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# Introduction

This is the report of following at meeting offline discussion:

* [Post123][415][POS] SLPP TS update (Intel)

 Scope: Update TS 38.355 and endorse a version for the plenary including the agreements of this meeting.

 Intended outcome: Endorsed TS

 Deadline: Short (for RP) Friday Sept 1st 1000 UTC

Sept 1st 1000 UTC Deadline Short Post Email Discussions

#  Contact Information

Respondents to the email discussion are kindly asked to fill in the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Contact: Name (E-mail) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yinghao Guo |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Discussion

**Question 1: Please provide your comments on Draft TS 38.355 v1.0.0 if any.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo | 1. Clause 4.3.2: in the sentence below the highlighted part may better say “…by the same endpoint for the same location session …”

The sequence number shall be distinct for different SLPP messages sent in the same endpoint in the same location session (e.g., may start at zero in the first SLPP message and increase monotonically in each succeeding SLPP message).[Rapp] Updated in v011. Clause 4.3.2: in the sentence below the highlighted part can be removed since sequence number is mandatory present in ASN.1.

Otherwise (i.e., if the sequence number is different or if no sequence number was previously received or if no sequence number is included), the message shall be processed.[Rapp] Updated in v011. Clause 6.1: in the editor’s note below the highlighted part “a bit” should be removed. We expect significant changes from RAN1 input.

Editor's note The structure may be updated a bit based on RAN1 agreements/parameter list.[Rapp] Updated in v011. Clause 6.2.1: SLPP-MessageType can be removed since it is not used anymore.

[Rapp] Updated in v011. Clause 6.5: In CommonIEsRequestAssistanceData replace “CommonIEsProvideCapabilities” by "CommonIEsRequestAssistanceData".

[Rapp] Updated in v011. Clause 6.6: In Method-A-RequestAssistanceData replace “Method-A-ProvideCapabilities” by "Method-A-RequestAssistanceData".

[Rapp] Updated in v011. Clause 6.7: In Method-B-RequestAssistanceData replace “Method-B-ProvideCapabilities” by "Method-B-RequestAssistanceData".

[Rapp] Updated in v011. Clause 6.8: In Method-C-RequestAssistanceData replace “Method-C-ProvideCapabilities” by "Method-C-RequestAssistanceData".

[Rapp] Updated in v01 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It might be useful to capture the following as FFS in the editor’s NOTE in the draft spec* Definition of need code in sidelink between UEs and in UL/DL between UE and LMF
* Use of AddModList

[Rapp] We already captured it as . Do not see the need to add more details.Editor's note FFS on Need code (e.g. how to support no UL/DL), support of delta signalling, full configuration, import IE from LPP, setup/release. * Specifying both the transmit and receive procedure and the difference between UE/UE and UE/LMF as end points

[Rapp] this should be obviously 😊 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The following might not be correct. It should be that the sequence number used for different sessions of the same pair of end points are independent *============excerpted from text================**Sequence numbers used in the messages transmitted from different endpoint are independent (e.g., can be the same).*[Rapp] Same as LPP, “The sequence number shall be distinct for different SLPP messages sent by the same endpoint for the same location session (e.g., may start at zero in the first SLPP message and increase monotonically in each succeeding SLPP message).”, i.e. sequence number shall be unique for the messages from the same endpoint for the same session. But independent for different end points.*===========================================* |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Should be most recently. A ) is missing*==================excerpted from text====================**A receiver shall record the most recent received sequence number for each location session. If a message is received carrying the same sequence number as that last received for the associated location session, it shall be discarded. Otherwise (i.e., if the sequence number is different or if no sequence number was previously received, the message shall be processed.*[Rapp] based on Lenovo’s comments deleted “or if no sequence number was previously received” and add “)” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Has SA2 agreed that SLPP can be transmitted via NAS MO-LR? Is it 5GC-MO-LR or SL-Mo-LR?*==================excerpted from text============================**When an SLPP message is transported via a NAS MO-LR request, the message does not request an acknowledgement.*[Rapp] updated to SL-MO-LR |
| Qualcomm | (1)Cover Sheet:For the cover sheet of a TS presentation to TSG, there is a template which should normally be filled out ("TS/TR presentation to TSG cover sheet")?<https://www.3gpp.org/delegates-corner/meetings/meeting-document-templates>[Rapp] good comments. I will check MCC to see how to handle it. Draft TS:(2)4.3.2: "Sequence numbers used in the messages transmitted from different endpoint are independent (e.g., can be the same)"endpoint should be "endpoints".[Rapp] updated.(3)4.3.2: "Editor's note FFS on the support of broadcast/groupcast."It seems the whole section 4.3 is written for unicast only. Hence, this Note should be moved up to section 4.3. Probably all Editor's Notes in 4.3.2 should be moved under 4.3?[Rapp] updated.(4)4.3.3.1: "When an SLPP message is transported via a NAS MO-LR request, the message does not request an acknowledgement."heading style (visible in final view) should be normal style.Rapp] updated.Suggest adding an Editor's Note that this requires SA2 support for SLPP messages carried in MO-LR and/or SL-MO-LR.Rapp] Has changed MO-LR to SL-MO-LR since so far only SL-MO-LR is mentioned in SA2 specification. (5)4.3.4.1: "If still unacknowledged after that, the sender aborts all SLPP activity for the associated session."This seems unreasonable. Maybe the sender aborts all SLPP activity for this Endpoint (there should be more than one Endpoint in a session, regardless of the cast type). Rapp] Thanks, looks good to me. Updated(6)4.3.4.2: Step 4: "If the acknowledgement in step 4 is still not received after sending three retransmissions, Endpoint A shall abort all procedures and activity associated with SLPP support for the particular location session"Same as above. It seems not reasonable to abort the whole session if the ACK of just one UE is not received.Rapp] Thanks, looks good to me. Updated to “for this Endpoint B”(7)6.2.1:SLPP-Message ::= SEQUENCE {should be extensible. Otherwise, only the message body can be extended, but not the "header".Rapp] Added messageClassExtension SEQUENCE {}(8)Annex <x> should switch back to Portrait orientation.Rapp] Done |

# Summary

Based on the input from companies, we have the following proposals:
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