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# Introduction

This document is to summarize the following email discussion

* [AT116bis-e][619][Relay] Remaining proposals on adaptation layer (Ericsson)

Scope: Discuss the remaining proposals from R2-2200943: P6/P3/P9.

Intended outcome: Report to CB session

Deadline: Monday 2022-01-24 1800 UTC

For rapporteur to have enough time drafting summary report, we would like to have the following two phases:

* Phase 1: collect companies’ views by 2022-01-21 1400 UTC
* Phase 2: rapporteur will finalize summary report based on inputs of phase 1 by 2022-01-24 1600 UTC

# Summary of AI 8.7.2.3

In the online discussion, the following proposals from R2-2200943 [1] are decided to be treated by this email discussion.

***Proposal 6 (discussion) If remote UE local ID is present in PC5 adaption layer header, RAN2 to down select the following options based on which remote UE can obtain the local ID from the gNB:***

***a. Option 1: via Uu RRC messages, including RRCSetup/RRCReconfiguration/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment***

***b. Option 2: Via SRAP header of RRCResume / RRCReestablishment***

***c. Option 3: relay UE forwards the local ID to remote UE via PC5 RRC message***

***Proposal 3 (discussion) Control PDU is not supported for the adaptation layer in this release.***

***Proposal 9 (discussion) RAN2 to discuss whether LCID for PC5 RLC channel is to be allocated by UE as in R16 or specified for Uu SRB0.***

## P3

Companies are invited to express views for the following questions.

Control PDU may be introduced in Uu adaptation layer or PC5 adaptation layer. it is necessary to check companies’ views for the two cases separately.

***Q1-1: which option do companies agree regarding whether to adopt control PDU in PC5 adaptation layer in this release?***

***Option 1: adopt the control PDU***

***Option 2: not adopt the control PDU***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes or No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 (No) | Control PDU is intended to support flow control. We disagree:   1. It is conflicted with agreement that “PC5 SRAP only support bearer mapping in this release” 2. From technique perspective, because Rel-17 supports only single hop, we think flow control can be achieved by relay UE and gNB implementation. For example, the below solutions can be considered:  * gNB or relay UE can limit number of remote UE connections based on the load and channel quality of the Uu and PC5 links. * In single hop relay, the traffic load of remote UEs can be roughly estimated based on SL BSR |
| CATT | Option 2 | It is clearly stated that for the Uu adaptation layer, bearer mapping and identification can be supported, and for the PC5 adaptation layer, only bearer mapping function can be supported. That’s to say, there is no need to further introduce a control PDU for adaptation layer in Rel-17 SL Relay. |
| vivo | Option 2 | Control PDU, e.g. for flow control and others, belongs to the scope of optimization and future extension, and is thus not necessary to be specified in R17 due to limited time. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 | Agree with other companies that RAN2 has already concluded to only support bearer mapping for the PC5 SRAP. Therefore, further discussion on control PDU shall be avoided. |
| Lenovo | See comments | Whether to support control PDU should be discussed based on use case. If control PDU is not supported in this release, the field included in header e.g D/C is still needed for forward compatibility purpose. |

***Q1-2: which option do companies agree regarding whether to adopt control PDU in Uu adaptation layer in this release?***

***Option 1: adopt the control PDU***

***Option 2: not adopt the control PDU***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes or No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 (No) | Similar comments in Q1-1. Please note that for Uu SRAP, we also have agreement that it only supports bearer mapping and remote UE identification. |
| CATT | Option 2 | It is clearly stated that for the Uu adaptation layer, bearer mapping and identification can be supported, and for the PC5 adaptation layer, only bearer mapping function can be supported. That’s to say, there is no need to further introduce a control PDU for adaptation layer in Rel-17 SL Relay. |
| vivo | Option 2 | Similar comments with Q1-1. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 |  |
| Lenovo | See comments | Whether to support control PDU should be discussed based on use case. If control PDU is not supported in this release, the field included in header e.g D/C is still needed for forward compatibility purpose. |

**Rapporteur summary**:

Rapporteur would like to try to reach at least a consensus about the above highlighted points and thus would like to suggest:



## P6

Companies are invited to express views for the following questions.

***Q2: which option do companies agree based on which remote UE can obtain the local ID from the gNB if the local ID is present in PC5 adaptation layer header?***

* ***Option 1: via Uu RRC messages, including RRCSetup/RRCReconfiguration/RRCResume/RRCReestablishment***
* ***Option 2: Via SRAP header of RRCResume / RRCReestablishment***
* ***Option 3: relay UE forwards the local ID to remote UE via PC5 RRC message***
* ***Option 4: Specified as “all-zero” value in this release***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes or No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | Because only single hop is supported in Rel-17, we think Option 1 is sufficient and can handle all scenarios. And Option 1 is also aligned the agreed way how relay UE gets remote UE’s local ID.  For Option 2, we agree that it can also work, although we are not totally sure whether any security concern because SRAP header is not security protected. However, it is redundant if Option 1 is adopted. It can be regarded as enhancement on top of Option 1. Because we agreed local ID is only 8bit, the benefit to save its payload size in Uu RRC message seems to be marginal.  For Option 3, we understand the intention is to have a unified procedure for local ID acquisition of remote UE (but if only option 1 is agreed, we don’t have this issue). However, you anyway need to use RRCReconfiguration during path switch, so the spec change on Uu is un-avoided. Meanwhile, Option 3 also means a latency of 1 Uu RRC message delivery because relay UE can’t multiplex PC5 RRC message and forwarded Uu SRB0/1 RRC message (e.g. ***RRCSetup /RRCResume/RRCReestablishment)*** in same MAC PDU. |
| OPPO | Option-1 | We are open to all options, and see the first priority is to converge on a solution ASAP.  Considering a) 2 is not a widely applicable solution since for RRC setup and HO case, the embed UP solution does not work, and b) 3 is not a widely applicable solution to HO, 1 is the one that can work for all cases.  So to save spec effort, 1 seems a better choice. |
| vivo | Option 4 | Option 4 is simple and can avoid going against previous agreement of not supporting any PC5-SRAP-header related impacts other than bearer mapping. |
| Ericsson | Option 1 | Agree with Qualcomm and OPPO, option 1 is the best option. |
| Lenovo | Option 1 | The remote UE can get the local ID before the packet including adaptation layer header is transmitted. |

**Rapporteur summary**:

Rapporteur would like to try to reach at least a consensus about the above highlighted points and thus would like to suggest:



## P9

Companies are invited to express views for the following questions.

***Q3: Regarding how to allocate LCID for PC5 RLC channel of remote UE Uu SRB0, which option do companies agree?***

* [**Option 1:  allocated by UE same as in R16 SL**](#_Toc93052901)
* [**Option 2: specified**](#_Toc93052902) **in RRC**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes or No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Option 2 | We have agreed to use specified PC5 RLC configuration for SRB0 delivery. Then, it means that a LCID is reserved for it (Otherwise, how relay UE can know it is the default PC5 RLC channel?) |
| vivo | Option 2 | We think specified PC5 RLC configuration for SRB0 includes the LCID value. |
| Ericsson | Option 2 |  |
| Lenovo | Option 2 |  |
|  |  |  |

**Rapporteur summary**:

Rapporteur would like to try to reach at least a consensus about the above highlighted points and thus would like to suggest:



# Conclusion

We have the following proposal:

[Proposal 1](#_Toc93423366)

[Proposal 2](#_Toc93423367)

[Proposal 3](#_Toc93423368)

3.1 Proposals in priority order

**Easy Proposals**

**Proposals for Online discussion**
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