|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Clause | Comment | Rapp Response |
| Xiaomi | 6.3.5 | Field description of sl-LBT-FailureRecoveryConfigConfigures parameters used for detection of sidelink consistent ~~sidelink~~ LBT failures for operation with shared spectrum channel access, as specified in TS 38.321 [3] | done |
| Xiaomi | 6.3.5 | FD of sl-FreqInfoToAddModListExt is added to sl-FreqInfoToReleaseList Seems typo should be added after sl-FreqInfoToAddModList | corrected |
| Xiaomi | 6.3.5 | FD of sl-FreqInfoToAddModList should clarify that In this release, only one entry can be configured in sl-FreqInfoToAddModListThe sentence still applies to sl-FreqInfoToAddModListCan not be directly deleted.  | Note that this is for connected UE, I thought different from SIB/Preconfiguration, this dedicated configuration is provided only after acquiring UE capability, so no backwards compatibility concern and then no need to stick to the old restriction.  |
| Xiaomi | 6.3.5 | sl-FreqInfoToReleaseListDo we need sl-FreqInfoToReleaseListExt? | No, since list size can be kept (as 8).Note this extension follows R2 guidance of list extension in A4.3.6. |
| Xiaomi | 6.3.5 | FD of sl-RLC-BearerToReleaseList, sl-RLC-BearerToReleaseListSizeExtShould have similar sentence that “The UE shall consider entries in sl-RLC-BearerToReleaseList and sl-RLC-BearerToReleaseListSizeExt as a single list, i.e. an entry created using sl-RLC-BearerToAddModList and in sl-RLC-BearerToAddModListSizeExt can be deleted using sl-RLC-BearerToReleaseList or sl-RLC-BearerToReleaseListSizeExt | I inherited the wording style from ***controlResourceSetToAddModListSizeExt******spatialRelationInfoToAddModListExt***but indeed there is a similar sentence in***switchTriggerToReleaseListSizeExt***so added as suggested. |
| Xiaomi | 6.3.5 | sl-PDCP-configwe need to have indication to enable PDCP duplication? moreThanOneRLC SEQUENCE { primaryPath SEQUENCE { cellGroup CellGroupId OPTIONAL, -- Need R logicalChannel LogicalChannelIdentity OPTIONAL -- Need R }, ul-DataSplitThreshold UL-DataSplitThreshold OPTIONAL, -- Cond SplitBearer pdcp-Duplication BOOLEAN OPTIONAL -- Need R } OPTIONAL, -- Cond MoreThanOneRLC  | But then would lead to another open issue that how to define a bearer which is split (two-legs) but without duplication? I thought it was not supported in LTE? |
| Ericsson | Cover page | The reason of change, and summary of changes need to be updated | done |
| Ericsson | 6.3.1 | In SIB 12, sl-FreqInfoListSizeExt-v18xy , Whether v18xy or r18 would depend on whether the new list contains the legacy carrier. if the new list contains the legacy carrier, the new list should use r18 as suffix, otherwise, use v18xy. Could rapp update the FD to reflect this? i.e., whether the new list contains the legacy carrier? | Thanks for this comment!The extension method here follows the guidance in A.4.3.6, the intention is to extend the legacy list in a way of "only the size of the list is extended", as a NCE extension, v18xy should be used.For the change in FD, after searching in 331, I failed to find similar part of "whether the new list contains the legacy carrier" in FD, so tends to not do it for this list specifically. Can wait for more comment from other companies.[Huawei] My understanding on Ericsson's comments is that, with "-r18" suffix, we are not to use NCE extension with only size extension but a new list including all carriers (legacy carrier or not)? Not sure which approach is better, "-v1800" approach would require gNB configure two lists to R18 UE while "-r18" approach require gNB only configure one list (the new list) to R18 UE with restriction e.g. the first row is legacy carrier. The difference seems rather small.  |
| Ericsson | 6.3.5 | ***sl-FreqInfoToAddModList, sl-FreqInfoToAddModListExt***This field indicates the NR sidelink communication configuration on some carrier frequency (ies) to add and/or modify. If the network includes *sl-FreqInfoToAddModListExt*, it includes the same number of entries, and listed in the same order, as in *sl-FreqInfoToAddModList.*“If the network includes *sl-FreqInfoToAddModListExt*, it includes the same number of entries, and listed in the same order, as in *sl-FreqInfoToAddModList”.*, where does this restriction text come from? Or in other words, is this restriction text really needed? | This is to follow the guidance of A4.3.6, where it is required that "The field description table should indicate that the parallel list contains the same number of entries, and in the same order, as the original list." |
| Ericsson | 6.3.5 | *SL-FreqSelectionConfig*The IE *SL-FreqSelectionConfig* specifies the configuration information for carrier selection for NR sidelink transmission using UE autonomous resource selection. ***SL-FreqSelectionConfig* information element**-- ASN1STARTSL-FreqSelectionConfig-r18 ::= SEQUENCE { priorityList-r18 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..8)) OF SL-Priority-r18, threshCBR-FreqReselection-r18 SL-CBR-r16 OPTIONAL, -- Need R threshCBR-FreqKeeping-r15 SL-CBR-r16 OPTIONAL -- Need R}SL-Priority-r18 ::= INTEGER (1..8)-- ASN1STOP1. All fields in this IE are better to be named as "sl-"
2. For the FD, Indicates the CBR threshold to determine A better wording suggestion, "based on which UE determines"
 | done |
| Ericsson | 6.3.5 | *SL-PDCP-Config*The IE *SL*-*PDCP-Config* is used to set the configurable PDCP parameters for a sidelink radio bearer.***SL-PDCP-Config* information element**-- ASN1START-- TAG-SL-PDCP-CONFIG-STARTSL-PDCP-Config-r16 ::= SEQUENCE { sl-DiscardTimer-r16 ENUMERATED {ms3, ms10, ms20, ms25, ms30, ms40, ms50, ms60, ms75, ms100, ms150, ms200, ms250, ms300, ms500, ms750, ms1500, infinity} OPTIONAL, -- Cond Setup sl-PDCP-SN-Size-r16 ENUMERATED {len12bits, len18bits} OPTIONAL, -- Cond Setup2 sl-OutOfOrderDelivery ENUMERATED { true } OPTIONAL, -- Need R ..., [[ primaryPath SL-RLC-BearerConfigIndex-r18 OPTIONAL -- Cond MoreThanOneRLC ]]The field needs to be named as "sl-PrimaryPath"? | done |
| Ericsson | 6.3.5 | ***sl-RLC-BearerConfigIndex***The index of the RLC bearer configuration. If the field *sl-RLC-BearerConfigIndex-v18xy* is present, the UE shall ignore the *sl-RLC-BearerConfigIndex-r16* field (without suffix).The need code is Need s, UE actions needs to be defined if the field is absent | Following the guidance in 331, only "Field description should indicate that if the elementId-vNxy is present, the elementId (without suffix) is ignored" is needed to justify the need-S code. Please let me know if there is similar example in the legacy for the list ID extension that clarifying the UE action for need-S reason. And we can wait for other companies' view here |
| Huawei | 5.8.9.3 | 1> Upon indication of consistent sidelink LBT failures for all RB sets from MAC entity: | "Upon" shall be "upon", small case. More importantly, some reference seems needed for "RB sets", would it be better with "... for all RB sets for a specific destination from MAC entity:" ?[Rapp] done |
| Huawei | 6.3.5  | *sl-RLC-BearerConfigIndex* | If the field sl-RLC-BearerConfigIndex-v18xy is present, the UE shall ignore the sl-RLC-BearerConfigIndex field (without suffix)."-r16" should not be included here, otherwise it is conflicting. [Rapp] corrected by removing “(without suffix)” |
| Huawei | 6.3.5 | The UE shall consider entries in *sl-RLC-BearerToAddModList* and in *sl-RLC-BearerToAddModListSizeExt* as a single list, i.e. an entry created using *sl-RLC-BearerToAddModList* can be modified using *sl-RLC-BearerToAddModListSizeExt* (or deleted using *sl-RLC-BearerToReleaseListSizeExt*) and vice-versa. | Question: sl-RLC-BearerToAddModList creates entries with small indexes (1-512), while sl-RLC-BearerToReleaseListSizeExt-v18xy is with large indexes (513-1024), how to understand that " an entry created using sl-RLC-BearerToAddModList can be deleted using sl-RLC-BearerToReleaseListSizeExt " ?[Rapp] this follows the list extension as guided in A 4.3.6, and the FD description was adopted as well in the similar list extension logically. Technically, since the sl-RLC-BearerToAddModList includes component of SL-RLC-BearerConfig-r16, where the new ID has been added (SL-RLC-BearerConfigIndex-v18xy), even if a component was added by the legacy addmod list, it can be deleted via the new release list. |
| Huawei | 6.3.5 | *MoreThanOneRLC* | This field is mandatory present upon Preconfiguration, SIB or RRC reconfiguration with setup of a PDCP entity for a radio bearer with more than one associated logical channel and upon RRC reconfiguration with the association of additional logical channels to the PDCP entity.Upon RRC reconfiguration when a PDCP entity is associated with multiple logical channels, this field is optionally present need M. Otherwise, this field is absent. Need R.The two highlighted parts are equivalent regarding condition "MoreThanOneRLC" however for one the field is mandatory and for another the field is optional? Would below revision work?This field is mandatory present upon Preconfiguration, SIB or RRC reconfiguration with setup of a PDCP entity for a radio bearer with more than one associated logical channel and upon RRC reconfiguration with the addition of logical channels to the PDCP entity.Upon RRC reconfiguration when a PDCP entity is already associated with multiple logical channels, this field is optionally present need M. Otherwise, this field is absent. Need R.[Rapp] the changed text aligns with my understanding, so revised accordingly.  |
| Huawei | for IE SL-Thres-RSRP-List  | A NR sidelink resource is excluded if the corresponding PSFCH transmission occasions overlap with resources indicated or reserved by the decoded EUTRA SCI in time domain and EUTRA PSSCH RSRP in the associated data resource is above the threshold defined by IE sl-NRPSFCH-EUTRA-ThresRSRP-List. A NR sidelink resource is excluded if it is indicated or reserved by the decoded EUTRA SCI and EUTRA PSSCH RSRP in the associated data resource is above the threshold defined by IE sl-NRPSSCH-EUTRA-ThresRSRP-List.  | There two sentences are redundant as they are stated in FD of sl-NRPSFCH-EUTRA-ThresRSRP-List and sl-NRPSSCH-EUTRA-ThresRSRP-List. [Rapp] Yet redundancy seems not a decisive point, if considering that, in case no change is made, the current description of SL-Thres-RSRP-List-r16 (now also applicable to the two new IEs as clarified below), now only defined for the legacy case, so rigorously, the current definition is limited/wrong. Also this section is about definition of IE " SL-Thres-RSRP-List", not about these two fields. [rapp] no since the SL-Thres-RSRP-List-r16 are also used by the two new IEs. |
| Huawei | 9.3  | sl-PreconfigFreqInfoListSizeEx-v18xy | "t" is missing in "...SizeEx-v18xy"[Rapp] Corrected. |
| Huawei | 9.X | Radio information related to Tx profile | I understand the motivation to have a clean slate approach on Tx profile for SL-CA however the current "double Tx profile" implementation could be anyway confusing? After previous discussion and change on sl-TxProfileList, I think there are no issues with at least current SL-TxProfileList-r17.Type SL-TxProfile-r17 can be understood as independent of IE SL-PreconfigurationNR and is used by e.g. CT spec for SL DRX without issues based on their LS. The below implementation would also work for SL-CA Tx profile? SL-TxProfile-r17 ::= ENUMERATED {drx-Compatible, drx-Incompatible, ca-backwardsCompatible-v18xy, ca-backwardsIncompatible-v18xy, spare4, spare3,spare2, spare1}This simple implementation with only two parameters is what in our mind when it is said SL-CA Tx profile is easy to implement?[Rapp] firstly, there is a tech issue in the way suggested by Huawei, i.e., it means upper layer would only indicate one value of the four (drx-Compatible, drx-Incompatible, ca-backwardsCompatible-v18xy, ca-backwardsIncompatible-v18xy), while rapp understand the indication of DRX-related tx profile and CA-related tx profile would be both necessary, and thus should be independent. [Huawei-V07]There shall be no issue if we use Tx profile list for one destination associating with multiple Tx profile values e.g. "CA compatible"+"SL DRX compatible". The enumerated values for one IE shouldn't be necessarily mutually exclusive, otherwise R17 Txprofile only have room for two values, no room for spare values for extension. [Rapp] For the “one destination associating with multiple Tx profile values”, it will bring more specification effort, since that we need to somewhat restrict the “multiple tx profile” should be actually that one value from the two r17 codepoints and two from the r18 codepoints, but defining the two as separate r17 and r18 definition would be clearer. Furthermore, as clarified, using SL-TxProfile-r17 will inherit the problematic Tx profile list SL-TxProfileList-r17 issue since R17. What is the reason that even thought we have identified the problem of SL-TxProfileList-r17, but still would like to keep using it now, when we have the chance to start a cleaner definition?Secondly, rapp understand the reason that we did not change r17 tx profile is not because it is tech correct, but more due to legacy change concern, and the up-to-implementation usage of Tx profile list **coupled with R17 profile** is quite confusing, or in my view, wrong.sl-TxProfileList-r17 SL-TxProfileList-r17***sl-TxProfileList***List of one or multiple Tx profiles, indicating the compatibility of supporting SL DRX as specified in TS 38.321 [3]. It is up to the UE implementation whether/how to apply this field.Considering the two reasons, a clean implementation of R18 Tx profile is preferred. We can wait for the view from others. |
| vivo | 6.3.5 | The parameter used for sidelink consistent LBT failure is not consistently defined between RRC spec and MAC spec, which needs to be aligned. In RRC running CR: ***sl-LBT-FailureRecoveryConfig***In MAC running CR: ***sl-lbt-FailureRecoveryConfig***: | Following the naming rule of 331, it should be sl-LBT-FailureRecoveryConfig, but in general, it is business as usual to align the naming across spec:s, we can further check it in the coming meeting(s). |
| vivo | 6.4 | Redundant word “Plus” should be removed from the filed name. See in red as below: SL-RLC-BearerConfigIndex-v18xy ::= INTEGER (maxSL-LCID-~~Plus~~1-r18..maxSL-LCID-r18)maxSL-LCID-~~Plus~~1-r18 INTEGER ::= 513 -- Maximum number of RLC bearer for NR sidelink communication per UE without duplication -- plus 1 | The intention is to start from the legacy max LCID number + 1. |
| vivo | 9.X | Not sure why we need to define TX Profile in RRC? In Rel-17, TX profile is introduced to ensure compatibility for groupcast and broadcast communication between UEs supporting/not-supporting SL DRX functionality, but no TX Profile in RRC is introduced. Thus, we think that the section 9.X may not not needed.9.X Radio Information Related to TX ProfileThis clause specifies RRC information elements that are transferred in Tx Profile.– *SL-TxProfile*The IE *SL-TXProfile* includes the Tx profile information.***SL-TxProfile* information elements**-- ASN1START-- TAG-SL-TXPROFILE-STARTSL-TxProfile DEFINITIONS AUTOMATIC TAGS ::=SL-TxProfile-v18xy ::= ENUMERATED {backwardsCompatible, backwardsIncompatible, spare6, spare5, spare4, spare3, spare2, spare1}END-- TAG-SL-TXPROFILE-STOP-- ASN1STOP | It is not correct that “but no TX Profile in RRC is introduced”, we did introduce profile in RRC |
| CATT | 6.3.5 | [CATT\_Xiao] We think we need to first discuss whether SL duplication really needs distinction of primary leg vs. secondary leg introduced. In LTE V2X SL, this issue was intentionally discussed, but finally it was concluded as unnceassry to do such distinction on between primary and secondary. We saw the rationale inserted in the running CR by the Rapp, but anyway there has been no firm agreement on distinguishing primary leg and secondary leg; so we would like to discuss the need of it first in the upcoming meeting (either in RRC or PDCP open issue discussion). An EN on this aspect is preferred (e.g. “FFS whether we introduce a PDCP-duplication flag or using the sl-PrimaryLeg indication”). – *SL-PDCP-Config*The IE *SL*-*PDCP-Config* is used to set the configurable PDCP parameters for a sidelink radio bearer.***SL-PDCP-Config* information element**-- ASN1START-- TAG-SL-PDCP-CONFIG-STARTSL-PDCP-Config-r16 ::= SEQUENCE { sl-DiscardTimer-r16 ENUMERATED {ms3, ms10, ms20, ms25, ms30, ms40, ms50, ms60, ms75, ms100, ms150, ms200, ms250, ms300, ms500, ms750, ms1500, infinity} OPTIONAL, -- Cond Setup sl-PDCP-SN-Size-r16 ENUMERATED {len12bits, len18bits} OPTIONAL, -- Cond Setup2 sl-OutOfOrderDelivery ENUMERATED { true } OPTIONAL, -- Need R ..., [[ sl-primaryPath SL-RLC-BearerConfigIndex-r18 OPTIONAL -- Cond MoreThanOneRLC ]]}-- TAG-SL-PDCP-CONFIG-STOP-- ASN1STOP | Sure, EN can be added. (I was more thinking about the unicast case may lead to the usefulness of ROHC feedback as the control PDU) |