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# Introduction

This document summarizes the offline discussion as:

* [AT118-e][701][V2X/SL] Miscellaneous corrections (OPPO)

**Scope:** Discuss corrections in R2-2204856, R2-2204857, R2-2205109, R2-2206043, R2-2204572, R2-2204573, R2-2204645, R2-2204646, R2-2205947 and R2-2205953, and prepare a merged 38.331/36.331 CR for agreeable corrections.

**Intended outcome:** Agree 38.331 CR in R2-2206281 and R2-2206282. Agree 36.331 CR in R2-2206283 and R2-2206284. Discussion summary in R2-2206285 (if needed). Email approval.

**Deadline:** 5/16 10:00am UTC

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | E-mail |
| OPPO | Bingxue Leng | lengbingxue@oppo.com |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Li Zhao | Zhaoli8@huawei.com |
| Xiaomi | Xing Yang | Yangxing1@xiaomi.com |
| Qualcomm | Dan Vassilovski | dvassilo@qti.qualcomm.com |
| CATT | Hao Xu | [xuhao@catt.cn](mailto:xuhao@catt.cn) |
| Nokia | Jakob Buthler | Jakob.buthler@nokia.com |

# Changes in R2-2204856/ R2-2204857 (Huawei)

Since CR R2-2204857 is a shadow CR for R17 specification due to the issues from R16 specification as proposed by R2-2204856, companies’ views are checked together for these 2 CRs.

# First change

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of changes/proposals** | **Reason for the change** |
| Change-1a: Move the description of the T400 startup to the end of setting the contents of RRCReconfigurationSidelink message. | According to the informative table for T400 in section 7.1.1, it is stated that T400 starts upon transmission of RRCReconfigurationSidelink. Thus, T400 should be started at the end of setting the contents of RRCReconfigurationSidelink message. However, in the current procedure in section 5.8.9.1.2, it is incorrect that T400 is started before setting the sl-CSI-RS-Config and the sl-LatencyBoundCSI-Report. |
| Change-1b: Delete the radio bearer constraint for the T400 startup. | It is specified that T400 starts for the destination associated with the sidelink DRB. This “associated with the sidelink DRB” constraint for the T400 startup is redundant because the RRC reconfiguration is for the specific unicast link and not for the specific radio bearer. |

**Q1a: Do you agree with the above proposed change-1a?**

**Option 1: Agree**

**Option 2: Disagree**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Disagree | Seems not a critical issue? |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Agree | Proponent. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Change seems not essential |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Disagree | Change seems not important time-wise |

**Q1b: Do you agree with the above proposed change-1b?**

**Option 1: Agree**

**Option 2: Disagree**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Agree | Proponent. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |

# Second change

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of changes/proposals** | **Reason for the change** |
| Adding a reference for the value offset00 in SL-PTRS-Config field descriptions. | The value offset00 in SL-PTRS-Config field descriptions is not clear, because in TS 38.211 there are multiple values of “offset00” are used in multiple clauses, hence the reference to the right clause shall be added. |

**Q2: Do you agree with the above proposed change?**

**Option 1: Agree**

**Option 2: Disagree**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Agree | Proponent. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |

# Third change

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of changes/proposals** | **Reason for the change** |
| Correction on name of IE SL-RLC-BearerConfigIndex . | Correction of typos on the name of IE “SL-RLC-BearerConfigIndex”. |

**Q3: Do you agree with the above proposed change?**

**Option 1: Agree**

**Option 2: Disagree**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Agree | Proponent. |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |

# Changes in R2-2205109 (ZTE)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of changes/proposals** | **Reason for the change** |
| Add the description of the motivation of (sl-maxTxPower, sl-MaxTransPower) in the field description. | In previous RAN2 meeting, one LS from RAN4 is received for clarification which RRC parameter (sl-maxTxPower, sl-MaxTransPower, SL-TxPower) is to limit the transmitted power PEMAX,c of PSSCH/PSCCH. And in previous RAN1 meeting, it can also be observed that RAN1 correct the power control parameter in CR(R1-2107221).  Therefore, current description of these two power parameters(sl-maxTxPower, sl-MaxTransPower) is ambiguous, it’s better to clarify this in field description |

**Q4: Do you agree with the above proposed change?**

**Option 1: Agree**

**Option 2: Disagree**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | see comment | For sl-MaxTransPower we are fine to clarify in RAN2 specification while for sl-maxTxPower seems the double clarification in RAN2 specification can be saved since RAN1 has already clearly stated in RAN1 spec (as CR in R1-2107221) |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Disagree | For sl-MaxTransPower, it is clearly stated in TS 38.101 that this parameter is used for PEMAX,c .No need to duplicate the description in RRC spec.   |  | | --- | | - For the total transmitted power PCMAX,PSSCH/PSCCH , PEMAX,c is the value given by IE *sl-maxTxPower*, defined by TS 38.331, when the UE is not associated with a serving cell on the NR V2X carrier . |   For sl-maxTxPower, it is clearly stated in TS 38.213 that this parameter is used for . We agree with OPPO that no need to duplicate the description in RRC spec.   |  | | --- | | - is determined by a value of *sl-MaxTxPower* based on a priority level of the PSSCH transmission and a CBR range that includes a CBR measured in slot [6, TS 38.214]; if *sl-MaxTxPower* is not provided, then ; | |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | Agree with Huawei HiSilicon. The RAN1 spec provides a clear description, which does not need to be replicated in the RRC spec. |
| CATT | Agree | Both sl-maxTxPower and sl-MaxTransPower can be clarified in RAN2 specification. |
| Nokia | Agree | We can agree to this change, but have a slight concerns of duplicating descriptions in case of the need to reflect changes in different spects |

# Changes in R2-2206043 (OPPO)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of changes/proposals** | **Reason for the change** |
| As discussed based on R17 RIL of [O030], it is suggested to revise the R16 spec and R17 spec to differentiate between the two, so the legacy bullet in R16 spec is limited to transmission only, and the newly added R17 bullet is for reception. | During ASN1 discussion of R17 spec, one issue is identified that the legacy spec described the QoS report in an unclear way, i.e., “is reporting QoS parameters and QoS profile(s) related to NR sidelink communication”, i.e., not sure if the “communication” is for transmission / reception or both. And it causes ambiguity since R17 introduces QoS report for Rx side, and thus the difference between R16 and R17 spec becomes difficult to handle. |

**Q5: Do you agree with the above proposed change?**

**Option 1: Agree**

**Option 2: Disagree**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | Proponent |
| Huawei HiSilicon | See comments | “NR sidelink communication” is a specific term with its definition in 38.300, thus it is better not to change the term itself for various scenarios. Considering there are existing wording of “sidelink communication transmission” and “sidelink communication reception” in the current specification, we would like to add “transmission”/“reception” following “communication”, rather than change “communication” to “transmission”/“reception”.  OPPO: Thanks for the suggestion, we are fine with adding “transmission”/“reception” following “communication” as long as it makes the specification clearer. |
| Xiaomi | Agree | Agree with HW’s modification |
| Qualcomm | Disagree | This seems an unnecessary change at this stage of the release. “NR sidelink communication” is explicitly defined in 3.1. We do not see a need to change the term in 5.8.3.1.  OPPO: If the concern is on the replace “communication” by “transmission”, we understand it can be solved by the suggestion from Huawei, i.e., add “transmission” after “communication”. |
| CATT | Disagree | It is unnecessary to revise R16 spec. |
| Nokia | Disagree |  |

# Changes in R2-2204572/ R2-2204573 (OPPO)

Since CR R2-2204573 is a shadow CR for R17 specification due to the issue from R16 specification as proposed by R2-2204572, companies’ views are checked together for these 2 CRs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of changes/proposals** | **Reason for the change** |
| In section 6.3.5, change sl-Tx-ConfigIndexList in the field description of sl-DefaultTxConfigIndex to sl-Tx-ConfigIndexList; | In the field description of sl-DefaultTxConfigIndex, it says sl-DefaultTxConfigIndex indicates the PSSCH transmission parameters to be used by the UEs which do not have available CBR measurement results, by means of an index to the corresponding entry in tx-ConfigIndexList(which is used in LTE V2X). However, there is no tx-ConfigIndexList defined in 38331, the correct IE name should be sl-Tx-ConfigIndexList. Therefore tx-ConfigIndexList should be changed into sl-Tx-ConfigIndexList in the field description of sl-DefaultTxConfigIndex. |

**Q6: Do you agree with the above proposed change?**

**Option 1: Agree**

**Option 2: Disagree**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | Proponent |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |

# Changes in R2-2204645/ R2-2204646 (OPPO)

Since CR R2-2204645 is a shadow CR for R17 specification due to the issue from R16 specification as proposed by R2-2204646, companies’ views are checked together for these 2 CRs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of changes/proposals** | **Reason for the change** |
| Correct that v2x-BandParametersNR, which refer to BandParametersSidelink-r16 is a per-band per-band-combination feature | v2x-BandParametersNR, which refer to BandParametersSidelink-r16 is a per-band per-band-combination feature but captured as per-band capability. |

**Q7: Do you agree with the above proposed change?**

**Option 1: Agree**

**Option 2: Disagree**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Agree | Proponent |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |

# Changes in R2-2205947/ R2-2205953 (Lenovo)

Since CR R2-2205953 is a shadow CR for R17 specification due to the issue from R16 specification as proposed by R2-2205947, companies’ views are checked together for these 2 CRs and the sidelink related change in the 2 CRs will be discussed here.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Summary of changes/proposals** | **Reason for the change** |
| The format of the names for MeasurementReportSidelink-IEs-r16, RRCReconfigurationSidelink-IEs-r16, RRCReconfigurationCompleteSidelink-IEs-r16, RRCReconfigurationFailureSidelink-IEs-r16, UECapabilityEnquirySidelink-IEs-r16 and UECapabilityInformationSidelink-IEs-r16 have been corrected to “-r16-IEs”. | The format of the names for MeasurementReportSidelink-IEs-r16, RRCReconfigurationSidelink-IEs-r16, RRCReconfigurationCompleteSidelink-IEs-r16, RRCReconfigurationFailureSidelink-IEs-r16, UECapabilityEnquirySidelink-IEs-r16 and UECapabilityInformationSidelink-IEs-r16 are not correct. Instead of “-IEs-r16” it should have been “-r16-IEs”. |

**Q8: Do you agree with the above proposed change?**

**Option 1: Agree**

**Option 2: Disagree**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Agree / Disagree** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Agree |  |
| Xiaomi | Agree |  |
| Huawei HiSilicon | Agree |  |
| Qualcomm | Agree |  |
| CATT | Agree |  |
| Nokia | Agree |  |

# Conclusions

# Reference

1. R2-2204856 Miscelleneous corrections Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-16 38.331
2. R2-2204857 Miscelleneous corrections Huawei, HiSilicon CR Rel-17 38.331
3. R2-2205109 Clarification on power control parameter ZTE Corporation, Sanechips,vivo CR Rel-16 38.331
4. R2-2206043 Correction on SUI message OPPO CR Rel-16 38.331
5. R2-2204572 Correction on field description of sl-DefaultTxConfigIndex OPPO CR Rel-16 38.331
6. R2-2204573 Correction on field description of sl-DefaultTxConfigIndex OPPO CR Rel-17 38.331
7. R2-2204645 Correction on per-FS capability OPPO CR Rel-16 36.331
8. R2-2204646 Correction on per-FS capability OPPO CR Rel-17 36.331
9. R2-2205947 Miscellaneous corrections Lenovo draftCR Rel-16 38.331
10. R2-2205953 Miscellaneous corrections Lenovo draftCR Rel-17 38.331