**[103-e-NR-Rel-16-V2X-05] Email discussion/approval regarding indication/derivation of TDD configuration.**

* **Issue SY-1-1: TDD configuration derivation**
* **Issue SY-1-2: TDD configuration for OoC UEs**

**till 10/29, with a potential CR by 11/4 – Teng (CATT)**

For the discussion on SL SYNC in this meeting, companies are encouraged to follow the steps:

* 10/26-10/27: 1st round to discuss the technical details.
* 10/27-10/28: 2nd round to discuss the proposal based on the discussion and contributions.
* 10/28-10/29: Conclusion for consensus.
* Till 11/4: CR after the consensus is reached.

**Issue SY 1-1 TDD configuration derivation**

This issue was discussed during last meeting but did not reach any consensus. The uncertainty part is whether the TDD configuration derivation can be aligned between Tx side and Rx side. Some companies thought it can be avoided by network implementation, while some other companies proposed to have further enhancement on the derivation equations to guarantee the alignment. During last meeting, the following potential options as candidates were discussed. The discussion during this meeting can start with the following options.

Based on Round 1 discussion, the 3 options are updated as follows, and more companies are added to support the corresponding option. Option 1 is agreeable by majority companies but 2 companies still have concerns on the first sentence that how the same UL slots understanding aligned between InC UEs and OoC UEs. Option 2 is similar to the second sentence of option1. Option 3 is to be considered as too restricted by majority companies and one company also thinks the ambiguous issue does not exist. Please provide your further views in Round 2 table.

The option 1 is considered with too strong restrictions because of the first sentence, and the second sentence seems more acceptable by companies. Option 2 is changed with red words: Sharp has a good explanation that it should be InC/OoC UEs instead of Tx/Rx UEs; the field name *sl-TDD-Config* in PSBCH is also added. Option 3 is still considered as too restricted similar with option 1. I would like to suggest taking Option 2 as a consensus, which has the least restriction on the design of TDD configuration. However, as ZTE mentioned, option 2 violate the WA in RAN1#100-e. Accepting Option 2 does not violate the WA, since it is about the case that InC UEs and OoC UEs communication.

The situation is not changed since the first round of discussion, and proponents for different options cannot be convinced each other. I also understand ZTE’s view that specification modification work load should also be considered as one of the consequence of the discussion on this issue. However, my suggestion is to down select one of the options and prepare the corresponding CR if it is really needed. Furthermore, proponents can also consider/provide the potential CR to each option. I would like to keep the 3 options at this stage, but I still suggest to companies being flexible by considering a compromised solution to this issue.

Based on the third round discussion, I can clearly see that Option 1 has the smallest impact on the current spec, which means NW implementation can guarantee the ambiguous issue not happening and no spec change is needed. However, ZTE has different understanding on the current spec description of the TDD derivation. Since companies standing for each option will not compromise, I would like to suggest taking the majority view by agreeing with option 1. According to majority view, NW can help to eliminate the ambiguous issue, and accept this option does not need spec change on TDD configuration / derivation.

* **Option 1**: For TDD configuration carried in PSBCH, the ambiguous issue between InC and OoC UEs can be eliminated up to network implementation. For TDD configuration for resource pool determination, *sl-TDD-Config* in PSBCH is used for OOC UE, if the UE selected a SyncRef UE.
* **Option 2**: InC UEs and OoC UEs use the same UL slots resources calculated for or indicated by *sl-TDD-Config* in PSBCH for resource pool determination.
* **Option 3**: To restrict the number of UL slots configured in tdd-UL-DL-ConfigCommon as integer multiple of granularity *w*.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Options** | **Supportive companies** |
| Option 1 | [LGE] [Ericsson] [Huawei, HiSilicon] [OPPO] [Samsung] [Nokia] |
| Option 2 | [vivo] [Qualcomm] [Sharp] [CMCC] |
| Option 3 | [ZTE, Sanechips] |

***FL proposal:***

* ***For TDD configuration carried in PSBCH, the ambiguous issue between InC and OoC UEs can be eliminated up to network implementation. For TDD configuration for resource pool determination, sl-TDD-Config in PSBCH is used for OOC UE, if the UE selected a SyncRef UE.***
  + ***No spec change is needed.***

**Round 3 comments 10/28-10/30**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| vivo | Support FL’s proposal in general. However, the sentence seems incomplete, it is not clear what purpose the IC and OoC UE use SL-TDD-Config in PSBCH for…   * **Option 2**: InC UEs and OoC UEs use the same UL slots resources calculated for or indicated by *sl-TDD-Config* in PSBCH for resource pool determination. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Apart from the concrete impacts to 214 mentioned in our previous round of comments, we believe 331 and 213 may also need to be adapted accordingly with the FL proposal. We sincerely hope the proponents could re-consider what agreeing to this could end up with in a maintenance phase.  We would appreciate an alternative FL proposal with all the options and relevant spec. impact listed under each option. |
| CMCC | Sorry for late reply and we support FL’s proposal since both option 1 and option 3 will put strong limitation to operator’s deployment. |
| Samsung | The current description of each option is not clear to understand. In our understanding, intension of Option1 is no spec change and leave it to network implementation. On the other hand, Option 2 and 3 are with spec change. Based on our understanding, we reformulated options as below.  Option1: No spec change is needed for sidelink TDD configuration  Option2: Spec change is necessary for sidelink TDD configuration   * Option 2-1: Only SL-TDD-Config (PSBCH TDD configuration) is allowed * Option 2-2: restricted configuration on tdd-UL-DL-ConfigCommon   Reminding that this is maintenance phase and to minimize spec impact, we support Option 1. |
| LGE | We also think the option 1 has the minimum spec impact, but as a compromise suggested by FL, if such a spec impact is allowed, we’re also ok with the option 2. Regarding Samsung’s reformulation above, TDD configuration for resource pool determination is missing in both options. |
| Ericsson | We are not supportive of the current FL proposal. We support Option 1. In our view, Option 1 works and keeps the standardization impact to the minimum leaving the solution up to network implementation. |

**Round 2 comments 10/27-10/28**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| FL | For Option1, ZTE has concerns that how the InC and OoC guarantee the same understanding on the UL slots, because it cannot be realized according to current specification. Besides, Qualcomm think Opt 1 and Opt 3 both have too restriction on the TDD configuration.  For Option 2, I change it by following the suggestion from Qualcomm. Vivo’s change suggestion is similar with the second sentence of option 1, so I think vivo can also accept the current option 2.  For Option 3, Sharp thinks the issue does not exist according to Qualcomm and Sharp’s analysis. Besides, Opt 3 does have restrictions on TDD configuration for InC and OoC UEs. |
| Qualcomm | In Option 1, to address the issue, the gNB needs to restrict TDD configuration to a multiple of w (Option 3). Is there a way to implement Option 1 without restricting the configuration? If the network doesn’t restrict configuration, then transmissions would not be decodable by OOC UEs, which would cause collisions and degrade performance.  Option 2 takes any value from TDD and uses a set of slots that could be signaled in PSBCH. I believe this would be the same set of slots that would result from Option 3, but without any restrictions on the network. |
| Sharp | First of all, just to clarify our comments in round 1: by “with the above, the issue as claimed in Option 3 does not exist” we mean “with Option 2, the issue as claimed in Option 3 does not exist”.  We share the views from Qualcomm on Option 1/2/3. In our view the shared SL/UL case is normally introduced by adding the support of SL functionalities to an existing NR Uu cell, in which case it is difficult to change the already deployed NR Uu TDD UL/DL configurations (if the number of UL slots is not an integer multiple of w) just to add the support of SL.  And, although we support Option 2 in general, on the detailed description of Option 2, it is a little unclear why there is a restriction that the InC UE is TX UE and the OoC UE is RX UE? In our view, it can be described in a more general manner, i.e. “both InC UE and OoC UE use the same UL slots resources calculated for or indicated by PSBCH”. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We have the same understanding as Qualcomm for option 1 (i.e., *In Option 1, to address the issue, the gNB needs to restrict TDD configuration to a multiple of w (Option 3)*). Under the current specification, if the common understanding is the same TDD pattern is desirable to be guaranteed between InC UE and OoC UE, the UL slots configured in *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigCommon* should be restricted to the integer multiple w. Since this restriction is necessary, it can be seen as an assumption or an expectation by UE(given we've agreed during the last meeting it's up to UE implementation to derive the SL slots for Rx UE). From this view point, we think this restriction should be embodied in specification, but not NW implementation. There may be many forms to embody this restriction in specification. In our view, one simple way is that the following two equations are included in specification.  For option 2, it violates the spirit of the following agreement in Physical layer structure for sidelink in RAN1 #100-e meeting which means that all slots having at least Y-th, (Y+1)-th, ....., (Y+X-1)-th symbols in TDD-UL-DL-ConfigCommon will be regarded as potential sidelink slots.   |  | | --- | | Agreements:  For derivation of the set of slots to be included in the resource pool, the baseline is the derivation with bitmap and periodicity based on Subclause 14.1.5 of TS36.213 with the following modifications.   * FFS: Periodicity and L\_bitmap value * The slot index is relative to slot#0 of the radio frame corresponding to SFN 0 of the serving cell if serving cell timing reference is in use, or DFN 0 otherwise * The following procedure is used.   + The set includes all the slots except the following slots:     - Slots in which SLSS resource is configured,     - **(Working assumption)** slots not having at least Y-th, (Y+1)-th, ....., (Y+X-1)-th symbols in a slot semi-statically for UL as indicated in TDD-UL-DL-ConfigCommon, where       * X is sl-LengthSymbols       * Y is sl-StartSymbol     - **(Working assumption)** reserved slots which are determined by the similar steps in Subclause 14.1.5 of TS36.213 |   Furthermore, it is not reasonable to let the InC UEs which has no need to transmit S-SSB to calculate the candidate SL slots according to the complicated procedure in 213 as mentioned by Sharp.  Moreover, we would like to say the restriction issue has been debated previously over whether to introduce a dedicated signaling to derive the SL slots for both InC and OoC UE. At that time, it was agreed that we still stick to the current RAN2 spec. that the slots are derived in TDD-UL-DL-ConfigCommon and translated via sl-TDD-Config in S-SSB to OoC UE. Option 2 may be considered at that time if proposed but unfortunately we are in maintenance phase and we really don't think there is room for a solution requiring major changes to 214/213 and 331 over the same restriction argument. |
|  |  |

**Round 1 comments 10/26-10/27**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| LGE | First of all, based on the FL summary document (R1-2009241), option 1 should also include TDD configuration derivation for resource pool determination. So we suggest to change the sentence for option 1 as follows:  **Option 1**: For TDD configuration carried in PSBCH, the ambiguous issue between InC and OoC UEs can be eliminated up to network implementation. For TDD configuration for resource pool determination, sl-TDD-Config in PSBCH is used for OOC UE, if the UE selected a SyncRef UE.  The reason for supporting option 1 is as follows. Regarding the SL slot derivation from sl-TDD-Config, from the beginning of the relevant discussions, it was a common understanding that only when a group indicated by sl-TDD-Config is composed of UL slots, it is counted as sl-TDD-Config. If there is any DL or flexible slots in a group, those slots may cause unwanted interference to DL communication, which was not acceptable. As a result, if there are UL slots less than the grouping factor, those UL slots are not used for SL slots. With this understanding, there is no ambiguity in current specification regarding the SL slot derivation from sl-TDD-Config.  When RX UE is out-of-coverage UE, S-SSB needs to be used to support synchronization and the same understanding on the TDD pattern. To be specific, the in-coverage UE transmits synchronization signals based on DL slot timing of the serving cell and PSBCH containing TDD pattern based on the higher layer parameter tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon of the serving cell. Once the RX UE successfully receives S-SSB, both UEs can be synchronized each other and have the same understanding on the TDD pattern. As a result, if the OOC UE has selected SyncRef UE, sl-TDD-Config provided by the received PSBCH is used to derive the TDD pattern, to which a SL resource pool bit map is applied. |
| vivo | First of all, we agree with LG that if a OoC UE selects a SyncRef UE as its sync source, it should use the SL-TDD-Config received from the sync source for pool derivation. This is exactly how an OoC UE who synchronized to a SyncRef UE derives the resource pool in LTE, and we think NR should follow this principle. The second sentence in option1 proposed by LG is fine (i.e., *For TDD configuration for resource pool determination, sl-TDD-Config in PSBCH is used for OOC UE, if the UE selected a SyncRef UE*.).  Secondly, for the IC UE, there may be a mismatch between the UL slots indicated by TDD-ConfigurationCommon in SIB1 and that based on the derived PSBCH, in this case, if IC UE determines pool based on the resource indicated by SIB1 while OoC UE uses the SL-TDD-Config transmitted by the IC UE, they will fail to communicate with each other. Either limiting the number of UL slots in SIB1 to multiples of w or allowing IC UE to use SL-TDD-Config in its PSBCH for pool determination could solve this problem, and we prefer the latter one because it does not impose further constraints on the Uu configuration. So we revised the option2 as below   * **Option 2**: For TDD configuration for resource pool determination, *sl-TDD-Config* in PSBCH is used for IC UE and OOC UE that selected a SyncRef UE. |
| Ericsson | We are supportive of Option 1. If a UE is in-coverage the potential ambiguity between the TDD configuration between in-coverage and out-of-coverage UEs can be taken care by the network implementation. For out-of-coverage UEs, they should follow the configuration carried in the PSBCH if SyncRefUE has been selected. Therefore, there is no need to have specification impact. |
| Qualcomm | We support Option 2 with some text changes described here.  For Option 1 to work, it would be a restriction on TDD signaling as in Option 3.  While Option 3 works, we think Option 2 is the most robust and flexible as it ensures communications between in-coverage and out-of-coverage UEs without placing restrictions on Uu TDD configuration. Some wording update is needed to state the value derived for PSBCH would be used instead of only the value indicated in PSBCH to cover the case where the UE has not received PSBCH.  **Option 2**: Tx UEs (InC) and Rx UEs (OoC) use the same UL slots resources calculated for or indicated by PSBCH. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | **We can live we option 1 and option 2 and slightly prefer to option 1.**  For sl-TDD-Config, 38.331 as stated that the content of sl-TDD-Config is the same tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon if UE is in coverage. The issue from the beginning is that, even indicated by SIB1, the tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon can be changed which up to the network configuration and operation consideration. While for the purely OoC UE, only pre-configuration can be relied which cannot updated as quick as signaling in SIB1. Hence the PSBCH is used to indicate the sl-TDD-Config to align with InC UE, if the OoC UE can hear InC UE.  For option 2, we all know that this issue only occur in shared TDD band/carriers, for this band/carriers, one simplest way is to set the InC and OoC UE has the same TDD configuration. But this will put strong limitation to the operators since as pointed above the tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon cannot be updated if this carrier is also used for ITS service. |
| OPPO | **Option 1.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the second sentence in option 1 added by LGE, we are fine.  For TDD configuration for resource pool determination, sl-TDD-Config in PSBCH is used for OOC UE, if the UE selected a SyncRef UE.  But for the first sentence in option 1, it seems to be unclear how to realize the same understanding on the TDD pattern between InC UE and OoC UE. From the sentence that “if there are UL slots less than the grouping factor, those UL slots are not used for SL slots.” , it is understood that only the UL slots equals to the grouping factor configured in ***tdd-UL-DL-ConfigCommon*** can be indicated in PSBCH. It obviously belongs to option 2. In our view, if the common understanding on the TDD pattern should be guaranteed between InC UE and OoC UE, the UL slots configured in tdd-UL-DL-ConfigCommon equal to the integer multiple w should be ensured. to reach this target, the following two equations should be included in spec accordingly.  For option 2, we agree the analysis from vivo, but It does not accord with the current spec description in section 8 in 38.214 as following. This would make the SL resource pools between InC UE and OoC UE different.   |  | | --- | | The set of slots that may belong to a sidelink resource pool is denoted by where  -  - the slot index is relative to slot#0 of the radio frame corresponding to SFN 0 of the serving cell or DFN 0,  - the set includes all the slots except the following slots,  - slots in which S-SS/PSBCH block (S-SSB) is configured,  - slots in each of which at least one of *Y-th*, *(Y+1)-th*, …, *(Y+X-1)-th* OFDM symbols are not semi-statically configured as UL as per the higher layer parameter *TDD-UL-DL-ConfigCommon*, where *Y* and *X* are set by the higher layer parameters *sl-StartSymbol* and *sl-LengthSymbols*, respectively.  ... | |
| Samsung | We support Option 1. |
| Sharp | We have a similar view as Qualcomm.   * For InC UE, for determination of “UL” slots, always interpret *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigCommon* in the form of *sl-TDD-Config* in PSBCH (i.e. the UE first derives “*sl-TDD-Config*” from *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigCommon* as specified in 213, and then follows the indication in the derived “*sl-TDD-Config*”, rather than in the received *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigCommon*), regardless of whether the UE transmits S-SSB or not. * For OoC UE, always follow the configuration it received from another UE (e.g. *sl-TDD-Config* in PSBCH), if any.   With the above, the issue as claimed in Option 3 does not exist. |
| Nokia | We support Opt 1. |

**Issue SY 1-2 TDD configuration for OoC UEs**

1 company proposed to consider the case when OoC UEs to obtain TDD configuration information, since there is no network for OoC UEs to receive *tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon*. A pre-configuration parameter is defined and used when UEs are OoC to derive TDD information.

According to the Round 1 views feedback, majority companies agree with the TP proposed by LG, and the following TP can be considered as a consensus.

***FL proposal:***

* ***Adopting the following TP for TS 38.213.***

--------------------------------------------------Start of draft TP of TS 38.213----------------------------------------------

16.1 Synchronization procedures

--------------------------------------------------<Unchanged parts omitted>----------------------------------------------

For transmission of an S-SS/PSBCH block, a UE includes a bit sequence in the PSBCH payload to indicate *sl-TDD-Config* and provide a slot format over a number of slots, where

- if *pattern1* is provided by *sl-TDD-Configuration-r16 or tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon*; if both *pattern1* and *pattern2* are provided by *sl-TDD-Configuration-r16* *or tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon* as described in Clause 11.1

- are determined based on

- in *pattern1* as described in Table 16.1-1 for

- in *pattern1* and *in pattern2* as described in Table 16.1-2 for

where and are as described in Clause 11.1

- are the 7th to 1st LSBs of , respectively

- for ,

- for ,

where

- is the number of symbols in a slot: if *cyclicPrefix-SL* = “ECP”; else,

- is 1 if , else is 0

- is 1 if , else is 0

- is the sidelink starting symbol index provided by *sl-StartSymbol*

- is the granularity of slots indication as described in Table 16.1-2

- , , , , are the parameters of *TDD-UL-ConfigurationCommon* as described in Clause 11.1, or the parameters of *sl-TDD-Configuration-r16* as defined in [9.3, TS 38.331]

- corresponds to SL SCS as defined in [4, TS 38.211]

--------------------------------------------------<Unchanged parts omitted>----------------------------------------------

--------------------------------------------------End of draft TP of TS 38.213----------------------------------------------

**Round 2 comments 10/27-10/28**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| FL | The above TP proposed by LGE is acceptable by majority companies.  Vivo suggests adding more specific indication wording for the parameter definitions. From my perspective based on the current responses from the companies, the current version of TP is fine and clear. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Round 1 comments 10/26-10/27**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| LGE | In Section 16.1 of 38.213 spec, there is no description how to derive sl-TDD-Config carried by PSBCH when OOC UE has no SyncRef UE and becomes a source of synchronization. In this case, for OOC UE’s transmission of an S-SS/PSBCH block, *sl-TDD-Configuration* in *SL-PreconfigurationNR* can be used for sl-TDD-Config generation. Suggest TP is as follows.   |  | | --- | | 16.1 Synchronization procedures  <Unchanged parts omitted>  For transmission of an S-SS/PSBCH block, a UE includes a bit sequence in the PSBCH payload to indicate *sl-TDD-Config* and provide a slot format over a number of slots, where  - if *pattern1* is provided by *sl-TDD-Configuration or tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon*; if both *pattern1* and *pattern2* are provided by *sl-TDD-Configuration* *or tdd-UL-DL-ConfigurationCommon* as described in Clause 11.1  - are determined based on  - in *pattern1* as described in Table 16.1-1 for  - in *pattern1* and *in pattern2* as described in Table 16.1-2 for  where and are as described in Clause 11.1  - are the 7th to 1st LSBs of , respectively  - for ,  - for ,  where  - is the number of symbols in a slot: if *cyclicPrefix-SL* = “ECP”; else,  - is 1 if , else is 0  - is 1 if , else is 0  - is the sidelink starting symbol index provided by *sl-StartSymbol*  - is the granularity of slots indication as described in Table 16.1-2  - , , , , are the parameters of TDD-UL-ConfigurationCommon as described in Clause 11.1, or the parameters of sl-TDD-Configuration as defined in [9.3, TS 38.331]  - corresponds to SL SCS as defined in [4, TS 38.211] | |
| Vivo | We also proposed a description regarding the PBSCH content derivation in the OoC case in our paper R1-2008668.  The wording suggested by LG is generally fine. But the definition of , , , , for OoC case is not clear, we suggest completing the description as below  - , , , , are the parameters of TDD-UL-ConfigurationCommon as described in Clause 11.1, or are provided by *referenceSubcarrierSpacing*, *nrofUplinkSlots* in *pattern1*, *nrofUplinkSymbols* in *pattern1*, *nrofUplinkSlots* in *pattern2*, *nrofUplinkSymbols* in *pattern2* according to sl-TDD-Configuration as defined in [9.3, TS 38.331] |
| Ericsson | We are supportive of the current TP by LGE. The exact wording of the parameters of the TDD-UL-ConfigurationCommon can be left up to CR phase if needed. |
| Qualcomm | We’re ok with the text proposed by LG. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | We are supportive of the current TP by LGE. As stated in the SY1-1, this is natural way to derive sl-TDD-Config when OoC UE cannot detect PSBCH. |
| OPPO | We are fine with LGE’s text proposal |
| ZTE,Sanechips | OK |
| Samsung | We are generally O.K for LGE’s text proposal but ‘*sl-TDD-Configuration-r16’* needs to be used instead *of ‘sl-TDD-Configuration’* in order to align higher layer parameter. |
| Sharp | Fine with the TP from LGE. |
| Nokia | We are OK with LGE proposal. |