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1. **Summary of evaluation results**

In RAN1#103-e meeting, RAN1 listed up three types of “A set of resources” for inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:

* Type A: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission
	+ e.g., based on its sensing result
* Type B: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission
	+ e.g., based on its sensing result and/or expected/potential resource conflict
* Type C: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resource where the resource conflict is detected

The summary of evaluation results is as follows:

* For Type A without sensing at UE-B,
	+ When a UE-A transmits multiple Type A information to multiple UE-B(s),
		- It is assumed that R16 Mode 2 RA is used to determine resources for inter-UE coordination signalling.
			* 5.4% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 320m [Huawei, R1-2101941].
				+ Coverage of 200m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.
	+ When a UE-A is the intended RX UE of UE-B,
		- Assumptions on latency and signalling overhead of transmitting and processing coordination information
			* R16 Mode 2 RA is used to determine resources for inter-UE coordination signalling,
				+ PRR loss is observed in highway and urban scenarios for aperiodic unicast traffic at 320m and 150m accordingly [Intel, R1-2100673].
			* No latency and no signalling overhead (genie-aided modelling)
				+ PRR gain is observed in highway and urban scenarios for aperiodic unicast traffic at 320m and 150m accordingly [Intel, R1-2100673]
				+ 3.4% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for aperiodic unicast traffic at 300m [Samsung, R1-2101232].

Coverage of 5m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

* For Type A and/or Type B with sensing at UE-B,
	+ When a UE-A transmits Type A information to multiple UE-B(s),
		- It is assumed that UE-A performs inter-UE coordination signalling once at the beginning of the evaluation in advance of UE-B’s transmission.
			* 4.96% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for periodic broadcast traffic at 150m [LGE, R1-2101786].
				+ Coverage of 10m is extended in urban scenario at PRR=0.95.
	+ When a UE-A is the intended RX UE of UE-B,
		- Assumptions on latency and signalling overhead of transmitting and processing coordination information
			* R16 Mode 2 RA is used to determine resources for inter-UE coordination signalling,
				+ [1-4.3]% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 320m [Huawei, R1-2101941].

Coverage of [10-100]m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

* + - * + No PRR gain is observed in highway and urban scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 320m and 100m [Intel, R1-2100673]
			* UE-A’s data transmission resources are used for inter-UE coordination signalling,
				+ 0.2% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for aperiodic groupcast traffic from 99.3% to 99.5% in 50m [Qualcomm, R1-2101910]

Coverage is extended from 33m to 38m at PRR=0.99.

Coverage is extended from 18m to 25m at PRR=0.995.

99.9% reliability communication is not possible

* + - * PSFCH format is used to indicate pre-conflict,
				+ 0.3% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for aperiodic groupcast traffic at 320m [Ericsson, R1-2101804].

Coverage of 40m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.99 and 50m for PRR=0.975.

* + - * + When sensing and non-sensing UEs are present in the scenario,

1% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for aperiodic groupcast traffic at 320m [Ericsson, R1-2101804].

Coverage of 70m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.99 and 100m for PRR=0.975.

* + - * Combination of R16 Mode 2 RA and PSFCH format for inter-UE coordination signalling,
				+ 3% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 50m [MediaTek, R1-2100606].
				+ Coverage of 10m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.
			* Implict post-conflict indication based on reception status of PSFCH w/o need of inter-UE dedicated signalling,
				+ 1%~2% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 100m [MediaTek, R1-2100606].
				+ 7%~8% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 100m [MediaTek, R1-2101926].
			* No signalling overhead and latency of 3ms+2 slots,
				+ 7.6% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 150m [OPPO, R1-2100142].

Coverage of 20m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

* + - * No signalling overhead and latency of 2ms,
				+ 20% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 320m [CATT, R1-2100352].

Coverage of 20m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

* + - * + No PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for aperiodic unicast traffic [CATT, R1-2100352].
			* Latency of N= 1, 2, 4 logical slots and no signaling overhead
				+ N= 1 slot: 3.2% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic groupcast traffic at 320m [Mitsubishi, R1-2100828].

Coverage extension of 50m in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

* + - * + N= 2 slots: 2.2 % PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic groupcast traffic at 320m [Mitsubishi, R1-2100828].

Coverage extension of  30m in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

* + - * + N= 4 slots: 2 % PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic groupcast traffic at 320m [Mitsubishi, R1-2100828].
				+ Coverage extension of  30m in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.
			* No latency and 1 sub-channel in a slot for signalling overhead of transmitting and processing coordination information
				+ 3% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for aperiodic unicast traffic at 150m [vivo, R1-2101791].

No coverage is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

* + - * + 4.3% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 150m [vivo, R1-2101791].

Coverage of 15m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

* + - * + If 20% of slots are used for UL TX of UE-A,

9% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 150m [vivo, R1-2101791].

Coverage of 40m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

* + - * + If 50% of slots are UL TX of UE-A,

46% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 150m [vivo, R1-2101791].

* + - * Latency with range of [1~10] slot and 10 RBs in a slot for signalling overhead of transmitting and processing coordination information
				+ When the UE-A is further determined by UE-B via PC5-RRC, and fixed overhead (10RB/100bit) are assumed without latency

2.6% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic broadcast traffic at 320m [ZTE, R1-2100925].

Coverage of 40m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

5.8% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for periodic broadcast traffic at 150m [ZTE, R1-2100925].

Coverage of 10m is extended in urban scenario at PRR=0.95.

* + - * 10% of resources are used for signalling related to coordination and latency of 10 slots,
				+ PRR loss is observed in highway scenario for periodic groupcast traffic at 320m [Fujitsu, R1-2100746].
			* No latency and no signalling overhead (genie-aided modeling)
				+ No PRR gain is observed in highway and urban scenario for aperiodic unicast traffic [Intel, R1-2100673]
				+ 2.5% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 320m [Intel, R1-2100673]
				+ 1.5% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 100m [Intel, R1-2100673]
				+ 6% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 320m [Mitsubishi, R1-2100828].

Coverage extension of 50m in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

* + - * + 3.2% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic groupcast traffic at 320m [Mitsubishi, R1-2100828].

Coverage extension of 50m in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.

* + - * + 1.2% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for periodic groupcast traffic at 320m [Fujitsu, R1-2100746].

Coverage of 20m is extended in urban scenario at PRR=0.95.

Coverage of 40m is extended in urban scenario at PRR=0.99.

* + - * + 5%~6% PRR gain is observed for uban scenario for periodic unicast traffic at 100m [MediaTek, R1-2100606]
* For Type C,
	+ Evaluation assumptions
		- UE-A is one of the RX UE of UE-B within the communication range requirement from the UE-B, if any.
		- PSFCH format is used for convey resource conflict indication.
	+ When the communication range requirement is smaller than or equal to 200m,
		- For the post-conflict indication,
			* [0.4-1.3]% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for aperiodic and periodic groupcast traffic at 50m [Intel, R1-2100673 (aperiodic traffic only)] [Fujitsu, R1-2100746].
				+ Coverage of [5-25]m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.
				+ Coverage of [50-60]m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.99.
			* 1.2% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for aperiodic groupcast traffic at 300m [Intel, R1-2100673].
			* 1% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for periodic groupcast traffic at 50m [Fujitsu, R1-2100746].
				+ Coverage of 10m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.
			* 0.7% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for aperiodic groupcast traffic at 50m [Fujitsu, R1-2100746].
				+ Coverage of 25m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.99.
			* 0.5% PRR gain is observed in urban scenario for aperiodic groupcast traffic from 99.3% to 99.8% in 50m [Qualcomm, R1-2101910]
				+ Coverage of 10m is extended from 33m to 44m at PRR=0.99.
				+ Coverage of extended from 18m to 36m at PRR=0.995.
				+ Enable 99.9% reliability communication range up to 20m
			* PRR gain of Mode 2 enahcement with ensuring the minimum number of retransmission is higher than that of Type C in highway scenario for aperiodic groupcast traffic [Intel, R1-2100673].
	+ When the communication range requirement is larger than or equal to 240m,
		- For the post-conflict indication,
			* [0.1-0.5]% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for aperiodic groupcast traffic at 320m [Intel, R1-2100673] [Ericsson, R1-2101804].
				+ Coverage of 25m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.95.
				+ Coverage of [10-50]m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.99 and 20m for PRR=0.975.
			* PRR gain of Mode 2 enahcement with ensuring the minimum number of retransmission is higher than that of Type C in highway scenario for aperiodic groupcast traffic [Intel, R1-2100673].
		- For the mix of pre-conflict (Type B) and post-conflict indication (Type C),
			* 0.6% PRR gain is observed in highway scenario for aperiodic groupcast traffic at 320m [Ericsson, R1-2101804].
				+ Coverage of 70m is extended in highway scenario at PRR=0.99 and 100m for PRR=0.975.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source (tdoc number)** | **Evaluation Scenario** | **What is the relationship between UE-A and UE-B, including additional latency and signaling overhead model** | **How UE-A determines the set of resources, including the form of the information** | **When UE-A sends the set of resources to UE-B** | **How UE-A sends the set of resources to UE-B, including container and signaling overhead model** | **How/when UE-B takes the received set of resources into account in the resource selection for its own transmission, including additional latency model**  | **Gain over Rel.16 Mode-2 RA** |
| OPPO [R1-2100142] | Unicast,Urban,Periodic(UUP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B.  | Type B. | 2 slots after UE-A receiving the triggering signalling from UE-B | Not modelled | The latency of transmitting and processing coordination information is set to 3ms.UE-B precludes resources overlapping with the indicated set, and selects resource from the remaining. | PRR gain is 1% at the range of 50m.PRR gain is 7.6% in the range at 150m.PIR gain is 5ms in average in the range of [100m,240m].Coverage of 20m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| Huawei [R1-2101941] | Unicast,Highway,Periodic(UHP) | **Scheme 1:**UE-A is the UE closest the center of UE group in geographical sense. UE-B(s) are other UEs in the UE group. **Scheme 2&3:**UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type A. **Scheme 1:**The set of resources is the resources for UE-B’s transmission.**Scheme 2&3:**The set of resources is the identified candidate resource set obtained by UE-A’s sensing and resource exclusion procedure. | When UE-A receives the trigger information from UE-B.The request signalling occupies one sub-channel in a slot. **Scheme 1:**Resources for the request are (pre)configured by UE-A. **Scheme 2&3:**Resources for the request are obtained by UE-B’s sensing and exclusion procedure.  | The signalling of the set of resources occupies one sub-channel in a slot. Resources for the signalling are obtained by UE-A’s sensing and exclusion procedure. | **Scheme 1:**UE-B uses the transmission resources provided by UE-A.**Scheme 2:**UE-B takes the union of UE-B’s S\_A and UE-A’s S\_A to obtain the final candidate resource set**Scheme 3:**UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and UE-A’s S\_A to obtain the final candidate resource set. | **Scheme 1:**PRR gain is 5.4% at the range of 320m.Coverage of 200m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99.**Scheme 2:**PRR gain is 4.3% at the range of 320m.Coverage of 100m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99.**Scheme 3:**PRR gain is 1% at the range of 320m.Coverage of 10m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| CATT [R1-2100352] | Unicast,Highway,Periodic(UHP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | A mix of Type A and Type B.UE-A determines the possible transmission occasions of UE-A as Type B resource set. | When UE-A receives the trigger information from UE-B. | Not modelled | The latency of transmitting and processing coordination information is set to 2ms.UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and Type A resource set to obtain the final candidate resource set.UE-B will preclude all the resources of Type B resource set.  | **Type A only:**PRR gain is 11% at the range of 300mCoverage of 50m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99.**Type B only:**PRR gain is 9% at the range of 300mCoverage of 50m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99.**Mix of Type A and B:**PRR gain is 20% at the range of 300m.Coverage of 100m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| CATT [R1-2100352] | Unicast,Highway,Aperiodic(UHA) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | A mix of Type A and Type B.UE-A determines the possible transmission occasions of UE-A as Type B resource set. | When UE-A receives the trigger information from UE-B.Resources for the request are obtained by UE-B’s sensing and exclusion procedure. | Not modelled | The latency of transmitting and processing coordination information is set to 2ms.UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and Type A resource set to obtain the final candidate resource set.UE-B will preclude all the resources of Type B resource set.  | No PRR gain. |
| vivo [R1-2101791] | Unicast,Urban,Aperiodic and periodic(UUA and UUP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type A. | Once resource (re)-selection is triggered at UE-B, the assistance info is provided by UE-A | 1 sub-channel and 1 slot signalling overhead is assumed; 0ms latency is assumed | Based on mixed candidate resource set derived by TX UE and RX UE | 3% PRR gain at the range of 150m.Coverage of 10m is extended at PRR=0.95.No coverage is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| vivo [R1-2101791] | Unicast, Urban, Aperiodic and Periodic (UUA and UUP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type-B | UE-A inform its SL transmission resource to UE-B |  | UE-B preclude the occasion of UE-A’s transmission  | 2%-3% PRR gain at the range of 150m.Coverage of 5m is extended at PRR=0.95. |
| vivo [R1-2101791] | Unicast,Urban,Aperiodic and Periodic(UUA and UUP)UL/SL coexistence | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type B.UE-A determines Type A resource set to further consider half-duplex problem and TX/TX overlap b/w UL and SL.  | UE-A inform its UL transmission resource to UE-B  |  | TX UE further precluding on UE-A’s SL occasion which incur SL TX and UL RX occasion overlap or SL TX and UL TX occasion overlap | **No UL slot:**4.3% PRR gain at the range of 150m.Coverage of 15m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99.**20% UL slot:**5.4% PRR gain at the range of 50m.9% PRR gain at the range of 150m.Coverage of 40m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99.**50% UL slot:**46% PRR gain in 150m. |
| MediaTek [R1-2100606] | Unicast,Urban,Periodic(UUP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B.UE-B can include TX UEs other than the intended TX UE of UE-A.  | Type B.When UE-A determines the resources reserved by UE-B as non-preferred resources, then the UE-A transmits non-preferred resource indication to UE-B. Otherwise, the UE-A will transmit the resource reserved by UE-B as non-preferred resource for other TX UE’s sensing/transmission.  | Upon receiving a new reservation. | PSFCH format is used for non-preferred resource indication.SCI (1st/2nd SCI) forwarding is used for non-preferred resource indication to avoid potential resource collision for other Tx UE.  | Upon receiving an inter-UE coordination message (PSFCH or SCI), a UE drops the concerned reservation and reselects resources based on sensing results | Genie algorithm in the simulation3% PRR gain in 50m.5% PRR gain in 100m.Coverage of 10m is extended at PRR=0.95. |
| MediaTek [R1-2100606/R1-2101926] | Scenario 1: Unicast,Highway,Periodic(UHP)Scenario 2:Unicast,Urban,Periodic(UUP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type B.UE-B will use the reception status of SL A/N from UE A (e.g., DTX status for SL A/N ) to trigger resource re-selection for avoidance of consecutive collision for periodic traffic  | Upon receiving a new reservation. | No need of dedicated signalling. | Upon receiving DTX status on SL A/N from UE a for multiple times. | **Scenario 1: [R1-2100606]**1.5% PRR gain in 50m.2% PRR gain in 200m.Coverage of 75m is extended at PRR=0.99.**Sceanrio 2: [R1-2101926]**4% PRR gain in 50m.7% PRR gain in 100m.Coverage of 10m is extended at PRR=0.99.Coverage of 15m is extended at PRR=0.95. |
| Intel [R1-2100673] | Groupcast (Option 1 with target range of 200m),Highway,Aperiodic(GHA) | UE-A is another receiver of UE-B within the target range. | Type C. | When UE-A observes half-duplex restriction for the same UE group. (Post-conflict indication) | PSFCH resource for groupcast HARQ-ACK feedback is reused.  | Upon receiving NACK from UE-A, UE-B performs retransmission.  | **Reference is R16 Mode 2:**0.4% PRR gain in 50m.1.2% PRR gain in 300m.Coverage of 25m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of 60m is extended at PRR=0.99.**Reference is Mode 2 RA with minimum (re)transmissions of 2:**0.1% PRR loss in 50m.2% PRR loss in 300m.Coverage of 20m is reduced at PRR=0.95.No coverage is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| Intel [R1-2100673] | Groupcast (Option 1 with target range of 400m),Highway,Aperiodic(GHA) | UE-A is another receiver of UE-B within the target range. | Type C. | When UE-A observes half-duplex restriction for the same UE group. (Post-conflict indication) | PSFCH resource for groupcast HARQ-ACK feedback is reused.  | Upon receiving NACK from UE-A, UE-B performs retransmission.  | **Reference is R16 Mode 2:**0.5% PRR gain in 320m.0% PRR gain in 400.Coverage of 25m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of 50m is extended at PRR=0.99.**Reference is Mode 2 RA with minimum (re)transmissions of 2:**0.5% PRR loss in 320m.1% PRR loss in 400m.No coverage is extended at PRR=0.95.No coverage is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| Intel [R1-2100673] | Unicast (AN disabled),Highway,Periodic(UHP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type A. | When UE-A receives the trigger information from UE-B.Signalling for the request is not modelled.  | Resources for the signalling are obtained by UE-A’s sensing and exclusion procedure. | UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and UE-A’s S\_A to obtain the final candidate resource set. | 0% PRR gain. |
| Intel [R1-2100673] | Unicast (AN disabled),Highway,Aperiodic(UHA) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type A. | When UE-A receives the trigger information from UE-B.Signalling for the request is not modelled. | Resources for the signalling are obtained by UE-A’s sensing and exclusion procedure. | **Scheme 2:**UE-B uses the transmission resources provided by UE-A. | **Scheme 2:**15% PRR loss in 300m. |
| Not modelled  | **Scheme 1:**UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and UE-A’s S\_A to obtain the final candidate resource set.**Scheme 2:**UE-B uses the transmission resources provided by UE-A. | **Scheme 1:**0% PRR gain.**Scheme 2:**5% PRR gain in 300m. |
|  | Unicast (AN disabled),Urban,Periodic(UUP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type A. | When UE-A receives the trigger information from UE-B.Signalling for the request is not modelled. | Resources for the signalling are obtained by UE-A’s sensing and exclusion procedure. | UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and UE-A’s S\_A to obtain the final candidate resource set. | 0% PRR gain. |
|  | Unicast (AN disabled),Urban,Aperiodic(UUA) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type A. | When UE-A receives the trigger information from UE-B.Signalling for the request is not modelled. | Resources for the signalling are obtained by UE-A’s sensing and exclusion procedure. | **Scheme 2:**UE-B uses the transmission resources provided by UE-A. | **Scheme 2:**9% PRR loss in 150m. |
| Not Modelled | **Scheme 1:**UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and UE-A’s S\_A to obtain the final candidate resource set.**Scheme 2:**UE-B uses the transmission resources provided by UE-A. | **Scheme 1:**0% PRR gain.**Scheme 2:**8% PRR gain in 150m. |
| Ericsson [R1-2101804] | Groupcast (Option 1 with target range of 500m)Highway,Aperiodic | Any UE. | Type B or Type C (future conflict).**Scheme 1:**Type C.A UE detects that a collision has taken place on a sub-channel or it detects that two UEs from the same group are in a half-duplex situation **Scheme 2:**Type B.A UE checks if the reservation overlaps some other reservation received earlier. If there is an overlap and the RSRP associated new reservation exceeds a certain threshold, the UE sends one bit.**Scheme 3:**Combination of Scheme 1 and 2. | **Scheme 1:**When UE-A observes a collision on a sub-channel or a half-duplex restriction for the same UE group.**Scheme 2:**Upon receiving a new (overlapping) reservation.**Scheme 3:**Combination of Scheme 1 and 2. | PSFCH format is used, and it can be shared with multiple UE-A(s) for the same problematic resources. | **Scheme 1:**Upon receiving NACK from UE-A, UE-B performs retransmission.**Scheme 2:**Upon receiving an inter-UE coordination message, a UE drops the concerned reservation and reselects resources**Scheme 3:**Combination of Scheme 1 and 2. | **R16 Mode 2 RA:****Scheme 1:**0.1% PRR gain in 320m.Coverage of 20m is extended at PRR=0.975.Coverage of 10m is extended at PRR=0.99.**Scheme 2:**0.3% PRR gain in 320m.Coverage of 50m is extended at PRR=0.975.Coverage of 40m is extended at PRR=0.99.**Scheme 3:**0.6% PRR gain in 320m.Coverage of 100m is extended at PRR=0.975.Coverage of 70m is extended at PRR=0.99.**Gain over Random RA (Scheme 2):** 1% PRR gain in 320m.Coverage of 100m is extended at PRR=0.975.Coverage of 70m is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| Fujitsu [R1-2100746] | Groupcast (Option 1 with target range of 100m)Highway,Periodic(GHP) | UE-A is another receiver of UE-B. | Type C. | When UE-A observes half-duplex restriction for the same UE group. (Post-conflict indication) | PSFCH resource for groupcast HARQ-ACK feedback is reused.  | Upon receiving NACK from UE-A, UE-B performs retransmission.  | 1% PRR gain in 50m.Coverage of 5m is extended at PRR=0.95. |
| Fujitsu [R1-210746] | Groupcast (Option 1 with target range of 100m)Urban,Periodic(GUP) | UE-A is another receiver of UE-B. | Type C. | When UE-A observes half-duplex restriction for the same UE group. (Post-conflict indication) | PSFCH resource for groupcast HARQ-ACK feedback is reused.  | Upon receiving NACK from UE-A, UE-B performs retransmission.  | 1% PRR gain in 50m.2% PRR loss in 100m.Coverage of 10m is extended at PRR=0.95. |
| Fujitsu [R1-210746] | Groupcast (Option 1 with target range of 100m)Highway,Aperiodic(GHA) | UE-A is another receiver of UE-B. | Type C. | When UE-A observes half-duplex restriction for the same UE group. (Post-conflict indication) | PSFCH resource for groupcast HARQ-ACK feedback is reused.  | Upon receiving NACK from UE-A, UE-B performs retransmission.  | 1.3% PRR gain in 50m.Coverage of 50m is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| Fujitsu [R1-210746] | Groupcast (Option 1 with target range of 100m)Urban,Aperiodic(GUA) | UE-A is another receiver of UE-B. | Type C. | When UE-A observes half-duplex restriction for the same UE group. (Post-conflict indication) | PSFCH resource for groupcast HARQ-ACK feedback is reused.  | Upon receiving NACK from UE-A, UE-B performs retransmission.  | 0.7% PRR gain in 50m.Coverage of 25m is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| Fujitsu [R1-210746] | Groupcast (Option 1 with target range of 320m)Highway,Periodic(GHP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type A and B. | When UE-A receives the trigger information from UE-B. | Not modelled.  | UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and UE-A’s S\_A to obtain the final candidate resource set. | 1% PRR gain in 320m.Coverage of 40m is extended at PRR=0.99.Coverage of 20m is extended at PRR=0.95. |
| Fujitsu [R1-210746] | Groupcast (Option 1 with target range of 320m)Highway,Periodic(GHP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type A and B. | When UE-A receives the trigger information from UE-B. | 10% of PRBs in a RP is always reserved for the signalling of the inter-UE coordination and the request. | The latency of transmitting and processing coordination information is set to 10 slots in average.UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and UE-A’s S\_A to obtain the final candidate resource set. | 1% PRR loss in 320m.Coverage of 30m is reduced at PRR=0.95. |
| Mitsubishi [R1-2100828] | Unicast (AN disabled),Highway,Periodic(UHP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type B. (an ordered /prioritized list of non-preferred resources with RSRP above a pre-defined /preconfigured RSRP threshold) | Once resource (re)-selection is triggered at UE-B, the assistance info is provided by UE-A | Not modelled.  | UE-B will preclude all the resources of Type B resource set.In the case of blocking situation (not enough remaining resources), RSRP-based thresholding at UE-B may re-integrate some of the excluded resources in the inverse order from the ordered list provided by UE-A. | 6% PRR gain in 320m.Coverage extension of 50m at PRR=0.95.Coverage extension of []m at PRR=0.99.7% PRR gain at 420m. (comm range) |
| Mitsubishi [R1-2100828] | Groupcast,Highway,Periodic(GHP) | UE-A(s) is/are selected candidate(s) out of the receivers of UE-B. | Type B. (an ordered /prioritized list of non-preferred resources with RSRP above a pre-defined /preconfigured RSRP threshold) | Once resource (re)-selection is triggered at UE-B, assistance info is provided by UE-A(s) within a certain range from UE-B. | Not modelled.  | When the TX (UE B) receives the assistance reports from the candidate UE A(s), it carries out a second round of prioritization of the non-preferred resources based on the number of occurrences of a given non preferred resource in the received assistance reports.UE-B will preclude all the resources of Type B resource set.In the case of blocking situation (not enough remaining resources), RSRP-based thresholding at UE-B may re-integrate some of the excluded resources in the inverse order from the ordered/prioritized list of non-preferred resources | 3.2% PRR gain in 320m.Coverage extension of 50m at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99.7% PRR gain in 420m. (comm range) |
| Mitsubishi [R1-2100828] | Groupcast,Highway,Periodic(GHP) | UE-A(s) is/are selected candidate(s) out of the receivers of UE-B. | Type B. (an ordered/ prioritized list of non-preferred resources with RSRP above a predefined/ preconfigured RSRP threshold) | Once resource (re)-selection is triggered at UE-B, the assistance info is provided by UE-A(s)  within a certain range from UE-B, with a delay of N= 1,2 or 4 logical slots | Not modelled. | When the TX (UE B) receives the assistance reports from the candidate UE A(s), it carries out a second round of prioritization of the non-preferred resources based on the number of occurrences of a given non preferred resource in the received assistance reports.UE-B will preclude all the resources of Type B resource set.In the case of blocking situation (not enough remaining resources), RSRP-based thresholding at UE-B may re-integrate some of the excluded resources in the inverse order from the ordered/prioritized list of non preferred resources | Latency N= 1 Slot: 3.2% PRR gain in 320m.Coverage extension of 50m at PRR=0.95.Coverage extension of []m at PRR=0.99.5% PRR gain in 420m. (comm range)Latency N= 2 Slots: 2.2% PRR gain in 320m.Coverage extension of 30m at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99.3% PRR gain in 420m. (comm range)Latency N= 4 Slots: 2% PRR gain in 320m.Coverage extension of 30m at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99.1% PRR gain in 420m. (comm range) |
| ZTE [R1-2100925] | Broadcast,Highway,Periodic(BHP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B, which is further selected by UE-B via PC5-RRC. | Type A. |  | Information bits: 300 bitsResource overhead: 10 RBLatency within [1~10] slot  | UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and UE-A’s S\_A to obtain the final candidate resource set. | 2.6% PRR gain in 320m.Coverage of 40m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| ZTE [R1-2100925] | Broadcast,Urban,Periodic(BUP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B, which is further selected by UE-B via PC5-RRC. | Type A. |  | Information bits: 300 bitsResource overhead: 10 RBLatency within [1~10] slot  | UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and UE-A’s S\_A to obtain the final candidate resource set. | 5.8% PRR gain in 150m.Coverage of 10m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| Samsung [R1-2101232] | Unicast,[Highway],Periodic(UHP) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type A. | When UE-A receives the trigger information from UE-B. | Not modelled. | UE-B uses the transmission resources provided by UE-A. | 60% PRR gain in 300m.No coverage is extended at PRR=0.95.No coverage is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| Samsung [R1-2101232] | Unicast,Highway,Aperiodic(UHA) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type A. | When UE-A receives the trigger information from UE-B. | Not modelled. | UE-B uses the transmission resources provided by UE-A. | 3.4% PRR gain in 300m.Coverage of 5m is extended at PRR=0.95.Coverage of []m is extended at PRR=0.99. |
| Qualcomm [R1-2101910] | Groupcat (Option 1 with target range of 60m)UrbanPeriodic(GUP) | UE-A is another receiver of UE-B. | Type C. | When UE-A observes resource conflict for the same UE group.(Post-conflict indication) | PSFCH resource for groupcast HARQ-ACK feedback is reused. Accounting for PSFCH half duplex, Maximum PSFCH transmission and reception capability, MPR and IBE | Upon receiving NACK from UE-A, UE-B performs retransmission.  | 0.5% PRR gain from 99.3% to 99.8% in 50m.Coverage of extended from 40.5m to 49.5m at PRR=0.99.Coverage of extended from 30m to 41.5m at PRR=0.995.Enable 99.9% reliability communication range up to 20m |
| Qualcomm [R1-2101910] | Groupcat (Option 1 with target range of 60m)UrbanAperiodic(GUA) | UE-A is another receiver of UE-B. | Type C. | When UE-A observes resource conflict for the same UE group.(Post-conflict indication)  | PSFCH resource for groupcast HARQ-ACK feedback is reused. Accounting for PSFCH half duplex, Maximum PSFCH transmission and reception capability, MPR and IBE | Upon receiving NACK from UE-A, UE-B performs retransmission.  | 0.5% PRR gain from 99.3% to 99.8% in 50m.Coverage of extended from 33m to 44m at PRR=0.99.Coverage of extended from 18m to 36m at PRR=0.995.Enable 99.9% reliability communication range up to 20m |
| Qualcomm [R1-2101910] | Groupcat (Option 1 with target range of 60m)UrbanAperiodic(GUA) | UE-A is receiver of UE-B. | Type B. | Whenever forwarding UEs have data to transmit | Not modelled.  | UE-B will preclude all the resources of Type B resource set. | 0.2% PRR gain from 99.3% to 99.5% in 50m.Coverage is extended from 33m to 38m at PRR=0.99.Coverage is extended from 18m to 25m at PRR=0.99.5.99.9% reliability communication is not possible |
| LGE [R1-2101786] | Broadcast,Urban,Periodic(BUP) | UE-A is RSU deployed in the center of each intersection of the urban grid. UE-B(s) are other vehicle UEs along the street.  | Type A.UE-A can provide the set of preferred resource to UE group. | UE-A can provide inter-UE coordination information periodically.  | It is assumed that UE-A can provide inter-UE coordination information periodically in long-term manner (i.e. relevant overhead and latency can be negligible.)  | UE-B takes the intersection of UE-B’s S\_A and the set of preferred set provided by UE-A to obtain the final candidate resource set. | 4.96% PRR gain in 150m.Coverage of 10m is extended at PRR=0.95. |

Please check whether the above evaluation methodology and gain are correctly captured or not, and provide input, if any, **by January 26th, 4:59pm UTC**. You can also make correction directly in the above summary of evaluation results.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Ericsson | See corrections above. Given that our scenario has PRR>0.95 for almost every simulated case, we have included results at PRR=0.975 instead.We have also clarified that the scheme in our contribution fits under the categories of Type B and Type C. |
| vivo | See correction above.  |
| ZTE | Updates on the details simulation methodology including overhead modelling and scenario. |
| Fujitsu | * Some corrections are made to align the summary and the table.
* Some irrelevant results are deleted. E.g., for a simulation with the target range of 100m, the results for a range larger than 100m is not so relevant and thus deleted.
* Another result with ideal coordination information report is added. In the contribution, we also provided the result for an ideal case. This is newly added in the summary and the table.
 |
| LGE | We updates our contribution and add our evaluation methodology and results in the above table.  |
| QC | We do not agree with this comparison as captured:* + - * PRR loss is observed in highway scenario for aperiodic groupcast traffic compared to R16 Mode 2 RA with minimum number of (re)transmissions of 2 [Intel, R1-2100673].

PRR gain should be listed in comparison to Rel-16 baseline. We can list the schemes with 2 blind retransmissions in a separate category; but 2 blind transmissions is not R16 Mode 2 RA and saying Type C technique incur a loss compared to R16 Mode 2 RA is incorrect. Delete irrelevant data (beyond targeted communication range).We would like to emphasize that only type C achieves 99.9% reliability communication in our simulation. Neither the baseline nor Type B achieved 99.9% reliability.For some of the schemes, there is no information on the assumed delay. We are not sure if that means delay associated with coordination messages are not modelled. We think that it would be very beneficial to have explicit confirmation if delay is being modelled or not.It is important to put the PRR gain in context of the absolute PRR by including the original PRR value and the enhanced PRR value. For example, 1 % gain from 98% to 99% is more significant than 1% gain from 10% to 11%, yet listing only the PRR gain would treat the two cases equally. This could also be addressed by looking at the PER.[QC 2] We updated out Tdoc with extra evaluation result for periodic traffic. We add one extra row to summarize the result. |

1. **FL’s observation on evaluation results (version 1)**

In this RAN1 meeting, it needs to make conclusion on the feasibility/benefit of inter-UE coordination and send an LS to RAN plenary meeting. In this sense, FL made the following observation after reviewing the submitted evaluation results.

***FL’s observation on evaluation results****:*

* *Type A and/or B*
	+ *For the case when one UE-A indicates the preferred resource set to each of multiple UE-Bs,*
		- *one company claimed that the inter-UE coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA.*
	+ *For the case when UE-A is the intended receiver of UE-B,*
		- *nine companies claimed that the inter-UE coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA*
			* *One company claimed that the gain of this solution becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception.*
		- *three companies claimed that the inter-UE coordination has no gain under certain scenarios (e.g., highway and/or urban scenario for aperiodic unicast traffic, highway scenario for periodic groupcast traffic)*
* *Type C*
	+ *For the case when UE-A indicates the resource conflict in previous transmission (i.e., post conflict),*
		- *five companies claimed that the inter-UE coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA*
			* *one company claimed that the inter-UE coordination has a lower gain with Rel-16 Mode 2 RA with ensuring the minimum number of (re)transmissions.*
			* *One company claimed that the implicit indication (i.e., no reception of A/N), i.e., no explicit indication/signaling for indication*
	+ *For the case when UE-A indicates the resource conflict in future (i.e., pre-conflict),*
		- *one company claimed that the inter-UE coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA and the gain is higher than the case when UE-A indicates the resource conflict in previous transmission*
	+ *For the case when UE-A indicates the resource conflict in the past (i.e., post conflict) and in the future (i.e., pre conflict)*
		- *one company claimed that the inter-UE coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA and that the gain is greater than the combination of the individual gains of the post-conflict and pre-conflict schemes.*

Please provide comment, if any, on the above FL’s observation **by January 26th, 4:59pm UTC**. Note that after finishing checking this observation, FL has a plan to provide/discuss potential conclusions on the feasibility/benefit of inter-UE coordination.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| NTT DOCOMO | Firstly, thank you so much for your efforts on evaluations.Then, three comments from our side.- In our understanding, pre-collision indication is a part of type B, and post-collision indication is intended as type C. However, the above FL’s observation seems to include pre-collision indication in both type-B (UL vs SL) and type C (second bullet). Correct categorizing is preferred.- In the above FL’s observation, type A and type B are treated in the same bullet. However, as abovementioned, type B includes pre-collision indication. This implies that achievable gain is different among type A and type B. Separate analysis is preferable.- Regarding type A, many companies show some gain under periodic traffic, not aperiodic. As presented in QC’s contribution, sharing latency is a key aspect for discussion on ‘beneficial or not’. From this perspective, type A is good scheme only for periodic transmission. As you know, NR-SL supports aperiodic transmission, which is one of the important features. For aperiodic transmissions, pre/post collision indication achieves performance gain as some companies kindly evaluated. This point should be included in the above observation and corresponding conclusion should consider it. |
| CATT, GOHIGH | Thanks for the summary.Regarding the categorizing the observations, it would be better to separate the observations of each resource coordination type for periodic transmission and aperiodic transmission. For example, from our evaluation results, there is no gain for the aperiodic transmission with resource coordination type A and/or type B.  |
| vivo | Thank you for the summary. Our view is as below1. Firstly, we prefer to list the observation based on each type, i.e., A,B and C2.For type-A, UE-A can assist multiple UE-Bs which is connected to UE-A from our perspective. We do not think it is reasonable to distinguish whether ‘UE-B is multiple UE’ or ‘target receiver’3.For type-C, we prefer to add the following observation: type B based solution set upper bound of performance gain for type-C based solution, which proves that type-C based solution is beneficial. The reason is as followingType B (non-preferred resource set) is trying to avoid the resource conflict due to collision, HD or TX/TX overlap, while type C is based on conflict detection/resolution. In our understanding, for some solution, type B based solution can set performance upper bound for type C based solution (In our simulation, the type-B based solution to address HD and TX/TX overlap issue can be implemented in a way to notify the future resource conflict, i.e., Type-C based pre-conflict indication).  |
| Fujitsu | In our contribution, we provide two simulation results for inter-UE coordination. The simulation results show the gain for one scenario, but no gain for the other scenario. However, only the result “without gain” is counted in the above observation. To also capture the result “with gain”, for the observation “eight companies claimed that the inter-UE coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA”, the wording “eight companies” should be changed to “nine companies”. |
| OPPO | We share the view that post-collision should go to Type B rather than Type C. According to the definition of Type B and Type C (reproduced below), expected/potential resource conflict pre-conflict in the future is covered by Type B, resource conflict happened in the past is covered by Type C. * *Type B: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ *e.g., based on its sensing result and/or expected/potential resource conflict*
* *Type C: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resource where the resource conflict is detected*
 |
| Samsung | Even though we have listed up 3 Types in the last meeting. In our understanding, it is not clear the difference between Type B and C. As OPPO commented, there is a confusion. This should be discussed in this meeting and we should make it clear in order to discuss evaluation results and also decide final inter-UE coordination schemes in next time.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share similar view with Docomo that pre-collision is part of Type-B since it indicates future resources which are not preferred for UE-B’s transmission. Post-collision can be Type-C. So we suggest to put pre-collision under Type-B to be more accurate.Type-A and Type-B are different solutions, and better to be analysed separately. |
| Ericsson | We have captured one missing point in the observations regarding the different Type-C schemes (pre-collision + post-collision).It is clear from the preceding answers that the categorization in terms of Type A/B/C is not mutually exclusive. We agree with the comment from DCM and OPPO that pre-conflict schemes could fit well under Type-B. At the same time, the commonalities with the other Type-C scheme are clear too. In any case, the importance of the classification is relative at this point. What really matters is the way forward regarding the specification. Proposal:RAN1 to specify:* Alt. 1: UE-A indicates (not) preferred set of resources to UE-B.
* Alt. 2: UE-A indicates resource conflict using 1 bit.

We suggest focusing on this and, if necessary, revisit the FL’s observations later. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree with the FL’s current split into Types A/B (which may be viewed as preventing a conflict from happening in the first place) and Type C (which may be viewed as resolving a conflict that has actually taken place, or is about to take place). Conflict prevention (Type A, Type B) is more feasible when transmissions are semi-persistent (i.e., predictable). Conflict resolution (Type C) can take care of those conflicts that could not be prevented. |
| QC | Types A and B should be listed separately as they are 2 different mechanisms, addressing different use cases, different UE-B behavior and having different content of coordination message. Even within one category, it should also be clearly stated how many results are with modelling of delay/overhead associated with coordination messages and how many make ideal assumptions. Benefit/feasibility of each mechanism cannot be decided based only on idealistic assumption. The current grouping makes this aspect unclear.We also agree with CATT that distinction of periodic/aperiodic/cast type is needed.  |
| IDCC | We also consider that resources pertaining to pre-collision should be categorized under Type B resources, since it deals with resources in which conflicts are “expected” and thus can be prevented. Type C is specific to resources in which conflicts are “detected” and thus already happened. So we think the definition of the resource types is good and we should proceed with further details. We suggest to prioritize the study the of scenarios with UE A as the intended RX UE, as most of the simulation demonstrating the performance gain has UE A as RX UE and in connection with this, we can evaluate which cast type of UE B transmission can benefit from each resource type. Both periodic and aperiodic traffic should be considered. Additionally, we agree with Ericsson to consider an indication of the resource set. Explicit resource information is suitable to Type A and Type B. On the other hand, Type C resources are resources in which collision is detected, so if a collision is detected, the resources are already reserved and thus there is no need for UE A to explicitly indicate the resources. However, the implicit indication e.g. using a PHY channel, should carry information to ensure the UE B can associate this indication with the applicable resources.  |
| Apple | For the different types of resource sets, our view is that Type A and Type B are proactive resource set, i.e. before UE-B’s resource reservation, while Type C is reactive resource set, i.e., after UE-B’s resource reservation. Overall, we share the views of QC that each resource type has its use cases. Type A resource set is more suitable for unicast where this set of preferred resources are good only for a particular UE-B. Type B resource set is more suitable for groupcast or broadcast, where every UE-B can make use of for its own resource selection. Type C resource set is suitable that a UE-A is the receiver UE from UE-B, since the inter-UE coordination could be transmitted in PSFCH-like channel.  |
| Bosch | Most of the results show some benefits for both post-conflict (Type C) and pre-resolution (Type A/B) schemes in different conditions. However, for Type A/B (i.e., pre-resolution), we still believe that the latency presented in some results is considering rather idealistic values to fit aperiodic traffic (i.e., feasibility issue) and the gain was mainly counted for periodic traffic in this case (i.e., benefit issue). Therefore, we support the following traffic/cast types for the different (reduced) resource sets in order to conclude on benefits/feasibility:* Type C (i.e., post-conflict, e.g., to a certain number of slots in the past) for:
	+ Aperiodic and periodic traffic
	+ For unicast, groupcast (Option 2 or 1 (e.g., re-using PSFCH design))
* Type A/B (i.e., pre-resolution) for
	+ periodic traffic
	+ unicast, groupcast Option 2

We also agree with Ericsson, that Type C may be indicated implicitly with references to, e.g., physical slots and Type A/B may be indicated explicitly with a set (many bits). In the latter case, periodic resources may minimize the resource set size. |
| Xiaomi | We share other companies view that periodic traffic and aperiodic traffic should be analysed separately. Also, it would be better to separately list the observations of each resource coordination type. Finally, we think pre-collision should be covered by observation of Type B, since pre-collision indicates future resources which are not preferred for UE-B’s transmission. Post-collision should be covered by Type-C, as it indicates resource which the resource conflict is detected. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with Apple. We think that the three types should be categorized according to whether the resources has already reserved by UE-B. Type A and Type B are the resources set before UE-B’s resource reservation. And type C is the resource conflict indication after UE-B’s resource reservation, mainly including two situations: the same resources are reserved but not used by different TX UEs and the resource conflict has already happened. |
| Convida Wireless | Each resource type such as Type A, Type B and Type C may have the associated and corresponding use case(s). We are fine that Types A and/or B and Type C are separately discussed for clearness. |
| Fraunhofer | Based on the observations from the simulation results, there is a clear benefit for supporting inter-UE coordination.In terms of feasibility, we agree with most of the companies that each type has an advantageous use case. Type A shows gains when it is the intended recipient UE, and the gain can be maximized by optimizing the means to transmit the assistance information, instead of using an entire time slot for its transmission. We also agree that type B should include the pre-collision cases. It is possible to categorize type B and C together as collision indicators, with a restriction on the time when the pre- and post-collisions occur, thereby optimizing the size of the assistance information.The separation of results based on periodic/aperiodic traffic is preferable. |
| Intel | Thanks a lot for the efforts on summary of evaluation results. We have the following comments:1. Results with some genie-aided/idealistic assumptions should be separated from evaluations that consider all practical aspects
2. We suggest to draw observations for different scenarios separately at least for the following aspects
	1. Traffic type: Periodic or Aperiodic
	2. Communication type: Unicast only, Groupcast only, Broadcast only, etc.
3. In our view, coarse categorization on Type A/B/C is not sufficient. It is better to discuss specific evaluated options/design principles under each category
4. Enhancements of Rel.16 solutions well fit Type B categorization and should be also reflected in observations relative to R16 design
5. WID requested RAN1 to analyze latency benefits. We propose to also capture evaluation results that have shown latency advantage.

“Study the feasibility and benefit of solution(s) on the enhancement(s) in mode 2 for enhanced reliability and reduced latency in consideration of both PRR and PIR defined in TR37.885 (by RAN#91), and specify the identified solution(s) if deemed feasible and beneficial [RAN1, RAN2]”1. If RAN1 is supposed to reach conclusions based on observations then it should be done on a per scheme / design principle basis and not on a basis of broad categories
 |
| MediaTek | Please check our updates above. |

1. **FL’s observation on evaluation results (version 2)**

Considering companies’ comments until now, FL’s observation on evaluation is updated as follows. Note that the pre-conflict indication is categorized as Type B. This means that Type C represents the post-conflict indication only.

***FL’s observation on evaluation results****:*

* *Type A*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination, depending on how UE-B uses Type A information,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for periodic unicast traffic*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for periodic unicast traffic*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for periodic broadcast traffic*
		- *Two companies claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for periodic unicast traffic without a consideration of signaling overhead for the coordination.*
			* *One company assumes latnecy for the coordination, and other company assumes no latency for the coordination.*
		- *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for periodic broadcast traffic without a consideration of latency for the coordination.*
* *Type A*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for aperiodic unicast traffic with a consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the coordination.*
		- *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for aperiodic unicast traffic without a consideration of signalling overhead for the coordination.*
		- *Two companies claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for aperiodic unicast traffic without a consideration of latency for the coordination.*
			* *One company assumes signalling overhead for the coordination, and other company assumes no signalling overhead for the coordination.*
		- *One companies claimed that depeding on how UE-B uses Type A information, whether or not to acheive the gain of Type A coordination compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA will change for aperiodic unicast traffic without a consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the coordination.*
* *Type B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *Five companies claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for periodic unicast traffic.*
			* *two companies assume latency but no signalling overhead for the coordination.*
			* *One company assumes signaling overhead but no latency for the coordination.*
			* *Two companies assumes neither signaling overhead nor latency for the coordination.*
		- *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for periodic groupcast traffic not only when signaling overhead for the coordination is not consrdered, but also when latency and signaling overhead for the coordination are not considered.*
		- *One company claimed that the gain of Type B coordination becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for periodic unicast traffic without a consideration of latency for the cooridnation..*
* *Type B*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *Two companies claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for aperiodic traffic of groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 with consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the cooridnation.*
		- *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for aperiodic traffic of unicast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback disabled without consideration of signaling overhead for the cooridnation.*
* *Type C*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *One company claimed that the Type C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 with consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the cooridnation.*
		- *One company claimed that the implicit Type C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast with consideration of latency and signaling overhead.*
* *Type C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *Four companies claimed that the Type C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 with consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the cooridnation.*
		- *One compay claimed that PRR gain of Mode 2 enahcement with ensuring the minimum number of retransmission is higher than that of Type C for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1.*
* *Type A and B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *One compay claimed that combination of Type A and B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA and Type A only/Type B only for periodic unicast traffic without consideration of signaling overhead for the cooridnation.*
		- *One compay claimed that combination of Type A and B coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for periodic traffic of groupcast with SL HARQ-ACk feedback Option 1 with consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the cooridnation.*
		- *One compay claimed that combination of Type A and B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for periodic traffic of groupcast with SL HARQ-ACk feedback Option 1 without consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the cooridnation.*
* *Type A and B*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *One compay claimed that combination of Type A and B coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for aperiodic unicast traffic without consideration of signaling overhead for the cooridnation.*
* *Type B and C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *Two compaies claimed that combination of Type B and C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA and Type B only/Type C only for aperiodic traffic of groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 with consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the cooridnation.*
1. **Proposed conclusion**

Based on the updated version of observation on evaluation results in Section 3, the following conclusion on the feasibility/benefit of inter-UE coordination is proposed.

***Proposed conclusion***

* *RAN1 concludes that the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2 is feasible, and its benefit compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA is identified in the following cases:*
	+ *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission, the inter-UE coordination is beneficial for periodic traffic when the signaling overhead is small (e.g. using semi-static signaling).*
	+ *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission, the inter-UE coordination is beneficial for periodic and aperiodic traffic when the signaling overhead is small (e.g. using semi-static signaling or an indicator with limited bit(s)).*
	+ *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources where the resource conflict is detected, the inter-UE coordination is beneficial for periodic and aperiodic traffic with SL groupcast HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 (i.e. NACK-only).*
1. **Email discussion after Wed’s GTW**

Based on companies’ comments and chairman’s guideline, it would be better to additionally enclose the following summary of detailed evaluation results in LS to RAN plenary. By doing so, when discussing how to update the objective of Mode 2 enhancement(s) in RAN plenary meeting, companies can refer to this summary for more detailed information of evaluation results.

***Summary of evaluation results (i.e., it wiil be enclosed in LS to RAN plenary)****:*

* *Type A: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ e.g., based on its sensing result
* *Type B: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ e.g., based on its sensing result and/or expected/potential resource conflict
* *Type C: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resource where the resource conflict is detected*
* *Type A*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination, depending on how UE-B uses Type A information,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACk feedback Option 1*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for broadcast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for broadcast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception*
		- *For the case where latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *Two companies claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACk feedback Option 1*
* *Type A*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination, depending on how UE-B uses Type A information,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception*
		- *For the case where latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type A coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that depeding on how UE-B uses Type A information, whether or not to acheive the gain of Type A coordination compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA will change for unicast*
* *Type B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *For the case where latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *Two companies claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the gain of Type B coordination becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast.*
		- *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *Type B*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
		- *For the case where latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the gain of Type B coordination becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for unicast*
* *Type C*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *Type C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *Four companies claimed that the Type C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
			* *One company claimed that PRR gain of Mode 2 enahcement with ensuring the minimum number of retransmission is higher than that of Type C for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1.*
* *Type A and B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that combination of Type A and B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type A, and Type B, respectively for unicast*
* *Type A and B*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that combination of Type A and B coordination is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *Type B and C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for both Type B and C coordination,*
			* *One compay claimed that combination of Type B and C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type B, and Type C, respectively for groupcast*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for Type C, but latency is considered for Type B,*
			* *One compay claimed that combination of Type B and C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type B, and Type C, respectively for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*

Please provide comment (including different view on enclosing this summary in LS to RAN plenary), if any, on the above summary of evaluation results **by January 28th, 4:59pm UTC**. To prepare the updated version of summary on evaluation results that will be used in Fri’s GTW, it would be highly appreciated if companies make comments, if any, as soon as possible.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| QC | We’d like to clarify that our results for resource information sharing as Type B assumed realistic latency (multiplexed with data) but zero overhead or impact on the decodability of data. Also it assumes that when there multiple transmissions of the same data packet, the content of resource information in each retransmission can be changed. For where to place pre-collision indication, we think it can also be categorized under Type C. It uses a similar mechanism to other conflict indicators and also indicates a resource where a conflict is detected. The detection itself has occurred in the past but the conflict could be in the past (post-collision) of future(pre-collision).[QC 2] We updated our contribution (R1-2101910) with additional result for periodic traffic case. Hence we would like to update this entry accoridingly*Periodic traffic* * *For the case where additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
	+ *~~One~~ Two compan~~y~~ies claimed that the Type C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*

Regarding this.* + - * *One company claimed that PRR gain of Mode 2 enahcement with ensuring the minimum number of retransmission is higher than that of Type C for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1.*

As we commented earlier, we do not agree with how this observation is captured. Comparisons should be with respect to R16 resource allocation at this stage. Otherwise, we'd need to do cross comparisons between all schemes and not just these two. We do not think such a comparison is feasible this meeting. We also would like to note that our results showed Type C ourperforming Type B yet those results were not captured, which is ok because we’re not at the stage where cross-scheme comparisons are performed yet. If the intention is to capture all the schemes with results submitted by all companies, then the Mode 2 enahcement with ensuring the minimum number of retransmission can be captured under a separate bullet compared to R16  *Two companies claimed that PRR gain of Mode 2 enhancement with ensuring the minimum number of retransmission coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA* We also agree with Intel comment on latency. We think that there are at least 2 companies showing positive results in this direction, and that should be captured, too.An editorial comment: could you please update the description to clarify that “both” latency and overhead, or “only” latency, or “only” overhead were accounted for by adding the words “both” and “only” where appropriate? |
| Fujitsu | Move our results under the bullet of Type A periodic traffic. No matter how preferred resources are signalled (we assume a bitmap indicates preferred and non-preferred resources), we simulate that the intersection of the preferred resources between UE B and UE A is used for resource selection. Therefore, our results actually belong to the Type A coordination. |
| MediaTek | We provided results for both Type B and Type C.For our Type B results, we assumes neither signalling overhead nor latency for coordination. We update the wording in the proposals above and extract them as below* *Type B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *Five companies claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for periodic unicast traffic.*
			* *~~One company assume latency and signaling overhead for the coordination~~*
			* *two companies assume latency but no signalling overhead for the coordination.*
			* *One company assumes signaling overhead but no latency for the coordination.*
			* *Two companies~~y~~ assume neither signaling overhead nor latency for the coordination.*

For our Type C results, the solution is using the reception status of SL A/N (i.e., DTX) to implicitly indicate the non-preferred resources for the post-conflict. So there is no signaling overhead and latency issue. Accordingly, we made the following updates for Type C case:* *Type C*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *One company claimed that the Type C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 with consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the cooridnation.*
		- *One company claimed that the implicit Type C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast with consideration of latency and signaling overhead.*
 |
| ZTE | We’d like to clarify that in our simulation, in addition to the signalling overehead (provided in the previous feedback), the latency (e.g., from triggering to acception of reporting) is also modelled as the distribution within [1~10] slot. So, we prefer to move our source under the 2nd level sub-bullet for Type A periodical traffic, since both latency and overhead are considered |
| Samsung | For Type A and periodic traffic case, we have an evaluation result. Please fine the update above |
| Ericsson | For Type-B – Aperiodic Traffic, the conclusion states “Two companies claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for aperiodic traffic of groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 with consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the cooridnation”. (I believe that this is where “pre-collision” indication has ended up). The results in our contribution include both GC Option 1 (Section 6.1) and GC Option 2 (Section 6). The text in red should be removed.Regarding the following text for “Type B and C - Aperiodic traffic”: “Two compaies claimed that combination of Type B and C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA and Type B only/Type C only for aperiodic traffic of groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 with consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the cooridnation.” We believe that the yellow part should be removed as it is not accurate. The results show that the conclusion holds ‘at least for aperiodic traffic’. Note also that the bullets above (i.e., “Type B and C - Aperiodic traffic”) already refer to aperiodic traffic. In addition, the text in red is again confusing. It is unclear whether it refers to B+C or to one of B/C. As stated above, our contribution includes both types of results and by comparing figures it is easy to verify that the statement (restrited to Option 1) is inaccurate, misleading, or even incorrect. We suggest removing that part too. |
| vivo | We need to clarify our simulation result, which may not aligned with FL understanding. Unicast is assumed in all of our simulations, and both periodic and aperiodic traffic are simulated.For type A, we provide additional updated simulation result [R1-2101911], assuming actual assistance information transmission. The performance gain is obviousFor type B, we simulate multiple solutions (which can be combined together). we do not consider actual transmission of assisting signalling, however the related overhead is counted assuming 1 sub-channel/1 slot overhead, and performance gain is quite large.  |
| CATT, GOHIGH | Update our assumption of type B aperiodic traffic, HARQ feedback for unicast is enable in our simulation. |
| Mitsubishi | In our contribution we showed that, for type B/periodic traffic/groupcast case, selection of UE candidates to act as UE-A allows to reduce signalling overhead, and that selecting 4 UEs over different directions and distances out of all the users procures almost the full amount of the achievable gain (Observation 8 in our contribution). Please capture the following sub-bullet point briefly summarizing this specific result* *Type B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *For the case where latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *Two companies claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that the Type B coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the gain of Type B coordination becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that mechanisms of UE-A selection allow to reduce the signaling overhead while keeping the gain of Type B coordination for groupcast.*
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Although we can understand why companies want their results to be reported to RAN, we consider this is not actually necessary for RAN to decide the WID (as the feature lead indicates). There are many divergences between what companies have simulated, whereas the presentation of them can be read as that they are all essentially equal and/or comparable, when they are not.When companies use a type of resource, the details of such type of resources could still be different. For example, for Type-A resources, some companies use S\_A as the preferred resources, while some other companies use actual transmitting resources as the preferred resources. Since RAN1 has not agreed a very clear definition of each type of resource, we suggest to append “-like” when we refer to the type to be more accurate, i.e., we suggest to change to “Type-A/B/C-like”.It’s inaccurate to say “Type A/B/C coordination”. “Type A/B/C” just refers to the type of resources, and not to the detailed coordination scheme (not even the manner in which the resources are eventually chosen). The detailed coordination schemes for each companies may still be different, and it depends on aspects like “How UE-A determines the set of resources”, “How/when UE-B takes the received set of resources into account in the resource selection for its own transmission”, etc. According to the table in Section 1, different companies have quite different schemes here.So it’s inaccurate to say such as “*One company claimed that the Type A/B/C coordination is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA …*”. To make it accurate, it needs to say “*One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like ~~coordination~~resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast …*”.Since the simulation details, such as simulation assumptions, coordination schemes, are not aligned among companies. It’s possible that when we change the simulation assumption or change the coordination schemes, the results could be different or even opposite. For example, if some company claims their scheme is not beneficial in a particular scenario due to the signalling overhead, it’s possible that if we further improve the scheme with less signalling overhead, we can observe gain in that scenario. We note from the papers that the design (and even the existence) of overhead is a key difference, and that changes in it could alter the relative gains or losses of schemes.We consider that this real situation in RAN1 needs to be clear from the LS to RAN plenary, by adding a note at the start:Note: * The simulation details, such as simulation assumptions, coordinationg schemes, are not aligned among companies. So the following observation only apply to that company’s specific scheme and simulation assumptions. If the simulation assumption or coordination scheme is changed, the results could be different or even opposite.

As we explained above, the following red changes in the summary are also needed (in the various places they apply):* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like ~~coordination~~resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like ~~coordination~~resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *Four companies claimed that their coordination schemes using the Type C-like ~~coordination~~resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *…(similar red changes to other bullets)…*

We will shortly upload results showing a gain in aperiodic unicast traffic for Type A-like resources (as soon as we get a tdoc number), and the relevant bullet updated as:* *Type A*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination, depending on how UE-B uses Type A information,*
			* *(…)*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
 |
| Intel | Please find our proposed modification below:1. For the Type A evaluations introduce sub-categories according to resource allocation schemes, e.g.
	1. Type A1: Hierarchical
	2. Type A2: Fully distributed
2. We propose to add pre-collision indication schemes to type-C category (since those indicate potential collision and have functional similarity with post-collision indication, i.e. belong to the same family of solutions)
3. We want to update observations for *Type A, Aperiodic traffic* setup made on our contribution [Intel, R1-2100673] as follows::
4. *One company claimed that*
	* + 1. *For one scenario of Type A information usage at UE-B (assuming candidate resource set intersection), the Type A coordination is not beneficial even without a consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the coordination.*
			2. *For another scenario of Type A information usage at UE-B (where RX allocates resources to TX), the Type A coordination is beneficial without a consideration of latency and signaling overhead for the coordination. However, losses are observed if inter-UE coordination latency and signaling overhead are taken into consideration*
5. Replace statement *Type A and B* with a new statement Combination of *Type A and B* to make it more clear that combination of the schemes is used for evaluations
6. We do not see any observation on latency benefit of inter-UE coordination solution. Given that our contribution provides the results of scheme based on Rel.16 design with minor changes in resource selection procedure (please refer to Sections 2.1 and 3 in R1-2100673) showing significant latency advantage. We suggest the following wording Type-B schemes:
	1. One company has shown that simple modification in Rel.16 resource selection procedure provides significant latency reduction w/o noticeable impact on relaibility. The solution does not require any new inter-UE coordination signaling on top of Rel.16 Mode-2 RA design.
 |

In general, when SID is converted to WID, the precise contents of conclusion in RAN WG is not a prerequisite to determine the objective of WID. In this sense, it would be possible to update the objective of Mode 2 enhancement(s) with the high level conclusion provided by RAN1, and the discussion on detailed schemes (including narrow downing solution(s)) can be taken in RAN1. Rather I think that if the contents of conclusion’s sub-bullet is described in more detail, RAN1 is more difficult to agree it. Also as the summary of detailed evaluation results mentioned above will be additionally enclosed in LS to RAN plenary, it would be possible to provide sufficient information when the relevant discussion (i.e., how to update the objective of Mode 2 enhancement(s)) is performed in RAN plenary. Please consider these aspects, when companies makes comment on the proposed conclusion.

***Proposed conclusion:***

* *RAN1 concludes that the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2 is feasible, and its benefit compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA is identified in the following cases:*
	+ *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission, the inter-UE coordination is beneficial for periodic traffic when the signaling overhead is small (e.g. using semi-static signaling).*
	+ *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission, the inter-UE coordination is beneficial for periodic and aperiodic traffic when the signaling overhead is small (e.g. using semi-static signaling or an indicator with limited bit(s)).*
	+ *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources where the resource conflict is detected, the inter-UE coordination is beneficial for periodic and aperiodic traffic with SL groupcast HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 (i.e. NACK-only).*

Please provide comment, if any, on the above proposed conclusion **by January 28th, 4:59pm UTC**. To prepare the updated version of proposed conclusion that will be used in Fri’s GTW, it would be highly appreciated if companies make comments, if any, as soon as possible.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| QC | The conclusion could be shortened to the main bullet, now that a detailed observation is also included:Proposed conclusion:* RAN1 concludes that the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2 is feasible, and is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA
 |
| Fujitsu | Agree in principle. However, the examples given in the bracket seem not to be reflected by the previous summary of the evaluation results, and more belong to details. Therefore, the brckets should be removed. In addition, “when the signalling overhead is small” may be modified as “when it is assumed the signalling overhead is small”. |
| MediaTek | Considering we may provide the observation details in the LS, the conclusion itself can be concise as QC’s proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer to a more general conclusion on the benefit of inter-UE coordination, such as the conclusion suggested by QC. Even if detailed observation is included, the examples in the sub-bullets are not necessary. We suggest to remove them. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think the conclusion is not accurate. For each mechanism, some campanies observed ‘beneficial’ but some companies observed ‘not beneficial’. So we cannot say simply ‘beneficial’ for each mechanism as the current conclusion.Now we will enclose the detailed observations above, in this case, the main conclusion can be that suggested by QC, where saying inter-UE coordination is feasible and beneficial as general principle. |
| ZTE | Agree with the proposal. The details including sub-bullet and example are benefical for further RAN level discussion and can provide the general overview of current situation. |
| Samsung | We share the view with QC/Xiaomi/DOCOMO. We suggest to remove the sub-bullets |
| NEC | We're OK with the QC's direction. On the other hand, if we're going to include the sub-bullets, clairifiations shoud include that the signalling overhead is for "the set of resources" only and how to judge the overhead is small or not small. |
| Ericsson | If there is no intention to capture details about the different solutions (beyond the current sub-bullets), we believe that the main bullet is everything that is needed. We think that RAN1 should clearly recommend specification of the featureProposed conclusion:* RAN1 concludes that the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2 is feasible, and is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA.
* RAN1 recommends specification of the feature.
 |
| OPPO | We share the view as other companies that given the observations would be enclosed in the LS sent to RAN, the subbullets in this conclusion seem redundante, the enclosed observations can deliver more accurate and comprehensive information to RAN. The wording proposed by Ericsson is supportive for us. |
| Fraunhofer | We agree with the direction of the conclusion.We would prefer to include details for the plenary to decide RAN1’s work for the normative phase. In our opinion, the type C simulations which send a single bit NACK indicating a collision is not covered in the WID description of inter-UE coordination. Hence although the type C bullet describes the sending of a set of resources from UE-A to UE-B, the simulations that show high gains do not actually send a set of resources. If a shorter version is preferred, the main bullet can be rephrased to:RAN1 concludes that the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2, where UE-A sends a set of resources to UE-B, is feasible and beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA. |
| vivo | Agree in principle. Some minor update, 1) add aperiodic traffic in the first bullet. 2) the guideline example of singaling overhead is not necessary, singaling aspect can be discussed in normative work. |
| CATT, GOHIGH | For concludion part, we share the same views as some companies, RAN1 only need to conclude the inter-UE coordination is beneficial and feasible. The observations can be as the context of the LS.  |
| Mitsubishi | I support the majority view that the main bullet point should be agreed (I prefer the version from Fraunhofer), while sub-bullets should be removed. Their content is already better covered by the detailed summary of evaluation results, and trying to agree on the contents of the sub-bullets doesn’t bring anything new to the table, but will certainly end up being lenghthy (what does “small overhead” mean? On whant grounds specifically name “semi-static signalling”? Some combinations of type/traffic were not investigated, so why somehow imply that they are not beneficial? Etc…). |
| Kyocera | We agree in principle. Clearly, the simulation results show there is a small gain in some cases when the signalling overhead is minimal. In our view, the sims results show either we altogether prevent the collisions to occur before the data transmissions or use minimal control signalling to avoid the next collisions after a collision is detected. In order to achieve minimum signalling either use SCI forwarding to prevent potential-collisions or use PSFCH-based coordination to avoid the next collision (post-collisions). Therefore, we should be more specific regarding the conclusions and provide a suggestion for RAN1 how to move forward. The following is our suggestion:Proposed conclusion:* RAN1 concludes that the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2 is feasible, and is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA **for some of the unicast/GC types scenarios when the signaling overhead is minimal.**

RAN1 recommends specification of the feature. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree with QC’s concise proposal. |
| FUTUREWEI | We prefer QC’s proposal for the conclusion. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | If the “summary of evaluation results” as modified in our comment above will be included in the LS to RAN plenary, the conclusion can be simplified, for which Fraunhofer’s suggested wording seems good.If the summary is removed, then the more detailed version prposed by the feature lead can be the baseline, with:* The bracketed examples removed
* Because “small” is a relative term but lacks a baseline, and the overhead is a matter of future design, the statement should be “…*when the signaling overhead is appropriately sized…*”
 |
| Intel | Considering that RAN1 will provide observations on all conducted evaluations so far we also prefer to remove sub-bulets with broad categorization of schemes.In our view, the main bullet should describe situation more precisely and provide more information in terms of what kind of benefits were observed.Our proposed wording for conclusion is:* RAN1 conducted evaluations and concludes that inter-UE coordination in Mode 2 is feasible. In selected scenarios and communication types, it is observed that inter-UE coordination solutions may benefit reliability compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA. The latency reduction benefits (if any) of considered inter-UE coordination solutions need further analysis.
* RAN1 has not converged on details of specific inter-UE coordination solution
 |
| Apple | We prefer a short and general conclusion. We are supportive to the wording from QC or the wording from Ericsson. |
| IDCC | We agree a conclusion simply stating that the inter-UE coordination is beneficial and feasible is sufficient, like the ones QC/Ericssons suggested and the observation can be included in the texts of LS to RAN plenary.  |
| Bosch | We agree only with the main bullet of the conclusion. Therefore, we would prefer to shorten the conclusion to the main bullet (without any sub-bullets). Further details, analysis, and recommendation for specification can be stated in the LS. |

1. **Draft poposals for Fri’s GTW**

Based on companies’ comments, the summary of detailed evaluation results is updated as follows. From FL perspective, it would be desirable to enclose this summary as an attachment in LS to RAN plenary, and by dosing so, when discussing how to update the objective of Mode 2 enhancement(s) in RAN plenary meeting, companies can refer to it for more detailed information of evaluation results.

***Proposal 1****: The following summary of detailed evaluation results is enclosed to LS as an attachment.*

***Summary of detailed evaluation results:***

* *Type A: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ e.g., based on its sensing result
* *Type B: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ e.g., based on its sensing result and/or expected/potential resource conflict
* *Type C: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resource where the resource conflict is detected*

*Note:*

* *Details of simulation assumptions for coordination schemes are not aligned among companies. The following observations only apply to company’s specific scheme and simulation assumption. If the simulation assumption for coordination scheme is changed, the results could be different.*
* *Type A*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources used for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination, depending on how UE-B uses Type A information,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for broadcast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for broadcast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception*
			* *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *For the case where only additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *Type A*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources used for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that PRR loss of their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is observed compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
				+ *Two companies claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination, depending on how UE-B uses Type A information,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception*
			* *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *For the case where only additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *Type B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *Two companies claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that PIR gain of their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is observed for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
		- *For the case where only additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the gain of their coordination scheme using Type B-like resource becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource with enhanced mechanism of UE-A selection is beneficial for groupcast.*
		- *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *Type B*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
		- *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
		- *For the case where only additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the gain of Type B-like resource becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for unicast*
* *Type C*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *Two companies claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *Type C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *Four companies claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *Combination of Type A and B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type A-like and B-like resources is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type A-like, and Type B-like, respectively for unicast*
* *Combination of Type A and B*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type A-like and B-like resources is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *Combination of Type B and C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for both Type B and C coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type B-like and C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type B-like, and Type C-like, respectively for groupcast*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for Type C, but only latency is considered for Type B,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type B-like and C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type B-like, and Type C-like, respectively for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*

Assuming that the summary of detailed evaluation results will be enclosed as an attachment in LS to RAN plenary, the majority of companies preferred to make the following version of conclusion (i.e., without having additional sub-bullets of further detailed observations). One company proposed to add more observations in this conclusion, but it is not supported by other companies.

***Proposed conclusion:***

* *RAN1 concludes that the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2 is feasible, and is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA*
* *RAN1 recommends specification of the feature.*
1. **Email discussion after Fri’s GTW**

During Fri’ GTW, the following conclusion was made for the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2:

***Conclusion****:*

* *RAN1 concludes that the inter-UE coordination in Mode 2 is feasible, and is beneficial (e.g., reliability, etc.) compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, and thus recommends specification of the feature.*
	+ *The detailed observations can be found in the attachment of the LS*

*Further discuss the detailed observations (starting from the FL’s summary)*

According to the conclusion above, further discussion is necessary on “**whether to modify/update the current version of detailed observations on evaluation results**” and “**if needed, how to do it**”. So, I would like to ask companies to provide their inputs, in any, for these questions **by February 1st, 4:59pm UTC.** Note that companies can find the latest version of observations under the question box. I also ask companies to check whether their evaluation results are correctly captured in the observations, and if there is any discrepancy, please comment. Just for the efficient update of evaluation results, it is preferred for companies to directly correct error, if any.

Considering that we need to discuss/approve the content of LS to RAN plenary after this discussion, it would be highly appreciated if companies make comments, if any, as soon as possible.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Intel | Please find our proposed modification below:1. For the Type A evaluations introduce sub-categories according to resource allocation schemes, e.g.
	1. Type A1: Hierarchical
	2. Type A2: Fully distributed

Motivation: we do see quite big difference in architectural/implementation aspects for these solutions above.1. We propose to move pre-collision indication schemes based on PSFCH-like signaling to type-C category (since those indicate potential collision and have functional similarity with post-collision indication, i.e. belong to the same family of solutions)

Motivation: Similarity of solutions and signaling aspects1. We suggest to add a sub-note if gains observed under ideal evaluation assumptions transform to losses or results w/o gains under practical evaluation assumptions. Please check corresponding change for Intel observations made for *Type A -> Aperiodic Traffic* case.
2. We do not see any observation on latency benefit of inter-UE coordination solution. Given that our contribution provides the results of scheme based on Rel.16 design with minor changes in resource selection procedure (please refer to Sections 2.1 and 3 in R1-2100673) showing significant latency advantage, we added the following wording for Type-B schemes aiming latency reduction:
	1. *One company has shown that simple modification in Rel.16 resource selection procedure provides significant latency reduction w/o noticeable impact on relaibility. The solution does not require any new inter-UE coordination signaling on top of Rel.16 Mode-2 RA design.*
3. We noticed that previously captured observation regarding the minimum number of retransmissions for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 was deleted. We provide updated version to be consistent with overall observation capturing framework
	1. *One company claimed PRR gain of Mode 2 enhancement that ensures the minimum number of retransmission over Rel.16 Mode RA design.*
4. We also propose to change the wording “*claimed*” on the wording “*observed*”
 |
| Ericsson | We propose to have the following conclusion (with observation and notes):**Conclusion:**RAN1 has studied schemes for inter-UE coordination in the following categories:* *Type A: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ e.g., based on its sensing result
* *Type B: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ e.g., based on its sensing result and/or expected/potential resource conflict
* *Type C: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resource where the resource conflict is detected*

In their results, the different companies have observed that each of the above types is beneficial at least in some cases (e.g., traffic type, cast mode, etc.) in terms of packet reception ratio.Note that:* The above categories are not mutually exclusive. Moreover, the categorization of some of the schemes is disputed.
* Different results may have been obtained using different sets of simulation assumptions.
* Some of the simulations have not modelled overhead and or latency. For a future selection of inter-UE coordination scheme(s), they will be considered.

After this, Copy the observations (from above) in two blocks:* Block 1. Observations from simulations with latency and overhead.
* Block 2. Observations from simulations without latency and/or overhead.
	+ Sub-block 2.1: With latency, without overhead
	+ Sub-block 2.2: Without latency, with overhead
	+ Sub-block 2.3: Without latency, without overhead
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t think RAN1 should spend too long crafting detailed observations for this (and thanks to Seungmin for saving us all a lot of time). This is because RAN has never requested any such observations, nor asked us to write a pseudo-TR. The WID only requires a RAN1 conclusion, by RAN#91, and does not indicate that there will be any decision point on the basis of input from the WG(s) at RAN#91.With that in mind, we think the current classification by Type A/B/C is reasonable and also aligned with RAN1#103-e conclusion. There is no need to further classify as A1, A2, etc. which is a technical design direction that does not affect benefit or feasibility. It took two RAN1 meetings to reach a conclusion on the definition of Type A/B/C, and whilst we are keen to proceed with technical design, we would prefer such discussions to be taken in a normative direction, rather than for a (non-requested) LS to RAN. In fact, for Type A/B/C resources, companies may still have different detailed solutions for the coordinated resources. That's why we suggest to use “Type-A/B/C-like” to be more accurate. Since the feature lead has captured that point, there is no need to give such details to RAN plenary, they can be further discussed in RAN1.As replied earlier, pre-collision is part of Type-B since it indicates future resources which are not preferred for UE-B’s transmission. Putting pre-collision under Type-B is more accurate.For “Type A, Aperiodic traffic”: We have some concern on the newly added bullet, i.e., the following cyan part. In general, the sentences in the obseravtions should give orthogonal information, so that people can know how many companies have done simulations and the performance of those simulations.If we have both the yellow part and cyan part below, it creates an incorrect impression that there are two independent simulations. Only one of them should be kept.==*One company claimed that PRR loss of their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is observed compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast**…**One company claimed that gains transform to performance losses if inter-UE coordination latency and signaling overhead are taken into consideration*==For “Type B, Aperiodic traffic”: we think neither of the following two bullets can be included in a reply to RAN. It seems the solutions in both bullets below do not require inter-UE coordination signalling, and thus do not appear to be in scope to the WID.==* + - * *One company claimed PRR gain of Mode 2 enhancement that ensures the minimum number of retransmission over the Rel.16 Mode RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK. feedback Option 1*

…* + *Aperiodic traffic (latency reduction analysis)*
		- One company has shown that simple modification of the Rel.16 resource selection procedure provides significant latency reduction w/o noticeable impact on reliability. The solution does not require any new inter-UE coordination signaling on top of the Rel.16 Mode-2 RA design.

==On Ericsson’s points:The conclusion agreed in the Fri GTW is not something we would now entirely revisit. That said:1. We are OK to include the Type A/B/C in the main body of the LS, as it does not matter much where they go. But if that causes much discussion here, let’s keep things as they are.2. It is possible to arrange the detailed observatiosn in various orders. Re-arranging mostly generates work for Seungmin ☺ but may not have any real relevance to RAN.3. On the “note that” bullets, we assume they could be added to the detailed observations, but not the agreed conclusion. First two are OK. Third is obvious from the detailed observations, and does not much need repeating. These things can only be considered to the extent that contributions do so, after all. |
| Fraunhofer | We agree with all points Huawei’s points.Based on our reading of the captured evaluation results, the main point of inter-UE coordination is that assistance information is conveyed from UE-A to UE-B, and how UE-B takes this information into account can be discussed as further details. Hence, we do not support Intel’s further classification of type A.We would also like to highlight that type A and B work across cast types, while type C specializes in groupcast transmissions. However, type C will not cater to unicast, groupcast option 2 and broadcast transmissions.If we are adding a concise conclusion in the LS, we agree with Ericsson, with the following comments:1. For type C, we prefer to add some detail, like:* *Type C: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources where the resource conflict is detected*
	+ e.g., based on an indication of detected past collisions

2. We would prefer to drop the note, since it is clear from the full set of observations. |
| Qualcomm | According to the definition of type C: “*UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources where the resource conflict is detected”, w*e see no reason why pre collision cannot be covered. Here, a conflict has already happened since 2 UEs reserve overlapping resource(s), regardless of the overlapping resource being in the past or not. Furthermore, pre-collision is different from other type B coordination in the sense that the UE B has not reserved the resource(s) being signaled, hence a collision has not happened. Another reason to consider pre and post collision in the same group is that the signalling mechasim is also similar between the 2 (1 bit indicator). We agree with Intel’s change to point out when a positive observation turns negative once latency/overhead assumptions are included.We also agree with Intel’s editorial change to use “observed” instead of “claimed”.We also made similar observations to Intel’s both for the minimum number of retransmissions and for the latency reduction method. Perhaps these could be captured as separate main bullets.We agree with Ericsson’s updated note to replace the existing note in the observation.Note that:* The above categories are not mutually exclusive. Moreover, the categorization of some of the schemes is disputed.
* Different results may have been obtained using different sets of simulation assumptions.
* Some of the simulations have not modelled overhead and or latency. For a future selection of inter-UE coordination scheme(s), they will be considered.

We also agree with Ericsson’s proposal to list the results with realistic assumptions and propose the following. We indicated a source number to clarify whether obersevations were made by the same company or not. To further compress the wording, we also grouped all observations from the same company for the same type in the same sentence. Observations from simulations considering both latency and resource overheadType A:* *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources used for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ *Source 1 observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast with periodic and aperiodic traffic*
	+ *Source 2 observed that PRR loss of their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is observed compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast with aperiodic traffic*
* *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ *Source 1 observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast with periodic and aperiordic traffic*
	+ *Source 3 and Source 4 observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for broadcast with periodic traffic*
	+ *Source 5 observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception with periodic and aperiodic traffic*
	+ *Source 2 observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast with periodic traffic*
	+ *Source 6 observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 with periodic traffic*
	+ *Source 7 observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast with aperiodic*

*Type B** *Source 8 observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast with periodic traffic*
* *Source 9 observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with aperiodic traffic*

*Type C** *Source 2, Source 6, Source 9, Source 10 observed that their coordination scheme using the Type C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 with aperiodic traffic*
	+ *Source 9 and Source 10 observed that their coordination scheme using the Type C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 with periodic traffic*

The rest of the observations could be similarly grouped in a similar manner. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We agree with Ericsson that observations are put in two blocks. The reason is, chairman’s request in GTW was to make conclusion with better readability. They would like to understand whether/how beneficial or not, so with or without overhead/latency of information sharing can be said preferentially. We should say thanks a lot Seungmin for current list below, and we feel the update can improve redability a bit. Note that at the same time, traffic type (periodic/aperiodic) should also be informed preferentially.Regarding pre-collision indication is one of type B or type C, in my understanding RAN1 agreed at the last meeting that type B includes it as ‘e.g. …’ saying, and type C is only post-collision. We are fine to include pre-collision indication as type C, but in this case, the conclusion should be updated appropriately. Without update, categolized in type C should be avoided. |
| vivo | Firstly, we agree with Huawei/Fraunhofer/DCM, current category should be kept (also prefer not to add sub-catagories), since companies are providing evaluation based on catagorization in RAN1#103 meeting, if new catagorization is added, companies have no more time to provide additional evaluation results for it. Secondly, we prefer not to add too much solution details in some specific observation to keep fair, we also believe the technical details is not benefical for RAN P discussion. We should focus on a readable observation as guided by chairman, e.g., merging similar observations, add source companies to the observation.  |
| CATT, GOHIGH | In general, we support to keep the current categories of observations. But the detail of each companies evaluation assumption seems redundant for RAN plenary. Regarding the node part, we support Ericsson’s update note. |
| Samsung | Our evaluation results were duplicated in the current categories. So we modified this in the below. As HW commented, we also think that Intel’s modification needs to be checked again. Specifically, we think that newly added subbullet below is not necessary beceasue main bullet already say that it is ideal assumption. If we allow this description, it seems unfair since in other cases the detailed description was not included.*One company claimed that gains transform to performance losses if inter-UE coordination latency and signaling overhead are taken into consideration*Any approach to improve readability on observation would be good but if it is not easy, we are O.K just polishing current observation.  |
| OPPO | Firstly, we fully agree with HW that there is no need to spend too much time on refining the observations which is not required by RAN plenary. Furthermore, we prefer not to add any scheme that cannot be categorized into either Type A/B or C. As to the change of categorization, based on the conclusion achived in the last meeting, pre-collision indication is one of Type B, no change is needed. For the first bullet of the note proposed by Ericsson, the 3 category types were concluded in the last meeting, when there was no objection raised, we did not see any case belonging to more than one categories. The second bullet of the note seems saying same thing as the current note. So we do not think the 2 bullets are necessary. |
| LGE | In the last meeting, there was a discussion reagarding whether pre-conflict indication scheme is part of Type-B or Type-C. In our understnaidng, the final conclusion was that it is a part of Type-B, but not Type-C. We think that additional note is not necessary. To be specific, how to continue the discussion on the inter-UE coordination is up to RAN1 and it does not need to be included in the LS. According to the agreed conclusion in this meeting, the evaluation observation is already sub-bullet of the sentence about inter-UE coordination. In other words, the evalution observation shall be related to the inter-UE coordination scheme. In this case, we do not need to include any scheme other than Type-A/B/C. Regarding latency anaylsis, one company (OPPO) provided their PIR results, so we cannot agree that the latency analysis has not been done at all for the inter-UE coordination.  |
| FUTUREWEI2 | We agree with several companies that refining the detailed observations for RAN is not needed for RAN plenary.  |

***Detailed observations on evaluation results (i.e., this version was shared in Fri’s GTW):***

* *Type A: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ e.g., based on its sensing result
* *Type B: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ e.g., based on its sensing result and/or expected/potential resource conflict
* *Type C: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resource where the resource conflict is detected*

*Note:*

* *Details of simulation assumptions for coordination schemes are not aligned among companies. The following observations only apply to company’s specific scheme and simulation assumption. If the simulation assumption for coordination scheme is changed, the results could be different.*
* *Type A*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources used for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination, depending on how UE-B uses Type A information,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for broadcast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for broadcast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception*
			* *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *For the case where only additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *Type A*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources used for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that PRR loss of their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is observed compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

*One company claimed that gains transform to performance losses if inter-UE coordination latency and signaling overhead are taken into consideration*

* + - *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination, depending on how UE-B uses Type A information,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception*
			* *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *For the case where only additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *Type B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *Two companies claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *One company claimed that PIR gain of their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is observed for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
		- *For the case where only additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that the gain of their coordination scheme using Type B-like resource becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource with enhanced mechanism of UE-A selection is beneficial for groupcast.*
		- *For the case where neither additional signaling overhead nor latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *Type B*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic (reliability analysis)*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
			* *One company claimed PRR gain of Mode 2 enhancement that ensures the minimum number of retransmission over the Rel.16 Mode RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK. feedback Option 1*
		- *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
		- *For the case where only additional signaling overhead is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using the gain of Type B-like resource becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for unicast*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic (latency reduction analysis)*
		- One company has shown that simple modification of the Rel.16 resource selection procedure provides significant latency reduction w/o noticeable impact on reliability. The solution does not require any new inter-UE coordination signaling on top of the Rel.16 Mode-2 RA design.
* *Type C*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *Two companies claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *Type C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for the coordination,*
			* *Four companies claimed that their coordination scheme using the Type C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *Combination of Type A and B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type A-like and B-like resources is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type A-like, and Type B-like, respectively for unicast*
* *Combination of Type A and B*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where only latency is considered for the coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type A-like and B-like resources is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *Combination of Type B and C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for both Type B and C coordination,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type B-like and C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type B-like, and Type C-like, respectively for groupcast*
		- *For the case where both additional signaling overhead and latency are considered for Type C, but only latency is considered for Type B,*
			* *One company claimed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type B-like and C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type B-like, and Type C-like, respectively for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
1. **Draft poposals for Tue’s GTW**

The summary of companies’ inputs during the email discussion is as follows:

* 1 company (i.e., Intel) proposed to introduce sub-categories in Type A according to resource allocation schemes, e.g., hierarchical or fully distributed, but other 3 companies (i.e., Huawei, Fraunhofer, vivo) opposed it. So, FL’s suggestion is not to make additional sub-categories in Type A.
* 2 companies (i.e., Intel, Qualcomm) proposed to move “Pre-conflict indication” in Type C, but other 4 companies (i.e., Huawei, DOCOMO, OPPO, LG) opposed it because the current classification is more aligned with the conclusion made in the last RAN1 meeting. So, FL’s suggestion is to keep “Pre-conflict indication” included in Type B.
* 1 company (i.e., Intel) proposed to include the following observation, but other 3 companies (i.e., Huawei, OPPO, LG) opposed it because it is not a kind of inter-UE coordination and doesn’t belong to the scope of study. So, FL’s suggestion is not to include it.
	+ *One company has shown that simple modification in Rel.16 resource selection procedure provides significant latency reduction w/o noticeable impact on reliability. The solution does not require any new inter-UE coordination signaling on top of Rel.16 Mode-2 RA design.*
* 2 company (i.e., Intel, Qualcomm) proposed to include the following observation, but other 3 companies (i.e., Huawei, OPPO, LG) opposed it because it is not a kind of inter-UE coordination and doesn’t belong to the scope of study. So, FL’s suggestion is not to include it.
	+ *One company claimed PRR gain of Mode 2 enhancement that ensures the minimum number of retransmission over Rel.16 Mode RA design.*
* 1 company (i.e., Ericsson) proposed to include the following additional note, but there were comments from other companies that 2nd bullet is already covered by the existing note, 3rd bullet can be derived from the observations from evaluation results, and 1st bullet is not correct understanding, etc. Since including additional notes is not critical, FL’s suggestion is not to include it.
	+ *Note that:*
		- *The above categories are not mutually exclusive. Moreover, the categorization of some of the schemes is disputed.*
		- *Different results may have been obtained using different sets of simulation assumptions.*
		- *Some of the simulations have not modelled overhead and or latency. For a future selection of inter-UE coordination scheme(s), they will be considered.*
* Some companies commented that there is no need to spend too much time on refining the observations that is not required by RAN plenary, and including more details of solutions in the observations is not meaningful for RAN plenary.
* Note that there is one company (i.e., OPPO) which shows that PIR gain of their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is observed for unicast, and the relevant observation is included.

For a better readability, the observations are re-arranged based on whether to model signalling overhead and/or latency in the evaluation.

***FL’s proposal****: Enclose following contents as an attachment of LS*

*=========================================================================================*

RAN1 has studied and evaluated schemes of inter-UE coordination in the following categories:

* *Type A: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ *e.g., based on its sensing result*
* *Type B: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ *e.g., based on its sensing result and/or expected/potential resource conflict*
* *Type C: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources where the resource conflict is detected*

Observations from evaluation results are summarized below. Note that details of evaluation assumptions for coordination schemes are not aligned among companies, and the following observations only apply to company’s specific scheme and evaluation assumption. If the evaluation assumption for coordination scheme changes, the result could be different.

* ***Observations from evaluation results w/ signaling overhead and latency for the inter-UE coordination scheme:***
* *Type A*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources used for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* + *Source 1 (R1-2101941) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* + *Source 1 (R1-2101941) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 3 (R1-2100746) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
				+ *Source 4 (R1-2101786) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for broadcast*
				+ *Source 5 (R1-2100925) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for broadcast*
				+ *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources used for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* + *Source 1 (R1-2101941) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed that PRR loss of their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is shown compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* + *Source 1 (R1-2101941) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception*
* *Type B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *Source 9 (R1-2101926) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *Source 12 (R1-2101804) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
* *Type C*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *Source 3 (R1-2100746) and Source 13 (R1-2101910) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *Type C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *Source 2 (R1-2100673), Source 3 (R1-2100746), Source 12 (R1-2101804), and Source 13 (R1-2101910) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *Combination of Type B and C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *Source 12 (R1-2101804) observed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type B-like and C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type B-like, and Type C-like, respectively for groupcast*
		- *Source 13 (R1-2101910) observed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type B-like and C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type B-like, and Type C-like, respectively for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* ***Observations from evaluation results w/o signaling overhead and/or latency for the inter-UE coordination scheme:***
* *W/o signaling overhead, w/ latency*
	+ *Type A*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 7 (R1-2100352) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + - *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 7 (R1-2100352) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + *Type B*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *Source 7 (R1-2100352) and Source 10 (R1-2100142) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

*Source 10 (R1-2100142) observed that PIR gain of their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is shown for unicast*

* + - * + *Source 11 (R1-2100828) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
		- *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *Source 7 (R1-2100352) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 13 (R1-2101910) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
	+ *Combination of Type A and B*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *Source 7 (R1-2100352) observed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type A-like and B-like resources is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type A-like, and Type B-like, respectively for unicast*
	+ *Combination of Type A and B*
		- *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *Source 7 (R1-2100352) observed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type A-like and B-like resources is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *W/ signaling overhead, w/o latency*
	+ *Type A*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + - *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + *Type B*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that the gain of their coordination scheme using Type B-like resource becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for unicast*
				+ *Source 11 (R1-2100828) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource with enhanced mechanism of UE-A selection is beneficial for groupcast*
		- *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the gain of Type B-like resource becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for unicast*
* *W/o signaling overhead, w/o latency*
	+ *Type A*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 8 (R1-2101232) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

*Source 3 (R1-2100746) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*

* + - *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources used for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + - * + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 8 (R1-2101232) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

*Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed that their coordination scheme using Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + *Type B*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* *Source 11 (R1-2100828) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *Source 11 (R1-2100828) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
			* *Source 9 (R1-2101926) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

*=========================================================================================*

1. **Email discussion after Tue’s GTW**

In Tue’s GTW, RAN1 made the following agreement.

*Agreements: Enclose following contents as an attachment of LS*

*=========================================================================================*

RAN1 has studied and evaluated schemes of inter-UE coordination in the following categories:

* *Type A: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ *e.g., based on its sensing result*
* *Type B: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission*
	+ *e.g., based on its sensing result and/or expected/potential resource conflict*
* *Type C: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources where the resource conflict is detected*

Observations from evaluation results are summarized below. Note that the detailed evaulations for coordination schemes may not be fully aligned among companies. The details of the above schemes may also be different among companies in the evaluation. As a result, the observations drawn may be specific to the corrpresonding evaluated schemes with the assumed evaluation assumptions.

* ***Observations from evaluation results w/ signaling overhead and latency for the inter-UE coordination scheme:***
* *Type A*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources used for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* + *Source 1 (R1-2101941) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* + *Source 1 (R1-2101941) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 5 (R1-2100925) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for broadcast*
				+ *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception*
				+ *Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 3 (R1-2100746) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources used for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* + *Source 1 (R1-2101941) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed that PRR loss of their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is shown compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
		- *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*
			* + *Source 1 (R1-2101941) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception*
* *Type B*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *Source 9 (R1-2101926) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *Source 12 (R1-2101804) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
* *Type C*
	+ *Periodic traffic*
		- *Source 3 (R1-2100746) and Source 13 (R1-2101910) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *Type C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *Source 2 (R1-2100673), Source 3 (R1-2100746), Source 12 (R1-2101804), and Source 13 (R1-2101910) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type C-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
* *Combination of Type B and C*
	+ *Aperiodic traffic*
		- *Source 12 (R1-2101804) observed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type B-like and C-like resources is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type B-like resource, and Type C-like resource, respectively for groupcast*
		- *Source 13 (R1-2101910) observed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type B-like and C-like resources is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type B-like resource, and Type C-like resource, respectively for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
			* *Both signaling overhead and latency are considered for Type C-like resource, but only latency is considered for Type B-like resource*
* ***Observations from evaluation results w/o signaling overhead and/or latency for the inter-UE coordination scheme:***
* *W/o signaling overhead, w/ latency*
	+ *Type A*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 7 (R1-2100352) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + - *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 7 (R1-2100352) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + *Type B*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *Source 7 (R1-2100352) and Source 10 (R1-2100142) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

*Source 10 (R1-2100142) observed that PIR gain of their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is shown for unicast*

* + - * + *Source 11 (R1-2100828) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
		- *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *Source 13 (R1-2101910) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*
				+ *Source 7 (R1-2100352) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
	+ *Combination of Type A and B*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *Source 7 (R1-2100352) observed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type A-like and B-like resources is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA, Type A-like resource, and Type B-like resource, respectively for unicast*
	+ *Combination of Type A and B*
		- *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *Source 7 (R1-2100352) observed that their coordination scheme using a combination of Type A-like and B-like resources is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
* *W/ signaling overhead, w/o latency*
	+ *Type A*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + - *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + *Type B*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that the gain of their coordination scheme using Type B-like resource becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for unicast*
				+ *Source 11 (R1-2100828) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource with enhanced mechanism of UE-A selection is beneficial for groupcast*
		- *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
				+ *Source 6 (R1-2101911) observed that their coordination scheme using the gain of Type B-like resource becomes larger under the scenario where UL transmission can overlap with SL transmission/reception for unicast*
* *W/o signaling overhead, w/o latency*
	+ *Type A*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 8 (R1-2101232) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

*Source 3 (R1-2100746) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast with SL HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1*

*Source 4 (R1-2101786) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for broadcast*

* + - *Aperiodic traffic*
			* + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources used for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + - * + *When UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission,*

*Source 8 (R1-2101232) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type A-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

*Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed that their coordination scheme using Type A-like resource is not beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

* + *Type B*
		- *Periodic traffic*
			* *Source 11 (R1-2100828) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*
			* *Source 11 (R1-2100828) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for groupcast*
			* *Source 9 (R1-2101926) observed that their coordination scheme using the Type B-like resource is beneficial compared to Rel-16 Mode 2 RA for unicast*

*=========================================================================================*

According to Chairman’s guideline in Tue’s GTW, I would like to trigger the email discussion to check the following two points.

* Contents of LS to deliver “RAN1 conclusion on the feasibility and benefits of inter-UE coordination” and “detailed observations from evaluation results for inter-UE coordination” to RAN plenary
* Whether there are any companies that propose to update the current version of observations

Firstly, you can find a draft of LS in the following link. Please provide comments, if any, on the draft of LS **by February 4th, 4:59pm UTC**. To make a stabilized version of LS before 3rd check point (i.e., February 4th), it would be highly appreciated if companies make comments as soon as possible.

* Draft LS on Mode 2 enhancements in NR sidelink
	+ <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Inbox/drafts/8.11.1.2/Email%20discussion%20on%20Draft%20of%20LS/R1-210xxxx%20Draft%20LS%20on%20Mode%202%20enhancements%20in%20NR%20sidelink.docx>
* Detailed observations from evaluation results for inter-UE coordination in Mode 2
	+ <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Inbox/drafts/8.11.1.2/Email%20discussion%20on%20Draft%20of%20LS/R1-210xxxx%20Detailed%20observations%20from%20evaluation%20results%20for%20inter-UE%20coordination%20in%20Mode%202.docx>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Fraunhofer | We are fine with the draft LS. The only comment is a typo under actions: “take the above conclusion~~s~~ into account”.Regarding the detailed observations, the new changes remove the focus from the sole purpose of the LS and the observations, which is on inter-UE coordination. We do not support the new changes, and prefer the original version that is based on the agreed set of observations from Tuesday’s GTW. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Secondly, please provide comments, if there are any companies that propose to update the current version of observations **by February 4th, 4:59pm UTC**. To make a stabilized version of LS before 3rd check point (i.e., February 4th), it would be highly appreciated if companies make comments as soon as possible.

Since the end of this meeting is approaching, considering a situation where the observations proposed by Intel are agreed to be included, I made the updated version of document for “detailed observations from evaluation results”, and you can find it in the following link. I think that this preparation would be helpful for other companies to understand in advance which parts need to be modified, and if needed, this updated version of document could be used at Thu’s GTW. Companies can also provide comments, if any, on whether this updated version of document is acceptable, further modification is necessary, etc.

* <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Inbox/drafts/8.11.1.2/Email%20discussion%20on%20Draft%20of%20LS/R1-210xxxx%20Detailed%20observations%20from%20evaluation%20results.docx>

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| Intel | Following the chair’s and FL’s guidance, we suggest to add observations on evaluations results that were not included in the latest version. The following update is proposed:Add new section/paragrapth with the following observations:**Evaluation of Rel.16 Mode-2 RA enhancements*** *Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed PRR gains over the Rel.16 Mode-2 RA if the minimum number of retransmission is ensured by UE for the case of Option 1 HARQ feedback. It is also observed that proposed solution is compatible with inter-UE coordination schemes requiring additional signaling between UEs.*
* *Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed reduced latency over the Rel.16 Mode-2 RA if resource selection procedure is adjusted to prioritize selection of early in time resources. It is also observed that proposed solution does not have noticeable impact on reliability and is compatible with inter-UE coordination schemes requiring additional signaling between UEs.*
 |
| NTT DOCOMO | Let me ask two questions on kind simulation results, for clarifications. The reason is that we would like to know whether type-A is really beneficial for aperiodic traffic. Please note that motivation is not to object but to know/clarify. :)* To HW

Regarding evaluations in x1941, in aperiodic traffic case, I would like to know the details of assumption.UE-B transmits request to UE-A at slot n, then UE-A receive and decode the request. And then UE-A selects resource to share information based on request, and prepare the signal (coding, etc.). After that, UE-A transmits the information to UE-B. UE-B receives the information, and then selects resource based on the information. Finally, UE-B prepares the signal (coding, etc.) and transmits it on the selected resource.Q1: Is the above procedure is correct in your evaluation?If correct, Q2: is all processing time considered in your evalulation?Q3: Could you kindly share the exact timing of each processing?* To vivo

Regarding evaluations in x1911, in aperiodic traffic case, I would like to know the details of assumption.Q1: Realistic assistance information is assumed in figure 10, 11, right? (I guess figure 11 is not periodic case but aperiodic case.) In this case, Q2: how does the sharing is triggered? Or frequenctly shared without trigger?Then, same questions as to HW;Q3: is all processing time considered in your evalulation?Q4: Could you kindly share the exact timing of each processing?At last, Q5: mixed mechanism show benefit, not only type A, right? Or is there results of type-A with realistic assumption?Maybe I missed some explanations in x1941 and x1911, if so, sorry for that. |
| vivo, and vivo 2 | To DCM, thank you for the question, our reply is as following Q1 reply: Figure 11 is for aperiodic traffic, sorry for the typo[DCM] I see, thanks for confirmation.Q2 reply: As you can see in our paper, where hierarchical inter-UE coordination is assumed for figure 10/11, where RX UE can be a centric UE (UE-A), where there are multiple TX UEs (UE-B) perform transmission to this centric RX UE. we assume RX UE suggestes some resources to each TX UE, TX UE can use those resource for enquiry of additional transmission resource depending on TB size (i.e., UE-B triggered assistance information transmission). When TX UE use the suggested resource, it can combine it in mode 2 resource selection procedure, e.g.,using the overlapping part with candidate resource set.[DCM] OK, UE-B triggers, ~~so UE-B may share may not. UE-A may have the information at resource selection timing, may not.~~ so after UE-B requests to UE-A and then UE-A shares some information.Q3/Q4 reply: the processing time is not simulated, as you know such parameter depends on hardware capability, it is challenging to assume a detailed parameter for that. I believe companies were not assuming to simulate proposing time in a system level simulation.[DCM] Oh, really. Aperiodic reservation is indicatable up to futhre 31 slots only, so timeline is very sensitive on performance evaluation in my understanding. For example, UE-~~B~~A does resource selection for sharing at slot m, then UE-~~B~~A transmits the information at slot m+2, then UE-~~A~~B receives it and uses in resource selection at slot m+4, then UE- ~~A~~B transmits at slot m+6. This would be almost the earliest situation, but actually longer time is needed due to random resource selection or limited sharing timing (otherwise so many resources are consumed for sharing). Assumption should not like, when at slot m UE- ~~A~~B has new data to transmit, UE- ~~B~~A shares information at slot m, then UE- ~~B~~A does resource selection at slot m, then UE- ~~B~~A transmits at slot m+2… In this case, could I ask what is the consideration of signaling latency?[vivo2]: in our understanding, ‘31 slots’ has nothing to do with the evaluated scheme, I am not sure how they are correlated. In the above example, the processing latency is 6 slots, or it may be shorter/longer depending on the actual processing time and signalling type (e.g., SCI or RRC…), actually it does not matter, even the latency is 6 slots, it can still within PDB of UE-B. [DCM2] Firstly, UE-A and UE-B were opposite, and I misunderstood answer on Q2. Let me update. OK, shared information is determined based on sensing/future TX resource at RX-UE/ future SL-UL conflict. Sorry, 31 slots was not accurate, reservation of n+31-th slot from n slot. The relation is, that aperiodic reservation at slot n can reserve up to slot n+31. So if time duration between info determination at UE-B (or trigger at UE-A) and selected resource at UE-A is close to/over 31 slots, aperiodic reservation information cannot be used for the assistance information. But you assume at least future TX resource/future SL-UL conflict, then the restriction does not exist. Thanks, I understand! :)Q5: it depends on how companies assume their detailed solution. If proactive solution is assumed, e.g., avoiding the conflit, in our understanding, type-A/B can be equivalent, there is no need to distinguish type-A/B, i.e., pool – typeA = TypeB.[DCM] Thank you, but we have combination part as ‘Combination of Type B and C’ in the list. If both mechanisms are used in evaluations, ‘combination of type A and B’ should be newly added and observation on your results should be moved there, shouldn’t it? I think in combination case, both benefits are included. This means, it is unclear that both are beneficial or either is beneficial…[vivo2] in simulation for figure 11, we assume it is only type A, no combination of type-A or Type-B, also we have no idea why/how A/B are combined since they are contradictory to each other, such scheme maybe used by other companies but not us.In our paper, we performs multiple simulations, some for type-A and some for type-B. we do not mixed them. The details is explained in our simulation description.[DCM2] OK, I would misunderstand… ‘Mixed solutions’ does not mean mixture of multiple types but type-A with considerations of several factors as TX/RX conflict, SL/UL conflict, right? If this is correct, then current observation seems no problem, thanks a lot for kind replys! |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As we wrote earlier, we do not agree to the observations proposed by Intel to promote their scheme, because they deal with schemes which are not inter-UE coordination, and inter-UE coordination is the only topic of the LS and the conclusion it reports. We certainly do not accept the claim that a scheme involving no inter-UE coordination is in scope to schemes based on inter-UE coordination. If companies want to have some technical discussion between companies around other schemes, that is to be welcomed (although it is almost impossible when we’re discouraged from using email to talk during an e-meeting). Nevertheless, that discussion isn’t relevant to the endorsed observations.Reply to NTT DOCOMO questions:* To HW

Regarding evaluations in x1941, in aperiodic traffic case, I would like to know the details of assumption.UE-B transmits request to UE-A at slot n, then UE-A receive and decode the request. And then UE-A selects resource to share information based on request, and prepare the signal (coding, etc.). After that, UE-A transmits the information to UE-B. UE-B receives the information, and then selects resource based on the information. Finally, UE-B prepares the signal (coding, etc.) and transmits it on the selected resource.Q1: Is the above procedure is correct in your evaluation?If correct, Q2: is all processing time considered in your evalulation?Q3: Could you kindly share the exact timing of each processing?Q1: We would like to understand if you are proposing that RAN1 should settle on detailed values for each of the individual items you mentioned, such as the time it takes to perform coding, etc., before results can be reported to RAN? Our worry is that such a level of detail is not practical to model in most companies’ system simulators (in the sense of introducing so many configurable parameters which then can be different per UE). This would be common to your preferred Type B resource also, in our understanding since the internal hardware operation of the UEs is the same. In any case, yes, the basic timeline you describe is what we used. Is there another one you think should be used instead? [DCM] Thank you, my intention is not to include all procedures in observations. As you assumed, it would be unnecessary. I asked Q1 to know/confirm procedures to ask Q2/Q3; if I misunderstand, I would misunderstand Q2/Q3 as well.Q2 and Q3: Slot n: UE-B transmits request to UE-A at slot n* + Based on UE-A’s own sensing result, assume UE-A selects three resources R1 in slot n1, R2 in slot n2, R3 in slot n3.
	+ R1 is used to transmit the coordinating information from UE-A to UE-B . R2/R3 are the “preferred resource”, R2 is for initial transmission, R3 is for retransmission if needed.
	+ slot n < n1 < n2 < n3. We ensure n2-n1>=2, n3-n2>=2. This is a lower-bound inequality, and the actual resources are still subject to resource (re-)selection. The lower bound models the processing times you are asking about.

In terms of whether a given latency total is likely to impact the conclusions, it has also to be seen in the context of Type B (and C) resources, because Type B, at least as proposed by DOCOMO on pre-collision signalling, is likely to be more sensitive to latency due to the 32 slot limit in SCI. Whereas for preferred resources in the future, this restriction does not exist (as you have concluded in the exchange with vivo). We noticed in your paper that you assert gains for Type B as pre-collision, but we wonder if DOCOMO’s assessment has been able to consider this problem and the overall latency structure, for Type B, without conducting evaluations, possibly e.g. by analytical methods?[DCM] Firstly, let me note again that my question is to know whether beneficial or not, not to object type-A. In addition, we really appreciate your efforts on evaluations since very helpful to discuss whether each type is beneficial or not.Thanks, I see the timeline. (I guess there is assumption of n1-n and n-n0, where n0 is packet arrival timing.) n2-n1=2, n3-n2=2 is lowest band, so as you mentioned, more time duration is assumed in practical situation, right? For aperiodic reservation, 31 slot limit in SCI is existing. When UE-A uses own sensing result, the reservation information from other UEs is under the 31 slot limit. We cannot ignore this aspect. Could I ask the upper bound of n2-n1 and n3-n2 (and n1-n, n-n0) in evaluations?I think UE-A in vivo’s evaluation uses information other than own sesing result, which is TX/RX overlap, SL/UL overlap. These information are not related to the 31 slot limit. Based on this, I feel that their obsservatinos seem valid. If only own sensing result is used, still the limit should be considered carefully.Regarding Type-B, our preference is pre-collision indication like HARQ feedback on PSFCH, which is used to know the fact of pre-collision on reserved resource and to **trigger** reselection. In this case, the indication is done quickly at UE-A. In other words, the latency is only feedback latency from PSSCH to PSFCH. The small latency is clear even without evaluation. Note that the indication would be not so beneficial in reselection itselt due to the 31 slot limit. But at least as reselection **‘trigger’**, the indication would be beneficial even under the 31 slot limit. Of course type-B for resource selection itselt is under the same constraints as type-A like your assuming method. This is true, and thus also whether type-B for resource selection itselt is beneficial for aperodic case or not is unclear for us, as we mentioned in our contribution.[HW, HiSi] Correct, as we said, 2 slots is simply the lower bound. n1, n2, n3 are selected within the delay budget.Regarding type B, without evaluation of the kind of details you are asking about for type A, it can be hard to make firm claims on benefit. |
| Fraunhofer | The observations captured, which are to be sent along with the LS, should be relevant only for inter-UE coordination. The observations suggested by Intel do not use inter-UE coordination, as defined in the WID. These are orthogonal solutions that may be “compatible with inter-UE coordination”, but so are other solutions currently discussed for Rel-17. Since the point of discussion is the efficacy of inter-UE coordination alone, we do not support its addition to the set of observations.We prefer to keep the observations that were agreed in Tuesday’s GTW, since they were already discussed, checked and ratified by respective companies many times over across the previous weeks. |
| QC | We support adding the two additional observations.We would like to follow up on Docomo’s questions regarding simulation assumptions. We think it is good to know more details about assumptions in companies’ simulations, so that RAN1 can understand the results better and as a result can capture a more accurate obersvation.We have the following questions for Huawei on timeline in R1-2101941:* If n2-n1 = 2, would UE-B have enough time to prepare a packet and transmit? Currently RAN1 agreed that this time need to be 2000us ($T\_{proc,1}^{SL}$, not counting slot alignment) for R16 UE, are 2 slots for 60kHz SCS (0.5ms) enough?

[HW, HiSi] In fact, Tproc,1 is just the upper bound, and the UE can always do faster than that, in Rel-16 all the way down to zero ms.* If n3 -n2 = 2, are there PSFCH resources in every slot?

[HW, HiSi] Yes.* Also, what is the gap between n and n1? Basically, UE-A need to decode the request, select resource and prepare the coordination message, we would expect this time is to be in the same ball park as $T\_{proc,1}^{SL}+T\_{proc,0}^{SL}$, that would be 10 slots for 60kHz SCS.

[HW, HiSi] It depends on the resource selection result by UE-A. Tproc,1+Tproc,0 is the most pessimistic upper bound of UE implementation, of the Rel-16 procedures.We see that R1-2101941 is assuming traffic with 5 to 10ms of PDB (please confirm if our understanding is correct), this might not leave sufficient time for the coordination exchange if we assume R16 processing timeline as a starting point. We think this is an important aspect to look at, as it will dictate the feasibility of the scheme.On a slightly different topic, in R1-2101941’s description of the simulation:“For the scheme where only UE-A senses, we assume UE-A provides resources for multiple UEs within one group. In our simulation, the highway topology defined in TR 37.885 is divided into three groups, the UE closest to the center of each group is designated as the coordinating UE of the group (i.e., UE-A), and provides resources to other UEs within the group. “What is the coverage size of the group and what is the overall length of the highway?[HW, HiSi] In our simulation, the highway topology defined in TR 37.885 is assumed. The total road length is 3464m, and then arranged as per our paper.We have a different view regarding the sentivity to latency of the schemes. A non-preferred resource would remain non-preferred. However a preferred resource could become occupied by another UE if a Rel-16 UE or a UE that doesn’t support inter-UE coordination uses or reserves it first. |

1. **Draft poposals for Thu’s GTW**

The following two points were mainly discussed after Tue’s GTW.

* 1) Contents of LS to deliver “RAN1 conclusion on the feasibility and benefits of inter-UE coordination” and “detailed observations from evaluation results for inter-UE coordination” to RAN plenary
* 2) Whether to include additional observations proposed by Intel
	+ Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed PRR gains over the Rel.16 Mode-2 RA if the minimum number of retransmission is ensured by UE for the case of Option 1 HARQ feedback. It is also observed that proposed solution is compatible with inter-UE coordination schemes requiring additional signaling between UEs.
	+ Source 2 (R1-2100673) observed reduced latency over the Rel.16 Mode-2 RA if resource selection procedure is adjusted to prioritize selection of early in time resources. It is also observed that proposed solution does not have noticeable impact on reliability and is compatible with inter-UE coordination schemes requiring additional signaling between UEs.

For 1st point, there was only one editorial comment from Fraunhofer, and the draft of LS was updated to reflect it. So, from FL’s perspective, this updated version is stable and we can approve it in Thu’s GTW.

For 2nd point, 2 companies (i.e., Intel, Qualcomm) agreed with it, while other 2 companies (i.e., Huawei, Fraunhofer) opposed it. So, no consensus was made. From FL’s point of view, the observations agreed in Tue’s GTW is the maximum we can achieve at this meeting.

***FL’s proposal****: Approve the draft LS (enclosing the observations agreed in Tue’s GTW as the attachment) of R1-2102165.*

1. **Email discussion after Thu’s GTW**

In Thu’s GTW, there was a discussion on whether to include two additional observations below and whether the relevant schemes belong to the scope of WID.

* Source 2 (R1-2100673) and Source 13 (R1-2101910) observed PRR gains over the Rel.16 Mode-2 RA if the minimum number of retransmission is ensured by UE for the case of Option 1 HARQ feedback. It is also observed that proposed solution is compatible with inter-UE coordination schemes requiring additional signaling between UEs.
* Source 2 (R1-2100673) and Source 13 (R1-2101910) observed reduced latency over the Rel.16 Mode-2 RA if resource selection procedure is adjusted to prioritize selection of early in time resources. It is also observed that proposed solution does not have noticeable impact on reliability and is compatible with inter-UE coordination schemes requiring additional signaling between UEs.

I would like to ask companies to provide their views on the following two points as soon as possible. You can also make other comments (e.g., contents of R1-2102165), if any.

* Q1) Whether to include two additional observations mentioned above?
* Q2) In case when the answer to Q1 is “Yes”, how to describe it including whether the following version shared in the reflector is acceptable? Since the end of this meeting is approaching, it is preferred for companies to directly provide the suggested wording.
	+ <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_104-e/Inbox/drafts/8.11.1.2/Email%20discussion%20on%20Draft%20of%20LS/R1-210xxxx%20Detailed%20observations%20from%20evaluation%20results%20v01.docx>

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes or No | Comment |
| Samsung | No | As we discussed in GTW today, the additional observations are actually out of the scope for inter-UE coordination. We support the FL’s proposal provided in GTW session today. |
| Vivo | No | Agree with Samsung, only inter-UE coordination scheme can be captured in the LS.For the ‘early in time resource selection’, since Rel-16 WI has discussed this solution, we even prefer to depriortize the related discussion to save time for other topic. |
| Intel | Yes | All evaluation results are important to better understand benefits of inter-UE coordination solutions. We can have endless discussion on whether solutions described in observations are in scope of inter-UE coordination or not but it is not the main point from our side and companies cannot use such arguments to preclude evalution results from other companies, especially when RAN1 has not officially agreed on exact definition of inter-UE coordination.We RAN1 has not looked at details of latency reduction options and there is no even conclusion on that objective. Solution proposed in observations are beneficial for inter-UE coordination since can facilitate latency reduction. Why should we hide this fact.To Samsung: It is unfair to block technical observations using formal arguments that those solutions are not in scope. Let’s say solution A from company#1 brings performance benefits and combination of solution (A+B) from company 2 brings even more performance improvement. Can you clarify why solution (A+B) should be precluded and not catured/considered?To vivo: It is true that solution was briefly discussed in Rel.16 and was dropped in Rel.16 due to arguments like: lack of time to specify it / it is optimization / Rel.16 already meets latency. Now RAN1 tasked to analyze latency reduction and only these observations talk about achieving reduced latency. So it is a beneficial for inter-UE coordination. At the moment there is no any conclusion on whether latency benefits are feasible.Finally, all current observations is a collection of observations from companies. We do not see even mechanism how some companies can oppose adding observations on evaluation results drawn by other companies especially showing clear benefits for inter-UE coordination framework. Oppositely, all evaluations and technical observations should be actually encouraged and obviously provided for consideration by RAN / 3GPP ecosystem. One company cannot object to evaluation efforts from another company unless it identifies some technical inaccuracy in evalution results or observation itself. From our perspective, the LS if it is not accompanied with a full set of observations is not a way forward. Our suggestion is:* Update summary of observation by adding new observations
* If some companies are not convinced that observations are in scope of WID study phase it is ok to add statement like : “Some companies do not observe that evaluated above options are in WID scope”
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Our comment was that the conclusion reached by RAN1 as the purpose of sending the LS deals with inter-UE coordination, and the two schemes are not inter-UE coordination schemes themselves. In simple terms, the two schemes were both proposed in Rel-16, where there was definitely no inter-UE coordination feature, and thus any scheme being repeated from Rel-16 cannot be an inter-UE coordination.As with other companies, we also support the FL’s proposal from section 10 of this document (i.e. that in Thursday’s GTW). In our view, the already-endorsed observations are the end point. |
| Fraunhofer | No | We agree with the views from Samsung, Vivo and Huawei. We support the FL’s proposal provided in Thursday’s GTW session. |

1. **Summary of contributions**
* How UE-A and UE-B are determined
	+ Option 1: UE-B is a PSCCH/PSSCH TX UE for data transmission, and UE-A is the intended receiver of UE-B [1] [2] [4] [5] [6] [10] [16] [19] [27]
	+ Option 2: UE-A and UE-B is determined via higher layer (e.g. application layer) [3] [5] [7]
	+ Option 3: UE-A is pre-defined, and UE-B is UEs that can receive inter-UE coordination information from other UE [7]
	+ Further consideration on the case when a leading-UE to suggest transmission resources to other UE(s) in a UE group [3] [5] [7] [18] [22] [33]
* How/when UE-A determines the contents of “A set of resources”, including consideration of UL scheduling?
	+ Type of “A set of resources”
		- Type A: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources preferred for UE-B’s transmission
			* e.g., based on its sensing result
		- Type B: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resources not preferred for UE-B’s transmission
			* e.g., based on its sensing result and/or expected/potential resource conflict
		- Type C: UE-A sends to UE-B the set of resource where the resource conflict is detected
		- Companies views
			* Option 1: Support Type A only [3] [5] [27]
			* Option 2: Support both Type A and Type B [2] [4] [6] [7] [10] [13] [14] [15] [17] [18] [19] [24] [25] [28] [29] [36]
			* Option 3: Support Type C [10] [14] [22] [28] [32]
			* Option 4: Support Type B only [35]
			* Option 5: Type B + Type C [12]
	+ Other information in the inter-UE coordination information
		- Type indicator for a set of resources [6] [7] [13] [28][4]
		- Indication about the intended recipient UE [13]
		- Resource pool index [13] [23]
		- Source ID of UE-B [14] [21]
		- Destination ID associated with UE-B [14] [21]
		- Associated RSRP [21] [28] [34]
		- Associated RX priority [28] [34]
		- Common DRX configuration [29]
		- Recommended TX parameters [29]
	+ Further consideration on the assumption of the behavior of UE-A to determine the inter-UE coordination information [8]
* When UE-A sends ”A set of resources” to UE-B, including which UE(s) sends it
	+ Explicit Trigger-based based coordination procedures [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [19][20] [22] [24] [25] [26] [27] [28] [30] [33]
		- Condition that UE-B transmit the triggering
			* When UE-B triggers resource selection procedure [2] [5] [7]
			* When UE-B fails TB reception [20]
			* Upon receiving scheduling request [20]
		- Information carried by the explicit triggering
			* the parameters related to the sensing procedure of UE-B [3] [4] [14] [19][22] [28]
			* the parameters related to TX packet of UE-B [7]
		- Container of the explicit triggering
			* 2nd SCI format [3] [14]
			* MAC CE [14]
			* PSFCH format [7] [28]
	+ Event-trigger based coordination procedures [3] [5] [6] [7] [12] [13] [14] [16] [17] [20] [24] [25] [26] [28] [29] [30] [32] [33] [35]
		- Based on (pre)configured periodicity [3] [7] [29] [30]
		- Based on detection of resource conflict [5] [12] [13] [16] [20] [26] [28] [29] [32] [35]
		- When the coordination information is updated for UE-B [7]
		- Based on decision in higher layer [7] [20]
		- Based on congestion status [13]
		- Based on distance between UE-A and UE-B [17] [24] [26] [29]
		- Based on RSRP measurement [24]
* How UE-A sends ”A set of resources” to UE-B, including container used for carrying it, implicitly or explicitly or both
	+ Container
		- SCI format 1-A [1] [24] [26] [29]
		- 2nd SCI format [1] [2] [3] [13] [14] [18] [24] [26] [27] [29] [33] [36]
		- MAC CE [7] [14] [20] [29] [33] [36]
		- PC5-RRC [2] [19] [20] [33] [36]
		- PSFCH format [2] [12] [14] [18] [20] [28] [32]
	+ Retransmission of the inter-UE coordination information
	+ Further consideration on whether shared or dedicated resource is used for inter-UE coordination signaling [8] [32]
* How/when/whether UE-B receives “A set of resources” and takes it into account in the resource selection for its own transmission
	+ Whether UE-B can skip sensing operation
		- UE-B does not perform its own sensing operation
		- UE-B performs its own sensing operation [7] [24]
	+ How UE-B performs resource (re)selection procedure upon receiving the inter-UE coordination information
		- Combine UE-B’s sensing results and resource set provided from UE-A [2] [3] [7] [13] [14] [20] [21] [22] [24] [25] [26] [28] [31][4]
		- Use resource set provided from UE-A without a consideration of UE-B’s sensing results [2] [3] [13] [21] [22] [25] [28] [31]
		- UE-B performs retransmission on the already selected resource(s) [32]
		- UE-B reselect all or a subset of its own selected resource(s) [2] [7] [10] [12] [20] [28] [31] [32] [35]
		- It is up to UE-B how to use it [6] [27]
	+ Cast type of UE-B that can use inter-UE coordination information
		- Unicast [2] [3] [5] [6] [7] [12] [13] [14] [16] [17] [19][25] [26] [27] [31] [33] [36][4]
		- Groupcast with HARQ-ACK feedback Option 1 [5] [6] [7] [12] [13] [14] [16] [17] [19][22] [27] [31] [32] [33] [36]
		- Groupcast with HARQ-ACK feedback Option 2 [2] [3] [5] [6] [7] [12] [13] [14] [16] [17] [19][22] [25] [27] [31] [33] [36]
		- Broadcast [6] [7] [12] [14] [16] [17] [22] [31] [33]
	+ Validity check of the received inter-UE coordination information at UE-B side
		- Based on distance between UE-A and UE-B [7] [13] [14]
		- Based on RSRP from UE-A to UE-B [7] [13] [14]
		- Based on information about target UE of the inter-UE coordination information [7]
		- Based on whether the indicated resource set is inside UE-B’s selection window [7] [13]
* Others
	+ Further consideration of using a single signaling to transmit one or multiple “set of resources” to multiple of UEs [2] [14] [22]
	+ Further consideration on the case when UE-B receives multiple inter-UE coordination information from one or multiple UE-A(s) [6] [7] [13] [33]
	+ Further consideration of congestion control for inter-UE coordination signaling [7] [29]
	+ Further consideration on the unmonitored slot at UE-B side [7] [14]
	+ Additional inter-UE coordination schemes do not show noticeable gain when practical evaluation assumptions are considered [11]
	+ Further consideration of using inter-UE coordination for UE with limited RX capability [12]
	+ Further consideration on the impact on Rel-16 UE sharing the same resource pool with UEs using inter-UE coordination operation [23] [29]
	+ Further consideration of retransmission of inter-UE coordination signaling [29]
	+ Further consideration on SL DRX to determine “A set of resources” at UE-A side [34]
1. **Reference**
2. R1-2100047 Views on resource allocation enhancements for sidelink communication FUTUREWEI
3. R1-2100142 Inter-UE coordination in mode 2 of NR sidelink OPPO
4. R1-2101941 Inter-UE coordination in sidelink resource allocation Huawei, HiSilicon
5. R1-2100352 Discussion on feasibility and benefits for mode 2 enhancements CATT, GOHIGH
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