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Introduction

This contribution provides discussion on critical issues for the first thread [101-e-NR-5G\_V2X\_NRSL-Mode-2-01].

[101-e-NR-5G\_V2X\_NRSL-Mode-2-01] Email discussion/approval with respect to processing times:

1a – Values for Tproc,0, Tproc,1, T3

1b – Sensing window size values in brackets

By 5/29, with potential TPs till 6/4 – Sergey (Intel)

Discussion

## Processing times

In order to facilitate decision, the discussion is split into several aspects.

First, although it is observed that majority of contributions proposes processing time values in slots, it is worth confirming that processing time values are further discussed in slots or in symbols / absolute time.

**Q1: Whether the processing time values are specified in slots or in absolute time using symbol level granularity?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Short answer: in slots or in symbols/absolute time** | **Comments** |
| Intel | slots | Simple option consistent with LTE. Other options are enhancements. Position of sidelink transmission does not change within slot and therefore no big value to use symbols. |
| Qualcomm | Either is workable | In either case, RAN1 needs to take care of slot boundary alignment. In specifications, a value of 0 means same slot as trigger (e.g. DCI and K0) and a value of 1 means the slot immediately after trigger.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | In slots | Slot is the scheduling unit for NR-V2X. Using symbol level granularity has no prominent benefits, but is complicated since we need to further consider slot boundary.For reference, the congestion control processing time is also specified in slots (see clause 8.1.6 of TS 38.214). |
| Samsung | In slots |  We share view with Intel and HW. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Slots | We share view with Intel and HW. |
| vivo | slots | We share view with Intel and HW |
| CATT | In physical slots. | Slot has been determined as the time-domain granularity for SL resource. The processing time is related to absolute time so it should not be defined in terms of logical slots. Therefore, we support that processing time values are specified in physical slots, considering processing time and slot boundary alignment. |
| Ericsson | Slots | All SL is slot based and there is no interaction with Uu |
| TCL | Slots | We share view with Intel and HW. Physical slots should be considered. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Slot.  |  |
| Apple | Slots | Since SL is based on slots, it is preferred to specify it in slots. |
| Nokia, NSB | slot |  |
| FUTUREWEI | slots | Both could work, but slot is cleaner |
| OPPO | Physical slots |  |
| NEC | Slot |  |
| LG Electronics | In slots | No strong benefit by defining the processing time value as a unit of symbols/absolute time |
| MediaTek | slots |  |

Second, many contributions assume there is relation between Tproc,0, Tproc,1 and T3. For example, T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1 T3 = Tproc,1.

**Q2: Is there any relation between Tproc,0, Tproc,1 and T3? If yes, please specify.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Short answer** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Yes | * Tproc,0 = 1 slot
* Tproc,1 = T3 measured in slots and defined by the following table below
 |
| Qualcomm | No | T3 contains operations from both Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 and the sum of the two is a reasonable upper bound to use for T3. However, they should be defined independently, in line with their current use in specifications.  |
| Huawei/HiSilicon  | Support T3=T1 | If T3 is too large, the UE may miss the SCIs during time interval (m-T3, m) that cause collision, since UE may choose not to do re-evaluation during this time interval.If T3 is too small, the re-selection window will be later than [m, m+T2-T1] and the reselected resource will be later than m, thus increasing latency.T3=T1 is a good trade-off that can provide a large sensing range, and ensure the re-selection window is no later than [m, m+T2-T1]. |
| Samsung | Yes | T3 is T1 +1 slots where T1 is the selected processing time for resource selection by UE within upper bound Tproc,1. |
| Vivo | Yes | T3 is the processing time of resource selection, it should be no larger than T1. For simplicity, it is fine to set T3= Tproc,1 considering T1 is determined by implementation. |
| CATT | Yes.T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1 | Tproc,0 is related the sensing results preparation procedures including at least PSCCH decoding and SL-RSRP.Tproc,1 is related resource (re)selection and transmission preparation procedures including PSCCH preparation and PSSCH preparation.For T3, in order to ensure the re-evaluation and pre-emption performance, all the sensing results before m-T3 should be available. Then procedures within T3 should contain the sensing results preparation, potential resource reselection and PSCCH and PSSCH transmission preparation. Therefore, we support T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1. |
| Ericsson | T3 = Tproc,0 + 1Tproc,1 is not related | T3 and Tproc,0 represent the same concept: the time that is necessary for decoding the transmissions received in one slot. However, there is a slight difference in how they are defined (a difference equivalent to using > or ≥) and 1 slot has to be added.Tproc,1 is a preparation time not a processing time.Regardless of the relationship between them, we think that it will be simplest to define them independently. |
| TCL | T3 = Tproc,0 + 1 or T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1 | This allows the UE to process and understand whether reselection is needed. Timing for reselection can be applied separately.Or, if we want to include a reselection without increasing latency, we need both decoding processing time and scheduling processing time. |
| Apple | T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1 | The processing time T3 should include UE processing time of SCI decoding and sidelink measurement, as well as the resource selection procedure and PSCCH/PSSCH preparation time.  |
| FUTUREWEI | Not necessarily | In our view, the restrictions on T3 is that it should be larger than Tproc, 0 and lower than T1. From our perspective, any value that works is acceptable. While we don’t see the need to link these parameters, we can accept such a decision if the group leans this way |
| OPPO | T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1 | For T3, it is related to the case where a UE has detected one or more of its pre-selected or already reserved resources been indicated/pre-empted by another UE, and the UE is triggered to perform reselection of the affected resource(s). In our view, it is no different to the case where L1 receives a packet TB from the upper layer and needs to perform Step 1 and Step 2. As such, T3 should be equal to Tproc,0 + Tproc,1. |
| NEC | Yes, T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1 | T3 should contains SCI decoding + measurement time and resource selection + PSCCH/PSSHC preparation time. |
| LG Electronics | Yes | T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1 +1  |
| MediaTek | YesT3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1 | T3 processing operation includes both measurements and resource (re)-selection operations. T3 should be a combination of Tproc,0 and Tproc,1. |

Some contributions consider that there is no need to define Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 separately and it may be sufficient to keep a single value which absorbs both SCI processing / measurement time and resource selection + PSCCH/PSSHC preparation time.

**Q3: Is it necessary to introduce both Tproc,0 and Tproc,1, or one of the values is sufficient?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Short answer** | **Comments** |
| Intel | No, it is not necessary | Only sum matters, therefore single value is enough |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 correspond to different aspects and functions and there could be tests for one value, independently of the other. This is also in line with current specifications. |
| Panasonic | No | We agree Intel. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Define Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 separately | $T\_{proc,0}$ is associated with the UE processing time on decoding the SCI and RSRP measurement.$T\_{proc,1}$ corresponds to the scheduling time and the data preparation time (channel coding, QAM modulation, RE mapping and OFDM baseband signalling generation). It includes both MAC and PHY processing.The UE operations accounted for by $T\_{proc,0}$ and $T\_{proc,1}$ are quite different, and thus have to be defined separately. Defining them together would force them both to be dimensioned for the lengthier set of processing, which would be unnecessary. |
| Samsung | Define Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 separately | Two processing times Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 are efinitely having different purpose as HW commented |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | We share view with Intel. |
| Vivo | Define Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 separately | One is corresponding to sensing window, the other is for selection window. Therefore, should be separated defined as in LTE. |
| CATT | Yes, it is necessary to introduce both Tproc,0 and Tproc,1. | Firstly, the procedures related to T\_(proc,0) and T\_(proc,1) are different. Secondly, Tproc,0 is used to determine the sensing window and Tproc,1 is used to determine the maximum value of T1. |
| Ericsson | Both | See the answer to Q2 |
| TCL | Define Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 separately | Agree with Intel/HW. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Define Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 separately  | $T\_{proc,0}$ is up to UE implementation. |
| Apple | Yes, define Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 separately | Tproc,0 is considered as UE processing time of SCI decoding and sidelink measurement. This value is used to define sensing window. Tproc,1 is considered as resource selection and PSCCH/PSSCH preparation processing time, and this value is used as a boundary of the resource selection window. It is preferred to define them separately so as to clarify the sensing window and resource selection window separately.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Yes, define them separately |  |
| FUTUREWEI | Separate definition |  |
| OPPO | Define Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 separately | Since these two UE processing times are relating to different operations and they are used for different purposes, it would actually be more confusing if they are combined and we can no longer distinguish between them in the spec. |
| NEC | Separately  | Separately define for different meanings. |
| LG | Define Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 separately | Not technically convinced to have a same value for Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 since each value targets different processing operations. |
| MediaTek | Yes, define Tproc,0 and Tproc,1 separately |  |

Finally, based on all the above answers, the concrete values for Tproc,0, Tproc,1, and T3 are discussed in Q4a and Q4b.

**Q4a: If in Q1 your answer is “in slots”, please fill the following table, where for each processing time four values need to be provided:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Tproc,0****{15, 30, 60, 120} kHz** | **Tproc,1****{15, 30, 60, 120} kHz** | **T3****{15, 30, 60, 120} kHz** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Tproc,0 is not specified | {3,3,4,5} | {3,3,4,5} | Sensing window [n –T0, n – Tproc,0] is replaced by sensing window [n –T0, n – 1] (same as in LTE) |
| Qualcomm | 1/1/2/4 | 2/3/5/9 | 3/4/7/13 | It is very important to balance the values. Very small values increase implementation complexity.If the values are too relaxed, the UE would be discarding substantial amount of sensing information. For example, 4ms in 60 kHz is 16 slots, half of W, which means that 50% of sensing information is not used. Large values would additionally degrade system performance because a UE is not reacting quickly (for any SCS).For Tproc,0 the specification uses $[n-T\_{0},n-T\_{proc,0}]$, which handles slots boundary.This is not the case for Tproc,1 and our proposed values account for this. (2 is 1 full slot + time to align to next slot boundary) |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | 1/1/2/2 slots | *3 ms for all SCS, i.e. 3, 6, 12, 24 slots* | T3=T1 | $T\_{proc,0}$ is associated with the UE processing time on decoding the SCI and RSRP measurement. 1/1/2/2 slots are reasonable values.$T\_{proc,1}$ consists of a “fixed” part and a “variable” part as follows:* “Fixed” part: scheduling time. When the MAC PDU comes to physical layer, the following steps are needed:
	+ Physical layer needs to prepare the sensing results and report these results to MAC layer.
	+ MAC layer makes decision on how and which resource will be allocated.
	+ MAC layer indicates the scheduling results to the physical layer.
	+ Note: The scheduling time will be larger for aperiodic traffic since the TB size is not known in advance, so the UE needs to reschedule the potential Tx resource.
	+ Note: The scheduling time is a “fixed” value since it relates to MAC scheduling, MAC-PHY exchange, etc., and is independent of the value of SCS. 2 ms is proposed for this “fixed” part.
* “Variable” part: data preparation time
	+ Including channel coding, QAM modulation, RE mapping and OFDM baseband signalling generation
	+ Note: The data preparation time is mainly about PHY processing, and is a “variable” that is highly dependent on UE capability now and in the future. And since the spec already allows any UE can go faster than $T\_{proc,1}$, this “variable” part just needs to be an upper bound. 1 ms is proposed for this “variable” part.

In summary, 3 ms (2 ms + 1 ms) is proposed for $T\_{proc,1}$ for all SCS. |
| Samsung | 1/1/{1,2}/{1,2} | 4/8/16/32 | T3=T1+1 | - Tproc,0 is defined as 1 slot for SCS {15, 30}kHz and (pre-)configured between {1, 2} slots for SCS {60, 120} kHz. (One slot for *Tproc,0* may not be enough for larger SCS. Therefore, two slots for *Tproc,0* can be considered for larger SCS such as 60 kHz and 120 kHz.)- Tproc,1­ defined as $4∙2^{μ}$ physical slots. (In LTE V2X, *Tproc,1* was defined as 4 subframes. In NR V2X, we can use this value. Since selection of *T1* is up to UE implementation subject to *T1 ≤ Tproc,1*, the fixed 4ms for *Tproc,1* is reasonable)- T3 is T1 +1 slots where T1 is the selected processing time for resource selection by UE within upper bound Tproc,1. (T3 value should be decided considering required time for implementation related to re-evaluation procedure. Specifically, T3­ is the processing time related to resource re-selection after re-evaluation. Besides to resource selection time, T3­ needs to consider additional processing time for dropping previously reserved resource(s) as well as overlapping between previously reserved resource(s) and newly selected resource(s). Considering this aspect, 1 slot is added into T1 for T3­) |
| CATT | 1/1/2/2 physical slots | $(4·2^{μ}-T\_{proc,0})$ physical slots | $4·2^{μ}$ physical slots | For Tproc,0, at least one slot is needed considering the processing time and slot boundary alignment. For the larger SCS of 60KHz and 120KHz, one additional physical slot should be introduced to ensure the sufficient processing time.For Tproc,1, it corresponds to the LTE-V2X procedures within T\_1 (up to 4ms) with excluding the processing time of PSCCH decoding and SL measurements, which is $(4·2^{μ}-T\_{proc,0})$. Note that Tproc,1 is a maximum value for T1, UE with stronger capability can determine a smaller T1 by its implementation. |
| Ericsson | {1,1,2,2} slots | {2,2,3,4} slots | Tproc,0 + 1 slots | Tproc,1 add 1 slot with respect to PUSCH times because the selection window is defined as [n+T1, n+T2].  |
| TCL | 1,1,2,2 | $$3·2^{μ} or 4·2^{μ}$$ | Tproc,0 + Tproc,1 | Tproc,1 should be an absolute time value as it is a fixed processing/scheduling time. 3 or 4ms is open for us. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | $T\_{proc,0}$ is up to UE implementation. | {3,3,4,5} | {3,3,4,5} |  |
| Apple | 1 for {15, 30} kHz;2 for {60, 120} kHz | UE cap. 1: 2/2/4/8 slots for 15/30/60/120 kHz;UE cap. 2:2/4/8/16 slots for 15/30/60/120 kHz; | UE cap. 1: 3/3/6/10 slots for 15/30/60/120 kHzUE cap. 2:3/5/10/18 slots for 15/30/60/120 kHz | Since Tproc,1 serves as an upper bound of T1, it should be large enough to allow UE to finish CR/CBR evaluation.Since CR/CBR processing time is based on UE capability, Tproc,1and T3 are also based on UE capability. |
| Nokia, NSB | 1,1,2,2 | 2,2,3,4 | 3,3,5,6 |  |
| FUTUREWEI | 1 ,1, 2, 2 | 1, 1, 2, 3 | 2, 2, 4, 5 |  |
| MediaTek | {1, 1, 2, 2} slots | {3,7,14,30} slots | {4, 8, 16, 32} slots | SCI decoding, RSRP measurements, and (re)-selection procedures in total should be given 4ms as upper bound. This value is also in line with LTE V2X procedures. UE can choose a smaller T1 value as it is up to UE implementation. In our view, 4ms is a large enough time to accommodate as an upper bound for processing times.  |

**Q4b: If in Q1 your answer is “in symbols”, please fill the following table, where for each processing time four values need to be provided:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Tproc,0 for****{15, 30, 60, 120} kHz** | **Tproc,1 for****{15, 30, 60, 120} kHz** | **T3 for****{15, 30, 60, 120} kHz** | **Comments** |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

**Q5: Any other important aspects you would like to highlight with respect to processing times, e.g. necessity to introduce more than one capability, or FR1 vs FR2 differentiation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Single capability is enough. |
| Qualcomm | No need to introduce two capabilities. FR1 vs. FR2 is accounted for by using SCS-dependent values. |
| Panasonic | We agree Qualcomm that FR1 vs. FR2 is accounted for by using SCS-dependent values. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Agree with QC.  |
| Vivo | No need |
| CATT | No need to introduce more than one capability. |
| Ericsson | No need |
| TCL | Agree with QC.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Only one capability is sufficient. |
| Apple | Since we already introduced UE capability of CR/CBR evaluation, it is preferred to introduce UE capability of the processing times.  |
| OPPO | Agree with QC |
| LG Electronics | Not necessary to define multiple capabilities  |
| MediaTek | Agree with QC. |

From answers on Q1-Q3, Q5, the following conclusion can be drawn:

**Conclusion**

* Tproc,0, Tproc,1 and T3 are defined in slots
* All three values are defined in specification
* Single capability is defined for each processing time

For Tproc,0 which has the meaning of performing PSCCH decoding and RSRP measurements, the majority proposes values {1,1,2,2}.

Proposal 1-1

* Tproc,0 is {1, 1, 2, 2} slots for {15, 30, 60, 120} kHz sub-carrier spacing respectively

3,3,4,5 – Intel, ZTE/Sanechips

2,3,5,9 – Qualcomm

3,6,12,24 – HW/HiSi, TCL

4,8,16,32 – Samsung, [TCL]

3,7,14,30 – CATT

2,2,3,4 – Ericsson, Nokia/NSB

2,2[4],4[8],8[16] – Apple

1,1,2,3 – Futurewei

3,7,14,30 – MediaTek

Since Tproc,1 is mainly dominated by computation time independent of the numerology, i.e. resource selection and physical channel preparation, it needs to be almost unchanged in terms of absolute time. It would be reasonable to adopt around 2 ms total Tproc,1 time.

That results in {2, 4, 8, 16} slots. Comparing to e.g. numbers resulting from averaging of companies’ proposals, that is {3, 5, 8, 15}, it may be a reasonable choice.

Proposal 1-2

* Tproc,1 is {2, 4, 8, 16} slots for {15, 30, 60, 120} kHz sub-carrier spacing respectively

For T3, the decision seems dependent on Tproc,1. In FL understanding, T3 has the same meaning and component as Tproc,1 but may require consideration on slot boundary alignment. In other words, the re-evaluation or pre-emption trigger is identical to resource selection trigger ‘n’.

Proposal 1-3

* Down-select this meeting:
	+ Option 1: T3 = Tproc,1
	+ Option 2: T3 = Tproc,1 + 1

## Sensing window size

There are currently brackets around sensing window size values:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement from RAN1#99:* T0 is (pre)-configured between: 1000+[100]ms and [100]ms
 |

RAN1 RRC parameters list contains the following entry:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 5G\_V2X\_NRSL-Core | Resource allocation Mode 2 |   |   |   |   | t0\_SensingWindow | new | t0\_SensingWindow | Parameter that indicates the start of the sensing window | [100] ms, 1000+[100] ms |   | Per resource pool | UE specific, Cell specific | 36.331, 38.331 |  |

In order to finalize this aspect, it is proposed to simply confirm the values in brackets:

**Q6: Is it OK to confirm the values in brackets, so that the agreement becomes the following?**

* T0 is (pre)-configured between: 1000+~~[~~100~~]~~ms and ~~[~~100~~]~~ ms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Comments** |
| Intel | Remove brackets |
| Qualcomm | Remove brackets |
| Panasonic | We agree to remove brackets. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Ok to confirm the values in brackets, i.e., remove brackets. |
| Samsung | Our preference is that T0 is (pre-)configured between 1000ms and 100ms.In our understanding, there is no motivation to add another 100ms for T0 =1000ms  |
| NTT DOCOMO | For shorter one, support to remove bracket.For larger one. Either to remove or not is ok. We are also wondering what the motivation to add 100ms for T0=1000ms.  |
| vivo | How 1100ms comes should be clarified before remove the brackets. |
| CATT | Remove brackets |
| Ericsson | Remove brackets |
| TCL | Agree to remove brackets. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Ok to confirm.  |
| Apple | Confirm the values in brackets. |
| Nokia, NSB | Confirm.  |
| FUTUREWEI | Confirm |
| OPPO | Remove brackets |
| NEC | Confirm 1000+100 ms and 100ms |
| LG Electronics | Fine to confirm |
| MediaTek | OK to confirm |

It seems majority view is to confirm the values in brackets:

Proposal 1-4

* Confirm that sensing window size parameter T0 is (pre)-configured between two values: 1100 ms and 100 ms

2nd round discussion

**Conclusion (not to be explicitly captured)**

* Tproc,0, Tproc,1 and T3 are defined in slots
* All three values are defined in specification
* Single capability is defined for each processing time

Proposal 1-1

* Tproc,0 is {1, 1, 2, 2} slots for {15, 30, 60, 120} kHz sub-carrier spacing respectively

Proposal 1-2

* Tproc,1 is {2, 4, 8, 16} slots for {15, 30, 60, 120} kHz sub-carrier spacing respectively

Proposal 1-3

* Down-select this meeting:
	+ Option 1: T3 = Tproc,1
	+ Option 2: T3 = Tproc,1 + 1

Proposal 1-4

* Confirm that sensing window size parameter T0 is (pre)-configured between two values: 1100 ms and 100 ms

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | Comments |
| Samsung | For proposal 1-1, 2 slots for {60, 120}kHz is O.K when sensing window size is 1000+[100]ms but we think that 1 slot for {60, 120}kHz seems also feasible option when sensing window size is [100]ms since reduced processing time is expected for the short duration of sensing window.For proposal 1-2, this is not our preference but we can accept.For proposal 1-3, could you add Option 3: T3=T1+1. We think that this is reasonable option since it considers processing time for resource selection and one additional slot to process any required time for re-evaluation.For proposal 1-4, before removing bracket further clarification is needed why 1100ms is necessary. Our preference is 1000ms for long sensing window.FL comment: in my understanding, the size of sensing window has no impact on processing time Tproc,0. It is determined by processing of the last slot in the window.If T3 is dependent on T1, then it is not a processing time.For 1100 ms, may be there can be more comments from proponents of this value in RAN1#99. |
| Ericsson | Proposal 1-1: Agree Proposal 1-2: We would like to understand why we are deviating so much from the PUSCH preparation times in TS 38.214 Section 6.4 (capability 1). If I am not mistaken, rounding up they result in {1,1,2,3} slots, right? I can understand positions wanting to add 1 slot at most 2, to align for slot boundaries, etc. But other than this, where does the difference come from?FL comment: From companies responses I understood that the main difference to UL is the need to run resource selection procedure, which can dominate Tproc,1. Execution of this procedure seems not dependent on SCS, i.e. has constant value in ms. Proposal 1-3: Option 2. But I want to reiterate, that they refer to the same time. It is just that the agreements we have include or not one extra slot. Proposal 1-4: Agree Can you clarify this comment:* Tproc,1 cannot be > 16 slots. Otherwise, aperiodic reservations almost don’t work due to signalling window size of 32 slots.

Our understanding is that Tproc,1 is the time between selection and the earliest firs transmission. The window refers to the distance between (2 or 3) consecutive transmissions.FL comment: The comment relates to the fact that between the end of sensing window and start of selection window there are > 16 slots, i.e. only remaining 16 slots have occupation information. In extreme example if Tproc,1= 32 slots and aperiodic reservations are configured, then all sensing info will be outdated after Tproc,1 |
|  OPPO | For the following conclusion, could you clarify they are to be defined in physical slots or counted in logical slots. I would assume physical slots.* Tproc,0, Tproc,1 and T3 are defined in slots

FL comment: let’s update next timeProposal 1-1 and 1-2: No strong view. Proposal 1-3: According to the summary v100, significant portion of companies expressed T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1. This should be included as an option as well.In our understanding, T3 time used in re-evaluation and pre-emption includes the time taken to decode PSCCH and measure RSRP for slot m-T3, perform Step 1 and Step 2, and prepare PSCCH/PSSCH for transmission in slot m. Thus, it should include both Tproc,0 and Tproc,1.FL comment: At least my understanding of this value is Tproc,1. The principle is to find the value so that the resource ‘m’ lays into the selection window during re-evaluation. Assuming re-evaluation is triggered in slot ‘n’, the selection window set on n+Tproc,1 should cover the resource ‘m’. Proposal 1-4: Agree |
| Qualcomm | General comment, since we’re using slots, we need to have a clear definition of what T  = 1 slot means. In our view, T=1 is the next slot, in which case, the actual time gap could be less than  a slot (similar to K values in Uu). This is not an issue for Tproc,0 because the spec excludes one slot using “)”. Proposal 1-1: We’re ok with the values for 15 kHz, 30 kHz, and 60 kHz. We think the value for 120 kHz should be larger: 4 slots. Proposal 1-2: We propose {2, 3, 5, 9}. We think a tighter timeline is needed here. In our view, the equivalent of 1ms (+ 1 slot for boundary alignment) is a good balance. This is important to be able to schedule transmissions as early as possible and to be able utilize as much sensing information as possible. If larger values are used, then W (in SCI) would need to be increased to at least 64 to still be able to use a large portion of the sensing information Proposal 1-3: We propose T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1. The following comment is not clear to us “T3 has same meaning as Tproc,1 if latest agreements are taken into account”.  In our understanding, T3 includes SCI decoding and resource selection. We agree with OPPO that there should be an option T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1 and we support that option. Proposal 1-4: we agree.  |
| Apple | Agree with Proposals 1-1, 1-2, 1-4. For Proposal 1-2, we think the main bottleneck is the CR/CBR evaluation time. Since Tproc,1 serves as an upper bound of T1, it should be large enough to allow UE to finish CR/CBR evaluation. Right now, CR/CBR evaluation time could be as large as 2/4/8/16 slots for 15/30/60/120 kHz. Hence, Tproc,1 may have to be no less than these numbers. For Proposal 1-3, since several companies think T3 includes UE processing time of SCI decoding and sidelink measurement (i.e., Tproc,0), we think the option T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1 should be included. |
| vivo | we agree on proposal 1-1 and 1-2For proposal 1-3, we prefer option 1. Tproc,1 is large enough for the UE to proceed resource selection produre. the time for PSSCH decoding and RSRP measurement should be counted before m-T3, which is a value used to derive the sensing window.For proposal 1-4, we have the same concern as Samsung. In our understanding, 1000ms can already cover longest configurable period, for sensing purpose,  it can simply reuse LTE mechanism to bound the sensing window with 1000ms, it is better to clarify why we need a different value from LTE. |
| NEC | No strong views on proposal 1-1,1-2 and 1-4.Regarding proposal 1-3, we support option 1. We understood FL's comments above that T3 is associated with selection window and share vivo's views that "time for PSSCH decoding and RSRP measurement should be counted before m-T3".Besides, even if we should count Pproc,0 and Pproc,1 into T3, we think it's more reasonable to take the larger value between Pproc,0 and Pproc,1 , e.g. max(Pproc,0 and Pproc,1), but not the sum value. |
| NTT DOCOMO | No strong views on 1-1 and 1-2. For proposal 1-3, we share the view with OPPO and QC. For proposal 1-4, we do not disagree, but it would be good to clarify why 1100ms (1000+[100]) is necessary, which is different from LTE V2X. If no strong benefit, reusing LTE V2X seems sufficient to us.  |
| MediaTek | For Proposal 1-1, we agree.For Proposal 1-2, we don’t agree. Some comments:* In our understanding, T1 will determine the UE’s processing time for resource re-selection, not Tproc,1. T1 is up to UE implementation whereas Tproc,1 is just an upper bound. Setting Tproc,1 to 4ms does not introduce any restriction. In fact, it is the more flexible approach. There are some cases where longer T1 values may be preferable. We shouldn't prevent such flexibility of setting T1 to a larger value when needed.
* Frankly, I don't see how Rel-15 UL min preparation times and Tproc,1 are related. In Rel-15 UL, the minimum timing values (i.e., N2) define a lower bound for possible UE processing times (i.e., K2), whereas Tproc,1 sets an upper bound for the actual processing time (i.e., T1).
	+ As an example, if N2=2 slots in UL, UE can be configured with K2=2,3,4,... slots. N2 defines a **lower bound** for K2. (here, I assume slot as time unit just for simplicity)
	+ However, If Tproc,1 is set to 2 slots, the only possible T1 values will be T1=1 or 2 slots. Tproc,1 defines an **upper bound** for T1.
* Moreover, we disagree with FL's comment on the potential issue with >16 slots. We can trust that UE chooses a sensible T1 value. UE will have strong incentive to set T1 to a reasonable value less than 16 slots with aperiodic reservations. Otherwise, UE's own mode-2 operation would not perform well.
* We want to choose a Tproc,1 value that provides more flexibility, rather than introducing restriction. We prefer setting T3 to 4ms and deriving Tproc,1 based on T3=Tproc,0+Tproc,1.
* Hence, Tproc,1 values can be defined as {3,7,14,30} slots (assuming that Tproc,0 is {1,1,2,2} slots).

For Proposal 1-3, we ideally prefer T3 = Tproc,0 + Tproc,1. But, between Option-1 and Option-2, our preference would be Option-2.For Proposal 1-4, we are supportive. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | Proposal 1-1: ok. And 1/1/2/4 slots is also fine for us.Proposal 1-2: disagree.We proposed 3 ms, i.e., 3/6/12/24 slots. This is mainly because the “fixed” part, i.e., MAC scheduling, MAC-PHY exchange will be the dominate factor. And the scheduling time will be even larger for aperiodic traffic since the TB size is not known in advance, so the UE needs to reschedule the potential Tx resource. So at least 2ms is needed for this “fixed” part.We share similar view with MediaTek that a larger value is preferred since $T\_{proc,1}$ is just an upper bound, and the spec already allows the UE can go faster than $T\_{proc,1}$. So a larger value does not introduce restriction, but provides more flexibility. And we do not agree with “Tproc,1 cannot be > 16 slots”. A more practical scenario is both periodic and aperiodic traffic exist, so no big issues here. And again, since $T\_{proc,1}$ is just an upper bound, we trust the UE will select a proper T1.Proposal 1-3: We support T3=T1.We are unclear why Tproc,0 should be included in T3 as mentioned by some companies.To our understanding, if re-selection is triggered at slot m-T3, then the sensing window is [m-T3-T0, m-T3-Tproc,0 ). So it seems no need to include Tproc,0 in T3.Proposal 1-4: Agree |
| CATT | Regarding the conclusion part, Tproc,0, Tproc,1 and T3 should be defined in physical slots. Proposal 1-1: AgreeProposal 1-2: DisagreeWe share same views as MediaTek and Huawei, a larger value shall be used for Tproc,1. Tproc,1 is used for the processing of resource (re-)selection, PSCCH/PSSCH transmission preparation and slot boundary alignment, which is different from the preparation time of PUSCH. In mode 2 procedure, at least three trips of interaction between physical layer and MAC layer shall be performed:* MAC layer shall indicate the intended candidate resources according to the traffic QoS.
* UE shall perform the candidate resources set identification and reporting, including potential iteration of RSRP threshold increasing.
* MAC layer shall perform resource selection and indicate the grant information to physical layer, including the potential iteration of resource selection to meet the limitation due to HARQ RTT time and 32 slots limitation.

Therefore, we prefer a larger value for Tproc,1, which is similar as T1(4ms) in LTE V2X excluding the sensing results preparation time(Tproc, 0).We support $Tproc,1=(4·2^{μ}-T\_{proc,0})$, which is 3/7/14/30 physical slots for 15KHz/30KHz/60KHz/120KHz SCS, respectively. And the Tproc, 1 is the upper bound of processing time, it is up to UE implementation to choose a smaller value than $Tproc,1$. Proposal 1-3 DisagreeWe share the same views as OPPO and QC, the moment 'm-T3' is not same as resource selection trigger timing 'n' , and all the sensing results before 'm-T3' should be available. Then procedures within T3 should contain the sensing results preparation, potential resource reselection and PSCCH and PSSCH transmission preparation. Thus, T3 should be equal to (Tproc,0 + Tproc,1).Proposal 1-4: Agree  |
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