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# Introduction

This document is to kick off the following email discussion:

* [AT115-e][609][Relay] Service continuity procedures (MediaTek)

Scope: Progress the remaining proposals on service continuity with focus on the stage 2 procedures.

Intended outcome: Report with TP for 38.300, in R2-2108939

Deadline: Tuesday 2021-08-24 2000 UTC

This email discussion intends to discuss the remaining proposals of service continuity in both R2-2107710 and R2-2108196. The delegates are strongly recommended to read both R2-2107710 and R2-2108196 before providing your reply to the questions casted in this document, since the background information of the proposals as summarized within both R2-2107710 and R2-2108196 is not repeated in this document.

This email discussion intends to also discuss the stage 2 level description (TP for TS38.300 running CR) based on the available agreements made for service continuity with regard to L2 relaying.

# Issue list

## Confirmation of the Remaining proposals within R2-2107710

During the online discussion, proposals 4/5/7/17/19/20/26 were agreed as captured in chair notes. However the following easy proposals within R2-2107710 were not discussed during online session:

Order of steps in service continuity procedures (step numbers referring to Figure 4.5.4.1-1 of TR 38.836):

Proposal 15 (easy) (15/19): For indirect to direct path switch, RRC Reconfiguration message to Relay UE can be sent any time after step 3 based on gNB implementation, as in the Figure 4.5.4.1-1.

Proposal 16 (easy): For indirect to direct path switch, the timing of the PC5 unicast link release is up to UE implementation after step 3.

Proposal 18 (easy): For indirect to direct path switch, based on RRC Reconfiguration by gNB Remote UE and Relay UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying and the timing of PC5 connection reconfiguration is up to UE implementation after step 3.

Proposal 22 (easy) (18/19): For indirect to direct path switch, step 8 can be executed in parallel or after step 5.

Proposal 28 (easy) (15/19): For direct to indirect path switch, the PC5 connection setup procedure is executed after step 3 if the connection has not been setup yet.

Data forwarding:

Proposal 21 (easy) (18/19): For indirect to direct path switch, Relay UE does not perform data forwarding back to gNB for Remote UE.

Message contents:

Proposal 25 (easy) (17/19): For indirect to direct path switch, the contents in RRC Reconfiguration message for Remote UE can be same as legacy NR RRC Reconfiguration with sync.

Proposal 30 (easy) (15/19): For direct to indirect path switch, additional indication from RRC\_CONNECTED Relay UE to gNB is not necessary to initiate Relay UE’s reconfiguration upon establishing unicast link with Remote UE.

Proposal 32 (easy) (18/19): For direct to indirect path switch, the contents in RRC Reconfiguration message for Relay UE can include at least Uu and PC5 RLC configuration for relaying, bearer mapping configuration.

### **Question 1(Proposal 15 within R2-2107710)**

Do you agree Proposal 15 within R2-2107710 as it is: for indirect to direct path switch, RRC Reconfiguration message to Relay UE can be sent any time after step 3 based on gNB implementation, as in the Figure 4.5.4.1-1?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We prefer to allow the following 2 gNB operations/implementation for flexibility:   1. Step 6 is sent right after Step 3 (HO cmd).   *gNB intends to release relay UE’s resource for relaying after sending HO command. This operation has benefit to free up relay UE resources and reduce loading on the relay UE.*   1. Step 6 is sent right after Step 5 (reconfig complete).   *gNB intends to keep relay UE’s resource for relaying until HO complete. This operation has benefit in case of HO failure.*  We don’t see clear benefit of one operation over another. Actually, benefit of 2) (i.e. fallback in HO failure) is marginal because RAN2 has agreed to introduce a default PC5 RLC configuration for RRC re-establishment (i.e. no need to rely on stored configuration in relay for re-establishment purpose).  In all, we believe we should provide the flexibility to NW and no need to restrict in specification. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | No | We think it is better to send the RRCReconfiguration to relay UE at step 6, not after step 3. Since the path switch to direct link may fail and remote UE may fallback to indirect link, it is suggested to keep the remote UE relevant configuration until the remote UE successfully connected to the gNB via Uu. The RRC reconfiguration of relay UE after Step 3 is too early. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | The argument that Relay UE should store the Remote UE’s context in case Remote UE experience a path switch failure and may reestablish to the source Relay seems aim at a optimization. We do not think it is necessary in this release. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Apple | No (need at least after step 5) | We think this at least has to be sent after Step 5. This helps to let relay UE to finish forwarding any undelivered UL PDUs to the gNB, if gNB removes adaptation layer configuration right after step 3, all the unforwarded RLC PDUs are lost |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | No | No enhancement is needed to reestablish UE context in the relay UE and source gNB due to loss of handover command or handover failure, with the understanding that network can perform step 6 after step 5. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q1: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) confirmed the support of the original Proposal 15 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, RRC Reconfiguration message to Relay UE can be sent any time after step 3 based on gNB implementation, as in the Figure 4.5.4.1-1. Among the replies that did not support the original Proposal 15 within R2-2107710, the main concern is that the path switch to direct link may fail and Remote UE may fallback to indirect link. In rapporteur understanding, the handling of path switch failure can be discussed later on. By the way, Apple’s reply on RLC PDU loss may be a bit misleading, since we just agreed to handle the lossless path switch according to PDCP status report at PDCP layer. Hence, it is proposed to agree the original Proposal 15 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-1: Agree Proposal 15 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, RRC Reconfiguration message to Relay UE can be sent any time after step 3 based on gNB implementation, as in the Figure 4.5.4.1-1.**

### **Question 2 (Proposal 16 within R2-2107710)**

Do you agree Proposal 16 within R2-2107710 as it is: for indirect to direct path switch, the timing of the PC5 unicast link release is up to UE implementation after step 3.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes, but.. | We have two clarifications:   1. It is only for PC5 link release if no shared with non-relay link, i.e., it is not about releasing of PC5 RLC channel for relaying which is covered by other proposals (P18). 2. As clarified online, it can be initiated by either relay UE or remote UE based on UE implementation.   Thus, we prefer below wording change:  for indirect to direct path switch, either relay UE or remote UE can initialize the PC5 unicast link release, and the timing ~~of the PC5 unicast link release~~ is up to UE implementation after step 3. |
| Xiaomi | No | In Wednesday meeting, following agreement was made.  For indirect to direct path switch, PC5 unicast link can be released after Remote UE and Relay UE receive RRC reconfiguration from gNB (if there are no non-relaying PC5 RLC channels on the same PC5 unicast link, i.e. dedicated relaying link). FFS details of inter-layer interaction.  According to above agreement, the PC5 unicast link release shall be done after Remote UE and Relay UE receive RRC reconfiguration from gNB, which corresponds to step 3 and step 6. |
| OPPO | Yes with comment | We agree it is up to **remote** UE implementation, as we commented about, the RRCReconfig for relay UE would be after step 3 at any time based on network implementation, in that case, we cannot ensure after step 3, relay UE can immediately get the RRCReconfig (i.e., step-6 may not be immediately after step 3) and initialize the PC5 unicast link release but anyway remote UE can be ensured.  And it is good to clarify it is for PC5-S.  So prefer the following wording  For indirect to direct path switch, the timing of the PC5**-S** unicast link release is up to UE implementation for remote UE after step 3, and for relay UE after step 6. |
| Lenovo | Yes with comments | We would like to point out one thing.  If we support P15 and P16, the relay UE will continue to transmit the DL data before the relay receives one of RRC Reconfiguration and PC5 S release request and after the remote UE receives RRC Reconfiguration. That means the remote UE will continue to receive the DL data from relay UE after the remote UE receives RRC Reconfiguration. |
| vivo | Yes, with comments | We assume that here the “UE implementation” means that after the PC5-S unicast link release procedure or PC5 RRC connection release *is triggered by step 3*, the *specific moment when* the Remote/Relay really executes the link/connection release afterward is up to UE implementation. The problem here is that no matter for PC5 RRC connection release or PC5-S unicast link release, the conditions/triggers on when to release are actually specified in the current RAN2/SA2 Spec:   * for the release of PC5 RRC connection, there are now the trigger conditions of “SL RLF” and “release indication from upper layers”; * for the release of PC5-S unicast link, there is an explicit PC5 unicast link procedure to be conducted.   That is, the current specs may not support the link/connection release completely based on UE implementation, i.e. the UE cannot arbitrarily release a unicast link/connection as long as it wants.  If the interpretation above is correct, suggested rewording would be as follows:  *When the PC5-S unicast link/PC5 RRC connection release is triggered after step-3, the timing of the PC5 unicast link release execution is up to UE implementation. FFS the trigger condition(s) of such PC5-S unicast link/PC5 RRC connection release.*  Technically speaking, it seems undesirable to introduce a completely UE-implementation-based link/connection release condition/trigger, even for the path switch cases. |
| Sharp | Yes with comments | We share the same view with Qualcomm that the PC5 link release could be initiated either by remote UE or relay UE.  The timing refers UE implementation. |
| ZTE | Yes with comments | It is suggested that relay or remote UE release the PC5 unicast link after step 5. As we mentioned before, since the path switch to direct link may fail and remote UE may fallback to indirect link, it is suggested to keep the PC5 link until the remote UE successfully connected to the gNB via Uu. |
| Ericsson | Yes with comments | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Samsung | Yes | The text change from Qualcomm is also fine. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Same view with Qualcomm. |
| CMCC | With comments | When the PC5-S unicast link release is triggered after step 3, the timing of the PC5 unicast link release execution is up to UE implementation. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes with comments | Although our interpretation of the online discussion and agreement is also both Remote UE and Relay UE are allowed to trigger the release of unicast link, it is worth to mention Relay UE is preferred to initiate the release otherwise Relay UE may want to continue DL forwarding but the link is released from Remote UE side.  Then for the timing as Remote UE and Relay UE are likely to receive the RRC reconfiguration message at different time points, the exact release timing is hard to specify, the easy solution is to be left to UE implementation. |
| Sony | Yes | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Kyocera | Yes | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Apple | No (need at least after step 5) | We think this at least has to be sent after Step 5. This helps to let relay UE to finish forwarding any undelivered UL PDUs to the gNB, if gNB removes adaptation layer configuration right after step 3, all the unforwarded RLC PDUs are lost |
| Intel | Yes with comment | Agree with OPPO view and text suggestion. |
| LG | Yes with comments | We’d like to point out one issue.  When remote UE receives RRCReconfiguartion message from gNB (step3), relay UE doesn’t know whether the remote UE receives RRCReconfiguration message. So, the relay UE keeps transmitting DL data stored in its buffer until receiving RRCReconfiguration message from gNB or PC5 unicast link release message from remote UE. So, the timing of the PC5 unicast link release is related to the timing when suspends DL data from relay UE. In other words, we need to consider the timing for suspending DL data from relay UE for service continuity. |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with QC’s rewording. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q2: According to the replies received, the majority companies (18/20) replied yes with comments. Among these companies, the majority companies proposed to reword the original proposal as: for indirect to direct path switch, either Relay UE or Remote UE can initialize the PC5 unicast link release (PC5-S), and the timing is up to UE implementation (i.e. for Remote UE it should be after step 3; for Relay UE it should be after step 6). The rapporteur understanding is that this proposal handles the cases where there is no non-relaying PC5 RLC channels on the same PC5 unicast link, i.e. dedicated relaying link).

Within these replies with Yes, there was a concern on the scenario where Relay UE may want to continue DL data forwarding but the link was released from Remote UE side. In rapporteur understanding, this won’t be a problem, since Relay UE would receive the release message from Remote UE before that and Relay UE should adjust the DL data forwarding accordingly. Secondly, the network implementation may ensure that it would not happen since the gNB had already reconfigured the Remote UE to perform path switch. There was also a confusion if the said PC5 unicast link release is PC5-S or PC5-RRC, rapporteur assumes it is PC5-S.

Among the replies that did not support the Proposal 16 within R2-2107710, the same concern repeated as for Proposal 15 within R2-2107710 (i.e. path switch failure, and lost unforwarded RLC PDUs. Rapporteur has the same understanding as for the Proposal 15 within R2-2107710.

Hence, it is proposed to agree the reworded Proposal 16 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-2: Agree reworded Proposal 16 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, either Relay UE or Remote UE can initialize the PC5 unicast link release (PC5-S), and the timing is up to UE implementation (i.e. for Remote UE it should be after step 3; for Relay UE it should be after step 6).**

### **Question 3 (Proposal 18 within R2-2107710)**

Do you agree Proposal 18 within R2-2107710 as it is: for indirect to direct path switch, based on RRC Reconfiguration by gNB Remote UE and Relay UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying and the timing of PC5 connection reconfiguration is up to UE implementation after step 3?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes, but | We think current wording is not crystal clear. Our understanding on this proposal is:   * Timing of such reconfiguration of PC5 RLC for relaying is triggered by RRC reconfiguration from gNB (i.e. not UE implementation). * Either remote UE or relay UE can initiate this procedure triggered by Reconfig message from gNB, as illustrated in below 2 cases:   + Case 1 (Remote UE): after reception of HO command (i.e. Step 3), remote UE sends RRCReconfigurationSidelink to relay UE for releasing PC5 link (as legacy PC5 connection reconfiguration procedure).   + Case 2 (Relay UE): after reception of RRCReconfiguraiton (i.e. Step6), relay UE sends RRCReconfigurationSidelink to remote UE for releasing PC5 link (as legacy PC5 connection reconfiguration procedure).   We tend to reuse PC5 RRC procedure / signaling as much as possible. Thus, we suggest below wording change:  for indirect to direct path switch, ~~based on upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB~~, Remote UE ~~and Relay UE~~ can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 3, and Relay UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 6. ~~and the timing of PC5 connection reconfiguration is up to UE implementation after step 3~~? |
| Xiaomi | No with comments | The question is not clear to us. If it’s up to gNB’s RRC Reconfiguration, the timing is not up to UE implementation. Upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration indicating release PC5 RLC, remote/relay UE shall follow the control from gNB. UE should not suspend gNB’s configuration. |
| OPPO | Yes but | Same view as QC, we agree the Uu-RRC RRCReconfig for relay UE can be at any time based on network implementation, in that case, relay UE can release PC5 RLC bearer after receiving Uu-RRC RRCReconfig after step 3 (as commented by QC, the timing is not up to UE implementation), while for relay UE, it is after step-6. |
| Lenovo | yes |  |
| vivo | Yes, with comments | This is also related to the discussion on whether relaying/non-relaying shared PC5 RRC connection is allowed. In the case of relaying dedicated PC5 RRC connection, the link/connection will be released directly, so any related PC5 configurations can be directly released w/o the need to further execute “PC5 reconfiguration procedure” for bearer release.  For a shared PC5 RRC connection (if really supported), since the link/connection cannot be released directly, the PC5 connection reconfiguration procedure is needed for PC5 RLC bearer release, at least following the current procedure. But as our comments in Q2, there may still be some trigger conditions added for SL-DRB release, as in the current Spec SL-DRB release also needs specified trigger conditions, and here we assume the relevant proposal in the question means that after this procedure is triggered, the *specific moment when* the UE really executes the procedure is in a UE implementation way. |
| Sharp | Yes but | We share the same view with Qualcomm that the PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying could be initiated either by remote UE or relay UE.  The timing refers UE implementation, which should be after reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB. |
| ZTE | Partially agree | It is suggested to remove the latter part “ and the timing of PC5 connection reconfiguration is up to UE implementation after step 3”. As mentioned by several companies, the PC5 relevant reconfiguration is executed based on the RRCReconfiguration message. |
| Ericsson | Yes | In principle we agree with Qualcomm. We can sort out the exact wording to capture in the Stage 2 email discussion. |
| Samsung | Yes | The text change from Qualcomm is also fine. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | We think the specific timing when the UE perform reconfiguration is left to UE implementation. |
| CMCC | Yes | We agreed with that proposal and prefer the clarified wording from QC. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | See comments | To us it is not clear if both Remote UE and Relay UE can receive Uu RRC reconfiguration for PC5 RLC bearer release and when/how to make sure the other side in Relay UE/Remote UE can perform the corresponding release at the same time. But we think this is actually the signaling detail which could be addressed during CR drafting. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Apple | No | This is not up to UE implementation. The relay UE may still have DL traffic which needs to be forwarded and the release PC5 RLC for relaying can only be executed after there is no more DL data to be forwarded by relay UE. This condition needs to be clearly specified. |
| Intel | Yes with comment | Agree with Qualcomm’s wording suggestion |
| LG | Yes | We have same view as QC. |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with QC’s rewording. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q3: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) replied yes (with comments) or partially agree. Among these companies, the majority companies accept the reworded proposal as suggested by Qualcomm: for indirect to direct path switch, Remote UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 3, and Relay UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 6. The rapporteur understanding is that this proposal handles the cases where there is no non-relaying PC5 RLC channels on the same PC5 unicast link, i.e. dedicated relaying link).

There is a concern on the UE implementation based release of PC5 RLC for relaying since the relay UE may still have DL traffic to forward. In rapporteur understanding, this won’t be a problem, since such case may be avoided by network implementation, since the gNB had already reconfigured the Remote UE to perform path switch and then the gNB can buffer the data, instead of still relying on the indirect path for data transmission.

Hence, it is proposed to agree the reworded Proposal 18 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-3: Agree reworded Proposal 18 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, Remote UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 3, and Relay UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 6.**

### **Question 4 (Proposal 22 within R2-2107710)**

Do you agree Proposal 22 within R2-2107710 as it is: for indirect to direct path switch, step 8 can be executed in parallel or after step 5.?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | It is same as legacy HO (i.e. data can be multiplexed with RRC reconfiguration complete) |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | yes |  |
| vivo | Yes | But it seems no specific Spec impact is needed. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | Legacy behavior |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q4: According to the replies received, all companies (19/19) replied yes. Then let us simply agree the original Proposal 22 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-4: Agree original Proposal 22 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, step 8 can be executed in parallel or after step 5.**

### **Question 5 (Proposal 28 within R2-2107710)**

Do you agree Proposal 28 within R2-2107710 as it is: for direct to indirect path switch, the PC5 connection setup procedure is executed after step 3 if the connection has not been setup yet?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes, but | This proposal is only for the case when unicast PC5 link is not established. When unicast PC5 link is already existing, this step is still needed to reconfigure PC5 RLC channel for relaying according to gNB configuration.  Thus, we propose below wording change:  for direct to indirect path switch, the PC5 connection setup procedure is executed after step 3 if the connection has not been setup yet; If existing PC5 link is reused for relaying, PC5 RLC channel for relay is reconfigured according to configuration from gNB. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | See comment | During the online discussion, email discussion rapporteur clarifies that within this email discussion, relay-only PC5 unicast link would be discussed and leave FFS for the relay/non-relay shared link case. Thus, target this proposal, we are wondering when will the “if” condition happen if we just consider relay-only case. To make it clear, we suggest to delete the “if” condition and mark FFS for shared link between relay service and non-relay service. |
| Lenovo | See comments | After gNB determines to perform path switching towards the target relay and the corresponding PC5 connection has not been established yet, gNB can request remote UE to establish the PC5 link towards the target relay. |
| vivo | Yes | As previous comments, we may further look into the trigger conditions for PC5 RRC connection establishment in this case. Current Spec has only the trigger condition “if PC5 RRC connection establishment is request by upper layers (i.e. PC5-S unicast link has been established)” for PC5 RRC connection establishment. Since PC5-S unicast link anyway needs to be setup, perhaps the simplest way is to make AS indicate the upper layers of the path switch, and when PC5-S unicast link is established, PC5-RRC connection will be established accordingly as per the current Spec. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes | Maybe no need to make the agreement too complex as in the stage 2 the arrow referring to this procedure it will be anyway dotted to indicate the optionality. |
| Samsung | Yes with comment | This proposal is to solve ‘whether Step 4 can be before step 2/3’ where Step 4 is “PC5 connection establishment, if not exist.” During the email discussion for this proposal the relay shared case was assumed based on the target Step 4. If the relay shared case is excluded then the Step 4 should be changed as “Step 4: Remote UE establishes PC5 connection with target Relay UE~~, if the connection has not been setup yet~~.” and no more clarification is needed about ‘Whether Step 4 can be before step 2/3.’ |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We also prefer to make it clear for the non-sharing case first. Whether there would be a shared case may need further confirmation in SA2. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | This is considering the relay-only connection. |
| LG | See comment | As we discussed during the RAN2 online meeting, we didn’t make any agreement on whether both relay and non-relay links exist in a single PC5 unicast link. We are assuming that the services for relaying and non-relaying will be different. Under this assumption, the destination address of relaying and non-relaying will be different, and it means that a single unicast link between the relay and remote UE cannot be made. We need to confirm from SA2 whether relay and non-relay services can have the same destination address.  If we assume that non-relaying and relaying links cannot make a single PC5 unicast link, we think the meaning of ‘if not exist’ in step 4 is useless. PC5 connection establishment has to be set up after remote UE receives the RRC Reconfiguration message from gNB. We suggest that the ‘if not exist’ part should be handled later marked as FFS. We think this issue can be handled after confirming that relay and non-relay services can make the same destination address from SA2. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q5: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) replied yes. Among these replies, some companies prefer to restrict the proposal on the case where there is no non-relaying PC5 RLC channels on the same PC5 unicast link, i.e. dedicated relaying link) and put FFS for shared link between relay service and non-relay service.

Hence, it is proposed to agree the reworded Proposal 28 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-5: Agree reworded Proposal 18 within R2-2107710: for direct to indirect path switch, the PC5 connection setup procedure is executed after step 3 if the PC5 connection has not been setup yet.** **FFS for shared PC5 link between relay service and non-relay service.**

### **Question 6 (Proposal 21 within R2-2107710)**

Do you agree Proposal 21 within R2-2107710 as it is: for indirect to direct path switch, Relay UE does not perform data forwarding back to gNB for Remote UE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | RAN2 has agreed “the DL/UL lossless delivery during the path switch is done according to the PDCP status report”.  In our understanding, this agreement has precluded the solution that relay UE performs data forwarding back to gNB for remote UE. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | We have agreed that lossless can be ensured by PDCP layer. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Apple | See comment | We are fine to follow the majority view. This is fine for single hop case, but for multi-hop case in R18, the PDCP-based recovery may not be a very efficient and timely solution to recover this kind of loss. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | Same view as QC. |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q6: According to the replies received, clear majority companies (19/20) replied yes. Then let us simply agree the original Proposal 21 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-6: Agree original Proposal 21 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, Relay UE does not perform data forwarding back to gNB for Remote UE.**

### **Question 7 (Proposal 25 within R2-2107710)**

Do you agree Proposal 25 within R2-2107710 as it is: for indirect to direct path switch, the contents in RRC Reconfiguration message for Remote UE can be same as legacy NR RRC Reconfiguration with sync?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes | Legacy message could be baseline. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Apple | See comment | Legacy message can be baseline. But the exact contents are FFS Stage-3 |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes | As baseline at least |

Rapporteur summary of Q7: According to the replies received, clear majority companies (19/20) replied yes. There are two companies that propose to agree it as baseline. Let us simply agree the original Proposal 25 within R2-2107710 following the majority view:

**Proposal-7: Agree original Proposal 25 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, the contents in RRC Reconfiguration message for Remote UE can be same as legacy NR RRC Reconfiguration with sync.**

### **Question 8 (Proposal 30 within R2-2107710)**

Do you agree Proposal 30 within R2-2107710 as it is: for direct to indirect path switch, additional indication from RRC\_CONNECTED Relay UE to gNB is not necessary to initiate Relay UE’s reconfiguration upon establishing unicast link with Remote UE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We don’t fully understand why this indication is needed. When to send Relaying configuration to relay UE is gNB decision as part of HO preparation, which doesn’t need relay to trigger. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | Whether additional signalling for the path switch to Relay UE in RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE is needed or not can be discussed separately. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes | We wonder the reason we agree on P30 is whether the related function has done with step5 (RRC Reconfiguration Complete message) ? |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q8: According to the replies received, all companies replied yes. Let us simply agree the original Proposal 30 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-8: Agree original Proposal 30 within R2-2107710: for direct to indirect path switch, additional indication from RRC\_CONNECTED Relay UE to gNB is not necessary to initiate Relay UE’s reconfiguration upon establishing unicast link with Remote UE.**

### **Question 9 (Proposal 32 within R2-2107710)**

Do you agree Proposal 32 within R2-2107710 as it is: for direct to indirect path switch, the contents in RRC Reconfiguration message for Relay UE can include at least Uu and PC5 RLC configuration for relaying, bearer mapping configuration?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes | Apple |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes with suggestion. | Similar to P26, shall we add “between PC5 RLC and Uu RLC” at the end of the current proposal to further clarity? |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q9: According to the replies received, all companies replied yes. For CATT suggestion, the rapporteur understanding is that the current proposal is clear enough. Let us simply agree the original Proposal 32 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-9: Agree original Proposal 32 within R2-2107710: for direct to indirect path switch, the contents in RRC Reconfiguration message for Relay UE can include at least Uu and PC5 RLC configuration for relaying, bearer mapping configuration.**

## Discussion of the Remaining proposals within R2-2108196

During the online discussion, proposals 2/13 were agreed as captured in chair notes. However the following proposals within R2-2108196 were not discussed during online session:

Measurements:

Proposal 1 RAN2 to discuss whether S-measure criteria shall be used by the Remote UE.

Proposal 3 RAN2 to discuss whether the SL measurement quantity should be SL-RSRP for the case of path switch from indirect to direct path.

Proposal 4 RAN2 to discuss whether the SL measurement quantity should be SD-RSRP for the case of path switch from direct to indirect path.

Proposal 5 RAN2 to discuss if the Relay UE ID that is included in the measurement report is the Source L2 ID.

Proposal 6 RAN2 to discuss whether the Relay UE can be configured with measurements towards one particular Remote UE for purposes of path switch of that Remote UE.

RRC\_IDLE or RRC\_INACTIVE relay UE:

Proposal 7 RAN2 to discuss whether a Relay UE in RRC\_INACTIVE state can be selected by the gNB during path switch from direct to indirect link.

Proposal 8 RAN2 to discuss whether a Relay UE in RRC\_IDLE state can be selected by the gNB during path switch from direct to indirect link.

Proposal 9 RAN2 to discuss how a Relay UE in RRC\_INACTIVE/RRC\_IDLE transits to RRC\_CONNECTED upon path switch (e.g., via indication coming from the gNB or Remote UE).

T304 alike timer:

Proposal 10 RAN2 to discuss on whether the legacy T304 can be reused for the path switch procedure.

Proposal 11 RAN2 to discuss the need of new timer(s) other than T304 for the path switch procedure and if yes, whether more than one new timer is needed (i.e., one for the direct to indirect path switch and another one for the indirect to direct path switch).

Contents of reconfiguration:

Proposal 12 RAN2 to discuss if the Relay UE ID included in RRC reconfiguration is C-RNTI and whether the Remote UE ID needs to be included in the RRC reconfiguration complete message.

### **Question 10 (Proposal 1 within R2-2108196)**

Do you agree that S-measure criteria shall be used by the Remote UE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | We think that even though the PC5 link quality between relay UE and remote UE is good enough, it can not guarantee that the PC5 link quality is better than Uu. |
| Qualcomm | No | First, Remote UE may have one chipset for sidelink and another for Uu. In this case, measurement on PC5 and Uu can be in parallel. Thus, S-measure is not necessary in this case.  Second, S-measure is never deployed although in spec for a long time |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We see the benefit to reduce remote UE measurement by introducing S-measure for remote UE.  Relay UE is expected to locate at the cell edge. So if remote UE is close to relay UE, it’s more likely to be able to find the serving cell. Otherwise, remote UE may not be able to find the serving cell. Therefore, the sidelink signaling strength could be used to control intra-frequency measurement.  Regarding MTK’s question, we want to clarify the S-measure on sidelink is different to S-measure on Uu. If the sidelink RSRP between relay and remote UE is below certain value, remote UE could choose not to perform intra-frequency measurement on serving cell. |
| OPPO | No | It should be addressed that even the PC5 link quality between relay UE and remote UE is good enough, the link quality between relay UE and Uu cannot be ensured. Therefore, S-measure criteria may not be adaptable for the sidelink relay scenario. |
| Lenovo | Yes for direct to indirect case.  No for indirect to direct case | We need to discuss S-measure criteria based on the different cases. the legacy threshold of S-measure criteria is based on Uu channel. Therefore, it is easy to extend to direct to indirect case.  For indirect to direct case, the s-criteria is not needed. |
| vivo | No | We think this is an optimization. |
| Sharp | No | We share the same view with OPPO. |
| ZTE | No | The remote UE may prefer the direct link access even if it has a good SL RSRP measurement result with a relay UE, the Uu measurement of the remote UE should not be limited. In addition, the relay selection and cell selection of remote UE may be performed independently. When to perform Uu measurement for the remote UE connected with a relay can be up to UE implementation. Based on this analysis, it is not necessary to define new S-measure criteria for Uu measurement. |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| Samsung | No | The SL signalling strength measured by Remote UE cannot guarantee whether serving cell is enough strong to skip non-serving cell measurement. |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| Sony | No |  |
| Kyocera | No | We don’t think there’s a clear benefit for having a new S-measure criterion that depends only on the PC5 link. |
| Apple | No |  |
| Intel | No |  |
| LG | No | If both Uu link and SL are available, remote UE can select a link by its implementation. The availability should be measured independently. So, new S-measure criteria for remote UE are not necessary. |
| CATT | Yes with comments | We share the same view as Lenovo. |
| Nokia | No | The cellID should also be included in the discovery message |

Rapporteur summary of Q10: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) replied No. The majority view is that the Sidelink signaling strength measured by Remote UE cannot guarantee whether serving cell is strong enough to skip non-serving cell measurement. Three companies replied yes, among which there is suggestion to extend S-measure criteria to direct to indirect case. Rapporteur suggests to follow the majority view:

**Proposal-10: S-measure criteria is not used by the Remote UE for direct-indirect path switch.**

### **Question 11 (Proposal 3 within R2-2108196)**

Do you agree that the SL measurement quantity should be SL-RSRP for the case of path switch from indirect to direct path?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes with comments | If SL-RSRP is available, the proposal works. However, it’s possible that SL-RSRP is not available in case of no data transmission from relay to remote. RAN2 should further discuss how to handle this case. |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| vivo | No, see comment | Now we are discussing measurement in RRC\_CONNECTED for path switch. In this circumstance, our view is that the SD-RSRP should always be measured, and whether SL-RSRP is measured is up to NW configuration.  Specifically, the SL-RSRP related meas and reporting config can be optionally provided, whereas the SD-RSRP related meas and reporting config may always be provided based on proper NW implementation. If the SL-RSRP related meas and reporting config is provided, the UE perform SL-RSRP measurement; otherwise, the UE doesn’t. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | See comment | We want to raise two concerns about the SL measurement report in case of path switch from indirect to direct path. Since we did agree that path switch from indirect to indirect path is not in scope of this WI, I guess that we need to clarifiy that the SL-RSRP that is reported is only that one related of the PC5 connection of the Relay UE to which the remote UE is connected to.  In fact, reporting the SL-RSRP of neighboring Relay UE is useless since the gNB will anyway discard such measurements (since path switch from indirect to indirect path does not happen). In this is the case, maybe we should make this crystal clear in the proposal.  If the motivation for having this is forward compatibility, we think that from a technical point of view both the SL-RSRP and SD-RSRP can be reported. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes with comment | In addition to SL-RSRP, SD-RSRP can also be measured and reported. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We understand the question is on the measurement quantity of **serving** Relay for path switch from indirect to direct. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | No | In our view, both SL-RSRP and SD-RSRP measurements should be considered, considering there are cases when discovery is available but not data. |
| Apple | Yes with comment | We think SL-RSRP can be the baseline for the indirect-to-direct switch case. FFS SD-RSRP is needed. |
| Intel | Yes with comment | As some companies pointed out, UE should be able to send SL-RSRP or SD-RSRP as available for the serving Relay (in relay reselection trigger, we left it to UE implementation whether SL-RSRP or SD-RSRP was used). |
| LG | Yes with comment | If SL-RSRP is available, we can use SL-RSRP. However, if SL-RSRP is not available because of a lack of data, the remote UE would use SD-RSRP. In this case, we may have to indicate whether it is SL-RSRP or SD-RSRP when reporting. Because the threshold for SL-RSRP and SD-RSRP may be different for deciding path switch. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q11: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) replied Yes or Yes with comments. Among the replies with comments, the majority suggests to mark the SL-RSRP as baseline and FFS for SD-RSRP. Rapporteur suggests to agree SL-RSRP as baseline for the SL measurement quantity for the case of path switch from indirect to direct path:

**Proposal-11: As a baseline, SL-RSRP is used as the SL measurement quantity for the case of path switch from indirect to direct path.**

### **Question 12 (Proposal 4 within R2-2108196)**

Do you agree that the SL measurement quantity should be SD-RSRP for the case of path switch from direct to indirect path?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| vivo | No, see comment | Now we are discussing measurement in RRC\_CONNECTED for path switch. In this circumstance, our view is that the SD-RSRP should always be measured, and whether SL-RSRP is measured is up to NW configuration.  Specifically, the SL-RSRP related meas and reporting config can be optionally provided, whereas the SD-RSRP related meas and reporting config may always be provided based on proper NW implementation. If the SL-RSRP related meas and reporting config is provided, the UE perform SL-RSRP measurement; otherwise, the UE doesn’t. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes with comment | We think that from a technical point of view both the SL-RSRP and SD-RSRP can be reported.  Whether to report the SL-RSRP is related to the support of shared relay and non-relay traffic in the same PC5-RRC connection. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes with comment | SD-RSRP is used for relay link quality measurement without unicast PC5 connection. Meanwhile, SL-RSRP is also helpful if shared relay and non-relay PC5 connection is supported. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes | Assuming only relay connection being discussed. |
| LG | Yes | When the path switch from direct to indirect, in our understanding, gNB selects a proper relay UE using reported measurement value from remote UE. So, before gNB decides HO, remote UE does not make PC5 connection with a relay UE for the path switching based on its own decision. According to this procedure, remote UE doesn’t make SL connection with relay UE before the decision of gNB, therefore the remote UE cannot report SL-RSRP to gNB. In the case of path switching from direct to indirect, the remote UE can report only SD-RSRP of candidate relay UE.  As we answered question 5, whether non-relay and relay links can be shared in a single PC5 unicast link should be confirmed by SA2. We are assuming that the relay and non-relay links will not use the same destination address because the service for relaying and non-relaying will be different. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia | No | Agree with Vivo |

Rapporteur summary of Q12: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) replied Yes or Yes with comments. Among the replies with comments or No, the main concern is the scenario where is shared link for relaying and non-relaying. If we consider non-shared case, there is only SD-RSRP available. The rapporteur understanding suggests to handle the cases where there is no non-relaying PC5 RLC channels on the same PC5 unicast link, i.e. dedicated relaying link) and put shared link case as FFS.

**Proposal-12: SD-RSRP is used as the SL measurement quantity for the case of path switch from direct to indirect path. FFS for shared PC5 link between relay service and non-relay service.**

### **Question 13 (Proposal 5 within R2-2108196)**

Do you agree that the Relay UE ID that is included in the measurement report is the Source L2 ID?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Relay UE’s source L2 ID is included in discovery message. It is straight forward to use it as relay UE identifier in measurement report. In addition, we think relay UE needs to send it to gNB in SUI so that gNB can get the mapping between relay’s C-RNTI and L2 source ID.  Another solution is to use C-RNTI of relay UE. However, it implies relay needs to broadcast its C-RNTI in discovery. It is not necessary because its source L2 ID is already included in discovery message. And remote UE should not need to know C-RNTI of relay which is only used by gNB according to C-RNTI’s definition. |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | We understand C-RNTI is more straightforward. Using L2 ID needs SUI reporting and also may needs to update L2 ID frequently as L2 ID would be updated during alive time of a unicast for safety consideration. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes with suggestion. | We propose below wording change:  Do you agree that the Relay UE ID that is included in the measurement report is the Source L2 ID of discovery message? |
| Nokia | Not sure | We share the concerns with Huawei, that the source L2 ID may not always be known by gNB. If this can be ensured easily, we have no issues with the proposal |

Rapporteur summary of Q13: According to the replies received, the majority companies (18/20) replied Yes or Yes with comments. Among the replies with comments or No, the main concern is that the gNB may not know the L2 ID of Relay UE. Rapporteur understanding is that legacy SUI message can ensure the report of the L2 ID of Relay UE to the gNB. Meanwhile, there may be security issue if the discovery message of Relay UE includes C-RNTI. Let us follow the majority view:

**Proposal-13:** **the Relay UE ID that is included in the measurement report is the Source L2 ID.**

### **Question 14 (Proposal 6 within R2-2108196)**

Do you agree that the Relay UE can be configured with measurements towards one particular Remote UE for purposes of path switch of that Remote UE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | No | Legacy measurement configuration for remote UE is sufficient. The benefit of this proposal is not clear to us. |
| Xiaomi | No | The measurement result between relay and remote UE can already be reported by remote UE. |
| OPPO | No |  |
| Lenovo | No |  |
| vivo | No | Logically, remote UE should be responsible for measurements related to path switch. Relay UE assisted measurement looks like some forms of optimization. |
| Sharp | No |  |
| ZTE | No |  |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No |  |
| Sony | Yes | We think the measurement report from relay UE could be used as a complementary scheme in addition to remote UE’s. |
| Kyocera | No |  |
| Apple | No |  |
| Intel | No |  |
| LG | No |  |
| CATT | No | Agree with QC. Enhancement is not considered in Rel-17. |
| Nokia | No | We have sympathy that this is an enhancement not to be considered in Rel-17 |

Rapporteur summary of Q14: According to the replies received, the majority companies (18/20) replied No or No with comments. Among the replies with comments or No, the main concern is that this is an enhancement and the legacy measurement configuration for remote UE is sufficient. Let us follow the majority view:

**Proposal-14:** **the Relay UE can NOT be configured with measurements towards one particular Remote UE for purposes of path switch of that Remote UE.**

### **Question 15 (Proposal 7 within R2-2108196)**

Do you agree that a Relay UE in RRC\_INACTIVE state can be selected by the gNB during path switch from direct to indirect link?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | We should focus on RRC\_ Connected Relay UE for path switch at this release due to work load. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | 1. gNB has UE context of relay UE in INACTIVE, so that it can prepare its HO command. 2. gNB keeps I-RNTI of relay, and can also get the mapping from relay’s L2 source ID to I-RNTI similar to CONNECTED state. Thus, gNB can identify relay UE based on measurement reporting from remote UE. 3. The INACTIVE relay UE transits to CONNECTED state after the remote UE connects to the relay UE (as part of HO procedures) and the remote UE context is fetched from gNB at that point. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | gNB is not aware of relay UE’s RRC state. Furthermore, RAN could page relay UE in order to trigger relay UE enter CONNECTED. The UE ID in paging message could be relay UE’s L2 source ID. |
| OPPO | Yes | As a matter of fact, relay UE would not be regarded as normal Uu UE since it does not have any particular traffic packets which needs to be transferred with network, in that case, network is not necessarily to know the relay UE’s context (even it can be known for RRC\_INACTIVE relay). Either remote UE or network trigger the relay to access into RRC\_CONNECTED can make it work. |
| Lenovo | No | It can work but Xn message is needed to assist gNB to identify relay state, which is complicated. It is better not to discuss it in this release. |
| vivo | No | RRC\_CONNECTED Relay UE first, please. |
| Sharp | No | We support remote UE could be switched to a relay UE without PC5 connection establishment between them. If such a relay UE is in RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE state, extra delay could be an issue. |
| ZTE | Yes | gNB may prioritize the RRC\_Connected relay UE to be selected as the target relay UE for remote UE. However, if no such suitable relay UE exists, gNB may also require the remote UE to switch to an RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE relay UE. |
| Ericsson | Yes | We think that this case is feasible. What needs to be specified is the trigger for the Relay UE to enter in RRC\_CONNECTED state in order to receive the RRC reconfiguration from the gNB. |
| Samsung | No | For RRC\_CONNECTED remote UE’s path switch, the candidate Relay UE should be in RRC\_CONNECTED which is controlled by gNB. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No/Postpone | It may be feasible, but considering switching to a Relay UE in RRC\_CONNECTED state is the most common/critical case, we should first focus on CONNECTED state and come back to other RRC states if time allows. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | The INACTIVE relay UE may be triggered to enter RRC CONN via RAN page or when the remote UE connects to the relay UE. |
| Apple | Yes | RRC state is no part of relay selection criteria |
| Intel | Yes but.. | The baseline should be that the gNB only triggers handover to a RRC\_CONNECTED Relay UE. Although RRC\_INACTIVE relay may be the only best option for the Remote UE considering the measurement information, we can postpone it for now as it involves additional spec impact; |
| LG | No | Relay UE in RRC CONNECTED should be considered first. |
| CATT | Yes | Agree with QC. The INACTIVE relay UE can transit to CONNECTED state quickly. It can trigger RRC resume procedure when received RRC reconfiguration complete message from remote UE. |
| Nokia | No/postpone | The states denoted are currently not a part of the work, at least after establishment, as we assume that when the remote receives the message, it should go into connected. |

Rapporteur summary of Q15: According to the replies received, 12 companies replied yes. However 9 companies including one company replied yes proposed to not support the proposal or postpone the proposal (i.e. RRC\_Inactive UE for path switch from direct to indirect link). The opponents want to work on the Relay UE in RRC CONNECTED first. Rapporteur do not think it is easy to agree it at this meeting:

**Proposal-15: RAN2 to discuss if Relay UE in RRC\_INACTIVE state can be selected by the gNB during path switch from direct to indirect link.**

### **Question 16 (Proposal 8 within R2-2108196)**

Do you agree that a Relay UE in RRC\_IDLE state can be selected by the gNB during path switch from direct to indirect link?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | We should focus on RRC\_ Connected Relay UE for path switch at this release due to work load. |
| Qualcomm | No | 1. gNB has no UE context of relay UE in IDLE, so that it can’t prepare its HO command. 2. In IDLE state, relay UE only has 5G-S-TMSI as UE ID. However, it is not known by gNB, and gNB can’t get a mapping from L2 source ID to IDLE UE IE |
| Xiaomi | Yes | gNB is not aware of relay UE’s RRC state. Furthermore, RAN could page relay UE in order to trigger relay UE enter CONNECTED. The UE ID in paging message could be relay UE’s L2 source ID. |
| OPPO | Yes | Same comment in Q15 |
| Lenovo | No | It can work but Xn message is needed to assist gNB to identify relay state, which is complicated. It is better not to discuss it in this release. |
| vivo | No | RRC\_CONNECTED Relay UE first, please. |
| Sharp | No | Same comment in Q15 |
| ZTE | Yes | gNB may prioritize the RRC\_Connected relay UE to be selected as the target relay UE for remote UE. However, if no such suitable relay UE exists, gNB may also require the remote UE to switch to an RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE relay UE. |
| Ericsson | Yes | Regardless of whether the gNB has the context of the relay UE or not, we think that also this case is feasible. The relay UE can simply trigger RACH. What needs to be specified is the trigger for the Relay UE to enter in RRC\_CONNECTED state in order to receive the RRC reconfiguration from the gNB |
| Samsung | No | For RRC\_CONNECTED remote UE’s path switch, the candidate Relay UE should be in RRC\_CONNECTED which is controlled by gNB. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No/Postpone | It may be feasible, but considering switching to a Relay UE in RRC\_CONNECTED state is the most common/critical case, we should first focus on CONNECTED state and come back to other RRC states if time allows. |
| Sony | No |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | Agree with ZTE.  Also, the remote UE should be allowed to report measurements for all relay UEs regardless of their RRC state. |
| Apple | Yes | Same as Q15 |
| Intel | Yes but.. | The baseline should be that the gNB only triggers handover to a RRC\_CONNECTED Relay UE and prioritizing it is up to gNB implementation. Although RRC\_IDLE relay may be the only best option for the Remote UE considering the measurement information, we can postpone it for now as it involves additional spec impact; |
| LG | No | Same comment in Q15 |
| CATT | Yes | The relay UE in IDLE state can be selected by the gNB during path switch from direct to indirect link.RAN2 further discusses how IDLE relay UEs can access the CONNECTED state, e.g., triggered by target gNB or remote UE. |
| Nokia | Yes | Or we can postpone |

Rapporteur summary of Q16: According to the replies received, 12 companies replied yes. However 10 companies including two companies replied yes proposed to not support the proposal or postpone the proposal (i.e. RRC\_IDLE UE for path switch from direct to indirect link). The opponents want to work on the Relay UE in RRC CONNECTED first. Rapporteur do not think it is easy to agree it at this meeting:

**Proposal-16: RAN2 to discuss if Relay UE in RRC\_IDLE state can be selected by the gNB during path switch from direct to indirect link.**

### **Question 17 (Proposal 9 within R2-2108196)**

If your answers to Q15/Q16 are yes, companies are invited to describe how a Relay UE in RRC\_INACTIVE/RRC\_IDLE transits to RRC\_CONNECTED upon path switch (e.g., via indication coming from the gNB or Remote UE)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company |  | Comments |
| Qualcomm |  | For INACTIVE relay UE, we prefer it transits to CONNECTED state after reception of RRC reconfiguration complete message from remote UE, and the remote UE context is fetched from gNB at that point. |
| Xiaomi |  | RAN could page relay UE in order to trigger relay UE enter CONNECTED. The UE ID in paging message could be relay UE’s L2 source ID |
| OPPO | We are open to both options |  |
| ZTE |  | Relay UE may detect the first RRC message (e.g. RRCReconfigurationComplete) from remote UE, establish the RRC connection with gNB and then forward the RRCReconfigurationComplete to gNB. |
| Ericsson |  | Relay UE can enter in CONNECTED upon an indication from the remote UE either explicit on PC5 and implicit (e.g., when receiving the RRCReconfigurationComplete from the remote UE).  For the INACTIVE relay UE, we may also relay to an indication from the network (e.g., paging). |
| Spreadtrum |  | IDLE/INACTIVE Relay UE can trigger RACH procedure upon receiving RRCRconfigurationComplete or some explicit indication from the Remote UE. |
| CMCC |  | Remote UE sends RRC reestablishment request to relay UE and trigger relay UE start uu RRC setup procedure. |
| Sony |  | Inactive relay UE can be transited into connected after receiving RRCReconfigurationComplete from remote UE. |
| Kyocera |  | For an INACTIVE relay UE, the gNB can trigger the relay UE to enter RRC CONN by paging the relay UE. For an IDLE relay UE, the relay UE may establish connection to the gNB after the remote UE connects to the relay UE. |
| Apple |  | Slightly prefer this to be triggered by remote UE |
| Intel |  | Ideally, we prefer uniform solution for IDLE/INACTIVE cases. We do not prefer sending RRCReconfiguration to a Remote UE with ‘idle’ relay UE as target node..  Some explicit indication from Remote UE to Relay UE may be used. |
| CATT |  | Relay UE in RRC\_INACTIVE/RRC\_IDLE transits to RRC\_CONNECTED upon RRC reconfiguration complete message from remote UE. |

Rapporteur summary of Q17: The reply itself is related to the answer of Q15/Q16. As the answer of Q15/Q16 did not present clear majority view, Rapporteur suggests to discuss the proposal of Q15/Q16 before Q17. Then no proposal is made for this discussion.

### **Question 18 (Proposal 10 within R2-2108196)**

Do you agree that the legacy T304 (or T304 alike timer) can be reused for the path switch procedure?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes but | We see the benefit to have T304-alike timer to control the procedure of path switch as normal handover procedures for Path switch from indirect to direct, where is there is RA procedure.  For path switch from direct to indirect, we may introduce a new timer since there is no RA procedure. |
| Qualcomm | Yes for indirect to direct |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes for indirect to direct |  |
| OPPO | Yes  Just for indirect to direct path switch |  |
| Lenovo | Yes for indirect->direct.  No for direct->indirect. | Legacy T304 is used to control the random access during handover. UE stops T304 when the UE completes random access. Therefore, legacy timer T304 can be reused in the path switching from indirect to direct since there is a random access in this path switching. But, for path switching from direct to indirect, there is no random access. A new timer could be needed for the path switching from direct to indirect. |
| vivo | Yes, with comment | For indirect-to-direct case, reusing T304 seems to have no problem.  For direct-to-indirect case, we may introduce a T304-like timer, with the failure handling following legacy Uu (i.e. reestablishment). As to the conditions on timer handling, e.g. when to start/stop/restart, we need to further discuss as what MTK commented above. |
| Sharp | Yes  Just for indirect to direct path switch |  |
| ZTE | Yes for indirect to direct |  |
| Ericsson | Yes for indirect to direct  New timer for direct to indirect path | We would need a new timer for the path switch procedure from direct to indirect path. The timer T304 is started at the reception of the reconfiguration with sync and is stopped when the RACH is completed.  However, in path switch the remote UE does not perform RACH and thus timer T304 cannot be reused. We also think that legacy reconfiguration with sync cannot be reused as such for the path switch from direct to indirect. |
| Samsung | Yes | Reuse T304 for indirect to direct |
| Spreadtrum | Yes for indirect to direct |  |
| CMCC | For indirect to direct only |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | Same view as above companies, legacy T304 could be reused for path switch from indirect to direct, and a new timer could be introduced for switch from direct to indirect. |
| Sony | Yes for indirect to direct |  |
| Kyocera | Yes for indirect to direct path switch |  |
| Apple | Yes for indirect to direct path switch |  |
| Intel | Yes | Same view as other companies for indirect to direct switching |
| LG | Yes, with comment | We think the T304-likely timer can be reused for path switch. But, to stop the timer of remote UE, relay UE has to do additional work. When relay UE confirms that the RRC Reconfiguration Complete message arrives gNB successfully, relay UE should inform it to its remote UE. After receiving the confirmation message from relay UE, the T304 timer of remote UE can stop. |
| CATT | Yes | Legacy T304 based failure detection is applicable to path switch from indirect to direct case, i.e. T304 expiry indicates the path switch failure. |
| Nokia | Yes for indirect to direct |  |

### **Question 19 (Proposal 11-1 within R2-2108196)**

Do you agree the need of new timer(s) other than T304 for the path switch procedure?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | For path switch from direct to indirect, we may introduce a new timer since there is no RA procedure. |
| Qualcomm | See comments | For path switch from indirect to direct, we don’t see need for new timer. The legacy one is sufficient  For path switch from direct to indirect, we think similar mechanism as T304 can be introduced, and only the stop condition needs spec change. The detailed spec change can be discussed in future meeting |
| Xiaomi | Comments | Unlike Uu, the PC5 unicast connection establishment is out of gNB’s control. It’s not clear to us how gNB set the new timer. If it’s blindly configured, we prefer leave to UE implementation to determine the PC5 unicast connection establishment failure. |
| OPPO | Yes  Just for path switch from direct to indirect | Same comment as QC |
| Lenovo | Yes for direct->indirect.  No for indirect->direct. | See comments for Q18 |
| vivo | Comment | It can be a new timer not completely the same as, but mostly like, T304. |
| Sharp | Yes  Just for indirect to direct path switch |  |
| ZTE | No | Agree with QC. There is no need to introduce a new timer. The legacy one is enough, only the stop condition needs change. |
| Samsung | Yes | For direct to indirect |
| Spreadtrum | Yes for direct to indirect |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes for switch from direct to indirect |  |
| Sony | Yes for direct to indirect |  |
| Kyocera | Yes | A new timer should be specified for the direct to indirect path switch. |
| Apple | No | Same understanding as QC |
| Intel | See comment | No strong view, go with majority view. |
| LG | No | There is no need to set up a new timer. See comments for Q18 |
| CATT | Yes with comments | For path switch from direct to indirect, T304-alike timer can be introduced, PC5 connection establishment procedure between relay UE and remote UE is considered. |
| Nokia | No | Agree with QC |

### **Question 20 (Proposal 11-2 within R2-2108196)**

If your answer to Q18 is yes, do you think if more than one new timer is needed (i.e., one for the direct to indirect path switch and another one for the indirect to direct path switch)?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | we may introduce a new timer only for path switch from direct to indirect |
| Qualcomm | No | For path switch from indirect to direct, we don’t see need for new timer. The legacy one is sufficient  For path switch from direct to indirect, we think similar mechanism as T304 can be introduced, and only the stop condition needs spec change (i.e. a timer is included in HO command as legacy and its starting condition is same as T304). The detailed spec change can be discussed in future meeting |
| Xiaomi | No |  |
| OPPO | No | As mentioned above, the legacy timer can be used for indirect to direct path switch. |
| Lenovo | No | See comments for Q18 |
| vivo | No | For indirect to direct case, our preference is to directly reuse T304, instead of a new one. |
| Sharp | No |  |
| ZTE | No |  |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| Samsung | No |  |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| CMCC | No |  |
| Huawei | No | Legacy T304 for indirect->direct path switch, and new timer for direct->indirect path switch. |
| Sony | No |  |
| Kyocera | No |  |
| Apple | No |  |
| LG | No |  |
| CATT | No |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q18/Q19/Q20: According to the replies received, all or majority companies replied yes to the question to introduce a new timer for path switch from direct to indirect path. Then the legacy T304 could be reused for path switch from indirect to direct path. Rapportuer suggests the following proposal:

**Proposal-17: the legacy T304 is reused for path switch from indirect to direct path and a new timer (T304 alike) is introduced for** **path switch from direct to indirect path.**

### **Question 21 (Proposal 12-1 within R2-2108196)**

Do you agree that the Relay UE ID included in RRC reconfiguration is C-RNTI?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company |  | Comments |
| MediaTek | No | We think the proposal itself is not clear. Actually within RRC reconfiguration, the reference contrition [8] discussed the necessity to put a Remote UE ID within the RRC reconfiguration message in order to help the Relay UE to know the destination of Remote UE, with the intention to proceed the subsequent indirect communication after the path switch for the Remote UE completes.  Then in this case, we think this discussion may be related to the local Remote ID allocation discussion within email discussion [604]. |
| Qualcomm | No | In path switch from direct to indirect, the intention of including relay UE ID in RRC reconfiguration towards remote UE is for remote UE to establish unicast PC5 link. As we specified in Rel-16 V2X, the unicast PC5 link is identified by Source L2 ID and Destination L2 ID (i.e. not based on C-RNTI). We think it is important to keep this principle.  Thus, we think relay’s UE L2 source ID can be included instead, and remote UE can find it via discovery message. If C-RNTI is included, gNB needs to provide the mapping from relay’s L2 source ID to C-RNTI to remote UE via another Uu RRC message, which is unnecessary spec change. |
| Xiaomi | No | The question is not clear. We understand the question means whether relay UE’ C-RNTI is included in RRC reconfiguration to remote UE during direct to indirect path switch. We prefer to use L2 source ID. |
| OPPO | See comment | First of all, we do not think this proposal is clear.  Our view is that the need of relay UE ID is for direct to indirect path switch and the need of remote UE ID is for indirect to direct path switch. Thus it is reasonable to clarify the scenario in the proposal.  Then we do not think C-RNTI is needed as relay UE ID. In general, relay UE’s source ID can work for more cases since that is the one to be included in discovery message. |
| Lenovo | See comments | Not sure whether RRC reconfiguration is sent to remote UE? if yes, Relay UE ID included in RRC reconfiguration could be Layer 2 source ID. Then, remote UE can establish the PC5 connection towards the candidate relay UE based on the Layer 2 ID. |
| vivo | No | We think the L2 ID may be already sufficient in this release, although we can understand that the concern may be the less stability of L2 ID than C-RNTI. |
| Sharp | No | We share the same view with Xiaomi, and prefer to use L2 source ID |
| ZTE | No | It should be the L2 ID of relay UE since the remote UE may report the L2 ID of relay UE to gNB. |
| Ericsson | No |  |
| Samsung | No | Relay UE ID in RRC reconfiguration can be SRC L2 ID of Relay UE. |
| Spreadtrum | No |  |
| CMCC | No | L2 ID is sufficient to indicate the relay UE ID in RRCReconfig |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | The usage of Relay UE ID in RRC reconfiguration message is to indicate the target Relay UE to be switched towards for the Remote UE. So this Relay UE ID should be aligned with the one indicated in the measurement results (discussed in Q13). If C-RNTI is used, then the gNB does not need to maintain the mapping between C-RNTI and L2 Relay UE ID, and remote UE can check the C-RNTI indicated by Relay UE for measurement reporting and target identification. |
| Sony | No |  |
| Kyocera | No | Agree with others that L2 ID of relay UE should be reported to the gNB. |
| Apple | No |  |
| Intel | No | Agree with Qualcomm and other companies. |
| LG | No | We think layer2 ID of relay UE should be included RRC Reconfiguration message for remote UE. |
| CATT | No | Agree with QC. |
| Nokia | Yes | But we can go with majority |

Rapporteur summary of Q21: According to the replies received, all or majority companies replied No. Actually according to the offline clarification, the question is not clear and the original intention is discuss if Remote UE ID included in RRC reconfiguration is C-RNTI, which has already been agreed during the CP discussion at this meeting (R2#115e). No proposal is made.

### **Question 22 (Proposal 12-2 within R2-2108196)**

Do you agree that the Remote UE ID needs to be included in the RRC reconfiguration complete message?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company |  | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes | We think that a local Remote UE ID may be included RRC reconfiguration complete message during path switch procedure. Meanwhile this discussion may be subject to the discussion at email discussion [604] for local Remote ID allocation. |
| Qualcomm | No | In path switch from direct to indirect, gNB can identify remote UE ID via the configured Uu RLC channel in Step 2. Thus, explicitly including remote UE ID is unnecessary.  Of course, it is only applied to relay in CONNECTED state. For IDLE/INACTIVE, further discussion is needed (if RAN2 agree to support). |
| Xiaomi | Comments | The question is not clear. We understand the question means whether remote UE’s ID needs to be included in RRC reconfiguration complete during indirect to direct path switch.  We understand this question is related to who allocates the temporary remote UE ID. If it’s allocated by gNB, remote UE doesn’t need to report its ID, since gNB can identify the remote UE by temporary ID. If it’s allocated by relay UE, remote UE need to report is ID. |
| OPPO | No | It is not needed for all cases since for connected relay UE, gNB can tell which remote UE it is via adaptation layer header design already. |
| Lenovo | No | The intention could be that gNB can identify the remote UE when receiving the complete message. If RRC reconfiguration complete is contained in relay’s Uu RRC message, the remote UE ID can be added in the Uu relay RRC message. We prefer not to impact the legacy RRC reconfiguration complete. |
| vivo | No | Assume this is related to the direct to indirect switch as seen from proponent contributions. Then what Remote UE ID this question is actually referring to. Local remote UE ID? But can/need it be visible at the remote UE (so to be included in the complete message)? We think for Remote UE identification, it seems the local remote UE ID in Uu adaptation layer header is already enough. |
| Sharp | No | If it is indirect to direct path switch case, it could be done as legacy and there is no need to include the remote UE id.  If it is direct to indirect path switch case, remote UE ID could be indicated in the adaptation layer, and also there is no need to include the remote UE id. |
| ZTE | Comments | If the local remote UE ID is allocated by gNB, it is not necessary to report the remote UE ID in the RRCReconfigurationcomplete message. However, if the local remote UE ID is allocated by relay UE, it may be necessary. Since the allocation of remote UE ID is still under continuation discussion [604], it is suggested to postpone this proposal till the decision is made for the local remote UE ID allocation. |
| Ericsson | Depends on who assigns the local ID on the adaptation layer. | We agree with ZTE comment |
| Samsung | No | Remote UE’s local ID can be already configured at target Relay UE/gNB and gNB knows which Remote UE’s RRCReconfigurationComplete based on the local ID in adapt header, so C-RNTI may not be needed. This issue seems to be discussed with local ID configuration in adapt header. |
| Spreadtrum |  | Same view with ZTE |
| CMCC | NO | For the case RELAY in RRC CONNECTED state, remote UE ID is not necessary. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | For direct->indirect path switch the target relay’s serving gNB should be able to know who is the accessing UE. Since the gNB will allocate C-RNTI to each UE including Remote UE, using C-RNTI as Remote UE identification in HO complete message should be the most straightforward way which can accommodate all possibilities regardless of who allocates local UE ID. |
| Sony |  | Same with ZTE |
| Kyocera | comments | Agree with ZTE that more discussion is needed. |
| Apple | Comments | Agree with ZTE |
| Intel | No | We prefer not to modify the legacy RRC message as much as possible. We also agree that the adaptation header can provide the local Remote UE ID (we prefer it being assigned by the gNB). |
| LG | Comments | The question is not clear. Does the Remote UE ID mean C-RNTI or layer2 ID? Does the RRC Reconfiguration Complete message means a message from relay UE or from remote UE?  We think the RRC Reconfiguration Complete message from remote UE should include C-RNTI when direct to indirect path switch. But when indirect to direct path switch, the RRC Reconfiguration Complete message from remote UE does not include C-RNTI as a legacy RRC Reconfiguration complete message. Because the remote UE performs RA and gNB can know the remote UE ID via msg3. |
| ZTE | Comments | Same concern as ZTE. |
| Nokia | No | We think that it will be possible to identify the new connection request i.e. by using information for SRB0 |

Rapporteur summary of Q22: According to the replies received, all or majority companies replied No or with comments. The question itself is strongly related to the discussion of the allocation of local remote UE ID. Since the allocation of remote UE ID is still under continuation discussion [604], it is suggested to postpone this discussion. No proposal is made.

## Stage 2 level description of service continuity of L2 relaying

During the post-meeting discussion after RAN2#114e, there is a discussion on how to capture the procedures of service continuity into the running CR of Stage 2 TS 38.300 for SL relay. However, the procedures of service continuity was not captured into the endorsed running CR yet.

This section proposes to discuss the stage 2 level procedure text and signalling flow for the service continuity of L2 U2N Relay operation following the description in reference contribution [2]:

**Switching from *indirect* to direct path**

For service continuity of L2 U2N relay, the following procedure is used, in case of U2N Remote UE switching to direct Uu cell:

1. The existing measurement configuration and measurement report signalling procedures can be used with extension to evaluate both relay link measurement and Uu link measurement. The measurement results from U2N Remote UE are reported when configured reporting criteria is met. The SL relay measurement report shall include at least U2N Relay UE ID, serving cell ID, and SL-RSRP information.

2. The gNB performs admission control based on its implementation and decides to admit the Remote UE onto direct Uu path.

3. The gNB sends RRCReconfiguration message to the U2N Remote UE to provide the RRC reconfiguration. The U2N Remote UE stops UP and CP transmission via U2N Relay UE after reception of RRCReconfiguration message from the gNB.

4. The U2N Remote UE synchronizes with the gNB and performs Random Access. From this step, the U2N Remote UE transits to a normal UE.

5. The UE (i.e. previous U2N Remote UE) feedbacks the RRCReconfigurationComplete to the gNB via target path, using the target configuration provided in the RRCReconfiguration message.

6. The gNB sends RRCReconfiguration message to the U2N Relay UE to reconfigure the connection between the U2N Relay UE and the gNB.

7. The UE (i.e. previous U2N Remote UE) or the U2N Relay UE initiates the PC5 link release, if needed.

8. The data path is switched from indirect path to direct path between the UE (i.e. previous U2N Remote UE) and the gNB. The timing of step 8 is independent of step 6 and step 7.

### **Question 23**

Do you agree that the above listed steps describes the signaling flow for U2N Remote UE switching to direct Uu cell?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Yes with comments | In 1, it’s FFS whether SD-RSRP could be reported. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes with comments | Relay UE continues to transmit DL data until receiving RRC reconfiguration from gNB or receiving PC5-s release request from remote UE. Therefore, it is possible for remote UE to continue to receive DL data buffered in relay UE in step 3. Therefore, FFS is needed for remote UE to continue to receive DL data buffered in relay UE after receiving RRC reconfiguration. |
| vivo | / | It seems a little bit earlier to review the TP word by word during the meeting, as there are likely agreements to be reached in this meeting and impacting above texts/below figures. Suggest to directly capture related procedural texts/figures in the post-meeting running CR email discussion, based on the agreements made in this meeting. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Ok as baseline for discussion | We think that this can be okay as baseline for discussion but we would like to have a better look at this TP during the post-meeting running CR email discussion. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We are generally fine with the current step description. We can take this TP as a baseline and see if further update is needed. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes with comment | We agree with Xiaomi that SD-RSRP may also be reported. |
| Apple | Too early | Can be discussed with post-meeting email disc |
| Intel | Yes with comment | We agree with comments from Xiaomi about SD-RSRP related to Q-11 above and Lenovo about buffered DL data; we can add corresponding FFS or agree the flow of steps as baseline. |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes, as baseline for discussion |  |



*Figure 1: Procedure for U2N Remote UE switching to direct Uu cell*

### **Question 24**

Do you agree that Figure 1 can be reused as the signaling flow for U2N Remote UE switching to direct Uu cell?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | See comments | It is better to refine this figure based on latest agreements, especially related to timing |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| vivo | / | Like in Question 23. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | See comments | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes |  |
| Apple | Too early | Can be discussed with post-meeting email disc based on the agreements in the meeting. |
| Intel | Yes | Agree as a baseline. We wonder if step 6 isn’t always needed? |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes with comments | Update the figure based on agreement. |
| Nokia | Too early | An email discussion may be needed |

**Switching from direct to indirect path**

For service continuity of L2 U2N Relay, the following procedure is used, in case of a UE switching to U2N Relay UE:

1. The UE (i.e. potential U2N Remote UE) reports one or multiple candidate U2N Relay UE(s), after it measures/discovers the candidate U2N Relay UE(s).

- The UE may filter the appropriate U2N Relay UE(s) according to Relay selection criteria before reporting. The measurement results from the UE are reported when the configured reporting criteria is met as legacy measurement report.

- The reporting can include at least U2N Relay UE ID, U2N Relay UE’ s serving cell ID, and SL-RSRP information.

2. The gNB decides to switch the UE (i.e. potential U2N Remote UE) to a target U2N Relay UE. Then the gNB may send an RRCReconfiguration message to the target U2N Relay UE.

3. The gNB sends the RRCReconfiguration message to the UE (i.e. potential U2N Remote UE). The contents in the RRCReconfiguration message can include at least U2N Relay UE ID, PC5 RLC configuration for relaying and the associated end-to-end Radio Bearer(s). The UE (i.e. potential U2N Remote UE) stops UP and CP transmission over Uu after reception of RRCReconfiguration message from the gNB.

4. The UE (i.e. potential U2N Remote UE) establishes PC5 connection with target U2N Relay UE, if the connection has not been setup yet.

5. The UE (i.e. potential U2N Remote UE) completes the path switch procedure by sending the RRCReconfigurationComplete message to the gNB via the Relay UE. From this step, the UE transits to a U2N Remote UE.

6. The data path is switched from direct path to indirect path between the U2N Remote UE and the gNB.

### **Question 25**

Do you agree that the above listed steps describes the signaling flow for U2N Remote UE switching to indirect Relay UE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| Xiaomi | Comments | Regarding step 1,   1. Remote UE may filter appropriate U2N relay not only according to relay selection criteria, but also other configured criteria. For example, only the intra-gNB relay UE is reported, since only intra-gNB service continuity is supported in R17. 2. Report should include SD-RSRP, since the PC5 connection may not be established. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes with comments | One FFs is needed: When to release source Uu link |
| vivo | / | Like in Question 23. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Ok as baseline for discussion | We think that this can be okay as baseline for discussion but we would like to have a better look at this TP during the post-meeting running CR email discussion. |
| Samsung | Yes with comment | In Step1, the reporting can include SD-RSRP since Remote UE measures on discovery message.  Regarding Step4, same comment as Q5:  “Step 4: Remote UE establishes PC5 connection with target Relay UE~~, if the connection has not been setup yet~~.” |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We are generally fine with the current step description. We can take this TP as a baseline and see if further update is needed. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Yes with comments | In step 1, SD-RSRP measurements should also be included for reporting to gNB.  In step 2, it should be further considered how the relay UE can be transitioned to RRC CONN if the relay UE is in RRC IDLE/INACTIVE. |
| Apple | Too early | Can be discussed with post-meeting email disc based on the agreements in the meeting. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| Nokia | Yes, as baseline |  |



*Figure 2: Procedure for U2N Remote UE switching to indirect Relay UE*

### **Question 26**

Do you agree that Figure 2 can be reused as the signaling flow for U2N Remote UE switching to indirect Relay UE?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| MediaTek | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | See comments | It is better to refine this figure based on latest agreements, especially related to timing |
| Xiaomi | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| vivo | / | Like in Question 23. |
| Sharp | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | See comments | Agree with Qualcomm |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Kyocera | Comments | We also think some of the steps need more discussion, esp. as they relate to the selection of the relay UE that is in IDLE/INACTIVE. |
| Apple | Too early | Can be discussed with post-meeting email disc based on the agreements in the meeting. |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |
| CATT | Yes with comments. | There are two step2s in the current Procedure and need to update the figure based on agreement. |
| Nokia | Maybe too early |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q23/Q24/Q25/Q26: According to the replies received, all or majority companies replied yes to the question. The majority view is to use the procedure text and figures proposed at R2-2107046 as the baseline to update the running stage 2 CR. There may be a need to update both the procedure text and the figures to reflect the agreements made by this meeting (R2#115e) for service continuity. The detailed comments can be solved during running CR discussion.

**Proposal-18: Use** **the procedure text and figures proposed at R2-2107046 for L2 Relay service continuity as the baseline to update the running stage 2 CR.**

## Other issues

There may be additional issues that need to be discussed to describe the service continuity of L2 relaying.

### **Question 27**

**Please give the explanation of any additional issues to describe the service continuity of L2 relaying.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Kyocera | It was agreed based on the relay reselection discussion in RAN2#113e that:  “*When relay performs HO to another gNB, relay UE may send a PC5-S message (similar to LTE) to its connected remote UE(s) and this message may trigger relay reselection.”*  Since the remote UE is RRC CONN, we think the decision for the relay UE’s operation, whether to be released or even to consider indirect to direct path switch should come from the gNB rather than via a PC5-S message. It is also questionable how the relay UE knows that the HO is an intra-gNB or an inter-gNB HO. |
|  |  |

Rapporteur summary of Q27: According to the reply from Kyocera, the discussion itself is about relay reselection. Rapporteur suggests to continue the discussion at Relay re/selection agenda item at this meeting (R2#115e) or at the next meeting by contribution. No proposal is made.

# Rapporteur’s summary and Proposal

Rapporteur summary of Q1: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) confirmed the support of the original Proposal 15 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, RRC Reconfiguration message to Relay UE can be sent any time after step 3 based on gNB implementation, as in the Figure 4.5.4.1-1. Among the replies that did not support the original Proposal 15 within R2-2107710, the main concern is that the path switch to direct link may fail and Remote UE may fallback to indirect link. In rapporteur understanding, the handling of path switch failure can be discussed later on. By the way, Apple’s reply on RLC PDU loss may be a bit misleading, since we just agreed to handle the lossless path switch according to PDCP status report at PDCP layer. Hence, it is proposed to agree the original Proposal 15 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-1: Agree Proposal 15 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, RRC Reconfiguration message to Relay UE can be sent any time after step 3 based on gNB implementation, as in the Figure 4.5.4.1-1.**

Rapporteur summary of Q2: According to the replies received, the majority companies (18/20) replied yes with comments. Among these companies, the majority companies proposed to reword the original proposal as: for indirect to direct path switch, either Relay UE or Remote UE can initialize the PC5 unicast link release (PC5-S), and the timing is up to UE implementation (i.e. for Remote UE it should be after step 3; for Relay UE it should be after step 6). The rapporteur understanding is that this proposal handles the cases where there is no non-relaying PC5 RLC channels on the same PC5 unicast link, i.e. dedicated relaying link).

Within these replies with Yes, there was a concern on the scenario where Relay UE may want to continue DL data forwarding but the link was released from Remote UE side. In rapporteur understanding, this won’t be a problem, since Relay UE would receive the release message from Remote UE before that and Relay UE should adjust the DL data forwarding accordingly. Secondly, the network implementation may ensure that it would not happen since the gNB had already reconfigured the Remote UE to perform path switch. There was also a confusion if the said PC5 unicast link release is PC5-S or PC5-RRC, rapporteur assumes it is PC5-S.

Among the replies that did not support the Proposal 16 within R2-2107710, the same concern repeated as for Proposal 15 within R2-2107710 (i.e. path switch failure, and lost unforwarded RLC PDUs. Rapporteur has the same understanding as for the Proposal 15 within R2-2107710.

Hence, it is proposed to agree the reworded Proposal 16 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-2: Agree reworded Proposal 16 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, either Relay UE or Remote UE can initialize the PC5 unicast link release (PC5-S), and the timing is up to UE implementation (i.e. for Remote UE it should be after step 3; for Relay UE it should be after step 6).**

Rapporteur summary of Q3: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) replied yes (with comments) or partially agree. Among these companies, the majority companies accept the reworded proposal as suggested by Qualcomm: for indirect to direct path switch, Remote UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 3, and Relay UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 6. The rapporteur understanding is that this proposal handles the cases where there is no non-relaying PC5 RLC channels on the same PC5 unicast link, i.e. dedicated relaying link).

There is a concern on the UE implementation based release of PC5 RLC for relaying since the relay UE may still have DL traffic to forward. In rapporteur understanding, this won’t be a problem, since such case may be avoided by network implementation, since the gNB had already reconfigured the Remote UE to perform path switch and then the gNB can buffer the data, instead of still relying on the indirect path for data transmission.

Hence, it is proposed to agree the reworded Proposal 18 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-3: Agree reworded Proposal 18 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, Remote UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 3, and Relay UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 6.**

Rapporteur summary of Q4: According to the replies received, all companies (19/19) replied yes. Then let us simply agree the original Proposal 22 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-4: Agree original Proposal 22 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, step 8 can be executed in parallel or after step 5.**

Rapporteur summary of Q5: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) replied yes. Among these replies, some companies prefer to restrict the proposal on the case where there is no non-relaying PC5 RLC channels on the same PC5 unicast link, i.e. dedicated relaying link) and put FFS for shared link between relay service and non-relay service.

Hence, it is proposed to agree the reworded Proposal 28 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-5: Agree reworded Proposal 18 within R2-2107710: for direct to indirect path switch, the PC5 connection setup procedure is executed after step 3 if the PC5 connection has not been setup yet.** **FFS for shared PC5 link between relay service and non-relay service.**

Rapporteur summary of Q6: According to the replies received, clear majority companies (19/20) replied yes. Then let us simply agree the original Proposal 21 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-6: Agree original Proposal 21 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, Relay UE does not perform data forwarding back to gNB for Remote UE.**

Rapporteur summary of Q7: According to the replies received, clear majority companies (19/20) replied yes. There are two companies that propose to agree it as baseline. Let us simply agree the original Proposal 25 within R2-2107710 following the majority view:

**Proposal-7: Agree original Proposal 25 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, the contents in RRC Reconfiguration message for Remote UE can be same as legacy NR RRC Reconfiguration with sync.**

Rapporteur summary of Q8: According to the replies received, all companies replied yes. Let us simply agree the original Proposal 30 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-8: Agree original Proposal 30 within R2-2107710: for direct to indirect path switch, additional indication from RRC\_CONNECTED Relay UE to gNB is not necessary to initiate Relay UE’s reconfiguration upon establishing unicast link with Remote UE.**

Rapporteur summary of Q9: According to the replies received, all companies replied yes. For CATT suggestion, the rapporteur understanding is that the current proposal is clear enough. Let us simply agree the original Proposal 32 within R2-2107710:

**Proposal-9: Agree original Proposal 32 within R2-2107710: for direct to indirect path switch, the contents in RRC Reconfiguration message for Relay UE can include at least Uu and PC5 RLC configuration for relaying, bearer mapping configuration.**

Rapporteur summary of Q10: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) replied No. The majority view is that the Sidelink signaling strength measured by Remote UE cannot guarantee whether serving cell is strong enough to skip non-serving cell measurement. Three companies replied yes, among which there is suggestion to extend S-measure criteria to direct to indirect case. Rapporteur suggests to follow the majority view:

**Proposal-10: S-measure criteria is not used by the Remote UE for direct-indirect path switch.**

Rapporteur summary of Q11: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) replied Yes or Yes with comments. Among the replies with comments, the majority suggests to mark the SL-RSRP as baseline and FFS for SD-RSRP. Rapporteur suggests to agree SL-RSRP as baseline for the SL measurement quantity for the case of path switch from indirect to direct path:

**Proposal-11: As a baseline, SL-RSRP is used as the SL measurement quantity for the case of path switch from indirect to direct path.**

Rapporteur summary of Q12: According to the replies received, the majority companies (17/20) replied Yes or Yes with comments. Among the replies with comments or No, the main concern is the scenario where is shared link for relaying and non-relaying. If we consider non-shared case, there is only SD-RSRP available. The rapporteur understanding suggests to handle the cases where there is no non-relaying PC5 RLC channels on the same PC5 unicast link, i.e. dedicated relaying link) and put shared link case as FFS.

**Proposal-12: SD-RSRP is used as the SL measurement quantity for the case of path switch from direct to indirect path. FFS for shared PC5 link between relay service and non-relay service.**

Rapporteur summary of Q13: According to the replies received, the majority companies (18/20) replied Yes or Yes with comments. Among the replies with comments or No, the main concern is that the gNB may not know the L2 ID of Relay UE. Rapporteur understanding is that legacy SUI message can ensure the report of the L2 ID of Relay UE to the gNB. Meanwhile, there may be security issue if the discovery message of Relay UE includes C-RNTI. Let us follow the majority view:

**Proposal-13:** **the Relay UE ID that is included in the measurement report is the Source L2 ID.**

Rapporteur summary of Q14: According to the replies received, the majority companies (18/20) replied No or No with comments. Among the replies with comments or No, the main concern is that this is an enhancement and the legacy measurement configuration for remote UE is sufficient. Let us follow the majority view:

**Proposal-14:** **the Relay UE can NOT be configured with measurements towards one particular Remote UE for purposes of path switch of that Remote UE.**

Rapporteur summary of Q15: According to the replies received, 12 companies replied yes. However 9 companies including one company replied yes proposed to not support the proposal or postpone the proposal (i.e. RRC\_Inactive UE for path switch from direct to indirect link). The opponents want to work on the Relay UE in RRC CONNECTED first. Rapporteur do not think it is easy to agree it at this meeting:

Rapporteur summary of Q16: According to the replies received, 12 companies replied yes. However 10 companies including two companies replied yes proposed to not support the proposal or postpone the proposal (i.e. RRC\_IDLE UE for path switch from direct to indirect link). The opponents want to work on the Relay UE in RRC CONNECTED first. Rapporteur do not think it is easy to agree it at this meeting:

**Proposal-15: RAN2 to discuss if Relay UE in RRC\_INACTIVE state can be selected by the gNB during path switch from direct to indirect link.**

**Proposal-16: RAN2 to discuss if Relay UE in RRC\_IDLE state can be selected by the gNB during path switch from direct to indirect link.**

Rapporteur summary of Q17: The reply itself is related to the answer of Q15/Q16. As the answer of Q15/Q16 did not present clear majority view, Rapporteur suggests to discuss the proposal of Q15/Q16 before Q17. Then no proposal is made for this discussion.

Rapporteur summary of Q18/Q19/Q20: According to the replies received, all or majority companies replied yes to the question to introduce a new timer for path switch from direct to indirect path. Then the legacy T304 could be reused for path switch from indirect to direct path. Rapportuer suggests the following proposal:

**Proposal-17: the legacy T304 is reused for path switch from indirect to direct path and a new timer (T304 alike) is introduced for** **path switch from direct to indirect path.**

Rapporteur summary of Q21: According to the replies received, all or majority companies replied No. Actually according to the offline clarification, the question is not clear and the original intention is discuss if Remote UE ID included in RRC reconfiguration is C-RNTI, which has already been agreed during the CP discussion at this meeting (R2#115e). No proposal is made.

Rapporteur summary of Q22: According to the replies received, all or majority companies replied No or with comments. The question itself is strongly related to the discussion of the allocation of local remote UE ID. Since the allocation of remote UE ID is still under continuation discussion [604], it is suggested to postpone this discussion. No proposal is made.

Rapporteur summary of Q23/Q24/Q25/Q26: According to the replies received, all or majority companies replied yes to the question. The majority view is to use the procedure text and figures proposed at R2-2107046 as the baseline to update the running stage 2 CR. There may be a need to update both the procedure text and the figures to reflect the agreements made by this meeting (R2#115e) for service continuity. The detailed comments can be solved during running CR discussion.

**Proposal-18: Use** **the procedure text and figures proposed at R2-2107046 for L2 Relay service continuity as the baseline to update the running stage 2 CR.**

Rapporteur summary of Q27: According to the reply from Kyocera, the discussion itself is about relay reselection. Rapporteur suggests to continue the discussion at Relay re/selection agenda item at this meeting (R2#115e) or at the next meeting by contribution. No proposal is made.

# Proposals for CB session

**Easy proposals:**

**Proposal-1: Agree Proposal 15 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, RRC Reconfiguration message to Relay UE can be sent any time after step 3 based on gNB implementation, as in the Figure 4.5.4.1-1.**

**Proposal-2: Agree reworded Proposal 16 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, either Relay UE or Remote UE can initialize the PC5 unicast link release (PC5-S), and the timing is up to UE implementation (i.e. for Remote UE it should be after step 3; for Relay UE it should be after step 6).**

**Proposal-3: Agree reworded Proposal 18 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, Remote UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 3, and Relay UE can execute PC5 connection reconfiguration to release PC5 RLC for relaying upon reception of RRC Reconfiguration by gNB in Step 6.**

**Proposal-4: Agree original Proposal 22 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, step 8 can be executed in parallel or after step 5.**

**Proposal-5: Agree reworded Proposal 18 within R2-2107710: for direct to indirect path switch, the PC5 connection setup procedure is executed after step 3 if the PC5 connection has not been setup yet.** **FFS for shared PC5 link between relay service and non-relay service.**

**Proposal-6: Agree original Proposal 21 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, Relay UE does not perform data forwarding back to gNB for Remote UE.**

**Proposal-7: Agree original Proposal 25 within R2-2107710: for indirect to direct path switch, the contents in RRC Reconfiguration message for Remote UE can be same as legacy NR RRC Reconfiguration with sync.**

**Proposal-8: Agree original Proposal 30 within R2-2107710: for direct to indirect path switch, additional indication from RRC\_CONNECTED Relay UE to gNB is not necessary to initiate Relay UE’s reconfiguration upon establishing unicast link with Remote UE.**

**Proposal-9: Agree original Proposal 32 within R2-2107710: for direct to indirect path switch, the contents in RRC Reconfiguration message for Relay UE can include at least Uu and PC5 RLC configuration for relaying, bearer mapping configuration.**

**Proposal-10: S-measure criteria is not used by the Remote UE for direct-indirect path switch.**

**Proposal-11: As a baseline, SL-RSRP is used as the SL measurement quantity for the case of path switch from indirect to direct path.**

**Proposal-12: SD-RSRP is used as the SL measurement quantity for the case of path switch from direct to indirect path. FFS for shared PC5 link between relay service and non-relay service.**

**Proposal-13:** **the Relay UE ID that is included in the measurement report is the Source L2 ID.**

**Proposal-14:** **the Relay UE can NOT be configured with measurements towards one particular Remote UE for purposes of path switch of that Remote UE.**

**Proposal-17: the legacy T304 is reused for path switch from indirect to direct path and a new timer (T304 alike) is introduced for** **path switch from direct to indirect path.**

**Proposal-18: Use** **the procedure text and figures proposed at R2-2107046 for L2 Relay service continuity as the baseline to update the running stage 2 CR.**

**Proposals for discussion:**

**Proposal-15: RAN2 to discuss if Relay UE in RRC\_INACTIVE state can be selected by the gNB during path switch from direct to indirect link.**

**Proposal-16: RAN2 to discuss if Relay UE in RRC\_IDLE state can be selected by the gNB during path switch from direct to indirect link.**
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