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# Introduction

Based on the outcome open issue list from Phase 1 [1] this document summarizes the Phase-2 discussion of the following email discussion:

* [POST116bis-e][706][V2X/SL] Open issues on power-saving resource allocation (vivo)

**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 R2-2201806). 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)

Specifically, this discussion focuses on the open issues with the suggested way of handling as “Company input into Pre117-e-offline”. Those issues categorized as “CR rapporteur handled issue” will be handled by the corresponding Spec rapporteurs for this WI in the running CR discussions.

**Contact list**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | E-mail |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Discussions

**[Issue 1] Should the resource allocation scheme(s) applicable in UE’s AS depend on the type of NR SL transmission configured by the upper layers? If yes, how such configuration should be reflected in the AS Spec (e.g. P2X vs. non-P2X as in LTE)?**

* **Option 1: Yes. A UE can be configured to perform NR SL transmission using power-saving resource allocation or NR SL transmission using non-power-saving resource allocation.**
* **Option 2: Yes. A UE can be configured to perform P2X related NR SL transmission or non-P2X related NR SL transmission (as in LTE).**
* **Option 3: No. A UE decides which resource allocation scheme can be used in the AS completely based on UE capability.**

The selection of options and comments from companies towards **Issue 1** are collected in the below table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Selected option(s)** | **Comments, if any** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**[Issue 2] Is there a case that an RRC\_CONNECTED UE needs to report the actual type of NR SL transmission it is configured to perform to the gNB?**

* **Option 1: Yes, it reports whether it is configured to perform NR SL communication using power-saving or NR SL communication using non-power-saving resource allocation.**
* **Option 2: Yes, it reports whether it is configured to perform P2X or non-P2X NR SL communication (as in LTE).**
* **Option 3: No, RAN decides what resource configuration and resource allocation scheme for a UE to use completely based on UE capability.**

The selection of options and comments from companies towards **Issue 2** are collected in the below table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Selected option(s)** | **Comments, if any** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**[Issue 4a] Do companies agree that NO Spec impact is needed to support the resource pool selection based on resource allocation scheme?**

* **Yes.**
* **No. If selected, please specify what Spec impact is needed in detail.**

The selection of options and comments from companies towards **Issue 4a** are collected in the below table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments, if any** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**[Issue 4b] Do companies agree that as in LTE, it is up to UE implementation to select the resource allocation scheme finally used in the selected resource pool (if the selected pool allows multiple resource allocation schemes the UE is configured/capable to perform)?**

* **Yes.**
* **No. If selected, please specify the reason why UE implementation does not work and detail what Spec impact is needed.**

The selection of options and comments from companies towards **Issue 4b** are collected in the below table.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments, if any** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Summary

**[To be added]**
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