also aligned with the Rel-16 logic, where the priority value indicated in SCI refers to the LCP priority value (smallest one).  Therefore, in Rel-17, if we strictly follow RAN1 agreement, the LCP priority value should be (pre)configured or indicated by the explicit request. From RAN2 point, we can further discuss the detailed configuration (RRC CR issue) and the MAC CE design (MAC CR issue). In addition, since the CSI MAC CE and DRX MAC CE have a fixed priority value “1”, One remaining issue pending on RAN2 is the priority order among these MAC CEs if the IUC MAC CE is configured or indicated with a priority value “1”. Similarly if the IUC MAC CE is configured or indicated with the same priority value as data, how to handle the priority order between this MAC CE and data. |
| **ZTE** | As comments in Q1, SL-BSR like priority order can be used as shown in following:  - MAC CE for SL-BSR prioritized according to clause 5.22.1.6;  - MAC CE for BSR, with exception of BSR included for padding;  - Single Entry PHR MAC CE or Multiple Entry PHR MAC CE;  - MAC CE for the number of Desired Guard Symbols;  - MAC CE for Pre-emptive BSR;  - MAC CE for SL-BSR, with exception of SL-BSR prioritized according to clause 5.22.1.6 and SL-BSR included for padding; |
| Lenovo | Agree with Huawei’s analysis, no strong view on the exact priority value of IUC MAC CE, but if IUC MAC CE shares the same priority value with CSI MAC CE, e.g., fixed priority value1, what should be discussed in RAN2 is the priority order handling between IUC MAC CE and CSI report MAC CE in the case that they cannot be transmitted at the same time. |
| Qualcomm | Similar to CSI MAC CE |
| Fraunhofer | We should follow the RAN1 agreements to prioritize the IUC MAC CE. |
| LG | The purpose of RAN1agreement is to resolve the conflict between NR SL (IUC and request-related) and UL/LTE SL from the PHY point of view, and when IUC and request-related messages are standalone and MUX with other MAC SDU, the priority that is finally taken on the SCI was the purpose of the decision.  So, in issue 3, RAN2 only needs to finish the priority order of IUC and request from the LCP point of view. |

**[Summary] The following agreement was made by discussing the priority value of IUC MAC CE in RAN1. Therefore, there is no need to further discuss the priority value of IUC MAC CE in RAN2. In RAN2, it is only needed to discuss the priority order of IUC MAC CE (i.e., both MAC CE for UE-A’s IUC information and MAC CE for UE-B’s explicit request) at this point. Like the discussion of SL CSI and SL DRX command MAC CE, the priority order for IUC MAC CE is discussed in phase-2.**

* *Agreement:*
  + *For inter-UE coordination information triggered by an explicit request in Scheme 1, the priority value of the inter-UE coordination information is (pre)configured priority value if it is provided by (pre)configuration. Otherwise, the priority value is the same as indicated by UE-B’s explicit request.*
    - *For the case when inter-UE coordination information is transmitted together with other data, the priority value of the multiplexed sidelink transmission is determined by the smallest priority value between the inter-UE coordination information and data*
* *Agreement:*
  + *For inter-UE coordination information triggered by an explicit request in Scheme 1, the priority value of explicit request is (pre)configured priority value if it is provided by (pre)configuration. Otherwise, the priority value is the same as that of a TB to be transmitted by UE-B.*
    - *For the case when the explicit request is transmitted together with other data, the priority value of the multiplexed sidelink transmission is determined by the smallest priority value between the explicit request and data*
* *Agreement:*
  + *For inter-UE coordination information triggered by a condition other than explicit request reception in Scheme 1, the priority value of the inter-UE coordination information is (pre)configured priority value if it is provided by (pre)configuration.* 
    - *FFS: Otherwise, the priority value is determined by UE-A’s implementation.*
    - *For the case when inter-UE coordination information is transmitted together with other data, the priority value of the multiplexed sidelink transmission is determined by the smallest priority value between the inter-UE coordination information and data*

**Regarding Huawei’s comment, moderator has a different view. The purpose of RAN1 agreement of priority value is to resolve the conflict between NR SL (IUC and request-related) and UL/LTE SL from the physical layer point of view, and is to determine the priority to be indicate on the SCI when IUC and request-related messages are transmitted in a standalone way or multiplexed with other MAC SDU. The priority value indicated in SCI is not LCP priority value.**

## Issue 4. Timer to handle latency bound for inter-UE coordination

The need for a timer based approach for the transmission of IUC MAC CE has been mentioned in [4] and [5]. That is, the issue that could be discussed in RAN2 is how to ensure that the inter-UE coordination information can be transmitted to MAC layer in time since the inter-UE coordination information is time-sensitive.

**Q4. If any, please comment if you have any missing issues or any suggestions for handling phase 2 discussion on this issue.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments, if any (missing issues or suggestions for handling this issue)** |
| **Ericsson** | In case MAC CE is used as the container for inter-UE coordination, it is beneficial to introduce latency bound for the MAC CE. In other words, the expected inter-UE coordination needs to be provided to UE-B within the latency bound, otherwise, the information would become invalid. Latency bound shall be defined for both inter-UE coordination request and inter-UE coordination information transmission.  In case a UE-B triggers an explicit request message for intended UE-A, after UE-A has received the request message from UE-B, the expected coordination information needs to be provided to UE-B by UE-A in time so that UE-B can determine its resources for transmission considering the received coordination information. Otherwise, the coordination information becomes too late for UE-B to take this coordination information into account. Same as CSI reporting procedure defined in R16, UE-A can be configured with the inter-UE coordination latency bound by its peer UE via PC5-RRC signaling,  **Issue 1: for explicit request procedure in scheme, what is the start/stop condition for the timer**  **Issue 2: for explicit request procedure in scheme, how to signal the timer value to UE-A?**  In case of non-explicit request procedure in Scheme 1, as soon as a trigger condition is met, UE-A needs to transmit the coordination information within a latency bound so that UE-B can determine its resources for transmission considering the received coordination information. Otherwise, the coordination information becomes too late for UE-B to take this coordination information into account.  **Issue 3**: **for non-explicit request procedure in scheme, what is the start/stop condition for the timer**  **Issue 4**: **for non-explicit request procedure in scheme, how to signal the timer value to UE-A?**  In addition, RAN2 can further discuss if a common latency bound can be applied for both explicit request procedure and non-explicit request procedure in scheme 1. |
| **InterDigital** | This should use CSI report functionality (i.e. also timer-based) as a baseline, in which case, not much would need to be discussed other than whether we agree to support timer based or not. |
| **Xiaomi** | **Suggest to reuse similar mechanism as CSI report latency bound.** |
| **vivo** | Timer can be just one alternative, but this issue should be further considered whether we really need latency requirement for this MAC CE. And even if so, based on what information we can set the value of this timer. The latency aspects for CSI MAC CE was introduced by RAN1 actually, so the first question to answer for this aspect may be to ask companies in RAN2 to decide whether this latency bound can be directly concluded by RAN2.  Considering the somewhat complicated situation, suggest to be ‘**Company tdocs invited’** |
| **CATT** | Agree with vivo. This issue related to the latency requirement for both IUC MAC CE and explicit request MAC CE. More analysis is needed. We also suggest change it to ‘**Company tdocs invited’.** |
| **OPPO** | Our understanding is this is a RAN2 issue and should be discussed in RAN2 since different from the CSI mechanism both the IUC report and the IUC request message are concluded as MAC CE (while CSI request is L1 signaling). We are fine to use the latency bound mechanism similar to CSI, including the timer length setting and start/stop/expiry condition discussion. |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | We think the following issues related to this aspect should be discussed.   1. The applied scenario for the latency bound, i.e., explicit request procedure only or non-explicit request procedure only or both explicit and non-explicit request procedures. 2. How to configure this timer 3. When to start/stop this timer 4. When to cancel the IUC MAC CE 5. UE behaviour if transmission of a pending IUC MAC CE with the sidelink grant(s) cannot fulfil the latency requirement associated to the IUC reporting |
| **ZTE** | We can mimic the CSI report MAC CE procedure. |
| **Intel** | Agree with Xiaomi that we can consider CSI reporting mechanism as baseline and then check if companies have any additional enhancements/modifications in mind. |
| **Lenovo** | Share the view that taking the design of CSI report timer as baseline. Further, the timer-based approach can be applied for both non-explicit request scenario and explicit request scenario. For explicit request scenario, timer-based design should be considered not only for IUC MAC CE, but also for IUC request message. Agree the vivo s comments for change it to “Company tdocs invited”. |
| **Qualcomm** | For request based IUC, may be handled similarly to CSI MAC CE. For condition based IUC, what’s the time reference for the timer? |
| **Fraunhofer** | Agree with Ericsson to further discuss the issues related to the IUC MAC CE timer. |
| **LG** | In the case of SL CSI, RAN1 discusses and decides latency bound. At this time, RAN1 had even considered the impact of this decision in terms of resource selection. If RAN2 intends to introduce IUC-related latency bounds, it should make the relevant agreement as soon as possible to give RAN1 time to consider potential impacts in terms of resource selection. (If possible, including the possibility of email approval, so that if it is decided, it can be decided before the next meeting)  We think the main scenario where latency bound is used is request-based IUC. However, RAN1 agreed to provide information on **Selection Window** for resource set determination in the Request message sent from UE-B to UE-A in the request-based IUC. Considering this, it is interpreted that the time limit used by UE-A to generate the resource set has already been provided by UE-B. For example, in the worst case, that is, it is self-evident that UE-A cannot send IUC to UE-B when out of this Selection Window.  For reference, according to the RAN 1 agreement below, receiving a request does not mean that UE-A and UE-B should send an IUC message.   * *Agreement:*   + *For Scheme 1, when the inter-UE coordination information transmission is triggered by UE-B’s explicit request,*      - *Starting/Ending time locations of resource selection window is provided by UE-B’s explicit request*       * *Starting/Ending time locations of resource selection window is a form of combination of DFN index and slot index* * *Agreement:*   + *For inter-UE coordination triggered by an explicit request in Scheme 1, whether or not to transmit the inter-UE coordination information upon the request reception is determined by UE-A’s implementation subject to the following procedures.*      - *Rel-16 procedure of UL/SL prioritization, LTE SL/NR SL prioritization, and congestion control*   Therefore, RAN2 does not need to spend time considering additional latency bounds under request-based IUC scenarios, and when condition-based, it is sufficient to leave it as UE-A's implementation (see RAN1 agreement below: condition-based agreement to determine the preferred resource set) The **Selection Window** to be used is determined by the UE implementation).   * *Agreement:*    + *For determining preferred resource set in Scheme 1, when inter-UE coordination information transmission is triggered by a condition other than explicit request reception,*     - *Values of following parameters are (pre)configured for a resource pool. If there is no (pre)configuration, UE-A determines by its implementation the values of the following parameters*       * *prio\_TX*       * *L\_subCH*       * *P\_rsvp\_TX*     - *UE-A determines by its implementation values of following parameters*        * *n+T\_1, n+T\_2*     - *FFS: Whether/how to support (pre)configuration of n+T\_1 and n+T\_2*     - *Note that it is up to RAN2 decision whether/how the values of these parameters are provided by PC5-RRC signaling from UE-B to UE-A and UE-A uses the received information to determine the preferred resource set* |

**[Summary] There was an opinion that the issue 4 could be discussed with the CSI report functionality (i.e. also timer-based) as a baseline. Besides, some company pointed out that “RAN1 agreed to provide information on Selection Window for resource set determination in the Request message sent from UE-B to UE-A in the request-based IUC. Considering this, it is interpreted that the time limit used by UE-A to generate the resource set has already been provided by UE-B.” Thus, there are two options we will discuss first. That is, it is possible to first decide whether to introduce a mechanism such as CSI report functionality (i.e. also timer-based) for IUC MAC CE transmission in RAN2 or leave it to the UE implementation. If it is preferred to introduce a mechanism such as CSI report functionality (i.e. also timer-based) in RAN2, the following issues can be discussed:**

* **The applied scenario for the latency bound, i.e., explicit request procedure only or non-explicit request procedure only or both explicit and non-explicit request procedures.**
* **How to configure this timer**
* **When to start/stop this timer**
* **When to cancel the IUC MAC CE**
* **UE behaviour if transmission of a pending IUC MAC CE with the sidelink grant(s) cannot fulfil the latency requirement associated to the IUC reporting**

## Others

**Any essential RAN2 open issue is missing? Please provide input to the following table, if any.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Other critical RAN2 open issues identified (if any)** |
| **Ericsson** | **In case RAN1 agrees to introduce MAC CE for explicit request message, how to design the IUC request MAC CE?** |
| **CATT** | **Agree with Ericsson, MAC CE for explicit request should be discussed.** |
| **Huawei, HiSilicon** | **We think RAN1 has achieved the following WA.**   * For Scheme 1,   + Following cast type(s) are supported for inter-UE coordination information transmission triggered by a condition other than explicit request reception     - Groupcast/Broadcast for non-preferred resource set, FFS for preferred resource set       * FFS: Under which conditions groupcast/broadcast can be supported     - Unicast       * FFS: Under which conditions unicast can be supported   **The conditions to support unicast/broadcast/groupcast are left to RAN2 for discussion. So we also need to discuss about this.**  **In addition, RAN1 has finished the discussion on the content of IUC MAC CE and request MAC CE, we need to start the discussion on the design/MAC CE format of these two MAC CEs.** |
| **Intel** | As Huawei mentioned, the support cast types and associated conditions (if supported) need to be discussed. |
| **Lenovo** | Agree with Huawei, the conditions to support unicast/broadcast/groupcast need to be discussed. |
| **Qualcomm** | RAN1 agreed the following issues for RAN2 to decide.  **Agreement**  For determining preferred resource set in Scheme 1, when inter-UE coordination information transmission is triggered by a condition other than explicit request reception,   * Values of following parameters are (pre)configured for a resource pool. If there is no (pre)configuration, UE-A determines by its implementation the values of the following parameters   + prio\_TX   + L\_subCH   + P\_rsvp\_TX * UE-A determines by its implementation values of following parameters   + n+T\_1, n+T\_2 * FFS: Whether/how to support (pre)configuration of n+T\_1 and n+T\_2 * Note that it is up to RAN2 decision whether/how the values of these parameters are provided by PC5-RRC signaling from UE-B to UE-A and UE-A uses the received information to determine the preferred resource set     **Agreement**  For inter-UE coordination information is triggered by UE-B’s request,   * A resource pool level (pre-)configuration can enable one of the following alternatives:   + Alt 1:     - Resource set type to be provided by inter-UE coordination information transmission is determined by UE-A’s implementation and its information is indicated by UE-A’s inter-UE coordination information       * UE-A’s inter-UE coordination information indicates either preferred resource set or non-preferred resource set   + Alt 2:     - Resource set type to be provided by inter-UE coordination information transmission is indicated by UE-B’s request       * UE-B’s request indicates either preferred resource set or non-preferred resource set   + Note that it is up to RAN2 decision whether/how UE-B provides its support of sensing/resource exclusion to UE-A via PC5-RRC signaling and UE-A uses the received information to determine the type of resource set to be transmitted to UE-B |

**[Summary]**

1. **MAC CE for explicit request message**
   * **Issue 2/3 includes a discussion of priority order/HARQ feedback options for MAC CE for explicit request messages.**
2. **Cast types(UC/GC/BC) of inter-UE coordination**
   * **In Phase-2, cast types for inter-UE coordination information transmission can be discussed. However, it is questionable if new conditions are needed other than to work like UC/GC/BC in legacy. For example, if there is a UC connection, it is transmitted to UC. If there is no UC connection, it is transmitted to GC or BC.**
3. **Support of signalling parameters used for determining preferred resource set from UE-A to UE-B**
   * **According to the RAN1 agreement (RAN1 instructed RAN2 to decide), in phase-2, it can be discussed whether/how the values of these parameters are provided by PC5-RRC signalling from UE-B to UE-A and UE-A uses the received information to determine the preferred resource set.**
4. **Support of signalling capability of UE-B’s sensing/resource exclusion used for UE-A’s resource set type to be provided by IUC information to UE-B**
   * **According to the RAN1 agreement (RAN1 instructed RAN2 to decide), in phase-2, it can be discussed whether/how UE-B provides its support of sensing/resource exclusion to UE-A via PC5-RRC signaling and UE-A uses the received information to determine the type of resource set to be transmitted to UE-B.**

# Output Open Issue List and Recommendations

**Issue 1. LCP for inter-UE coordination MAC CE, i.e., support for standalone inter-UE coordination MAC CE/multiplex MAC CE and MAC SDU in a MAC PDU**

* **Issue 1 has already been resolved (i.e., support standalone inter-UE coordination MAC CE/MAC CE multiplexed with other MAC SDU) and there seems to be no further issues.**

**Issue 2. HARQ feedback option of inter-UE coordination MAC CE**

* **For standalone MAC CE and multiplexed MAC CE with other MAC SDU, HARQ feedback option (i.e. enabled or disabled) is discussed in the phase-2 discussion. Furthermore, HARQ feedback option for both MAC CEs for UE-A’s IUC information and UE-B’s explicit request is discussed in the phase-2.**

**Issue 3. Priority value/priority order of MAC CE for inter-UE coordination information**

* **It is only needed to discuss the priority order of IUC MAC CE (i.e., both MAC CE for UE-A’s IUC information and MAC CE for UE-B’s explicit request) at this point. Like the discussion of SL CSI and SL DRX command MAC CE, the priority order for IUC MAC CE is discussed in phase-2.**

**Issue 4. Timer to handle latency bound for inter-UE coordination**

* **There are two options RAN2 will discuss first. RAN2 can first decide whether to introduce a mechanism such as CSI report functionality (i.e. also timer-based) for IUC MAC CE transmission in RAN2 or leave it to the UE implementation.**
* **If it is decided to introduce a mechanism such as CSI report functionality (i.e. also timer-based) in RAN2, the following issues can be further discussed:**
  + **The applied scenario for the latency bound, i.e., explicit request procedure only or non-explicit request procedure only or both explicit and non-explicit request procedures.**
  + **How to configure this timer**
  + **When to start/stop this timer**
  + **When to cancel the IUC MAC CE**
  + **UE behaviour if transmission of a pending IUC MAC CE with the sidelink grant(s) cannot fulfil the latency requirement associated to the IUC reporting**

**Issue 5. MAC CE for explicit request message**

* **Issue 2/3 includes a discussion of priority order/HARQ feedback options for MAC CE for explicit request messages.**

**Issue 6. Cast types (UC/GC/BC) of inter-UE coordination**

* **In Phase-2, cast types for inter-UE coordination information transmission can be discussed. However, it is questionable if new conditions are needed other than to work like UC/GC/BC in legacy. For example, if there is a UC connection, it is transmitted to UC. If there is no UC connection, it is transmitted to GC or BC.**

**Issue 7. Support of signalling parameters used for determining preferred resource set from UE-A to UE-B**

* **According to the RAN1 agreement (RAN1 instructed RAN2 to decide), in phase-2, it can be discussed whether/how the values of these parameters are provided by PC5-RRC signalling from UE-B to UE-A and UE-A uses the received information to determine the preferred resource set.**

**Issue 8. Support of signalling capability of UE-B’s sensing/resource exclusion used for UE-A’s resource set type to be provided by IUC information to UE-B**

* **According to the RAN1 agreement (RAN1 instructed RAN2 to decide), in phase-2, it can be discussed whether/how UE-B provides its support of sensing/resource exclusion to UE-A via PC5-RRC signalling and UE-A uses the received information to determine the type of resource set to be transmitted to UE-B.**
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