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Introduction

This contribution provides discussion on reply LS to R1-2009508 within the thread [103-e-NR-Rel-16-V2X-15].

[103-e-NR-Rel-16-V2X-15]: Email discussion/approval of reply LS to R1-2009508 by 11/9 – Sergey (Intel)

Discussion

RAN2 sent the following LS body:

|  |
| --- |
| RAN2 previously sent the LS to RAN1 in R2-2008585 including the issue on whether to perform reselection for dropped retransmission after checking whether there is(are) pre-empted resource(s). Meanwhile, RAN2 recognized that RAN1 made a new agreement on pre-emption in RAN1#102-e as follows:   * *If periodic reservation is in use by a UE, and if pre-emption is enabled in a resource pool, the UE checks pre-emption for resources provided by MAC layer to L1, according to specified procedures*   + *L1 expects that MAC layer provides resources intended for transmission of one TB, which can fit to resource selection window of current TB of the UE, and for which the relevant priority is available*   + *If a resource is pre-empted, a re-selection for the pre-empted resource is triggered based on the specified step 1 and step 2 procedures,*      - *with details up to UE implementations, including whether/how to set the reservation period in the re-selected resource*   + *FFS in TP phase how/where to capture this in specification*     - *During the pre-emption checking, j is up to Cresel-1*   RAN2 understands that the above agreement is related to the step of checking whether there is(are) pre-empted resource(s) which has been specified in 38.321. RAN2 would like to ask RAN1 to clarify the above agreements that may impact MAC specification:  **Q1: Does the TB in the above agreement correspond to only MAC PDU created for transmission?**  **Q2: Is it correct understanding that whenever a MAC PDU is created, UE checks whether there is(are) pre-empted resource(s) among all remaining periodic reserved resources assuming that the periodic reserved resources are used for transmissions of potential MAC PDUs which have the same priority with the created MAC PDU?**  **Q3: Does RAN1 assume that only retransmission resources in periodic reservation are checked for pre-emption?** |

In this section, the questions are discussed one-by-one.

## Reply to Q1

|  |
| --- |
| **Q1: Does the TB in the above agreement correspond to only MAC PDU created for transmission?** |

In FL understanding, the answer to Q1 could be ‘yes’. The intention of the RAN1 agreement was to limit the set of resources {r’} passed to PHY layer to only the ones in current period / selection window. And according to another agreement, it is not possible to interlace TB/PDU between periods.

**Tentative reply**: Yes

**Internal question 1: Please share your views on Q1 and whether the above FL tentative conclusion is agreeable.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Comments** |
| vivo | OK with FL reply |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the FL reply |
|  |  |

## Reply to Q2

|  |
| --- |
| **Q2: Is it correct understanding that whenever a MAC PDU is created, UE checks whether there is(are) pre-empted resource(s) among all remaining periodic reserved resources assuming that the periodic reserved resources are used for transmissions of potential MAC PDUs which have the same priority with the created MAC PDU?** |

In FL understanding, the resources passed to PHY are still for one TB/PDU within one period/sensing window. However, since the range of j from 0 to Cresel-1 was not modified, effectively potential future collisions for other PDUs can be considered. This does not have any impact on the original assumption and intention of the RAN1 agreement.

**Tentative reply**: A UE checks whether there is(are) pre-empted resources(s) among resource within a current period limited by a selection window for current TB. However, since the pre-emption check procedure reuses generic steps of identifying a candidate resource set, the collision in future periods could be factored into the pre-emption condition. MAC layer is assumed to be agnostic whether the collision was identified for future periods or for current period.

**Internal question 2: Please share your views on Q2 and whether the above FL tentative conclusion is agreeable.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Comments** |
| vivo | If my understanding is correct, RAN2 will decide whether only to deliver resource set in current period to PHY for pre-emption purpose. Thus, Only the first sentence is necessary, we do not need to give reason to RAN2. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with vivo’s view that only the first sentence is necessary. The second part could lead to cases where the UE detects a pre-empted resource in a future period but ends up also reselecting the resource in the current period. |
|  |  |

## Reply to Q3

|  |
| --- |
| **Q3: Does RAN1 assume that only retransmission resources in periodic reservation are checked for pre-emption?** |

In FL understanding, the initial transmission resources within a given period are also checked for pre-emption, since there is no exception to which resources could be subject to pre-emption.

**Tentative reply**: No, RAN1 does not assume that only retransmission resources in periodic reservation are checked for pre-emption. RAN1 assumes any resource can be checked for pre-emption subject to the conditions that it fits to current selection window.

**Internal question 3: Please share your views on Q3 and whether the above FL tentative conclusion is agreeable.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Comments** |
| vivo | Generally fine with reply. Or directly feedback ‘both initial transmission and retransmission resource may be subject to the check.’, then RAN2 can consider the LS regarding check timing and this LS to finalize the spec. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with the FL reply |
|  |  |