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# 1 Introduction

This is to report the result of the following email discussion after RAN2#111-e Meeting [1].

* [Post111-e][703][V2X] 37.324 corrections (CATT)

Discuss the need of changes proposed from R2-2006616 and R2-2007734. If the need is agreed, prepare agreeable 37.324 CR in R2-2008359. Note cover-page should be written well (with reasonable impact analysis). CR will be approved by email.

Deadline Short

The remainder of this document is organized to discuss the 1st correction from R2-2007734 ‎as the following. The discussions are in Section 2 and the conclusions are summarized in Section 3.

# 2 Discussion

## 2.1 SDAP Rx behaviour

The related proposal is available in the below table:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Tdoc | Proposals |
| ASUSTeK | R2-2007734‎ | 1. Change for PC5 QoS flow remapping in subclause 5.2.4:

**Option 1**: A NOTE is added in subclause 5.2.4 to indicate the agreement, i.e. “NOTE: SDAP Rx behaviour upon remapping is left to UE implementation for insequence delivery.”**Option 2**: After a PC5 QoS flow is remapped from the previously-mapped SL-DRB to the current SL-DRB, the UE shall not deliver the retrieved SDAP SDU to the upper layer until an End-Marker control PDU for the PC5 QoS flow is received. |

For the 1st change made by R2-2007734, it’s proposed to specify the SDAP Rx behaviour upon remapping for ‎insequence delivery‎ as following options:

**Option 1**: A NOTE is added in subclause 5.2.4 to indicate the agreement, i.e. “NOTE: SDAP Rx behaviour upon remapping is left to UE implementation for insequence delivery.”

**Option 2**: After a PC5 QoS flow is remapped from the previously-mapped SL-DRB to the current SL-DRB, the UE shall not deliver the retrieved SDAP SDU to the upper layer until an End-Marker control PDU for the PC5 QoS flow is received.

This issue has been discussed during RAN2#108 meeting. The related agreement was made as: *SDAP Rx behaviour upon remapping is left to UE implementation for insequence delivery. And it will not be captured in the specification.* Rapporteur ‎thinks it would be better to respect the previous agreement and not capture anything for the SDAP Rx behaviour upon remapping for ‎insequence delivery‎ in the spec. Companies views are appreciated to be collected in the following table.

**Question: Does company agree to specify the SDAP Rx behaviour upon remapping for ‎insequence delivery in 37.324, as proposed two options as above from R2-2007734?**

**- Agree as above Option1;**

**- Agree as above Option2;**

**- Disagree, i.e., respect the previous agreement and keep the current spec as it is.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Views: Agree/Disagree | Comments |
|  OPPO | No |  As captured in the cover page of 7734: In RAN2#108 meeting, the following agreement was made: “*SDAP Rx behaviour upon remapping is left to UE implementation for insequence delivery. And it will not be captured in the specification.*”. I.e., during the discussion in RAN2#108, I thought the sentence was comprehensive enough to close this issue, but obviously it is not to all and now it pop up again, but I fail to know how to make it clearer.. |
| Ericsson | No | We agree with OPPO. When this issue was discussed and the agreement was taken, we decided to not capture anything in the specification. Therefore, we should stick to this principle. |
| Intel | No | We share the view with OPPO and Ericsson that we should stick with the prior agreement and do not think any other action is needed. |
| ASUSTeK | Option 1 | We raise this issue again because people would implement a UE incorrectly if following the current specification in sub-clause 5.2.4. We think it is RAN2’s responsibility to make sure people would implement a UE correctly when following the 3GPP specification. Therefore, we suggest at least a NOTE could be added to reflect (part of) the agreement so as to avoid incorrect UE implementation. |
| LG | No | Keep the current spec as it is. Any other action is not needed.  |
| ZTE | No | We do not see strong reason to capture it in the specification and prefer to keep the current specification. |

**Proposed conclusion:**

TBD

# 3 Conclusion

TBD
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