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# Introduction

This is for the summary of documents submitted / related to AI 8.7.4.

# Phase-1 Discussion

## Questions for Easy Proposals

In [1], it is proposed to solve the left editor-note in the TR for U2U relay as follows

*Editor note: RAN2 will strive for a common solution to the in- and out-of-coverage cases.*

[…]

*Editor note: RAN2 will strive for a common solution between same cell and different cell cases for this scenario. If a common solution is not possible and impacts are found to supporting different cell case, RAN2 works on the same cell case with higher priority.*

**Q1-1: Do you agree to move the note “*Editor note: RAN2 will strive for a common solution to the in- and out-of-coverage cases.*” into normative text?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Not-agree | Comment |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, MotM | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Agree |  |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Fraunhofer | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| ETRI | Agree |  |
| Philips | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| **LG** | Agree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Convida | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |

Rapporteur comment: All companies agree.

Rapporteur recommendation:

1. Move the note “ Editor note: RAN2 will strive for a common solution to the in- and out-of-coverage cases.” into normative text.

**Q1-2: Do you agree to remove the note of “*Editor note: RAN2 will strive for a common solution between the same cell and different cell cases for this scenario. If a common solution is not possible and impacts are found to supporting different cell case, RAN2 works on the same cell case with higher priority.*”?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Not-agree | Comment |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| Lenovo, MotM | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Agree |  |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Fraunhofer | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| ETRI | Agree |  |
| Philips | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| **LG** | Agree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Convida | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |

Rapporteur comment: All companies agree.

Rapporteur recommendation:

1. Remove the note of “*Editor note: RAN2 will strive for a common solution between the same cell and different cell cases for this scenario. If a common solution is not possible and impacts are found to supporting different cell case, RAN2 works on the same cell case with higher priority.*”

In [18], it is proposed to consider different criterion for selection between direct and indirect link(s). While in [16], it is proposed to adopt LTE solution to prioritize direct link if Uu link quality is above a threshold.

**Q1-3: Do you agree that** **as in LTE, an in-coverage remote UE searches for a candidate relay UE if direct Uu link quality of the remote UE is below a configured threshold?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Not-agree | Comment |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree | We prefer to reuse LTE solution |
| Lenovo, MotM | Agree with comment | Yes if search = discovery, but PC5 RRC Connection need not be established until the UE has data to send. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei | Agree |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Agree with comments | LTE solutions can be one option, in addition, for a remote UE in RRC CONNECTED with L2 relay architecture, gNB controlled option shall be also considered. |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Fraunhofer | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| ETRI | Agree |  |
| Philips | Agree | We propose to modify this sentence in Clause 4.3 of TR 38.836:  Relay reselection should be triggered if the NR Sidelink signal strength of current Sidelink relay or NR Uu signal strength are below a (pre)configured threshold |
| ZTE | Agree | Reuse LTE solution. |
| LG | Agree with comments | LTE solution can be one option. We can discuss other cases: for example, power saving UE can select relay UE even though the Uu signal strength are over a (pre)configured threshold. In SID, power saving is one of objectives. |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Convida | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |

Rapporteur comment: All companies agree.

Two companies mentioned the possibility of other solution, for which rapporteur understand is not excluded by the proposal here yet.

One company suggest one TP, which can be discussed when capturing it in TR.

Rapporteur recommendation:

1. As in LTE, an in-coverage remote UE searches for a candidate relay UE if direct Uu link quality of the remote UE is below a configured threshold

In [22], it is proposed to add the SA2 conclusion into RAN2 TR, i.e., for L3 U2U relay, according to TR 23.752

- UE-to-UE Relay discovery and selection are supported by:

- Model A discovery (as described in sol#11);

- Model B discovery (as described in sol#8); and

- Integrated PC5 unicast link establishment procedure (as described in sol#8).

[…]

* The relay reselection can be viewed just like redoing the relay selection as described in Sol#8 or be performed as described in Sol#50. The reselection criteria are to be coordinated with RAN2 WG.

While for L2 U2U relay

- For Relay reselection, the negotiated UE-to-UE Relay reselection in Sol#50 and the Relay selection in Sol#8 can be used under different conditions. Both Sol#50 and Sol#8 can be taken as baseline.

So SA2 has converged on solution #8 and #50 for both L2 and L3 relay **re**selection, while the solution for relay selection is only clarified for L3 relay as #8 and #11 but not for L2 relay.

**Q1-4: Do you agree to capture in RAN2 TR that Solution#8 and Solution#50 are taken as baseline solution for L2 and L3 UE-to-UE relay reselection, and solution#8 and solution#11 are taken as baseline solution for L3 UE-to-UE relay selection?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Not-agree | Comment |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree | It is aligned with our understanding of SA2 conclusion on relay (re)selection |
| Lenovo, MotM | Agree | Solution#8 and Solution#11 can work. Solution#50 can lead to some AS issues. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei | No strong view | Minor wording suggesting:” **to capture in RAN2 TR that R2 understand, as in SA2 TR, xxxx**”.This is to clarify we didn’t change anything of SA2. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Agree |  |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| Apple | See comment | Soluiton#50 is a path switching solution for U2U relay rather than a relay reselection solution. It is not very clear what is the boundary line between the functons of relay reselection and path setup, or whether we prefer an approach to solve both together. The mechanism and criteria to reselect a relay is similar to solution 8 and solution 11. For this reason, Solution 50 is an enhancement, and not suitable to be called as a “baseline” solution. Maybe we can say “to capure in RAN2 TR that Solution 50 can be used as an enhancement approach for relay reselection.” |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Fraunhofer | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | RAN2 should rather use references to sections/figures of SA2 TR instead of copying text unless there are some AS aspects to be added |
| Intel | Agree | Agree with Huawei and Nokia comments |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| ETRI | Agree |  |
| Philips | Agree | Agree with Nokia |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Convida | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |

Rapporteur comment: All companies agree.

There are comments to add SA2 TR reference when capturing this.

Rapporteur recommendation:

1. Capture in RAN2 TR that Solution#8 and Solution#50 in TR 23.752 are taken as baseline solution for L2 and L3 UE-to-UE relay reselection, and solution#8 and solution#11 in TR 23.752 are taken as baseline solution for L3 UE-to-UE relay selection.

## Questions which Have Been Discussed/Concluded

In [6][12][15], for U2N relay, it is proposed to adopt a mixed direct/indirect scenario for the in-coverage remote UE, e.g.,

* Split CP and UP on direct and indirect path respectively;
* Deliver UP on direct and indirect path simultaneously (e.g., according to whether they are delay sensitive or not);
* Deliver CP on direct and indirect path simultaneously (e.g., with duplication or not);

On the other hand, rapporteur observes that the opposite proposal has been discussed in RAN2#111 in R2-2008264 with clear majority support. From rapporteur perspective, for U2N relay, we can go for the majority view.

Revised Proposal 11: For UE to NW relay, RAN2 assumes the remote UE has an active end-to-end connection via only a single relay UE or via Uu at a given time. The remote UE can have a direct Uu connection or a connection via a single relay UE, but these two connections should not be active at the same time. Mechanisms for ensuring service continuity (e.g. during path switch) are not precluded.

**Q2-1a: Do you agree no need for in-coverage remote UE to support simultaneous direct (via Uu) and indirect (via PC5 through a L2 UE-to-Network Relay UE)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Not-agree | Comment |
| MediaTek | Not-agree | The direct link to gNB is legacy behaviours, no too much effort is needed. It can be easier adopted. |
| Qualcomm | Agree | If it is allowed, it means the remote UE needs to support dual connectivity of Uu and PC5 for L2 relay because both links are terminated in same gNB. It will bring many issues and new requirements. For example, considering we don’t have RAN4 TU on sidelink relay, how can RAN2 determine the RAN4 requirement of PC5+Uu DC? Given we have identified a lot of issues to resolve in WI phase, we recommend RAN2 to consider it in future release. |
| Lenovo, MotM | Not-agree | We need a solution that works, and we do not see how one-path-at a time can help in RLF situation. Since the central idea of the Study is Coverage Extension/ Reliability, any hurried agreements will do long term damage. RAN2 needs to invest some time to think here; we have sufficient time for work phase. |
| Samsung | Agree | We prefer to focus on baseline scenario in this release i.e., one termination point via either direct link or indirect link. |
| OPPO | Agree | Although the benefit has been clarified as above, our assessment is this goes beyond the capacity of WI in this release. |
| Huawei | Postpone to WI phase | Clearly this is enhancement. We can consider this in the WI later phase to check if this can be easily achieved with minor spec impact, when we have the clear views on the basic solution. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree | Only one active link is supported in this release. |
| Ericsson (Min) | Agree | Agree with Qualcomm’s comments. |
| Apple | Agree | I think this is an optimizaiton which can be discussed in future release |
| Sony | Agree | We prefer the baseline scenario in this release and consider the extension in future releases. |
| Xiaomi | Agree | This could be done in future release. |
| InterDigital | Postpone to WI | Agree with HW. It is not necessary to discuss this now. |
| vivo | Not agree | The scenario was discussed in last meeting only for one QoS flow on duplicated path, while for other cases e.g. Split CP and UP on direct and indirect path, CP on direct and indirect path simultaneously, have not been discussed and sufficiently evaluated.  In our understanding, it is hurry to exclude mixed direct/indirect scenario in this release, at least we can further check/evaluate this in WI phase. |
| Fraunhofer | Not-Agree | Same as Huawei and Lenovo, we think that this has benefits and should be considered in WI phase. |
| Nokia | Agree | Due to complexity our view is that RAN2 has no time for this non-essential enhancement in Rel-17. It could be considered in future releases. |
| Intel | Agree | Although we see the point that it will aid in reliability, we concur with several companies’ view that it is too wide a scope to be considered in Rel-17 but can be part of future enhancements. |
| CATT | Postpone to WI phase | We share the same view with HW. |
| ETRI | Not-Agree | Agree with Huawei. The enhancement can be considered in the WI stage with minimum specification impacts. |
| Philips | Not-agree | We second Lenovo. At the same time we understand the concerns from other companies. We propose to include an EN in the TR to indicate that this scenario is FFS during WI phase. |
| ZTE | Agree | If simultaneous direct and indirect link is supported, it consumes more power for remote UE to monitor both Uu and PC5 interface. In addition, more issues should be considered, e.g. UE capability, path selection, packet duplication/split. RAN2 is suggested to focus on baseline scenario and basic functionalities in this release. |
| **LG** | Agree | Agree only one active link in this release. |
| ASUSTeK | Agree | We think simultaneous direct and indirect can be supported in future release. |
| Convida | Agree | Agree with OPPO. Although the benefit is clear, this goes beyond the capacity of WI in this release. |
| CMCC | Agree | It can be discussed in future release. |

Rapporteur comment:

Agree: 15

Not-agree: 6

Postpone to WI phase: 3

Since the majority is no need to support this simultaneous connection, RAN2 cannot conclude the necessity of RAN2 discussion for simultaneous connection for L2 U2N relay at this meeting.

**Q2-1b: Do you agree for in-coverage remote UE, whether to support simultaneous direct (via Uu) and indirect (via PC5 through a L3 UE-to-Network Relay UE) is out of RAN2 scope?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Not-agree | Comment |
| MediaTek | Agree | For L3 case, it is out of RAN2 scope. |
| Qualcomm | Yes…(see comments) | In our understanding, simultaneous PC5 and Uu operation has been supported in Rel-16 NR V2X: a sidelink UE can simultaneously have Uu transmission with gNB and PC5 transmission with another sidelink UE. For L3 relay, because remote UE is not visible to gNB, the Uu link and PC5 link are not terminated in same gNB. Thus, we think it is same as simultaneous PC5 and Uu operation in Rel-16 NR V2X.  To avoid further controversial discussion in last meeting of SI phase, we can accept if it is agreed as “out of RAN2 scope” as Rapporteur suggested, or no agreement is made. We don’t accept agreement that such operation is not allowed for L3 U2N relay. |
| Lenovo, MotM | Not-agree | The Study (RP-193253) clearly requires coverage extension – and using multi-path diversity is one of the main tools available to RAN2/ 1. It can’t be out of scope for us. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei | Not agree | The aspect on CP link between remote UE and gNB is R2 scope. Yet, we have no conclusion on this, which is pretty essential. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | Agree |  |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| Apple | Not Agree | What is the exact multi-path solution discussed here for L3 relay? Is gNB behind the relay still invisible to remote UE? If the direct and indirect path converges into the same gNB and if this convergence is not agnostic to AS layer, then there some AS layer issues need to be discussed in RAN2. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Not agree | We still think this has RAN2 impacts. |
| vivo | Not agree | Agree with Qualcomm observation that the Uu link and PC5 link are not terminated in same gNB, but as Apple also pointed out, it depends on the definition for ‘simultaneous direct (via Uu) and indirect (via PC5 through a L3 UE-to-Network Relay UE)’, especially if we consider the two paths may converge into the same gNB in the end.  To have an agreement of ‘out of RAN2 scope’ is too strong to us. |
| Fraunhofer | Not-Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree | Same view as QC |
| Intel | Agree with Comment | It depends on whether path switching has AS layer impact. In any case, as discussed in previous question, simultaneous connections may be too wide a scope for Rel-17 discussions. |
| CATT | Not-Agree | We have doubt about the definition of “simultaneous” for L3 and prefer not to rushing for this part. |
| Philips | Not agree | We second Lenovo. In addition, the fact that indirect link is via L3 does not necessarily mean it is out of scope for RAN2. We feel more comfortable if RAN2 explicitly agrees to this unlike Qualcomm is suggesting.  We propose to include an EN in the TR to indicate that this scenario is FFS during WI phase. |
| ZTE | Agree | For L3 relay, it depends heavily on SA2. From AS perspective, remote UE is not visible to gNB in L3 relay, as Qualcomm commented, if simultaneous direct and indirect link means simultaneous Uu and PC5 operation, it has been supported by R16 NR V2X. |
| **LG** | Not agree | It can be out of scope in L3 relay. |
| Convida | Not agree | The Uu between remote UE and the gNB is in R2 scope. |
| CMCC | Not agree | Share the same understanding as apple. |

Rapporteur comment:

Agree: 11

Not-agree: 11

Without majority view, RAN2 cannot conclude the necessity of RAN2 discussion for simultaneous connection for L3 U2N relay in this meeting.

1. Whether to support simultaneous direct (via Uu) and indirect (via PC5 through a L3 UE-to-Network Relay UE) is left to WI phase in contribution-driven manner.

In [15], similar proposal is proposed for U2U relay as well.

On the other hand, rapporteur observes that the opposite proposal has been discussed in RAN2#111 in R2-2008264 with clear majority support (20 out of 25 select option-a)). From rapporteur perspective, for U2N relay, we can go for the majority view.

Question 14: Which connectivity scenarios should be supported for the source UE in UE to UE relaying?

a) Active link to the target UE either directly or via a relay UE, but not both

b) Active link with a target UE both directly and via a relay UE

c) Active links with a target UE supported via different relay Ues

d) Active links with two different target Ues via two different relay Ues

**Q2-2a: Do you agree no need for source UE to support simultaneous direct (connecting to destination UE directly) and indirect (through a L2 UE-to-UE Relay UE)?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Not-agree | Comment |
| MediaTek | Not-agree | b), c) should be supported. |
| Qualcomm | Agree | Same comments to Q2-1a, we recommend RAN2 to consider it in future release. |
| Lenovo, MotM | Not-agree | We need a solution that works, and we do not see how one-path-at a time can help in RLF situation. Since the central idea of the Study is Coverage Extension/ Reliability, any hurried agreements will do long term damage. RAN2 needs to invest some time to think here; we have sufficient time for work phase. |
| Samsung | Agree | Same as Q2-1a |
| OPPO | Agree | Although the benefit has been clarified as above, our assessment is this goes beyond the capacity of WI in this release. |
| Huawei | Postpone to WI phase |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree | Same as Q2-1a |
| Ericsson (Min) | agree |  |
| Sony | Agree | Same as Q2-1a |
| Apple | Agree | We can stick to the earlier RAN2 agreement |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Postpone to WI | As with comments to Q2-1a, there is no need to conclude on this now. |
| vivo | Postpone to WI phase | We think this is not fully evaluated and we can continue the discussion in WI phase. At least we understand some of the alternatives (e.g. b/c) are beneficial to reliability/coverage. |
| Fraunhofer | Not-Agree | We think the simultaneous connections will enhance the reliability and should be discussed in WI phase. |
| Nokia | Agree | Due to complexity our view is that RAN2 has no time for this non-essential enhancement in Rel-17. It could be considered in future releases. |
| Intel | Agree | Same as Q2-1a. |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Philips | Not-agree | Same as Q2-1a |
| ZTE | Agree | Same as Q2-1a |
| **LG** | Agree | Same as Q2-1a |
| ASUSTeK | Agree | We think simultaneous direct and indirect can be supported in future release. |
| Convida | Postpone to WI or next release | The benefit is clear. Postpone to WI or next release |
|  |  |  |

Rapporteur comment:

Agree: 14

Not-agree: 4

Postpone to WI: 3

Since the majority is no need for supporting simultaneous connection, RAN2 cannot conclude the necessity of RAN2 discussion for simultaneous connection for L2 U2U relay in this meeting.

**Q2-2b: Do you agree whether source UE supports simultaneous direct (connecting to destination UE directly) and indirect (through a L3 UE-to-UE Relay UE) is out of RAN2 scope?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Not-agree | Comment |
| MediaTek | Agree | For L3 case, it is out of RAN2 scope. |
| Qualcomm | Yes..(see comments) | Same comments to Q2-1b, although we think it is already supported in NR Rel-16 (i.e. one sidelink UE can have simultaneous connection with two other sidelink UEs), we can accept if it is agreed as “out of RAN2 scope” as Rapporteur suggested, or no agreement is made. We don’t accept agreement that such operation is not allowed for L3 U2U relay. |
| Lenovo, MotM | Not-agree | The Study (RP-193253) clearly requires coverage extension – and using multi-path diversity is one of the main tools available to RAN2/ 1. It can’t be out of scope for us. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei | Not agree | The PC5 RRC connection is R2 scope. We may need to clarify if there is still PC5 RRC connection allowed in direct link between those two UEs, in addition to the relayed link. |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | agree |  |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| Apple | Depends | We need to know what is the exact L3 solution for this. If it uses PDCP split/duplication, then there is RAN2 impact. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Not agree | We see some RAN2 impacts, similar to the UE to NW case. |
| vivo | Not agree | Similar as Q2-1b. We may not have any explicit agreement on ‘out of RAN2 scope’. |
| Fraunhofer | Not-Agree | Same view as Huawei. |
| Nokia | Agree | Same view as QC |
| Intel | Agree with comment | Similar to response for L2 relay, we think simultaneous connections may not be considered in Rel-17 scope/timeframe and even if so, it is not clear whether there is RAN2 impact, so early to agree whether it is out of scope or not. |
| CATT | Not-Agree | We have doubt about the definition of “simultaneous” for L3 and prefer not to rushing for this part. |
| Philips | Not-agree | Same as Q2-1b |
| ZTE | Agree | Similar as Q2-1b, if simultaneous direct and indirect link for L3 relay means means simultaneous PC5 connections with multiple sidelink UEs, it has been supported in R16 NR V2X. |
| LG | Agree |  |
| Convida | Agree |  |

Rapporteur comment:

Agree: 13

Not-agree: 7

Depends: 1

Since the majority is this is out of RAN2 scope, RAN2 cannot conclude the necessity of RAN2 discussion for simultaneous connection for L3 U2U relay in this meeting.

There are some papers that raises additional factors to take into account for relay (re)selection, e.g., Relay load [7], MCR [17], serving cell and RRC state of relay UE[18], “Failure” indication from relay UE [7][21], where the former one may include impact on discovery message content design.

Additionally, rapporteur would like to point out the following agreement from RAN2#112

Proposal 12 [Easy]: Additional AS layer criteria can be considered in WI phase for both Layer 2 and layer 3 U2N relay solutions.

**Q2-3: Given the agreement as above, do you agree no need to further discuss the other additional factors (e.g., Relay load [7], MCR [17], serving cell and RRC state of relay UE[18], “Failure” indication from relay UE [7][21]) for U2N relay in study phase?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Not-agree | Comment |
| MediaTek | Agree | We should discuss additional AS layer criteria in WI phase |
| Qualcomm | Agree | We should respect the agreement we made in RAN2#112-e |
| Lenovo, MotM | Agree if it can be discussed in WI. | Our understanding of the proposal is that can be directly worked at in the WI phase. |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei | Agree to postpone to WI phase |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree | This can be discussed in WI |
| Ericsson (Min) | agree |  |
| Sony | Agree to postpone | This should be discussed in WI phase. |
| Xiaomi | Agree | Could be discussed in WI though. |
| InterDigital | Agree to postpone. |  |
| Vivo | Agree to postpone. |  |
| Fraunhofer | Agree | It should be discussed in WI phase. |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree | Can be discussed in WI stage. |
| ETRI | Agree |  |
| Philips | Agree | To be discussed during WI phase as already stated in TR 38.836 |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| **LG** | Agree | We should discuss additional AS layer criteria in WI. |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Convida | Agree | Discuss in the WI phase |

Rapporteur comment: All companies agree, so no need for further conclusion.

For UE-to-UE relay, when source UE performs relay selection, it is proposed to take the 2nd hop (between relay UE and destination UE) signal quality into account [7][10][21].

Based on the observation by rapporteur, SA2 has agreed on both discovery model-A/B for the U2U relay, and this is also related to discovery message content design which relates to SA2 scope. Also, rapporteur would like to point out the following agreement from RAN2#112

Proposal 14 [Easy]: Additional AS layer criteria can be considered in WI phase for both Layer 2 and layer 3 U2U relay solutions.

**Q2-4: Given the agreement as above, do you agree no need to discuss if the link quality between the relay UE and destination UE should be considered by source UE to (re)select relay UE in study phase?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Not-agree | Comment |
| MediaTek | Agree | We should discuss additional AS layer criteria in WI phase |
| Qualcomm | Agree | We should respect the agreement we made in RAN2#112-e |
| Lenovo, MotM | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei | Agree to postpone to WI phase |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | agree | Additional AS criteria can be discussed in WI phase. |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree to postpone. |  |
| Vivo | Agree |  |
| Fraunhofer | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree | We think that it is important to consider this aspect but can be discussed during WI stage. |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| ETRI | Agree |  |
| Philips | Agree | To be discussed during WI phase as already stated in TR 38.836 |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree | We should discuss additional AS layer criteria in WI. |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Convida | Agree | Discuss in the WI phase |

Rapporteur comment: All companies agree, so no need for further conclusion.

Considering that signal strength of both discovery message and unicast link can act as base for relay (re)selection, there are some discussion on how to select between the two in different cases.

In [8], it points out the RSRP measurement may be hard if the relay and remote UE are not continuously exchanging messages over the link. In [7], to address the similar issue, it is proposed to rely on data availability.

Proposal 2: Relay reselection is triggered based on only SL-RSRP of data, if data is available at the remote UE.

Proposal 3: If the data has not been available at the remote UE for some time, the remote UE triggers reselection based on discovery RSRP.

While in [16], the proposal is in the opposite direction

Proposal 1: Remote UE only use SL-RSRP to evaluate whether PC5 link quality with a relay UE satisfies relay reselection criterion when the remote UE has PC5-RRC connection with the relay UE.

And rapporteur would like to point out the following agreement from RAN2#112

Proposal 3: Remote UE may also use SL-RSRP measurements on the SIdelink unicast link to evaluate whether PC5 link quality with a relay UE satisfies relay reselection criterion. Details e.g. in case of no transmission on the unicast link can be discussed in WI phase.

**Q2-5: Given the agreement as above, do you agree how to perform RSRP measurement based on RSRP of discovery message and/or SL-RSRP if remote UE has PC5-RRC connection with relay UE can be decided in WI phase?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Agree/Not-agree | Comment |
| MediaTek | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree | We should respect the agreement we made in RAN2#112-e |
| Lenovo, MotM | Agree |  |
| Samsung | Agree |  |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei | Agree to postpone to WI phase |  |
| Spreadtrum | Agree |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | agree |  |
| Sony | Agree |  |
| Apple | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| InterDigital | Agree |  |
| vivo | Agree |  |
| Fraunhofer | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |
| Intel | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| ETRI | Agree |  |
| Philips | Agree |  |
| ZTE | Agree |  |
| LG | Agree |  |
| ASUSTeK | Agree |  |
| Convida | Agree |  |
| CMCC | Agree |  |

Rapporteur comment: All companies agree.

Rapporteur recommendation.

1. How to perform RSRP measurement based on RSRP of discovery message and/or SL-RSRP if remote UE has PC5-RRC connection with relay UE can be decided in WI phase.

## Questions for New Proposal

In [4], it is proposed that RAN2 discuss whether remote/relay UEs can belong to different PLMN. Rapporteur understands this issue is more up to decision by SA2, e.g., impact to the CN architecture if any, and the impact to discovery message content design if any.

**Q3-1: For the issue of “whether the UE-to-Network relay UE and remote UE can belong to different PLMN”, do you think:**

**Case-1: Decision needs to be done in SI (if this option is selected, please indicate whether you support “UE-to-Network relay UE and remote UE belong to different PLMN” in the comment);**

**Case-2: No need to decide at SI phase:**

* **Case-2a: Capture in the TR that this issue is left to WI phase;**
* **Case-2b: No need to capture the issue in the TR;**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Which case for this issue(1, 2a, or 2b)? | Comment |
| MediaTek | 2a |  |
| Qualcomm | Case-2b (and wait SA2 conclusion) | We have the same understanding as Rapporteur: it should be concluded in SA2 and then notify RAN2. We don’t think it is an essential issue which needs to be concluded in SI phase in RAN2. Thus, we don’t prefer to capture in TR that “left to WI phase”.  Of course, if SA2 agree it, RAN2 can update the TR in future. |
| Lenovo, MotM | 2a | We have a dependency on other groups (SA and CT), so need to wait. |
| Samsung | Case-2b | This issue should be up to SA2 decision. RAN2 can discuss in WI phase if needed. |
| OPPO | 2b | For this issue, since the motivation is still dependent on other WG, we tend to avoid capturing in TR already now. |
| Huawei | 2b | If this is really essential, companies can raise this in WI phase by contribution. |
| Spreadtrum | Case 2b | We understand that this case is possible in RAN side, But whether the CN can support it or not needs to be determined by SA2. |
| Ericsson (Min) | 2b |  |
| Sony | 2b | We have dependency on other WGs and its late for SI completion |
| Apple | 2b | This is an upper layer issue and to be studied by SA2. |
| Xiaomi | 2b | This is up to other WGs decision. |
| InterDigital | 2b |  |
| vivo | 2a | We are fine to capture it in the TR. |
| Fraunhofer | 2b |  |
| Nokia | 2b |  |
| Intel | 2b |  |
| CATT | 2a | We are fine to postpone the discussion to WI stage. |
| ETRI | 2b |  |
| Philips | 2b | This is already captured in solution #41 of TR 23.752 |
| ZTE | 2b | We think this issue should not be decided by RAN2, instead it depends on SA2 decision. It is not necessary to capture the issue in RAN2 TR. |
| LG | 2b |  |
| ASUSTeK | 2b |  |
| Convida | 2b |  |
| CMCC | 2b |  |

Rapporteur comment:

2a: 4

2b: 20

Clear majority view is no need to capture anything in TR.

In [19], one issue raised that since TX power of unicast signal may not be of fixed value due to power control, whether the remote UE has to be aware of the TX power to evaluate the link quality for relay (re)selection.

**Q3-2: For the issue of “whether remote UE needs to know the TX power of unicast link messages”, do you think:**

**Case-2: No need to decide at SI phase:**

* **Case-2a: Capture in the TR that this issue is left to WI phase;**
* **Case-2b: No need to capture the issue in the TR;**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Which case for this issue(1, 2a, or 2b)? | Comment |
| MediaTek | 2a |  |
| Qualcomm | Case-2b | We think it is one kind of enhancement of AS criteria of relay (re)selection, which can be discussed in WI phase in contribution driven manner. At this stage, we don’t see need to capture in TR. |
| Lenovo, MotM | 2b |  |
| Samsung | Case-2b | This can be discussed under relay selection/reselection in WI phase as Q2-3, Q2-4. |
| OPPO | 2b | Share the same view with QC that it can be contribution driven. |
| Huawei | 2b | Companies can always remind us on this consideration in WI phase by contribution. |
| Spreadtrum | Case 2b |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | 2b | No Need to discuss this issue during the SI phase, since this issue has RAN1 impacts, which can not be addressed during the SI phase. |
| Sony | 2b | This can be discussed in RAN1 based on company contributions |
| Apple | 2b |  |
| Xiaomi | 2a | We think this could be captured in TR. |
| InterDigital | 2b | These are normal WI discussions – no need to mention this level of detail in the TR. |
| vivo | 2b |  |
| Fraunhofer | 2b |  |
| Nokia | 2b |  |
| Intel | 2b |  |
| CATT | 2b |  |
| ETRI | 2b |  |
| Philips | 2b |  |
| ZTE | Case 2b | It can be raised and discussed in WI phase by contributions, but no need to capture which specific issues should be studied in the TR at this stage. |
| LG | 2a | We think it need to be captured in TR |
| ASUSTeK | 2b |  |
| Convida | 2b |  |
| CMCC | 2b |  |

Rapporteur comment:

2a: 3

2b: 21

Clear majority view is no need to capture anything in TR.

In[8], it is proposed to have a relay-specific resource pool for easier QoS enforcement.

Furthermore, rapporteur understands the issue is only for data communication, since the issue for shared/separate resource pool has been addressed separately in discovery section.

**Q3-3: For the issue of “a relay-specific resource pool for communication”, do you think:**

**Case-1: Decision needs to be done in SI (if this option is selected, please indicate whether you support “a relay-specific resource pool for communication” in the comment)**

**Case-2: No need to decide at SI phase:**

* **Case-2a: Capture in the TR that this issue is left to WI phase;**
* **Case-2b: No need to capture the issue in the TR;**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Which case for this issue(1, 2a, or 2b)? | Comment |
| MediaTek | 2a |  |
| Qualcomm | Case-2b | We think it is an optimization. So, it can be discussed in WI phase in contribution driven manner. At this stage, we don’t see need to capture in TR. |
| Lenovo, MotM | 2b |  |
| Samsung | Case-2b | This can be discussed under resource pool design during WI phase. |
| OPPO | 2b | Share the same view with QC that it can be contribution driven. |
| Huawei | 2b | This is really an optimization. |
| Spreadtrum | Case 2b |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | 2b | No Need to discuss this issue during the SI phase, since this issue has RAN1 impacts, which can not be addressed during the SI phase. |
| Sony | 2b |  |
| Apple | 2b |  |
| Xiaomi | 2b | We don’t see the clear motivation to do this. |
| InterDigital | 2b |  |
| vivo | 2b |  |
| Fraunhofer | 2a | We believe that the dedicated resource pool should be further discussed in WI phase as it can bring benefits w.r.t. QoS provisioning. Due to its importance, we think that it can be captured in TR as a topic for WI phase. |
| Nokia | 2b |  |
| Intel | 2b |  |
| CATT | 2b |  |
| ETRI | 2b |  |
| Philips | 2b |  |
| ZTE | 2b | It can be raised and discussed in WI phase by contributions, but no need to capture which specific issues should be studied in the TR at this stage. |
| LG | 2b |  |
| ASUSTeK | 2b |  |
| Convida | 2b |  |
| CMCC | 2b |  |

Rapporteur comment:

2a: 2

2b: 22

Clear majority is no need to capture anything in TR.

Besides, there are some discussion on the additional condition(s) for UEs to manage the PC5 link for the relayed connection to network, e.g.,

* For relay UE: In [10], it is proposed relay UE may release the PC5 connection or requesting remote UE to reselect, in case of QoS degradation, or impending handover. In [20], it is proposed that Relay UE may be activated when located in the recommended activation area.
* For remote UE: In [14], remote UE may decide whether to establish/maintain the PC5 connection via UE-to-Network relay according to (pre-)configuration, e.g., when it enters OOC scenario in RRC\_IDLE state, for RAU, paging monitoring or periodic traffic;

On the other hand, rapporteur understand some conditions above are not purely RAN2 related but also of SA2 scope.

**Q3-4: For the issue of “additional condition/trigger(s) for PC5 connection management by UE-to-network Relay UE,** **e.g., QoS degradation, impending handover, activation area”, do you think:**

**Case-1: decision can be done in SI (if this option is selected, please indicate whether you support any of the condition/trigger(s) for “PC5 connection management by UE-to-network Relay UE” in the comment)**

**Case-2: No need to decide at SI phase:**

* **Case-2a: Capture in the TR that this issue is left to WI phase;**
* **Case-2b: No need to capture the issue in the TR;**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Which case for this issue(1, 2a, or 2b)? | Comment |
| MediaTek | 2b | The above additional condition/trigger(s) seems in SA2 scope. |
| Qualcomm | Case-2b | We think it is one kind of enhancement of AS criteria of relay (re)selection, which can be discussed in WI phase in contribution driven manner. At this stage, we don’t see need to capture in TR. |
| Lenovo, MotM | 2b | AS criteria of relay (re)selection can be discussed in WI phase. |
| Samsung | Case-2b | This can be discussed during WI phase. |
| OPPO | 2b | Share the same view with MTK that this includes the dependency with other WG, so maybe good to wait for input from SA2 first before capturing it in TR already now. |
| Huawei | 2b | More clarification are needed before capture something in the TR. |
| Spreadtrum | Case 2b |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | 2b | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Sony | 2b |  |
| Apple | 2b | Agree with QC |
| Xiaomi | 2b |  |
| InterDigital | 2b |  |
| vivo | 2b | It can be discussed in WI phase. |
| Fraunhofer | 2b |  |
| Nokia | 2b |  |
| Intel | 2b | [Proponent]; We think that additional AS layer criteria for relay reselection would aid further with service continuity for L2 relaying however, we are fine to go with majority view as these criteria can be considered as enhancements which can be looked at in more detail during WI stage. |
| CATT | 2b |  |
| ETRI | 2b |  |
| Philips | 2b |  |
| ZTE | Case-2b |  |
| LG | 2b |  |
| ASUSTeK | 2b |  |
| Convida | 2b |  |
| CMCC | 2b |  |

Rapporteur comment: All companies agree no need to capture anything in TR.

**Q3-5: For the issue of “additional condition/trigger(s) for PC5 connection management by UE-to-network Remote UE, e.g., entering OOC in RRC\_IDLE, RAU, paging monitoring or periodic traffic”, do you think:**

**Case-1b: decision can be done in SI if this option is selected, please indicate whether you support any of the condition/trigger(s) for “PC5 connection management by UE-to-network Remote UE” in the comment)**

**Case-2: No need to decide at SI phase:**

* **Case-2a: Capture in the TR that this issue is left to WI phase;**
* **Case-2b: No need to capture the issue in the TR;**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Which case for this issue(1, 2a, or 2b)? | Comment |
| MediaTek | 2a |  |
| Qualcomm | Case-2b | We think it is one kind of enhancement of AS criteria of relay (re)selection, which can be discussed in WI phase in contribution driven manner. At this stage, we don’t see need to capture in TR. |
| Lenovo, MotM | 2b | AS criteria of relay (re)selection can be discussed in WI phase. |
| Samsung | Case-2b | This can be discussed during WI phase. |
| OPPO | 2b | Share the same view with MTK that this includes the dependency with other WG, so maybe good to wait for input from SA2 first before capturing it in TR already now. |
| Huawei | 2b | Again, we only need to capture something which is the common view from companies. |
| Spreadtrum | Case 2b |  |
| Ericsson (Min) | 2b | Agree with Qualcomm. |
| Sony | 2b |  |
| Apple | 2b | Agree with QC |
| Xiaomi | 2b |  |
| InterDigital | 2b |  |
| vivo | 2b |  |
| Fraunhofer | 2b |  |
| Nokia | 2b |  |
| Intel | 2b | Further details can be considered during WI phase. |
| CATT | 2b | We share the same view with QC. |
| Philips | 2b |  |
| ZTE | Case-2b |  |
| LG | 2b |  |
| ASUSTeK | 2b |  |
| Convida | 2b |  |
| CMCC | 2b |  |

Rapporteur comment:

2a: 1

2b: 22

Clear majority view is no need to capture anything in TR.

# Phase-3 Discussion

As discussion in online

Deadline: Tuesday 2021-02-02 1200 UTC – extended to Thursday 2021-02-04 0200 UTC for discussion on P5; either we capture in the TR that simultaneous connections are left for normative phase, or we do not capture anything either way.

In phase-2, a follow-up discussion to check companies view:

**Q4: For the issue of “for in-coverage remote UE, whether to support simultaneous direct (via Uu) and indirect (via PC5 through a L3 UE-to-Network Relay UE)”, do you think:**

**Case-1: Capture in the TR that this issue is left to WI phase**

**Case-2a: No need to capture it in the TR, but can capture “Whether to support simultaneous direct (via Uu) and indirect (via PC5 through a L3 UE-to-Network Relay UE) is left to WI phase in contribution-driven manner” as an agreement;**

**Case-2b: No need to capture it either in TR or in meeting minutes;**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Which case for this issue(1, 2a, or 2b)? | Comment |
| OPPO | 2a, 2b | We are open to either 2a or 2b, considering the issue/solution has not been clarified so far, there is little reason to go for case-1. |
| Qualcomm | 2b | Agree with OPPO. We don’t see why it is an essential issue. And we are not convinced why this issue is treated specially (agreement or capturing in TR) over all other priority-3 proposals left without agreements, some of which were already discussed extensively in multiple rounds of meetings. |
| ZTE | 2b | We have the same understanding with Qualcomm. Considering this is a new scenario with dual connection and not an essential one, we don’t think it should be treated in this stage. |
| LG | 2b | We agree with OPPO and Qualcomm. It has not been discussed enough during SI. So, we are not sure why this has to be captured urgently in TR. |
| vivo | 2a, 2b | Agree with OPPO. And I understand that it may be hard to totally exclude this issue according to online discussion so 2a would be a compromised way to progress. |
| Huawei | 1 or 2a | No strong view on either captured in TR or in chair minutes. But, we prefer to delete the redundant part “**~~in contribution-driven manner~~**”.  Again, “RRC CP @direct +UP @indirect” is important to be clarified, which impacts on whether we support the gNB dedicated signalling controlled relay selection and discovery procedures/parameters. |
| Samsung | 2b | Agree with Qualcomm. We do not think that RAN2 has studied enough about these scenarios and the consequences to be captured in TR and to be discussed in WI phase. |

# Phase-3 Conclusion

We have the following proposals

# Reference

1. R2-2100109 Left issues on Scenario and L23 accessment OPPO discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
2. R2-2100123 Finalize the comparison and conclusion section of TR 38.836 Qualcomm Incorporated discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
3. R2-2100171 Discussion on Remote UEs in RRC Inactive MediaTek Inc. discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
4. R2-2100205 Further Clarification on the Sidelink Relay Scenario CATT discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
5. R2-2100309 Comparison of L2 and L3 Relay ZTE Corporation discussion
6. R2-2100444 Remote UE connectivity MediaTek Inc. discussion Rel-17
7. R2-2100523 Relay selection and reselection InterDigital discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
8. R2-2100550 Open Issues on NR Sidelink Relaying Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI discussion
9. R2-2100616 Conclusion on the feasibility of L2 and L3 based Sidelink Relaying Intel Corporation discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
10. R2-2100625 Further details on relay reselection Intel Corporation discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
11. R2-2100980 Comparative analysis of L2 and L3 SL Relay architecture Ericsson, Samsung, Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
12. R2-2101180 Consideration on Control Plane messages transmission path for remote UE vivo, Philips, Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, AT&T discussion Rel-17
13. R2-2101210 SI acquisition, CN Registration and RNAU Lenovo, Motorola Mobility discussion FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
14. R2-2101325 Support of idle mode mobility for remote-UE in SL UE-to-Nwk relay Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
15. R2-2101453 Providing Reliability and Coverage using Relays Lenovo, Motorola Mobility, Philips, AT&T, Fujitsu discussion FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
16. R2-2101784 Consideration on relay selection and reselection Huawei, HiSilicon discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
17. R2-2101778 Further consideration of relay selection and reselection criteria LG Electronics Inc. discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
18. R2-2101785 Relay UE selection and reselection prioritization LG Electronics Inc. discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
19. R2-2101788 Relay reselection using discovery message and sidelink unicast link LG Electronics Inc. discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
20. R2-2101890 discussion on RRC procedures of L2 U2N relay ETRI discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay
21. R2-2101107 Consideration on U2N relay and U2U relay Lenovo, Motorola Mobility discussion Rel-17
22. R2-2100534 Remaining aspects for relay (re)selection Ericsson discussion Rel-17 FS\_NR\_SL\_relay

# TP

*Change Start*

4.3 Relay (re-)selection criterion and procedure

The baseline solution for relay (re-)selection is as follow:

Radio measurements at PC5 interface are considered as part of relay (re)selection criteria.

- Remote UE at least use the radio signal strength measurements of sidelink discovery messages to evaluate whether PC5 link quality of a Relay UE satisfies relay selection and reselection criterion.

- When Remote UE is connected to a Relay UE, it may use SL-RSRP measurements on the sidelink unicast link to evaluate whether PC5 link quality with the Relay UE satisfies relay reselection criterion.

Further details on the PC5 radio measurements criteria, e.g., in case of no transmission on the sidelink unicast link can be discussed in WI phase. How to perform RSRP measurement based on RSRP of discovery message and/or SL-RSRP if remote UE has PC5-RRC connection with relay UE can be decided in WI phase.

For relay selection, as in LTE, an in-coverage remote UE searches for a candidate relay UE if direct Uu link quality of the remote UE is below a configured threshold.

For relay (re-)selection, Remote UE compares the PC5 radio measurements of a Relay UE with the threshold which is configured by gNB or preconfigured. Higher layer criteria also need to be considered by Remote UE for relay (re-)selection, but details can be left to SA2 to decide. Relay (re-)selection can be triggered by upper layers of Remote UE.

Relay reselection should be triggered if the NR Sidelink signal strength of current Sidelink relay is below a (pre)configured threshold. Also, relay reselection may be triggered if RLF of PC5 link with current Relay UE is detected by Remote UE.

*Next Change*

5.1 Scenario, Assumption and Requirement

The UE-to-UE Relay enables the coverage extension of the sidelink transmissions between two sidelink UEs and power saving. The coverage scenarios considered in this study are the following:

1) All UEs (Source UE, Relay UE, Destination UE) are in coverage.

2) All UEs (Source UE, Relay UE, Destination UE) are out-of-coverage.

3) Partial coverage whereby at least one of the UEs involved in relaying (Source UE, Relay UE, Destination UE) is in-coverage, and at least one of the UEs involved in relaying is out-of-coverage.

RAN2 will strive for a common solution to the in- and out-of-coverage cases. For the UE-to-UE Relay, the scenario where UEs can be in coverage of the different cell is supported.

*Next Change*

5.3 Relay (re-)selection criteria and procedure

The baseline solution for relay (re-)selection is as follow:

Radio measurements at PC5 interface are considered as part of relay (re)selection criteria.

- Remote UE at least use the radio signal strength measurements of sidelink discovery messages to evaluate whether PC5 link quality of a Relay UE satisfies relay selection and reselection criterion.

- When Remote UE is connected to a Relay UE, it may use SL-RSRP measurements on the sidelink unicast link to evaluate whether PC5 link quality with the Relay UE satisfies relay reselection criterion.

Further details on the PC5 radio measurements criteria, e.g., in case of no transmission on the sidelink unicast link can be discussed in WI phase. How to perform RSRP measurement based on RSRP of discovery message and/or SL-RSRP if remote UE has PC5-RRC connection with relay UE can be decided in WI phase.

For relay (re-)selection, Remote UE compares the PC5 radio measurements of a Relay UE with the threshold which is configured by gNB or preconfigured. Higher layer criteria also need to be considered by Remote UE for relay (re-)selection, but details can be left to SA2 to decide. Relay (re-)selection can be triggered by upper layers of Remote UE.

Relay reselection should be triggered if the NR Sidelink signal strength of current Sidelink relay is below a (pre)configured threshold. Also, relay reselection may be triggered if RLF of PC5 link with current Relay UE is detected by Remote UE.

The above-described baseline for relay (re)selection apply to both L2 and L3 relay solutions. Additional AS layer criteria can be considered in WI phase for both L2 and L3 UE-to-UE relay solutions.

For relay (re-)selection, when Remote UE has multiple suitable Relay UE candidates which meet all AS-layer & higher layer criteria and Remote UE need to select one Relay UE by itself, it is up to UE implementation to choose one Relay UE.

As captured in TR 23.752, solution#8 and solution#50 in TR 23.752 are taken as baseline solution for L2 and L3 UE-to-UE relay reselection, and solution#8 and solution#11 in TR 23.752 are taken as baseline solution for L3 UE-to-UE relay selection.