|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Clause | Comment | Rapp Response |
| OPPO | 16.9.x.2 | **This** should be applicable to all cases, now it sounds like it is limited to the flows of standardized PQI. (considering the next sentence seems specifically for the non-standardized PQI)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 flowsis there any other case?OPPO: thanks for the comment by Xiaomi, indeed our previous comment is misleading somehow.. now reworded. | Rapp: Agree with the comment. And in combination with the subsequent comment, the paragraph has been restructured for clarity. |
|  |  | **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.Apple: same comments as OPPO. | Rapp: The sentence in bold was meant to address only case of the default SLRB is used and the SL-CAPC of the default SLRB is not configured, as indicated by the companies. Addressed in combination with the above comment. |
| Xiaomi | 16.9.x.4 | Typo “intendeds” should be “intends” | Rapp: Addressed. |
| 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” | Rapp: Re-worded so that we refer to the ID used for the transmission. |
| 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”.** | Rapp: As per comment by Xiaomi and Apple, left the GC/BC FFS for now in an editors note, and only flow is mentioned for now. |
| Huawei | 16.9.y | On this sentence " A UE using mode 2 resource selection performs carrier selection and may select one or more carriers used for sidelink. ": not sure which agreement this is based upon? do we really need this sentence? If it is from WID on "SL CA is applied for only mode 2", maybe we can wait on how to capture this? | Rapp: Although we do not have this agreement explicitly, this is legacy LTE and applies to NR as well. Considering subsequent paragraphs discuss how carrier selection is done, this seems necessary for readability.[Huawei] Even though WID states we shall use LTE principles for CA as much as possible, we did make explicity agreements for features. I am fine now for this sentence and will see if it needs to be modified based on meeting agreements. Rapp: Yes – can modify if any upcoming agreements conflict with WID guidance. |
| Apple | 16.9.x | "The carrier(s) that can be used for transmitting data are configured by the V2X layer per service and QoS flow"It is not clear whether it is "per service" or "per QoS flow", which are different in our opinion. We know there is ambiguity for BC/GC. So, based on agreement of RAN2#123, maybe we can just mention it per QoS flow for unicast for now.  | Rapp: As per comment by Xiaomi and Apple, left the GC/BC FFS for now in an editors note, and only flow is mentioned for now. |
| Ericsson  |  | 1. in clause 16.9.x.2, "Table 16.9.x-1 below shows which SL-CAPC should be used for which standardized PQI, i.e., which SL-CAPC to use for a given QoS flow.", where PQI should be in a plural format, PQIs.2. in clause 16.9.x.2"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"this sentence mixes per flow CAPC determination and per bearer CAPC determination. A better wording is suggested as tbe below"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 for the flow directly from the table below ~~for~~ if the flow is associated with standardized PQI and selects the lowest SL-CAPC priority level (highest SL-CAPC value) among the associated QoS flows for the default SL RB"3. in clause 16.9.x.2“when the SL-CAPC is not indicated in the DCI”, would depend on RAN1, or in other words, if RAN1 doesn’t agree to introduce CAPC in DCI, this text would need to be removed, therefore suggest to add a FFS or EN for this. OPPO: our R1 told me no such case of CAPC coming from DCI.4. in clause 16.9.Y“The carrier(s) that can be used for transmitting data are configured by the V2X layer per service and QoS flow”, it shall be sufficient to mention only QoS flow according to SA2 LS response. | Rapp:1. Added an (s)
2. Adopting the suggested change with just removal of the last part (“for the default SLRB” as this was already at the beginning of the sentence.
3. This is directly from a RAN2 agreement. Prefer to keep this text and if the agreement is somehow reverted we can revisit.
4. Addressed based on comment from other companies.
 |
| ZTE | 16.9.x.2 | 1. “When choosing the SL-CAPC for a SL-DRB the gNB takes into account the PQI of all QoS flows mapped to that SL DRB. ”I think “gNB” should be replaced by “network”, since pre-configuration is not determined by gNB, it’s determined by PCF/UDM. 2. “The UE then selects the lowest SL CAPC priority level (highest SL CAPC value) among the QoS flows to determine the SL CAPC for the feault SLRB. ”Firstly, type correction, “feault ”->”default”. Secondly, “among the QoS flow” should be ”among the QoS flow associated to default SLRB”3. RAN2’s agreement is “If PQI-based CAPC mapping is agreed, as in NR-U, to determine the CAPC of the SL TB when the CAPC is not indicated in the DCI”, is it correct to directly say “When performing Type 1 LBT for the transmission of a sidelink TB”?4. “The UE triggers SL RLF for all PC5-RRC connections when the UE has triggered SL-specific consistent LBT failure in all RB sets.”I think “all RB sets” should be “all RB sets within configured resource pool”, since some RBs within SL BWP may not be included in the resource pool, for example, RB sets for SSB transmission. | Rapp:1. Adopted the suggested change.
2. Fixed the typo. For the second change, the sentence already mentions it is the default SLRB so this should already be clear.
3. Rapporteur’s view is the sentence accurately reflects the agreement in RAN2.
4. For stage 2, prefer to keep the wording of the RAN2 agreement, and details can be included in stage 3.
 |
|  | 16.9.Y | In clause 16.9.x.5, “mode 2 resource allocation” is used. However, in 16.9.Y, “mode 2 resource selection” is used. Prefer a unified naming, i.e. “mode 2 resource allocation” | Rapp: Adopted the suggested change. |
|  | 16.9.x.4 COT Sharing | 1. if “COT initiating UE” and “COT responding UE” is used, I think we need to clarify what is “initiating UE”/”responding UE”. Otherwise, I suggest to use “UE”/”peer UE” | Rapp: Think these terms are clear from the context of this and other sections.  |
|  | 16.9.Y | 1. current wording does not reflect that mode1 is not supported for SL CA.2. “For unicast, the carrier(s) that can be used for transmitting data are configured by the V2X layer per QoS flow.”This is confused, V2X layer only pass the frequency per QoS flow. Then, I do not think it is correct to use “ are **configured** by the V2X layer” | Rapp:1. Added “for mode 2” in the first sentence of the section.
2. Replaced “configured” by “provided”
 |
| Qualcomm | 16.9.x.2  | “When choosing the SL-CAPC for a SL-DRB the gNB takes into account the PQI of all QoS flows mapped to that SL DRB.” This is for UE at Mode 1 or RRC connected state. | Rapp:1. Rapporteur understanding is this applies also for SIB/preconfiguration as well.
 |
|  | 16.9.x.4 | “In unicast, the destination/source ID of the responding UE’s transmission should match the source/destination ID of the initiator UE’s transmission for the same unicast link. “L1 or L2 IDs? Initiating UE’s L1 source ID won’t match exactly the responding UE’s L1 destination ID for sharing the COT. | Rapp:1. On the L1 or L2 IDs, this is probably more stage 3. The current text should be fine for stage 2.
2. Addressed based on other companies.
 |
|  | 16.9.Y | “A UE using mode 2 resource selection performs carrier selection and may select one or more carriers used for sidelink.”Rewording: A UE using mode 2 resource ~~selection~~ allocation performs carrier selection or reselection and may select one or more carriers used for sidelinkNote: the formal term is Resource Allocation (RA) mode 1 or mode 2. |  |