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# 1 Introduction

The following document is to provide and collect input about a way forward in resolving the remaining open issues present in the running CR for 38.304 for SL relay. Also, this is related to the following email discussion:

 **[AT118-e][613][Relay] 38304 relay CR (Ericsson)**

      Scope: Update the rapporteur CR, incorporating decisions of this meeting and taking into account related proposals in the related tdocs: R2-2205905, R2-2204992.

      Intended outcome: Agreed CR (without CB if possible)

      Deadline:  Wednesday 2022-05-18 0400 UTC

# 2 Contact information

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email address |
| OPPO | Boyuan Zhang | zhangboyuan@oppo.com |
| InterDigital | Martino Freda | martino.freda@interdigital.com |
| ZTE | Lin Chen | chen.lin23@zte.com.cn |
| CATT | Hao Xu | xuhao@catt.cn |
| Samsung | Hyunjeong Kang | hyunjeong.kang@samsung.com |
| Nokia | Gyuri Wolfner | gyorgy.wolfner@nokia.com |

# 3 Discussion

## 3.1 Changes in [R2-2205905](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205905.zip)

This open issue relates to the fact it is not clear that paging reception by the relay UE includes monitoring paging for the remote UE. It is also not indicated where the relay UE obtains the DRX cycle of the remote UE. According to this the solution si to add a sentence indicating that the relay can perform paging reception for the remote UE’s that are attached. The description of the DRX cycle is updated to clarify that the relay can obtain it in PC5-RRC signaling.

**Question 1:** Do companies agree with the changes proposed in [R2-2205905](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2205905.zip)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| OPPO | Comment | No strong view on the first change.For the second change, do not think it is needed since the L2 relay architecture does not change the formula for PO/PF calculation. |
| InterDigital | Yes | For the second change, the DRX cycle is obtained from PC5-RRC (not Uu RRC or upper layers), so the current spec is incorrect for a L2 U2N Relay. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | One typo?A L2 U2N Relay UE monitors the paging occasions of it PC5-RRC connected remote UEs. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes with comment | Agree with the intention. But the 2nd change may need some clarification that the information is used to calculate PO/PF for Remote UE not Relay UE itself. |
| Nokia | Yes | There is a typo in the 1st sentence"A L2 U2N Relay UE monitors the paging occasions of its PC5-RRC connected remote UEs" |

## 3.2 Changes in [R2-2204992](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204992.zip)

This CR proposes mostly miscellaneous correction in order to support SL relay in TS 38.304.

**Question 2:** Do companies agree with the changes proposed in [R2-2204992](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_118-e/Docs/R2-2204992.zip)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| OPPO | Yes | Proponent |
| InterDigital | No | The current text is not incorrect – this change seems to be mostly cosmetic. |
| ZTE | No | For the first change, the title of the clause 8.1 include sidelink discovery. If the sidelink discovery is changed to sidelink relay discovery, it would be better to also mention the procesing of non-relay discovery. |
| Lenovo | No with comments | Regarding the first change, we agree that current description need to be updated. |
| CATT | See comments | For the first change, we wonder whether need to change the title of 8.1 from “, and NR sidelink discovery” to “, and NR sidelink relay discovery”.For the second change, the content in the bracket seems no restriction to only containing relay case.  |
| Samsung | See comment | For the 1st change, we also have similar thought whether non relay discovery should be clarified. |
| Nokia | Comment | The 1st change is a valid clarificationThe 2nd change is acceptable, but not necessary |

# 4 Conclusion

According to the discussion in section 3, the following proposals are formulated:

# 5 References