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# Introduction

This is the trigger of the following email discussion:

* [AT113bis-e][702][V2X/SL] Miscellaneous corrections on RRC

 **Scope:** Discuss R2-2102712, R2-2102984, R2-2102985, R2-2102986, R2-2103090, R2-2103127, R2-2103317, R2-2103318, R2-2103767, R2-2104105, and R2-2104108 in the Rapporteur’s miscellaneous correction CR(s) offline discussion, by taking into account Rapporteur’s recommendations in Table 1.

 **Intended outcome:** Agreeable 38.331 CR in R2-2104464, 36.331 CR in R2-2104465, and discussion summary in R2-2104466 if needed.

**Deadline:** 4/19, 14:00 (UTC).

Companies are requested to provide their views on the issues listed in this document.

# Miscellaneous corrections on TS 38.331

The CRs that need to be discussed are listed as below.

#### ***R2-2102712***

In R2-2102712, it proposed to add a note to indicate that SL CG type 2 should not be used when T310 is running.

Question 1: Do companies agree to add a note to indicate that SL CG type 2 should not be used when T310 is running as proposed in R2-2102712?

* **Yes.**
* **No (Please clarify why the proposed changes are not acceptable).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### ***R2-2102984***

In R2-2102984, it proposed to add the missing “sl-RLC-BearerToReleaseList” in the SL DRB release condition.

Question 2: Do companies agree to add the missing “sl-RLC-BearerToReleaseList” in the SL DRB release condition as proposed in R2-2102984?

* **Yes.**
* **No (Please clarify why the proposed changes are not acceptable).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### ***R2-2102985/R2-2102986***

In R2-2102985/R2-2102986, besides the editorial changes included in this CR that can be agreed and merged into the Rapp’s miscellaneous correction CR, it proposed to add a note saying that how the UE handles the SL related BSR/SR procedure is up to UE implementation. Rapporteur think the current Spec has already accurately captured the last meeting agreements, and the note proposed by this CR is not needed.

Question 3: Do companies agree to add a note saying that how the UE handles the SL related BSR/SR procedure is up to UE implementation as proposed in R2-2102985/R2-2102986?

* **Yes.**
* **No (Please clarify why the proposed changes are not acceptable).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| OPPO | No |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### ***R2-2103317***

In R2-2103317, it proposed to clarify that integrity check also applies to SL-SRB1 and clarify, when 2 additional MCS table is configured, which one is the first MCS table in the sl-Additional-MCS-Table and which one is the 2nd, in order to match what is specified in TS 38.214. Rappoteur think the intention is agreeable. It can be further discussed whether it is needed to also cover the case when only one Additional MCS table is configured in this field.

Question 4: Do companies agree to the changes as proposed in R2-2103317?

* **Yes.**
* **No (Please clarify why the proposed changes are not acceptable).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| OPPO | See comment | Change-1 is NOK, since srb1 IP check failure may happen during re-keying procedure, for which there is no need to do RLF. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Question 5: Do companies agree to clarify when only one Additional MCS table is configured?

* **Yes.**
* **No (Please clarify why the proposed changes are not acceptable).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### ***R2-2103767***

In R2-2103767, it proposed to clarify that the initiating UE should not report the peer UE’s capability to the NW the UE has already reported it. Rappoteur think it seems that the proposal has already covered by the existing texts and no specification is needed.

Question 6: Do companies agree to clarify that the initiating UE should not report the peer UE’s capability to the NW the UE has already reported it as proposed in R2-2103767?

* **Yes.**
* **No (Please clarify why the proposed changes are not acceptable).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| OPPO | See comment | Firstly, it is good to check the understanding of the current spec:Based on Rapp-remarkit seems the UE can already save the capability, due to the “(if needed)”.. but we tend to think that may not be interpret as the back-door to do delta report for SUI (otherwise, one can make use of this (if needed) in an arbitrary manner..), so the issue observed by Nokia is valid to us.Secondly, whether to pursue some change:from our perspective, it is not super critical for R16, since the capability signalling size is OK. But we tend to believe SUI message may later grow up quickly when we step into R17, 18.. so at some time, to allow delta report for SUI message would be a good / generalize method to solve the SUI message size issue. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

#### ***R2-2103090/R2-2103127/R2-2103318/R2-2104105***

The proposed changes in R2-2103090, R2-2103127, R2-2103318 and R2-2104105 are quite straightforward, rapporteur will directly merge the changes into the miscellaneous CR.

# Miscellaneous corrections on TS 36.331

#### ***R2-2104108***

In R2-2104108, besides some editorial changes that are quite straightforward, it proposed in the field description for daps-HO in section 6.3.2, clarify the configuration is not allowed when sidelink is configured.

Question 7: Do companies agree to clarify in the field description for daps-HO that the configuration is not allowed when sidelink is configured as proposed in R2-2104108?

* **Yes.**
* **No (Please clarify why the proposed changes are not acceptable).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comment |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion
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