**3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 Meeting #109 electronic R2-20xxxxx**

**24 Feb – 6 Mar 2020**

**Agenda item: 6.4.2.1**

**Source: Huawei (Rapporteur)**

**Title: Report for the offline discussion on Category-2 proposals in RRC summary**

**Document for: Discussion and Decision**

# Introduction

This document includes the offline discussion #702 on the related issues and proposals which were discussed in the RRC summary submitted in R2-2002093 [1]. According to the scope clarified during the on-line discussion on Monday, only the Proposal C-2 and proposals in Category 2, i.e. “Proposal that need further discussion [FFS]” in [1] are within the scope of this offline discussion. Note that original proposal C-3 and C-3a which are related to MAC reset aspects will be handled by MAC related offline discussion, not here.

R2-2002093 Summary document for AI 6.4.2.1 - RRC aspects Huawei (Rapporteur) discussion Rel-16 5G\_V2X\_NRSL-Core

* Proposal C-1 is agreed.
* Proposal C-2b will be discussed in offline.
* Proposal C-11 is agreed.
* Proposal C-2 to proposal C-10a will be discussed in offline (may exclude some proposals, Proposal C-3 will be discussed in MAC related offline.).
* [Offline Disc#702]: To discuss the proposals identified in the above for further offline discussion (Huawei, R2-2001965) (Comeback Thurs.)
* [Offline Disc#703]: To update and agree 38.331/36.331 CR (Huawei, R2-2001966 for 38.331 CR, R2-2001967 for 36.331 CR) (Comeback Thurs. or next Wed.)

# Discussions

### Discussion on Proposal C-2/C-2a/C-2b – SL-RSRP reporting

The below questions are to collect companies’ views of proposal C-2 and C-2a in [1]. It is about SL-RSRP reporting and what is specifically going to be discussed is “whether to introduce a “delta” measurement result for the event triggered SL-RSRP reporting from the RX UE to the TX UE, or even more trigger events are needed (e.g. TX UE triggered RX UE reporting)”. The specific technical issue is that, if only relying on the A1-like and A2-like events agreed in the last meeting for even-triggered SL-RSRP from the RX UE to the TX UE, i.e. reporting if the absolute SL-RSRP result becomes above/below an threshold, there may be the case that the SL-RSRP keeps on staying above/below the corresponding threshold, so that the TX UE cannot get any SL-RSRP result, thus unable to carry out power control as RAN1 expected.

* **Question 1**: Should an event based on “delta” SL-RSRP measurement results be supported for the event triggered SL-RSRP reporting at the RX UE?

1. Yes, if the delta value between the current measured SL-RSRP and the last reported SL-RSRP exceeds a threshold, then the SL-RSRP reporting is triggered;
2. No, it is not needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 1** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | a) | Obviously periodical triggering is not efficient, and the current A1/A2 like events are not useful for the RSRP reporting for SL, which is mainly used for power control, i.e., TX power has to be adjusted when the RSRP change is larger than a threshold. Similar trigger has been defined for PHR, following the same spirit. |
| Huawei | a) | Similar view as OPPO. |
| Ericsson | a) only if TX triggered RSRP report is not supported in Q2 | We also see the current A1/A2 like events are not enough for the RSRP reporting. Two solutions in Q1 and Q2 can work:   * #1 RSRP report triggered by “delta” SL-RSRP measurement in Q1 * #2 TX UE triggered SL-RSRP measurement in Q2   Different than NR-Uu, SL TX UE can adapt the power for reference signalling, and the last SL-RSRP measurement becomes invalid. Then, it is natural that TX UE can trigger another SL-RSRP report when the transmission power changes as solution#2.  For solution#1, it might not work properly if the measured SL-RSRP changes slowly, e.g. the “delta” value is small but last for long time.  Thus, in our view, we prefer #2 in Q2. |
| Qualcomm | a) |  |
| Interdigital | a) | Same view as OPPO |
| Apple | a) | Agree that A1/A2 like event triggers are not suitable for this SL unicast scenario, a step-wise threshold is preferred |
| vivo | b) | We prefer option-b to make it simple at this release, because we think it is a kind of optimization for this issue. To be more specific, firstly, the change for SL-RSRP may be the result of the TX transmission power change or the TX UE moving fast, but not the evaluation criteria to do the power control. Secondly, it is not clear that how long will it take for the SL-RSRP to change a quantity by a ‘delta’ value, if it takes some time then the SL-RSRP report based on this ‘delta’ would be not in time and meaningless.  And last but not least, the TX UE can anyway configure periodic SL-RSRP report to RX UE to know the change of SL-RSRP if it wants and there would be no problem for the system to work well. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q1:**

* **Question 1a**: On top of the events already agreed, are there even more events that need to be specified for the event triggered SL-RSRP reporting from the RX UE to the TX UE?

1. Yes, TX-triggered SL-RSRP reporting for the RX UE is needed. If this option is selected, please detail the standard impacts (i.e. how TX UE decides whether/when the SL-RSRP reporting needs to be triggered, what message is used to inform the RX UE if triggered, etc.)
2. No, it is not needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 1a** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | b) | According to the running CR, the triggering of RSRP reporting is configured by Tx-UE via PC5-RRC (either timer triggered or event triggered), following the same approach used by Uu interface. Under the current framework, after adding the “delta” event, we believe no additional event needed. |
| Huawei | b) | Similar view as OPPO. Also, the TX-triggered event has overlapped motivation as the “delta” based event, but is with much more unclear impacts that need further discussion. |
| Ericsson | a) | Same comment as in Q1 |
| Qualcomm | b) |  |
| Interdigital | b) | Specifying delta-based events should be sufficient and this would not be needed. |
| Apple | b) |  |
| vivo | b) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q1a:**

The below question is to collect companies’ views of proposal C-2b in [1]. It is about SL-RSRP reporting and the issue to be addressed is “what if the SL-RSRP result is not available at each periodic SL-RSRP reporting occasion, due to no-ongoing SL transmission on the corresponding SL-RSRP reporting period”. Based on the on-line discussion on Monday, the candidates include that the UE does not perform SL-RSRP reporting in such case, and that it is up to UE implementation how to deal with this situation.

* **Question 2** For a reporting occasion in periodic SL-RSRP reporting, if the SL-RSRP measurement result is unavailable in the latest reporting period, due to no ongoing reporting SL transmission, how should the UE behave at this reporting occasion?

1. The SL-RSRP reporting is not carried out by the UE at this specific reporting occasion
2. It is up to UE implementation, and a NOTE is captured in the TS 38.331.
3. It is up to UE implementation, and not any standard impact is needed.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 2** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | C | As commented online, the problem may also happen in R15 system, e.g., CSI-RS pre-empted by SSB, so we believe the legacy specification can already handle the situation, so no standard impact is needed. |
| Huawei | a) |  |
| Ericsson | a) |  |
| Qualcomm | a) |  |
| Interdigital | c) | We think this can be handled by UE implementation without the need to specify anything. |
| Apple | C | Left to UE implementation |
| vivo | c | In our understanding, the issue is similar for NR-U. and in NR-U discussions, it was agreed that *NR licensed specification in Rel-15 are considered as a baseline for NR-U*, and *There is no consensus in RAN1 to introduce a mechanism to handle missing RLM-RS.*  Therefore we think we need to do nothing for this specific scenario and just leave it to UE implementation. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q2:**

### Discussion on Proposal C-4/C-4a/C-4b – Mode-2 TX pool selection

The below questions are to collect companies’ views on Proposal C-4/C-4a/C-4b in [1]. It is about mode-2 TX resource pool selection, and the reason why this issue is discussed as one of the RRC aspects is that in LTE V2X SL, it is RRC layer of the UE which selects the specific mode-2 TX pool used at a given time and instructs the selected TX pool to the lower layers. As per proposal C-4, there could be three options, i.e. zone-based selection, HARQ FB based selection and UE implementation based selection, as indicated in the below Question 3.

Rapporteur would like to note that besides the per-pool configurations in LTE V2X SL, e.g. CBR-priority lookup table, speed-priority look-up table, etc., even more factors have been agreed by RAN1 to be configured in a per-pool manner in NR SL, e.g. applicable MCS table. As a result, it seems not enough to consider only some isolated factors like zone, HARQ FB resources, priority, CBR, etc., separately for the selection of a resource pool; instead, all above potential should be taken into account. It is obvious not desirable to specify how the UE exhaust all of above factors in the standard, and thus the simplest way is to leave the mode-2 TX resource pool selection to UE implementation which is going to take into consideration all above factors and make the best choice.

* **Question 3**: How is mode-2 TX resource pool selection performed, in case multiple pools are (pre-)configured?

1. Zone-based resource pool selection – the UE selects resource pool(s) associated with its current geo-location;
2. HARQ FB based resource pool selection – the UE selects the resource pool based on whether there is an SLRB with HARQ FB enabled and whether the resource pools have PSFCH resources;
3. Resource pool selection is up to UE implementation – no standardization efforts, simplest way.
4. No pool selection is done in RRC. MAC layer conducts TX pool selection (how to specify a rule or left to UE implementation can be discussed in MAC spec later).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 3** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | c | For zone-based resource pool, RAN2 previously has sent a LS to RAN1, yet no reply from RAN1 yet. Considering that no progress in RAN1 on this part yet, RAN2 should not further proceed on this aspect.  For FB based resource pool solution, we agree with the rapporteur analysis that there would factors more than HARQ FB that affects pool selection. In order to avoid over-specifying various factors for pool selection in R16 (and later in R17+), option c) can solve all these issues ultimately. |
| Huawei | c | Similar view as OPPO.  Also, as illustrated in the discussion texts above Q3, considering only an individual factor is not enough in NR SL. Take the zone-based pool selection as an example: as the usable MCS table is now per-pool configuration, there is the likeliness that a UE selects a pool only based on the zone it is located in, but the MCS included in the MCS table of the selected pool cannot support the transmission of the TBs to be sent at all. As a result, the pool selected based only on zone is an error, as it cannot support the transmission actually. |
| Ericsson | b) | For a), we understand that it is still under RAN1 discussion wither to support it or not.  For b), when the LCH which as data available and triggers the resource selection requests a HARQ feedback, it does not work if UE later selects a pool without PSFCH resources. It seems straightforward to us to support the pool selection based on PSFCH resource.  For c), as said, if it’s up to UE implementation, a UE may select a pool without PSFCH resource for LCHs requesting HARQ feedback. It simply cannot work.  Other factors pointed out by rapporteur, e.g. CBR-priority lookup table, speed-priority look-up table, are related to PHY transmission parameter selection while has nothing to do with the pool selection procedure. |
| Qualcomm | c | Note that RAN1 has not agreed to zone-based resource pool selection |
| Interdigital | a is specified, UE implementation for other | HARQ FB based resource pool selection can be left to UE implementation as a reasonable UE will chose the correct pool based on whether PSFCH resources are available or not. However, for zone-based pool selection, this was specified in LTE, and so it would make sense to keep the LTE baseline. |
| Apple | d | Given that multiple TX pools are to be used by a single TX UE, it is no longer suitable to have semi-static RRC configuration to instruct UE to use which pool. The simplest way-forward is to move this issue out of RRC spec, so it will not impact ASN.1. Companies can have time to discuss TX pool selection in April meeting. Even if RAN1 decides to support zone-based resource configuration, this pool selection procedure can still be done in MAC layer. |
| vivo | b) | If the UE is configured with HARQ-enable and it does have the need for HARQ feedback, it would be strange and unreasonable that the UE performs the pool selection in a entirely ‘blind’ way. And if UE do not consider the HARQ related factors in pool selection, at least it should be able to request to NW or perform pool reselection for PSFCH resources.  For a), the zone-based pool selection seems to have no gain due to RAN1 evaluation and maybe there is no need to support this. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q3:**

* **Question 3a**: In case Option a) is selected in Q3, are two sets of zone configurations needed (with one used for mode-2 resource pool selection and the other used for distance calculation by RAN1)?

1. Yes. If this option is selected, please clarify the reason.
2. No.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 3a** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| Interdigital | Yes | Ideally, different configurations would be preferable because the zones are being used for different purposes. |
| Apple | Pending RAN1 | If RAN1 wants to support zone-based resource selection, in addition to zone-baed TX UE location indication, then two different sets of configurations are needed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q3a:**

As there is anyway the issue on whether the UE’s RRC layer instructs all (pre-)configured mode-2 TX resource pools to the lower layers, or only instructs the selected one, regardless of which option is selected above in Q3; therefore, below question is to discuss this issue.

* **Question 4**: Should the RRC layer of the UE instruct all the mode-2 TX resource pools (pre-)configured or instruct only the mode-2 TX resource pool selected to the lower layers?

1. Instruct all the mode-2 TX resource pools (pre-)configured to the lower layers, with lower layers performing pool selection (similar to LTE D2D);
2. Instruct the selected mode-2 TX resource pool to the lower layers, with RRC layer carrying out the resource pool selection (similar to LTE V2X SL).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 4** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | a) | As replied in Q3, the factors that affects pool selection are mostly up to MAC layer decision, so it is straightforward to rely on MAC layer to perform pool selection. |
| Huawei | a) | Similar view as OPPO. |
| Ericsson | a) |  |
| Qualcomm | a) |  |
| Interdigital | a) | MAC layer can select the (pre)configured pools based on (e.g. need for PSFCH configured). Any selection by RRC (e.g. zone-based) would be part of the (pre)configured pools provided by the RRC, |
| Apple | a) | As explained in Q3, the TX pool selection issus is a MAC issue. So RRC indicates all the pools to lower layer. |
| vivo | a) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q4:**

### Discussion on Proposal C-5 – AS configuration failure related

This section discuss the *RRCReconfigurationFailureSidelink* content in Proposal C-5 in [1], *together with* the AS configuration failure procedure not having been concluded from the email discussion [2] (specifically related to Proposal 4 and 5 therein). The discussion on the content of *RRCReconfigurationFailureSidelink* message comes first.

* **Question 5:** What information should be included in *RRCReconfigurationFailureSidelink* from the RX UE to the TX UE?

1. A failure type of “AS configuration failure” is included;
2. The SLRB configurations (signaled in the RRCReconfigurationSidelink from the peer UE) that caused the AS configuration failure are included;
3. Nothing is included, keeping RRCReconfigurationFailureSidelink as an empty message.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 5** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | c | b) is not correct since AS configuration failure includes ASN.1 decoding error, in which case it is infeasible to judge the IE mapping. Furthermore, AS-layer configuration may further involve in later releases to configure not only SLRB, but also MAC/PHY parameters, so limit the error cause to SLRB is not future proof.  For a), it is not clear how to further split AS configuration failure into different category, i.e., no clear motivation to define different failure cause at least in R16. |
| Huawei | c | Similar view as OPPO. |
| Ericsson | a)-b) | Keeping an RRC message empty is very inefficient and usually unnecessary. For this reason, we believe that either option a) or option b) should be supported.  Between the two, option a) could be a good compromise to help the TX UE to decide what to do. On top of this, adding the *RRCReconfigurationSidelink* from the peer UE that caused the AS configuration failure, may help sometime to figure out if the failure is given to a wrong filling of the fields or some wrong configuration.  According to this, the TX UE may eventually re-send a new *RRCReconfigurationSidelink* to solve this issue. |
| Qualcomm | c |  |
| Interdigital | b (and possibly a) | Declaring failure for the entire unicast link due to failure of a single SLRB configuration seems unnecessary. Including SLRB configuration in the failure allows the TX UE to provide an updated configuration without having to tear down the PC5-S link already established. Other parameters to the message (if needed in later releases) can easily be added. ASN.1 decoding error can be handled by not providing any SLRB configuration, or having a separate failure cause. |
| Apple | a, b | We think for the clarity of the PC5-RRC procedure, both a failure cause and additional information (e.g, SLRB configuration deemed approrioate/inappropriate) should be allowed by RX UE to send back to TX UE, so that TX UE can adjust its behavior accordingly. |
| vivo | A or c with comments | We think this issue may be coupled to the issue that how we treat the AS configuration failure procedure. If we would like it to follow the RLF procedure then c) is enough. Otherwise, we can put a failure type of “AS configuration failure” inside the message. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q5:**

Based on Monday on-line discussion, regarding what TX UE should do upon receiving *RRCReconfigurationFailureSidelink*, Option C, i.e. up to UE implementation, has already been out; also, based on the atmosphere of the on-line discussion, it seems that Option B, i.e. report a new failure cause to the NW, received the support of a majority of companies. For the sake of progress, therefore, below question tentatively asks whether tOption 2 in [2] can be accepted as a way forward at this stage.

* **Question 5a**: As per on-line discussion on Monday, do companies now agree that the TX UE reports a new failure cause to the NW upon the reception of *RRCReconfigurationFailureSidelink* from the RX UE?

1. Yes.
2. No. If this option is selected, please clarify the reason and specify other solutions (in detail).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 5a** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | b) | As commented online, one cannot perform reporting for IDLE/INACTIVE/OOC UE anyway.  For CONNECTED UE, our first preference is to align with IDLE/INACTIVE/OOC UE as well, since there is anyway scenarios where the failure cannot be solved by reporting, e.g., in case the network does not respond with an updated configuration (similar to the IDLE/INACTIVE/OOC where UE relies on fixed SIB/pre-configuration). |
| Huawei | a) | Due to Monday on-line discussion, the option asked in the question (original option b in the email discussion) seems most promising to be converged to; so, for the sake of progress, we’d like to propose to support it. |
| Ericsson | a) | Reporting a failure case to the network it may help the network to understand what the cause of the failure was. At the end, this is something that is already done for the RLC failure case. |
| Qualcomm | b) | Agree with OPPO’s comments. Option 2 is not meaningful for Mode 2 (OOC) |
| Interdigital | a) | For CONNECTED UE, it seems consistent with other behaviors (e.g. RLF) to report configuration failure to the network. |
| Apple | b | WE prefer a solution working for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode |
| vivo | b) | We share the same view with OPPO to align with IDLE/INACTIVE/OOC UE. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q5a:**

* **Question 5b**: If Option a) is selected in Q5a, how does the TX UE deal with the failing SLRB(s) included in the AS configuration failure message (if any)?

1. Release them.
2. Continue using them.
3. Suspend UP data transmission until updated configurations acquired are applied to both TX and RX

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 5b** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | Discuss the UP behavior for AS-layer configuration failure, but not limited to SLRB configuration failure. | Although we respond b) to Q5a, this is our comment to Q5b:  The premise of Q5b is that AS configuration failure is only caused by SLRB configuration, yet as responded in Q5, it is not future-proof to assume that the failure is only for SLRB configuration, i.e., it may be caused by MAC/PHY configuration that could be included in AS-layer configuration later.  So it would be more future-proof to discuss the UP behavior for AS-layer configuration failure, but not limited to SLRB configuration failure. |
| Huawei | c) | We think it is good to have a simple and generic operation for the UP data transmission, so we propose option c). |
| Ericsson | a) | If there is a failure, it means that the configuration has been never applied and there is, in reality no SLRB. According to this, the UE should just discard the failed AS configuration (i.e., maybe “release” is not the right term here). |
| Interdigital | a) | Any SLRBs that fail due to configuration should not be established in the first place. Therefore b and c are not possible. |
| Apple | See comment | I do not understand why faiulure case handling or reconfiguration are only applicable to CONNECTED UE. Even For IDLE /INACTIVE UE, we think at least the UE pair can fallback to prior working configuration with successfully configured SLRBs. |
| vivo | See comments | Agree with Apple. Option a) in Q5a may not be the precondition for the question and we may discuss a unified solution for the UEs in different RRC state. Fallback to prior working configuration as Apple mentioned can be a solution. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q5b:**

### Discussion on Proposal C-6 – RLC AM SLRB release

The below question is to collect companies’ views on Proposal C-6 in [1]. It is about how to release the SLRB configuration provided by the gNB only for RLC AM status reporting. The specific issue is that, the configuration of the peer UE’s SLRB used for RLC AM feedback transmission is triggered by the initiating UE, and the release of this SLRB is also triggered by the reception of the SLRB release signalling in *RRCReconfigurationSidelink* from the initiating UE. However, when the SLRB is released, the peer UE will not report to its own gNB, as the SLRB release is not due to the termination of any PC5 QoS flows in the upper layers, so that the peer UE’s gNB will not know such release without SUI reported by the peer UE and thus cannot release the SLRB configuration properly.

* **Question 6**: When a peer UE receives the release of an RLC AM/UM SLRB via PC5-RRC from the initiating UE, should it report the release of this SLRB to its own gNB?

1. Yes, by excluding the entry in the *sl-RLC-ModeIndicationList* corresponding to the released SLRB in SUI.
2. No, no need to deal with this issue.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 6** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | a) | It is straightforward to act as the counterpart procedure we agreed in R2#108, i.e., we agreed for the reporting for SLRB establishment in R2#108, and the corresponding procedure is needed for SLRB release. |
| Huawei | a), or following majority’s view | Option a) looks like having been supported by the current specification, as the *sl-RLC-ModeIndicationList* is a full list and will remove the corresponding entry when it no more needs to exist. |
| Ericsson | a) | It seems natural that the peer UE informs its gNB about the SLRB release, so the gNB can remove the relevant context. |
| Qualcomm | a) |  |
| Interdigital | a) | Agree with Ericsson that the network should be informed. |
| Apple | a |  |
| vivo | a) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q6:**

### Discussion on Proposal C-7 – Handling of SL configuration during state transition

The below question is to collection companies’ vies on proposal C-7 in [1]. It is related to how to handle the SL configuration during the state transition, and the specific issue is “whether such handling during state transition should be supported as full configuration operation”. Specifically, the question below asks whether this is needed, and take one step forward to ask such full configuration is applied to which specific cases and involve what specific SL related configurations (if regarded as needed).

* **Question 7**: Does the SLRB handling during the state transition need to be supported as the full configuration operation?

1. Yes. If this option is selected, please clarify such full configuration applies to which specific cases and involves which specific SL related configurations.
2. No, it is up to UE implementation how to address this issue.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 7** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | a) | The scenario is that   * When Tx-UE switch between dedicated RRC / SIB / pre-configuration; * When Tx-UE switch between SIB:s;   In the above scenario(s), Tx-UE cannot get delta-configuration when changing from old-configuration to new-configuration, which means that Tx-UE experience a full-configuration on Uu interface, and the issue is how to reflect the full-configuration on PC5 interface. It is straightforward to reflect such behaviour on PC5 via full-configuration as well, considering the following reasons (which is also the main reason that full-configuration is used in legacy Uu system):  - Firstly, some parameters cannot be changed after DRB re-established. For example: 1) for SDAP, SDAP header presence/absence are not reconfigurable after DRB setup, and 2) for PDCP, SN length, integrity protection and ciphering are not reconfigurable after DRB setup. For these type of parameter, the reconfiguration can only be implemented by SLRB release and add, i.e., full configuration.  - Secondly, full configuration is necessary to handle the configuration between different releases of NR-V2X. In other words, in case old-configuration is based on Rel-x NR-V2X, while new-configuration is based on Rel-y NR-V2X, full configuration is needed. |
| Huawei | a) with comments | We think option a) is needed only for the handover case, as in Uu. The reason to have a full configuration operation is that the target gNB, for an RRC\_CONNECTED UE during handover, has the choice of providing either delta configuration or full configuration via dedicated signaling, so that it needs to indicate which one is applied explicitly to the UE which shall follow that indication accordingly. This issue might also apply to the UE performing NR SL communication in RRC\_CONNECTED, so for the handover case option a) seems needed.  For other cases, where the UE uses the SIB configuration or pre-configuration after entering the new state (i.e. RRC\_IDLE/OoC), the target SL (pre-)configurations has no other choice but to be provided in a full configuration manner. This is different from the handover case where either style of the configuration is possibly provided by the target gNB. To this end, we think for such cases, the *common understanding* should be that UE has no other choice but to do full configuration without potential ambiguity, and thus there seems to be no need to intentionally specify this. |
| Ericsson | a) | Agree with OPPO analysis |
| Qualcomm | a) |  |
| Interdigital | a) | Agree with the scenarios from Huawei. |
| Apple | b) with comments | Not sure what is the specification impact of proposal a, we think the current PC5-RRC procedure already support full configuration. It is up UE to use it or not. |
| vivo | a) | We agree that some parameters cannot be changed after DRB re-established so we can rely on full configuration for this. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q7:**

### Discussion on Proposal C-8 – PC5-S connection vs. PC5-RRC connection

The below question is to discuss proposal C-8 in [1]. It is related to the clarification on a previous RAN2 agreement “For a pair of UEs performing unicast communication, PC5-S connections and PC5 RRC connections are 1 to 1 mapping”, as some companies think the wording of this agreement is literally not aligned with SA2’s latest progress in TS 23.287 on PC5-S connection in the upper layers. It has been clarified in [1] that the true intention of this agreement on the relationship between PC5-S connection and PC5-RRC connections was to decide how to the model *PC5-RRC connection* in the AS (so as to avoid further introducing a so called *“UE ID” in the AS* @RAN2 #107bis), but *NOT* to decide how the PC5-S connection in the upper layers is configured/maintained (which should be an SA2-decided issue). Therefore, with the PC5-RRC connection agreed by RAN2 as an AS connection between a pair of SRC L2 ID and DST L2 ID, as already indicated in the earlier LS to SA2/RAN1 and now specified in TS 38.331 running CR [5], it is fully up to SA2 on whether to have more than one PC5-S connections in the upper layers on a PC5-RRC connection, and this seem to be pure upper layer issues without obvious AS impacts. As a result, it seems that only a clarification is needed on the relationship of PC5-S connection vs. PC5-RRC connection in the upper layers.

* **Question 8**: Do companies agree that it is up to SA2 whether more than one PC5-S connections can be associated with a PC5-RRC connection (which was agreed and specified as an AS connection between a pair of SRC L2 ID and DST L2 ID by RAN2)?

1. Yes.
2. No. If this option is selected, please clarify the reason.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 8** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | No need to revisit this issue, i.e., neither LS is needed and nor RAN2 spec impact. | Our understanding is that RAN2 has previously discussed the one-to-many mapping between PC5-RRC link and PC5-S link, for which we concluded that there would be only one-to-one mapping.  For SA2, our understanding is that SA2 has not intention to go this one-to-many mapping either – specifically, by reading the related paper, seems the issue is caused by the interperation that there is a one-to-two mapping between PC5-RRC and PC5-S for IP and non-IP traffic, but by checking SA2 spec:   1. According to the following description, L2-ID and APP-layer ID is one-to-one mapping      1. According to the following text and figure, a “unicast link” in SA2 is defined for a APP-layer ID pair, i.e., unicast link and APP-layer-ID-pair is one-to-one mapping      1. Then according to the following sentence, each unicast link is for a single NW layer protocol, i.e., IP/non-IP     So there is one-to-one mapping between L2-ID – APP-layer ID – unicast-link – NW-layer-protocol, so there is no chance for a single pair of L2-ID to carry more than one NW-layer protocol. |
| Huawei | a), and no further RAN2 action or discussion on this issue is needed. | We have the similar view as OPPO that we needn’t revisit this issue anymore, with the reason that how many PC5-S connections are associated with a PC5-RRC connection is a pure upper-layer issue and has no AS impact needed. For the IP vs. non-IP issue for unicast raised by some companies (as also analyzed by OPPO above), we’d like to clarify that we already had the PDCP SDU type field in the AS, and it is just used to distinguish IP and non-IP packets and is commonly applied to all unicast/groupcast/broadcast as in LTE. Beyond that, we don’t need anything else in the AS to distinguish IP or non-IP services/links specifically for unicast.  At present, no other AS impact is further identified by companies, so we don’t foresee any AS impacts related to how many PC5-S connection can be associated with a PC5-RRC connection in the upper layers. Therefore, no further action or discussion by RAN2 is needed for this issue, and one can always turn to his/her own SA2 delegate for clarification. |
| Ericsson | a) | Agree with Oppo and Huawei |
| Qualcomm |  | Agree with prior comments that there is no need to revisit this issue (LS to SA2 not required) |
| Interdigital | a) | Agree with the Rapporteur description that this is upto SA2 and there is no further action needed by RAN2. |
| Apple | a | Up to SA2 |
| vivo | a) | For the issue itself, in our understanding(with discussion to SA2 colleague):  The UE is supposed to use an existing link is the peer Application Layer IDs are the same and the network layer protocol is the same (IP or non IP). So you probably end up with 2 unicast links, one for IP and the other non IP.      But we agree with the rapporteur that the intention of former agreement on the relationship between PC5-S connection and PC5-RRC connections was NOT to decide how the PC5-S connection in the upper layers is configured/maintained. So we can leave it to SA2. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q8:**

### Discussion on Proposal C-9 – SRC L2 ID in SUI or not

The below question is to collect companies’ views on proposal C-9 in [1]. It is related to whether to report the SRC L2 ID in the SUI, along with the DST L2 ID. Note that even if the reporting SRC L2 ID itself can be agreed, at this stage of Relase-16 it is not desirable to perform further enhancements (e.g. some enhancement based on the gNB awareness of the paring relation between two UEs) based on that. So this point is still to be confirmed in the below questions.

* **Question 9**: Does the SRC L2 ID also need to be reported in the SUI?

1. Yes. If this option is selected
2. No.
3. Wait for SA2.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 9** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | B | Since the flow-ID (which is used for SDAP configuration) is defined in SUI is a per-UE manner, i.e., it would not reused for different destination UE, even if there is a case of different source address for a same destination address (which we do not agree as a valid scenario), there should be no ambiguity for SDAP configuration.  For other reasons like gNB awareness of UE pairing, the motivation has to be clarified first – from our perspective, which seems not a critical issue at current stage anyway. |
| Huawei | a) |  |
| Ericsson | a) | In our understanding, there are some potential benefits to let gNB be aware of UE paring:   * If two UEs are configured by the same gNB, gNB can consider the peer UE’s capability when provide SLRB configuration to the initiating UE. * Or gNB can forward the peer UE’s capability to the initiating UE in advance.   SRC L2 ID seems a very simple future proof design, besides this we tend to agree that further enhancement is not desirable at this stage, |
| Qualcomm | b |  |
| Interdigital | a) | SLRB configuration at the gNB would benefit if the gNB is aware that two unicast links associated with two different destination IDs are associated with the same physical UE. One simple way to do this is to simply report the source ID in SUI. |
| Apple | b | Agree with OPPO |
| vivo | c) | This issue was discussed in SA2 and there are some solutions proposed then but without progress, e.g. During the PC5 unicast link establishment procedure, if UE A receives 2 PC5 unicast link accept messages with same target L2 ID, UE A will reject one of them to avoid the L2 ID confliction.  Also we think it has the possibility that UE A can receive message from UE-B and UE-C with the same L2-ID, but at a very low probability.  So, one option is that we can wait SA2 progress on this. Maybe this issue is not a big problem if SA2 finally decides to do nothing. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q9:**

* **Question 9a**: If “yes” is selected in Q9, do companies agree that no other enhancements based on the reporting of SRC L2 ID should be further pursued in this release (e.g. enhancements with gNB awareness of the pairing of two UEs), besides the reporting of SRC L2 ID itself?

1. Yes.
2. No.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 9a** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| Huawei | a) | But we would like to highlight again that even if reporting SRC L2 ID is agreed, no other enhancements (e.g. pairing based operations in RAN, etc.) should be pursued based on this SRC L2 reporting in this release. |
| Ericsson |  | I think we should not agree this at this stage as the functional freeze is postponed until June. Even if our target would be to minimize the standardization impact at this stage, we believe whether further enhancements or not it depends by the circumstances. |
| Interdigital | a) |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q9a:**

### Discussion on Proposal C-10/10a – SIB size reduction or not

The below question is to collect companies’ views on proposal C-10/10a in [1]. It is related to whether SIB size reduction should be done for the NR SL specific SIB in various cases. For this issue, since only one company provided calculation of the current SIB size, perhaps the most RAN2 can do in this meeting is to attempt to discuss the need of it. Therefore, the below question only covers the need itself. IT should be noted that, at least until now, even the need of SIB reduction has not been sufficiently analysed by companies’ documents, not mentioning the solutions on how to do it. Therefore, even if the SIB size reduction were to really be determined as needed, it could only be done in April/May meeting as ASN.1 correction, not possibly in this meeting or before March

**Question 10**: In SIB size reduction needed for the NR SL specific SIB?

1. Yes, but should only be done in the ASN.1 correction phase (i.e. in April/May, not before March);
2. No at least for the time being, with the need FFS in April/May;
3. No, not needed at all;
4. Others.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Companies are invited to provide views below for Question 10** | | |
| **Companies** | **Preferred options** | **Comments if any** |
| OPPO | It is a critical issue for inter-RAT scenario, but OK with a) | As calculated in our paper, the SIB size is obviously out of the limit for LTE SIB, i.e., in case of LTE Uu controlling NR SL scenario, there is no way to use the current ASN.1 definition, which means inter-RAT support would not be feasible for R16 – that is not a preferred result for sure. Our proposal is to employ the DL segmentation, which has been used for CMAS/ETWS and DL DCCH as well.  For intra-RAT scenario, it is also worth to remove the redundant part, to ensure the SIB size can be fit into 24PRB case (the minimum one in 24/48/96 cases).  So we would like to encourage companies to look into this issue as soon as possible, and at least solve this issue before ASN.1 frozen. |
| Huawei | A or B | We would like to first thank OPPO for the thorough analyses. We think that maybe this issue can be further discussed in detail in April or May meeting (before ASN.1 freeze), since for the time being it seems that companies are still not pretty sure on the need with in-depth analyses and since this is inherently an ASN.1 correction issue (though critical, if needed). |
| Ericsson | b) | I think we need to understand better if there is a problem and how to tackle it if needed. Therefore, we prefer to postpone this for the time being.  We can further investigate this in May or April meeting. |
| Qualcomm | a |  |
| Interdigital | b | This seems not a critical issue. |
| Apple | a |  |
| vivo | b) | Agree with Ericsson. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Result and Conclusion of Q10:**

# Conclusion

To be added later…
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