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# 1 Introduction

This document is the report of the following email discussion:

* [AT117-e][627][Relay] Remaining issues on control plane (Huawei)

 Scope:

* Discuss emergency case for relay UE setting cause value

 Intended outcome: Report to CB session

 Deadline: Tuesday 2022-03-01 1200 UTC

The suggested deadline for companies' feedback: Monday W2, 2022-02-28 1200 UTC.

# 3 Discussion

On how the relay UE to set the cause value in its own msg3 when remote UE’s first RRC message triggers relay UE entering RRC\_CONNECTED state, there was no majority’s support on either specified solution, then it was agree to go with the direction of leaving it to relay UE’s implementation.

It is left to relay UE’s implementation on how to set cause value in its own msg3 when remote UE’s first RRC message triggers relay UE entering RRC\_CONNECTED state, with the possible exception of the emergency case (to be discussed offline).

However there were some comments on the emergency case. This offline was allocated for further discussion and clarification on that case.

Discussion:

…

Xiaomi wonder if we leave it to relay UE implementation, the relay UE would have freedom to set any cause value (e.g. emergency). They do not think it is acceptable if the relay UE can set the emergency value by implementation. Ericsson have the same concern. Apple have the same concern.

Moderator understands the comment is whether relay UE is allowed to set the cause value as emergency which would be taken as higher priority access type. However, it is not clear what the real concern/negative impact would be.

On one hand, from network side, it may want to prioritize the access of relay considering the relay is to enhance the coverage and suppose to serve more than one remote UEs. And if the relay UE enters connected mode during path switch, it would be helpful to indicate high priority in msg3 to ensure network will accept the access. On the other hand, companies seems to think if relay UE sets the cause as emergency it may mislead network, resulting in invalid admission control. In this case, the solution could be limit relay UE not to set emergency as cause value. So we would like to check company views in the following questions.

**Question 1: Which option do companies prefer?**

* **Option 1: relay UE is allowed to set establishmentCause/resumeCause as any existing value including emergency;**
* **Option 2: relay UE is allowed to set establishmentCause/resumeCause as any existing value except emergency;**
* **Other options (please add here).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | See comments | First, I think it is necessary to clarify understanding on Monday’s outcome of discussion. Our understanding is:* No new PC5-RRC signaling is introduced to indicate cause value of remote UE
* Relay UE doesn’t have requirement to decode Msg3 of remote UE

If this understanding is correctly, it seems to imply that relay UE has no way to know cause value of remote UE. Then, Option 2 is the only choice (i.e., it is impossible for relay UE to use “emergency”, given it doesn’t even know which cause value remote UE is using) |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Question 2: Whether/how to capture the adopted option in Q1 in spec?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments and Suggestions |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 4 Conclusion

TBD