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| **Company** | **Clause Number and Related specification** | **Comment** |
| Xiaomi | 5.8.9.1a.4  Do we need to reflect the condition for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE when duplication is configured and for all RRC states when duplication is not configured？ | [Rapp] after offline with Xiaomi, I understand the key point is about how to understand the case that “RRC\_CONNECTED UE with duplication is configured”, for which network will provide two carrier sets explicitly. But it seems better to further discuss/clarify this issue a bit more before reflecting it in spec. So suggest to pend this change till next meeting. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The agreed changes based on P2, P3 in R2-2402227 are added in the section for PC5-S message:  1> if transmission of PC5-S message for a specific destination is requested by upper layers for sidelink SRB:  Should be added instead in the section for PC5-RRC message (?):  1> if a PC5-RRC connection establishment for a specific destination is indicated by upper layers: | [Rapp] Agree with the point that this conclusion also applies to PC5-RRC, yet it should be also applicable to PC5-S? not sure if I misunderstood any point here? If so, please be free to correct, thanks!  [Huawei, HiSilicon] Regarding PC5-S carriers, our understanding is that SA2 has yet to finalized on the conclusion "whether the upper layer indicates the carriers for the PC5-S messages". If SA2 finally decides the higher layer indicates carriers for PC5-S message, the section under "1> if transmission of PC5-S message for a specific destination is requested by upper layers for sidelink SRB:" needs to be corrected. With indicated carrier from the upper layer, there is no point for the UE to derive the "superset". On the other hand, if SA2 finally has not conclusion on this matter, we are open to keep the current texts for PC5-S messages.  [Rapp] Sure here what we did is more to capture what we agreed so far at RAN2, and surely we may further check the R2 conclusion is still valid or not (and make change to the spec if needed) if there is further conclusion @ S2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 6.3.5, for Type " SL-Unlicensed-r18 " under IE "SL-BWP-Config", there is one type: contigousRB-> contiguousRB | [Rapp] thanks for catching it. |
| CATT | One redundant “the” needs to be removed.  5.8.3.2 Initiation  . A UE capable of NR sidelink communication that is in RRC\_CONNECTED may initiate the procedure to report the frequency(ies) and Tx Profile associated with each QoS flow for NR sidelink groupcast or broadcast transmission. A UE capable of NR sidelink communication that is in RRC\_CONNECTED may initiate the procedure to report the frequency(ies) associated with each QoS flow for NR sidelink unicast transmission. | [rapp] thanks for catching it |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | On the capturing of above agreement (P2, P3 in R2-2402227 ), the current texts are "UE indicates carriers including both legacy carrier and higher layer indicated carriers for QoS flow". However the agreement is " any carrier within the super-set of <legacy carrier, and the carriers that the QoS flows of the unicast link associate with> ". Imaging both legacy carriers and carriers for QoS flows are indicated, UE needs to indicate both of them which is not intended. UE only needs to indicate "any of them". So we suggest to consider to revise to "any carrier of blahblah, or blahblah". I copied our TP (R2-2402362) below for reference (no need to consider PC5-S carrier for now):  " where the carriers indicated for the SL-SRB3 of PC5-RRC message are any of the carriers associated with the PC5 QoS flows or ~~with the PC5-S messages of the corresponding destination~~ (the legacy carriers)" | [Rapp] thanks for the comments. For the conclusion ("For SCCH, when duplication is not configured, a UE can use any carrier within the set of <legacy carrier, and the carriers that the QoS flows of the unicast link associate with>.), my interpretation is that RRC layer can indicate a set of carriers (rather than indicate a single carrier) to MAC (similar to the carrier set associated with the QoS flow(s), and MAC layer, during LCP, can transmit the data via any carrier within the set (please correct me if any gap here). But if it is the \*both\* that causes some concern, I will remove it in the revision version. |