# Open issue list in 38.300

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Open Issue** | **CR-Rapporteur Comment** |
| **X.1** | EN at 16.12.4:  Editor’s Notes: FFS for L3 U2U relay (re)selection triggering, whether there is a need for the PC5-RLF indication. | In the case of L2 U2U, the source remote UE performs relay (re)selection when receiving RLC indication from relay UE.  But it’ not clear that RLF indication is needed or not for L3 U2U Remote UE. |
| **X.2** | In the U2U relay connection establishment procedure (figure 16.12.x-1), the issue is when the QoS split procedure is performed. | Some companies think that the QoS split is done before end-to-end PC5 connection establishment. But other companies think that the QoS split is done after end-to-end PC5 connection establishment. When the QoS split is performed is need to be clarified.  (Option-1) The QoS split performs before end-to-end PC5 connection establishment (i.e., before determination QoS flow between source remote UE and target remote UE).  (Option-2) The QoS split performs after end-to-end PC5 connection establishment (i.e., after determination QoS flow between source remote UE and target remote UE). |
| **X.3** | EN at 16.12.X:  Editor’s Notes: FFS whether the split QoS value need to be delivered to the peer L2 U2U Remote UE. | In the normal SL connection (i.e., not U2U relay operation), TX UE configures the SL connection related configuration to the RX UE. The RX UE can also use the given configuration from TX UE when RX UE has data PDU to transmit to the TX UE, if the given configuration from TX UE is available to transmit the data PDU from RX UE to TX UE. In other words, the SL configuration from TX UE can be a bi-directional configuration.  In U2U relay operation, the same principle can be applied. If the target remote UE knows the split QoS value for the 2nd-hop, the target remote UE may reused the configuration configured by relay UE in the 2nd-hop, when target remote UE has a data PDU to deliver to the source remote UE via relay UE.  So, we can discuss whether the split QoS from relay UE for the 2nd-hop need to be delivered to the target remote UE. |
| **X.4** | EN at 16.X.2.2  Editor's Notes: FFS how data packet can be delivered to an intended PDCP entity or RLC entity is done without describing the N3C indirect path part (i.e. how to describe the indirect path part) | In the N3C indirect path, some specified description may be needed how data packet can be delivered to the intended PDCP entity or RLC entity. |
| **X.5** | EN at 16.x.3.x  Editor’s Notes: FFS when the RRCReconfiguration messages are sent to the source L2 MP Relay UEs. Whether the order of the step 3 and 4 is up to network implementation for the relay UE in RRC\_CONNECTED. | In the indirect path change during multi-path, it’s not clear when gNB sends RRCReconfiguration to the source remote UE. The ordering between RRCReconfiguration to the target remote UE and RRCReconfiguration to the remote UE needs to be claried. |
| **X.6** | EN at 16.x.3.x  Editor’s Notes: FFS: Whether RAN2 can confirm the step 3. Whether the order of the step 3 and 4 is up to network implementation.  In the direct path change for the multi-path operation (figure 16.x.3.x-4), whether step 3 is needed.  If the step 3 is needed, whether the order between step 3 and step 4 can be gNB implementation. | For the direct path addition in multi-path operation, whether the gNB will configure which information to the current connected relay UE. The direct path addition is related to the remote UE, so, why/which information gNB will configure to the relay UE is not clear.  If the RRCReconfiguration for direct path addition to the relay UE is needed, the order between the RRCReconfiguration to the remote UE and the RRCReconfiguration to the current relay UE need to be clarified. |
| **X.7** | EN at 16.x.3.x  Editor’s Notes: FFS on the definition and corresponding operation for the suspending of indirect/direct path.  In the multi-path operation, if RLF is happened in one path, the remote UE can report the alternative path when the alternative path is configured non-split SRB1 or split SRB1, and the path is not suspended.  But the issue is that how to define the path suspension, and if the path is suspended, how to operate the remote UE. | How to define the path suspension is not clear.  And if the path is suspended, in the RLF case, it’s not clear whether the remote UE performs reestablishment. |
| **X.8** | In the indirect path addition/change for multi-path operation, whether the gNB need to know the release information (i.e., Rel-17 or Rel-18) of the selected relay UE. | For the alignment with terminology between CRs, the current CR changed the L2 MP Relay UE to L2 U2N Relay UE and L2 MP Remote UE to L2 U2N Remote UE.  After changing the terminology, Rapporteur has a question whether there is no need not to differentiate rel-17 relay UE and rel-18 relay UE.  For example, according to the current agreement, the remote UE can send PC5-RRC message to the IDLE/INACTIVE relay UE to make the relay UE become RRC\_CONNECTED. The gNB configures to send PC5-RRC message to the remote UE because the gNB can know whether the selected relay UE is in RRC\_CONNECTED or IDLE/INACTIVE. But the gNB cannot guess whether the selected relay UE is Rel-17 Relay UE or not.  If the selected relay UE is a Rel-17 U2N Relay UE, the Relay UE cannot become RRC\_CONNECTED as receiving the PC5-RRC message from the remote UE. So, the gNB should configure only split bearer to the remote UE, if the selected relay UE is IDLE/INACTIVE Rel-17 Relay UE.  So, the issue can be how the gNB can know whether the selected relay UE is ‘rel-17 relay UE’ or ‘rel-18 relay UE’. |
| **X.9** | For the description MP, whether Scenario-1 and Scenario-2 procedures (indirect path addition/change, direct path addition/change) are added separately. | For the MP path indirect path addition/change and direct path addition/change, the current text are illustrating Scenario-1 and Scenario-2 in one figure for each cases. But some companies want to describe Scenario-1 and Scenario-2 separately.  Rapp think that if all procedures and figures are added separately for Secnario-1 and 2, there are added too much figures and procedures. And also many part can be duplicated. So, if there is no problem to cover the Scenario-1 and Scenario-2 in one figure with description, Rapp want to maintain the current form. However, if many companies want that the separate figures and descriptions are added separate Scenario-1 and 2, the procedures and figures can be changed and added. |
|  |  |  |
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