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# Introduction

This is discussion document for below offline discussion of RAN2#111-e:

* [AT111-e][604][Relay] L3 relay protocol stacks (Qualcomm)

      Scope: Discuss and document the proposed L3 relay design(s), focussing on general mechanisms of L3 architecture based sidelink relaying including protocol stacks and high level description of required UP/CP functionalities

      Intended outcome: Summary with potential agreeable TP

      Deadline:  Monday 2020-08-24 1200 UTC

As mentioned in “Scope”, we will discuss the following aspects:

* User plane protocol stack of L3 UE-to-NW relay
* Control plane protocol stack of L3 UE-to-NW relay, and the related control plane procedures:
  + Authentication
  + PC5 link establishment procedure
  + QoS for relaying functionality
  + Security of relayed connection
  + Service continuity
* Protocol stack of L3 UE-to-UE relay

Meanwhile, rapporteur have below clarifications on the offline discussion scoping:

* Discovery and relay (re)selection are not included in discussion scoping
* Candidate solutions are from SA2 TR 23.752 [1] and companies’ contributions [3-28].
* On UE-to-UE relay: although few companies discussed its L3 relay protocol stacks, note that following Note of SID

“NOTE 2: It is assumed that UE-to-network relay and UE-to-UE relay use the same relaying solution” [2].

Rapporteur tried to progress with assumption the similar protocol stack of L3 UE-to-Network relay can be reused for L3 UE-to-UE relay.

Finally, because the outcome may include an agreeable TP, rapporteur would like to divide into 2 phases:

* Phase 1: collect companies’ view, by Friday 2020-08-21 23:50 UTC
* Phase 2: rapporteur will share summary report and TP based on input of phase 1 for review, by Monday 2020-08-24 12:00 UTC

# Discussion

Below discussion, please note NOTE1 of SID [2]:

*“NOTE 1: The study shall take into account of further input from SA WGs, e.g., SA2 and SA3, for the bullets above (if applicable).”*

Thus, for each discussion, we will first provide inputs from SA2 and SA3 as starting point.

## User plane protocol stack of L3 UE-to-NW relay

SA2 agreed on the L3 user plane protocol stack (shown in Figure 1 below) in TR 23.752 [1] clause 6.6:



**Figure.1: User plane protocol stack for L3 UE-to-Network Relay in clause 6.6 of TR 23.752**

Multiple companies discussed this topic [3][4][5][13][16][18][22][23][28]. Their opinions can be summarized below:

* Alt-1: Follow Figure 1 in clause 6.6 of TR 23.752 ([3][4][5][13][16][18][22][23][28])
  + According to them, there are no AS impacts expected for supporting this user plane protocol stack for L3 relays and RAN2 can adopt this protocol stack as is for L3 relay.
* Alt-2: With adaptation layer above PDU layer ([9]), as illustrated in Figure. 2.
  + According to [9], this reflects the intended L3 UE relay operation, in which 5G QoS flow is first mapped to PC5 QoS flow for sidelink transmission; then the PC5 QoS flow is mapped to 5G QoS flow of the relay UE for transmission over Uu interface; finally the 5G QoS flow of the relay UE is mapped back to the remote UE’s 5G QoS flow at UPF. .



**Figure.2: User plane protocol stack for L3 UE-to-NW Relay proposed in [9]**

Companies are invited to share their preference for these alternatives:

**Q1: Which alternatives do you prefer for user plane protocol stack of L3 UE-to-NW Relay?**

* **Alt-1: Figure 1 (in clause 6.6 of TR 23.752)**
* **Alt-2: Figure 2 (proposed in [9])**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preference  (Alt-1/Alt-2) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Alt-1 | We see no reason to deviate the protocol stack as discussed at SA2, as L3 relay is mainly in SA2 expertise. |
| Futurewei | Alt-2 | It makes clear that 5G QoS flow of the remote UE needs to be mapped to 1) PC5 QoS flow between the remote UE and the relay UE and 2) 5G QoS flow of the relay UE. These three types of QoS flows belong to 3 different PDU sessions, the remote UE’s PDU session, the PC5 session between the remote UE and the relay UE, and the relay UE’s PDU session, respectively. |
| Xiaomi | Alt-1 | Any L3 solution should be confirmed by SA2 first. But we wonder whether this selection should be made in RAN2. |
| OPPO |  | Apparently the selection of L3 relay protocol it is up to SA2, e.g., one has to consider the other alternative of N3IWF.  On the other hand, RAN2 can try to have common understanding of the assumed protocol stack based on which to discuss RAN2 aspect – so the question is whether the alternatives of L3 relay stacks in SA2 TR makes a difference to RAN2-related work? |
| Ericsson (Tony) | Alt-1 | Alt-1 is aligned with SA2 and we see no reason to deviate from this. |
| Qualcomm | Alt-1 | @Xiaomi: the figure of Alt-1 is already captured in SA2 TR 23.752. I am not sure why you think SA2 needs to confirm something in their TR?  @OPPO: since this protocol stack is specified in SA2 TR, why can’t RAN2 study its RAN impact first? Our consideration is that L3 relay protocol stack with or without N3IWF has only SA2 impact and no RAN2 impact. Thus, we would like to first capture L3 relay protocol stack without N3IWF and study its RAN2 impact. After that (maybe next meeting), we can also capture L3 relay protocol stack with N3IWF, and companies can quickly confirm no extra RAN2 impact on top of this one.  @Futurewei: we understand your intention. However, adaptation layer is over PDU layer. And QoS flow is mapped between remote and relay in your proposal. Then, I am not sure whether it is within RAN2 scoping? |
| CATT | Alt-1 or N3IWF | Agree with OPPO, the L3 relay architecture should be decided by SA2. |
| Fraunhofer | Alt-1 | It is unclear to us why the requirements of the application would need to be translated to the 5G QoS flows first rather than to the PC5 QoS flows directly. From our understanding, applications would be designed for both sidelink and Uu based protocol stack. |
| Huawei |  | We share the same view with OPPO and CATT that the L3 protocol stack should be decided by SA2. And what RAN2 can do is only to analyze the RAN2 impact.  And our understanding is from RAN2’s point view, the AS part of Alt-1/Alt-2/N3IWF are the same (at least for AS protocol stack).  Regarding QoS aspect, we are not sure how the 5G QoS flow works for L3 relay, given that the remote UE may transmit 5G QoS flow/PDU session via PC5 to relay UE. |
| vivo | Alt-1 | Take Alt-1 as the basic L3 Relay architecture. |
| ZTE | Alt-1 | For alt-2, we think mapping between QoS flows and PDU session is handled by core network, which is out of RAN2’s scope. And for protocol stack design, PDU session shall not be included in the protocwordol as one layer. As described in 23.501, PDU layer is corresponds to the PDU carried between the UE and the DN over the PDU Session.When the PDU Session Type is IPv4 or IPv6 or IPv4v6, it corresponds to IPv4 packets or IPv6 packets or both of them; When the PDU Session Type is Ethernet, it corresponds to Ethernet frames. In other words, PDU layer is IP layer or Ethernet layer. In consequence, it doesn’t make sense that we put QoS flow mapping layer, i.e. adaptation layer , above the PDU layer. |
| Lenovo | Alt-1 | SA2 made already agreement on L3 protocol stack. |
| Nokia |  | The L3 protocol stack is in the scope of SA2. Alt-1 is an acceptable starting point with the disclaimer that the solution with N3IWF should also be captured. (Minimal or no RAN impacts are expected between the L3 variants.) It might be better not to capture anything before SA2 concludes this issue. |
| Apple | Alt-1 or N3IWF | TO be finally decided by SA2 |
| Convida |  | We share the same view as OPPO. The selection of L3 relay protocol should be up to SA2. The key for RAN2 is to discuss RAN2 potential impacts that could help progress the work in RAN2 in RAN2 but also that could be factored into SA2 L3 relay selection decision if any. |
| Intel | Alt-1 | We also understand that it is finalized in SA2 |
| Spreadtrum | Alt-1 | To be aligned with solution captured in SA2 TR. |
| Fujitsu | Alt-1 | We should follow what SA2 discussed. |
| Samsung | Alt-1 | This is within SA2 remit anyway. We do however also support (as discussed in SA2) the N3IWF variant. |
| LG | Alt-1 |  |
| Sony | Alt-1 |  |
| ETRI | Alt-1 | We prefer Alt-1 that is aligned with SA2’s discussion. |

##### **Summary of Q1**

1. **15 companies prefer to use Alt-1 as baseline user plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay in RAN2. However, most of them also mentioned that it should be SA2 to decide because L3 relay is mainly in SA2 expertise.**
2. **6 companies prefer to consider both Alt-1 and SA2 defined another protocol stack (with N3IWF in solution#26), and leave SA2 for further work**
3. **1 company prefer to use Alt-2 as baseline user plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay in RAN2**

**Rapporteur think:**

* **People in 1) and 2) actually have similar understanding but use different descriptions. They all prefer RAN2 to follow SA2 specified user plane protocol stacks design because no issues are identified to support them from RAN2 perspective.**
* **For 3), rapporteur think Alt-2 is out of scoping of RAN2 because its adaptation layer is over PDU layer and QoS flow is mapped between remote and relay. Thus, rapporteur would suggest Futurewei to propose Alt-2 in SA2. If Alt-2 is agreed in SA2, RAN2 can also capture it in RAN2 TR.**

**To make progress, rapporteur suggest to just capture SA2 specified options and clarify that no issue for RAN2 to support them:**

**Proposal 1: On user plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay, capture the followings in RAN2 TR:**

* **SA2 specified two user plane protocol stacks for L3 UE-to-NW relay in TR 23.752 (Figure 6.6.1-2 of solution#6 and Figure 6.23.2-3 of solution#23). No issues are identified to support them from RAN2 perspective, and RAN2 leaves future work to SA2.**

## Control plane protocol stack of L3 UE-to-NW relay

Because control plane protocol stack is related to AS control plane procedures. Thus, rapporteur suggest to first study control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-NW relay, and then discuss control plane protocol stack based on the inputs.

### Control plane procedure

Figure 3 shows the relay connection setup procedures agreed for L3 UE-to-network relay in SA2, in section 6.6 of TS 23.752 [1]. 

Figure.3: L3 UE-to-NW relay connection setup procedures

These procedures reuse the LTE ProSe and NR V2X procedures, and rapporteur think that basically the high-level procedures as proposed by SA2 are sufficient for L3 relay operation. Multiple companies discussed this topic [3][4][21], and it seems most of them agree the high-level procedure in Figure.3. Rapporteur would like to confirm whether companies have the common understanding.

**Q2: Do you agree to capture the high-level connection setup procedure of L3 UE-to-NW relay in Figure. 3 in TP?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments (please provide comment if you think “No”) |
| MediaTek | Yes with but | We agree the overall procedure as shown in the figure for connection setup procedure of L3 UE-to-NW relay. But it is better for RAN2 to make a reference link to the section of SA2 which helps to capture any latest update from SA2 side. By the way, as can be seen, there is no AS layer procedure in the flow and then capturing the figure does not help to proceed L3 relay study at RAN2 side. |
| Futurewei | No | NG-RAN is also involved in Step 3 to configure the sidelink DRB for relay. Figure 3 is too abstract to help document RAN UP/CP functionalities, lacking steps taken between the remote UE, the relay UE, and the serving gNB in the UE-to-Network relay connection setup procedure. |
| Xiaomi | Yes with comments | Generally, the solution is fine. But we think the relay selection should also be included in the procedure, which may have AS impact. |
| OPPO |  | We do not see the point to copy a figure from SA2 TR has no/little content for RAN into RAN TR..  On the other hand, RAN2 can try to have common understanding of the assumed protocol stack based on which to discuss RAN2 aspect – so the question is whether the alternatives of L3 relay stacks in SA2 TR makes a difference to RAN2-related work? |
| Ericsson | Yes | However, we agree with MediaTek that a reference to the SA2 TR it would help to capture any latest update made by SA2.  We are also fine to investigate the RAN2 impact in how the AS layer is impacted by this procedure, even if we do not see a strong change in legacy procedures. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We agree with MediaTek that a reference to SA2 TR is helpful.  Our consideration is that this figure is just a starting point for RAN2 to study L3 relay’s AS impacts. If we don’t even have a common understanding of baseline procedure, how can we discuss its AS impact on the fly? We do plan to study its AS impact, e.g. discovery and relay (re)selection will be included in this figure after their AS impacts are identified.  @OPPO: we are still not sure why RAN2 need to jump to study the impact of protocol stack with N3IWF, before the study of the one without N3IWF is finished. |
| CATT | Yes | This section should be appear in the TR, but the details can refer to SA2 spec. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | Agree with QC, we can use this as a baseline and discuss aspects that impact the AS |
| Huawei |  | Agree with OPPO, there is no need to copy this SA2 figure in RAN2 TR, we can decide what RAN2 related CP procedures to be discussed/captured. |
| vivo | Yes | This Figure helps us to better understand the whole picture of how L3 based relaying works. |
| ZTE | Yes | We also need to add more RAN2 related details below this figure in RAN2 TR. |
| Lenovo | Yes | We agree that the procedure captured in SA2 TR should be the starting point. However there is in our understanding not much benefit to copy it in TP. Reference to SA2 TR may be sufficient. |
| Nokia | Yes, but see comments | We should refer to SA2 TR on the details of the procedure. We should also capture the procedure for N3IWF solutions. (Minimal or no RAN impacts are expected between the L3 variants.) |
| Apple | Yes | Agree with MediaTek that can be refer to SA2 TR. We do not see any RAN2 impact for this procedure. |
| Convida | No with comment | See feedback to Q1 |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes, but | We think a reference to SA2 TR is enough, since there is litter AS layer procedure in Figure 3. |
| Fujitsu | Yes | We have to study how the AS layer is impacted and what additional steps are need by this procedure. |
| Samsung | Yes | Agree with the majority – we should use the latest reference architecture as agreed by SA2, and then focus on the study of its impact on AS procedures. We should also take into account the N3IWF variant and any impact it may have on AS procedures. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Sony |  | Agree with Mediatek |
| ETRI | Yes | We share the view with Ericsson that a reference to SA2 TR is helpful and it may be a starting point to study the RAN impacts. |

##### **Summary of Q2**

**Most companies agree to include high-level connection setup procedure with a reference to SA2 TR as a baseline to discuss AS impacts. However, they are wondering whether the figure from SA2 TR is too abstracted to indicate RAN2 impacts. For example, relay reselection is not included in the figure.**

**To make progress, rapporteur suggest to first capture the figure from SA2 TR in RAN2 TR, and describe the identified AS impacts. We can further add details for the figure if more RAN2 impacts are identified**

**Proposal 2: In RAN2 TR, capture Figure 6.6.2-1 of TR 23.752 with a reference to SA2 TR with identified RAN2 impacts analysis. Relay (re)selection is added after the step of “Discovery”. Other procedures identified with RAN2 impact can also be added in the Figure.**

Then, rapporteur think the following details of each step in Figure. 3 need further discussion:

* Relay / Remote UE authorization (corresponding to step 0)
* PC5 link establishment procedure (corresponding to step 3)
* QoS for relaying functionality (corresponding to relay PDU session establishment in step 3)
* Security of relayed connection
* Service continuity

#### Relay / Remote UE authorization

It is illustrated in step 0 of Figure. 3. In TR 23.752 [1], SA2 agreed to reuse PCF based service authorization and provisioning defined for NR V2X in TS 23.287 [29] for both L3 and L2 relays.

Multiple companies discussed this topic, and their views can be summarized as below:

* View 1: RAN2 follows SA2/SA3, i.e. no RAN2 impact expected ([3][8][13][14][28])
* View 2: RAN2 need further discussion:
  1. View 2-1: The authorization information stored in gNB is only introduced for relay and transparent to remote UE. In addition, the ignalling procedure will reuse the Rel-16 NR V2X sidelink authorization as baseline, e.g. in NG interface and Xn interface. [17]
  2. View 2-2: RAN study the potential impacts to the ignalling procedures of remote UE authorization (e.g. relay performs an additional authentication step before allowing the remote UE to access the application server). [7]

Rapporteur’s understanding is that this is a NAS procedure and there is no AS aspect to be further defined for this step. Meanwhile, Rapporteur also think the issues raised in View 2-2 have been studied in SA2 as solution#30 (separate authorization) and solution#35 (mutual authorization) in TR 23.752 [1]. Furthermore, it seems both solution#30 and solution#35 only need some N2 interface change, which is RAN3 scoping. Thus, to make progress, rapporteur suggest RAN2 to agree view 1.

**Q3: Do you agree that there is no RAN2 impacts expected for support of Relay/Remote UE authorization for L3 UE-to-NW relay in SI (i.e. RAN2 follows SA2/SA3 agreements)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments (please provide comment if you think “No”) |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | We assume the rapporteur here asked for the authorization for communication while the discovery related part is handled in 606. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | @OPPO, No, we think it is in scoping of this email discussion. And we sent this discussion document before the discovery discussion 606. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Fraunhofer | Yes, with comment | We understand the views of the rapportuer. However, similar to OPPO, we were also under the similar assumption regarding the differentitation between authorization for discovery and authentication of a PDU session |
| Huawei | Yes, with comment | We also understand this is a common issue for L3 and L2, so that it would be better to cover this in #606. |
| vivo | See comments | We are a little confused about tise question. In our understanding, no matter which view 1 or 2 is selected, the main work lies in SA2 and RAN3, not RAN2. A LS can be sent to SA2/RAN3 to inform our decision if we agree simply to follow other WG’s input. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | No RAN2 impact is foreseen here. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Convida | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Same view as OPPO. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

##### **Summary of Q3**

**Although most companies agree no RAN2 impact is foreseen, SI rapporteur pointed that another email discusson (#606) has covered the same question, and suggested to leave it to another email discussion. Email discussion Rapporteur think it is fine.**

**Proposal 3: Leave discussion on Relay / Remote UE authorization in email discussion#606**

#### PC5 link establishment procedure

It is illustrated in left part of step 3 in Figure. 3. SA2 assumes that the remote UE user plane traffic is only sent to the selected relay UE. That is, use PC5 unicast communication for the L3 Remote UE traffic. Also, to support the PC5 unicast communication, SA2 agreed to reuse NR V2X PC5 unicast link establishment procedures for L3 relay as per the architecture recommendations in 5G ProSe SA2 TR [1]. Because NR V2X PC5 unicast link setup is based on PC5-S and PC5-RRC, Rapporteur think it can be reused in L3 UE-to-NW relay, which needs companies’ confirmation.

**Q4: Do you agree to reuse Rel-16 NR V2X PC5 unicast link establishment procedures based on PC5-S/PC-RRC to setup a secure unicast link between Remote UE and Relay UE before traffic relaying?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments (please provide comment if you think “No”) |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes with comment | Rel-16 NR V2X PC5 unicast link establishment procedure can be reused for the sidelink connection with the control of gNB connected to the relay UE. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes with comment | Yet the part of PC5-S is still in SA2 scope, what RAN can assume would be the reusing of PC5-RRC procedures. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Legacy Rel-16 NR V2X PC5 unicast link establishment procedures can be the baseline in this case. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We have same understanding as Ericsson. The intention is just to confirm the legacy procedure can be reused. In addition, we are not sure how PC5-RRC can be established if we don’t have PC5-S. |
| CATT | Yes | But the PC5-S signaling content may be different, which depends on SA2 design. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes | Agree with Ericsson |
| Huawei | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes, with comments | Agree with the intention to reuse legacy but we may wait for SA2 progress on the detailed PC5-S signaling procedure, e.g., merging of discovery and unicast link establishment procedures is still under discussion in SA2. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | Rel-16 NR V2X PC5 unicast link establishment procedures should be the baseline. |
| Nokia | Yes | We also think that Rel-16 NR V2X PC5 unicast link establishment should be the baseline. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Convida | Yes | Legacy Rel-16 NR V2X PC5 unicast link establishment procedures can be the baseline in this case. |
| Intel | Yes | Same comment as OPPO |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Same view as Ericsson |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

##### **Summary of Q4**

* **All companies agree to reuse Rel-16 NR V2X PC5-RRC establishment procedures to setup a secure unicast link between Remote UE and Relay UE before traffic relaying.**
* **Some companies have concern that PC5-S signaling content / design may depend on SA2 design. RAN2 conclusion should not influence SA2 work. Rapporteur agree.**

**To make progress, rapporteur would like to suggest:**

**Proposal 4: In TR, capture that “Rel-16 NR V2X PC5-RRC establishment procedure is reused to setup a secure unicast link between Remote UE and Relay UE before traffic relaying”.**

**Proposal 5: In TR, add one editor note “whether new PC5-S signaling is introduced depends on SA2”**

#### QoS for relaying functionality

It is related to the right part of step 3 in Figure. 3. L3 Relay UE forwards Remote UE’s traffic to CN using its own PDU session. SA2 agreed that QoS for relaying functionality reused Rel-16 V2X design with new PQIs in TR 23.752 [1], and E2E QoS support is specified in TR 23.752 [1]. As illustrated in Figure. 4, QoS is managed separately on the two hops, and need to be linked to achieve E2E QoS. Furthermore, as illustrated in solutions 6.24, and 6.25 from [1], because the relayed data would go over relay UE’s PDU session, the relay UE may perform appropriate mapping of PQI to 5QI by communicating with the SMF/PCF and also perform UE requested PDU session modification accordingly.



**Figure.4: QoS model of L3 UE-to-NW relay in TR 23.752**

Multiple companies discussed this topic [5][6][8][11][13][18], but it seems there is no clear summary on what SA2 agreed. Thus, Rapporteur would like to confirm whether people have same understanding, which can be starting point of QoS discussion in RAN2.

**Q5: For L3 UE-to-NW relay QoS support, do you agree RAN2 to follow below SA2 TR:**

1. **PC5 link reuses Rel-16 V2X design with new PQIs in TR 23.752**
2. **E2E QoS support is specified in TR 23.752 , where relay may perform appropriate mapping of PQI to 5QI by communicating with SMF/PCF and performs UE requested PDU session modification accordingly.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments (please provide comment if you think “No”) |
| MediaTek | Yes | Meanwhile, we think RAN2 needs to discuss the corresponding AS support to enforce the QoS mechanism as will be concluded by SA2. |
| Futurewei | Yes | We understand a) and b) are captured in TR 23.752 as possible solutions for L3 UE-to-Network relay.  We also think that AS involvement after b) to enforce the updated QoS profile should be discussed and documented. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO |  | We fail to understand the said “SA2 agreement”: there is no TR conclusion in SA2 TR yet.. so the a/b here are just alternatives on the table. Furthermore, for a), our understanding of the new PQI is it has nothing to do with the relay. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | @OPPO: we changed “SA2 agreement” to “SA2 TR”.  Our understanding is both a and b will be specified in SA2. Up to now, we are not aware any RAN2 contribution discussed AS support to enforce QoS. Let us discuss based on companies’ contribution. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |
| Huawei |  | We understand the QoS framework is in SA2 scope, and RAN2 should focus on how to enforce the E2E QoS in RAN, e.g. the SLRB configuration and the bearer mapping. |
| vivo | Yes | We wait for SA2 progress for L3 QoS support. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | The E2E QoS is in the scope of SA2. RAN2 should only investigate if any AS enhancements is needed to support the solution agreed in SA2 |
| Apple | Yes with comments | Not sure if new PQIs are really needed for PC5 link in L3 U2N relay. But agree this can be decided by SA2. |
| Convida |  | It will be more efficient to have the discussion progresses and matures further in SA2 with somewhat a more tangible or lead L3 architecture candidate in SA2 before discussion in RAN2 on some of these issues. It is difficult for RAN2 to efficiently discuss some of these issues while it remains unclear which architecture option is a leading option or the selected option from SA2 perspective. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Same view as MediaTek – but as Qualcomm suggest, any such discussion should be based on companies’ contributions and not on theoretical assumptions.  Also, could we please clarify what ‘new PQI’ means? New PQI could be interpreted as PQI introduced for relay purposes in this SI, which we assume is not the intention here – the reference here is to the work done in Rel-16 SL, correct? |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

##### **Summary of Q5**

**Most companies have the same understanding that SA2 specified:**

1. **Reuse separate Uu QoS and PC5 QoS, i.e. solution#25 of TR23.752**
   * **Note: because some companies have concern on “new PQI”, rapporteur removed it**
2. **End-to-End QoS support in solution#24 of TR 23.752, where relay can obtain a mapping between PQI and 5QI from SMF/PCF**

**Proposal 6: On QoS support, capture in TR: SA2 specified two solutions for QoS support of L3 UE-to-NW relay:**

* **PCF sets separate Uu QoS parameters and PC5 QoS parameters in solution#25 of TR 23.752.**
* **End-to-End QoS support in solution#24 of TR 23.752, where relay can obtain a mapping between PQI and 5QI from SMF/PCF**

**Some companies think 2) may have AS impact because relay may need to enforce the E2E QoS after obtaining the mapping between PQI and 5QI from SMF/PCF. Rapporteur’s understanding is that relay enforces it via reconfiguration of PC5 SLRB based on the mapping from SMF/PCF. It is legacy PC5 RRC procedure, i.e. no new AS impacts.**

**To make progress, rapporteur would like to suggest to confirm whether companies have the same understanding:**

**Proposal 7: RAN2 is kindly suggested to discuss after relay obtains the mapping between PQI and 5QI from SMF/PCF (in solution#24 of [1]), whether it can enforce E2E QoS via legacy PC5 RRC reconfiguration of SLRB and resource allocation, i.e. no need to introduce new AS procedure.**

Furthermore, companies provide the below proposals:

* [5] proposed that SMF/PCF is responsible for the end-to-end PDB splitting between the Uu link and PC5 link. The spitted PDB is indicated to relay to perform UE requested PDU session modification.
* [13] proposed for uplink data of remote UE, the bearer mapping can be realized by using uplink QoS rules of relay UE while the mapping between Uu traffic and PC5 traffic shall be considered for downlink data.
* [8] proposed to wait SA2 inputs on:
  1. Whether splitting of end-to-end QoS profile onto individual link PQI and 5QI
  2. Whether the PDB will be provided as end-to-end parameter or split using upper layer signalling.

Rapporteur understand all above proposals are being discussed in SA2, and RAN2 can leave them to SA2 decide. To make progress, rapporteur would like to confirm whether companies have the same understanding:

**Q6: For L3 UE-to-NW relay QoS support, do you agree it is left to SA2 to conclude:**

1. **Whether splitting of end-to-end QoS profile onto individual link PQI and 5QI**
2. **Whether the PDB will be provided as end-to-end parameter or split using upper layer signalling.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments (please provide comment if you think “No”) |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | Yes | We should focus on the impacts of a) and b) on RAN. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Apparently it is SA2 scope. |
| Ericsson | No | It is beneficial to leave to gNB to perform PDB split, since gNB has better knowledge than CN. Generally, there is RAN2 aspect. CN provides the complete PDB without splitting to the gNB. gNB can perform the split considering radio channel quality of both links. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We don’t think it has RAN2 impacts |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |
| Huawei | Yes, but | Our understanding is this is in SA2 scope, and it is unclear to us how it works to let gNB split PDB in L3 relay, as the remote UE is invisible to gNB. |
| vivo | Yes, with comment | If QoS parameter split by CN is adopted, existing mechanism can be reused with minor specification efforts. However, the static split cannot take actual radio link quality into account, thus it may not be an optimum solution to guarantee QoS.  If CN just provides end-to-end QoS profile, then RAN can further study how to split and support QoS considering both PC5 and Uu link. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Nokia | No | We agree with Ericsson |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Convida | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes but… | SA2 should decide – but they may decide for gNB to perform the PDB split as Ericsson explain. There may need to be an LS to SA2 on this matter, to understand the individual remits of SA2 and RAN2. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

##### **Summary of Q6**

* **Most companies agree to leave these QoS enhancement proposals to SA2**
* **2 companies (Ericsson and Nokia) proposed to leave to gNB to perform PDB split. Rapporteur is not sure whether it is within RAN2 scoping. and didn’t find contribution with solution. Samsung mentioned that SA2 should decide whether gNB can perform PDB split. It seems SA2 has studied it. Thus, Rapporteur suggest to leave the decision to SA2, and RAN2 can focus on AS impacts analysis for SA2 specified QoS solutions.**
* **1 companies (vivo) proposed RAN2 can further study how to split QoS if SA2 agree that CN can provide end-to-end QoS profile. Rapporteur think it is always allowed but it depends on SA2 and so no need to discuss now.**

**Proposal 8: RAN2 leaves further QoS enhancement for L3 UE-to-NW relay to SA2 (e.g. whether gNB can perform PDB split). RAN2 can discuss AS impacts related to SA2 specified QoS solutions.**

In addition, [8] proposed to discuss whether remote UE can provide information on which QoS flows need to be relayed to relay. Because this proposal has AS impact, rapporteur would like to ask:

**Q7: For L3 UE-to-NW relay QoS support, do you think whether remote UE needs to provide information on which QoS flows need to be relayed to relay?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | We think that populating the information of relaying QoS flows between Remote UE and Relay UE would be subject to the function of PC5-S if supported, then this may be discussed by SA2. |
| Futurewei | Yes? | We’re not sure about the question, but we assume the remote UE and the relay UE can establish understanding of the PC5 QoS flow used for relay purpose in L3 UE-to-Network relay. |
| Xiaomi | Not in AS | We don’t understand how AS could decide which QoS flow need to be relayed in L3 relay. The procedure could be discussed in SA2 if necessary. |
| OPPO |  | Our understanding of this question is to move issues in SA2 to RAN2, which is apparently out of competence of RAN2 |
| Ericsson | No | It is CN that performs mapping for L3 relay. There is no need for the remote UE to provide information to the relay UE. |
| Qualcomm | No | Same understanding as Ericsson. |
| CATT |  | It should be discussed by SA2. |
| Fraunhofer | No | Agree with QC, Ericsson |
| Huawei |  | We are not quite sure about the question. May need further clarification on whether the information refers to QoS parameter mapping or which QoS to relay. |
| vivo | See comments | We think which QoS flows need to be relayed is configured to remote and relay UEs by CN and this information may be exchanged during relay discovery procedures. The details are up to SA2 discussion and decision. |
| ZTE | Yes with but | It depends on SA2. |
| Lenovo | No | Not sure that we understand the point of the question. At least we agree with others that this is SA2 scope. |
| Nokia | No |  |
| Apple | No | We think even if it is to be provided, no AS layer solution is needed. |
| Convida |  | We don’t understand this question or at least the intention of the question. This should be up to SA2 to discuss and decide on. |
| Intel | Yes with comment | To provide some clarification from our side, we agree with other company views about how the QoS flows are to be mapped for L3 relaying and that it needs to be discussed in SA2 how relay UE performs the mapping of E2E QoS onto individual links. The intention here is to leave room for potential AS layer enhancements to realize some form of service continuity, and/or network control given that we have PC5-RRC between Remote UE and Relay UE. (which was not the case during FeD2D study). |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| Fujitsu | No | It should be discussed in SA2 |
| Samsung | No | No such information in AS. |
| LG | No |  |
| Sony | No | We don’t see any RAN2 impact |
| ETRI | No | SA2 discussion first. |

##### **Summary of Q7**

* **Most companies don’t agree that remote UE needs to provide information on which QoS flows need to be relayed to relay in AS.**
* **1 company (Intel) clarified the intention of the proposal is to leave room for potential AS layer enhancements to realize some form of service continuity, and/or network control. Then, rapporteur think Intel can further propose in service continuity discussion. However, it seems they also agree that the QoS info should not be provided in AS layer.**

**Proposal 9: Remote UE doesn’t need to provide information on which QoS flows need to be relayed to relay in AS layer.**

#### Security of relayed connection

For L3 UE-to-NW relay, hop-by-hop security is supported in the PC5 link and Uu link. Furthermore, SA2 also proposed a solution to provide end-to-end security for the remote UE traffic via N3IWF in solution#23 [1]. Specially, Remote UE follows the procedures defined in TS 23.502 [30] clause 4.12 to register to 5GC via N3IWF and establish corresponding PDU sessions. The data traffic over the PDU sessions is protected by IPSec between the remote UE and N3IWF [1]. The protocol stack of this solution can be described as Figure.5.





Figure. 5 Protocol stacks for L3 UE-to-network relay in Solution#23 [1]

Multiple companies discussed this topic [4][5][8][13][17][28], and their views can be summarized as below:

* View 1: Leave security design/evolution of L3 UE-to-NW relay to SA2/SA3 ([4][5][8])
* View 2: RAN2 send LS to SA3 to check the security related aspects for NR sidelink relay ([17][28]), e.g. whether L3 relay can guarantee the E2E security
* View3: For the E2E security solution via N3IWF, RAN2 to study [13]:
  + Whether remote UE and relay UE need to and how to differentiate those different traffic and discuss how remote UE and relay UE differentiate those different traffic
  + Whether differentiate security traffic and non-security into different PC5-DRB and Uu DRB.

In Rapporteur’s understanding, SA2 had sent LS to SA3 on security requirement of UE-to-NW relay in [31]. And SA2 is studying and evaluating the E2E security via N3IWF. Thus, Rapporteur think RAN2 can wait SA2/SA3 inputs on E2E security evaluation. For the view 3, rapporteur also think it can be left to SA2/SA3 because whether there is a differentiation is provided for NAS vs UP traffic and how it is provided is CN topic and is kind of specified in SA2 that multiple PDU Sessions can be configured on relay UE by CN in solution#23 [1].

**Q8: For security of L3 UE-to-NW relay, do you agree that RAN2 leaves it to SA2/SA3 to conclude:**

* **Evaluation on whether it can guarantee the E2E security**
* **For the E2E security solution via N3IWF, whether traffic differentiation is provided for NAS vs UP and security vs non-security traffic**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments (please provide comment if you think “No”) |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | No | The study of this aspect is in the scope of RAN SID. And according to the instruction of this email discussion, “high level description of required UP/CP functionalities” should be discussed and documented.  According to the SID, the enhancement in RAN on security should be studied after SA3 provides conclusion. Hence, what we should document is the status with current RAN security mechanism for L3 UE-to-Network relay. And an LS should be sent to SA3 to inform them our findings. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO |  | For security, a LS has been sent by SA2, which however only includes high level questions, we are fine to send a LS including concrete questions on L23 in order to ensure we can get the SA3 reply before the end of this study. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | For LS to SA3, however, we are not sure what RAN specific security questions are identified. And we fail to see what RAN2 can do before SA3 provides conclusion to SA2. |
| CATT |  | Agree with OPPO, we suggest RAN2 send LS to SA3. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes |  |
| Huawei |  | Agree with OPPO, we can send LS to SA3. |
| vivo | See comments | We suggest RAN2 to send a LS to SA3 for feasibility and performance of E2E security in L3 relay architecture via N3IWF. |
| ZTE | Yes | For bullet1, we agree to leave it to SA2/SA3 to conclude. For bullete2, we think RAN2 needs to make the decision as it has large impacts on RAN2.Normally, NAS signaling will be transmitted over SRB, if RAN2 do not differentiate the NAS and UP, the QoS of NAS signaling can not be guaranteed. Similarly, N3IWF will increase the latency of security traffic as UP traffic will be disposed by remote UE’s core network. In consequence, security and non-security also need to be differentiated in AS layer.And, according to 23.502, AS layer can recognize NAS signaling/UP traffic and security/non-security traffic based on the IP information of packet, we can send a LS to SA2 for further confirmation. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | RAN2 should only send LS to SA3 if there are RAN specific questions. The general issues are covered by LS of SA2. |
| Apple |  | While it is true for SA3 to decide, we are also fine to send LS to SA3 from RAN2. |
| Convida |  | Share the same view as Futurewei. Beside it is not clear what the question means. As per the SID, the discussion on security of relayed connection should be concluded first in SA3 before RAN2 get involved. So why we need to answer this question here again since the answer to the question is already captured in the SID. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum |  | Agree with OPPO. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |

##### **Summary of Q8**

**Most companies agree that SA2 specified two security solutions for L3 UE-to-NW relay:**

1. **Hop-by-hop security (via legacy Uu security and PC5 security)**
2. **End-to-end security via N3IWF in solution #23 of TR 23.752.**

**Meanwhile, although SA2 has sent LS to SA3 on security requirement, some companies think the SA2 LS only included high-level questions, which may not address RAN2 concern. Thus, they prefer to send a LS to SA3 on RAN specific security issues.**

**Considering it is almost half-to-half support on the RAN2 LS, rapporteur suggest to have online discussion. And because only CATT provided a draft LS to SA2. Rapporteur suggest online discuss to discuss based on CATT’s draft LS.**

**Proposal 10: On security, capture in TR: SA2 specified two solutions for security support of L3 UE-to-NW relay:**

* **Hop-by-hop security (via legacy Uu security and PC5 security)**
* **End-to-end security via N3IWF in solution #23 of TR 23.752**

**Proposal 11: RAN2 to online discuss whether to send LS to SA3 on RAN specific security questions for L3 UE-to-NW relay based on CATT’s draft LS (R2-2007168).**

**Meanwhile, 1 company (ZTE) proposed to further discuss whether traffic differentiation is provided for NAS vs UP and security vs non-security traffic for E2E security solution via N3IWF. However, rapporteur think RAN2 can do thing before getting reply LS from SA3 (either from SA2 or RAN2 to be discussed). Thus, rapporteur suggest not to discuss it for now.**

#### Service continuity

In SA2 TR [1], the service continuity for L3 UE-to-NW relay can be guaranteed in the upper layer. According to current information, the below options may be chosen to solve L3 service continuity question:

* Support application layer service continuity using existing mechanism, e.g. TS 23.280 for MC services, TS23.237 for IMS services, etc.
* N3IWF based solution (solution#23) [1] supports SSC mode 1 and SSC mode 3 using existing mechanism.
* L3 relay baseline solution (solution#6) [1] support SSC mode 3 using existing mechanism and FFS on SSC mode 1.

For all above solutions, most companies don’t think they have RAN2 impacts [5][8][10][13][16][18], i.e. it can be left to SA2 for service continuity design / evaluation of L3 UE-to-NW relay. To make progress, rapporteur would like to confirm whether companies have same understanding.

**Q9: Do you agree RAN2 to leave service continuity design / evaluation of L3 UE-to-NW relay to SA2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments (please provide comment if you think “No”) |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | No | The above descriptions of SA2 status on service continuity seems to be the rapporteur’s interpretation, which don’t reflect what’s in [1].  And it is also confusing to cite TS 23.280 for MC services, TS23.237 for IMS services, and SSC modes as evidences that service continuity is being taken care in SA2 for L3 UE-to-Network relay. Please note that all these works exist in Rel-16 or earlier, and they don’t excuse RAN from developing handover mechanisms to support service continuity. In fact, these works are more related to service continuity during the change of PDU session anchor, which are orthogonal to the service continuity RAN is supposed to support during the change of RAN nodes.  The study of this aspect is in the scope of RAN SID. And according to the instruction of this email discussion, “high level description of required UP/CP functionalities” should be discussed and documented.  If nothing can/should be done in RAN for L3 UE-to-NW relay, we should document the findings, including the consequence on the service continuity during the change of RAN nodes. |
| Xiaomi | No | * Path switch also has impact on service continuity. If the path switch is triggered too late, there may be RLF, which would result in interruption. This part can be common design for L2 and L3 relay and the evaluation should be done in RAN2. |
| OPPO | Yes | The related procedure is apparently out of RAN2.  And if it is the common view from companies, we can simply capture in the TR that for L3, the service continuity related aspects are addressed in SA2 TR. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Fraunhofer | Yes, with comment | We agree that the design is out of scope of RAN2. However, we share the same view as Futurewei and Xiaomi that implications to the path switching procedure should be studied. |
| Huawei | No | We think RAN scope includes AS service continuity, and if all work on service continuity is to be left to SA2, it may mean there is no AS service continuity for L3 relay. We would like to check whether this is a RAN2 common understanding? |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | Considering that gNB does not aware of remote UE, it is difficult to support service continuity from AS layer perspective. In consequence, service continuity need to be guaranteed by upper layer. |
| Lenovo | Yes | More in the scope of SA2. Service continuity is transparent to AS in our understanding. |
| Nokia | Yes, but (see comment) | RAN2 should investigate if the performance of service continuity can be enhanced with RAN support. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Convida | Yes | Once SA2 concludes we can evaluate impacts if any to RAN2 procedures. |
| Intel | Yes (with comment) | We also think that some optimizations related to triggering path switching beyond reselection criteria can be considered in RAN2 to support service continuity for L3 relaying. But it can be considered with lower priority during the SI |
| Spreadtrum | No | RAN should also be involved to support service continuity for L3 relay. |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | Agree with Futurewei and Xiaomi. |
| LG | No | To support enhanced service continuity, RAN2 needs to study what to do in AS layer. It can be applied to both L2 and L3 relay mechanism. |
| Sony | Not sure | We are not clear if the whole work can be done in SA2 without any RAN2 involvement including the path switch. |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

##### **Summary of Q9**

* **Most companies agree that SA2 has specified at least one solution (i.e. N3IWF based solution) for the service continuity of L3 UE-to-NW relay in upper layer. Rapporteur think we can capture it in RAN2 TR. Note that rapporteur has removed other solutions due to concern from some companies.**
* **Most of companies agree that no RAN2 impact is expected and thereby can leave the evaluation of service continuity design to SA2.**
* **1 company proposed to consider “AS service continuity”. Rapporteur don’t understand what is “AS service continuity”. RAN2 discussed “service continuity” in many topics (e.g. MBMS, VoLTE), and our understanding is that they all mean higher layer requirement. Rapporteur prefer not to open the discussion of a new concept in this tightly scheduled SI.**

**To make progress, Rapporteur would like to suggest:**

**Proposal 12: On service continuity of L3 UE-to-NW relay, capture in TR: “SA2 specified one solution for the service continuity of L3 UE-to-NW relay in upper layer via N3IWF (i.e. solution#23 in TR 23.572). RAN2 didn’t identify RAN2 impact and thereby leave the evaluation of service continuity to SA2.”**

**Note that path switch questions raised in Q9 is summarized together in Q10**

Meanwhile, there are some proposals on gNB controlled path switch (e.g. PC5<->Uu and PC5<->PC5) [25][26] (which are not clear whether to apply to L3 UE-to-NW relay) or gNB-assisted path switch [6][16]. However, Rapporteur’s understanding is that NG-RAN is not aware of the remote UE in L3 UE-to-NW relay, and thereby gNB controlled path switch seems to be impossible, i.e. path switch in L3 UE-to-NW relay relies on relay (re)selection. For gNB-assisted path switch, Rapporteur think it should be discussed after RAN2 concluded design of relay (re)selection. To make progress:

**Q10: For L3 UE-to-NW relay, do you agree:**

* **Path switch (e.g. PC5<->Uu and PC5<->PC5) relies on relay (re)selection**
* **gNB-assisted path switch can be discussed after RAN2 concluded design of relay (re)selection**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments (please provide comment if you think “No”) |
| MediaTek | Yes with but | We doubt if the relay (re)selection based path switch can really achieve the service continuity as required by SA1. |
| Futurewei | Yes | For L3 UE-to-Network relay, path switch relies on relay (re)selection. |
| Xiaomi | No | Although the path switch shall be triggered after at least one relay is selected, but we think the functionality of relay (re)selection and path switch are independent. Relay selection is controlled by upper layer. But path switch should be controlled by AS, since the sidelink and Uu status are not visible in upper layer. They can be discussed separately. |
| OPPO | There is no need to discuss it | Since for L3 relay, if any path switching e.g. PC5<->Uu and PC5<->PC5), it is invisible by RAN/AS-layer, so out of RAN2 scope. |
| Ericsson | No | Agree with OPPO. |
| Qualcomm |  | @OPPO, Ericsson: the intention is just to clarify that gNB controlled path switch is not applied to L3 UE-to-NW relay  @Xiaomi: we think your proposal on path switch can be discussed in relay (re)selection because it as coupling with relay reselection. As you mentioned. |
| CATT | Yes with comment | UE has discovered a relay UE is one mandatory condition for path switch, but whether to perform the path switching should be decided by upper layer. |
| Fraunhofer | Yes, with comment | We request that gNB-assisted path switch be a part of the design for relay (re)selection |
| Huawei | FFS | We would like to ask for further clarification on the relation between path switch and service continuity. |
| vivo | Yes | At least we can take the Rel-13 UE-to-Network relay (re)selection mechanism as a starting point. |
| ZTE | Yes | Legacy LTE UE-NW relay can be taken as a baseline. |
| Lenovo |  | We agree that path switch in L3 UE-to-NW relay relies on relay (re)selection. Don’t see any RAN2 implications |
| Nokia | NO to 1st bullet YES to 2nd bullet | Relay selection and reselection and path switch should be discussed separately. |
| Apple |  | gNB-assisted relay selection and path switch are not to be supported for L3 relay deisgn |
| Convida | There is no need to discuss it | Agree with OPPO. |
| Inel | Ok in principle |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes | We believe that, path switch is coupled with relay selection. |
| Samsung | Yes | Since the configuration of measurements will be defined for relay (re)selection and the configuration can be used for path switch, gNB assisted path switch for L3 is not any different from relay (re)selection. If more than measurements configuration will be defined for gNB assisted path switch, then this question may need to be elaborated further. |
| LG | Yes | RAN2 needs to study service continuity in L3 relaying via gNB assistance. |
| Sony |  | Agree with Mediatek |
| ETRI | Yes | Path switch with relay selection is related to achieve service continuity. |

##### **Summary of Q10**

* **Companies don’t have consensus on whether path switch relies on relay (re)selection in L3 UE-to-NW relay.**
* **Some companies (xiaomi, Fraunhofer, Nokia, Intel, LG) think we can consider enhanced path switch (e.g. gNB controlled or gNB assisted). However, most of them also agree it is more or less coupled with relay (re)selection for L3 relay. Rapporteur suggest to discuss these enhancement with or after (re)selection.**
* **One company (Huawei) wonders the relation between path switch and service continuity. Rapporteur has the same view as OPPO/Ericsson that if any path switching for L3 relay e.g. PC5<->Uu and PC5<->PC5), it is invisible by RAN/AS-layer, so out of RAN2 scope. This point is covered in Proposal 12.**

**To make progress, Rapporteur would like to suggest:**

**Proposal 13: Solutions to enhance service continuity (e.g. gNB assisted path switch) can be discussed with or after relay (re)selection.**

### Control plane protocol stacks

Based on Figure 3 of the relay connection setup procedures agreed for L3 UE-to-network relay in SA2, multiple companies discussed control plane protocol stack of L3 UE-to-NW relay [3][13][16][18][22]:

* Alt-1: Remote UE has no NAS connection with AMF and PC5-S is needed for the link between remote and relay, as illustrated in Figure 6 [3][13][16][18].
  + Note that “PC5-S” and “PC5-RRC” are put together because they were agreed to be sent in parallel in Rel-16 NR V2X
* Alt-2: Remote UE has NAS connection with AMF, as illustrated in Figure 7 ([22])
  + Note that it may have CN impacts that requires SA2 validation (remote UE has NAS connection with AMF) if it is agreed



Figure. 6 Control plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay (Alt-1)



Figure. 7 Control plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay (Alt-2) from [22]

**Q11: Which alternatives do you prefer for control plane protocol stack of L3 UE-to-NW Relay?**

* **Alt-1: Figure 6**
  + **Remote UE has no NAS connection with AMF**
  + **“PC5-S” and “PC5-RRC” are put together because they were agreed to be sent in parallel**
* **Alt-2: Figure 7**
  + **Remote UE has NAS connection with AMF**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preference  (Alt-1/Alt-2) | Comments |
| MediaTek |  | We do not see the need to discuss the control protocol stack for L3 UE-to-NW relay, as Remote UE can use the legacy approach when considering NAS connection. |
| Futurewei | Alt-1 | Remote UE doesn’t have RRC connection with gNB, and can’t have NAS connection with AMF. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 1 | Alt 1 is aligned with existing framework. But we wonder whether it’s out of RAN2 scope. |
| OPPO |  | It is apparently in SA2 scope. |
| Ericsson | Alt-1 | Alt-1 is aligned with SA2. |
| Qualcomm | Alt-1 | We share same understanding as Ericsson that it is aligned with SA2. If people have concern, we can send LS to SA2 for confirmation.  We fail to understand MediaTek’s comment that Remote UE can use the legacy approach when considering NAS connection. The remote UE can be Out-of-coverage. We are not sure what is legacy approach for OOC remote UE. |
| CATT |  | Regarding to the NAS connection, it should be decided in SA2, not in RAN2. |
| Fraunhofer | Alt-2 | In principal, for UE-to-Network relaying, we believe there are several advantages to the remote UE having a NAS connection with the AMF. Both alternatives should be included in the LS to SA2 for their arbitration. |
| Huawei |  | We agree this is in SA2’s scope, and suggest to send LS to SA2. |
| vivo | See comments | The solution for NAS connection is up to SA2. Both Alt-1 and Alt-2 are possible depending on the L3 relay architecture w/o N3IWF. |
| ZTE | Alt-1 | For Alt-2, we think it doesn’t make sense for remote UE connect with core network in L3 relay. How gNB recognize NAS message of remote UE? If we gNB can recongnize the NAS message of remote UE, it needs remote UE to be aware by gNB, which deviate the principle of L3 relay. |
| Lenovo | Alt-1 | SA2 assumes that Remote UE has no NAS connection with AMF. Remote UE has just an IP connection with the relay UE. |
| Nokia |  | It is not in the scope of RAN2 whether there is a NAS between Remote UE and CN. It might be better not to capture anything before SA2 concludes this issue. |
| Apple | Alt-1 | Also, we agree this is finally to be decided by SA2, no RAN2 impact foreseen. |
| Convida |  | This should be something for SA2 to discuss and decide on. |
| Intel |  | We also understand that both alternatives are possible and it is in SA2 scope, but it is to be noted that the security solution as outlined in this document by Figure 5 and the points raised by the rapporteur about differentiation of NAS vs. UP etc. relies on NAS connection of the remote UE. However, it needs to be ensured that it is Remote UE’s AMF and potentially behind N3IWF. The CP stack needs to be verified by SA2/SA3. |
| Spreadtrum | Alt-1 | Alt-1 is aligned with SA2. |
| Fujitsu | Alt.1 |  |
| Samsung |  | Should be decided by SA2. |
| LG | Alt.1 |  |
| Sony |  | We are not sure if it is in RAN2 scope |
| ETRI | Alt-1 | We prefer Alt-1 that is aligned with SA2’s discussion. |

##### **Summary of Q11**

**Most companies think the control plane protocol stacks should be decided in SA2 because its design is related to NAS connection which is within SA2 scoping. Rapporteur suggest to follow majority view:**

**Proposal 14: RAN2 leaves control plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay to SA2.**

## Protocol stack of L3 UE-to-UE relay

There are few discussions on L3 UE-to-UE relay protocol stack (only [22] provided a figure). However, please note that following Notes of SID

*“NOTE 2: It is assumed that UE-to-network relay and UE-to-UE relay use the same relaying solution” [2].*

Rapporteur think maybe we can try to progress by assuming that the same protocol stack of UE-to-Network relay can be reused for UE-to-UE relay.



**Figure.8: User plane protocol stack for L3 UE-to-UE Relay (Alt-1)**



**Figure.9: User plane protocol stack for L3 UE-to-UE Relay (Alt-2)**

**Q12: Which alternatives do you prefer for user plane protocol stack of L3 UE-to-UE Relay?**

* **Alt-1: Figure 8 (corresponding to Alt-1 in Q1)**
* **Alt-2: Figure 9 (corresponding to Alt-2 in Q1)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preference  (Alt-1/Alt-2) | Comments |
| MediaTek | Alt-1 | Alignment to Q1 |
| Futurewei | Alt-2 | It makes clear that PC5 QoS flow between the remote UE and the end UE needs to be mapped to 1) PC5 QoS flow between the remote UE and the relay UE and 2) PC5 QoS flow between the relay UE and the end UE. These three types of QoS flows belong to 3 different PDU sessions, of unicast connections between the remote UE and the end UE, between the remote UE and the relay UE, and between the relay UE and the end UE, respectively. |
| Xiaomi | Alt-1 |  |
| OPPO |  | It is apparently in SA2 scope. |
| Ericsson | Alt-1 |  |
| Qualcomm | Alt-1 |  |
| CATT |  | SA2 scope |
| Fraunhofer | Alt-1 |  |
| Huawei |  | Same comments in Q1. |
| vivo | Alt-1 | The same protocol stack of UE-to-Network relay can be reused for UE-to-UE relay. |
| ZTE | Alt-1 | See comments in Q1 |
| Lenovo | Alt-1 |  |
| Nokia |  | This is not in the scope of RAN2. It might be better not to capture anything before SA2 concludes this issue |
| Apple | Alt-1 |  |
| Convida |  | It is up to SA2 scope to discuss and decide. |
| Intel | Alt-1 |  |
| Spreadtrum | Alt-1 |  |
| Fujitsu | Alt-1 |  |
| Samsung |  | SA2 remit. |
| LG | Alt-1 |  |
| Sony | Alt-1 |  |
| ETRI | Alt-1 |  |



**Figure.10: Control plane protocol stack for L3 UE-to-UE Relay (Alt-1)**



**Figure.11: Control plane protocol stack for L3 UE-to-UE Relay (Alt-2) from [22]**

**Q13: Which alternatives do you prefer for control plane protocol stack of L3 UE-to-UE Relay?**

* **Alt-1: Figure 10 (corresponding to Alt-1 in Q11)**
* **Alt-2: Figure 11 (corresponding to Alt-2 in Q11)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Preference  (Alt-1/Alt-2) | Comments |
| MediaTek |  | We do not see the need to discuss the control protocol stack for L3 UE-to-UE relay, control protocol stack should be transparent to L3 UE-to-UE relay operation. |
| Futurewei | Alt-1 | PC5-S is needed in L3 UE-to-UE relay. |
| Xiaomi | Alt 1 | Alt 1 is aligned with existing framework. But we are wondering whether it’s out of RAN2 scope. |
| OPPO |  | It is apparently in SA2 scope. |
| Ericsson | Alt-1 | PC5-S part is within SA2 scope. |
| Qualcomm | Alt-1 | If people have concern, we can send LS to SA2 for confirmation. |
| CATT |  | SA2 scope |
| Huawei |  | Share the same view with MediaTek. |
| vivo | Alt-1 | PC5-S and PC5-RRC are always together considering the signaling procedure of the Rel-16 NR V2X and can be reused. |
| ZTE | Alt-1 |  |
| Lenovo | Alt-1 | SA2 scope |
| Nokia |  | This is not in the scope of RAN2. It might be better not to capture anything before SA2 concludes this issue |
| Apple | Alt-1 | Anything involving PC5-S To be decided by SA2, although we think Alt 1 seems the apparent choice. |
| Convida |  | It is up to SA2 scope to discuss and decide. |
| Intel | Alt-1 |  |
| Spreadtrum | Alt-1 | It is within SA2 scope. |
| Fujitsu | Alt.1 |  |
| Samsung | Alt-1 | Should be decided by SA2. |
| LG | Alt-1 |  |
| Sony |  | It is SA2 scope |
| ETRI | Alt-1 |  |

##### **Summary of Q12/Q13**

**Although rapporteur has tried to make progress with assumption “that the same protocol stack of UE-to-Network relay can be reused for UE-to-UE relay”, most companies think the protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-UE relay is in SA2 scoping. Rapporteur suggest to follow majority view:**

**Proposal 15: RAN2 leaves protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-UE relay to SA2.**

For control plane procedure, SA2 is still discussing different UE-to-UE relay solutions, including L2 and L3 solution [1]. For this moment, it is difficulty for RAN2 to decide the AS impact and thereby can leave to SA2 in SA2. In addition, some use scenarios of UE-to-UE relay are not clear (e.g. service continuity). Thus, rapporteur assume that its design can be left to SA2 in SI.

Rapporteur would like to confirm whether companies have same understanding.

**Q14: For control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-UE relay, do you agree to leave it to SA2 in SI?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments (please provide comment if you think “No”) |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Futurewei | No | It shouldn’t be left to SA2, as this aspect is in the RAN SID.  But we do see this of lower priority, and RAN2 can focus study on UE-to-network relay. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO |  | It is apparently in SA2 scope. |
| Ericsson | No | The protocol stack is within RAN2 scope. |
| Qualcomm |  | We prefer it can be studied after L3 UE-to-NW relay design is stable because for this moment, it is difficulty for RAN2 to decide the AS impact. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Huawei |  | We share the same view as Qualcomm, as the RAN2 impact of U2U is not quite clear now. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | Similar view as Qualcomm: RAN2 should start the study after SA2 selected a solution |
| Apple | Yes | SA2 to decide. No AS layer control plane procedures foreseen. |
| Convida |  | Agree with Qualcomm. As matter of fact, we believe L3 relays study particularly L3 U2N relay should progress and mature first in SA2, then RAN2 can evaluate in impact to RAN2 protocol stack and procedures. |
| Intel |  | Same view as Qualcomm |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| Fujitsu | Yes |  |
| Samsung | No | There are several potential RAN2 impacts. However this aspect can be deprioritized. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| ETRI | Yes |  |

##### **Summary of Q14**

**For control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-UE relay:**

* **Most companies are not clear on its RAN2 impacts at this stage.**
* **3 companies (Ericsson, Samsung and Futurewei) think there may be some RAN2 impacts. Thus, don’t agree to leave it to SA2,**

**Rapporteur suggest to postpone discussion on control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-UE relay meanwhile we can wait SA2 input.**

**Proposal 16: Postpone the study of control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-UE relay until the L3 UE-to-NW relay design is stable.**

# Summary

**Easy agreement (14/14 or 13/14)**

**Proposal 1: On user plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay, capture the followings in RAN2 TR:**

* **SA2 specified two user plane protocol stacks for L3 UE-to-NW relay in TR 23.752 (Figure 6.6.1-2 of solution#6 and Figure 6.23.2-3 of solution#23). No issues are identified to support them from RAN2 perspective.**

**Proposal 2: In RAN2 TR, capture Figure 6.6.2-1 of TR 23.752 with a reference to SA2 TR with identified RAN2 impacts analysis. Relay (re)selection is added after the step of “Discovery”. Other procedures identified with RAN2 impact can also be added in the Figure.**

**Proposal 3: Leave discussion on Relay / Remote UE authorization in email discussion#606**

**Proposal 5: In TR, add one editor note “whether new PC5-S signaling is also introduced depends on SA2”**

**Proposal 6: On QoS support, capture in TR: SA2 specified two solutions for QoS support of L3 UE-to-NW relay:**

* **PCF sets separate Uu QoS parameters and PC5 QoS parameters in solution#25 of TR 23.752.**
* **End-to-End QoS support in solution#24 of TR 23.752, where relay can obtain a mapping between PQI and 5QI from SMF/PCF**

**Proposal 7: After relay obtains the mapping between PQI and 5QI from SMF/PCF (in solution#24 of [1]), RAN2 further discuss whether it is sufficient to enforce E2E QoS via legacy PC5 RRC reconfiguration of SLRB and resource allocation.**

**Proposal 8: RAN2 don’t intend to study QoS enhancement for L3 UE-to-NW relay to SA2 (e.g. whether gNB can perform PDB split). RAN2 can discuss AS impacts related to SA2 specified QoS solutions.**

**Proposal 9: Remote UE doesn’t need to provide information on which QoS flows need to be relayed to relay in AS layer.**

**Proposal 10: On security, capture in TR: SA2 specified two solutions for security support of L3 UE-to-NW relay:**

* **Hop-by-hop security (via legacy Uu security and PC5 security)**
* **End-to-end security via N3IWF in solution #23 of TR 23.752**

**Proposal 13: Solutions to enhance service continuity (e.g. gNB assisted path switch) can be discussed with or after relay (re)selection.**

**Proposal 14: RAN2 leaves control plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay to SA2.**

**Proposal 15: RAN2 leaves protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-UE relay to SA2.**

**Proposal 16: Postpone the study of control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-UE relay until the L3 UE-to-NW relay design is stable. This is based on the assumption that L3 UE-to-UE relay has similar control plane procedure as L3 UE-to-NW relay, instead of prioritization between UE-to-NW and UE-to-UE relay.**

**May need online discussion (11/14 or 10/14)**

**Proposal 4: In TR, capture that “Rel-16 NR V2X PC5-RRC establishment procedure is reused to setup a secure unicast link between Remote UE and Relay UE before unicast traffic relaying”.**

**Proposal 12: On service continuity of L3 UE-to-NW relay, capture in TR: “SA2 specified one solution for the service continuity of L3 UE-to-NW relay in upper layer via N3IWF (i.e. solution#23 in TR 23.572). RAN2 didn’t identify RAN2 impact and thereby leave the evaluation of service continuity to SA2.”**

**Need online discussion**

**Proposal 11: RAN2 to online discuss whether to send LS to SA3 on RAN specific security questions for L3 UE-to-NW relay based on CATT’s draft LS (R2-2007168).**

**Initial input from company for each proposal before online:**

**P1 with rewording of Huawei: 14/14**

**P2: 14/14**

**P3: 14/14**

**P4: 12/14 (with change)**

**P5: 14/14**

**P6: 14/14**

**P7 with change: 14/14**

**P8 with rewording of Huawei: 14/14**

**P9: 13/14**

**P10: 13/14**

**P11: Online discussion**

**P12: 10/14**

**P13: 12/14**

**P14: 13/14**

**P15: 14/14**

**P16 with change per Ericsson: 14/14**

# Phase 2 discussion

In order to speed up progress, Rapporteur would like to get companies’ initial input on whether agree each proposal before online discussion. Note that rapporteur will not suggest to agree proposals via email discussion, but just want to have a reference on how to progress during online discussion.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Proposal | [Company name] Yes/No | and comments |
| Proposal 1 | [Qualcomm] Yes | During offline inputs, most companies agreed that L3 relay user plane protocol stack should be decided by SA2. Thus, we prefer to just capture the solutions specified in SA2 TR 23.752, and mentioned that no RAN2 impacts are identified.  Some companies had concern that RAN2 TR can just add a reference to SA2 TR, to avoid maintenance efforts (e.g. if SA2 changed their solutions). However, it is our understanding that this part of SA2 TR is already stable. Note that rapporteur have added the figure number and solution # below the figure in draft TR. Thus, there seems to be no further maintenance needed. We think anyway we should have user protocol stack captured in TR (which means it is RAN2 consensus) to analyze its AS impacts. If SA2 has updated, we can always capture a new figure in TR. |
| [Company name] Yes/No? |  |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes |  |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes | Not sure if we need an LS to send to SA2, to show RAN2 preference on the protocol stack.  [Rapporteur] as I mentioned, majority don’t think we have RAN2 perference because protocol stacks is SA2 scoping. |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes |  |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawe] Yes only if with wording update | Sugget to reword the last sentence to “**No issues are identified to support them from RAN2 perspective for now~~, and RAN2 leaves future work to SA2~~.**”  [Rapporteur] OK and I also remove “for now” because of the removal of last sentence. As metioned, we can always add update once SA2 has update. |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes in principle | 1. Agree with Huawei’s suggestion for rewording  2. Every update to SA2 stack will then need to be reflected in our TR. We agree the stack is already fairly stable, but it is still a bit suboptimal.  [Rapporteur] see comment to Huawei. |
|  | [vivo] Yes |  |
| Proposal 2 | [Qualcomm] Yes | Please note that rapporteur have modified the figure in TR according to comments in Q2 (i.e. add step of relay reselection). The intention of the figure is now to illustrate the AS impacts RAN2 identified. Based on companies’ inputs on Q2, we believe this is needed. |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes | FFS can be added to indicate other RAN2 impacts that could be added.  [Rapporteur] We have included it in Proposal 2 itself. It looks a little strange to capture this FFS in TR because it is exactually RAN2’s job..  **Proposal 2: In RAN2 TR, capture Figure 6.6.2-1 of TR 23.752 with a reference to SA2 TR with identified RAN2 impacts analysis. Relay (re)selection is added after the step of “Discovery”. Other procedures identified with RAN2 impact can also be added in the Figure.** |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes |  |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes |  |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Yes |  |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes | Agree with Intel’s suggestion.  [Rapporteur] see comment to Intel |
|  | [vivo] Yes |  |
| Proposal 3 | [Qualcomm] Yes | It is better to handle in #606 because it covers both L2 and L3 relay. |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes |  |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes |  |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes |  |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Yes |  |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes |  |
|  | [vivo] Yes but with comments | Our concern is that email discussion#606 is dedicated for Discovery model and procedure. Here the authorization mechanism is related to SL Communication which is after Discovery. We should keep this in mind when making conclusions on Relay / Remote UE authorization in #606. |
| Proposal 4 | [Qualcomm] Yes | It is majority view in phase 1 |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes | This seems common to both L2 and L3 relaying. So, capturing in TR needs to take that into account. |
|  | [CATT] Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes | Common design for both U2U and U2N |
|  | [LG] Yes | I need to clarify regarding P4**:**  **In TR, capture that “Rel-16 NR V2X PC5-RRC establishment procedure is reused to setup a secure unicast link between Remote UE and Relay UE before traffic relaying”.**  In this sentence, my understanding is that traffic relaying means only unicast traffic relaying but, other groupcast or broadcast traffic can be relayed without establishement of PC5-RRC connection. Is it correct understanding?  [Rapporteur] I added “unicast” before “traffic relaying”:  **Proposal 4: In TR, capture that “Rel-16 NR V2X PC5-RRC establishment procedure is reused to setup a secure unicast link between Remote UE and Relay UE before unicast traffic relaying”.** |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Maybe | Here we say that we re-use the Rel-16 NR V2X PC5-RRC establishment procedure but in the discovery email discussion companies are in favor to decouple the discovery and link establishment procedure. Therefore, we believe this statement is not entirely correct.  [Rapporteur] Our understanding is that discovery can be decoupled with link establishement procedure. However, a PC5-RRC procedure is anyway needed before unicast traffic relaying, right? Otherwise, what is the PC5 link status in traffic relaying? |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Yes |  |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Maybe | Agree with Ericsson, we would prefer to use the Rel-16 NR V2X PC5-RRC as a baseline and if required, study necessary changes for the discovery procedure  [Rapporteur] see commet to LG. It is similar to yesterday’s discussion on scenario |
|  | [Samsung] | Yes |
|  | [vivo] Yes |  |
| Proposal 5 | [Qualcomm] Yes |  |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes | Same comment as above. |
|  | [CATT] Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes | The new PC5-S signalling design is mainly SA2 work, that is for sure. But I am wondering whether there is no RAN2 consideration at all. Maybe we can change the wording to “**whether new PC5-S signaling is introduced also depends on SA2**”  [Rapporteur] Add “also” |
|  | [LG] Yes | I have same understanding with ZTE. We are not sure whether there is no impact on RAN2 regarding new PC5-S signaling.  [Rapporteur] see comment to ZTE |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes |  |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Yes |  |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes | We share similar concerns as ZTE and LG – although ZTE’s proposed wording may not be the best way forward in our view, since it implies that SA2 plays a secondary role in PC5-S design.  [Rapporteur] see comment to ZTE |
|  | [vivo] Yes |  |
| Proposal 6 | [Qualcomm] Yes | Similar comment to Proposal 1 |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes |  |
|  | [CATT] Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes |  |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes |  |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Yes with comments | We agree the intention is to confirm RAN2 will follow SA2 solution, but we are wondering is it proposed to capture the whole SA2 solutions into RAN2 TR, if so, we think it is not needed.  [Rapporteur] I don’t capture whole SA2 solution2 in RAN2 TR. I just add breif desciption on them. |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes |  |
|  | [vivo] Yes |  |
| Proposal 7 | [Qualcomm] Yes | We can also label it as FFS if no consensus |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] FFS | FFS. Traditionally mapping of QoS is done by gNB or TX UE using pre-configuration. We think that the relay UE performing the mapping thus may involve AS impact, although it can reuse legacy procedures.  [Rapporteur] OK. I change P7 to FFS |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes |  |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] FFS | [Rapporteur] OK. I change P7 to FFS |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Yes only if with wording update | **Suggest the wording is “FFS: after relay obtains the mapping between PQI and 5QI from SMF/PCF (in solution#24 of [1]), whether it can enforce E2E QoS via legacy PC5 RRC reconfiguration of SLRB and resource allocation, i.e. no need to introduce new AS procedure.”**  Some clarifications maybe needed, e.g. RAN2 also need to discuss some RAN2 spec impact from remote UE side.  [Rapporteur] I have reword to FFS P7, per Intel and Ericsson request |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes but... | Only if FFS is added.  [Rapporteur] I have reword to FFS P7, per Intel and Ericsson request |
|  | [vivo]FFS | Similar view as Intel. The wording “i.e. no need to introduce new AS procedure” is too strong at this early phase. |
| Proposal 8 | [Qualcomm] Yes | This is to make clear RAN2 and SA2 responsibility on QoS |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes with comment | We understand that QoS at a high level is in SA2 realm. If it only involves splitting of E2E QoS onto link-by-link QoS, we agree. However, there may be AS impacts involving mapping that need to be taken care of.  [Rapporteur] We have statement that RAN can study AS impact in P8:  **Proposal 8: RAN2 leaves further QoS enhancement for L3 UE-to-NW relay to SA2 (e.g. whether gNB can perform PDB split). RAN2 can discuss AS impacts related to SA2 specified QoS solutions.** |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes |  |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes |  |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Yes with comments | We agree the intention, but some rewording maybe needed, e.g. “**RAN2 do not intent to study QoS enhancement of L3 relay (e.g. whether gNB can perform PDB split). RAN2 can discuss AS impacts related to SA2 specified QoS solutions.**”  [Rapporteur] OK. |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes |  |
|  | [vivo]Yes |  |
| Proposal 9 | [Qualcomm] Yes |  |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] | We are ok to go with majority view |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes |  |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes |  |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Need online discussion | Since we modified the P7 to further study RAN2 impact, we are wondering whether this propose is in the scope of “RAN2 impact”, so maybe we can pospone this one after more discussion on QoS aspect.  [Rapporteur] Disagree. Note the last wording of P9. No company agree it in phase 1 discussion. I have tried to use the most netural way for P9.  **Proposal 9: Remote UE doesn’t need to provide information on which QoS flows need to be relayed to relay in AS layer.** |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [vivo]Yes |  |
| Proposal 10 | [Qualcomm] Yes | Similar comment to Proposal 1 |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes with comment | It is worthwhile to consider how non-IP data can be supported with N3IWF solution (IPSec-based). If not, and if it is a requirement, it may be beneficial to capture it.  [Rapporteur] This is topic in SA2’s scoping, right? |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes |  |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes |  |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Need online discussion | We understand from RAN2 point of view, we should focus on the security mechanism enforced in RAN scope. We do not think we should capture upper lay security mechanism which is invisible to RAN in RAN2 TR.  [Rapporteur] Disagree. |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes |  |
|  | [vivo]Yes |  |
| Proposal 11 | [Qualcomm]  Need online discussion | It needs online discussion: whether RAN2 specific question is identified. If yes, we are fine to send LS to SA3 for progress. Otherwise, we are not fine because it may confuse SA3 (because they have received a LS from SA2) |
| [OPPO] Need online discussion |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes | It would be beneficial to ask for their evaluation of E2E security based on N3IWF vs. PDCP. |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] No | We did not see the need to send LS to SA3 at this stage. SA3 is working on the evaluation of the security aspects for 5G ProSE Relay.  Last week, SA3 agreed S3-201759, which captured the key issue on security of UE-to-Network Relay (to be captured in their TR33.847), which include the following evaluation as discussed by RAN2. So then it may be enough. *X.Y.2 Security threats* *If the UE-to-network is used for commercial services, and a remote UE uses this relay to connect to the 5G network. If the UE-to-Network relay knows whatever the remote UE send, and if there is no security protection in the application layer, the UE-to-Network Relay can get everything the remote UE sends.* *X.Y.3 Potential Security requirements* *Confidentiality protection, Integrity protection and replay-protection shall be supported between the UE and the AN.* |
|  | [ZTE]Agree to discuss online | RAN2 should firstly identify our necessity, i.e. what is the need for traffic differentiation for UP/NAS and Security/Non-security. If RAN2 agrees that there is really a need, then we can send to SA2, with clarification of RAN2 necessity. |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes but | Agree with MediaTek comment. SA3 is already working on this topic and will inform SA2 and RAN2 once a conclusion is reached. |
|  | [Nokia] No | Due to SA2 LS, SA3 has already been starting to work on this topic. Sending an additional LS to SA3 with RAN2 specific questions should be a consquence of a discussion on a technical issue where RAN2 needs input from SA3 for the decision. |
|  | [Huawei] Need online discussion | Need to discuss the content captured in LS. |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Needs online discussion |  |
|  | [Samsung] No | Same view as Nokia. |
|  | [vivo] Yes | We suggest RAN2 to send a LS to SA3 for feasibility and performance of E2E security in L3 relay architecture via N3IWF. It facilitates our further design on the two relay architectures with different security solutions. |
| Proposal 12 | [Qualcomm] Yes | Similar comment to Proposal 1 |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes |  |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Need online discussion | The service continuity solution proposed by SA2 is only targeting on N3IWF, but N3IWF itself is an optionally architecture solution. Therefore, RAN2 should send the LS to SA2 to check any other service continuity solution which can be commonly used for all L3 architecture.  [Rapporteur] OK to raise it online |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes but | Our understanding is that the solution with N3IWF is not the only solution to ensure service continuity with L3 relay. Probably we may also send an LS to SA2 to check whether other options have been studied by SA2.  [Rapporteur] OK to raise it online as ZTE suggested |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Need online discussion | Suggest the wording as “Support of service continuity of L3 relay relies on N3IWF based solution defined in SA2 TR. RAN2 does not support RAN specific solution for service continuity of L3 relay. “  [Rapporteur] Disagree. We don’t the conclusion of 2nd sentence. Note that P13 is changed to below per Nokia requested:  **Proposal 13: Solutions to enhance service continuity (e.g. gNB assisted path switch) can be discussed with or after relay (re)selection.** |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes, with comment | Agree with ZTE and Ericsson  [Rapporteur] OK to raise it online as ZTE suggested |
|  | [Samsung] Yes |  |
|  | [vivo] Yes |  |
| Proposal 13 | [Qualcomm] Yes | This is to address some companies’ concern that Proposal 12 may preclude their enhancement. Because it is more or less coupled with relay (re)selection, it is better to discuss with/after relay (re)selection. |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes |  |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] See comment | We understand some companies would like to couple relay selection with path switch. But we are not sure what is the connection between service continuity with relay selection.  [Rapporteur] That is why I mentioned “with/after relay (re)selection” in P13..I think we can’t have consensus before discussion of relay reselection. |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes |  |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Need online discussion | Pending on P12. |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes |  |
|  | [vivo] Yes with comment | As for relay re(selection), we wonder if we can reach the consensus that at least the Rel-13 UE-to-Network relay (re)selection mechanism is taken as a starting point. |
| Proposal 14 | [Qualcomm] Yes | It is majority view in phase 1 (impact of NAS is SA2 scoping) |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes |  |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes |  |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes but | The SA2 TR has already design protool options for UE-to-UE relay and we need to include them in the TR as we are doing for the UE-to-NW relay use case. We need to be consistant with the information we are going to put in our TR.  [Rapporteur] I agree. But the issue is that solution#6 in TR23.752 doesn’t include a control plane protocol stack.. So, I am not sure how to refer to SA2 TR. |
|  | [Nokia] Yes | In the RAN2 TR we may add references to the figures of the SA2 TR to make clear this agreement.  [Rapporteur] I agree. But the issue is that solution#6 in TR23.752 doesn’t include a control plane protocol stack.. So, I am not sure how to refer to SA2 TR. |
|  | [Huawei] Need on-line discussion | We understand there would be NAS layer in N3IWF-based solution, and how to carry NAS message of remote UE via sidelink and how the relay UE forward it via Uu should have RAN2 impact, so RAN2 need further discussion in SI phase.  [Rapporteur] Disagree. Why NAS impact should be studied in RAN2? Isn’t NAS transmitted transparently in RAN? |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes |  |
|  | [vivo] Yes with comments | SA2 is responsible for NAS singnaling and procedure, while RRC and lower layers are still within RAN responsibility. Thus, the CP protocol stack may still need confirmation or discussion from RAN2. |
| Proposal 15 | [Qualcomm] Yes | It is majority view in phase 1 |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes |  |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes |  |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] Yes but | The SA2 TR has already design protool options for UE-to-UE relay and we need to include them in the TR as we are doing for the UE-to-NW relay use case. We need to be consistant with the information we are going to put in our TR.  [Rapporteur] I agree. But the issue is that solution#10 in TR23.752 doesn’t include a plane protocol stack for L3 UE-to-UE relay.. So, I am not sure how to refer to SA2 TR. |
|  | [Nokia] Yes | In the RAN2 TR we may add references to the figures of the SA2 TR to make clear this agreement.  [Rapporteur] I agree. But the issue is that solution#10 in TR23.752 doesn’t include a plane protocol stack for L3 UE-to-UE relay.. So, I am not sure how to refer to SA2 TR. |
|  | [Huawei] Yes |  |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes |  |
|  | vivo] Yes with comments | Similar comments as Proposal 14. RAN2 involvement may be needed on the AS protocol design at later phase. |
| Proposal 16 | [Qualcomm] Yes | It is majority view in phase 1 |
| [OPPO] Yes |  |
|  | [Intel] Yes |  |
|  | [CATT]Yes |  |
|  | [MediaTek] Yes |  |
|  | [ZTE] Yes |  |
|  | [LG] Yes |  |
|  | [Xiaomi]Yes |  |
|  | [Ericsson] No | We should not have any prioritization on which use case UE to NW or UE to UE relay we are going to study. For us, SA2 already have CP and UP architecture for both use case and we should consider them in the RAN2 TR. We strongly disagree in any prioritization between UE to NW and UE to UE relay.  [Rapporteur] I added clarification in P16. Hope it address your concern:  **Proposal 16: Postpone the study of control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-UE relay until the L3 UE-to-NW relay design is stable. This is based on the assumption that L3 UE-to-UE relay has similar control plane procedure as L3 UE-to-NW relay, instead of prioritization between UE-to-NW and UE-to-UE relay.** |
|  | [Nokia] Yes |  |
|  | [Huawei] Yes with comments | Suggest to reword to “**Postpone the study of control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-UE relay until SA2 design is stable**”  [Rapporteur] Disagree. The maority in phase 1 prefer to first study UE-to-NW relay. |
|  | [Fraunhofer] Yes |  |
|  | [Samsung] Yes |  |
|  | [vivo]Yes |  |

# Phase 3 discussion

In Tuesday’s online session, we agreed below:

* Capture a reference to the SA2 UE-to-UE stack and agree P1 in the form below.

Proposal 1: On user plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay, capture the followings in RAN2 TR:

• SA2 captured two user plane protocol stacks for L3 UE-to-NW relay in TR 23.752 (Figure 6.6.1-2 of solution#6 and Figure 6.23.2-3 of solution#23). No impacts are identified to support them from RAN2 perspective.

Proposal 2: In RAN2 TR, capture Figure 6.6.2-1 of TR 23.752 with a reference to SA2 TR with identified RAN2 impacts analysis. Relay (re)selection is added after the step of “Discovery”. Other procedures identified with RAN2 impact can also be added in the Figure. RAN2 will further consider procedures with RAN2 impact.

Proposal 3: Leave discussion on Relay / Remote UE authorization in email discussion#606

Proposal 5: In TR, add one editor note “whether new PC5-S signaling is also introduced depends on SA2”

Proposal 6: On QoS support, capture in TR: SA2 captured two solutions for QoS support of L3 UE-to-NW relay:

• PCF sets separate Uu QoS parameters and PC5 QoS parameters in solution#25 of TR 23.752.

• End-to-End QoS support in solution#24 of TR 23.752, where relay can obtain a mapping between PQI and 5QI from SMF/PCF

Proposal 7: After relay obtains the mapping between PQI and 5QI from SMF/PCF (in solution#24 of [1]), RAN2 further discuss whether it is sufficient to enforce E2E QoS via legacy PC5 RRC reconfiguration of SLRB and resource allocation.

Proposal 8: RAN2 don’t intend to study QoS enhancement for L3 UE-to-NW relay to SA2 (e.g. whether gNB can perform PDB split). RAN2 can discuss AS impacts related to SA2 specified QoS solutions.

Proposal 9: Remote UE doesn’t need to provide information on which QoS flows need to be relayed to relay in AS layer.

* Above proposals are agreed

On security, capture in TR: SA2 captured two solutions for security support of L3 UE-to-NW relay:

• Via legacy Uu security and PC5 security

• Via N3IWF in solution #23 of TR 23.752

RAN2 will evaluate any impact in RAN2 scope from these solutions.

And Discussion can continue to progress P4, P11, P14-P16.

Proposal 4: In TR, capture that “Rel-16 NR V2X PC5-RRC establishment procedure is reused to setup a secure unicast link between Remote UE and Relay UE before unicast traffic relaying”.

Proposal 14: RAN2 leaves control plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay to SA2.

Proposal 15: RAN2 leaves protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-UE relay to SA2.

Proposal 16: Postpone the study of control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-UE relay until the L3 UE-to-NW relay design is stable. This is based on the assumption that L3 UE-to-UE relay has similar control plane procedure as L3 UE-to-NW relay, instead of prioritization between UE-to-NW and UE-to-UE relay.

Proposal 11: RAN2 to online discuss whether to send LS to SA3 on RAN specific security questions for L3 UE-to-NW relay based on CATT’s draft LS (R2-2007168).

Based on agreement and Phase-2 discussion, rapporteur would like to modify P4 and P14-P16 as follows:

* P4: according to Phase-2 input, rapporteur think adding “unicast” should address most companies’ concern, and it is aligned with the agreement we made in scenario discussion

*Proposal 4: In TR, capture that “Rel-16 NR V2X PC5-RRC establishment procedure is reused to setup a secure unicast link between Remote UE and Relay UE before unicast traffic relaying”.*

* P14: During online discussion, only Huawei had concern that RAN2 should analyze the impact of NAS signaling. Rapporteur is confused because it seems to be general principle that NAS signaling is transparently sent in RAN. To address Huawei’s concern, rapporteur suggest to add a reference to SA2 TR:

*Proposal 14: RAN2 leaves control plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay to SA2. And RAN2 TR adds a reference to SA2 TR.*

* P15: During online discussion, we agreed:
* Capture a reference to the SA2 UE-to-UE stack and agree P1 in the form below.

Then rapporteur think we can make life easier:

*Proposal 15: RAN2 leaves protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-UE relay to SA2. And RAN2 TR adds a reference to SA2 TR.*

* P16: During phase-2 discussion, Ericsson had concern that it may imply some prioritization between U2W and U2U relay. Rapporteur had add clarification and think we should be able to agree it

*Proposal 16: Postpone the study of control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-UE relay until the L3 UE-to-NW relay design is stable. This is based on the assumption that L3 UE-to-UE relay has similar control plane procedure as L3 UE-to-NW relay, instead of prioritization between UE-to-NW and UE-to-UE relay.*

Considering these 4 proposals are not really controversial, rapporteur propose:

**Proposal 16: Agree below 4 proposals (changes highlighted):**

1. *In TR, capture that “Rel-16 NR V2X PC5-RRC establishment procedure is reused to setup a secure unicast link between Remote UE and Relay UE before unicast traffic relaying”.*
2. *RAN2 leaves control plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay to SA2. And RAN2 TR adds a reference to SA2 TR.*
3. *Proposal 15: RAN2 leaves protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-UE relay to SA2. And RAN2 TR adds a reference to SA2 TR.*
4. *Proposal 16: Postpone the study of control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-UE relay until the L3 UE-to-NW relay design is stable. This is based on the assumption that L3 UE-to-UE relay has similar control plane procedure as L3 UE-to-NW relay, instead of prioritization between UE-to-NW and UE-to-UE relay.*

**Q1: Do you agree the above 4 proposals with changes according to online/offline feedback?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments (please provide comment if you think “No”) |
| Qualcomm | Yes (all 4 proposals) |  |
| vivo | Yes for 1), 2), 3).  For 4) see comment | In our understanding, if there is significant progress on L3 UE-to-NW relay design, we can begin working on L3 UE-to-UE relay.  So, we suggest a revision as follows:  “*~~Postpone~~ For the study of control plane procedure of L3 UE-to-UE relay wait until some progress are made on the L3 UE-to-NW relay design ~~is stable~~*” |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with the rapporteur's modification. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |

For P11, rapporteur think it may be difficulty to make progress in this meeting because it is not expected to have online time to identify RAN specific security questions for L3 UE-to-NW relay. Thus, Rapporteur would suggest to postpone this discussion. However, we can still try to see whether any situation change:

**Q2: Do you agree to postpone the discussion of sending LS to SA3 for RAN specific security questions for L3 UE-to-NW relay?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comment |
| Qualcomm | Yes | It looks like there is no another way around. |
| Vivo | Yes | Since SA2 had sent a similar LS to SA3 and based on that LS there is no specific issue from RAN2 point of view by now. |
| CATT | Yes | We agree with HW’s below proposal.  RAN2 will evaluate any impact in RAN2 scope from these solutions.  We reckon that it is not an easy agreement that there is no need to ask SA3 any questions during the current SI stage. The down-selection of L2/L3 is co-responsible for SA2 and RAN2. So it is better to take more attention to the security topics and keep in touch with SA3.  We also think this is a common topic for L2 and L3, so maybe it should not be limited to the question just for the L3 U2W relay. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |

Finally, Rapporteur has updated TR in appendix according to agreements and P17. It is not intended to get agreed in this meeting, but provide company a picture of RAN2 TR.
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# Text proposal for L3 UE-to-NW relay

4.6 Layer-3 Relay

4.6.1 Architecture and Protocol Stack

SA2 captured two user plane protocol stacks for L3 UE-to-NW relay in TR 23.752 (Figure 6.6.1-2 of solution#6 and Figure 6.23.2-3 of solution#23), which are illustrated in Figure 4.6-1 and Figure 4.6-2. No impacts are identified to support them from RAN2 perspective.



Figure 4.6-1: user plane protocol stack of L3 UE-to-NW relay specified in solution#6 of [1]



Figure 4.6-2: user plane protocol stack of L3 UE-to-NW relay specified in solution#23 of [1]



Figure 4.6-3: basic connection setup procedure of L3 UE-to-NW relay based on Figure 6.6.2-1 of [1]

The basic connection setup procedure for the both SA2 specified protocol stacks is illustrated in Figure 4.6-3 which is based on Figure 6.6.2-1 in TS 23.752 [1]. Among them, the following procedures are identified with RAN2 impacts:

* Step 3: the discovery procedure, which are described in Section 4.2.
* Step 4: the relay (re)selection procedure, which are described in Section 4.3.
* Step 5: Rel-16 NR V2X PC5-RRC establishment procedure is reused to setup a secure unicast link between Remote UE and Relay UE before unicast traffic relaying

*Editor notes: whether new PC5-S signaling is also introduced depends on SA2*

SA2 captured control plane protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay in solution#6 in [1]. RAN2 leaves its design to SA2.

4.6.2 QoS

The basic QoS support mechanism for L3 UE-to-NW relay is illustrated in Figure 4.6-4 from TR 23.752 [1].



Figure 4.6-4: basic QoS support mechanism of L3 UE-to-NW relay specified in [1]

SA2 captured two solutions for QoS support of L3 UE-to-NW relay:

1. PCF sets separate Uu QoS parameters and PC5 QoS parameters in solution#25 of [1].
2. End-to-End QoS support in solution#24 of [1], where relay can obtain a mapping between PQI and 5QI from SMF/PCF

RAN2 don’t intend to study QoS enhancement for L3 UE-to-NW relay.

*Editor notes: whether other QoS solution (e.g. whether gNB can perform PDB split) is introduced depends on SA2.*

4.6.3 Security

SA2 captured two solutions for security support of L3 UE-to-NW relay:

1. Via legacy Uu security and PC5 security
2. Via N3IWF in solution #23 of TR 23.752

*Editor notes: whether the SA2 specified solutions can satisfy the security requirement depends on SA3*

*Editor notes: whether other security solution is introduced depends on SA2.*

4.6.4 Service Continuity

4.6.5 Control Plane Procedure

*Editor notes: This section is to describe CP procedure other than service continuity.*

# Text proposal for L3 UE-to-UE relay

## 5.6 Layer-3 Relay

### 5.6.1 Architecture and Protocol Stack

SA2 captured protocol stacks of L3 UE-to-NW relay in solution#10 in [1]. RAN2 leaves its design to SA2.

### 5.6.2 QoS

### 5.6.3 Security

### 5.6.4 Control Plane Procedure