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| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Clause | Comment | Rapp Response |
| Apple | 5.3a.1.1 | Logically, the determination of egress link (towards which relay UE) is the very first step. This shall happen even before determine UE ID fields (as local IDs have to be determined only after U2U relay UE has been determined), So I suggest to move “Determine the egress link in accordance with clause 5.3a.1.x; “ in front of the first bullet | No strong view on the order of “UE ID determination” and “egress link determination” in 5.3a.1.1, but our understanding is when the data packet is delivered to SRAP together with the L2 IDs, the local IDs can already be determined, i.e., no need to depend on which the relay UE is. |
| Apple | 5.3a.1.2, | The L2 IDs (for end-to-end link) must be provided by upper layer along with SRAP PDU, so that the procedures indicated here can work. This is better clearly specified. The current text is very confusing. For example, I suggest to say:  *for the concerned end-to-end link associated with SRAP PDU, based on destination L2 ID of this link provided by upper layer, the UE determines the DST UE ID field as same as sl-PeerRemoteUEIdentity corresponding to sl-peerRemoteUE-L2Identity configured by the relay UE determined in 5.3a.1.x, as specified in TS 38,331; based on source L2 ID of this link provided by upper layer, the UE determines the SRC UE ID field as same as sl-RemoteUEIdentity associated with sl-RemoteUE-L2Identity configured by the relay UE determined in 5.3a.1.x, as specified in TS 38,331.* | Thanks for the suggested rewording, but seems the current wording already reflect the point that Local ID is determined based on L2 ID provided by upper layer. So prefer to keep the current text for now. |
| Apple | 5.3a.1.x | The new condition for egress link determination is wrong. Multiple different relay UE can provide *sl-LocalID-PairToAddModList* . Two different relay UEs may provide exact same local ID pair to the source remote UE. So, this condition is not sufficient. For source remote UE, this has to be based on L2 ID (of the target remote UE) provided by the upper layer, so we need to clearly say that there is a configured “*sl-PeerRemoteUE-L2Identity”* is used to match the dest L2 ID , and identify the PC5 link based on this, even though this may overlap with 5.3a.1.2. If possible, we can merge the new 5.3a.1x into 5.3a.1.2 | Thanks, new 5.3a.1x is merged into 5.3a.1.2 |
| Apple | 5.3a.1.3 | Regarding “corresponding to RLC channel ID indicated by upper layer for the concerned bearer”, not sure which upper layer provides the RLC channel ID? This seems wrong to me. The correct behavior is to determine egress PC5 Relay RLC channel based on AS layer SRAP configuration determined based on TS 38.331 procedure. | Thanks, the rewording is fine for us. |
| Apple | 5.4 | Fro U2U relay UE, The “SLRB-config” part in the phrase “or the 5 bits LSBs of *slrb-PC5-ConfigIndex* included in *SLRB-Config* “ is better removed. This part (how L2 U2U relay understand e2e SLRB mapping” is still to be discussed as related RILs (J107, H693, Z755, A622, O409) remains unresolved. To be safe, we can simply say “the 5 LSBs of *slrb-PC5-ConfigIndex* used in end-to-end SL DRB configuration procedure as specified in TS 38.331 [3]” | Thanks, fine for the rewording. |
| ZTE | 5.3a.1.x | Actually the egress link should be determined based on the L2 IDs (for end-to-end link) provided by upper layer along with the packet to be transmitted, but not depends on SRAP header, in which the UE ID fields are also determined corresponding to Local IDs configured for the concerned L2 IDs. | Thanks, please see the response to above Apple’s comment on the merging of new 5.3a.1x into 5.3a.1.2. |
| ZTE | 5.3a.1.3 and 5.3a.3.3 | For egress RLC channel determination In U2N relay, it is clearly specified (in clause 5.2.2.2 and 5.3.1.2) based on which configuration the egress RLC channel ID is determined. For U2U relay, the UE may determine the egress RLC channel based on dedicated RRC configuration or derive by itself. This should be clearly specified in SRAP spec just as U2N relay case. So the following is suggested:  - Else if the U2U SRAP Data PDU is for SL DRB:  - if there is an entry in *sl-MappingToAddMod-U2U-List*, in which the *sl-RemoteUE-SLRB-Identity* corresponded *slrb-PC5-ConfigIndex* of the end-to-end SLRB matches the BEARER ID fieldof the SRAP Data PDU:  - determine the egress PC5 Relay RLC channel of the determined egress link corresponding to *sl-EgressRLC-ChannelPC5* configured for the concerned *sl-RemoteUE-SLRB-Identity* as specified in TS 38.331 [3].  - else:  - determine the egress PC5 Relay RLC channel of the determined egress link corresponding to *sl-RLC-ChannelID-PC5* in the *SL-RLC-ChannelConfigPC5* which corresponds to the *SL-RLC-BearerConfig* derived based on the per-hop QoS of the end-to-end SLRB according to *SIB12* or *SidelinkPreconfigNR*; | In this meeting, we have concluded no need to consider the different RRC states in SRAP configuration, so no need to describe the detailed SRAP configuration determination in SRAP layer;  And based on Apple’s comment, the wording is revised a little bit to remove the RLC channel ID part. |
| ZTE | 5.3a.1.3 | Some minor corrections:  - If the U2U SRAP Data PDU is for SL SRB (i.e., the BEARER ID field is 0/1/2/3):  - Determine the egress PC5 Relay RLC channel in the determined egress link corresponding to *logicalChannelIdentity* for SL-U2U-RLC as specified in TS 38.331 [3].  - Else if the U2U SRAP Data PDU is for SL DRB: | Thanks, revised. |
| ZTE | 5.3a.1.1 | Keep the same style as in other clauses:  - Submit this U2U SRAP Data PDU to the determined egress PC5 Relay RLC channel of the determined egress link. | Thanks, revised. |
| ZTE | 5.3a.3.2 and 5.3a.1.x | Add “the” in the following sentence:  For a U2U SRAP Data PDU to be transmitted, the SRAP entity shall: | Thanks, revised. |
| Samsung | 4.2.2 | The term ‘PC5 interface’ is used in the SRAP spec to denote both a collection of PC5 links, and also to denote a specific, individual,single PC5 link (between the Relay UE and an individual Remote UE). We therefore think we should introduce a NOTE in section 4.2.2 stating that PC5 interface in this specification refers to both the collection of PC5 links between U2N Relay UE and U2N Remote UE / U2U Relay UE and U2U Remote UE, and each of these individual links, depending on the context. | Thanks for the comment, with the clarification in current 4.2.2, our understanding is that there seems no ambiguity on the SRAP entity modeling  On the U2N Relay UE, the SRAP sublayer contains one SRAP entity at Uu interface and a separate collocated SRAP entity at the PC5 interface. On the U2N Remote UE, the SRAP sublayer contains only one SRAP entity at the PC5 interface. On the U2U Relay UE and U2U Remote UE, the SRAP sublayer contains only one SRAP entity at the PC5 interface. |
| Samsung | 5.1 | The RRC specification refers to the SRAP specification for establishment of SRAP entity. In our view, RRC spec itself is unclear on whether:  A. A)“No SRAP entity” as condition for entity establishment in the RRC spec refers to the Relay UE itself as a whole; or  B. B)“No SRAP entity” refers to the associated Remote UE, and there is therefore a potential discrepancy between RRC and SRAP, i.e. even for legacy (U2N), SRAP entity is established at the Relay UE per Remote UE according to RRC spec, whereas according to SRAP spec there is one entity per Relay UE.  We believe A) above is the intended meaning and it is aligned with the SRAP concept of single SRAP layer per Relay UE. We do however believe a clarification is necessary, and that the SRAP spec is a better place for this clarification than RRC since RRC already refers to SRAP on this matter.   As already mentioned in our submission to the Athens meeting we therefore propose to add a NOTE in section 5.1 clarifying that an SRAP entity at the PC5 interface of a U2N Relay UE or a U2U Relay UE is considered established when the first PC5 link on this interface is established towards a Remote UE. It should be further stated that further establishment of other links (between the U2N Relay UE / U2U Relay UE and other Remote UEs) of the same PC5 interface, does not lead to addition of other SRAP entities at the U2N Relay UE / U2U Relay UE, or the re-establishment of existing SRAP entity. | Thanks for the comment, we understand the SRAP modeling seems clear, if any unclear UE behavior on the SRAP establish in RRC specification, maybe it is better to clarify it in RRC. |
| Samsung | 6.3.2 | Current text: 6.3.2 UE ID Length: 8 bits.  In U2N Relay case, this field carries local identity of U2N Remote UE. In U2U Relay case, there are two UE ID fields: one for local identity of each U2U Remote UE.  It is unclear from above which of the two fields for the U2U case is for SRC UE ID, and which for the DST UE ID.  Our proposal is as follows: 6.3.2 UE ID Length: 8 bits.  In U2N Relay case, there is one UE ID field carrying the local identity of U2N Remote UE. In U2U Relay case, there are two UE ID fields: first one carrying the local identity of SRC U2U Remote UE, second one carrying the local identity of DST U2U Remote UE. | Thanks, revised |
| Samsung | 6.3.5, 6.3.6 | Do we need ‘in this release’? Typically this is avoided in our specs. | Thanks, our understanding is “in this release” is necessary since it allows the future compatibility of using of reserved bits and control PDU. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |