|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Clause | Comment | Rapp Response |
| Ericsson | 4.2.2 | The intermediate relay connects the two PC5 interfaces, so at the PC5 interface should be updated as ”at the PC5 interface(s)” | Our understanding is that ”The intermediate relay connects the two PC5 links”, PC5 interface is a general terminology for SL RAT. And this case is not new, for R18 U2U Relay, same wording was used. |
| Ericsson | 4.2.2 | Here should be updated as: if the SRAP header is not present. For non first relay UE, the SRAP header will be present (i.e., added by the first relay UE after reception from remote UE). | This paragraph is for “For UL data packet corresponding to SRB0 of the Child UE”, so SRAP header is not present for sure. |
| Ericsson | 4.2.2/5.2.2.0 | It is only the first relay UE needs to remove the SRAP header before forwarding the SRAP data PDU to child UE. | This paragraph is for “For DL data packet corresponding to SRB0 of the Child UE”, so the relay UE equals to the First Relay in this case. |
| Ericsson | 4.5 | Change to ”child UE”? The intermediate relay UE has dual roles in the structure, both remote UE role and relay UE role, therefore, it is more accurate to refer to ”child UE” | Based on the terminology definition of Child UE, it is the directly connected UE in downstream direction, so we understand we can not use child UE here. |
| Ericsson | 5.2.2.1 | For multi-hop relay, this L2 ID should be the L2 ID of the directly connected relay UE (child), rather than the destination remote UE. So, the text here needs to be updated. | This is just the IE name, it doesn’t mean this L2 ID is the faraway remote UE. |
| Ericsson | 5.3.3 | Is this clause aiming to cover all relay UE roles, including the first relay, the intermediate relay and last relay? | Yes, by following the below R2 agreement:The term “U2N relay UE” can include first/intermediate/last relay UEs in multihop, if not otherwise qualified. We can distinguish explicitly when a requirement applies only to single-hop or only to certain multihop roles. |
| Ericsson | 5.3.3 | A condition should be added here, ”if SRAPB header is absent”, which is used to indicate that the relay UE is the single hop U2N relay or the first relay in case of multiple hop relay. Since the relay UE other than the first relay in case of multi-hop relay doesnot need to add SRAP header to SRB0 message. | The understanding is SL-RLC0 is only used to carry SRAP PDU without SRAP header, so no ambiguity here |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 4.2.2 | It may be helpful to split Figure 4.2.2-2 into two separate figures: one illustrating the functional view of the SRAP sublayer at the PC5 interface between the Remote UE and the Relay UE, as in the legacy setup, and another showing the interface between Relay UEs for the multihop scenario. | Thanks, seems different taste of how to draw the figure. The current figure in the running CR is trying to reuse the common part as much as possible, not only for the figure itself but also for the explanation text below the figure, i.e., W/O diff the PC5 interface between single-hop and multiple-hop, the text can be basically reused. So it is preferred to keep the current shape, but we can further discuss if any strong concern.  |
| Apple | 4.2.2 | The following sentence is wrong because the definition of “U2N relay UE” is changed:On the U2N Relay UE (including the last Relay UE in multi-hop U2N Relay), the SRAP sublayer contains one SRAP entity at Uu interface and a separate collocated SRAP entity at the PC5 interface.In the above sentence, the U2N relay UE is not clearly qualified to only mean last relay, “including” is insufficient. My suggestion is as below: On the U2N Relay UE (except the intermediate relay UE in multi-hop U2N Relay), the SRAP sublayer contains one SRAP entity at Uu interface and a separate collocated SRAP entity at the PC5 interface. |  |
| Apple | 5.3.3 | In the section 5.3.3, the determine egress PC5 link part is missing, for single-hop U2N relay case, this is not needed because the egress link is Uu (by default), but for intermediate relay case, this is to be added. We suggest to separate Uu and PC5 description for this section, by adding the following sentence before the “Determine the egress RLC channel in accordance with clause 5.3.3.2” sentence:When the transmitting part of the SRAP entity on the PC5 interface has an SRAP Data PDU to transmit, the transmitting part of the SRAP entity on the PC5 interface shall:- Determine the egress link as the PC5 link to its parent relay UE as specified in TS 38.331 [3]; |  |
| Apple | 5.3.3.2 | We think the egress RLC channel may not be always explicitly configured in UL direction because there is no strong motivation to configured different SRAP mapping for each child, child of child, etc. So, the text may need to cover the case that there is a match UE ID, but there is no SRAP mapping provided explicitly in RRC.I suggest to add an EN: *EN: FFS whether intermediate relay UE can reuse SRAP maping for its own UL traffic for UL forwarding when gNB not providing explicit configuraiton* |  |