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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).  **Samsung(Weiwei)**: We have different understandings. The original intention of introducing of T421 in scenario 1 is to avoid spending a long period for PC5 link establishment, and the time spent by the indirect path addition/change can be restricted by T421. In our understanding, regardless of type of indirect path, the remote UE should have the same latency requirement for path addition/change. Thus, for scenario 2, the intention for T421 is still applicable, and it is more meaningful than scenario 1. The reason is that the N3C link establishment relies on the unknown non-3GPP technology; if T421 is not introduced for scenario 2, it means that the path addition/change procedure has no time restriction, and it completely relies on the procedure of N3C link.  Rapp\_v1: we tend to agree with CATT that if to support N3C indirect path addition/change failure, asn.1 change and T421 are both not needed, as failure detection can be left to UE implementation and the existing failure type can be reused, and only some procedure text is needed. but if not all companies agree to remove T421 in scenario 2, we can further discussion in the meeting. |
| 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.  Rapp\_v1: my understanding is the proposed text in H659 is compatible with the idea “the UE to detect non-3GPP connections when a UE supporting N3C originates an RRC connection for data’, because how to determine there is N3C is up to UE implementation. Considering idle/inactive relay reporting is not supported, only when the relay UE is in connected state, the (remote) UE can report this to network, before that, if network configures N3C relay reporting, the (remote) UE just report 0 relay UE, and if this status changed, i.e. relay UE moves to connected state, the (remote) UE updates the reporting. we can further check this in the meeting, so for now the status of H659 is changed to ToDo. |
| 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?  Rapp\_v1: the considering is more for the case when the number of candidate N3C relay UEs changes from non-zero to 0, it is not clear absent means there is no candidate relay or candidate relay number is not change. |
| 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.  Rapp\_v1: the proposed changes in H695 is: if split SRB1 with duplication is configured, xxxx, or xxx, so the part after “or” should cover non-split SRB1 and split SRB1 without duplication? and for the detailed changes, it is true there are two options and RAN2 needs to down-select. |
| 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.  Rapp\_v1: I got the point, but my understand is that in Rel-17 connected remote UE will not make any action based on this unsolicited SIB1 if any, neither does the MP remote UE, which can be considered as connected state remote UE?  **Lenovo (Lianhai) v2:** After Rel-17 connected remote UE receives unsolicited SIB1, the remote UE performs the actions specified in clause 5.2.2.4. (see 5.8.9.9.3). Therefore, MP remote UE will also perform the actions specified in clause 5.2.2.4 after receiving unsolicited SIB1 for the different cell. Therefore, we need to modify it. for example, we can have a note that MP remote UE will ignore the received unsolicited SIB1 if there are different cells for direct path and indirect path. |
| OPPO | O430, O431, O432, O433 | Rapp: this is connected state configuration, if UE requests the configuration via SUI for a connection, the network will provide the related connection, not sure why need to check if the connection is not there?  [OPPO] We are trying to clarify that the “release/addition” is not “release/addition” of U2U Remote/Relay UE but just configurations to the existing Relay-Remote connection. And we found in R17 U2N Relay, for L2 Remote UE release operation at U2N Relay UE, relay UE also checks the existence of PC5-RRC connection with the corresponding remote UE indicated in sl-RemoteUE-ToReleaseList, we understand similar assumption can be applied here, i.e., UE need to check the existence of PC5-RRC connection indicated in the “Add/Release” of U2U Relay/Remote UE configuration, i.e., whether the configuration from NW is valid or not.  Rapp\_v1:  For point #1: the “release/addition” is not “release/addition” of U2U Remote/Relay UE but just configurations to the existing Relay-Remote connection, I fully agree, and the current specification uses “configure/modify the configuration/release the configuration” which should align with point #1.  For point #2: the reason to let relay UE check if there is a connection in Rel-17 is that the remote UE may already release this connection, but in Rel-18 we only consider configuration release and even not touch the connection, so the checking seems not necessary. |
| OPPO | X029, X030, X031 | We have no conclusion/agreement on this proposal, i.e., for source remote UE, there is no “threshold condition with the Sidelink U2U Relay UE.”.  Rapp\_v1: I agree that we have not discussed such details. the situation is that following the current specification, after discovery procedure is triggered by relay reselection, the remote UE needs to check direct link quality, and only the AS threshold of direct link has met, the remote UE can transmit discovery message. Not sure if everyone is on the same page. I change the statues to ToDo. If there are different views, we can have further discussion in the meeting. |
| OPPO | Q582 | We understand the intention, but just wonder whether “solicitation message” (as PC5-S message) is visible to AS layer.  Rapp\_v1: There are several different cases of discovery transmission (e.g. by source remote UE, target remote UE, relay UE). for instance, relay UE needs to check threshold condition before transmitting discovery solicitation message to target, but does not need to check AS condition before transmitting discovery response message to source UE. Therefore, it seems to be clearer if we can use the discovery message name to differentiate different case. |
| Nokia | H656, H695, O424, B110 | **Nokia(Sunyoung):** We need to cover two cases: 1) non-split SRB1 and 2) split SRB1 without duplication configured. For both cases, we think T421 can be stopped when PC5 connection is successfully made, i.e., option 1 discussed in RAN2#124. Given that T400 is stopped upon reception of RRCReconfigurationCompleteSidelink, it would be redundant to have the share the same condition for stopping two similar timers (T400 and T421).  **Samsung(Weiwei)** We share the same understanding as Nok. For option 2, the remote UE will start T400 when T421 is running, and both timers can be used to detect the failure of indirect path addition/change. The potential consequence is that, if both timers expire at the similar time, the remote UE cannot clearly indicate the cause of failure (i.e., whether to indicate T421 expiry or SL radio link failure). On the other hand, if Option 1 is selected, the remote UE can indicate the failure caused by the failed establishment of PC5 connection via T421 expiry, while the remote UE can indicate the SL radio link failure when T400 expires. In other words, option 1 can clearly separate the PC5 link establishment problem from SL radio link failure.  Rapp\_v1: let’s have further discussion in the meeting. |
| Nokia | H662 | **Nokia(GWO):** Our understanding is that this NOTE is only applicable to single path. |
| Nokia | J062 | **Nokia(GWO):** Our understanding is that if this is an issue, then it is an issue coming from Rel-17. |
| Nokia | Q581 | **Nokia(GWO):** We are OK with the proposal of removing the additional checking. |
| Nokia | A619 | **Nokia(GWO):** The local ID is always assigned and maintained by the U2U Relay UE. We think that it can be left to the UE implementation when it is released. |
| Nokia | N026 | **Nokia(GWO):** We think that a simple additional criterion that neither SL-RSRP nor SD-RSRP is available can solve this Editor’s Note (our original comment was unclear):  2> if *sd-RSRP-ThreshU2U* is not configured, or if the SD-RSRP measurement of the peer NR sidelink U2U Remote UE is available and is below *sd-RSRP-ThreshU2U* by *sd-HystMinU2U* if configured; or~~:~~  2> if neither the SL-RSRP measurement nor the SD-RSRP measurement of the peer NR sidelink U2U Remote UE is available:  3> consider the threshold conditions to be met (entry); |