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**1. Overall Description:**

RAN2 identified that the maximum number of CBR ranges for dedicated SL PRS resource pool, the maximum number of CBR levels for dedicated SL PRS resource pool and the maximum number of SL PRS transmission Configuration index in *sl-PRS-TxConfigIndexList-r18* in RRC spec are not totally aligned with the RAN1’s parameter list. The details are:

* The maximum number of CBR ranges for SL positioning is 7 in RRC IE *sl-CBR-RangeDedicatedSL-PRS-RP-List-r18* instead of 8 designed by RAN1,
* The maximum number of CBR levels is 15 in RRC IE *SL-CBR-LevelsDedicatedSL-PRS-RP-r18* instead of 16 designed by RAN1,
* The maximum number of SL PRS transmission Configuration index in *sl-PRS-TxConfigIndexList-r18* is 15 in RRC spec instead of 16.

Considering the ASN.1 has already been frozen and extending the value of these parameters will cause complicated signalling work and may cause messy in asn.1, RAN2 agree not to update the asn.1 for the missing one value corrections on these three parameters above.

RAN2 would like to ask RAN1 if it is not acceptable that CBR range, CBR level and SL-PRS-TxConfigIndexList won’t be extended as RAN2 agreed.

**2. Actions:**

**To** **RAN1**

**ACTION:**  RAN2 kindly ask RAN1 if it is not acceptable that CBR range, CBR level and SL-PRS-TxConfigIndexList won’t be extended as RAN2 agreed.

**3. Date of Next RAN2 Meetings:**

TSG-RAN WG2#128 2024-11-18 to 2024-11-22 Orlando, US

TSG-RAN WG2#129 2025-02-17 to 2025-02-21 Athens, GR