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# 1 Introduction

This document is the summary report of the following offline discussion:

* [AT116bis-e][608][Relay] RAN sharing (Huawei)

 Scope: Discuss the issue of RAN sharing for relays, taking into account the related parts of contributions from AI 8.7.2.1. Conclude on what will be supported and analyse spec impact (conclusions to be taken into account by rapporteurs of affected running CRs).

 Intended outcome: Report to Tuesday CB session

 Deadline: Monday 2022-01-24 1800 UTC

The rapporteur would like to suggest an intermediate deadline for companies' feedback: Friday 2022-01-21 1800 UTC. The summary and proposals will be provided in Monday morning for further review before the CB session.

# 2 Contact Points

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Name | Email Address |
| InterDigital | Martino Freda | martino.freda@interdigital.com |
| CATT | Hao Xu | xuhao@catt.cn |
| OPPO | Bingxue Leng | lengbingxue@oppo.com |
| vivo | Boubacar Kimba | kimba@vivo.com |
| Ericsson | Antonino Orsino | antonino.orsino@ericsson.com |
| Qualcomm | Peng Cheng | chengp@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Lenovo | Prateek Basu Mallick | pmallick @ lenovo.com |
| Nokia | Gyuri Wolfner | gyorgy.wolfner@nokia.com |
| Apple | Zhibin Wu | zhibin\_wu@apple.com |
| MediaTek | Xuelong Wang | Xuelong.Wang@MediaTek.com |
| LG | Seoyoung Back | Seoyoung.back@lge.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Discussion

RAN2 has discussed RAN sharing in last meeting, but no consensus was achieved. In this meeting, several contributions discussed whether and how to support RAN sharing as well as the potential RAN2 spec impact from the following aspects:

**SA2 aspects**

* Authorization of Relay UE and Remote UE, Security procedure of Relay UE and Remote UE, PLMN selection of Remote UE
* Relay and Remote UE’s PDU session Setup towards different PLMN

**RAN2 aspects**

* Access control (including UAC parameters), as well as TAC/Cell Identity
* Uu radio resources and PC5 Radio Resources allocation
* Mobility
* Stage 3 signalling of PLMN list broadcasting

**Other aspects**

* Use of PLMN specific features

**RAN sharing support in RAN2**

## 3.1 SA2 aspects

Although those aspects are in the SA2 scope, considering companies may think the SA2 design would bring RAN2 impact, we can have a general discussion to align companies’ understanding.

### 3.1.1 Authorization of Relay UE and Remote UE, Security procedure of Relay UE and Remote UE, PLMN selection of Remote UE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R2-2200552 MediaTek Inc., CATT, OPPO, Qualcomm Incorporated, ZTE, Huawei, HiSilicon, Apple, InterDigital | PLMN based authorizationMeanwhile, from relay discovery perspective, the current procedure can already support the distribution of PLMN information during discovery procedure (governed by SA2). By the way, PLMN based authorization for relaying operation is supported regardless whether there is RAN sharing or not. Remote UE's PLMN selection in case of RAN sharingDuring relaying operation in RAN sharing scenario, the selection of PLMN by Remote UE should be transparent to Relay UE, since this is out of Relay UE’s responsibility. In case of RAN sharing, the Remote UE may select a PLMN is that is different from the R-PLMN from Relay UE. We did not see a reason for Remote UE to ask Relay UE to approve its PLMN selection, or vice versa. In practice, the PLMN serving the Remote UE may be different from the one serving the Relay UE. In addition, the NAS based PLMN selection is not a discussion in RAN2 scope.SecurityIn case of RAN sharing or non-RAN sharing scenario, Remote UE and Relay UE run the security procedure independently. The key derivation should be dominated by the PLMN they selected. Although this is an area for SA3, we do not see any special handling needed for the case of RAN sharing. |
| R2-2200946 Nokia Shanghai Bell | The relay and the remote UEs should be authorized for relay services. This authorization may be PLMN specific. If the remote UE and the relay UE are registered to a different PLMNs then they may use authorizations that are not valid for the PLMN of the other UE. E.g., the discovery code from the operator of the relay UE is used to establish the relay connection towards another operator selected by the remote UE. This is an issue that SA2, and SA3 should investigate before standardizing the support of this scenario. Our view is that RAN2 should send an LS to SA2 and SA3 if it is decided to support this scenario. |
| R2-2201158 Ericsson | There are no guarantees that the Remote UE’s selected PLMN would even be allowed for the Relay UESecurity procedures (also affecting SA2/SA3) towards different CNs are not clear. |
| R2-2200166 CATT | Since RAN sharing has been supported in Rel-15, the effects due to RAN sharing mainly in the core network, such as remote UE’s PLMN selection and authorizations. Therefore, it is unnecessary to exclude RAN sharing for L2 U2N relay in Rel-17 from RAN2’s perspective.Proposal 2: It is unnecessary to exclude RAN sharing from RAN2 perspective. |

In general, R2-2200946 and R2-2201158 raises concerns that there might be issues for authorization, security and PLMN selection for RAN sharing scenario, particularly when the Remote UE registers to a different PLMN from Relay UE’s PLMN, while R2-2200552 and R2-2200166 give some analyse and conclude there is no RAN impact on those aspects.

In the rapporteur’s understanding, the general architecture and procedures in TS 23.304 support RAN sharing with the unified solutions/procedures specified for non-RAN sharing cases, i.e. there is no PLMN specific authorization/security procedure/PLMN selection for RAN sharing case. Thus there is no particular issue on those aspects from RAN2 point of view as well. The detailed analyses are as below:

**Regarding RAN sharing support:** It clearly states that Relay UE and Remote UE can access and be service by different PLMNs in case of RAN is shared by MOCN architecture.

|  |
| --- |
| Excerpt from TS 23.3044.2.7.2 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay reference architectureFigure 4.2.7.2-1 shows the 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay reference architecture. The 5G ProSe Layer-2 Remote UE and 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay may be served by the same or different PLMNs. If the serving PLMNs of the 5G ProSe Layer-2 Remote UE and the 5G ProSe Layer-2UE-to-Network Relay are different then NG-RAN is shared by the serving PLMNs, see the 5G MOCN architecture in clause 5.18 of TS 23.501 [4]. |

**Regarding authorization of Relay UE and Remote UE**, the follow observations can be made according to 5.1 Authorization and Provisioning for ProSe service:

* Authorization of Relay UE: A UE is authorized in which PLMN networks it can act as a Relay, i.e. it allows the Relay UE act as a Relay as long as Relay’s registered PLMN is authorized PLMN.
* Authorization of Remote UE: A UE is authorized in which PLMN networks it can access 5GC via an U2N Relay, i.e. the Remote UE is allowed to discover a Relay UE as long as Remote’s registered PLMN is authorized PLMN.
* No combined authorization of Remote UE and Relay UE.
* No per PLMN specific design on authorization for RAN sharing case or non-RAN sharing case.

|  |
| --- |
| Excerpt from TS 23.3045.1 Authorization and Provisioning for ProSe service…- The PCF in the HPLMN may configure a list of PLMNs where the UE is authorised to act as 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay. Authorisation for 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay and 5G ProSe Layer-3 UE-to-Network Relay are independent of each other.- The PCF in the HPLMN may configure a list of PLMNs where the UE is authorised to access 5GC via 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay (i.e. to act as 5G ProSe Remote UE). Authorisation to access via 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay and via 5G ProSe Layer-3 UE-to-Network Relay are independent of each other. |

**Regarding security procedure of Relay UE and Remote UE**, we can see during authorization the Relay /Remote UE is provided with RSC and corresponding security related content as well, which means the Relay/Remote UE is allowed to perform discovery and establish security based on the provided RSC(s) in the authorized PLMN(s). No per PLMN specific procedure or requirement of security defined for RAN sharing case or non-RAN sharing case.

|  |
| --- |
| Excerpt from TS 23.3045.1.4 Authorization and Provisioning for 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay…The following information is provisioned in the UE in support of the UE assuming the role of a 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay:…2) ProSe Relay Discovery policy/parameters for 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay:- Includes the parameters that enable the UE to perform 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay Discovery when provided by PCF or provisioned in the ME or configured in the UICC:- 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay Discovery parameters (User Info ID, Relay Service Code(s), UE-to-Network Relay Layer Indicator(s)); the UE-to-Network Relay Layer Indicator indicates whether a particular RSC is offering 5G ProSe Layer-2 or Layer-3 UE-to-Network Relay service.…- Includes security related content for 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay Discovery for each ProSe Relay Service Code.…The following information is provisioned in the UE in support of the UE assuming the role of a 5G ProSe Remote UE and thereby enabling the use of a 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay:…2) Policy/parameters for 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay Discovery:- Includes the parameters for 5G ProSe Relay Discovery and for enabling the UE to connect to the 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay after discovery when provided by PCF or provisioned in the ME or configured in the UICC:- 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay Discovery parameters (User Info ID, Relay Service Code(s), UE-to-Network Relay Layer indicator(s)); the UE-to-Network Relay Layer Indicator indicates whether a particular RSC is offering 5G ProSe Layer-2 or Layer-3 UE-to-Network Relay service.…- Includes security related content for 5G ProSe UE-to-Network Relay Discovery for each ProSe Relay Service Codes. |

**Regarding PLMN selection of Remote UE**, the Relay UE would advertise the PLMN(s) supported by its serving cell to the Remote UE, and Remote UE checks whether there is authorized PLMN which can be considered as available PLMN for the NAS PLMN selection as legacy. Then except the PLMNs advertising which would be discussed in RAN2 aspects, there is no new thing required.

|  |
| --- |
| Excerpt from TS 23.3045.4.2 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay…For PLMN selection and relay selection in the 5G ProSe Layer-2 Remote UE:- The 5G ProSe Layer-2 Remote UE checks whether the PLMN(s) supported by the serving cell of the 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay(s) are authorized to be connected to via a 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay(s), and only the authorized PLMN(s) are then available PLMNs for NAS PLMN selection;- The 5G ProSe Layer-2 Remote UE selects the 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay considering the selected PLMN by NAS layer. |

**Observation 1: According to SA2 TS 23.304, the L2 U2N Relay UE and L2 U2N Remote UE are allowed to be served by the same or different PLMNs.**

**Observation 2: Regarding authorization and security procedure of Relay UE and Remote UE as well as PLMN selection of Remote UE in L2 U2N relay operation, according to SA2 TS 23.304 there is no PLMN specific handling and thus no corresponding RAN2 impact.**

**Question 1: Do companies agree with O1 and O2, i.e. there is no RAN2 impact (except PLMN list broadcasted in RAN) to support authorization/security procedure/PLMN selection in case of Remote UE register a different PLMN from Relay UE’s PLMN?**

If companies provide answer no, please indicate what explicit RAN2 impact would be in the comment column.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | Response to Ericsson, Nokia and Lenovo comment:The question (Q1) itself has already indicated the PLMN list broadcasted in RAN. From security perspective, we did not see the difference between RAN sharing and non-RAN sharing case. RAN2 coordinated with SA3 on the security issue before. SA3 had a SI on ProSe security (SID in SP-200350) and generated TR 33.847, which endorses solution #14 reusing the security mechanism from TS 33.501, and have been doing normative work in TS 33.503. TR 33.847 was only finalized in SA#94-e, and TS 33.503 is still in draft status. I looked at the SA documents and there was an exception approved for the 5G ProSe security WI (SP-211355), with the incomplete work task being security for L3 relay. TS 33.503 says very little about security for L2 relay, but it does say “During the connection establishment, the Remote UE and NG-RAN node shall establish AS security as specified in TS 33.501”, which clearly means that AS security has been taken into account. We do not think RAN2 need to remind the other WG to do their specific work in their regime. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Regarding the explicit RAN2 impact raised by Ericsson, Lenovo and Nokia:For the PLMN list forwarding impact, we have already agreed the cellAccessRelatedInfo (including PLMN list) forwarding in discovery message in non-RAN sharing case, which means there is no additional RAN impact from PLMN list;For the security issue, as rapp and Qualcomm analysed, there is no per PLMN specific procedure or requirement of security defined for RAN sharing or non-RAN sharing case, which means no additional security issue for RAN-sharing case.For the issue on whether SA2 supports RAN-sharing case, the LS from SA2 in last RAN2 meeting (R2-2111236) already indicates that SA2 supports the RAN-sharing case.(“ SA2 has assumed 5G MOCN architecture is supported for 5G ProSe Layer-2 UE-to-Network Relay as described in clause 4.2.7.2 of TS 23.304,…”) |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | We cannot claim that there is no RAN impact since the list of PLMN needs to be broadcasted. Also, we are not sure if there are no security problem from a procedural point of view since SA3 has not been consulted on this. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | For the security concern raised by Ericsson, we think its impacts in RAN sharing and non-RAN sharing case should be same. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | No | Agree with Ericsson in at least that up to 12 PLMNs (and allied info) needs to be provided by relay to remote. |
| Nokia | No | There are RAN2 impacts (see answers to other questions), and we do not agree with O1 and O2 as it is in the scope of SA2 to decide if 23.304 supports this case |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |

### 3.1.2 Relay and Remote UE’s PDU session Setup towards different PLMN

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R2-2200552 MediaTek Inc., CATT, OPPO, Qualcomm Incorporated, ZTE, Huawei, HiSilicon, Apple, InterDigital | We think that Relay UE and Remote UE perform the PDU session establishment independently. Relay UE is only responsible to bridge the communication between the Remote UE and the gNB, and then Remote UE should establish the PDU session with its selected 5GC via legacy procedure. Such NAS layer procedure (i.e. PDU session establishment) is managed by SA2/CT1. |
| R2-2201158 Ericsson | How is the Relay UE expected to set up PDU session towards a PLMN that is different from its RPLMN? The Remote UE’s choice of PLMN can’t dictate the Relay UEs PLMN selection. |

As clarified in R2-2200552, the Relay UE and Remote UE have its own NAS connection and PDU sessions. The PDU session setup for Relay UE and Remote UE are indecently and supported by existing procedures. No special impact in both RAN2 and SA2 is foreseen.

**Question 2: Do companies agree that there is no RAN2 impact to allow Relay and Remote UE’s PDU session Setup towards different PLMNs based on existing PDU session management procedures?**

If companies provide answer no, please indicate what explicit RAN2 impact would be in the comment column.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | 1. Response to Ericsson comment:

Since SA2 has already sent an LS indicating that from their perspective RAN sharing is supported, then RAN2 should not assume that SA2 has not discussed the impact on PDU session setup. As described in TR 23.752, the SA2’s endorsed solution #7 describes that, the remote UE establishes its own PDU session and there is no mention of the relay UE needing to establish a second PDU session. (Step 7 in section 6.7.3 specifically addresses how the remote UE communicates with its own AMF.) So then this issue was discussed during the SI phase at SA2. In detail of the procedure of SA2, the Remote UE has its own PDU Sessions between itself and its UPF. The L2 U2N Relay does NOT maintain the PDU Sessions of the Remote UE – it’s up to the Remote UE to do that. We agree with Qualcomm on that it will be strange if RAN2 send LS back to SA2 to request them to work on NAS signalling on PDU session issue.1. Response to Nokia comment:

Since the discussion of PDU session is in the scope of SA2, we do not think there is additional RAN2 impact. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Regarding the explicit RAN2 impact raised by Ericsson:We fail to see the issue on “relay UE has to maintain two different PDU sessions”, since Relay UE and Remote UE have its own NAS connection and PDU sessions, and the signalling is NAS signalling, which is transparent to relay UE, i.e., Relay UE is no aware of the PDU session of the remote UE. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | Regarding the PDU session setup, our view is that there are additional requirement for the relay UE that needs to maintain two different PDU sessions, one for itself, and one for the remote UE. According to this, we are not sure is SA2 already has the signalling support for this case. Maybe is good to send an LS and check with them.Even if this is over NAS and thus in the SA domain, also some RAN procedure are impacted and is good to check if something is needed from our side. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Our understanding is that SA2 has discussed the impact on PDU session setup. Even if any signalling impact, it is not AS signalling and so SA2 should work it. Because this RAN sharing study was triggered by SA2 LS, it will be strange if RAN2 send LS back to SA2 to request them to work on NAS signalling.. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | Still it would be sensible to check with other groups as Ericsson suggested |
| Nokia | No | PDU session management is not in the scope of RAN2, but as Ericsson commented RAN2 impacts should be checked |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |

## 3.2 RAN2 aspects

### 3.2.1 Access control (including UAC parameters), TAC, Cell Identity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R2-2200552 MediaTek Inc., CATT, OPPO, Qualcomm Incorporated, ZTE, Huawei, HiSilicon, Apple, InterDigital | The current UAC-based cell barring mechanism is designed based on PLMNs. In SIB1, the parameter uac-BarringPerPLMN-List is defined within the uac-BarringInfo. The IE UAC-BarringPerPLMN-List provides access category specific access control parameters, which are configured per PLMN/SNPNIt should be noted that, as agreed by RAN2 before, legacy UAC mechanism would be reused for L2 relay operation, i.e. the U2N Remote UE performs unified access control as defined in TS 38.331. The U2N Relay UE in RRC\_CONNECTED does not perform UAC for U2N Remote UE’s data. The legacy UAC has already supported the case of RAN sharing.The same analysis can apply to TAC and cell ID.  |
| R2-2200946 Nokia Shanghai Bell | The basic issue is the resources of which PLMNs are used by the radio bearers used for relayed traffic, as in shared cells a gNB may enforce PLMN specific resource limitations. Those bearers may be simply considered Uu bearers of the relay UE, and thus they may be considered to use the resources of the PLMN of the relay UE. When a new session is created for a remote UE, the access control (UAC) is performed by the remote UE based on the UAC parameters of the PLMN of the remote UE, and this may lead to inconsistent behaviour. If these radio bearers are considered to use the radio resources of the PLMN of the remote UE then multiplexing of traffic from different remote UEs can be a problem.  |
| R2-2201158 | o UAC, TAC and cell ID are parameters that can be PLMN specific, so it needs to be sorted out which ones are going to be used when relay UE establish a connection |

As clarified in R2-2200552, in Uu the UAC parameters, TAC, Cell Identity are provided per-PLMN in SIB1. By supporting SIB forwarding including SIB1, the per-PLMN parameters are already available to Remote UE from signalling point of view. Then similar as the discussion on authorization, the Relay UE is assumed to advertise the configuration of PLMNs supported by its serving cell. Thus the Relay UE should forwards the existing parameters in SIB1 without sorting or filtering according to its registered PLMN. No RAN2 impact foreseen to obtain Remote UE’s UAC parameters, TAC, Cell Identity and other per PLMN parameters in SIB on top of the SIB request/forwarding.

**Question 3: Do companies agree that there is no extra RAN2 impact to provide per-PLMN parameters in SIB including UAC parameters, TAU, Cell Identity to the Remote UE on top of SIB request/forwarding procedures?**

If companies provide answer no, please indicate what explicit RAN2 impact would be in the comment column.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | 1. Response to Ericsson comment:

In case of RAN sharing, the SIB1 should be common to all of PLMNs. It is not correct to say there is different SIB1 for each PLMN. The relay selection and reselection procedure is not impacted since the remote UE does not need to the know the selected PLMN of Relay UE. The selection of PLMN by Remote UE should be transparent to Relay UE, since this is out of Relay UE’s responsibility. In practice, the PLMN serving the Remote UE may be different from the one serving the Relay UE. Secondly, we do not think the relay UE needs to know in advance which PLMN the remote UE wants to connect. We agree with Qualcomm on that relay UE will forward *cellAccessInfo* from SIB1 to Remote UE in discovery message, which provides all the required per-PLMN information if any. The selection of PLMN by the Remote UE need not to interact with Relay UE.Thirdly, it is not correct to say different PLMN have different SIBs in case of RAN sharing. All of the SIBs should be common. There is no mapping between SIBs and PLMNs. 1. Response to Nokia comment:

We did not see any reason for the remote UE to inform the relay UE about the selected PLMN. The current UAC-based cell barring mechanism is designed based on PLMNs. In SIB1, the parameter uac-BarringPerPLMN-List is defined within the uac-BarringInfo. The IE UAC-BarringPerPLMN-List provides access category specific access control parameters, which are configured per PLMN/SNPN as below: UAC-BarringPerPLMN ::= SEQUENCE { plmn-IdentityIndex INTEGER (1..maxPLMN), uac-ACBarringListType CHOICE{ uac-ImplicitACBarringList SEQUENCE (SIZE(maxAccessCat-1)) OF UAC-BarringInfoSetIndex, uac-ExplicitACBarringList UAC-BarringPerCatList } OPTIONAL -- Need S}In case of RAN sharing, we can expect that more UAC-BarringPerPLMN may be added depending on the number of PLMNs supported by RAN sharing. However, we do not see the spec impact as the current value for maxPLMN (i.e. 12) as defined for one cell has already considered the case of RAN sharing.It should be noted that, as agreed by RAN2 before, legacy UAC mechanism would be reused for L2 relay operation, i.e. the U2N Remote UE performs unified access control as defined in TS 38.331. The U2N Relay UE in RRC\_CONNECTED does not perform UAC for U2N Remote UE’s data. The legacy UAC has already supported the case of RAN sharing. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Regarding the explicit RAN2 impact raised by Ericsson:We fail to understand the issue on “This basically means that the relay UE should monitor and acquire the SIB1 by two different PLMNs at the same time” since there is no per-PLMN SIB1 but per-PLMN parameters in the single SIB1. The relay UE can forward the whole SIB1 to remote UE and doesn’t need to know which parameter will be used by remote UE.For the other issues:* The relay (re)selection considering PLMN aspect, we think for both RAN-sharing and non-sharing cases, the PLMN should be considered by remote UE, which is already a RAN2 conclusion;
* For the issue on relay UE needs to know the PLMN of the remote UE, we fail to see the need, since as we explained before, relay UE is transparent to remote UE’s NAS message.
* For the same reason, the relay UE doesn’t need to maintain the mapping between remote UE and PLMN to which there are connected.
 |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | As already clear, some parameter can be PLMN-specific. This basically means that the relay UE should monitor and acquire the SIB1 by two different PLMNs at the same time.Given this, with the current signalling the relay UE may indeed forward the SIB1 to the remote UE but there is no indication to which PLMN the SIB1 that is delivered belong to. On top of this, we also see the following issues regarding this case and all of them have impact in RAN: * The relay selection and reselection procedure is impacted since the remote UE needs to know to which PLMNs the relay UE can connect.
* The relay UE needs to know in advance which PLMN the remote UE wants to connect, and this info should be implemented either in the discovery message or PC5-RRC is the PC5 connection is already existing or established before the relay connection.
* Relay UE needs to keep a mapping between remote UE and PLMN to which there are connected. This basically means that the relay UE needs to acquire constantly SIBs from different PLMNs and forwards those SIBs to the right remote UE.
 |
| Sony | Yes | Broadcast of these parameters will be RAN2 impact. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | Our understanding is that relay UE will forward *cellAccessInfo* from SIB1to Remote UE in discovery message, which as provided all the required per-PLMN information. The, the Remote UE should choose the one to use based on its needs. That being said, relay UE just send unchanged IE in Uu SIB1 in discovery, and it doesn’t need to keep a mapping for remote UE on its PLMN. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | We think one (first) PLMN of the relay UE’s serving cell can be provided to the remote UE as part of Relay UE’s discovery message. The remaining PLMNs can be provided afterwards, assuming the Discovery message itself does not have space to accommodate information for all (up to) 12 PLMNs – this needs to be verified though. |
| Nokia | No | We think that it is too early to make the decision without RAN2 discussion. RAN2 should also specify the use of some of the parameters (e.g., UAC parameters). RAN2 should also investigate e.g., if the remote UE should inform the relay UE about the selected PLMN.  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |

### 3.2.2 Uu radio resources and PC5 Radio Resources allocation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R2-2200946 Nokia Shanghai Bell | The basic issue is the resources of which PLMNs are used by the radio bearers used for relayed traffic, as in shared cells a gNB may enforce PLMN specific resource limitations. Those bearers may be simply considered Uu bearers of the relay UE, and thus they may be considered to use the resources of the PLMN of the relay UE. When a new session is created for a remote UE, the access control (UAC) is performed by the remote UE based on the UAC parameters of the PLMN of the remote UE, and this may lead to inconsistent behaviour. If these radio bearers are considered to use the radio resources of the PLMN of the remote UE then multiplexing of traffic from different remote UEs can be a problem.The remote UE and relay UE use PC5 resource allocation based on the parameters that are provided by different PLMNs. The PC5 resource coordination among PLMNs has not been standardized and there is no intention to standardize it. Therefore, from standardization perspective this is not an issue, but there may be deployment issues that operators of shared cells should considered. |

For radio resource management, in general there is no spec restriction on per-PLMN radio resource usage for RAN sharing/MOCN scenario (which literally means the gNB and the carrier are shared by operators), but it is allowed to perform per-PLMN configuration by network implementation if needed. Then in L2 U2N relay operation, the gNB is aware of the selected PLMN of Relay UE and Remote UE from msg5 and the Uu bearer/PC5 bearer carrying Remote UE’s service as well as the bearer mapping at Relay UE are configured by the gNB, the gNB is still able to provide per-PLMN configuration, e.g. some Uu RLC bearers can be PLMN exclusive (i.e. not shared with other PLMN’s traffic).

**Question 4: Do companies agree that there is no need to specify new RAN2 solutions to provide PLMN specific Uu and PC5 radio resource configuration for L2 U2N Relay operation?**

If companies provide answer no, please indicate what RAN2 solution/impact would be in the comment column.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | Response to vivo, Ericsson and Nokia comment:The PLMN specific Uu and PC5 radio resource configuration is a common issue for relaying case and non-relaying case. It is an common issue for both sidelink communication and non-sidelink based communication. From air interface perspective, we agree with Qualcomm on that it is up to network implementation to align radio resources among different PLMNs in legacy system. For RAN sharing, the specs did not specify the radio resources configurations coordination among different PLMNs. From PC5 interface perspective, we do not think the SL discovery introduce anything new comparing to sidelink communication for resource allocation in case of RAN sharing. The current resource pools for SL communication doesn’t differentiate PLMN. We do not need to assume the requirement to have PLMN specific PC5 resource pools configuration for SL communication/SL discovery in case of RAN sharing. It should be noted that RAN2 never provided per-PLMN configuration. Per-PLMN issue is not a RAN2 issue. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | For the issue raised by vivo and Ericsson, we have same understanding as Qualcomm and Samsung that the same principle in legacy Uu and general SL should be applied here, i.e., rely on NW implementation to align the resource, which means there is no RAN2 impact for this. (And we are also fine to have no PLMN-specific PC5 resource coordination if that is the intention of opponent) |
| vivo | Yes with comments | We think enabling provision of PLMN specific Uu and PC5 radio resource configuration for L2 U2N Relay operation does have some RAN2 impact. For example, at least in SIB12 PLMN specific Uu and PC5 radio resource configuration need to be introduced for SL discovery for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs. This also means that for RAN sharing scenario shared resource pools for SL discovery and communication is not allowed since the resource pools for SL communication doesn’t differentiate PLMN.To avoid the above RAN2 impacts, some clarifications are needed as below:1. For RAN sharing, whether our intention is just not specify any RAN2 solution to provide PLMN specific Uu and PC5 radio resource configuration for L2 U2N Relay operation, instead of deny the potential RAN2 impacts.

2) If 1) is the common understanding, RAN2 to clarify that we rely on some NW implementation/co-ordinations to align the Uu and PC5 radio resource configuration among different PLMNs. |
| Ericsson | No | We agree with vivo understanding that per-PLMN configuration it has an impact for RAN2. E.g., forwarding SIB needs also to differentiate to which PLMN the SIBs belong to.Also, as also vivo clarified for RAN sharing scenario shared resource pools for SL discovery and communication is not allowed since the resource pools for SL communication doesn’t differentiate PLMN.This requires additional work in RAN2. |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We are confused by vivo’s comments. Isn’t the same principle in legacy Uu that it is up to NW implementation to align radio resource among different PLMNs? If Yes (i.e. RAN sharing in L2 relay follows the same principle of legacy Uu), why do RAN2 need to clarify it is same as legacy Uu?  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Isn’t the situation commented by vivo new due to SL discovery? We understand it happens in normal SL communication where the resources are used for RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE UEs without any additional specification related to PLMN. |
| Lenovo | Yes | We agree that there is no need. The radio resource allocation should be oblivious of the PLMN the remote UE chooses to register to – this is the RAN sharing concept, we believe. |
| Nokia | Comment | RAN2 can decide not to have any PLMN specific PC5 configurations, but it requires that the operators sharing the RAN also share and coordinate the PC5 resources. It will be very difficult (may be impossible) to introduce any PLMN specific resource allocation on PC5 in the future after this decision. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |

### 3.2.3 Mobility

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R2-2200552 MediaTek Inc., CATT, OPPO, Qualcomm Incorporated, ZTE, Huawei, HiSilicon, Apple, InterDigital | For idle mode based mobility, Remote UE and Relay UE operate independently for both non-RAN sharing and RAN sharing scenarios, where Remote UE and Relay UE may have different RPLMNs. In case of RAN sharing, for connected mode based mobility for Relay UE, it follows the legacy behavior; for connected mode based mobility for Remote UE, there is no PLMN change during service continuity, which is true for both indirect-direct and direct-indirect path switch.  |
| R2-2200946 Nokia Shanghai Bell | Path swich between the direct and indirect paths may means "inter-PLMN path switch", and therefore it requires additional investigations if this has any specification impacts. |

As analysed in R2-2200552, the path switch from direct to indirect or from indirect to direct is controlled by gNB and restricted to intra-gNB case, Remote UE’s PLMN won’t change during such procedures. Thus no RAN sharing specific impact needs to be considered.

**Question 5: Do companies agree that there is no RAN sharing specific impact needs to be considered by RAN2 for L2 U2N mobility?**

If companies provide answer no, please indicate what RAN2 impact would be in the comment column.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | 1. Response to Ericsson comment:

For service continuity discussion, so far there is no decision on which relay UE’s cell ID should be reported by Remote UE. If NCGI is included in measurement report as relay UE’s cell ID, there will be PLMN information. Then I think Ericsson comment (*when the remote UE reports the relay UEs to the gNB, there is no PLMN information related to each relay UE*) is a misunderstanding.1. Response to Sony comment:

Regarding “A relay UE may relay the traffic from a subset of RAN sharing PLMNs of the cell”, in case of RAN sharing, during Relay discovery, the remote UE should select the suitable Relay UE according to the criteria in both AS layer and upper layer. And the Relay discovery message has already included the PLMN information. This applies to both general relay selection and direct-to-indirect oriented relay selection. 1. Response to Nokia comment:

Regarding “the case when relay UE moves from a share to a non-shared cell should be investigated”, we think this is a common issue that applies to both Relay UE and normal UE. In legacy system supporting RAN sharing, this was specified. Then we do not think we need specify it in the context of sidelink relaying. Regarding “In some cases, the gNB may also need to consider the PLMNs of the remote UEs connected to a relay UE, and this may require that relay UE sends PLMN information about remote UEs to the gNB.” , we think Remote UE can simply follow the legacy normal UE behaviour. We did not see the usage or the benefit for Relay UE to forward the Remote UE’s PLMN to gNB.  |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | For the direct to indirect mobility issue raised by Ericsson:Besides the explanation from Qualcomm, for RRC CONNECTED relay UE, gNB can handle the PLMN-specific part by using NCGI; for IDLE/INACTIVE relay UE, firstly whether it is supported is uncertain, then if it is supported, the IDLE/INACTIVE relay UE camped to the cell after its PLMN selection, which means the PLMN which relay UE belongs is supported in the cell. Therefore, no issue identified. |
| vivo | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | No | For path swich from direct to indirect there is an issue. The issue is that when the remote UE reports all the relay UE to the gNB, the gNB may select a relay UE that belongs to a different PLMN without really knowing it. This is because when the remote UE reports the relay UEs to the gNB, there is no PLMN information related to each relay UE. This information is currently missing from the current signalling and has an additional RAN2 impact. |
| Sony | No | A relay UE may relay the traffic from a subset of RAN sharing PLMNs of the cell and direct to indirect path switch will have RAN2 impacts. But we think these impacts are not large.  |
| Qualcomm  | Yes | For Ericsson raised issue, RAN2 was discussing to include NCGI (i.e. PLMN ID + CGI) of serving cell of relay UE in measurement report if RAN sharing is supported. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes | Same understanding as Qualcomm |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Nokia | No | We are not aware of any requirements that all cells of a gNB shall be shared by the same operators. Therefore, the case when relay UE moves from a share to a non-shared cell should be investigated. In some cases, the gNB may also need to consider the PLMNs of the remote UEs connected to a relay UE, and this may require that relay UE sends PLMN information about remote UEs to the gNB. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |

### 3.2.4 Stage 3 signalling of PLMN list broadcasting

Related to the “WA: cellAccessRelatedInfo from SIB1 is forwarded before PC5-RRC connection. FFS the exact signalling.” made in RAN2 #116 meeting, the contributions below give proposals on how to signal the PLMN list in cellAccessRelatedInfo.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R2-2200173 Qualcomm Incorporated | Proposal 9: Confirm the WA that cellAccessRelatedInfo from SIB1 is forwarded before PC5-RRC connection, no matter whether RAN sharing is supported or not in L2 relayProposal 10: cellAccessRelatedInfo from SIB1 is included in a RRC container of primary discovery message (i.e., not in “Relay Discovery Additional Information”) |
| R2-2200372 OPPO | Proposal 1 If the WA on cellAccessRelatedInfo forwarding before PC5-RRC connection is confirmed, RRC container in discovery is used to carry the SI before PC5-RRC connection. |
| R2-2200475 vivo | Proposal 9: RAN2 to discuss which option is preferred to include PLMN ID list in discovery message.* Option 1: an RRC container, which may reuse plmn-IdentityInfoList included in cellAccessRelatedInfo;
* Option 2: an additional IE explicitly included in Relay Discovery Additional Information.

Proposal 10: Send an LS to SA2, if any option is agreed in Proposal 9. |
| R2-2200166 CATT | Proposal 3: RAN2 confirms cellAccessRelatedInfo from SIB1 is forwarded before PC5-RRC connection establishment.Proposal 4: Relay forwards cellAccessRelatedInfo from SIB1 to the remote UE by discovery message.Proposal 5: RAN2 sends LS to SA2 to inform that cellAccessRelatedInfo should be included in the discovery message from relay UE to remote UE.  |

All the proposals suggest to confirm the WA of forwarding cellAccessRelatedInfo from SIB1 for RAN sharing case (if supported) by discovery message. R2-2200173 and R2-2200372 propose RRC container to include the information, while R2-2200475 is open to RRC container or explicit IE. R2-2200173 propose primary discovery message, while R2-2200475 also consider additional discovery message. As the similar discussion is on-going for non-RAN sharing case, the same signalling design could apply to this RAN sharing case if RAN2 can conclude to support.

**Question 6: Do companies agree that cellAccessRelatedInfo from SIB1 is forwarded before PC5-RRC connection for RAN sharing case (if supported)? The same signalling design agreed for non-RAN sharing case should apply to this RAN sharing case?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| InterDigital | Yes | We can confirm the working assumption. |
| MediaTek | Yes | We can confirm the working assumption. |
| CATT | Yes | We can confirm the working assumption. |
| OPPO | Yes |  |
| vivo | Partially Yes | But for non-RAN sharing case, we do not see the motivation to forward *cellAccessRelatedInfo* from SIB1 before PC5-RRC connection. |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | Assuming Discovery can contain info for up to 12 PLMNs |
| Nokia | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |

## 3.3 Other aspects

### 3.3.1 Use of PLMN specific features

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R2-2200946 Nokia Shanghai Bell | There can be PLMN specific features that may only be used in the shared cell by UEs connected to certain PLMN. The issue in this case is which PLMN should be considered by the remote UE: its own PLMN or the PLMN of the relay UE or both. |

In L2 U2N relay operation, Remote UE can establish its own NAS connection and RRC connection via Relay UE, and the existing NAS procedure and RRC procedures are supported in legacy way. It should not be a problem if network wants to provide PLMN specific configuration to enable some features in legacy way.

**Question 7: Do companies agree that the PLMN specific configuration/handing (if any) can be left to network implementation, thus no new RAN2 solutions need to be specified for RAN sharing support in L2 U2N relay operation?**

If companies provide answer no, please indicate what the RAN2 solution/impact would be in the comment column.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | Response to Ericsson comment:PLMN-specific configuration discussion is a common issue for normal UE, instead of Relay UE and Remote UE. if 3GPP later on wants to provide PLMN-specific configuration, the first discussion should be on normal UE. We already clarified our understanding for the mobility case and the delivery of the SIB in our reply to Q1-Q5.Response to Nokia comment:Regarding the support of “emergency services”, we think this is not a RAN2 discussion. Service level support discussion should be at SA/CT WG. It would be very strange for RAN2 judge the issue that is in scope of other WG. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Agree with Qualcomm, i.e., leaving the per-PLMN configuration/resource/handling to NW implementation is just follow the legacy Uu/general SL principle (we are also fine with no PLMN-specific PC5 resource configuration if that is the intention of opponents). |
| vivo | Yes | Similar comments as replied in **Question 4.** |
| Ericsson | No | We cannot rely entirely to the network implementation, and we need anyway to implement the signalling if the network wants to provide PLMN-specific configuration. Also, we see there is also some impact on the relay UE and remote UE, mostly regarding the mobility case and the delivery of the SIB. |
| Sony | Yes | Similar comment as Q5 |
| Qualcomm | Yes | For PLMN specific configuration, our understanding is that it follows legacy Uu principle to leave to NW implementation for the shared radio resource among different PLMNs.For mobility, we think the serving cell ID of relay UE in measurement report is NCGI.For SIB, we think the current WA on cellAccessInfo should be sufficient. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes |  |
| Nokia | No | In some cases it may be OK, but e.g., emergency services cannot be left to network implementation. RAN2 shall not make a decision that makes difficult to support of emergency services in the next release. It requires further RAN2 discussion to clarify these aspects. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |

## 3.4 RAN sharing in RAN2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| R2-2200166 CATT | Since RAN sharing has been supported in Rel-15, the effects due to RAN sharing mainly in the core network, such as remote UE’s PLMN selection and authorizations. Therefore, it is unnecessary to exclude RAN sharing for L2 U2N relay in Rel-17 from RAN2’s perspective.Proposal 2: It is unnecessary to exclude RAN sharing from RAN2 perspective. |

Based on the discussion on RAN2 spec impact, it would also be helpful to collect company views on whether RAN sharing can/should be supported in L2 U2N relay operation from RAN2 point of view.

**Question 8: Whether RAN sharing can be supported in L2 U2N relay operation from RAN2 point of view?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No | Comments |
| InterDigital | Yes |  |
| MediaTek | Yes | We propose the following summary for RAN sharing discussion: RAN2 can have basic support of RAN sharing for L2 relays in Rel-17, without additional RAN2 spec impact beyond delivery of the PLMN list to the remote UE. Our summary and the response to Ericsson and Nokia comment is as below:**Security**From security perspective, we did not see the difference between RAN sharing and non-RAN sharing case. RAN2 coordinated with SA3 on the security issue before. SA3 had a SI on ProSe security (SID in SP-200350) and generated TR 33.847, which endorses solution #14 reusing the security mechanism from TS 33.501, and have been doing normative work in TS 33.503. We do not think RAN2 need to remind the other WG to do their specific work in their regime.**PDU session**Since SA2 has already sent an LS indicating that from their perspective RAN sharing is supported, then RAN2 should not assume that SA2 has not discussed the impact on PDU session setup. As described in TR 23.752, the SA2’s endorsed solution #7 describes that, the remote UE establishes its own PDU session and there is no mention of the relay UE needing to establish a second PDU session. So then this issue was sufficiently discussed during the SI phase at SA2. it will be strange if RAN2 send LS back to SA2 to request them to work on NAS signalling on PDU session issue.**PLMN specific configuration (including SIB) and relay selection and reselection**In case of RAN sharing, the SIB1 and other SIB should be common to all of PLMNs. It is not correct to say there is different SIB1/SIB for each PLMN. The relay selection and reselection procedure is not impacted since the remote UE does not need to the know the selected PLMN of Relay UE. The selection of PLMN by Remote UE should be transparent to Relay UE, since this is out of Relay UE’s responsibility. In practice, the PLMN serving the Remote UE may be different from the one serving the Relay UE. Secondly, we do not think the relay UE needs to know in advance which PLMN the remote UE wants to connect. We agree with Qualcomm on that relay UE will forward *cellAccessInfo* from SIB1 to Remote UE in discovery message, which provides all the required per-PLMN information if any. The selection of PLMN by the Remote UE need not to interact with Relay UE. We did not see any reason or any usage for the remote UE to inform the relay UE about the selected PLMN.Thirdly, it is not correct to say different PLMN have different SIBs in case of RAN sharing. All of the SIBs should be common. There is no such mapping between SIBs and PLMNs. PLMN-specific configuration discussion is a common issue for normal UE, instead of Relay UE and Remote UE. if 3GPP later on wants to provide PLMN-specific configuration, the first discussion should be on normal UE.**UAC issue** The current UAC-based cell barring mechanism is designed based on PLMNs. In SIB1, the parameter uac-BarringPerPLMN-List is defined within the uac-BarringInfo. The IE UAC-BarringPerPLMN-List provides access category specific access control parameters, which are configured per PLMN/SNPN. In case of RAN sharing, we can expect that more UAC-BarringPerPLMN may be added depending on the number of PLMNs supported by RAN sharing. However, we do not see the spec impact as the current value for maxPLMN (i.e. 12) as defined for one cell has already considered the case of RAN sharing. It should be noted that, as agreed by RAN2 before, legacy UAC mechanism would be reused for L2 relay operation, i.e. the U2N Remote UE performs unified access control as defined in TS 38.331. The U2N Relay UE in RRC\_CONNECTED does not perform UAC for U2N Remote UE’s data. The legacy UAC has already supported the case of RAN sharing.**PLMN specific Uu and PC5 radio resource configuration**The PLMN specific Uu and PC5 radio resource configuration is a common issue for relaying case and non-relaying case. It is an common issue for both sidelink communication and non-sidelink based communication. From air interface perspective, we agree with Qualcomm on that it is up to network implementation to align radio resources among different PLMNs in legacy system. For RAN sharing, the specs did not specify the radio resources configurations coordination among different PLMNs. From PC5 interface perspective, we do not think the SL discovery introduce anything new comparing to sidelink communication for resource allocation in case of RAN sharing. The current resource pools for SL communication doesn’t differentiate PLMN. We do not need to assume the requirement to have PLMN specific PC5 resource pools configuration for SL communication/SL discovery in case of RAN sharing. It should be noted that RAN2 never provided per-PLMN configuration. Per-PLMN issue is not a RAN2 issue.**Mobility/service continuity/path switch issue**For service continuity discussion, so far there is no decision on which relay UE’s cell ID should be reported by Remote UE. However, if NCGI is agreed to be included in measurement report as relay UE’s cell ID, there will be PLMN information. Then I think Ericsson comment (*when the remote UE reports the relay UEs to the gNB, there is no PLMN information related to each relay UE*) is a misunderstanding.Regarding “A relay UE may relay the traffic from a subset of RAN sharing PLMNs of the cell” from Sony, in case of RAN sharing, during Relay discovery, the remote UE should select the suitable Relay UE according to the criteria in both AS layer and upper layer. And the Relay discovery message has already included the PLMN information. This applies to both general relay selection and direct-to-indirect oriented relay selection. Regarding “the case when relay UE moves from a share to a non-shared cell should be investigated” as raised by Nokia, we think this is a common issue that applies to both Relay UE and normal UE. In legacy system supporting RAN sharing, this was specified. Then we do not think we need specify it in the context of sidelink relaying. Regarding “In some cases, the gNB may also need to consider the PLMNs of the remote UEs connected to a relay UE, and this may require that relay UE sends PLMN information about remote UEs to the gNB.” as raised by Nokia , we think Remote UE can simply follow the legacy normal UE behaviour. We did not see the usage or the benefit for Relay UE to forward the Remote UE’s PLMN to gNBRegarding the support of “emergency services” as raised by Nokia, we think this is not a RAN2 discussion. Service level support discussion should be at SA/CT WG. It would be very strange for RAN2 judge the issue that is in scope of other WG. **Paging in case of MultiSIM for SL relay**We see this is not in the scope of SL relay WI. It is not clear if this is really a discussion for RAN sharing. |
| CATT | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | As our replied to all the above Qs, we think RAN sharing can be supported in L2 U2N relay operation from RAN2 point. |
| vivo | Yes | The detailed wording can be further discussed in the LS draft. |
| Ericsson | No | As stated in the previous comment, we cannot claim that supporting RAN sharing it has no RAN2 impact (that was also the conclusion of the discussion from RAN plenary).There are aspects where RAN2 needs to discuss and decide how to proceed. In particular:* The relay selection and reselection procedure is impacted since the remote UE needs to know to which PLMNs the relay UE can connect.
* The relay UE needs to know in advance which PLMN the remote UE wants to connect, and this info should be implemented either in the discovery message or PC5-RRC is the PC5 connection is already existing or established before the relay connection.
* Relay UE needs to keep a mapping between remote UE and PLMN to which there are connected. This basically means that the relay UE needs to acquire constantly SIBs from different PLMNs and forwards those SIBs to the right remote UE.
* For remote UE that triggers relay selection and reselection there will be an additional criteria to consider also the PLMN to which the relay UE is connected. For the moment there is no such criteria even if the remote UE needs to consider this information.
* For path swich from direct to indirect there is an issue. The issue is that when the remote UE reports all the relay UE to the gNB, the gNB may select a relay UE that belongs to a different PLMN without really knowing it (inter-PLMN mobility). This is because when the remote UE reports the relay UEs to the gNB, there is no PLMN information related to each relay UE. This information is currently missing from the current signalling and has an additional RAN2 impact.
* A further issue is regarding the handling of the paging. We know that the MultiSim WI is trying to solve this issue but we needs to check if the multiSim principles apply without any changes also to the case of SL relay. In our understanding if we want to support multiSIM for SL relay additional work in RAN2 is needed.
 |
| Sony | Yes |  |
| Qualcomm  | Yes | We don’t think supporting MUSIM in L2 relay is in Rel-17 scope. |
| ZTE | Yes |  |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Lenovo | Yes | PLMNs broadcasted by the serving cell of a potential relay can be used by the remote UE as a relay selection criterion. This means that remote will select a relay that is served by a RAN-shared cell leading it to H/ E-PLMN. Thereafter, the relay is just a mean to reach the remote UE to the network and we do not see any further impact. |
| Nokia | No | It is possible, but it requires additional time allocation from RAN plenary  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| LG | Yes |  |

If consensus can be achieved on above aspects, the LS could be sent to SA2 with the RAN2 agreements.

# 4 Conclusion

TBD
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