**[104-e-NR-5G\_V2X-05]: Remaining UL/SL prioritization rule, till 1/28, with potential CRs till 2/2 – Hanbyul (LGE)**

* **PP-1-1: How SL HARQ-ACK report is piggybacked on PUSCH**
* **PP-1-3: Further consideration on prioritization rule between PUCCH for the response of MsgB and SL TX**
* **PP-1-4: Further consideration on prioritization rule between SL reception and PUCCH carrying SL HARQ-ACK report**

**PP-1-1: How SL HARQ-ACK report is piggybacked on PUSCH**

Q1: Whether or when SL HARQ-ACK report can be piggybacked on PUSCH of priority index 1 (i.e. URLLC PUSCH)

* Option 1: SL HARQ-ACK report can be piggybacked on only PUSCH of priority index 0 (No spec change).
* Option 2: when the priority value of SL PUCCH is smaller than sl-PriorityThreshold.
* Option 3: when sl-PriorityThreshold-UL-URLLC is provided.
* Option 4: when the priority value of SL PUCCH is smaller than sl-PriorityThreshold-UL-URLLC.
* Option 5: Others (Please specify it).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Comment |
| Sharp | Option 1 | We don’t think any further optimization on this should be introduced at this late stage of Rel-16. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 1 | Potential SL HARQ report and uRLLC PUSCH collision could be avoided by implementation in lieu of being handled by additional specific change. Priority based solutions(option 2-4) would incur additional blind detection for gNB to sort out whether multiplexing exists given it has no knowledge of SL priority level. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 5 | In my understanding, current spec. does not include any text for condition of SL HARQ-ACK mux on PUSCH. It means, someone could misunderstand that SL HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed on any PUSCH (with any priority). Even if option 1 is taken, no spec change will not work as intended.  Dropping deprioritized on should be specified. |
| LG | Option 4 | According to the current specification, if SL HARQ-ACK reports can be piggybacked on only PUSCH of priority index 0, when the UL channel carrying the SL HARQ-ACK is collided with PUSCH of priority index 1, then the SL HARQ-ACK report could be dropped even though the priority value of the SL HARQ-ACK report is sufficiently small.  At least when the SL HARQ-ACK report is prioritized over URLLC Uu UCI, it needs to allow the case when the SL HARQ-ACK report is piggybacked on URLLC PUSCH. To do this, it can be considered that the UE assumes that the priority index of the SL HARQ-ACK report is 1 when the priority value of SL PUCCH is smaller than sl-PriorityThreshold-UL-URLLC. |
| Apple | Option 5 | In case SL HARQ-ACK report cannot be piggybacked on URLLC PUSCH (i.e., Option 1), we may need to specify the dropping rule. Maybe we could say SL HARQ-ACK report is dropped when it has overlap with URLLC PUSCH. This has the minimum spec. impact at the late stage of Rel-16 maintenance. |

Q2: Do you agree following proposal?

Proposal:

*For prioritization between PUCCH carrying SL HARQ-ACK reports and PUSCH without UL-SCH,*

* *When the priority index of the PUSCH is 1,* 
  + *if sl-PriorityThreshold-UL-URLLC is provided*
    - *the PUCCH has higher priority than the PUSCH if the priority value of the SL HARQ-ACK reports is smaller than sl-PriorityThreshold-UL-URLLC; otherwise, the PUCCH has higher priority than the PUCCH*
  + *else*
    - *the PUSCH has higher priority than the PUCCH*
* *else*
  + *the SL transmission or reception has higher priority than the UL transmission if the priority value of the SL transmission(s) or reception is smaller than sl-PriorityThreshold; otherwise, the UL transmission has higher priority than the SL transmission or reception*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Comment |
| Sharp | No | See our comments for Q1. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | No | We prefer to resolve this by implementation. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | This case seems to be included in the mentioned case of section 16.2.4.3.1 of 38.213: ‘For prioritization between SL transmission or …’, so no spec update is assumed, right? |
| LGE | Yes | In our understanding, the PUSCH without UL-SCH would be the case when PUSCH carries aperiodic CSI or SP-CSI only. In this case, the prioritization between SL TX and PUCCH carrying Uu UCI can be reused. |
| Apple | Yes | Overall, this case can be handled in a similar way as PUCCH carrying SL HARQ-ACK vs. PUCCH carrying UCI (i.e., Section 9.2.5.0 in 38.213). One typo in the proposal is  *“otherwise, the PU~~C~~SCH has higher priority than the PUCCH”* |

Q3: Whether or how to handle the case when a PUSCH with no UCI overlaps with two non-overlapping PUCCHs each of which contains SL HARQ-ACK and Uu UCI



[R1-2101583]

* Option 1: UE does not expect the above collision case
  + Option 1-1: No spec change
  + Option 1-2: Add a sentence in the specification
* Option 2: Apply prioritization rule for overlapping PUCCH to the case of non-overlapping PUCCH which collided with a PUSCH.
* Option 3: Others (Please specify it).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Comment |
| Sharp | Option 1-1, or  Option 1-2 | We don’t think any further optimization on this should be introduced at this late stage of Rel-16. On the other hand, maybe it is OK to add a sentence in the specification to clarify that such a case is not expected. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 1-1 | We prefer to resolve this by implementation. Even if some high level guidance were needed, this could be implemented by a RAN1 conclusion. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Option 2 | In the current spec, PUSCH is scheduled after DL assignment/SL grant so that UL DAI/SAI works well and the corresponding HARQ-ACK can be multiplexed on the PUSCH. In that sense, Option 1 is too restrictive for PUSCH scheduling.  In addition, we think that the collision between PUCCH with SL HARQ-ACK and PUSCH with A/SP-CSI should be discussed to conclude how to handle this case. Note that the current spec allows multiplexing the SL HARQ-ACK on the PUSCH. |
| LGE | Option 1-1 | When at least one of non-overlapping PUCCHs and overlapping PUSCH is scheduled by gNB, gNB could ensure that such collision case does not happen.  Even for the case when PUCCHs and PUSCH are configured by gNB, the network can ensure such collision does not happen. One simple way is that the SL PUCCH and Uu PUCCH are always overlapping at least for the case when they are configured by gNB. |
| Apple | Option 1-2 | Maybe one sentence of explanation that “this case is not expected by UE” is fine. |

**PP-1-3: Further consideration on prioritization rule between PUCCH for the response of MsgB and SL TX**

Q4: Do you agree following proposal?

Proposal:

* *PUCCH transmission for the response of MsgB is prioritized over SL transmission(s).*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Comment |
| Sharp | No | We don’t think any further optimization on this should be introduced at this late stage of Rel-16. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes |  |
| NTT DOCOMO | No | Current spec does not prioritize PUCCH for response of Msg4. We think the same prioritization among them is better. |
| LGE | Yes | If this is not agreed, it would be necessary to newly define UE behavior when the UE drops the PUCCH for the response of the received MsgB. |
| Apple | Yes | As a part of initial access, PUCCH for response of MsgB should have higher priority over sidelink. |

**PP-1-4: Further consideration on prioritization rule between SL reception and PUCCH carrying SL HARQ-ACK report**

Q5: Do you agree following proposal?

Proposal:

*For prioritization between SL RX and PUCCH carrying SL HARQ reporting,*

* *The PUCCH transmission has higher priority than a SL transmission if a priority value of the PUCCH is smaller than a priority value of the SL reception.*
* *If the priority value of the PUCCH transmission is larger than the priority value of the SL reception, the SL reception has higher priority.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer | Comment |
| Sharp | Yes | (“SL transmission” => “SL reception” in the first bullet?)  In our understanding this is something missing in the spec. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No | We prefer to discuss PSFCH/S-SSB Rx only, whose priority level is fully known to UE. The preferred change looks like.  *For prioritization between SL PSFCH or S-SSB Rx and PUCCH carrying SL HARQ reporting,*   * *The PUCCH transmission has higher priority than a SL PSFCH or S-SSB Rx if a priority value of the PUCCH is smaller than a priority value of the SL PSFCH or S-SSB Rx.* * *If the priority value of the PUCCH transmission is larger than the priority value of the SL PSFCH or S-SSB reception, the SL reception has higher priority.* |
| NTT DOCOMO | Yes | Common solution with SL transmission.  ZTE’s update seems feasible. |
| LGE | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes | SL reception has the same prioritization rule as SL transmission in this case. |