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# Introduction

This is to kick off the following email discussion:

* [POST113-e][701][V2X/SL] Response LS to RAN1 LS (R2-2102328) (LG)

 **Scope:** Prepare response LS to RAN1 based on the agreement made in the discussion of R2-2102190. We can confirm RAN2 can do the necessary spec update and indicate RAN2 will let RAN1 updated once spec update is completed.

 **Intended outcome:** Approved LS in R2-2102196

 **Deadline:** Short (3/2 11:00 UTC)

# Discussion

As already clarified by RAN2 chairman’s guideline, RAN2 can do the necessary MAC spec update related to Option 1’ for Mode 2 based on RAN1 LS [1]. Note that this principle is also aligned with that of Mode 1 operation agreed in RAN2#113-e meeting.

**Question 2.1: Do you agree to approve contents of draft LS [2] *i.e. to confirm Option 1’ in the incoming RAN1 LS from RAN2 perspective*? In case when you have any comments on wording/sentence of draft LS, please provide it directly.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Answer (yes or no) | Comments |
| Ericsson | No | RAN2 has actually agreed Option 2, level 3 logical slots. We have suggested rewording in the LS draft.  |
| Sharp | Yes | In our understanding, RAN1 only asked whether RAN2 can do the specs update. Note that “resource reservation period” in RAN1 LS and “CG period” in RAN2 discussion are two different things, although they share same value ranges. Since option 1’ in RAN1 would cause change to 8.1.7 of TS38.214 which is referred in RAN2’s specs, the motivation for RAN 1 LS is to confirm whether RAN2 can update the corresponding specs to adjust for the change in 8.1.7 of TS38.214. Once RAN2 inform the specs can be updated, RAN1 would automatically agree the corresponding CR and drop the other one. Thus, we basically agree with rapporteur’s version and don’t think to clarify Level 3 logical slots is necessary. |
| ZTE | No | We think we should directly answer RAN1’s question: RAN2 can do the specification update necessary to implement Option 1’. As for the clarification of Level 3 logical slots, it is out of the scope of RAN1’s LS. |
| Huawei | Yes, with the original version provided by LG | Agree with ZTE. This reply LS should directly answer RAN1’s question which asks if the Option 1’ in RAN1 LS is acceptable from RAN2 perspective. The Level\_3 slot RAN2 agreed is just the Option 1’ asked by RAN1 in the LS, which is the majority’s understanding. This means, the original draft LS from LG is already OK.W.r.t. whether to include additional information for mode-1 SL CG, we don’t have a strong view. But if RAN2 decides to do so, we agree with OPPO’s comment in the reflector that this additional information should be provided separately from the answer to the RAN1 question itself. |
| LG | Yes | We need to answer directly RAN1’s question. Hence, our uploaded draft LS is enough and clear. |
| vivo | Yes | We echo companies’ view that the original version is enough to directly say option-1 is agreed to be implemented in MAC specification. We don’t need words like ‘level 3 slot’.For mode-1 CG related agreement we are also fine to include it in the LS to give more information. |
| CATT | Yes | We agree with the original draft LS from LG. For the detailed formatting, we advise that the information about “Response to:” should be added. |
| Samsung | Ye | We agree with the original draft LS by LG. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Agree a clear, concise response is appropriate, as per the original LS draft. |

#### Summary 2.1:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Answer | Number of supporting companies |
| Yes |  |
| No |  |
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