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# Introduction

[101-e-NR-5G\_V2X\_NRSL-QoS-01] Email approval of the TP regarding treatment of resources reserved, but not used due to HARQ feedback and/or pre-emption by 5/28 – Torsten (Nokia)

This email thread includes the following issue:

* Issue 1.2: CR – treatment of resources reserved, but not used due to HARQ feedback and/or pre-emption

# Second round

## Summary of views expressed in first round

Regarding Q1, there is a slight majority in favour of changing TS 38.215 such that future granted resources which have been released due to HARQ feedback are not counted in the evaluation of CR:

* Yes: Futurewei, Apple, Intel, Samsung, Ericsson, ZTE/Sanechips, CATT (7)
* No: Nokia/NSB, OPPO, vivo, Huawei/HiSilicon, LGE (5)

Regarding Q2, only a few companies have expressed the view that further clarification is needed.

## Next step

Regarding Q1, on reviewing TS 38.321, I find that the behaviour for releasing resources due to HARQ feedback is already specified explicitly:

|  |
| --- |
| 5.22.1.1 SL Grant reception and SCI transmission…If the MAC entity has been configured by RRC to transmit using pool(s) of resources in a carrier as indicated in TS 38.331 [5] or TS 36.331 [21] based on sensing or random selection, the MAC entity shall for each Sidelink process:…1> if a configured sidelink grant is available for retransmission(s) of a MAC PDU which has been positively acknowledged as specified in clause 5.22.1.3.3:2> clear the PSCCH duration(s) and PSSCH duration(s) corresponding to retransmission(s) of the MAC PDU from the configured sidelink grant. |

My understanding is that the only plausible interpretation of the term “granted” in the definition of CR in TS 38.215 is with reference to TS 38.321’s configured sidelink grant, since there is no other definition of “grant” or “granted” in current specifications that could be applicable.

It then follows that if resources - PSSCH duration(s) - are cleared from the configured sidelink grant then they are no longer “granted” in the sense of TS 38.215.

Hence a change to TS 38.215 is not required to achieve the behaviour preferred by the majority of companies. However, we can consider adding a note in TS 38.215 to state explicitly that “granted” refers to the configured sidelink grant of TS 38.321. An example TP is shown below the table.

**Proposed conclusion:**

**Future granted resources which have been released due to HARQ feedback are not counted in the evaluation of CR.**

## Company views – Second round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **A: Do you agree with the above interpretation of 38.215 and 38.321 and the proposed conclusion?****B: Do you think that a note explaining “granted” should be added to 38.215?** |
| Nokia, NSB | A: Yes. 38.215 and 38.321 are clear that future retransmission resources released due to HARQ feedback are not counted in CR evaluation. B: OK to add a note to 215 for the avoidance of doubt, even though it is not strictly necessary. |
| LG Electronics | A: It seems that FL’s interpretation is correct. On the other hands, we are not technically convinced why there would be no penalty for TX UE to reserve retransmission resources but release those resources after receiving ACK. This is because such resources could not be used by other UEs in the system. B: No. Even though RAN1 agree that future granted resources which have been released due to HARQ feedback are not counted in the evaluation of CR, we think that additional clarification on TS 38.215 is not necessary. |
| OPPO | Same as Nokia. |
| Ericsson | We agree with the conclusion made by the FL. We would like to have a note/indication in 38.215 to avoid any potential confusion in the future. |
| Intel | We support the note. Otherwise, different interpretations are possible. |
| Samsung | A: SupportB: Support |
| ZTE, Sanechips | A: Agree.B: Share the same view as FL (there is no other definition of “grant” or “granted” in current specifications that could be applicable, however a note can be considered).  |
| Apple | A: SupportB: Support. A note in 38.215 addresses the ambiguity of terminology “granted”.  |

Example TP for an explanatory note:

----------------------------------------------------begin text proposal for 38.215-----------------------------------------------

NOTE 6: A resource is considered granted if it is a member of a configured sidelink grant as defined in TS 38.321 [7].

----------------------------------------------------end text proposal for 38.215-----------------------------------------------

# First round - Company views

Currently, according to TS 38.215, in the future segment of the CR evaluation window, slots [n, n+b], granted resources are counted.

**Q1: Should TS 38.215 be changed such that future granted resources which have been released due to HARQ feedback are not counted in the evaluation of CR?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Answer** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | No | Rationale:* Given the size of the evaluation window (at least 1000 slots) is much larger than the reservation window (32 slots), typically the CR result would not change significantly.
* Incentive against excessive resource reservation
* Avoid spec change which does not seem strictly necessary and is not justified by any evaluation results.
 |
| Futurewei | Yes | In our view, it is preferable not to count resources that have been released: for some traffic (e.g., for URLLC-like traffic, but also others) we can see cases where a UE would want to reserve more resources than necessary to be conservative and meet its latency and/or reliability requirements. While we agree that the CR difference would likely be small, since there really is no complexity penalty to do so, released resources should not be counted |
| Apple | Yes | We slightly prefer not to count resources, which will be released due to HARQ feedback, in CR evaluation. This is more accurate, although the difference is likely small.  |
| OPPO | No | Agree with Nokia and furthermore this is not an essential correction or performance impact due to small difference. |
| Intel | Yes | In our view, it is useful correction. It is important to clarify that all reserved resources within [n, n+b] are taken into account for CR evaluation except already released resources that are not taken for CR estimation. |
| Samsung | Yes | In our view, it is more reasonable not to count resources which will be released due to HARQ feedback. When the UE counts many future grants for CR evaluation, it is more necessary. Furthermore, we think that it is more fair approach in congestion control. For example, there are two UEs where one UE reserves many resources by blind retransmission and the other UE reserves many resource resources by feedback based retransmission. Assuming situation that two UEs need to drop transmission in order to meet CR limit, we think that the UE using feedback based retransmission should reflect possibly unused resources in CR evaluation and give more chance to grab the channel. |
| vivo | No | This impact seems to be limited or negligible. Firstly, the portion of such resources would be small: at most two reserved resources if Nmax is three. Thus, it should not play an important role here. Secondly, the CR evaluation window is determined for each transmission by UE implementation. The UE can select a suitable window to mitigate the impact. Finally, the unused resources are not counted in the past segment. Therefore, this impact is only temporary and has no impact in the long term. Further enhancement is not pursued for CR evaluation in this release. |
| Ericsson | Yes | In our view the CR should capture a UE’s resource occupancy as closely as possible, hence reserved-but-released future resources should not be counted in CR evaluation. |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | No | Regarding the future resources which are reserved but released internally by the UE due to HARQ feedback, these remain granted in the sense of 38.215, since an SCI has been transmitted claiming them. Since other UEs will not try to detect a PSFCH carrying ACK in order to know the resources have become available, the resources will still be considered reserved at system level. If a UE’s CR measurement is defined to be reduced by excluding such resources, it will be able to re-select new additional resources, and the load on the system will increase, whilst the UE has no penalty for reserving in the first place more resources than it needs given a reliability requirement in HARQ operation. Therefore, such granted (but unused) resources are still counted in the channel occupancy ratio (CR).FL response: Your definition of “granted” seems to that a resource is granted if has been reserved. But I don’t see any specification text that supports this link.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes | We share the same view with Intel. |
| CATT | Yes | We think it is more accuracy for CR evaluation. |
| LG Electronics | No | First of all, we share the same view with Nokia and Huawei. Also in case of generating SL grant to be used for multiple MAC PDU transmissions, our understanding of MAC specification is that even if TX UE receives ACK from RX UE, the SL grant is not clear. In this sense, there should be a penalty in counting CR value since other UEs in the system can’t use these reserved resources.FL response: I think that the 38.321 text shown above is quite clear that the ReTX resources are cleared from the configured sidelink grant.  |

**Q2: For pre-emption, as explained by Huawei/HiSilicon, it seems clear that pre-empted resources are not counted (details in the “Issues” section below). Please state if you think that any further discussion is needed on pre-empted resources in CR evaluation (no need to fill this table if you don’t think anything else is needed for pre-empted resources).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Apple | We agree that the pre-empted resources are not counted in CR evaluation. It is better to add a note in 38.215 to clarify it.  |
| Intel | We agree that pre-empted resources are not considered for CR evaluation. In our view, preempted resource is a type of released resource and thus same behavior should be applied. It would be good to have some clarification on this aspect as well. |
| Samsung | We think that pre-emption is a different story compared with Q1. According to pre-emption, UE will reselect resource(s) for the pre-empted resource(s). Therefore, the portion of occupied resource(s) will not be changed. Therefore, even if we discard the pre-empted resource(s), we need to count again for reselected resource(s) for CR evaluation. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**Q3: Any other aspects?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Issues included in this email thread

## Topic 1: Sidelink Congestion Control

### Issue 1.2: CR – treatment of resources reserved, but not used due to HARQ feedback and/or pre-emption

#### Background

One remaining issue is how resources which have been reserved but have not been used or will not be used due to HARQ feedback or have been pre-empted should be counted in channel occupancy ratio (CR).

This aspect is not directly covered by the existing agreements that LTE CR is the baseline, since the LTE sidelink does not support HARQ feedback or pre-emption.

The current CR definition in TS 38.215 counts resources “used for … transmissions in slots [n-a, n-1] and granted in slots [n, n+b]”. Hence, for the past segment of the evaluation window, slots [n-a, n-1], it is clear that resources which have been reserved but released or pre-empted are not counted, since they have not been used for transmission.

For the future segment of the evaluation window, slots [n, n+b], the current definition counts all the resources **granted** for transmissions. So the first question to answer is what, in the presence of the new features of HARQ feedback and pre-emption, the meaning of “granted” is. The grant here is the “configured sidelink grant” defined in TS 38.321.

##### Pre-emption

For the case of pre-emption, [Huawei, HiSilicon] point out that according to TS 38.321 the pre-empted UE clears the grant when it detects pre-emption:

|  |
| --- |
| *(copied from TS 38.321)*5.22.1.2 TX resource (re-)selection check…1> if a sidelink transmission is scheduled by any received SCI indicating a higher priority than the prority of the logical channel and expected to overlap with a resource of the configured sidelink grant, and a measured result on SL-RSRP associated with the sidelink transmission is higher than [threshold]:2> clear the configured sidelink grant associated to the Sidelink process, if available;2> trigger the TX resource (re-)selection. |

Hence it seems clear that future pre-empted resources are not counted in CR evaluation.

##### Release of resources due to HARQ feedback

For this case RAN1 have agreed that usage of HARQ feedback for release of unused resource(s) is supported:

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements**:*** NR V2X Mode-2 supports resource reservation for feedback-based PSSCH retransmissions by signaling associated with a prior transmission of the same TB
	+ FFS impact on subsequent sensing and resource selection procedures
	+ At least from the transmitter perspective of this TB, usage of HARQ feedback for release of unused resource(s) is supported
		- No additional signaling is defined for the purpose of release of unused resources by the transmitting UE
		- FFS the behavior of the receiver UE(s) of this TB and other UEs
 |

There are two points of view on this issue:

On the one hand, one can argue that, for the future segment of the evaluation window, CR is supposed to capture the expected resource occupancy as closely as possible. From that point of view, resources which the UE knows will not be occupied, should not be counted as occupied. Moreover, the term “release” could imply that the released unused resource(s) should not be considered part of the configured sidelink grant.

On the other hand, it can be argued that an incentive against excessive resource reservation is beneficial; e.g. in the case of HARQ feedback, if for a unicast link the initial TX of a TB is almost always successful, but the UE always reserves 2 retransmissions then one can argue that the UE is “greedy” and should be penalized by counting the reserved, but almost always unused, resources in CR.

#### Views expressed in contributions

Should future resources which have been released due to HARQ feedback be counted in the evaluation of CR?

Yes: [Nokia, NSB], [vivo], [Huawei, HiSilicon], [LGE], [OPPO]

No: [ZTE, Sanechips], [CATT], [Apple], [InterDigital], [Ericsson]

Up to UE implementation: [Samsung] – this, in my reading, goes further than the other proposals and gives the UE the freedom to assume that all future retransmission resources will be released and hence do not need to be counted in CR.

#### Feature lead view

Should be discussed to finalize the specification.

# References

1. [RP-200129](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/TSG_RAN/TSGR_87e/Docs/RP-200129.zip), “Revised WID: 5G V2X with NR sidelink”
2. TR 37.885, Study on evaluation methodology of new Vehicle-to-Everything V2X use cases for LTE and NR
3. TR 38.885, Study on NR Vehicle-to-Everything (V2X)

Background

WI Objectives

At RAN#83, a new work item “5G V2X with NR sidelink” (5G\_V2X\_NRSL) was approved ‎[1]. Two of the objectives are relevant for the present agenda item:

|  |
| --- |
| 1. NR sidelink: Specify NR sidelink solutions necessary to support sidelink unicast, sidelink groupcast, and sidelink broadcast for V2X services, considering in-network coverage, out-of-network coverage, and partial network coverage.* …
* Congestion control [RAN1, RAN2]

4. Specify support for QoS management [RAN2, RAN3, RAN1] |

Earlier Agreements

The following relevant agreements have been reached in previous meetings:

QoS

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:From RAN1 perspective, at least the following QoS-related parameters relevant to physical layer studies are considered: * Priority
* latency
* reliability
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:RAN1 studies further how to use * priority,
* latency,
* reliability,
* minimum required communication range (as defined by higher layers) if agreed to use

in the physical layer aspects of at least * resource allocation and
* congestion control and
* resolution of in-device coexistence issues and
* power control
 |

In the Sidelink resource allocation mode 2 agenda item, the following working assumption was reached:

|  |
| --- |
| Working assumption:* An indication of a priority of a sidelink transmission is carried by SCI payload
	+ This indication is used for sensing and resource (re)selection procedures
	+ This priority is not necessarily the higher layer priority
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* For the priority indication in 1st stage SCI:
	+ Up to RAN2 on how to define the mapping between the priority indication and the corresponding QoS
	+ Size is 3 bits (as a working assumption)
 |

Sidelink Congestion Control

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* Introduce at least one congestion metric for NR sidelink
	+ FFS details – to be done in WI phase (if included)
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* Congestion control is supported at least for sidelink mode 2
	+ Note: details of congestion control can be covered in the work item phase, not in this SI.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Conclusion**:* It is deemed beneficial to report Sidelink Congestion Metrics(s) to a gNB
	+ Consequently, it is recommended to specify the corresponding details in the WI phase
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:Support at least NR CBR as congestion metric for NR sidelink congestion control. * LTE CBR is the baseline for defining NR CBR.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* LTE V2X sidelink congestion control is the starting point for defining NR sidelink congestion control.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* Higher-layer reporting of CBR to the gNB is supported for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* For PSCCH/PSSCH multiplexing option 3, one CBR measurement over a resource pool is defined.
	+ PSFCH resources, if (pre)configured, are excluded from this CBR measurement.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:Define NR sidelink Channel Occupancy Ratio (CR) measurement.* LTE CR is the baselines
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* Congestion control can restrict the values of at least the following PSSCH/PSCCH TX parameters per resource pool:
	+ Range of MCS for a given MCS table supported within the resource pool
	+ Range of number of sub-channels
	+ Upper bound of number of (re)transmissions – already agreed in mode 2 AI
	+ Upper bound of TX power (including zero TX power)
* Congestion control can set an upper bound on channel occupancy ratio (CR), CRlimit.
* Ranges/bounds of the transmission parameters and CRlimit are functions of QoS and CBR.
* In addition to congestion control (in use or not in use), the above parameters can be restricted by reusing the same mechanism as in LTE
	+ For speed, further discussion on absolute vs. relative speed
	+ FFS other parameter(s) that can be restricted
	+ FFS whether or not to tie the speed with a UE capability
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:Lookup table links CBR range with values of the transmission parameters and CRlimit for each value of the indication of a priority of a sidelink transmission carried by SCI payload (as per WA from RAN1#98), Lookup table is (pre)configured. Details up to RAN2. * Up to 16 (as a working assumption) CBR ranges are supported
	+ The working assumption will be automatically confirmed in RAN1#99 if no further input
 |
| Agreements:* Sidelink RSSI (SL-RSSI) measurement is used for CBR estimation
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:A sidelink resource is busy for the purpose of CBR measurement if Sidelink RSSI measured by the UE in that resource exceeds a (pre-)configured threshold. |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:The CBR measurement time window size is 100 ms and 100 slots by (pre-)configuration.CR window size is { 1000 ms, 1000 slots } by (pre)-configuration |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:* The future segment of the CR evaluation window reuses the same behaviour as in the LTE V2X sidelink.
	+ FFS whether additional constraints on UE’s choice of values for a and b are needed
 |
| Agreement: For the constraints on past/future window in CR evaluation:1. n+b shall not exceed the last transmission opportunity of the grant for the current transmission
2. b >= 0
3. b < (a+b+1)/2

 Notes:* in the first bullet point above, LTE’s “should” has been replaced by “shall”
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:* UE evaluates CR and applies CR\_limit for every (re)transmission.
 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Agreement: * The CBR processing time is given by UE capability according to the following table

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **µ**  | Congestion process time 1 (slots) | Congestion processing time 2 (slots) |
| 0 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 2 | 4 | 8 |
| 3 | 8 | 16 |

* A UE shall only apply a single CBR/CR processing time capability in SL.
* CR processing time is the same as CBR processing time.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:* The slot index in the definition of CBR is the physical slot index.

Agreement:* The slot index in the definition of CR is the physical slot index.
 |

TX Parameter Restrictions

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:* Only TX parameter restriction based on absolute speed can be (pre)configured in Rel-16.
 |

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:* In addition to congestion control (in use or not in use), the following PSSCH/PSCCH TX parameters per resource pool can be restricted by reusing the same mechanism as in LTE:
	+ Range of MCS for a given MCS table supported within the resource pool
	+ Range of number of sub-channels
	+ Upper bound of number of (re)transmissions

Note: This reverts the agreement made in RAN1#98b, which included “Upper bound of TX power” in the set of TX parameters that can be restricted using this mechanism. |

Appendix: Contributions used as basis for the summary

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| [R1-2003314](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003314.zip) | Remaining details of QoS management for sidelink | Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| [R1-2003384](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003384.zip) | Remaining issues on QoS management for sidelink | vivo |
| [R1-2003499](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003499.zip) | Remaining details of QoS management for NR sidelink | Huawei, HiSilicon |
| [R1-2003553](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003553.zip) | Remaining issues on QoS | ZTE, Sanechips |
| [R1-2003567](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003567.zip) | Discussion on QoS management for NR sidelink | LG Electronics |
| [R1-2003619](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003619.zip) | Remaining issues on QoS management in NR V2X | CATT |
| [R1-2003878](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003878.zip) | On QoS Management for NR Sidelink | Samsung |
| [R1-2004077](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2004077.zip) | Remaining open issues on QoS | OPPO |
| [R1-2004220](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2004220.zip) | Remaining Issues of Sidelink QoS Management | Apple |
| [R1-2004297](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2004297.zip) | Remaining Issues on Congestion control and QoS Management for NR-V2X | InterDigital, Inc. |
| [R1-2004549](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2004549.zip) | QoS management for NR sidelink | Ericsson |
|  |  |  |

[R1-2003314](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003314.zip) Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell

**Proposal 1: CBR-based power control is applied in both resource allocation modes.**

**Proposal 2: For CR evaluation, past resources which had been reserved, but then released due to HARQ feedback or pre-empted, are not counted.**

**Proposal 3: For CR evaluation, do not amend the specification to support that future resources which had been reserved, but then released due to HARQ feedback or pre-empted, are not counted.**

[R1-2003384](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003384.zip) vivo

***Proposal 1: The reserved but not used* *resources are still counted for CR evaluation, i.e., further enhancement for* *CR evaluation is not needed.***

[R1-2003499](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003499.zip) Huawei, HiSilicon

**Observation 1: For the past segment of the evaluation window, i.e., slots [n-a, n-1], the current definition of CR does not count resources which are reserved but not used due to HARQ feedback** **or pre-emption.**

Note: No text proposal is needed since the behavior in Observation 1 has already been specified in TS 38.215.

**Observation 2: For the future segment of the evaluation window, i.e., slots [n, n+b], resources which have been reserved by an SCI transmission but released due to HARQ feedback are, in the existing definition of CR, counted among the “granted” resources in the future segment.**

Note: No text proposal is needed since the behavior in Observation 2 has already been specified in TS 38.215.

**Observation 3: For the future segment of the evaluation window, i.e., slots [n, n+b], resources which have been reserved by an SCI transmission but not used due to pre-emption** **are, in the existing definition of CR, not counted among the “granted” resources in the future segment.**

Note: No text proposal is needed since the behavior in Observation 3 has already been specified in TS 38.215.

[R1-2003553](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003553.zip) ZTE, Sanechips

Observation 1: The resources reserved by previous SCI but released due to ACK feedback are not counted in CR evaluation.

Proposal 1: Both NR SL-CBR and LTE SL-CBR can be reported to the gNB for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.

Proposal 2: Rel-16 V2X does not support the function of disabling semi-persistent resource reservation by congestion control.

[R1-2003567](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003567.zip) LG Electronics

***Proposal: No special handling is needed for the resources reserved but not used (e.g., due to HARQ feedback) in the CR valuation.***

[R1-2003619](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003619.zip) CATT

***Proposal 1: The future reserved resource but released due to ACK feedback is excluded from the CR evaluation.***

***Proposal 2: It is unnecessary to explicitly disable the SPS resource reservation due to congestion control, and it is left for UE implementation.***

[R1-2003878](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2003878.zip) Samsung

***Proposal 1:*** *The followings are proposed for CR evaluation:*

* *In evaluating SL CR, the UE shall assume the transmission parameter used at slot n is reused according to the existing grant(s) in slot [n+1, n+b] without packet dropping* *if SL HARQ feedback is disabled.*
* *In evaluating SL CR, the UE shall assume the transmission parameter used at slot n is reused according to the existing grant(s) in slot [n+1, n+b] and the existing grant(s) can be released by the UE if SL HARQ feedback is enabled.*

[R1-2004077](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2004077.zip) OPPO

***Proposal 1: It is proposed to also support CBR reporting of Type 1 CG resources to LTE eNB.***

***Proposal 2: No update is needed to the existing CR definition due to reserved but unused resources in the future segment of the CR computation.***

[R1-2004220](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2004220.zip) Apple

***Proposal 1:*** *In evaluating sidelink CR, the reserved but released resources, due to HARQ ACK feedback or pre-emption, are not counted as granted or used.*

***Proposal 2:*** *The value* $P\_{max\\_CBR}$ *in the PSSCH transmit power formula is set to infinite for mode 1.*

[R1-2004297](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2004297.zip) InterDigital, Inc.

**Proposal 1:** *The reserved resources but then released are not counted in CR evaluation.*

**Proposal 2:** *Congestion control considers disabling of semi-persistent resource reservation when CBR is greater than a threshold.*

**Proposal 3:** *A resource pool can be configured with an allowed QoS for the data that can be transmitted using that resource pool.*

[R1-2004549](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_101-e/Docs/R1-2004549.zip) Ericsson

Proposal 1 Do not count reserved-but-not-used resources in CR evaluation.