

RAN

3GPP TSG RAN#94e  
RP-213623

Electronic Meeting, December 6 - 17, 2021

Agenda Item: 9.3.2.11

Source: RAN Vice-Chair (Deutsche Telekom)

Title: Moderator's summary for discussion [94e-46-R17-SLRelay-WI] on SL Relay

Document for: Information & Decision

This NWM thread's timeline is based on the overall RAN#94e timeline provided by the RAN Chair

This NWM thread discusses the question if RAN WGs (in particular RAN2) should continue work on QoE pause/Resume in Rel-17 or not.

This NWM thread discuss the Status Report in RP-212818 (Rapporteur OPPO, CMCC), the proposed WID revision in RP-212819 (Rapporteur OPPO, CMCC), the clarification of CU-DU split for SL relay in RP-213416 (ZTE, Sanechips) and the potential down-scoping in RP-213459 (Ericsson).

---

## 1 Initial Round

### 1.1 Comments on the Status Report

[RP-212818] The SR reports 70% completion while only having 1 quarter remaining to finalise Rel-17 in RAN2 and RAN3. The list of open issues based on the latest WID is included.

#### **Feedback Form 1: Comment on the SR and remaining work in RAN2 and RAN3**

<b>1 – HuaWei Technologies Co.</b>
Fine.
<b>2 – Deutsche Telekom AG</b>
(as Deutsche Telekom) Wth 70% finalisation and a long list of open issue and only a quarter left, there seems to be something wrong. We propose to have a re-view and specifically identify which parts are still missing and identify a reasonable down-scoping.
<b>3 – Apple Europe Limited</b>
We are fine with the status report.

**4 – LG Electronics Inc.**

We are fine with the status report.

**5 – Intel Korea**

We think the remaining open issues are reasonable for RAN2 and since we understand that RAN3 has agreed to work on F1 support within the time units they have available, we are fine with the status quo.

**6 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.**

We are ok with the current SR.

But indeed, some remaining issues has been repeatably discussed for several RAN2 meetings. Maybe it's more critical that RAN2 can make quick decisions on these issues than down-scoping for better progress.

**7 – CATT**

We are fine with the status report.

**8 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology**

We are also fine with the SR and agree with Vivo that in the coming meetings we need to make decisions without further stretching issues that have been discussed for a while.

**9 – MediaTek Inc.**

We are fine with the status report. Regarding the WG-level progress, we agree with vivo that it is important for RAN2 to progress on some issues that have been difficult.

**10 – China Mobile Com. Corporation**

We are fine with the SR.

**11 – Samsung R&D Institute UK**

We are fine with the status report. We think that the open issues can be resolved during 2022 1Q.

**12 – ZTE Corporation**

We are fine with the status report.

**13 – Nokia Corporation**

In our view the status in the SR is actually overly optimistic. Based on the long list of open issues it is quite probable that this work cannot be ready in time. Therefore, we are supportive of considering down-scoping.

**14 – AT&T**

AT&T

We agree with both Samsung and Intel regarding the open issues tabulated in the SR report.

**15 – Philips International B.V.**

We are fine with the status report

**16 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software**

We are fine with the SR and the reported progress

**1.2 Comments on the revised WID**

[RP-212819] The WID revision only propose changes to the specifications, not any content or timeline changes. It is assumed that this version could be approved, but potentially an update is needed based on the outcome of this discussion topic.

**Feedback Form 2: Feedback in WID update proposal**

**1 – Ericsson LM**

Fine for now. TBD if/what updates are needed based on this discussion.

**2 – HuaWei Technologies Co.**

We think to add RAN3 specifications into the WID is reasonable and sufficient, therefore we are fine with this update.

**3 – InterDigital Germany GmbH**

Fine for now at least

**4 – Deutsche Telekom AG**

(as Deutsche Telekom) OK based on the current status

**5 – Apple Europe Limited**

We are fine with the WID update.

**6 – LG Electronics Inc.**

We are fine with the WID update.

**7 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.**

Fine with the updates.

**8 – Intel Korea**

We are fine with the updates.

**9 – CATT**

We are fine with the updates.

**10 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology**

The update is reasonable.

<p><b>11 – MediaTek Inc.</b></p> <p>OK with the WID update.</p>
<p><b>12 – China Mobile Com. Corporation</b></p> <p>The rapporteurs provide the updates to reflect the potential affected specs by supporting sidelink relay in CU-DU architecture.</p>
<p><b>13 – Samsung R&amp;D Institute UK</b></p> <p>It is fine to add TS38.473 as the impacted spec. However, for TS38.463, we are not sure if any impact is needed.</p>
<p><b>14 – ZTE Corporation</b></p> <p>In addition to TS 38.473, we think TS38.401 may be added to the impacted spec. Actually, RAN3 is now discussing the baseline flow chart for RRC establishment/resume/reestablishment for sidelink relay by considering CU-DU split, which may be captured in TS 38.401.</p>
<p><b>15 – Nokia Corporation</b></p> <p>In our view the WID update is ok.</p>
<p><b>16 – Philips International B.V.</b></p> <p>We are fine with the updates</p>
<p><b>17 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software</b></p> <p>the proposed WID update is fine for us</p>

### 1.3 Comments on the CU-DU split proposal

[RP-213416] Clarification is needed if the current WID includes solutions for a split CU-DU architecture or not. If not it should be further concluded if a new scope for this needs to be added to a revised WID. The RAN3 related discussion and workload should be taken into account for this decision.

#### **Feedback Form 3: CU-DU split architecture for SL relay - covered in WID / update needed / not supported in Rel-17**

<p><b>1 – Ericsson LM</b></p> <p>RAN3 has agreed that F1 impacts are foreseen due to SL relaying. We believe that the discussions on these impacts should continue in RAN3. No need for plenary to intervene in this. Regarding whether to consider IAB solutions as baseline; we believe RAN3 is best suited to decide if/what from IAB to reuse and not.</p> <p>We do agree that no new RAN3 TUs can be added for this item.</p>
<p><b>2 – HuaWei Technologies Co.</b></p> <p>We understand Q2 already added the corresponding specification, and as usual RAN3 can accommodate this work for Rel-17 addressing the need from other WGs, therefore we don't see strong need to add more</p>

objectives or TUs explicitly.

### **3 – InterDigital Germany GmbH**

Agree with Ericsson and Huawei.

### **4 – Apple Europe Limited**

We think RAN3 WG should continue the work on this aspect and there is no need for technical discussion in RAN plenary level.

We agree with Huawei that the WID objective need not to be updated.

### **5 – LG Electronics Inc.**

We also think that no WID update (besides those discussed in Section 1.2) or TU allocation change is necessary.

### **6 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.**

Agree with Huawei that there is no strong need to add more objectives or TUs.

### **7 – Intel Korea**

We understand that RAN3 WG already agreed to support F1 updates for L2 U2N Relay in Rel-17 using current TUs. We think that support/not support discussion is then not needed at plenary level. For WID update, we are open about it if there is majority view; one way is no need to update the WID in that the RAN3 impact as shown for objective 6: Control plane procedures is sufficient.

### **8 – CATT**

We share the same view as Ericsson and Huawei that there is no need to add more objectives or TUs. For the F1 design principle, we can leave it to RAN3.

### **9 – China Mobile Com. Corporation**

RAN3 has discussed sidelink relay in CU-DU split architecture in RAN3#114, and made an agreement “Support SL relay in split architecture in R17.” The current objective does not preclude any architecture, so we could keep it as it is. RAN3 will try to fit the corresponding work to the existing TU allocation. F1 design principle should follow RAN3 guideline.

### **10 – Samsung R&D Institute UK**

Current WID does not explicitly mention whether the support of CU-DU split is considered or not. However, we understand that companies are fine to carry out discussion including CU-DU split. Moreover, the workload is acceptable in RAN3 as well. Thus, we are fine to have some updates to the WID. The simplest way is to add TS38.473 as the impacted spec, which is covered by RP-212819. Moreover, a bullet with CU-DU split support in objective part would be fine to us as well.

### **11 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology**

We are also fine to leave this to RAN3.

**12 – ZTE Corporation**

We are neutral to the potential WID update. We may keep the objective as it is even if RAN3 decides to support the F1 enhancement. Since the WID does not mention whether the CU/DU split architecture is supported, it can be regarded as not excluding CU/DU split architecture. On the other hand, if some companies think that it is more appropriate to capture the potential specification of CU/DU split scenario, it is also acceptable to add one more objective, i.e. specify F1 signalling support for L2 U2N relaying.

**13 – QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.**

We agree with other companies that RAN3 will continue the work anyway without RAN guidance and without additional TUs.

**14 – Philips International B.V.**

We agree with Ericsson and Huawei

**15 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software**

okay for RAN3 to manage, no need for further WID updates for this

1.4 Comments on the down-scoping

[RP-213459] Due to the fact of the workload and the remaining open issues also reported in the SR for this WID the following down-scoping for Rel-17 WID are proposed.

Please provide feedback on these individually listed below.

**Feedback Form 4: Down-Scoping of WID is needed ?**

**1 – Ericsson LM**

We think there are significant amount of work left for this item. To complete in time, it is important that the WGs do not spend time on adding optimizations which are not critical for completing the work. There are (as explained in RP-213459) some discussions in RAN2 on features which are not critical to enable SL relaying operation, and these should be down scoped/down prioritized.

**2 – HuaWei Technologies Co.**

In general we don't see much sense to do this down-scope exercise. Details can be seen in individual points.

**3 – InterDigital Germany GmbH**

Agree with Huawei

**4 – Deutsche Telekom AG**

(as Deutsche Telekom) Getting a SR of 70% completion at this phase is a clear indication that there is too much open and not yet covered. We support a reasonable down-scoping of the Rel-17 work.

**5 – MediaTek Inc.**

We agree that there are a lot of open issues, but many of them are stage 3 aspects that would expect to be finalised at the end of the WI (e.g., it's not surprising that the data PDU format for SRAP is not finalised at this stage). We tend to think that no downscoping of objectives is needed; comments below on the specific proposals received at this meeting.

**6 – Apple Europe Limited**

In general, we feel there is no urgency for down-scoping. For individual technical topics, we prefer to handle them in WG level based on company contributions, and RAN2 can decide/choose the appropriate solution to ensure the SL relay work can be completed in time.

**7 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.**

Based on the progress so far (i.e., the issues solved vs. the issues to solve), we do not see the need of down-scoping (please note that when the open issue list was formulated in a detailed manner, i.e., including stage-3 issues as commented above). More practically, we can check the following concrete proposals one-by-one.

**8 – LG Electronics Inc.**

We think it is not urgent for RAN to down-scope the WI objectives while some details can be discussed in the subsequent feedback formats. But we agree with Ericsson that it should be reminded to prioritize essential issues over the optimization issues.

**9 – Intel Korea**

We agree with other company views that it is not high priority to down scope the WID now and we can focus on important issues instead of optimizations at WG level.

**10 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.**

No need to do down-scoping. But also share the same view with Ericsson that optimization discussion/work should be avoided in future RAN2 meetings.

**11 – CATT**

We trust RAN2 can handle it in time, hence there is no need to down-scoping right now.

**12 – China Mobile Com. Corporation**

SR reports 70% completion looks acceptable for companies. Down-selection is not necessary from our perspective so far.

**13 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology**

We think the remaining open issues can be closed in time as some of these are stage-3 points. We need to hasten up the decision making by not un-necessarily pushing back repeatedly discussed topics and by being more receptive to reasonable proposals. We do not see any need for down-scoping now.

**14 – Samsung R&D Institute UK**

We do not think that down-scoping is needed at this stage.

**15 – Nokia Corporation**

We support the proposal 1 of RP-213459 for RAN to discuss down scoping for the Rel-17 SL Relay WI.

**16 – ZTE Corporation**

We think the RAN2 progress is not slow. It is not necessary to discuss down-scoping at this stage. Even if it is necessary, it is suggested to discuss the detailed issues in RAN2 first.

**17 – AT&T**

AT&T

We agree with many that down-scoping is not necessary.

**18 – Philips International B.V.**

We think that down-scoping is not needed.

**19 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software**

no need for down-scoping

**Feedback Form 5: The control plane objective of SL Relay  
WID covers only SIBs related to SL relay operation**

**1 – Ericsson LM**

There are some SIBs which must be forwarded by the relay UE to the remote UE to enable SL relay operation and SL operation. These SIBs are already agreed in RAN2. However, there are some suggestions to forward also other SIBs, i.e. SIBs that are not related to or critical for SL relay operation. We think that to not jeopardize the completion of the WI, it is best use of time in RAN2 is to only support forwarding of the SIBs which are necessary for SL relay operation, and down-scope the provision of other SIBs.

**2 – HuaWei Technologies Co.**

We understand the mechanism of forwarding SIB is independent with specific SIBs. To specify which SIBs can be forwarded would only add more RAN2 work to identify these SIBs with extra specification impacts. Thus we don't see this helps the discussion.

**3 – MediaTek Inc.**

In general we agree with Huawei. When this was discussed at the WG level, there was a strong majority for the WA that the remote UE can request any SIB for which it has a requirement; i.e., if the remote UE is doing something that requires it to have a particular SIB, it should be able to request the SIB, without artificial restrictions. We don't think it's reasonable to have the plenary overturn this RAN2 WA by fiat.

**4 – Apple Europe Limited**

We share the same view with Huawei and MediaTek. Artificial restriction of SIBs allowed to be requested by L2 remote UE will only add more specification work.

**5 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.**

This issue is essentially more about preference on solution alternative(s) of a detailed technical issue, so the answer would not affect the WI scope in our view.

For the answer of this question: As clarified above, RAN2 has discussed this issue several times, clear majority view is to avoid explicit down-selecting / filtering of SIB, which is in order to *avoid* unnecessary work due to donw-selecting / filtering.

So to avoid additional work load due to debating on the need of SIB down-selection, one way-out is to directly confirm the WA to conclude on this issue: “Any SIB which the remote UE has a requirement to use (e.g. for relay purpose) can be requested by the remote UE (from the relay UE or the network).”

**6 – LG Electronics Inc.**

We think this is rather a WG level solution detail. On the other hand, we think the RAN2 WA is still unclear, for example, the exact meaning of ”remote UE has a requirement to use” in the sense that this requirement may mean only relay related requirement or may include any requirement a remote UE has for its current operation. In the latter case, we think there might be mismatch between the capability of relay and remote UEs and we wonder what will happen if the relay UE is not equipped with a functionality on which a remote UE has a requirement and thus request SIB.

**7 – Intel Korea**

We have a WA (below) about this aspect and based on company contributions about the FFS, we wonder if we can decide at WG level on how to address it: “WA: Any SIB which the remote UE has a requirement to use (e.g. for relay purpose) can be requested by the remote UE (from the relay UE or the network). [20/23] FFS how to capture this in spec, but this agreement does not automatically imply signalling to request all SIBs.”

**8 – QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.**

Agree with Huawei. The procedure should be generic and we see no need to have restriction for SIBs.

**9 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.**

We understand the issue, but think it can be left to ASN.1 review to discuss how to fulfill the requirement.

**10 – CATT**

The current issue is rather a WG-level solution detail. Let’s resolve it in RAN2.

**11 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology**

First, we agree that this is WG related item but if we can avoid wasting another round in WG, it will be good to close this here. Remote UE can request SIB(s) and Relay UE should provide those and only those SIBs. Why remote UE requests certain SIBs, can be left to Remote UE implementation. We do not see any reason for bad remote UE implementations. In addition, RAN2 should consider relay UEs as well, as some of these might also be limited in their capacity/ battery. So, a SIB provisioning mechanism where the Relay UE needs to forwards the same SIB(s) to each linked Remote UE, should be avoided. The field success of relaying will depend on both remote and relay UE performance.

**12 – Samsung R&D Institute UK**

This can be discussed in WG level whether to limit SIB handling to SL relay operation.

**13 – Nokia Corporation**

In our view this is technical RAN2 issue and discussion should continue in RAN2.

**14 – ZTE Corporation**

Actually, we think it is not necessary to allow remote UE to request all the SIBs since several SIBs are useless to remote UE connected to the network via relay UE. However, it is suggested to further discuss this in RAN2.

**15 – Philips International B.V.**

We agree with MediaTek

**16 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software**

This is a detailed discussion and decided in RAN2

**Feedback Form 6: Support of RAN sharing for SL relay is deferred to a later release****1 – Ericsson LM**

SL relaying in RAN sharing scenarios would require significant work in the RAN2. RAN sharing in a SL relaying scenario has the complication where the relay and the remote UE associates to different PLMNs.

Some of these issues include: remote UE to authorize the PLMN info from the relay UE, impact on the discovery procedure, System Information provision from relay UE to the remote UE, etc.

Further impact is described in RP-213459.

**2 – HuaWei Technologies Co.**

For RAN sharing for SL relay, from RAN2 perspective broadcasting multiple PLMNs is already supported, the remaining work is mainly in SA and we don't see need to trigger this discussion in RAN.

**3 – InterDigital Germany GmbH**

agree to delay sharing.

**4 – Deutsche Telekom AG**

(as Deutsche Telekom) RAN sharing is far more than just sending the multiple PLMNs in case of MOCN. There needs to be an overall coordinated approach to provide all functionality of RAN sharing. We think that SL-Relay RAN Sharing is a niche scenario in the time of Rel-17 and hence we support deferring it to a later release.

**5 – MediaTek Inc.**

Here we are unclear what the anticipated RAN2 impact to support RAN sharing would be. The examples given in the Ericsson paper are generally about NAS functionality, which goes over the top from the L2 relaying perspective, and we agree with the majority of companies in RAN2 who felt that this was not a problem to support from RAN2 perspective, given that SA2 agree to support their end.

## **6 – Apple Europe Limited**

For RAN sharing, majority view of RAN2 is that this can be supported from AS layer perspective. Then, it is completely up to SA2 to decide whether to support it or not. It seems there is no need for a discussion on this in RAN plenary.

## **7 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.**

Similarly, this issue is essentially more about preference on solution alternative(s) of a detailed technical issue, so the answer would not affect the WI scope in our view.

For the answer of this question: firstly, SA2 has supported this scenario (see TS 23.304 section 4.2.7.2), and triggered by LS from SA2, RAN2 has discussed this issue, clear majority view is to support RAN sharing to align with SA2, and the only left issue is how to deliver the necessary message to remote UE, for which RAN2 has clarified with an WA on “cellAccessRelatedInfo from SIB1 is forwarded before PC5-RRC connection. FFS the exact signalling.” Together with clarification in LS-reply to SA2 as “If SA2 conclude RAN sharing should be supported, RAN2 majority prefer to deliver the non-serving PLMN IDs to remote UE via discovery message and further discussion on whether to include it in a RRC container of discovery message or not will be carried out in RAN2.”.

So to avoid additional work load due to further debating on supporting RAN sharing or not, it is helpful if we can directly confirm the support of RAN sharing, so that RAN2 can directly work on the solution to deliver the message.

## **8 – LG Electronics Inc.**

In our view, supporting RAN sharing is not one of the top priority topics in this WI. It is okay to support it with a minor work in RAN2 side, but would like to avoid having a lengthy discussion around this topic. We think WG chair and the rapporteur can take into this consideration in the WI management.

## **9 – Intel Korea**

No strong view. Our 2 cents: If RAN2 impacts other than broadcasting PLMN ID list are foreseen (based on SA2 LS about MOCN), we can postpone it, however, as we understand, we need additional spec effort to preclude this scenario. Furthermore, from the LS, we understand that the assumption to support MOCN stemmed from SA2, so it needs to be checked with them; RAN plenary guidance may be useful.

## **10 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.**

According to RAN2 LS reply to SA2 in R2-2111370 (as highlighted below), no consensus reached in the last RAN2 meeting.

*For Rel-17 U2N sidelink relay, RAN2 discussed whether RAN sharing can be supported for the NG-RAN node for Rel-17 Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay. Unfortunately, no consensus was reached. (The majority view is it can be supported.)*

Given that RAN2 impact has not been fully investigated, we suggest to continue the discussion in next RAN2 meeting. Similar handling has already been applied to the topic on whether to support SL discovery range requirement in RAN2. We think RAN2 can make final discussion given the specification work to be done for RAN sharing.

### **11 – QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.**

We share the view from Huawei. Concerns raised seem to be related to SA design for which we have the following understanding.

- For Layer-2 Relay, the Relay will forward all the parameters to the Remote UE (as RAN2 has been discussing). The Remote UE should choose the one to use based on its needs. Which one Relay uses to establish a connection does not really matter.
- For Layer-3 Relay, the Relay will select the PLMN based on its own configuration. It will then announce the corresponding Relay Service Code (RSC) in the discovery message supported by this connection. Remote UE will select the appropriate Relay based on the RSC. It doesn't matter which PLMN the relay is served by.

All in all, we do not see a reason why RAN should postpone.

### **12 – CATT**

RAN sharing should be supported in the current release. As we estimate, the major impact is on SA such as charging, policy, and so on. Further, if RAN sharing is supported, the coverage enlarges effect will be enhanced clearly. We don't see a clear obstacle to adopt it in RAN2 so far.

### **13 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology**

We "can" side with majority here assuming this is really only about signalling multiple PLMNs to remote UE before PC5 connection establishment (as far as RAN2 is concerned), which we imagine is not that straightforward (e.g., how many bits can be included in Discovery - though there's no clear restriction here but system capacity and relay UE's battery is at stake). There's no operator seeking RAN sharing and DT are even proposing to postpone this. So, we need to be careful but as said, we will be fine either ways.

### **14 – Samsung R&D Institute UK**

For RAN sharing, we do not see any further AS impact except the non-serving PLMN ID(s) in SL discovery message.

### **15 – Nokia Corporation**

We agree that supporting RAN sharing will require extra work. We think we should limit the support of RAN sharing in the following way: Relay UE can be in shared cell, but Remote UE shall be attached to the same PLMN as the Relay UE.

### **16 – ZTE Corporation**

Since SA2 has agreed to support RAN sharing, it would be better for RAN to also support this if the specification impact is minor.

### **17 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software**

we believe that this will consume little RAN time and is mostly an SA issue. We expect the rapporteur and meeting chair will limit discussion time, and if this becomes a problem then can be reported (removed) at the next plenary.

**Feedback Form 7: No specification effort is done to enable SL-DRX for L2 Sidelink Relay in Rel-17.**

**1 – Ericsson LM**

We believe that the result of the RAN2 discussion so far is that, while RAN2 will not restrict the configuration of SL DRX in a L2 SL relaying scenario, RAN2 will not specify any enhancements to enable SL DRX for L2 SL Relay operation within R17 time frame.

Further impact is described in RP-213459.

**2 – HuaWei Technologies Co.**

For SL DRX, in our view Rel-17 can already apply SL DRX for L2 U2N relay without any extra standards impacts. Therefore we suggest to reword this a bit: no specification effort is needed to support SL DRX for L2 sidelink relay in Rel-17.

**3 – InterDigital Germany GmbH**

No specification effort needed.

**4 – MediaTek Inc.**

We also understand that this can be done without specification effort.

**5 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.**

In RAN2#116, it was concluded that

*Agreements on SL-DRX for ProSe:*

1: *RAN2 confirms Rel-17 SL-DRX design can be reused for relay-related ProSe communication in layer-3 relay without additional specific solution discussion/specification effort.*

2: *Keep RAN2 previous agreement (prioritize the non-relay case without consideration of relay specific optimization in Rel-17) but we're not going to make any conclusion if L2 relay-related ProSe communication is supported or not in Rel-17 now.*

3: *RAN2 confirms Rel-17 SL-DRX design can be reused for L3 relay-related ProSe discovery without additional specific solution discussion/specification effort (by applying SL default-DRX configuration). No conclusion if L2 relay-related ProSe discovery is supported or not in Rel-17 now. RAN2 does not specify any restriction now.*

Where the clear majority view is that DRX for L2 relay can be supported without additional work in Rel-17. So we support this proposal, by 1) confirm the “SL-DRX for L2 Sidelink Relay” can be supported since R17, and 2) confirm it is supported without additional work in R17.

**6 – Apple Europe Limited**

Same view as Huawei that SL-DRX solution can be reused w/o spec impact in Rel-17 for L2 relay. Any further DRX optimizations for L2 relay shall be discussed in future releases.

**7 – LG Electronics Inc.**

We think RAN2 conclusion already said there will be no extra effort in Rel-17 for supporting SL DRX for L2 U2N relay, and RAN2 needs to keep this conclusion. As discussed in the thread for Rel-18 SL relay enhancements, the group can review in RAN#95e whether the spec completed with this RAN2 conclusion

<p>allows applying SL DRX for L2 U2N relay. If deemed so, no additional spec work is necessary in Rel-18 while some solution needs to be considered in Rel-18 otherwise.</p>
<p><b>8 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.</b></p> <p>We are OK that RAN plenary confirms no more specification effort or discussions are needed for this inter-WI feature, or confirms that it is up to UE/NW implementation whether to support this feature.</p>
<p><b>9 – Intel Korea</b></p> <p>We agree with Rapporteur’s conclusion. We still have objective 4 in R-18 WID, if needed.</p>
<p><b>10 – QUALCOMM JAPAN LLC.</b></p> <p>Fine. We understand this is reconfirming RAN2 agreement?</p>
<p><b>11 – CATT</b></p> <p>Same view as the majority.</p>
<p><b>12 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology</b></p> <p>We are happy with RAN2 agreements made on this issue.</p>
<p><b>13 – Samsung R&amp;D Institute UK</b></p> <p>Any additional specification impact for L2 sidelink relay can be confirmed after SL enhancement WI is completed. If any, we think that the required specification work should not be in Rel-17 and it should be an objective of future releases.</p>
<p><b>14 – Nokia Corporation</b></p> <p>We see that DRX is important but there is not enough time to do this in Rel-17</p>
<p><b>15 – ZTE Corporation</b></p> <p>We are fine to the statement that ”SL DRX for L2 UE-to-network Relay can be supported in Rel-17 without additional specification effort.”</p>
<p><b>16 – Philips International B.V.</b></p> <p>We agree with Apple.</p>
<p><b>17 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software</b></p> <p>SL-DRX is important, but considering R18 WID we agree with the majority above and with no further optimisation in R17</p>

There might be room for further down-scoping which could be discussed as part of this thread. If so, please provide the proposed down-scope area with a justification (which should not repeat any RAN WGs discussion, but guide RAN in the decision if more down-scoping is needed)

## Feedback Form 8: Further down-scoping proposals

### 1.5 Report from Initial Round

#### Report on 1.1

16 companies provided input. 14 companies indicated that they are fine with the SR and would leave the further organization to finalize the work to the WGs

2 companies (Nokia and Deutsche Telekom) indicated that the SR is either overly optimistic or 70% is insufficient and the list of open items is too long at this stage.

**Conclusion: Given the overwhelming support of the SR no further action is needed.**

#### Report on 1.2

17 companies provided input. All companies indicated that the update of the WID is fine (only adding specs). ZTE indicate that TS38.401 may be added considering the CU-DU split.

The moderator advices that ZTE's comment is considered at one of the next possible update after RAN3 has finalized the related work.

**Conclusion: The update of the WID provided in RP-212819 can be approved. No further discussion is needed.**

#### Report on 1.3

15 companies provided input. All companies indicated that the work in RAN3 has been started already and that no new TU nor an WID update is needed.

**Conclusion: CU-DU split architecture for SL relay is considered in the RAN3 work and the organization of work is left to RAN3. Neither an WID update nor new TU are required.**

#### Report on 1.4 form 4

19 companies provided input. 15 companies indicated no down-scoping is needed, while 4 companies (Ericsson, Nokia, Intel & Deutsche Telekom) supported a down-scoping

**Conclusion: No down-scoping is needed, and work organization should be left to the RAN WGs.**

#### Report on 1.4 form 5

16 companies provided input. Majority of companies indicate that that this is WG level detail discussion and should be decided in RAN2, Ericsson proposed to down-scope the provision of SIB as in their input document. 3 companies proposed different WA (which have or have not yet been discussed in RAN2). Given the technical details and the level of support to continue the work in RAN2, the moderator advices that this topic is continued in RAN2 and based of a short discussion there a decision is taken (ideally in the next meeting)

**Conclusion: Continue this technical discussion in RAN2.**

### Report on 1.4 form 6

17 companies provided input. 4 (5?) companies proposed to delay RAN sharing to a future release, especially with the argument that this is not only about the broadcast of multiple PLMN IDs. The 5<sup>th</sup> company proposed to “limit the support of RAN sharing in the following way: Relay UE can be in shared cell, but Remote UE shall be attached to the same PLMN as the Relay UE.”

**Conclusion: No down-scoping is needed, and work organization should be left to RAN2.**

### Report on 1.4 form 7

17 companies provided input. All companies indicated that either no specification effort is needed or that no optimization should be done in Rel-17

**Conclusion: No down-scoping is needed, and work organization should be left to RAN2.**

---

## 2 Intermediate Round

As moderator I do not believe that there is more to be discussed in the intermediate round as the positions in the initial round were extremely clear.

Nonetheless I created a form to allow companies to provide feedback on the Report of the initial round.

**PLEASE DO ONLY PARTICIPATE IF YOU HAVE STRONG CONCERNS.**

### **Feedback Form 9: STRONG CONCERNS on the moderator’s proposals from the initial round**

#### **1 – MediaTek Inc.**

R2 Chair: No strong concerns, but a high level comment. For most/all functionality with open points, discussions are ongoing and points have been raised. I believe that a compromising spirit and ability to make the needed decisions in the WG is essential. Usually the willingness to compromise increases as deadlines approach and I hope this is the case also for this WI. I observe that the companies that didn’t want this WI in the first place are the ones with most objection comments in the WG, which worries me somewhat. Anyway as long as the discussion in the WG is kept technical and focuses on constructivity it should be possible to proceed in reasonable ways.

#### **2 – MediaTek Inc.**

R2 Chair: Note that even without downscoping at current TSG RAN, the work in the WG while addressing the full scope may anyway use some Chair prioritization.

### 2.1 Report from Intermediate Round

The only comment received in the intermediate round was from RAN2 chair, indicating that moderator’s proposals are acceptable and the work in RAN2 will continue according to the usual process incl. potential prioritization by the chair if needed.

He also reminded that willingness to compromise is key to progress the work.

With this the NWM discussion is closed.