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| **Company** | **RIL Number** | **Comment** |
| CATT | C234, C235, H661 | Rapporteur’s comment for the related RIL is listed as below:  Rapp: C234 and C235 are based on assumption of support N3C indirect path addition/change failure detection and reporting, while H661 propose to not have T421 for N3C case. The rapp understands if totally align with scenario 1, there should be path addition/change failure for scenario 2, but the issue is whether/how to determine change failure. In scenario 1, the remote UE may not be able to establish PC5 connection with relay UE successfully, so T421 is specified; however, in scenario 2, can we assume the N3C is stable without failure detection based on timer?  if companies think failure handling is necessary, we can have further discussion.  Indeed, C234 and C235 assume supporting N3C indirect path addition/change failure detection and reporting. But this does mean we need to have T421 for N3C case.  For the yellow marked part, CATT’s have the same point with HW that T421 for N3C case is not needed.  For the green marked part, our point is the case for N3C indirect path addition/change failure can really happen, but we don’t need to specify any method to determine the change failure (leave it to UE implementation).  When the case for N3C indirect path addition/change failure happens, our target is to capture some procedure description to guidance UE how to handle it (For this part, we can fully reuse scenario1 case).  As Rapporteur mentioned in the comment, the 1st question is for N3C whether the failure will happen for N3C indirect path addition/change case?  If the answer to 1st question is “will happen”, then we need to further check whether we leave the failure detection to UE implementation?  If the answer to 2nd questionis “leave the detection to UE implementation”, then we just add some text procedure description without introduce any new IE to finish the whole task (to guidance UE how to handle it). |
| MediaTek | H659 | We agree with the issue given the current structure of the ASN.1, but we think the current way of triggering the UE to detect non-3GPP connections is not the best solution in the scenario where a UE supporting N3C originates an RRC connection for data that would benefit from MP. We will bring a tdoc. |
| Sharp | J106 | [RIL]  SIZE should start from 1 since this field is optional.  [proposed change]  N3C-RelayUE-InfoList-r18 ::= SEQUENCE (SIZE (1..8)) OF N3C-RelayUE-Info-r18  Rapp’s comment is below  *Rapp: size 0 is useful which means there is no N3C available.*  gNB understand there is no N3C available when n3c-RelayUE-InfoList-r18 is absent in UEAssistanceInformation (gNB also understands there is no L2 U2N relay available when sl-MeasResultsCandRelay-r17 is absent in measurement report).  What is the difference between the case that n3c-Relay-InfoList-r18 is absent and the case that n3c-Relay-InfoList-r18 is exist but size is 0? |
| Sharp | H695 | Added comment is missing;  [Sharp] Firstly, there are two cases that the current stopping conditions do not cover, i.e. non-split SRB is configured or split-SRB without duplication is configured. And Huawei’s proposal does not cover the case where non-split SRB is configured. We suggest to modify proposed change as below:  Upon successfully sending RRCReconfigurationComplete message (i.e., PC5 RLC acknowledgement is received from target L2 U2N Relay UE) if split SRB1 with duplication is configured.  Upon reception of *RRCReconfigurationCompleteSidelink* message from target L2 U2N relay UE if non-split SRB1 or split SRB1 without duplication is configured.  Relating to this, RAN2 may need to discuss based on the following agreement:  [RAN2#123bis] down-select next meeting from the following options for the stop condition:  Option 1: PC5 connection is established (i.e., PC5-S unicast link establishment procedure is complete).  Option 2: upon reception of RRCReconfigurationCompleteSidelink. |
| Sharp | H682 | Added comment is missing;  [Sharp] We agree with Huawei. And further change to support update QoS is needed as follows:  5.8.9.11.3 Actions related to transmission of the UEInformationResponseSidelink by the UE  The UE shall perform the following actions upon reception of the *UEInformationRequestSidelink* or upon change in any of the information in the UEInformationResponseSidelink: |
| Lenovo | B108 | Rapp: B108, X028 seem to discuss the same thing, i.e. whether unsolicited SIB1 forwarding would impact L2 U2N remote UE configured with MP. The rapp understands in Rel-17, only idle/inactive UE rely on relay's SIB1 forwarding, so it would be straightforward that MP remote UE will not process this unsolicited SIB1 forwarding. it is not preferred to change relay UE's behavior, since there is no need to let relay UE differentiate Rel-17 remote UE and Rel-18 MP remote UE.  **Lenovo(Lianhai):** We are fine that MP remote UE will not process this unsolicited SIB1 forwarding since it will not impact relay UE's bebahaviour. But our understanding is that we need to capture ‘MP remote UE will not process this unsolicited SIB1 forwarding’ in the specification. |
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