**[101-e--NR-5G\_V2X\_NRSL-SYNC-03]**

**Email discussion regarding**

* **Issue 12: Collision between S-SSB and DL slots**
* **Issue 14: (Pre-)configuration of SL BWP**
* **Issue 18: S-SSB RSRP measurement**

**Till 5/28. If consensus can be reached, any follow-up TP by 6/3 – Teng (CATT)**

**Issue 12 Collision between S-SSB and DL slots**

***FL Proposal: S-SSB transmission/reception slots are not supposed to overlap with DL slots.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree. The phrasing should be more formally:   * S-SSB transmission/reception slots are assumed to be configured not to include any DL slot.   The same principle has been captured in LTE-V. |
| Intel | Our understanding is that on a given carrier all SL resources are configured on UL resources only. Therefore, our proposal is: “SL transmissions on a given carrier do not overlap with DL and FL slots.” |
| OPPO | In LTE-V2X, SL transmission can only happen on UL resources. This mechanism can be reused in NR-V2X. we have the following agreement till now. To align with LTE-V2X mechanism, we can limit SL transmissions on UL resources only. Otherwise, there will be misalignment of the SL resources for IC and OOC UE because only UL slot is indicated by PSBCH.  Proposal:   * SL transmissions use only cell-specific UL resources in Uu.   Agreements:   * NR supports SL transmissions at least in cell-specific UL resources in Uu. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Issue 14 (pre-)configuration of SL BWP**

***FL Proposal:***

* ***The same SL BWP should be (pre)configured for both RRC idle (or out of coverage NR V2X UEs) and RRC connected UEs.***
* ***Not support that the UE assumes the subcarrier with index 0 in the S-SS/PSBCH block is aligned with a subcarrier with index 0 in the SL BWP.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Huawei, HiSilihcon | Agree.  For the first bullet, the UE supports only single active BWP in Uu link. In sidelink, the only way is make the SL BWP in RRC connected and idle/inactive state the same. The final form of the proposal needs to avoid the word “should”, e.g. “is”.  For the second bulletin, the current specification wording cannot be supported by any agreements and contradicts the agreements that the S-SSB frequency location is configured by absoluteFrequencySSB-SL. |
| Intel | We do not see the need for this proposal. |
| OPPO | For the first bullet: agree.  For the second bullet: disagree.  If the proposal is agreed, how to determine the frequency position of SL BWP? Additional RB offset between the first RB of S-SSB and RB#0 of SL BWP needs to be introduced? We don’t think that is good option at the last meeting of NR-V2X. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Issue 18 S-SSB RSRP measurements**

***FL Proposal: S-SSB RSRP is measured based on S-SSS. In addition, PSBCH-DMRS can be used for S-SSB RSRP measurement optionally.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Disagree.  The use of DM-RS has been captured already clearly in 38.215 as following.   |  | | --- | | PSBCH Reference Signal Received Power (PSBCH-RSRP) is defined as the linear average over the power contributions (in [W]) of the resource elements that carry demodulation reference signals associated with physical sidelink broadcast channel (PSBCH). |   No need to re-open the discussion. |
| Intel | Disagree. LTE V2X sync procedure was agreed to be reused. DMRS should be used for PSBCH RSRP measurements. |
| OPPO | Agree with HW. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |