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# Introduction

This is to kick off the email discussion.

* [Post125bis][408][POS] Rel-18 positioning RRC CR (Ericsson)

 Scope: Update and check the Rel-18 positioning CR to 38.331.

 Intended outcome: Endorsed CR in R2-2403819

 Deadline: Short

# 2 RIL O800

RIL O800 raises the question: *Have we made agreement that sl-RxPool and/or sl-PRS-RxPool should be only included in handover message but not other RRC dedicated message?*

The description for SL Positioning mimics the SL Communication description:

Below is what is captured for SL Communication:

### 5.8.7 Sidelink communication reception

A UE capable of NR sidelink communication that is configured by upper layers to receive NR sidelink communication shall:

1> if the conditions for NR sidelink communication operation as defined in 5.8.2 are met:

2> if the frequency used for NR sidelink communication is included in *sl-FreqInfoToAddModList*/*sl-FreqInfoToAddModListExt* in *RRCReconfiguration* message or *sl-FreqInfoList*/*sl-FreqInfoListSizeExt* included in *SIB12*:

3> if the UE is configured with *sl-RxPool* included in *RRCReconfiguration* message with *reconfigurationWithSync* (i.e. handover):

And for SL Positioning

#### 5.8.18.2 NR sidelink positioning measurement

A UE capable of NR sidelink positioning that is configured by upper layers for performingSL-PRS measurement:

1> if the conditions for NR sidelink positioning operation as defined in 5.8.2 are met:

2> if the frequency used for NR sidelink positioning is included in *sl-FreqInfoToAddModList* in *RRCReconfiguration* message or *sl-FreqInfoList* included in *SIB12* or *SIB23*:

3> if the UE is configured with *sl-RxPool* and/or *sl-PRS-RxPool* included in *RRCReconfiguration* message with *reconfigurationWithSync* (i.e. handover):

Companies are requested to provide their view on O800. If the current implementation is fine or if any change is needed and if yes what are the suggested changes:

Please provide your opinion/comments on the O800.

Option 1: Current CR is fine, no change needed.

Option 2: There may be other message that may be impacted, or the current changes are not correct.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company Name | Option 1/2 | Comments |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 LPHAP

Please provide your comments on the LPHAP changes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.2 Sidelink

Please provide your comments on Sidelink changes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.3 Bandwidth Aggregation

Please provide your comments on the bandwidth aggregation changes.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.4 REDCAP CR

Please provide your comments on the RedCap changes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## 3.5 Any other comments

Please provide any other comments below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company Name | Comments |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion

In the previous sections we made the following observations:

Based on the discussion in the previous sections we propose the following:
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