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# 1 Introduction

This is to report the result of the following email discussion on RRC CR [1]

* [AT111-e][706][V2X] Corrections for prioritization (LG for discussion and MAC CR, Vivo for RRC CR)

Discuss the corrections from {change 2 in R2-2006585 and R2-2006613} and prepare agreeable 38.321/36.321/38.331 CRs (38.321 CR in R2-2008333, 36.321 CR in R2-2008334, 38.331 CR in R2-2008335, Offline discussion summary in R2-2008336 if needed). CRs will also cover recommendation 1B, recommendation 1C, and recommendation 2A from R2-2008113. CRs will be approved via email. Deadline is 8/26 20:00pm (UTC) => Deadline is extended to 8/28 10:00am (UTC)

To allow potential update to the CR, please provide your feedback by 8/28 06:00am (UTC), thank you

# 2 Discussion

Based on email discussion summary in R2-2008336, there are two options for the RRC CR format:

**Option 1**: Update the field description of *MAC-MainConfigSL* field descriptions to relect the necessary change as “draft\_CRxxxx\_38331\_R2-2008335(Option 1)” in draft folder.

| *MAC-MainConfigSL* field descriptions |
| --- |
| ***sl-BSR-Config***  This field is to configure the sidelink buffer status report. |
| ***sl-PrioritizationThres***  Indicates the SL priority threshold, which is used to determine whether SL TX is prioritized over UL TX, as specified in TS 38.321 [3]. If this field is present, the field *ul-PrioritizationThres* shall be present. |
| ***ul-PrioritizationThres***  Indicates the UL priority threshold, which is used to determine whether SL TX is prioritized over UL TX, as specified in TS 38.321 [3]. If this field is present, the field *sl-PrioritizationThres* shall be present. |

**Option 2**: Add the field condition table to relect the necessary change as “draft\_CRxxxx\_38331\_R2-2008335(Option 1)” in draft folder.

| *MAC-MainConfigSL* field descriptions |
| --- |
| ***sl-BSR-Config***  This field is to configure the sidelink buffer status report. |
| ***sl-PrioritizationThres***  Indicates the SL priority threshold, which is used to determine whether SL TX is prioritized over UL TX, as specified in TS 38.321 [3]. |
| ***ul-PrioritizationThres***  Indicates the UL priority threshold, which is used to determine whether SL TX is prioritized over UL TX, as specified in TS 38.321 [3]. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Conditional Presence | Explanation |
| *SLThreshold* | The field is mandatory present if the field *sl- PrioritizationThres* is configured; otherwise it is absent, Need M. |
| *ULThreshold* | The field is mandatory present if the field *ul- PrioritizationThres* is configured; otherwise it is absent, Need M. |

Rapporteur would like to collect companies on which of the above options we should proceed with. And whether any revision is needed.

**Question 1: Which of the above two options do companies prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option 1 /option2 | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | This seems the simpler approach at this stage of the release |
| Samsung | Option1 |  |
| ZTE | Option2 | Option2 seems a formal manner to capture the agreement. |
| Ericsson | Option2 | We are a bit surprised that this discussion is even happening. According to the ASN.1 RRC convention is ANNEX A.3.6 we have the following: A.3.6 Fields with conditional presence A field with conditional presence is declared with the keyword OPTIONAL. In addition, a short comment text shall be included at the end of the paragraph including the keyword OPTIONAL. The comment text includes the keyword "Cond", followed by a condition tag associated with the field ("UL" in this example):  -- /example/ ASN1START  LogicalChannelConfig ::= SEQUENCE {  ul-SpecificParameters SEQUENCE {  priority INTEGER (0),  ...  } OPTIONAL -- Cond UL  }  -- ASN1STOP  When conditionally present fields are included in an ASN.1 section, the field description table after the ASN.1 section shall be followed by a *conditional presence* table. The conditional presence table specifies the conditions for including the fields with conditional presence in the particular ASN.1 section.   | Conditional presence | Explanation | | --- | --- | | UL | Specification of the conditions for including the field associated with the condition tag = "UL". Semantics in case of optional presence under certain conditions may also be specified. |   The conditional presence table has two columns. The first column (heading: "Conditional presence") contains the condition tag (in *italic* font style), which links the fields with a condition tag in the ASN.1 section to an entry in the table. The second column (heading: "Explanation") contains a text specification of the conditions and requirements for the presence of the field. The second column may also include semantics, in case of an optional presence of the field, under certain conditions i.e. using the same predefined tags as defined for optional fields in A.3.5.  Conditional presence should primarily be used when presence of a field depends on the presence and/or value of other fields within the same message. If the presence of a field depends on whether another feature/function has been configured, while this function can be configured independently e.g. by another message and/or at another point in time, the relation is best reflected by means of a statement in the field description table.  If the ASN.1 section does not include any fields with conditional presence, the conditional presence table shall not be included.  Whenever a field is only applicable in specific cases e.g. TDD, use of conditional presence should be considered.  According to this rule, there is no doubt on which Option RAN2 should go. |
| HW | Option 1 | Option 1 seems enough. |
|  |  |  |

**Proposed conclusion:**

TBD

**Question 2: Are companies fine with the current wording desription of option 1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| HW | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Proposed conclusion:**

TBD

**Question 3: Are companies fine with the current wording desription of option 2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes / No | Comments |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Added a minor correction. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Proposed conclusion:**

TBD

# 3 Conclusion

In the previous sections we made the following observations:

TBD

Based on the discussion in the previous sections we propose the following:

TBD
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