|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Clause | Comment | Rapp Response |
| OPPO | 16.9.x.2 | **This** should be applicable to all cases, rather than limited to “default SLRB is used for a QoS flow and the SL-CAPC of the default SLRB is not configured”  When the default SLRB is used for the QoS flow and the SL-CAPC of the default SLRB is not configured, the UE derives SL-CAPC directly from the table below for standardized PQI and **selects the lowest SL-CAPC priority level (highest SL-CAPC value) among the associated QoS flows**.  Xiaomi: We think the current wording from IDC correctly reflect the following agreement:  **SL CAPC when CAPC of the default SLRB is not configured (P1:4757)**  select the lowest CAPC priority level (highest CAPC value) among the associated QoS flows  is there any other case? |  |
|  |  | **It** is not always the case, but should limited to the case where “default SLRB is used for a QoS flow and the SL-CAPC of the default SLRB is not configured”  For non-standardized PQI, the UE may s**elect selects the SL-CAPC of the standardized PQI having the which best matches the QoS characteristics of the non-standardized PQI based on the closest PDB**.  Xiaomi: same comment as OPPO. |  |
| Xiaomi | 16.9.x.4 | Typo “intendeds” should be “intends” |  |
| Xiaomi | 16.9.x.4 | the responding UE’s destination/source ID is not critical clear, should be “destination/source ID of PSSCH/PSCCH transmission from responding UE” .  similarly the responding UE’s destination ID should be “destination ID of PSSCH/PSCCH transmission from responding UE” |  |
| Xiaomi | 16.9.y | According to the LS from SA2, not sure if the following sentence also holds for BC/GC. Prefer to have editor notes for BC/GC. Also not sure if service should be reflected in AS spec?  **“The carrier(s) that can be used for transmitting data are configured by the V2X layer per service and QoS flow”.** |  |