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# Introduction

This document is for the following discussion

# Discussion

According to the left issues identified during [Post116bis-e][633][Relay] Relay open issues list (OPPO), the following questions are used to collect companies view.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| O5.04 | [FFS point from R2#116b agreement] Confirm the working assumption of length of remote local UE ID. | Pre117-e-offline | Due to the working assumption made in RAN2 #116b:  Working assumption:  Remote local UE ID is 8 bits.  We have the corresponding open issue. |

**Q1: Do you agree to confirm the working assumption from 116b as follows?**

Working assumption:

Remote local UE ID is 8 bits.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Sharp | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree if majority as compromise | We can agree to the WA if majority agrees, but fail to see how this will solve any forward compatability issues as 8 bits seems somehow little even for multi-hop. Potentially, we could say 5 bits and 3 reserved? |
| Fujitsu | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree | During RAN3#114bis-e meeting, one working assumption has been reached that local UE ID may be unique per relay UE. If that is the case, the 8bits local remote UE ID is enough.  WA: the gNB-DU can include the gNB-DU F1AP UE ID of relay UE in the INITIAL UL RRC MESSAGE during the initial access of remote UE with local UE ID unique per relay UE. |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree | Not sure about Nokia’s concerns wrt forward compatibility, in light of recent decisions on (lack of) support for multi-hop in next Release. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| O5.05 | [FFS point from R2#116b agreement] Confirm the working assumption of presenting remote UE ID in PC5 adaptation layer header. | Pre117-e-offline | Due to the working assumption made in RAN2 #116b:  Working assumption:  Remote UE ID is always present in PC5 adaptation layer header. RAN2 does not pursue procedural spec impact for handling it beyond P6 of R2-2200943. To be revisited this meeting in light of any conclusion on P6.We have the corresponding open issue. |

**Q2: Do you agree to confirm the working assumption from 116b as follows?**

Working assumption:

Remote UE ID is always present in PC5 adaptation layer header. RAN2 does not pursue procedural spec impact for handling it beyond P6 of R2-2200943. To be revisited this meeting in light of any conclusion on P6.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | Agree | Can remove the part of  Remote UE ID is always present in PC5 adaptation layer header. ~~RAN2 does not pursue procedural spec impact for handling it beyond P6 of R2-2200943. To be revisited this meeting in light of any conclusion on P6.~~ |
| Qualcomm | Agree | Agree with OPPO. |
| Ericsson | Agree | Agree with OPPO suggested changes |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | No need to change/re-open the previous agreement. |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Sharp | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | Agree with OPPO |
| Fujitsu | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree | We share the same view as OPPO. |
| vivo | Agree | Agree with Huawei. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree see comment | Okay to acccept the WA as a compromise for something that has no real value in Release-17. However, not happy to just delete text relating to P6, we still want assurances that there are no further unnecessary optimisation. |
| Samsung | Agree | Same view as Xiaomi and Huawei. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| O5.08 (together with content from Q1.03) | [FFS point from R2#116 agreement] SUI content to enable reporting the UE’s L2ID and discovery via SUI message to gNB by relay/remote UE | Pre117-e-offline | Due to the following agreement made in RAN2 #116:  Proposal 15 (modified): Relay UE is configured by gNB with the local/temp remote UE ID to be used in adaptation layer by RRCReconfiguration message, after reporting the remote UE’s L2ID via SUI message to gNB and before forwarding the first SRB0 UL message of the remote UE. FFS if impact to the SUI contents is needed to enable this.  Proposal 5 (discussion) Regarding how to indicate L2 ID of remote UE in the SUI message by relay UE, RAN2 to down select the following options:  a. Option 1: add a new IE to carry L2 ID of remote UE  b. Option 2: reuse the existing field sl-DestinationIdentity to request TX resources, in addition, introduce an indicator indicating that the destination ID is for relay purpose  And also 2 EN in RRC running CR  Editor’s Note: RAN2 to further discuss whether an explicit indication in SUI is required to differentiate relay case and non-relay case when UE requests discovery configuration.  Editor’s Note: RAN2 to further discuss whether an explicit indication in SUI to request of Local remote UE by Relay UE is required.  And also there are questions related to UE ID update.  We have the corresponding open issue.  Rapp understand it is a general issue on how to report remote UE ID in SUI |

This general question on how to perform report in SUI relates to both communication (relay) and discovery (relay and non-relay).

Firstly, based on the following agreement, L2 relay UE need to report source L2 ID to gNB, moderator understand it should be the source ID of relay-related discovery transmission, since the usage of it is for gNB to know which relay UE is the target relay UE reported by source UE (after receiving the discovery message) using measurement report, yet good to confirm in R2

Proposal 9:[Easy]Relay UE in RRC\_CONNECTED reports its source L2 ID to gNB, via SidelinkUEInformationNR.

Besides, due to the following agreement from 116

Proposal 16: [21/22] RRC reconfiguration message towards the target Relay UE should include the Remote UE’s local ID/AL ID and L2 ID when preparing the direct-to-indirect path switch.

Moderator understand there is a need for L2 remote UE to report its source L2 ID to network, which is the ID to be used to establish PC5 link with target relay UE.

**Q3-1a: In SUI, for L2 relay scenario, in which case(s), the source ID should be reported?**

**Case-1a: L2 remote UE reporting source ID of relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-1b: L2 remote UE reporting source ID of non-relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-2a: L2 remote UE reporting source ID of established PC5 link with L2 relay UE**

**Case-2b: L2 remote UE reporting source ID to be used to establish PC5 link with L2 relay UE**

**Case-3a: L2 relay UE reporting source ID of relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-3b: L2 relay UE reporting source ID of non-relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-4: L2 relay UE reporting source ID of established PC5 link with L2 remote UE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Case(s)** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | 2b, 3a | 1b/3b for non-relay discovery is not needed since LTE.  3a is needed since that is the ID remote UE can measure before switching, and gNB can use that ID to configure the remote UE on the target relay UE to switch to.  2b is needed so that gNB can configured the target relay UE on the incoming remote UE before PC5 link establishment for local ID and egress RLC channel.  1a is not needed because the source ID for remote UE discovery transmission is used for discovery solicitation message, which may or may not be the same as 2b, so reporting of 2b is enough.  2a and 4 are not useful since the Ids for eastablished link is not useful for gNB configuration |
| Qualcomm | 1a, 3a | We agree with OPPO’s comments on relay UE part to use source L2 ID on discovery (i.e. 3a).  For remote UE, we prefer to align with relay UE to use source L2 ID on discovery (i.e. 1a). In our understand, L2 ID to be used to establish PC5 link sounds strange because remtoe UE (directly connected to gNB) even don’t know whether NW will handover it to another cell or a relay. Then, does it mean remote UE directly connected to gNB needs to prepare its L2 ID in advance, even if it doesn’t know whether source will handover it to a relay (and doesn’t know which relay UE to switch)? Instead, remote UE should always have L2 ID for discovery avaiable, as long as it supports L2 relay. And the L2 ID for discovery is not coupled to the target relay UE.  [OPPO] according to our S2 colleague, the two ” **source ID of relay-related discovery transmission**” and ” **source ID to be used to establish PC5 link with L2 relay UE**” are not necessarily the same, and there are proposal in the coming S2 meeting to mandarate the two to be different. So in R2, seems we cannot assume the two to be the same.  **[QC] We agree that these 2 source L2 ID can be different. However, the intention for remote UE to report its source L2 ID is just for gNB to indentify it during direct-to-indirect path switch, right? Then, source L2 ID for discovery is more suitable because it is irresptive of which target relay UE.**  [OPPO] After offline with QC, i assume the common ground is 1) the ID for 1a and for 2b can be same and can be different, 2) the ID reported to network has to be the ID that remote UE use for the transmission of DCR message, 3) the ID may be decided / changed by remote UE when a path switching is to be initiated. Is that the common view by others? |
| Ericsson | 1a, 3a | We share the concern raised by Qualcomm, although as OPPO pointed out, that disvoery ID and the ID to establish PC5 link with L2 relay UE may be different potentially, however, we think it is sufficient to have both Ids to be the same. |
| MediaTek | 1a, 3a | We agree with Qualcomm’s comments, take direct-to-indirect path switch to IDLE relay UE case as example, in this case, a remote UE should first perform relay-related discovery to find relay UE and then gNB can tell relay UE remote UE’s ID to establish PC5 link. |
| Intel | 2b, 3a | We understand OPPO’s point that the source ID may be different (although we have not found explicit indication in SA2 TS 23.304) and think it is probably safer to use 2b. For direct-to-indirect scenario, since the Remote UE was connected to the gNB, it can provide the source ID that it intends to use for PC5 link that the gNB can use. Having said that, we are fine with 1a as well as it makes practical sense for Remote UE to use the same ID for both relay discovery and PC5 link. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2b, 3a | Share the views from rapportuer.  **But**, do we really need to specify the L2 ID reporting from remote UE? For direct-to-indirect path switch, the 1st UL SRAP data from remote UE will include local ID. Relay UE can identify the remote UE by the local ID. Why does relay UE need to know the L2 ID of the coming remote UE?  **[QC] The intention is to include it in RRCReconfiguration message towards target relay UE, as agreed in RAN2#116-e:**  Proposal 16: [21/22] RRC reconfiguration message towards the target Relay UE should include the Remote UE’s local ID/AL ID and L2 ID when preparing the direct-to-indirect path switch.  **It is not for SRAP.**  [Huawei]: Yes, my point is ”L2 ID” in the above agreement @116 is useless, since we agree the local ID carrid in PC5 SRAP @116bis. |
| Apple | 3a, 1a(?) | I share the same view of Qualcomm that remote UE cannot predict the Src L2 ID to be used in PC5 in the future. Such an ID is only generated when the UE wants to send DCR message (PC5-S signaling) to anothe SL UE (i.e., relay UE)  But I also doubt that a remote UE has always has Src L2 address available in Case 1a, because remote UE may just doing model-A discovery and does not need a L2 Src ID for discovery message transmisison. In my opinion, the Src L2 ID is generated on-demand, and is not to be used as a permanent identifier of remtoe UE. |
| Sharp | 2b, 3a | Agree with OPPO based on the understanding of different source L2 IDs for discovery and PC5 link establishment. If it can be limited to be the same, we are also fine to follow the majority’s view. |
| Spreadtrum | 1a,3a | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Nokia | 1a, 3a |  |
| Fujitsu | 1a, 3a | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| CATT | 3a | We share the same understanding as rapp’s latest reply as below:  1) the ID for 1a and for 2b can be same and can be different,  2) the ID reported to network has to be the ID that remote UE use for the transmission of DCR message,  3) the ID may be decided / changed by remote UE when a path switching is to be initiated. |
| vivo | 2b, 3a | Share the similar views from rapportueur.  About 1a and 2b, we think the reporting time point is different. Relay-related discovery transmission by remote UE occurs before triggering PC5 link establishment with L2 relay UE, e.g. send DCR message. If these two source L2 IDs of remote UE are same, both 1a and 2b are feasible. 1a is more preferable because of earlier time. If these two source L2 IDs are different, only 2b is feasible since 2b can be used to identify a remote UE in a relay architecture. Also, 2b is needed at least for the Local remote UE ID linkage to Remote UE L2 ID in the D2I path switch case (as what QC clarified above). |
| ZTE | 3a | 3a) should be supported since the gNB may correlate the remote UE’s measurement report of candidate relay which include the source ID for discovery of relay UE based on the L2 relay UE reporting source ID of relay-related discovery transmission.  With regard to 2b, we tend to share Huawei’s view that relay UE could identify the remote UE based on the gNB allocated local remote UE ID in SRAP subheader and the PC5 RLC channel configuration at relay UE should also include the local remote UE ID. |
| CMCC | 1a, 3a | We agree with Qualcomm. |
| LG | 2b, 3a | When remote UE performs a measurement report, there is no way except for the remote UE to report the SRC ID of discovery message to the serving gNB of remote UE (3a). During direct-to-indirect path switching, the time that gNB prepares relay UE may be before SL connection between remote UE and relay UE. Therefore, the reported L2 ID of remote UE has to be the src ID to be used to establish PC5 link with L2 relay UE (2b). |
| InterDigital | 1a, 3a | We think it is sufficient to report source IDs associated with the relay’s discovery transmission for service continuity |
| Xiaomi | 1a, 3a | Whilst we understand the statement that potentially the discovery ID and ID used to establish the PC5 link may be different however we agree with QC view that the Remote UE use source L2 ID for discovery |
| Samsung | 2b, 3a | Same view as OPPO. |

For L3 relay and L3 remote UE, the reporting of source ID seems not very necessary, considering they are not needed in legacy LTE L3 relay scheme.

**Q3-1b: Do you agree there is no need for L3 relay UE or L3 remote UE to report its source ID (for discovery and for communication) to network?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | Agree | Same as LTE |
| Qualcomm | Agree | Same as LTE |
| Ericsson | agree | Same as LTE |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Sharp | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Fujitsu | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| |  |  | | --- | --- | | LG | Agree | | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |

And there was comment raised during post-116b that there might be cases where the source ID is updated/changed by UE autonomously, so the question is whether there is left issue to handle in such case. Moderator understands

1) There is no requirement in TS 23.304 on source ID update for discovery transmission (related to 1a/1b/3a/3b of Q3-1a).

2) And for source ID for communication, there is indeed requirement for established unicast link, for which case (related to case-2a and case-4 in Q3-1a),

if companies believe the reporting is needed, a further report on the updated ID is sufficient, i.e., no left issue.

**Q3-1c: Do you agree there is no left issue for source ID update (for the cases to be concluded from Q3-1a)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | Agree | The only related case is 3a in Q3-1a, where the report on source-ID is sufficient. |
| Qualcomm | See comments | We think it is better to clarify when remote UE and relay UE in CONNECTED state will report its L2 ID. In our understanding, the timing is:   1. Determine to support L2 relaying and initiate discovery 2. Determine to stop L2 relaying support and suspend discovery 3. Link layer ID updated due to any reason   [OPPO] 1 and 2 seems similar to the current spec for communication, rapp understand it is straightforward. For 3, it relies on the output from 1a (for communication), and if it is for discovery, rapp understand there is no spec in S2 saying link layer ID update is applicable to discovery as well. |
| Ericsson | comments | Agree with Qualcomm, 3) seems need to be captured in the spec, regarding ”conditions” when L2 ID report needs to be performed |
| MediaTek |  | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Apple | No | We agree with Qualcomm that Src L2 ID change has to be considered and UE need trigger reporting in those cases.  Also, For the case of 3a), the current SUI reporting is insufficient because the remote UE’s report of measurements may be assocaited with an old L2 Src ID used by IDLE/INACTIVE relay UE, and relay UE may change its Src L2 ID and enter RRC\_CONNECTED. In this case, the gNB cannnot associate the measurement reports with the relay UE context of new Src L2 ID. So, we suggest to enhance SUI to require UE to report its last used Src L2 ID as an additoanl parameter to assist gNB to correctly evaluate the relay UE candidate. |
| Sharp | See comments | Clarify source L2 ID should be reported when source L2 ID updated due to any reasons. For groupcast and broadcast, UE also may change source L2 ID when Application Layer ID changes or the privacy protect timer expires, although only unicast needs link identifier update procedure to inform the peer UE. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Fujitsu | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| vivo | Comments | Besides potential agreed triggers in Q3-1a, we think source ID update needs to be reported timely. This hasn’t been something already supported in the RRC Spec. |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | comments | We support the clarification that updated source ID is reported |
| Samsung | See comments | We also think that source L2 ID can be updated, and this updated source L2 ID then needs to be reported. |

For destination ID report, w.r.t the necessary, it relates to the possibility of doing mode-1 scheme, i.e., using the index in SUI to generate BSR. Then the only doubt is at L2 remote UE, since it has been agreed that

Proposal 1: In this release, for L2 U2N relay, remote UE can’t be configured to use CG type 1 of RA Mode 1 if relay connection has been setup

**Q3-2a: In SUI, for L2/L3 relay scenario, in which case(s), the destination ID should be reported?**

**Case-1a: L2 remote UE reporting destination ID of relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-1b: L2 remote UE reporting destination ID of non-relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-2: L2 remote UE reporting destination ID of established PC5 link with L2 relay UE**

**Case-3a: L2 relay UE reporting destination ID of relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-3b: L2 relay UE reporting destination ID of non-relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-4: L2 relay UE reporting destination ID of established PC5 link with L2 remote UE**

**Case-5a: L3 remote UE reporting destination ID of relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-5b: L3 remote UE reporting destination ID of non-relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-6: L3 remote UE reporting destination ID of established PC5 link with L3 relay UE**

**Case-7a: L3 relay UE reporting destination ID of relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-7b: L3 relay UE reporting destination ID of non-relay-related discovery transmission**

**Case-8: L3 relay UE reporting destination ID of established PC5 link with L3 remote UE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Case(s)** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | 1a,1b,3a,3b,5a,5b,7a,7b  4,6,8 (i.e., except 2) | 1a,1b,3a,3b,5a,5b,7a,7b are for discovery transmission, which has been agreed  4,6,8 are needed since they can work in mode-1  2 is not needed since it cannot work in mode-1 anyway |
| Qualcomm | Agree with OPPO | Agree with OPPO |
| Ericsson | Agree with OPPO |  |
| MediaTek | Agree with OPPO |  |
| Intel | Agree with OPPO |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon |  | We don’t need further agreement. This is just clarificaiton/interpretation on the agreement ”for L2 U2N relay, remote UE can’t be configured to use CG type 1 of RA Mode 1”.  We acctually produced significant agremments for SL relay. Let’s not further agree something if it can be derived from existing agreement. |
| Apple | Same view as OPPO |  |
| Sharp | Agree with OPPO |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree with OPPO |  |
| Nokia | Agree with OPPO |  |
| Fujitsu | Agree with OPPO |  |
| CATT | Same view as OPPO. |  |
| vivo | Agree with OPPO |  |
| ZTE | Agree with OPPO |  |
| CMCC | Agree with OPPO |  |
| LG | Agree with OPPO |  |
| InterDigital | Agree with OPPO |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree with OPPO | With the understanding given in the comment to QC, the the reuse is bouund by any further agreement related to additional signalling in Q3-2c. And that the exclusion of case 2 in no way impacts the legacy reporting of the relay UE’s L2 ID even in legacy *SL-TxResourceReqList-r16* |
| Samsung | Agree with OPPO |  |

For discovery, there is an agreement from 116b as follows

Proposal 3.2: [19/20] SUI includes an indication of whether a particular destination L2 ID is associated to discovery.

Based on the running-CR discussion, one open issue identified is that whether there is a need to further differentiate between relay and non-relay discovery on top of the indication agreed above.

Moderator understand the source of this is that the dedicated configuration of threshold-based relay configuration is included in dedicated signaling, proponent tend to use this indication for network to decide whether to provide threshold related relay-related discovery configuration.

**Q3-2b: In SUI, when reporting a particular destination L2 ID associated with discovery (related to case-1a/1b/3a/3b/5a/5b/7a/7b of Q3-2a), is there an need to further report explicit relay type info, i.e., relay-discovery and non-relay-discovery, to differentiate between the two?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Needed / not-needed** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm | See comments | In our understanding, the intention to introduce discovery destination ID reporting is for gNB to differentiate whether coming BSR for discovery or communication. From this perspective, it seems no need to introduce explicit indication on whether it is relay discovery or non-relay. However, since it is a minor issue, we can agree if majority prefer. |
| Ericsson | no | Relay discovery and non relay discovery use the same SRB and the same resource pool, therefore, gNB doesn’t need to treat them differently. |
| MediaTek | Not-needed |  |
| Intel | Not needed | Agree with Ericsson’s comment |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Needed |  |
| Apple | no |  |
| Sharp | No | Agree with Ericsson. |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| Fujitsu | Not needed |  |
| CATT | No |  |
| vivo | No |  |
| ZTE | No |  |
| CMCC | No |  |
| LG | No |  |
| InterDigital | No |  |
| Xiaomi | No | Have similar understanding to comments made by others above. When reporting to the gNB the orginal proposal is merely to aid differentiation regarding the BSR (i.e. whether for discovery or communication) |
| Samsung | Not needed |  |

Then for the cases of reporting destination ID, there is one left issue in Pre-116b summary unhandled, i.e., P5 of R2-2200943.

Proposal 5 (discussion) Regarding how to indicate L2 ID of remote UE in the SUI message by relay UE, RAN2 to down select the following options:

a. Option 1: add a new IE to carry L2 ID of remote UE

b. Option 2: reuse the existing field sl-DestinationIdentity to request TX resources, in addition, introduce an indicator indicating that the destination ID is for relay purpose

Moderator understand it is a general question applicable to L2/L3, relay/remote and communication/discovery case.

The background of this question is there is an existing IE in SUI message as follows

SL-TxResourceReqList-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofSL-Dest-r16)) OF SL-TxResourceReq-r16

SL-TxResourceReq-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {

sl-DestinationIdentity-r16 SL-DestinationIdentity-r16,

sl-CastType-r16 ENUMERATED {broadcast, groupcast, unicast, spare1},

sl-RLC-ModeIndicationList-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1.. maxNrofSLRB-r16)) OF SL-RLC-ModeIndication-r16 OPTIONAL,

sl-QoS-InfoList-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofSL-QFIsPerDest-r16)) OF SL-QoS-Info-r16 OPTIONAL,

sl-TypeTxSyncList-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofFreqSL-r16)) OF SL-TypeTxSync-r16 OPTIONAL,

sl-TxInterestedFreqList-r16 SL-TxInterestedFreqList-r16 OPTIONAL,

sl-CapabilityInformationSidelink-r16 OCTET STRING OPTIONAL

}

And in LTE SUI message, the relay and non-relay cases are differentiated (there is no destination report for discovery in LTE SUI since there discovery is carried via MAC transparent mode using PSDCH)

SidelinkUEInformation-r12-IEs ::= SEQUENCE {

commRxInterestedFreq-r12 ARFCN-ValueEUTRA-r9 OPTIONAL,

commTxResourceReq-r12 SL-CommTxResourceReq-r12 OPTIONAL,

discRxInterest-r12 ENUMERATED {true} OPTIONAL,

discTxResourceReq-r12 INTEGER (1..63) OPTIONAL,

lateNonCriticalExtension OCTET STRING OPTIONAL,

nonCriticalExtension SidelinkUEInformation-v1310-IEs OPTIONAL

}

SidelinkUEInformation-v1310-IEs ::= SEQUENCE {

commTxResourceReqUC-r13 SL-CommTxResourceReq-r12 OPTIONAL,

commTxResourceInfoReqRelay-r13 SEQUENCE {

commTxResourceReqRelay-r13 SL-CommTxResourceReq-r12 OPTIONAL,

commTxResourceReqRelayUC-r13 SL-CommTxResourceReq-r12 OPTIONAL,

ue-Type-r13 ENUMERATED {relayUE, remoteUE}

} OPTIONAL,

discTxResourceReq-v1310 SEQUENCE {

carrierFreqDiscTx-r13 INTEGER (1..maxFreq) OPTIONAL,

discTxResourceReqAddFreq-r13 SL-DiscTxResourceReqPerFreqList-r13 OPTIONAL

} OPTIONAL,

discTxResourceReqPS-r13 SL-DiscTxResourceReq-r13 OPTIONAL,

discRxGapReq-r13 SL-GapRequest-r13 OPTIONAL,

discTxGapReq-r13 SL-GapRequest-r13 OPTIONAL,

discSysInfoReportFreqList-r13 SL-DiscSysInfoReportFreqList-r13 OPTIONAL,

nonCriticalExtension SidelinkUEInformation-v1430-IEs OPTIONAL

}

And BSR report use the index of these list sequentially to define destination index

NOTE 1: When configuring *commTxResourceReq*, *commTxResourceReqUC*, *commTxResourceReqRelay* and *commTxResourceReqRelayUC*, E-UTRAN configures at most *maxSL-Dest-r12* destinations in total (i.e. as included in the four fields together).

**Q3-2c: For the destintion ID to be reported (as to be concluded based on Q3-2a), which option is preferred**

**Option 1: Add a new IE**

**Option 2: Reuse the existing field *sl-DestinationIdentity*, in addition, introduce an indicator indicating that the destination ID is for transmission for discovery / transmission to remote UE / transmission to relay UE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | 1 | A cleaner solution as in LTE. |
| Qualcomm | 1 | Same view as OPPO |
| Ericsson | 1 | Agree with OPPO and Qualcomm |
| MediaTek | 1 |  |
| Intel | 1 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2 | There is no accutally difference among those options. Why can’t be left to running CR rapporteur? |
| Apple | 2 | Because the ”destination index” space is still a unified index in SL BSR, introducing another destination list will need RAN2 to explain how to count two different destination lists to generate the Destination index. We would rather to use Option 2. |
| Sharp | 1 |  |
| Spreadtrum | 1 |  |
| Nokia | 1 | Agree with OPPO, this seems like a cleaner solution |
| Fujitsu |  | Can follow the majority. |
| CATT | 2 | If option1 will introduce more spec explaination work raised by Apple, considersing the time limitation, we prefer option2. |
| vivo | 1 |  |
| ZTE | 1 | The relay’s report of destination L2 ID of remote UE actually involves the local remote UE ID request. It is suggested to differentiate it from the normal destination ID report. |
| CMCC | 1 |  |
| LG | 1 |  |
| InterDigital | 1 |  |
| Xiaomi | 1 |  |
| Samsung | 1 |  |

Due to the EN in 331 running-CR, one left issue is as follows

Editor’s Note: RAN2 to further discuss whether an explicit indication in SUI to request of Local remote UE by Relay UE is required.

**Q3-2d: When report destination ID of peer UE as L2 remote UE (case-4 of Q3-2a), do you agree to report an indicator on whether local ID allocation is required.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comment** |
| Qualcomm |  | This question is related to Q3-2e. If Option-1a is agreed for Q3-2e, it seems no need to have explict indicator |
| Intel | See comment | Based on our understanding, if option 1 is chosen for Q3-2c, then, this separate indicator is not needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree | Even if there is no update L2 reproting, the SUI should indicate the destination L2 ID is for remote UE, which requires local ID, rather than for legacy V2X UE.  Also, it seems only remote UE to be going to connected mode requries this local ID. |
| vivo | Comments | Rely on the conclusion of Q3-2c. If option 1 is agreed, separate indicator is not needed. |
| ZTE | Agree | Considering the L2 ID of remote UE may change from time to time, it is necessary to indicate whether new local remote UE ID should be allocated when relay UE report the L2 ID of remote UE. Otherwise, it is necessary to send the mapping between previously allocated local remote UE ID and new L2 ID of remote UE to gNB, which may be used by gNB to determine it is not necessary to allocate new local remote UEID for this new L2 ID of remote UE. |
| Samsung | See comment | If option 1 is agreed in Q3-2c, separate indicator is not needed. |

Then there is another issue related to how to handle L2 ID change procedure, as included in the pre-116b summary

Proposal 12 (low priority) It is up to Relay UE implementation to handle the exceptional case where the PC5 unicast link L2 ID update procedure and local Remote UE ID update procedure coincide. FFS whether a note needs to be added in the spec.

Proposal 13 (low priority) During DST L2 ID update procedure, to avoid allocating the local ID for same remote UE again, it is suggested to include the allocated remote UE’s local ID in SUI message.

The background of this is in TS 23.304 (S2 spec for ProSe), there is L2 ID update for unicast link (so that the IDs of the two UEs in the same unicast link change).

Moderator understand that

- At relay UE side, it has to be aware of the association between old and new L2 ID, so that if network configuration for the old L2 ID arrives after L2 ID updated, the configuration is still valid;

- At network side, it has to be aware of the association between old and new L2 ID, so that it would not take a PDCP PDU for an old remote UE as for an new remote UE

To achieve this

1) P12 suggest no new signaling or normative impact, i.e., it leaves to relay-UE / network implementation to handle it

2) P13 suggest new signlaing and normative impact, i.e., it relies on the report by relay-UE to associate between old and new L2 ID

**Q3-2e: If one selected case-4 of Q3-2a, which option is preferred to handle the L2 ID update issue**

**Option-1a: No new signaling, relay-UE would not report the updated ID of remote UE**

**Option-1b: No new signaling, relay-UE would report the updated ID of remote UE**

**Option-2: Introduce new signaling for relay-UE to report the association between old and new ID of remote UE**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | 1a | 1b is not feasible since network cannot differentiate between whether the reported new L2 ID is for an old remote UE for a new remote UE, so has to allocate new local ID for it anyway, and when transmitting / receiving a SRAP PDU with the new local ID, hard to decide which PDCP entity to use.  2 is not needed since as long as the relay-UE does not report the new ID, there is no ambiguity at network side, and relay UE itself can be aware of the association anyway. |
| Qualcomm | 1a | 1a is sufficient. gNB can just assign a new one, irrespective whether it assigned an old one or not before. We don’t see issue. |
| Ericsson | 1a | From the relay UE perspective, 1a is sufficient. Since remote UE will anyway report its L2 Id to the gNB, so, the gNB can understand the assoiciation relation between the new L2 id of the remote UE and the local ID. |
| MediaTek | 1a |  |
| Intel | 1a |  |
| Huawei, HiSiliocn | 1a | This seems same as R16. |
| Apple | 2 | In principle, the remote UE shall not hide the L2 Destination Ids from the gNB. We think 1a is an makeshift solution with risk. We prepfer to have a clean solution for this problem. |
| Sharp | 1a |  |
| Spreadtrum | 1a |  |
| Nokia | 1a | At least new signalling is not needed at gNB side since as OPPO states, if gNB does not know about any new ID, there should not be an issue |
| Fujitsu | 1a |  |
| CATT | 1a |  |
| vivo | 1a |  |
| ZTE | See comment | If the proposal in Q3-2d is agreed, it is not necessary to design other new signalling to solve the issue mentioned in P13. To be specific, when relay UE report the updated L2 ID of remote UE, it may indicate to gNB that it does not request a new local ID for this remote UE.  If the proposal in Q3-2d is not agreed, a solution is necessary to solve the duplicated local remote UE ID allocation. We agree with Apple that the makeshift solution may bring up risk. In this sense, option 2 is better. |
| CMCC | 1a |  |
| LG | 1a |  |
| InterDigital | 1a |  |
| Xiaomi | 1a |  |
| Samsung | 1a |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| O5.09 | [EN from running-CR of 38.351] how for SRAP entity at Uu interface on U2N Relay UE, SRAP entity at PC5 interface on U2N Relay UE, and SRAP entity at PC5 interface on U2N Remote UE to handle error data. | CR rapporteur handled | Due to the following EN in 38.351 running CR:  Editor’s Note: how for SRAP entity at Uu interface on U2N Relay UE, SRAP entity at PC5 interface on U2N Relay UE, and SRAP entity at PC5 interface on U2N Remote UE to handle error data.  We have the corresponding open issue. |

In the current running CR, the error data handling is captured as follows

When a SRAP Data PDU that contains a UE ID or BEARER ID which is not included in *sl-SRAP-Config-Remote* (for Remote UE) or *sl-SRAP-Config-Relay* (for Relay UE) is received, the SRAP entity shall:

- discard the received SRAP Data PDU.

**Q4: Do you agree with the current running-CR above on error data handling?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Ericsson | agree |  |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Sharp | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Fujitsu | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree but... | There are cases where blanket discarding could be detrimental. We suggest RAN2 discuss this further. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| O5.10 | [From companies input] How for RRC\_INACTIVE/RRC\_IDLE Relay to get local ID from remote UE direct-to-indirect switching | Pre117-e-offline | Based on company input here |

This issue was raised in Post-116b discussion, i.e., from Relay-UE perspective, it would receive the first message from the moving remote UE on SRB1, with SRAP header, where the UE ID was configured by network to Remote-UE within path switching command. Then there seems an issue on how for relay-UE to get local ID of remote UE, from the SRAP Data PDU (received from PC5 interface) header , or from network configuration as during normal RRC connection setup.

Moderator understand that the egress RLC channel configuration is needed for relay UE in such scenario anyway, so the only point to debate is whether the local ID configuration can be saved, meaning relay-UE relies on the SRAP Data PDU to get it

-- ASN1START

-- TAG-SL-SRAP-CONFIG-START

SL-SRAP-Config-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {

sl-LocalIdentity-r17 INTEGER (0..255) OPTIONAL, -- Need M

sl-MappingToAddModList-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxLC-ID)) OF SL-MappingToAddMod-r17 OPTIONAL, -- Need M

sl-MappingToReleaseList-r17 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxLC-ID)) OF [SL-E2E-RB-Ientity-r17] OPTIONAL, -- Need M

...

}

SL-MappingToAddMod-r17 ::= SEQUENCE {

sl-RemoteUE-RB-Identity-r17 CHOICE {

srb-Identity-r17 SRB-Identity,

drb-Identity-r17 DRB-Identity

},

sl-Egress-RLC-Channel-Uu-r17 LogicalChannelIdentity OPTIONAL, -- L2RelayUE

sl-Egress-RLC-Channel-PC5-r17 SL-RLC-BearerConfigIndex-r16 OPTIONAL, -- Need N

...

}

-- TAG-SL-SRAP-CONFIG-STOP

-- ASN1STOP

**Q5: For RRC\_INACTIVE / RRC\_ILDE Relay UE, how for it to get local ID configuration for remote UE during direct-to-indirect switching?**

**Option-1: Take the UE ID in SRAP PDU (received from PC5 interface) for usage, so the configuration by network on *sl-LocalIdentity-r17* can be saved**

**Option-2: The configuration by network on *sl-LocalIdentity-r17* cannot be saved, i.e., the relay UE behaviour is the same as normal RRC connection setup**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | 2 | Network implementation would ensure the local ID configuration to remote UE and to relay UE aligns with each other, as for normal RRC connection setup scenario, i.e., there is no need to differentiate the behavior between different scenarios. |
| Qualcomm | 2 | Same view as OPPO. We also prefer to have unified procedure on remote UE local ID assignment as RRC connection setup. |
| Ericsson | 2 | Agree with OPPO |
| MediaTek | 2 |  |
| Intel | 2 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 2 | Local ID itself only is uselees, without the the assocaiate bearer mapping (SL-MappingToAddMod) configured for relay. |
| Apple | Comment | We do not underdtand the question about ” **get local ID configuration from remote UE”** part. If the local ID is to be obtained “from” remote UE, then Only Option 1 is feasible. |
| Sharp | 2 |  |
| Spreadtrum | 2 |  |
| Nokia | 2 |  |
| Fujitsu | 2 |  |
| CATT | 2 |  |
| vivo | 2 |  |
| ZTE | 2 |  |
| CMCC | 2 |  |
| LG | 2 |  |
| InterDigital | 2 |  |
| Xiaomi | 2 | Reliable configuration should be maintained and configured by the network |
| Samsung | 2 | Agree with OPPO. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| O5.11 | [FFS point from R2#116 agreement] Agreement: Any spec impact for RLC channel split between Uu DRB and Uu SRB | Pre117-e-offline | Due to the RAN2#116 agreement  As in Uu, a Uu DRB and a Uu SRB are mapped to different RLC channels (i.e., PC5 RLC channel and Uu RLC channel). FFS if there is any spec impact.  We have the open issue. |

In 116, the following agreement was reached, and thus the bearer ID field as concluded as 5-bit.

Agreement:

As in Uu, a Uu DRB and a Uu SRB are mapped to different RLC channels (i.e., PC5 RLC channel and Uu RLC channel). FFS if there is any spec impact.

Yet there is an issue raised during post-116b that since when relay UE receives a SRAP PDU (from PC5 interface, or from Uu interface) with bearer ID of 0/1/2/3, it cannot know whether the SRAP PDU is for DRB or for SRB, it cannot derive which egress RLC channel to use.

After some offline, moderator understand the solution is simply to enable an input for relay UE to differentiate between ingress RLC channel for SRB and DRB, explicitly/implicitly via CP or UP.

**Q6: How for relay UE to differentiate between SRAP data PDU for SRB and DRB if the BEARER ID is 0/1/2/3**

**Option-1 (explicit CP method): to introduce an explicit configuration from network to relay UE, on ingress RLC channel(s) split between SRB and DRB**

**Option-2 (explicit UP method): to add an 1-bit field in SRAP Data PDU, to differentiate between SRB and DRB**

**Option-3 (implicit CP method): reuse the signalling of *SL-SRAP-Config*, i.e., take *sl-Egress-RLC-Channel-Uu* and *sl-Egress-RLC-Channel-Uu* as ingress RLC channel as well (e.g., for a SRAP Data PDU received from PC5 via *sl-Egress-RLC-Channel-Uu*, relay UE can know whether it is SRB or DRB based on the associated *sl-RemoteUE-RB-Identity*)**



|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | 1,3 | 1 and 3 align with the previous agreement, i.e., to split RLC-channels between the ones for SRB and DRB, so that no need to introduce additional bit in SRAP Data PDU format. The only difference is that 1 requires new Uu signaling, while 2 does not, yet would put more restriction on ingress RLC channel selection.  2 is also a feasible way-out, we can follow majoirty view if 2 is preferred. |
| Qualcomm | ~~None~~ 3 | We are still confused what is the issue to resolve?   * When bearer ID is 0, specified config is used for SRB0 and dedicated config is used for DRB0. Relay UE can differentiate them via whether it is specified config or not * When bearer ID is 1   + If RRCRestablishment/RRCResume, default config is used for SRB1 while dedicated config is used for DRB1. Relay UE can differentiate them via whether it is specified config or not   + If not RRCRestablishment/RRCResume, remote UE should have received Gnb dedicated configuration on bearer mapping, irrespective whether it is SRB1 or DRB1. SO, it can still differentiate them via their different bearer mapping configurations received in previous Uu RRC message. * When bearer ID is 2   + Remote UE should have received Gnb dedicated configuration on bearer mapping, irrespective whether it is SRB2 or DRB2. SO, it can still differentiate them via their different bearer mapping configurations received in previous Uu RRC message. * When bearer ID is 3   + There is no SRB3 in relay because SN is not supported in the scoping.   [OPPO] it is not about which configuration to use, it is about how to decide on the egress RLC channel by relay UE, since that for a same BEARER-ID x in SRAP PDU header, it may be either for SRB x or DRB x, for which different RLC channel are to be used, how for relay UE to differentiate between the two => that is the key issue.  [QC] OK. We can change our position to Option 3 clarified by Huawei. However, we don’t need explicitly specify the relay UE behavior in RRC spec, right? Then, can we suggest to modify Huawei’s version as:  **The RB type of a SRAP PDU (i.e. SRB or DRB) is determined by relay UE, based on the CHOICE type of *sl-RemoteUE-RB-Idenntify-r17* associated with the ingress PC5/Uu RLC channel of this SRAP PDU. No spec impact is foreseen**  [Huawei]: We have no strong view on spec impact. But, it seems we need to assume SRAP layer knows the RB type of each received SRAP data based on the option3. |
| Ericsson | 3 | 1 and 2 are not aligned with RAN2 agreements. How to map a RB to an egress RLC channel is fully up to gNB configuration. There is no need to do any extra split in the RLC channel space. The issue can be left to RRC CR discussion to address, i.e., use a note in the RRC spec or use the signaling configuration. |
| MediaTek | 3 |  |
| Intel | 3 |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 3 | **Option 3 should be clarified as:**  **The RB type of a SRAP PDU (i.e. SRB or DRB) is determined by relay UE, based on the CHOICE type of *sl-RemoteUE-RB-Idenntify-r17* associated with the ingress PC5/Uu RLC channel of this SRAP PDU.**  **[OPPO] Q: does this change mean that, e.g., for UL and for a specific DRB, for relay UE, it will get the SRAP PDU from remote UE via 1) exactly the egress RLC channel as in *sl-Egress-RLC-channel-PC5-r17* for the concerned DRB, or 2) does NOTE have to be the egress RLC channel as in *sl-Egress-RLC-channel-PC5-r17* for the concerned DRB, but can be *another* RLC channel, as long as its “CHOICE type of *sl-RemoteUE-RB-Idenntify-r17*” is DRB?**  **[Huawei]: 1) Not have to be the “concern DRB” ID, but just need to be DRB type of RB. 2) Yes. This is to only restrict the RB type but not DRB ID.** |
| Apple | 3 | Option 3. We also agree with the comment from Huawei |
| Sharp | 3 |  |
| Spreadtrum | 3 |  |
| Nokia | 3, if any |  |
| Fujitsu | 3 |  |
| CATT | 3 |  |
| vivo | 3 | Agree with Huawei’s clarification. |
| ZTE | 1 or 2 | Option-3 works well for bi-directional Uu/PC5 RLC channel. However, for the unidirectional Uu/PC5 RLC channel, it is impossible to take the RB type of egress RLC channel as ingress RLC channel. For example, the remote UE1’s DRB1 is unidirectional (e.g. UL only). The Uu RLC channel 2 and PC5 RLC channel 3 for relaying remote UE1’s DRB1 may be also configured as unidirectional. In this case, the remote UE1’s DRB1 relevant bearer mapping entry may be configured at relay UE as follows:  Remote UE 1, DRB1 -> egress Uu RLC channel 2;  In this case, when relay UE receive the SRAP PDU from PC5 RLC channel 3, it can not determine the RB type of PC5 RLC channel 3 since there is no bearer mapping entry with PC5 RLC channel 3 as egress RLC channel. I guess in this case it needs to add one more condition, i.e. for PC5/Uu RLC channel with only unidirectional bearer mapping, it is regarded as DRB by default.  Actually, we prefer option-1 and option-2. The spec impact is very small and both solutions are more straightforward and simple for implementation compared with option-3. For option 1, it only need one bit indication in RRC signalling. For option-2, the only impact is to leverage one reserved bit. |
| CMCC | 3 |  |
| LG | 3 |  |
| InterDigital | 3 |  |
| Xiaomi | 3 | Agree that the mapping should be down to gNB configuration. |
| Samsung | See comment | Different RLC channels are indeed to be used for SRBs and DRBs, as previously agreed; however this is fully within the NW control when configuring the mapping. Is the idea here that the Relay UE will autonomously decide which bearer goes onto which RLC channel, depending on the CHOICE type?  [Rapp] the egress RLC channel is still under network control, the Q is just for relay UE to base on what to know the incoming PDU is for DRB or SRB. The majority view is basing on the egress RLC channel configuration to judge the ingress RLC channel. |

# Summary

For Q1, all companies agree.

**Recommendation 1 [19/19]: RAN2 confirm the working assumption of ” Remote local UE ID is 8 bits.”**

For Q2, all companies agree.

**Recommendation 2 [19/19]: RAN2 confirm the working assumption of ”** **Remote UE ID is always present in PC5 adaptation layer header.”**

For Q3-1a, all companies agree with 3a. Furthermore, 17/19 support to report either 1a or 2b, yet the view on selecting which one is diverse, i.e., 1a vs 2b is 10 vs. 8 (including CATT whose comment lean towards 2b). Moderator offline with proponent of 1a, and would like to suggest the following WF.

**Recommendation 3-1a-1 [19/19]: L2 relay UE report source L2 ID of relay-related discovery transmission to gNB.**

**Recommendation 3-1a-2 [?/19]: RAN2 discuss whether to report 1) source L2 ID to be used to establish PC5 link with L2 relay UE (i.e., used to send DCR message) or 2) source L2 ID of relay-related discovery transmission to gNB. And if the latter one is adopted, RAN2 discuss how to handle the case where model-A discovery is used by relay UE.**

For Q3-1b, all companies agree no need for source ID report in case of L3-relay, so no need for proposal.

For Q3-1c, majority view [11/19] is no further left issues. The others mainly propose to clarify the initiation condition for source ID report, including when the L2 relaying / discovery is initiated, and the source ID is updated. Moderator understand it can be handled in running CR discussion.

**Recommendation 3-1c [?/19]: Relying RRC running-CR discussion on how to specify the initiation condition for source L2 ID reporting.**

For Q3-2a, clear majority support the options except 2 [18/19].

**Recommendation 3-2a [18/19]: L2-remote, L2-relay, L3-remote and L3-relay UE report destination L2 ID for discovery transmission. L2-relay-UE, L3-remote-UE and L3-relay-UE report (i.e., except L2-remote-UE) destination L2 ID for established PC5 link for relaying.**

For Q3-2b, clear majority view [17/19] is not to introduce the relay/non-relay discovery differentiation indicator.

**Recommendation 3-2b [17/19]: In SUI, when reporting a particular destination L2 ID associated with discovery, RAN2 not pursue explicit relay type indication to differentiate between relay-discovery and non-relay-discovery.**

For Q3-2c, clear majority view [16/19] is option-1, including 1 who can follow majority] is to introduce new IE.

**Recommendation 3-2c [16/19]: For the destination L2 ID reporting for discovery and for established PC5 link for relay, add a new IE (i.e., instead of reusing the existing field *sl-DestinationIdentity*).**

For Q3-2d, not many companies expressed the view.. so far support vs not-support is 2 vs 3, so a bit hard to conclude.

**Recommendation 3-2d: When L2-relay UE report destination L2 ID of peer UE (i.e., ID of L2-remote UE), RAN2 discuss whether to report an indicator on whether local ID allocation is required [2/6] or not [4/6]**

For Q3-2e, clear majority view [17/19] is 1a.

**Recommendation 3-2e [17/19]: L2 relay-UE not report the updated ID of L2-remote UE of the established PC5 link.**

For Q4, all companies agree with the running-CR content.

**Recommendation 4 [19/19]: When a SRAP Data PDU that contains a UE ID or BEARER ID which is not included in sl-SRAP-Config-Remote (for Remote UE) or sl-SRAP-Config-Relay (for Relay UE) is received, the SRAP entity shall discard the received SRAP Data PDU.**

For Q5, clear majority [18/19] on option-2.

**Recommendation 5 [18/19]: For RRC\_INACTIVE / RRC\_IDLE L2-Relay UE, it gets local ID configuration for L2-remote UE during direct-to-indirect switching from network configuration on *sl-LocalIdentity-r17*.**

For Q6, clear majority [17/19] on option-3.

**Recommendation 6 [17/19]: In order for L2-relay UE to differentiate between SRAP data PDU for SRB and DRB if the BEARER ID is 0/1/2/3, for a SRAP Data PDU received from PC5 via *sl-Egress-RLC-Channel-Uu*, L2-relay UE can know whether it is SRB or DRB based on the associated *sl-RemoteUE-RB-Identity*.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Recommendation Number** | **Comment** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Recommendation 3-1a-2 | 1) Minor re-wording ”source ID”=> “source L2 ID”.  [Rapp] OK. Apply this to other similar places.  2) Our concern is not about what exactly is L2 ID. We’d like to clarify: why do we need remote UE to report its L2 ID to gNB?  It seems based on the agreement for “*RRC reconfiguration message towards the target Relay UE should include the Remote UE’s local ID/AL ID and L2 ID when preparing the direct-to-indirect path switch.*” But, please note this agreement was made at R2#116 and we also made agreement on PC5 SRAP to include local ID at R2#116bis later. With local ID included in PC5 SRAP, there is no need for remote UE to report its L2 ID and for gNB to configure the L2 ID of remote UE to relay UE (for SRB1 case). Relay UE can know the mapping between local ID and L2 ID of remote UE, by reading the local ID from the 1st SRAP data from remote UE and also its L2 ID.  If there is no clear motivation, we prefer not to introduce a new signalling.  [Rapp] We can further discuss this issue online. From rapp perspective, I see some difference in-between, i.e., with L2 ID, relay can know the identity of remote UE since the first PC5-S message, yet with local ID, relay UE can know the identity since the first message via SL-RLC0/1 – companies can express preference over the two. |
| Recommendation 3-1c | We want to clarify what’s new compared to R16 on handle the source ID update. If it is fine in the current spec, then the issue seems one R16 leftover CR.  [Rapp] Rapp observe the input by proponent (e.g., QC) aims at discovery, which does not exist in R16 spec. Yet I leave it to the proponent to clarify. |
| Recommendation 3-2b | Relay-discovery requires some discovery related thresholds to be configured to UE, while not needed for non-relay-discovery case. Without the type indication, how can gNB know whether to configure those thresholds?  [Rapp] Although i can see the point of it, my interpretation of the majority view is either gNB blindly provides the related configuration, or gNB bases on other report to derive on the need (e.g., relay related source/destination IDs). But I leave it to the proponents to clarify. |
| Recommendation 3-2d | Asumming Recommendation 3-2c is agreed, there seems remote UE type indicator for L2 ID reporting. Do we assume this as the indication to request gNB to allocate new local ID?  [Rapp] can you clarify more on the ” remote UE type indicator for L2 ID reporting”?  [Huawei]: Do we assume the highlight below, as discussed in Q3-2c, as the indicator for remote UE type/local ID request?  SidelinkUEInformation-v1310-IEs ::= SEQUENCE {  commTxResourceReqUC-r13 SL-CommTxResourceReq-r12 OPTIONAL,  commTxResourceInfoReqRelay-r13 SEQUENCE {  commTxResourceReqRelay-r13 SL-CommTxResourceReq-r12 OPTIONAL,  commTxResourceReqRelayUC-r13 SL-CommTxResourceReq-r12 OPTIONAL,  ue-Type-r13 ENUMERATED {relayUE, remoteUE}  } OPTIONAL,  In LTE, the ue-Type seems the type of UE transmitting this message. So, relay UE cannot use it as the indicator for local ID request.  We’d like to emphasize that there has to be some explicit or implicit indicator in SUI to inform gNB, when local ID is required for remote UE. For now, **there is no clear candidate solution proposed, instead of an explicit indicator.** Without this indicator, gNB cannot know whether SUI is for a remote UE, which requires local ID, or a legacy V2X UE. Then, it results in blind local ID allocation. |
|  | Recommendation 3-1a-2 | Our preference was for 1a, 3a (not included above).  [Rapp] OK, added into the ratio.  So the recommendation selects the minority preference with an indication to some offline discussion, it may be helpful if further elaboration regarding the offline was made.  [Rapp] As described above, the discussion output is as follows  [OPPO] After offline with QC, i assume the common ground is 1) the ID for 1a and for 2b can be same and can be different, 2) the ID reported to network has to be the ID that remote UE use for the transmission of DCR message, 3) the ID may be decided / changed by remote UE when a path switching is to be initiated. Is that the common view by others?  Whilst we share similar understanding to Huawei regarding the use of the local ID in the SRAP header that it is known by the gNB, then the concern over the choice of L2 ID in the reconfiguration message is unclear. However we support the QC observation regarding the potential use is for identification during path switch, direct-to-indirect. Wherein the discovery L2 ID is more representative of the Remote UE.  [OPPO] After a second thought, i reword 3-1a-2, in order for a more open discussion, i.e., start from asking whether 1a and 2b can be different, and if so, which one should be reported. Frankly speaking, i still have difficulty to undertstand that if 1a and 2b can be different, how would reporting of 1a help the procedure – isn’t that so only the 2b useful for the path switching procedure (as the source ID of DCR message)? |
|  | Recommendation 3-1c | We think cases of source L2 ID update should be reported  [Rapp] given the current shape of 3-1c, we should be able to check all the 3 conditions (including the ID update case) as raised by QC. |
|  | Recommendation 3-2d | Our understnding aligns with others that assume if 3-2c recommendation is for a new IE (option 1) then separate indicator is not needed  [Rapp] OK, Xiaomi view is added into the voring ratio of 3-2d. |
| Qualcomm | Recommendation 3-1a-2 | On Huawei’s comments, we share the rapporteur’s view that "with L2 ID, relay can know the identity of remote UE since the first PC5-S message”.  For current formulation of summary proposal, we understand Rapporteur suggested compromise, but we are still not sure how to address below questions. We don’t think each company is in same page. So, some clarification is required:   * How does Remote UE know which L2 Relay UE is it going to establish the link? * How remote UE generates source ID to be used before deciding to establish a link?   Thus, we suggest to online discuss this issue.  [Rapp] After further offline with QC, rapp understand there are two ways out  1) if go with 1a, it assumes the remote UE always used ID-1a for DCR transmission, and the left Q is how to handle model-A discovery where remote UE does not transmit discovery message  2) or go with 2b  So i further revise the proposal to make it clear. |
| Qualcomm | Recommendation 3-1c | We think it should be clarified that source L2 ID for discovery should be reported to gNB if it is updated.  We failed to see why it is a Rel-16 legacy issue? Note in Rel-16, SUI message includes destination L2 ID rather than source L2 ID.  SidelinkUEInformationNR-r16-IEs ::= SEQUENCE {  sl-RxInterestedFreqList-r16 SL-InterestedFreqList-r16 OPTIONAL,  sl-TxResourceReqList-r16 SL-TxResourceReqList-r16 OPTIONAL,  sl-FailureList-r16 SL-FailureList-r16 OPTIONAL,  lateNonCriticalExtension OCTET STRING OPTIONAL,  nonCriticalExtension SEQUENCE {} OPTIONAL  }  SL-InterestedFreqList-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofFreqSL-r16)) OF INTEGER (1..maxNrofFreqSL-r16)  SL-TxResourceReqList-r16 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofSL-Dest-r16)) OF SL-TxResourceReq-r16  SL-TxResourceReq-r16 ::= SEQUENCE {  sl-DestinationIdentity-r16 SL-DestinationIdentity-r16,  sl-CastType-r16 ENUMERATED {broadcast, groupcast, unicast, spare1},  sl-RLC-ModeIndicationList-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1.. maxNrofSLRB-r16)) OF SL-RLC-ModeIndication-r16 OPTIONAL,  sl-QoS-InfoList-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofSL-QFIsPerDest-r16)) OF SL-QoS-Info-r16 OPTIONAL,  sl-TypeTxSyncList-r16 SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..maxNrofFreqSL-r16)) OF SL-TypeTxSync-r16 OPTIONAL,  sl-TxInterestedFreqList-r16 SL-TxInterestedFreqList-r16 OPTIONAL,  sl-CapabilityInformationSidelink-r16 OCTET STRING OPTIONAL  }  [Rapp]Rapp understand it is to answer HW question. |
| Qualcomm | Recommendation 3-2d | Our understanding is that if Recommendation 3-2c is agreed (i.e. a new IE is introduced in SUI), isn’t the presence of the new IE indicates the requirement for local ID?  [Rapp] Rapp leave it to propoent to clarify. |
| Apple | Recommendation 3-1a-2 | Our understanding is that these addresses (1a and 2b) are to be same. But one issue is that remote UE using model-A relay discovery only (monitoring relay) do not need to generate a Src L2 ID. So, we need force remote UE to conduct an L2 ID self-asssignment in this case, which may address QC’s concern.  [Rapp] see reply to QC comment above. |
| Apple | Recommendation 3-1c | We think the remote UE update its L2 ID need report the new L2 ID to gNB  [Rapp] The current wording of 3-1c does nto exclude this, and thus we can disc this during CR discussion. |
| Apple | 3-2c | If we go with option 1, then there is impact to MAC spec for the ”destination index’ in BSR. We still see no big difference for Option 1 and 2 in RRC impact. Maybe comapniesd can still consider option 2 to reduce MAC impact.  [Rapp]Rapp understand it is similar to LTE spec like    Considering this, seems the majority view is still a valid / reasonable way-out. |
| Apple | 3-2d | If option 1 is chosen, Apple think the separate indicatior is not needed.  [Rapp] Rapp leave it to propoent to clarify. |
| Apple | 3-2e | We still think hiding the real L2 Destinaiton ID from gNB in SUI reporting is wrong in principle. This will force relay UE to maintain some L2 ID translation map for each of its connected remote UEs. We would prefer to solve it in a more conventional way (e.g. by adding new signaling).  [Rapp] even if the new signaling is introduced, as pointed by some companies, it may still happen that gNB configuration w.r.t the old ID is provided \_after\_ the new ID is reported, so meaning the relay UE has to maintain the new/old ID mapping anway. Considering this, seems still the majority view is a better way-out. |
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