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1. Introduction

This is to discuss the offline as follows.

1. Discussion on 6265

R2-2406265 Miscellaneous correction on R18 SL Evolution OPPO CR Rel-18 38.331 18.2.0 4863 - F NR\_SL\_enh2

Change-1:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reason for Change | There are both “Additional RLC bearer” and “Additional sidelink RLC bearer” terms in the spec, while on the former has been defined. |
| Summary of change: | Align the terminology as “Additional sidelink RLC bearer” |
| CR |  |

Change-2:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reason for Change | In 5.8.9.1a.4, it is specified that RRC layer indicate “carrier**(s)**”, as indicated in *sl-FreqInfoList* / *sl-PreconfigFreqInfoList*, to lower layer, but neither *sl-FreqInfoList* nor *sl-PreconfigFreqInfoList* will include more than one carrier. |
| Summary of change: | Remove the plural form of the “carrier**~~(s)~~**” in 5.8.9.1a.4 |
| CR |  |

Change-3:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reason for Change | In 5.8.9.1a.6.1, one of the duplication configuration initiation condition is “for unicast, for sidelink SRB 1/2/3, if UE **decides to use** PDCP duplication after receiving RRCReconfigurationCompleteSidelink”, which comes from R2#123bis agreement that ***Agreements on SRBs****1. SL PDCP duplication can be* ***applied*** *to SL-SRB3 only after receiving RRCReconfigurationCompleteSidelink.**2. SL PDCP duplication can be* ***applied*** *to SL-SRB1/2 only after receiving RRCReconfigurationCompleteSidelink.*The real intention was to restrict the timing to “**apply**” the duplication, which has already been reflected in 5.8.9.1a.6.2, “for unicast, for SRB, **after receiving the *RRCReconfigurationCompleteSidelink* message**, if the additional Sidelink RLC bearer addition **was decided by UE**:”, and it is obvious that the duplication **decision** has to be done **before** the transmission of the RRCReconfiguratIonSidelink. |
| Summary of change: | Remove the restriction of “after receiving RRCReconfigurationCompleteSidelink”, and add the condition of UE capability, to align with DRB case. |
| CR |  |

Change-4:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reason for Change | In 9.1.1.4/5, for the RLC and MAC configuration of additional SL RLC bearer, terminologies are not aligned. |
| Summary of change: | Align the terms, to be “Additional RLC configuration”, and “MAC configuration associated to additional RLC configuration” |
| CR |  |

**Q1: Do you agree with the 4 changes proposed by 6265? If no, please clarify which changes is not agreeable and why**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment (e.g., which change is not agreeable and why) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Google | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |

1. Discussion on 7372

R2-2407372 Correction on setuprelease type sidelink fields handling Google CR Rel-18 38.331 18.2.0 4821 1 F NR\_SL\_enh2 R2-2405322

Change-1:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reason for Change | Section 5.8.13.2:When the *sl-DiscConfig* is “not set to *setup”* in the *RRCReconfiguration*; and the frequency used for NR sidelink discovery is not included *in sl-FreqInfoList* included in *SIB12* or not sl-DiscConfigCommon is included in SIB12, the UE should pefrom the actions as specifed in the bullet “1> else”. Current UE behaviour is not correct. |
| Summary of change: | In section 5.8.13.2, add the sentence “and set to setup” in the first bullet 1>. |
| CR |  |

Change-2:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reason for Change | Section 5.8.9.1.3:When the receiving *PCsl-DRX-ConfigUC-PC5* is set to release, the UE should configure lower layer to cancel the sidelink DRX operation associated to the PC5-RRC connection.When the *sl-MeasConfig* is set to *release*, the UE should release all the stored sidelink measurement object, sidelink reporting configuration, the sidelink quantity configuration and sidelink measurement identity; |
| Summary of change: | In section 5.8.9.1.3:Add a bullet to specify the cancel behaviours after receiving the *PCsl-DRX-ConfigUC-PC5*; Add the bullet to specify the UE behaviours related to release all the stored sidelink measurement object, sidelink reporting configuration, the sidelink quantity configuration and sidelink measurement identity;  |
| CR |  |

Change-3:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reason for Change | Section 5.3.5.14:The field *sl-UE-SelectedConfig* should not be configured simultaneously with *sl-ScheduledConfig*. In current procedural text, there is no UE behaviors related to release *sl-UE-SelectedConfig* and *sl-ScheduledConfig*. If the request from the NW is to release the stored *sl-UE-SelectedConfig* and setup *sl-ScheduledConfig*, the UE will keep both configurations according to current procedural text. |
| Summary of change: | In section 5.3.5.14, add the bullets to specify the UE actions related to release *sl-ScheduledConfig* and *sl-UE-SelectedConfig*. |
| CR |  |

Change-4:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reason for Change | Section 5.3.5.3 and 5.3.13.4:When the sl-ConfigDedicatedNR is set to release, the UE should release the stored sidelink configurations.5.8.9.1b.1.1 Sidelink Carrier Release ConditionFor NR sidelink communication, sidelink carrier release is initiated in the following cases:1> for unicast, if sl-Carrier-Id of the sidelink carrier is received in sl-CarrierToReleaseList in the RRCReconfigurationSidelink; or1> for unicast, if a sidelink carrier failure has been indicated by MAC layer; or1> for unicast, if the sidelink carrier release was triggered due to the configuration received within the sl-ConfigDedicatedNR, SIB12, SidelinkPreconfigNR or upper layer; or |
| Summary of change: | In 5.3.5.3 and 5.3.13.4, specify that the UE releases the sl-ConfigDedicatedNR according to section 5.8.9.1b.1. |
| CR |  |

**Q2: Do you agree the 4 changes proposed by 7372? If no, please clarify which changes is not agreeable and why**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment (e.g., which change is not agreeable and why) |
| OPPO | No | Considering this part in the specThere is no need for this change (within change-2) at leastFor the other changes, considering RRC Rapp proposal in We lean towards negative for the other changes.But we are open to hear views from others. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | Considering there will be no critical ambiguity of UE behavior without the changes, we understand such descriptions related to setup/release type fields can be added for future releases. |
| Google | Yes | Agreed with the comments from OPPO. However, RRC Rapp proposal only provide the generic rule for the SetupRelease field (Below is the agreed text I copied from R2-2407086). We think it is not cover the first change and the 4th change. In the 1st and the 4th change, the UE behavior for release is not just release field-rX. Base on this, we propose to include the 1st and the 4th change in final CR.*Typically, a field defined using the parameterized SetupRelease type does not require procedural or field description text that refer to the setup or release values. If such field anyway requires procedural text for specific actions, the field is referred to using the values defined for the type itself, namely, "setup" and "release". For example, procedural text for field-rX above could be as follows:**1> if field-rX is set to "setup":**2> do something;**1> else (field-rX is set to "release"):**2> release field-rX (if appropriate).* |
| Ericsson | No | According to RRC rapporteur suggested rules on setuprelease, we think the proposed changes are minor, there is no ambiguity on UE behaviors even without the changes. |
| vivo | No | We don’t think there is really ambiguity, and according to RRC rapporteur suggestion we prefer not to have this changes. |