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1. Introduction

The document provides a summary of XR evaluation results based on the submitted simulation data in excel appendix of contributions [1-17] for the [106-e-NR-XR-03] Email discussion/approval on initial performance evaluation results.

Following check points are planned for the discussion. Note that the deadline for the discussion for the email thread is 8/27.

[106-e-NR-XR-03] Email discussion/approval on initial performance evaluation results – Xiaohang (vivo)

* 1st check point: August 19
* 2nd check point: August 24
* Final check: August 27

**For the discussion in RAN1 #106-e, following is planned.**

* During RAN1#106-e, a moderator (Xiaohang, vivo) will present an excel file that collects companies’ results submitted for RAN1#106-e.  Discussions to cross-check companies’ results for clarification purpose will be conducted in email thread.
* Based on the excel file, RAN1#106-e will start to discuss observations/conclusions to be captured in the TR.  Xiaohang will also present a summary of results as well as initial observations from the results.
* Companies who have not submitted results following the excel format are recommended to submit an excel file during RAN1#106-e.
* Companies can submit updated results for the same cases or results for new cases in future meetings and can ask to replace/update their results in the excel file with the new/updated results. In other words, the excel file is a living document that are to be updated in future meetings as necessary.

1. Discussion on evaluation results

In this section, discussions to cross-check companies’ results for clarification purpose will be conducted.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Moderator | Question for clarification:  **@InterDigital**  According to the agreement on system capacity definition, System capacity is defined as the maximum number of users per cell with at least X % of UEs being satisfied, where X=90 (baseline) or 95 (optional).  For the capacity evaluation results, it seems the results in your contribution showing % of satisfied UEs when the number of UEs per cell = C1(Capacity) is lower than 90%? Could you clarify why?  **@Ericsson**  For Capacity evaluation, for cases e.g. FR1, InH, DL VR/AR, 30Mbps with SU-MIMO, it seems your results are much lower than the results from other companies. Could you explain why?  **@CMCC**  For capacity, DU, VR/AR, 30Mbps with MU-MIMO, it seems your results are much lower than the results from other companies. Could you explain why?  **@ China Unicom**  Could you provide the % of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1 corresponding to the capacity?  **@Qualcomm**  For the evaluation results of QC in FR2 UL InH in Table 30, why the number of satisfied UEs with 400MHz bandwidth is smaller than that with 100MHz bandwidth?  **@Nokia**  Why the average PS gain of R15/16CDRX of Nokia is much higher than other results while keeping limited capacity loss? |
| Futurewei | Thank you for the moderator’s hard work in providing this summary. We would like to note Futurewei added/uploaded results in excel sheet accordingly with the moderator suggestion and would appreciate it to be included in this word doc.  Here we make a couple of general points and suggestions on the methodology adopted   * In general, looking at the capacity results summarized in the tables in Appendix there are cases which present large variations and are highly diverse. As an example, for UL Table 13 the minimum capacity value is >10 while the maximum capacity 198. A similar is observation is made for other scenarios such as Table 16. Some wide variations are also present for the DL capacity results. Variance calculation may provide some insights. It is not clear at this point if simple arithmetic average is the best representative (while removing outliers). This calls for some efforts on aligning and calibrating the results from the group such that averaging (or other form of processing of the results) may make sense. * Number of companies contributed evaluation results are still limited which is reasonable as we are finalizing the evaluation methodology and assumptions and it takes time and efforts to generate proper results. Therefore, it is a bit early to try to draw observation and conclusion based on the current results. * We also noted that sometimes the results for the same scenario and traffic model, some different assumptions are used by the companies as notes of the tables specified. This makes the dataset of the same assumption even smaller. * The Study group would also need to discuss how the to use the averaged results (or other forms of processing of the results agreed by the group). For example, how do we use the averaged capacity to compare to capacity with potential enhancement techniques it is not very clear at this point. |
| Nokia, NSB | Thank you for a nice summary. We would ask to clarify a few things here (related to the question to Nokia):   * How is the “capacity loss” defined and measured in the combined statistics? According to the table template, only the “percentage of satisfied UEs” is reported as a capacity-centric metric for Baseline (i.e., P1) and CDRX (i.e., P2) schemes. So, is the capacity loss computed as P1 – P2, P2/P1 or something else? * Regarding the PS gains, we don’t see them much higher than the values reported by other companies (when comparable CDRX configs are analyzed). An important note here can be that R15/16 CDRX configs have the minimum long duration of 10ms (as per TS 38.331, “DRX-Config information element”, page 431). Hence, it may be better to threat the results submitted by companies for long duration of less than 10ms, including Nokia (8, 4, 4) and (4,2,2) as eCDRX. Here, the only comparable results for (4,2,2) are provided by IDT in Table 38 and further, but it is hard to compare directly, as IDT results may have different deployment assumptions (i.e., it is 12 UEs/cell deployed, which is much higher than the observed capacity limit, isn’t the system overloaded?) |

1. Discussion on initial observations

(Note: Regarding the initial observations, it should be noted that current observations are made mainly based on the simulation cases with sufficient evaluation results submitted by companies. Moreover, as starting point, we focus on the observations for baseline performance. The observation for the enhancement schemes can be discussed later after we have clear picture on the baseline performance.)

* 1. Capacity
     1. FR1 InH DL

8 sources (OPPO, Nokia, Qualcomm, vivo, CATT, MediaTek, ZTE, CMCC) reported the evaluation results of capacity performance with InH, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 1 to Table 4.

Following is observed for **CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {5.96~14.5}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [9.6].
* With MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {12.8~16.5}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [14.67].

Following is observed for **VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* For 60 FPS, with SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {5.2~13.2}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [8.41].
* For 60 FPS, with MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {5~10.8}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [9.53].

Following is observed for **VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* For 60 FPS, with SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {3.27~4.6}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [4.06].
* For 60 FPS, with MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {5.91~12}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [7.88].
  + 1. FR1 DU DL

9 sources (Nokia, Qualcomm, vivo, CATT, MediaTek, ZTE, Huawei, Ericsson, Xiaomi) reported the evaluation results of capacity performance with Dense Urban, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 5 to Table 8.

Following is observed for **CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {7.6~13}. With excluding the smallest and the largest values among sources, the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [10.16].
* With MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {16.1~19.65}. With excluding the smallest and the largest values among sources, the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [17.42].

Following is observed for **VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* For 60 FPS, with SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {5.1~10.6}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [7.99].
* For 60 FPS, with MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {11.6~13.59}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [12.77].

Following is observed for **VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* For 60 FPS, with SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {4.1~7}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [5.6].
* For 60 FPS, with MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {6.91~8.4}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [7.7].
  + 1. FR1 UMa DL

6 sources (Huawei, Qualcomm, vivo, China unicom, MediaTek, ZTE) reported the evaluation results of capacity performance with UMa, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 9 to Table 12.

Following is observed for **CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {5.4~10.33}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [7.93].
* With MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {8~14.33}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [11.58].

Following is observed for **VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* For 60 FPS, with SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {4.4~8}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [5.75].
* For 60 FPS, with MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {5.2~10}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [8.33].

Following is observed for **VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* For 60 FPS, with SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {2.4~5.5}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [4.03].
* For 60 FPS, with MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {2.9, 4.68}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [3.79].
  + 1. FR1 InH UL

6 sources (Nokia, CATT, MTK, vivo, Interdigital, QC) reported the evaluation results of capacity performance with InH, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 13 to Table 15.

Following is observed for **UL pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 250 FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {>10~198}.
* With MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {>20, 240}.

Following is observed for **UL scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 60FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {5.09, 13.95}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [9.52].
* With MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {7.1, 11.5}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [9.3].

Following is observed for **UL two-stream pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 250FPS + scene/video/ data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 60FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {5.56, 12.71}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [9.14].
  + 1. FR1 DU UL

9 sources (Nokia, Ericsson, MTK, vivo, Interdigital, Huawei, QC, ZTE) reported the evaluation results of capacity performance with DU, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 16 to Table 18.

Following is observed for **UL pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 250 FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {>10~224.9}
* With MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {>15, >240}

Following is observed for **UL scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 60FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {5~9.49}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [7.96].
* With MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {7.3~10.9}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [8.77].

Following is observed for **UL two-stream pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 250FPS + scene/video/ data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 60FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {5~10.78}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [7.74].
  + 1. FR1 UMa UL

5 sources (Ericsson, MTK, vivo, Huawei, QC) reported the evaluation results of capacity performance with Uma, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 19 to Table 21.

Following is observed for **UL pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 250 FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {15~143}.
* With MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {>15, >240}.

Following is observed for **UL scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 60FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {0~1.34}, and the mean value of capacity performance is smaller than [1].
* With MU-MIMO, the capacity performances are in the range of {0, <1}, and the mean value of capacity performance is smaller than [1].
  + 1. FR2 InH DL

6 sources (Nokia, Qualcomm, vivo, MediaTek, ZTE, Ericsson) reported the evaluation results of capacity performance with InH, 100/400MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 22 to Table 25.

Following is observed for **CG, 8Mbps, 15ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, 100MHz bandwidth, the capacity performances are in the range of {20~27.5}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [23.75].

Following is observed for **CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, 100MHz bandwidth, the capacity performances are in the range of {6~10}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [9.36].

Following is observed for **VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* For 60 FPS, with SU-MIMO, 100MHz bandwidth, the capacity performances are in the range of {5.5~10}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [8.48].

Following is observed for **VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* For 60 FPS, with SU-MIMO, 100MHz bandwidth, the capacity performances are in the range of {3~6.13}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [4.61].
  + 1. FR2 DU DL

5 sources (Nokia, Qualcomm, vivo, MediaTek, Ericsson) reported the evaluation results of capacity performance with Dense Urban, 100/400MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 26 to Table 29.

Following is observed for **CG, 8Mbps, 15ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, 100MHz bandwidth, the capacity performances are in the range of {20~24}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [22].

Following is observed for **CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* With SU-MIMO, 100MHz bandwidth, the capacity performances are in the range of {6~16.16}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [9.522].

Following is observed for **VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* For 60 FPS, with SU-MIMO, 100MHz bandwidth, the capacity performances are in the range of {5.3~13.44}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [8.12].

Following is observed for **VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**

* For 60 FPS, with SU-MIMO, 100MHz bandwidth, the capacity performances are in the range of {2~8.2}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [4.71].
* For 60 FPS, with SU-MIMO, 400MHz bandwidth, the capacity performances are in the range of {16~19}, and the mean value of capacity performance is approximately [17.5].
  + 1. FR2 InH UL

3 sources (MediaTek, Qualcomm, vivo) reported the evaluation results of capacity performance with FR2, InH, UL, as shown in Table 30 to Table 33.

(TBD on observation)

* + 1. FR2 DU UL

3 sources (MediaTek, Qualcomm, vivo) reported the evaluation results of capacity performance with FR2, DU, UL, as shown in Table 34 to Table 37.

(TBD on observation)

* + 1. Summary of discussion

1. **Please share your comment on the observations for capacity evaluation for FR1 DL.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | We think the observations are quite good. An observation (table) to capture the capacity bottleneck (DL or UL) for each deployment/application would be good. |
| Futurewei | One general comment, it is not clear why for the FR1 DU DL scenario has been treated differently than the rest of the scenarios. In particular, for this case outliers have been excluded while reset of scenarios include all statistics. |
| Nokia, NSB | **FR1 InH DL:**  The statistical data for **FR1 InH DL** (also relevant for other cases, e.g., FR1 DU, FR1 Uma, FR2 InH) contains the results with the “max MCS up to 64QAM” together with “up to 256QAM” option. Do we want to consider both type of results (“up to 256QAM” and “up to 64QAM”) together in the same range?  [**Question to OPPO, CATT, ZTE, China Unicom**] What are the reasons/advantages for choosing the option of max MCS up to 64 QAM, instead of agreed “Up to 256QAM”?  [**Question to CMCC]** for the case: **FR1 InH DL,** **VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**. Particularly the results from **CMCC** on MU-MIMO says they have 100% of satisfied UEs out of 5 UEs. Does it mean that for the case with 6 UEs the percent of satisfied UEs is less than 90%?  **FR1 Uma DL:**  We have a comment for the case: **VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 60 FPS**  We notice that the mean value for MU-MIMO is even **a bit less** than the one for SU-MIMO. Such trend is different from all the previous cases, where MU-MIMO was always **notably higher** than SU-MIMO. We might not have enough data to make the conclusion for that case. There are just two companies submitted the results.  [**Question to moderator**] Do we want to keep this observation with the trend in its current form?  [Question to **Qualcomm and vivo**] In that regard, could you, please, provide some more details on the MU-MIMO scheme you have used in your simulations? In particular, it would be interesting to know if the scheduler has a discrete set of beams to choose from or if more advanced techniques have been used. In case a grid of beams has been defined it would be helpful to know the configuration used in the simulations. |
| CATT | The summary and observation are quite comprehensive. Most companies are in the similar range. However, we observe the excessive good capacity results. It would be nice to outline the results with excessive good or bad capacity with note of analyzing the outcome of those excessive results. |

1. **Please share your comment on the observations for capacity evaluation for FR1 UL.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | We think the observations are quite good. An observation (table) to capture the capacity bottleneck (DL or UL) for each deployment/application would be good. Also, it seems that AR (with 10Mbps UL data) does not work in FR1 Uma, and this can also be captured in the observation. |
| Nokia, NSB | It can be observed that 0.2 Mbit/s in UL (Pose/control) is not a limiting factor for capacity in both DU and InH.  Same here regarding SU-MIMO vs. MU-MIMO in InH UL scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 60FPS: MU-MIMO results appear to be slightly lower (in any case, not notably higher) than the ones for SU-MIMO. What is the reason for such a trend? |

1. **Please share your comment on the observations for capacity for FR2 DL.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | We think the observations are quite good. An observation (table) to capture the capacity bottleneck (DL or UL) for each deployment/application would be good. |
| Nokia, NSB | There may be a minor typo in Table 27, where Note 2 and Note 3 are swapped. Shouldn’t it be “Note 2~~3~~: 400MHz bandwidth”?  There may be also a minor typo in Table 32 (Note 4~~2~~: 60ms PDB). |

1. **Please share your comment on the observations for capacity evaluation for FR2 UL.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | We think the observations are quite good. An observation (table) to capture the capacity bottleneck (DL or UL) for each deployment/application would be good (after the UL statistics are available). |
|  |  |

* 1. Power consumption
     1. FR1 InH DL

4 sources (Interdigital, Nokia, vivo, CATT) reported the evaluation results of power consumption compared to AlwaysOn (baseline) scheme, with InH, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 38 to Table 40. **Note that the results in red are not satisfy the capacity requirement i.e., there are at least 90% satisfied UEs in the system.**

Comparing to UE always on, following is observed for **CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB:**

* For R15/16CDRX power saving scheme, the power saving gain are in the range of {15.23%~27.09%} for high load.

Comparing to UE always on, following is observed for **VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB:**

* For R15/16CDRX power saving scheme, the power saving gain are in the range of {3.67%, 5.72%} for low load with no capacity loss and {2.39%~6.14%} for high load with {0.69%~6.94%} capacity loss.

Comparing to UE always on, following is observed for **VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB:**

* For R15/16CDRX power saving scheme, the power saving gain are in the range of {3.46%, 5.32%} for low load with no capacity loss and {2.83%, 4.68%, 25.45%} for high load with around {2.23%, 3.89%} capacity loss.
  + 1. FR1 DU DL

5 sources (Interdigital, Huawei, Ericsson, vivo, Interdigital) reported the evaluation results of power consumption compared to AlwaysOn (baseline) scheme, with DU, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 41 to Table 43. **Note that the results in red are not satisfy the capacity requirement i.e., there are at least 90% satisfied Ues in the system.**

Comparing to UE always on, following is observed for **VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB:**

* For R15/16CDRX power saving scheme, the power saving gain are in the range of {3.65%, 5.57%} for low load with no capacity loss and {3.03%, 4.70%} for high load with {0.85%, 2.32%} capacity loss.

Comparing to UE always on, following is observed for **VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB:**

* For R15/16CDRX power saving scheme, the power saving gain are in the range of {3.53%, 5.56%} for low load with no capacity loss and {3.10%, 4.69%} for high load with around {1.45%, 2.51%} capacity loss.
  + 1. FR1 Uma DL

1 sources (vivo) reported the evaluation results of power consumption compared to AlwaysOn (baseline) scheme, with Uma, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 44 and Table 45.

(TBD on observations)

* + 1. FR1 InH UL

1 source (vivo) reported the evaluation results of power saving performance with InH, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 46 to Table 48.

(TBD on observations)

* + 1. FR1 DU UL

1 source (vivo) reported the evaluation results of power saving performance with DU, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 49 to Table 51.

(TBD on observations)

* + 1. FR1 Uma UL

1 source (vivo) reported the evaluation results of power saving performance with Uma, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 52.

(TBD on observations)

* + 1. FR1 InH DL+UL

4 sources (vivo, Qualcomm, MediaTek, ZTE) reported the evaluation results of power consumption compared to AlwaysOn (baseline) scheme, with InH, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 53 to Table 59. **Note that the results in red are not satisfy the capacity requirement i.e., there are at least 90% satisfied Ues in the system.**

Following is observed for **DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB)**, one source (vivo) provides the following results:

* For R15/16CDRX power saving scheme, the power saving gain are in the range of {3.643%~3.71%} for low load with no capacity loss and {2.33%~3.45%} for high load with around 1% capacity loss.

Following is observed for **DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL video-stream (10Mbps, 30ms PDB)**, one source (vivo) provides the following results

* For R15/16CDRX power saving scheme, the power saving gain are in the range of {2.59%~4.20%} for low load with no capacity loss and {1.69%~2.62%} for high load with up to 0.83% capacity loss.

Following is observed for **DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL two-stream (pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB) + video-stream (10Mbps, 30ms PDB))**, one source (vivo) provides the following results

* For R15/16CDRX power saving scheme, the power saving gain are in the range of {1.02%~1.81%} for low load with no capacity loss and {0.83%~1.59%} for high load with up to 1.39% capacity loss.
  + 1. FR1 DU DL+UL

4 sources (vivo, Qualcomm, MediaTek, Ericsson) reported the evaluation results of power consumption compared to AlwaysOn (baseline) scheme, with dense urban, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 60 to Table 63. **Note that the results in red are not satisfy the capacity requirement i.e., there are at least 90% satisfied Ues in the system.**

Following is observed for Following is observed for **DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB),** two sources (vivo, Qualcomm) provide the following results

* For R15/16CDRX power saving scheme, the power saving gain are in the range of {2.44%~3.56%} for low load with no capacity loss and {2.24%~7.03%} for high load with {0.85%~2.32%} capacity loss.

Following is observed for Following is observed for **DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL video-stream (10Mbps, 30ms PDB),** one sources (vivo) provides the following results

* For R15/16CDRX power saving scheme, the power saving gain are in the range of {2.39%~3.79%} for low load with no capacity loss and {1.62%~2.58%} for high load with up to 0.7% capacity loss.

Following is observed for Following is observed for **DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL two-stream (pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB)+video-stream (10Mbps, 30ms PDB)),** one sources (vivo) provides the following results

* For R15/16CDRX power saving scheme, the power saving gain are in the range of {0.91%~1.63%} for low load with no capacity loss and {0.79%~1.51%} for high load with up to 0.9% capacity loss.
  + 1. FR2 InH DL

3 sources (vivo, Nokia, Qualcomm) reported the evaluation results of power saving performance with InH, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 64 to Table 66.

(TBD on observation)

* + 1. FR2 DU DL

1 sources (vivo) reported the evaluation results of power saving performance with Dense Urban, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format, as shown in Table 67 and Table 68.

(TBD on observation)

* + 1. FR2 InH UL

1 source (vivo) reported the evaluation results of power saving performance with FR2, InH, UL, pose/control stream as shown in Table 69 and Table 70.

(TBD on observation)

* + 1. FR2 DU DL

1 source (vivo) reported the evaluation results of power saving performance with FR2, DU, UL, pose/control stream as shown in Table 71 and Table 72.

(TBD on observation)

* + 1. Summary of discussion

1. **Please share your comment on the observations for power evaluation for FR1 DL.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | The observations seem to only capture power saving results for CDRX (which seems poor). We think at least PDCCH skipping like results should be also captured. |
| Nokia, NSB | Following the same approach as agreed during the previous meeting for capacity studies (“When companies are submitting evaluation results to RAN1, it is recommended to submit results at least the following parameters in the below table.”), it may be beneficial to **select one common R15/16 CDRX configuration that provides calibration of the results among companies.** This may be, i.e., (16, 8, 8) or (16, 14, 4).  The deviations in the results may be reduced if CDRX configs with long cycle duration of less than 10ms are excluded from R15/16 and moved to the “eCDRX” category.  **More clarification is needed on how the results for “capacity loss” are obtained** (i.e., some companies report the results, where N > C1, which contradicts the general approach, where N1=C1 for baseline and N1 can be less than C1 for Optional).  Also, we have a comment regarding the note in the beginning of the section “**Note that the results in red are not satisfy the capacity requirement i.e., there are at least 90% satisfied Ues in the system.**” This note is a bit strange, as following the revised table template the “true capacity” value is not calculated during the UE power studies. Hence, there is often a case, where “UE always ON” reports 90.2% satisfied Ues, while some DRX config results in “89.3% of satisfied Ues”. We don’t see any motivation to highlight that 89.3% is lower than the capacity requirement, as true capacity is not calculated during the UE power studies. |
| CATT | The power saving results should be categorized by different power saving techniques, which in addition to legacy DRX configuration. |

1. **Please share your comment on the observations for power evaluation for FR1 DL+UL.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | The observations seem to only capture power saving results for CDRX (which seems poor). We think at least PDCCH skipping like results should be also captured. |
|  |  |

1. Evaluation Results

(Note: in this section, the evaluation results are summarized in form of tables for different cases, with capturing the key information and performance metrics from the excel file. The intention is that the evaluation results could be appropriately presented in the TR. The detailed assumptions for the evaluation results can refer to the excel file. Another intention is that it can be helpful to make observation based on these results in the tables.)

* 1. Capacity Results: FR1 DL
     1. InH Scenario

**InH, CG, 8Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 1 System capacity of CG (8Mbps) application in FR1 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | >20 | >20 | N/A |  |  |  |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 100% |  |
| CMCC |  |  |  | 9.00 | 9 | 97.22% | Note 1 |
| QC | 22.3 | 22 | 94% | 44.1 | 44 | 90% |  |
| Note 1: 10ms PDB | | | | | | | |

**InH, CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 2 System capacity of CG (30Mbps) application in FR1 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| OPPO | 14.5 | 14 | 93% |  |  |  |  |
| OPPO | 14.9 | 14 | 93% |  |  |  | Note 1A |
| OPPO | 14.7 | 14 | 93% |  |  |  | Note 1B |
| OPPO | 15.5 | 15 | 94% |  |  |  | Note 2 |
| OPPO | 16 | 16 | 89% |  |  |  | Note 1A，2 |
| OPPO | 11.8 | 11 | 92% |  |  |  | Note 1B，2 |
| Nokia | 5.96 | 5 | 99% |  |  |  |  |
| Ericsson | 2.4 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | 9 | 9 | 89.55% |  |  |  |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 6 | 6 | 50% |  |
| CATT |  |  |  | 15 | 15 | 90% | Note 3 |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 12.9 | 12 | 90% |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 13.3 | 13 | 92% | Note 4 |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 8.6 | 8 | 93% | Note 5 |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 6.4 | 6 | 92% | Note 6 |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 6 | 6 | 90% | Note 7 |
| QC | 8.4 | 8 | 97.5 | 12.8 | 12 | 95% |  |
| vivo | 10.14 | 10 | 91.67% | 16.2 | 16 | 91.15% |  |
| vivo | 11.43 | 11 | 96.06% | 16.67 | 16 | 92.01% | Note 8 |
| Note 1A: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 1B: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are zero, i.e. packet arrival among UEs are synchronized  Note 2: without jitter  Note 3: jitter range equals [0, 8]ms with 2ms STD  Note 4: the relationship of standard deviation/maximum/minimum packet size w.r.t [10.5, 150, 50]% of mean packet size  Note 5: Precise Preemption  Note 6: Rel-15 Preemption  Note 7: Scheduling uRLLC traffic and delaying XR traffic when collision occurs  Note 8: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling | | | | | | | |

**InH, VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 3 System capacity of VR/AR (30Mbps) application in FR1 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| OPPO | 13.2 | 13 | 93% |  |  |  |  |
| OPPO | 13.7 | 13 | 93% |  |  |  | Note 1A |
| OPPO | 9.9 | 9 | 90% |  |  |  |  |
| OPPO | 14.1 | 14 | 93% |  |  |  | Note 2 |
| OPPO | 15.4 | 15 | 94% |  |  |  | Note 1A，2 |
| OPPO | 6.4 | 6 | 86% |  |  |  | Note 2 |
| Nokia | 5.2 | 5 | 94% |  |  |  |  |
| Ericsson | 0.52 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | 8 | 8 | 88.13% |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 11.4 | 11 | 92% |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 11.8 | 11 | 94% | Note 3 |
| CMCC |  |  |  | 5.00 | 5 | 100.00% |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 17% |  |
| CATT |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 96% | Note 4 |
| QC | 60 | 7 | 7 | 10.3 | 10 | 93% |  |
| vivo | 60 | 8.27 | 8 | 10.8 | 10 | 92.50% |  |
| vivo | 60 | 10.77 | 10 | 12.4 | 12 | 93.06% | Note 5 |
| vivo |  |  |  | 16.53 | 16 | 92.71% | Note 6 |
| Note 1A: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 1B: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are zero, i.e. packet arrival among UEs are synchronized  Note 2: without jitter  Note 3: the relationship of standard deviation/maximum/minimum packet size w.r.t [10.5, 150, 50]% of mean packet size  Note 4: jitter range equals [0, 8]ms with 2ms STD  Note 5: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling  Note 6: separate packet arrivals in time for dual-eye buffer with 120FPS | | | | | | | |

**InH, VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 4 System capacity of VR/AR (45Mbps) application in FR1 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Nokia | 3.27 | 3 | 97% |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | 4.6 | 4 | 96.30% |  |  |  |  |
| Interdigital | 2 | 2 | 17% |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 7.2 | 7 | 92% |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 7.3 | 7 | 93% | Note 1 |
| CATT |  |  |  | 12 | 12 | 94% | Note 2 |
| QC | 4.3 | 4 | 97% | 6.4 | 6 | 93% |  |
| vivo |  |  |  | 5.91 | 5 | 96.67% |  |
| vivo |  |  |  | 9.22 | 9 | 91.36% | Note 3 |
| Note 1: the relationship of standard deviation/maximum/minimum packet size w.r.t [10.5, 150, 50]% of mean packet size  Note 2: jitter range equals [0, 8]ms with 2ms STD  Note 3: separate packet arrivals in time for dual-eye buffer with 120FPS | | | | | | | |

* + 1. DU Scenario

**DU, CG, 8Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 5 System capacity of CG (8Mbps) application in FR1 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | >20 | >20 | N/A |  |  |  |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 8 | 8 | 100% |  |
| CMCC |  |  |  | 9.00 | 9 | 100.00% | Note 1 |
| QC | 24.4 | 24 | 93% | 56.6 | 56 | 92% |  |
| Note 1: 10ms PDB | | | | | | | |

**DU, CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 6 System capacity of CG (30Mbps) application in FR1 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Nokia | 8.5 | 8 | 97% |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 10 | 10 | 92% |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| Ericsson | 5.1 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | 13 | 13 | 90.41% |  |  |  |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 4 | 4 | 50% |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 14.7 | 14 | 93% |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 14.8 | 14 | 93% | Note 2 |
| Huawei | 7.6 | 7 | 92.52% | 16.1 | 16 | 90.77% |  |
| QC | 10 | 10 | 91% | 16.5 | 16 | 93% |  |
| vivo | 11.68 | 11 | 94.81% | 19.65 | 19 | 92.56% |  |
| vivo | 13.58 | 13 | 94.90% | 19.75 | 19 | 92.86% | Note 3 |
| Note 1: jitter range equals [0, 8]ms with 2ms STD  Note 2: the relationship of standard deviation/maximum/minimum packet size w.r.t [10.5, 150, 50]% of mean packet size  Note 3: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling | | | | | | | |

**DU, VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 7 System capacity of VR/AR (30Mbps) application in FR1 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Nokia | 6.54 | 6 | 97% |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | 8 | 8 | 91% |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| Ericsson | 4.2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | 10.6 | 10 | 94.30% |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 12.5 | 12 | 90% |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 13.6 | 13 | 92% | Note 2 |
| CMCC |  |  |  | 3.00 | 3 | 100.00% |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 25% |  |
| Huawei | 5.1 | 5 | 91.43% | 11.6 | 11 | 92.86% |  |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 6.3 | 6 | 91.67% | Note 3 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 19.3 | 19 | 90.54% | Note 4 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 14 | 14 | 90.08% | Note 5 |
| QC | 8.2 | 8 | 93% | 13.4 | 13 | 92% |  |
| vivo | 9.49 | 9 | 94.18% | 13.59 | 13 | 92.43% |  |
| vivo | 12.67 | 12 | 95.12% | 14.4 | 14 | 91.84% | Note 6 |
| vivo |  |  |  | 20.78 | 20 | 92.54% | Note 7 |
| Note 1: jitter range equals [0, 8]ms with 2ms STD  Note 2: the relationship of standard deviation/maximum/minimum packet size w.r.t [10.5, 150, 50]% of mean packet size  Note 3: 7ms PDB  Note 4: 13ms PDB  Note 5: Frame Level Integrated Transmission (FLIT)  Note 6: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling  Note 7: separate packet arrivals in time for dual-eye buffer with 120FPS | | | | | | | |

**DU, VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 8 System capacity of VR/AR (45Mbps) application in FR1 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Interdigital | 0 | 0 | 0% |  |  |  |  |
| Xiaomi | 9 | 9 | 91% |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| Xiaomi | 7 | 7 | 90% |  |  |  |  |
| Nokia | 4.1 | 4 | 92% |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | 6 | 6 | 91.75% |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | 0 | 0 | N/A |  |  |  | Note 2A |
| MTK | 4.2 | 4 | 91.93% |  |  |  | Note 2B |
| MTK | 10.3 | 10 | 91.53% |  |  |  | Note 2C |
| MTK | 12.3 | 12 | 92.15% |  |  |  | Note 2D |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 7.8 | 7 | 97% |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 7.9 | 7 | 97% | Note 3 |
| QC | 5.2 | 5 | 93% | 8.4 | 8 | 92% |  |
| vivo |  |  |  | 6.91 | 6 | 95.63% |  |
| vivo |  |  |  | 11.42 | 11 | 91.77% | Note 4 |
| Note 1: UE/stream satisfied if DL packet success rate > 95%  Note 2A: DDDDD DDDUU (2.6GHz)  Note 2B: DSUDD SUUDD (4.9GHz)  Note 2C: DDDDD DDDUU (2.6GHz) + DSUDD SUUDD (4.9GHz)  Note 2D: DDDDD DDDUU (2.6GHz) + DSUDD SUUDD (4.9GHz)  Note 3: the relationship of standard deviation/maximum/minimum packet size w.r.t [10.5, 150, 50]% of mean packet size  Note 4: separate packet arrivals in time for dual-eye buffer with 120FPS | | | | | | | |

* + 1. UMa Scenario

**Uma, CG, 8Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 9 System capacity of CG (8Mbps) application in FR1 DL Uma scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | >20 | >20 | N/A |  |  |  |  |
| China Unicom | >30 | >30 |  |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| QC | 17.5 | 16 | 94% | 23.8 | 23 | 93% |  |
| Note 1: 10ms PDB | | | | | | | |

**Uma, CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 10 System capacity of CG (30Mbps) application in FR1 DL Uma scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | 9.5 | 9 | 92.35% |  |  |  |  |
| China Unicom | 7.9 | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 11.6 | 11 | 93% |  |
| Huawei | 6.5 | 6 | 92.86% | 12.4 | 12 | 92.46% |  |
| QC | 5.4 | 5 | 92% | 8 | 8 | 90% |  |
| vivo | 10.33 | 10 | 91.90% | 14.33 | 14 | 91.33% |  |
| vivo | 11.94 | 11 | 93.78% | 14.45 | 14 | 91.73% | Note 1 |
| Note 1: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling | | | | | | | |

**Uma, VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 11 System capacity of VR/AR (30Mbps) application in FR1 DL Uma scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| China Unicom | 4.6 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | 8 | 8 | 89.05% |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 10 | 10 | 90% |  |
| Huawei | 4.5 | 4 | 92.38% | 9.3 | 9 | 91.22% |  |
| QC | 4.4 | 4 | 94% | 5.2 | 5 | 91% |  |
| vivo | 7.24 | 7 | 92.48% | 8.82 | 8 | 93.75% |  |
| vivo | 8.56 | 8 | 92.64% | 9.55 | 9 | 92.30% | Note 1 |
| vivo |  |  |  | 14.59 | 14 | 92.06% | Note 2 |
| Note 1: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling  Note 2: separate packet arrivals in time for dual-eye buffer with 120FPS | | | | | | | |

**Uma, VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 12 System capacity of VR/AR (45Mbps) application in FR1 DL Uma scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | 4.2 | 4 | 92.86% |  |  |  |  |
| China Unicom | 5.5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| QC | 2.4 | 2 | 93% | 2.9 | 2 | 93% |  |
| vivo |  |  |  | 4.68 | 4 | 94.05% |  |
| vivo |  |  |  | 8.12 | 8 | 90.87% | Note 1 |
| Note 1: separate packet arrivals in time for dual-eye buffer with 120FPS | | | | | | | |

* 1. Capacity Results: FR1 UL
     1. InH Scenario

**InH, pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 13 System capacity of pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR1 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Nokia | >10 | >10 | 100% |  |  |  |  |
| CATT | >12 | >12 |  |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| MTK | >30 | >30 | 100% |  |  |  | Note 2 |
| vivo | >20 | >20 | 100.00% |  |  |  |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 20 | 20 | 100% | Note 3 |
| QC | 198 | 192 | 99% | >240 | 240 | 99% |  |
| Note 1: DDDUU  Note 2: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal | | | | | | | |

**InH, scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 14 System capacity of scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR1 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| CATT | 6 | 6 | 100% |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| MTK | 5.09 | 5 | 90% |  |  |  | Note 2 |
| vivo | 13.95 | 13 | 93.59% |  |  |  |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 11.5 | 11 | 92% | Note 3 |
| QC |  |  |  | 7.1 | 7 | 95% |  |
| Note 1: DDDUU  Note 2: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 3: with jitter | | | | | | | |

**InH, pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB) + scene/video/data/voice-stream (10Mbps, 30msPDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 15 System capacity of pose/control (0.2Mbps) and scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR1 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | 5.56 | 5 | 93.23% |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| vivo | 12.71 | 12 | 93.29% |  |  |  |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 7.2 | 7 | 58% | Note 2 |
| QC |  |  |  | 3.4 | 3 | 94% |  |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: video-traffic with jitter | | | | | | | |

* + 1. DU Scenario

**DU, pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 16 System capacity of pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR1 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Nokia | >10 | >10 | 100% |  |  |  |  |
| Ericsson | 15 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | >30 | >30 | 100% |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| vivo | >20 | >20 | 99.99% |  |  |  |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 8 | 8 | 40% | Note 1 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | >15 |  | 100% |  |
| QC | 224.9 | 224 | 92% | >240 | 240 | 99% |  |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal | | | | | | | |

**DU, scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 17 System capacity of scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR1 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Ericsson | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | 9.39 | 9 | 90% |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| vivo | 9.49 | 9 | 92.95% |  |  |  |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  |  |  | 10.9 | 10 | 94% |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 2.3 | 2 | 17% | Note 2 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 8.1 | 8 | 91.67% |  |
| Huawei |  |  |  | <1 |  |  | Note 3 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 5.4 | 5 | 92.19% | Note 4 |
| Huawei |  |  |  | 8.3 | 8 | 93.81% | Note 5 |
| QC |  |  |  | 7.3 | 7 | 90% |  |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: with jitter  Note 3: 10 ms PDB  Note 4: 15ms PDB  Note 5: 60ms PDB | | | | | | | |

**DU, pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB) + scene/video/data/voice-stream (10Mbps, 30msPDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 18 System capacity of pose/control (0.2Mbps) and scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR1 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | 10.78 | 10 | 93.93% |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| Ericsson | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| vivo | 7.43 | 7 | 92.29% |  |  |  |  |
| Interdigital |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0% | Note 2 |
| QC |  |  |  | 3.1 | 3 | 91% |  |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: with jitter | | | | | | | |

* + 1. Uma Scenario

**Uma, pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 19 System capacity of pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR1 UL Uma scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Ericsson | 15 | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | >30 | >30 | 100% |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| vivo | >20 | >20 | 97.70% |  |  |  |  |
| Huawei |  |  |  | >15 |  | 95.56% |  |
| QC | 143 | 136 | 94% | >240 | 240 | 93% |  |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal | | | | | | | |

**Uma, scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 20 System capacity of scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR1 UL Uma scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Ericsson | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| MTK | 1.34 | 1 | 90% |  |  |  | Note 1 |
| vivo | <1 | <1 | 74.60% |  |  |  |  |
| Huawei |  |  |  | <1 |  |  |  |
| QC |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0% |  |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal | | | | | | | |

**Uma, pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB) + scene/video/data/voice-stream (10Mbps, 30msPDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 21 System capacity of pose/control (0.2Mbps) and scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR1 UL Uma scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **MU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** | **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Ericsson | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| QC |  |  |  | 0 | 0 | 0% |  |

* 1. Capacity Results: FR2 DL
     1. InH Scenario

**InH, CG, 8Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 22 System capacity of CG (8Mbps) application in FR2 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | >20 | >20 | N/A |  |
| QC | 27.5 | 27 | 92% | Note 1 |
| QC | >30 | >30 | 90% | Note 1, 2 |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: 400MHz bandwidth | | | | |

**InH, CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 23 System capacity of CG (30Mbps) application in FR2 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Nokia | >10 | >10 | 100% |  |
| Ericsson | 3.9 | 3 |  |  |
| MTK | 11 | 11 | 90.46% |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 9.9 | 9 | 93% |  |
| QC | 6 | 6 | 90% | Note 1 |
| QC | 28 | 28 | 90% | Note 1, 2 |
| vivo | 9.91 | 9 | 95.37% |  |
| vivo | 10.23 | 10 | 91.11% | Note 3 |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: 400MHz bandwidth  Note 3: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling | | | | |

**InH, VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 24 System capacity of VR/AR (30Mbps) application in FR2 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Nokia | >10 | >10 | 99% |  |
| Ericsson | 3.3 | 3 |  |  |
| MTK | 10 | 10 | 89.00% |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 8.2 | 8 | 91% |  |
| QC | 5.5 | 5 | 98% | Note 1 |
| QC | 26 | 26 | 90% | Note 1, 2 |
| vivo | 8.72 | 8 | 92.01% |  |
| vivo | 8.83 | 8 | 92.36% | Note 3 |
| vivo | 10.23 | 10 | 91.94% | Note 4 |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: 400MHz bandwidth  Note 3: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling  Note 4: separate packet arrivals in time for dual-eye buffer with 120FPS | | | | |

**InH, VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 25 System capacity of VR/AR (45Mbps) application in FR2 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Nokia | 6.13 | 6 | 98% |  |
| MTK | 4.7 | 4 | 96.26% |  |
| QC | 3 | 3 | 90% | Note 1 |
| QC | 20.5 | 20 | 92% | Note 1, 2 |
| vivo | 4.67 | 4 | 94.44% |  |
| vivo | 6.03 | 6 | 90.28% | Note 3 |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: 400MHz bandwidth  Note 3: separate packet arrivals in time for dual-eye buffer with 120FPS | | | | |

* + 1. DU Scenario

**DU, CG, 8Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 26 System capacity of CG (8Mbps) application in FR2 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | >20 | >20 | N/A |  |
| QC | 24 | 24 | 90% | Note 1 |
| QC | >30 | >30 | 90% | Note 1, 2 |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: 400MHz bandwidth | | | | |

**DU, CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 27 System capacity of CG (30Mbps) application in FR2 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Nokia | 8.25 | 8 | 93% |  |
| Ericsson | 6.2 | 6 |  |  |
| MTK | 11 | 11 | 90.60% |  |
| QC | 6 | 6 | 90% | Note 1 |
| QC | 25 | 25 | 90% | Note 1, 2 |
| vivo | 16.16 | 16 | 92.36% |  |
| vivo | 16.82 | 16 | 96.73% | Note 3 |
| Note 1: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling  Note 2: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 3: 400MHz bandwidth | | | | |

**DU, VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 28 System capacity of VR/AR (30Mbps) application in FR2 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Nokia | 6.35 | 6 | 96% |  |
| Ericsson | 5.3 | 5 |  |  |
| MTK | 10 | 10 | 88.58% |  |
| QC | 5.5 | 5 | 97% | Note 1 |
| QC | 23.5 | 23 | 91% | Note 1, 2 |
| vivo | 13.44 | 13 | 95.24% |  |
| vivo | 14.16 | 14 | 91.27% | Note 3 |
| vivo | 16.28 | 16 | 93.55% | Note 4 |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: 400MHz bandwidth  Note 3: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling  Note 4: separate packet arrivals in time for dual-eye buffer with 120FPS | | | | |

**DU, VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 29 System capacity of VR/AR (45Mbps) application in FR2 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| Nokia | 3.94 | 3 | 98% |  |
| MTK | 4.7 | 4 | 92.62% |  |
| QC | 2 | 2 | 90% | Note 1 |
| QC | 19 | 19 | 90% | Note 1, 2 |
| vivo | 8.2 | 8 | 93.25% |  |
| vivo | 10.32 | 10 | 93.97% | Note 3 |
| vivo | >16 | >16 | 100.00% | Note 2 |
| Note 1: separate packet arrivals in time for dual-eye buffer with 120FPS  Note 2: 400MHz bandwidth  Note 3: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling | | | | |

* 1. Capacity Results: FR2 UL

**InH, pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 30 System capacity of pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR2 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | 12.09 | 12 | 90.28% | Note 1 |
| QC | 8 | 8 | 90% | Note 1 |
| QC | 7 | 7 | 90% | Note 1, 2 |
| QC | 15 | 15 | 90% | Note 1, 3 |
| QC | 23 | 23 | 90% | Note 1, 4 |
| QC | > 30 | >30 | 90% | Note 1, 5 |
| QC | 23 | 23 | 90% | Note 1, 6 |
| vivo | >20 | >20 | 97.69% |  |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: 400MHz bandwidth  Note 3: Regular slot, FDM/SDM  Note 4: mini-slot, Full Antenna  Note 5: mini-slot, FDM/SDM  Note 6: DDDUU | | | | |

**InH, scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 31 System capacity of scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR2 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | 1 | 1 | 90% | Note 1 |
| QC | 10 | 10 | 90% | Note 2 |
| vivo | 8.59 | 8 | 95.14% |  |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: DDDUU | | | | |

**InH, scene/video/data/voice-stream, 20Mbps, 30ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 32 System capacity of scene/video/data/voice (20Mbps) application in FR2 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| QC | 6 | 6 | 90% | Note 1,2 |
| QC | 5 | 5 | 92% | Note 1,2,3 |
| QC | 6 | 6 | 90% | Note 1,2,4 |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: DDDUU  Note 3: 15ms PDB  Note 2: 60ms PDB | | | | |

**InH, pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB) + scene/video/data/voice-stream (10Mbps/20Mbps, 30msPDB)**

Table 33 System capacity of pose/control (0.2Mbps) and scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps/20Mbps) application in FR2 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | 1.26 | 1 | 93.75% | Note 1 |
| QC | 3.5 | 3 | 93% | Note 1, 2 |
| QC | 6 | 6 | 90% | Note 1, 2, 4 |
| QC | 15.5 | 15 | 94% | Note 1, 2,3,4 |
| QC | 8 | 8 | 90% | Note 1, 2,4,5 |
| QC | 5 | 5 | 90% | Note 1, 2,4,6 |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: video-stream with jitter  Note 3: 400MHz bandwidth  Note 4: DDDUU  Note 5: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling  Note 6: scene/video/data/voice-stream: 20Mbps, 30ms PDB | | | | |

* + 1. DU Scenario

**DU, pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 34 System capacity of pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR2 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | >30 | >30 | 99% | Note 1 |
| QC | 10 | 10 | 90% | Note 1 |
| QC | 10 | 10 | 90% | Note 1, 2 |
| QC | 16 | 16 | 90% | Note 1, 3 |
| QC | 21.5 | 21 | 91% | Note 1, 4 |
| QC | >30 | >30 | 90% | Note 1, 5 |
| QC | 22 | 22 | 90% | Note 1, 6 |
| vivo | >20 | >20 | 96.51% |  |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: 400MHz bandwidth  Note 3: Regular slot, FDM/SDM  Note 4: mini-slot, Full Antenna  Note 5: mini-slot, FDM/SDM  Note 6: DDDUU | | | | |

**DU, scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 35 System capacity of scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR2 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | 1.29 | 1 | 90% | Note 1 |
| QC | 9 | 9 | 90% | Note 2 |
| vivo | 8.3 | 8 | 92.66% |  |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: DDDUU | | | | |

**DU, scene/video/data/voice-stream, 20Mbps, 30ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 36 System capacity of scene/video/data/voice (20Mbps) application in FR2 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| QC | 5 | 5 | 90% | Note 1,2 |
| QC | 3.5 | 3 | >90% | Note 1,2,3 |
| QC | 5 | 5 | 90% | Note 1,2,4 |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: DDDUU  Note 3: 15ms PDB  Note 2: 60ms PDB | | | | |

**DU, pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB) + scene/video/data/voice-stream (10Mbps/20Mbps, 30msPDB)**

Table 37 System capacity of pose/control (0.2Mbps) and scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps/20Mbps) application in FR2 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **SU-MIMO** | | | **Notes** |
| **Capacity** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell =C1** |
| MTK | 10 | 10 | 90% | Note 1 |
| QC | 2 | 2 | 90% | Note 1, 2 |
| QC | 5 | 5 | 90% | Note 1, 2, 4 |
| QC | 10 | 10 | 90% | Note 1, 2,3,4 |
| QC | 12.5 | 12 | 93% | Note 1, 2,4,5 |
| QC | 2.5 | 2 | 92.50% | Note 1, 2,4,6 |
| Note 1: the interval of packet arrival among UEs are equal  Note 2: video-stream with jitter  Note 3: 400MHz bandwidth  Note 4: DDDUU  Note 5: adopting delay-aware (DA) scheduling  Note 6: scene/video/data/voice-stream: 20Mbps, 30ms PDB | | | | |

* 1. UE Power Consumption Results: FR1
     1. DL power consumption
        1. InH Scenario

**InH, CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 38 Power consumption results of CG (30Mbps) application in FR1 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| Interdigital | AlwaysOn - baseline | 12 | 6 | 50% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_4\_12) | 12 | 2 | 17% | 5.28% |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 12 | 4 | 33% | 16.41% |
| Nokia | R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 5 | 5 | 97.00% | 27.09% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_4\_4) | 5 | 5 | 96.05% | 23.57% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_8\_8) | 5 | 5 | 94.33% | 15.23% |

**InH, VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 39 Power consumption results of VR/AR (30Mbps) application in FR1 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** | **Notes** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 5 | 10 | 100.00% | - |  |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% | 5.72% |  |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% | 3.67% |  |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% | 28.38% |  |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 5 | 10 | 100.00% | 35.18% |  |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 10 | 10 | 92.50% | - |  |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 10 | 10 | 91.25% | 4.88% |  |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 10 | 10 | 91.81% | 3.24% |  |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 10 | 10 | 91.25% | 23.84% |  |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 10 | 10 | 90.70% | 31.34% |  |
| Interdigital | AlwaysOn - baseline | 12 | 2 | 17% | - |  |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_4\_12) | 12 | 0 | 0% | 6.42% |  |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 12 | 0 | 0% | 17.39% |  |
| Nokia | R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 5 | 5 | 89.33% | 27.09% |  |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_4\_4) | 5 | 5 | 84.00% | 23.57% |  |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_8\_8) | 5 | 5 | 0.50% | 15.23% |  |
| CATT | AlwaysOn - baseline | 12 | 12 | 95.83% |  |  |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_12\_4) | 12 | 12 | 90.97% | 2.39% |  |
| R15/16CDRX (6\_4\_2) | 12 | 12 | 88.89% | 6.14% |  |
| XR-dedicated PDCCH monitoring window | 12 | 12 | 90.00% | 3.87% | Note 1A |
| XR-dedicated PDCCH monitoring window | 12 | 12 | 86.67% | 3.87% | Note 1B |
| XR-dedicated PDCCH monitoring window with UE playout buffer | 12 | 12 | 91.67% | 17.44% | Note 1C  Note 2 |
| C-DRX with UE playout buffer (16\_8\_4) | 12 | 12 | 91.67% | 12.57% | Note 2 |
| Note 1A: Monitoring cycle=8ms; Monitoring window=6ms  Note 1B: Monitoring cycle=16ms; Monitoring window=12ms  Note 1C: Monitoring cycle=16ms; Monitoring window=8ms  Note 2: UE playout buffer size = 5ms | | | | | | |

**InH, VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 40 Power consumption results of VR/AR (45Mbps) application in FR1 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 3 | 5 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 3 | 5 | 100.00% | 5.32% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 3 | 5 | 100.00% | 3.46% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 3 | 5 | 100.00% | 26.74% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 3 | 5 | 100.00% | 34.28% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 5 | 5 | 96.67% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 5 | 5 | 92.78% | 4.68% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 5 | 5 | 94.44% | 2.83% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 5 | 5 | 93.89% | 22.61% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 5 | 5 | 93.89% | 30.64% |
| Interdigital | AlwaysOn - baseline | 12 | 2 | 17% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_4\_12) | 12 | 0 | 0% | 5.84% |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 12 | 0 | 0% | 16.30% |
| Nokia | R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 3 | 3 | 94.72% | 25.45% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_4\_4) | 3 | 3 | 83.88% | 21.04% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_8\_8) | 3 | 3 | 0.00% | 13.04% |

* + - 1. DU Scenario

**DU, CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 41 Power consumption results of CG (30Mbps) application in FR1 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| Interdigital | AlwaysOn - baseline | 8 | 4 | 50% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_4\_12) | 8 | 2 | 25% | 6.64% |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 8 | 2 | 25% | 17.65% |
| Huawei | AlwaysOn - baseline | 7 | 7 | 90.88% |  |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_5\_4) | 7 | 7 | 49.52% | 7.00% |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 7 | 7 | 86.26% | 2.76% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_8\_8) | 7 | 7 | 43.20% | 5.93% |
| Ericsson | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 4 | 90.00% |  |
| Genie | 4 | 4 | 90.00% | 40.00% |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_3) | 4 | 4 | 87.00% | 4.00% |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_5\_5) | 4 | 4 | 76.00% | 8.00% |
| eCDRX (16.6666\_8\_3) | 4 | 4 | 80.00% | 21.00% |

**DU, VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 42 Power consumption results of VR/AR (30Mbps) application in FR1 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 7 | 13 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 7 | 13 | 100.00% | 5.57% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 7 | 13 | 100.00% | 3.65% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 7 | 13 | 100.00% | 27.49% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 7 | 13 | 100.00% | 34.71% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 13 | 13 | 92.43% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 13 | 13 | 90.11% | 4.70% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 13 | 13 | 91.58% | 3.03% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 13 | 13 | 91.22% | 21.72% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 13 | 13 | 91.21% | 29.90% |
| Interdigital | AlwaysOn - baseline | 8 | 2 | 25% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_4\_12) | 8 | 0 | 0% | 7.09% |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 8 | 2 | 25% | 18.05% |
| Huawei | AlwaysOn - baseline | 5 | 5 | 92.00% |  |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_5\_4) | 5 | 5 | 23.71% | 7.39% |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 5 | 5 | 85.71% | 2.89% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_8\_8) | 5 | 5 | 0.00% | 7.62% |
| Ericsson | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 4 | 90.00% |  |
| Genie | 4 | 4 | 90.00% | 44.00% |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_3) | 4 | 4 | 82.00% | 5.00% |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_5\_5) | 4 | 4 | 27.00% | 10.00% |
| eCDRX (16.6666\_8\_3) | 4 | 4 | 84.00% | 23.00% |

**DU, VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 43 Power consumption results of VR/AR (45Mbps) application in FR1 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 3 | 3 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 3 | 3 | 100.00% | 5.56% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 3 | 3 | 100.00% | 3.53% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 3 | 3 | 99.47% | 27.26% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 3 | 3 | 99.47% | 34.64% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 6 | 6 | 95.63% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 6 | 6 | 93.12% | 4.69% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 6 | 6 | 94.18% | 3.10% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 6 | 6 | 94.18% | 22.95% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 6 | 6 | 93.39% | 30.75% |
| Interdigital | AlwaysOn - baseline | 8 | 0 | 0% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_4\_12) | 8 | 0 | 0% | 6.39% |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 8 | 0 | 0% | 16.93% |

* + - 1. Uma Scenario

**Uma, VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 44 Power consumption results of VR/AR (30Mbps) application in FR1 DL Urban Macro scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 8 | 98.81% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 4 | 8 | 98.41% | 6.26% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 4 | 8 | 98.81% | 4.05% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 4 | 8 | 97.22% | 29.06% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 4 | 8 | 96.38% | 35.75% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 8 | 8 | 93.75% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 8 | 8 | 91.47% | 5.02% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 8 | 8 | 92.85% | 3.23% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 8 | 8 | 91.87% | 23.33% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 8 | 8 | 92.06% | 31.98% |

**Uma, VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 45 Power consumption results of VR/AR (45Mbps) application in FR1 DL Urban Macro scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 2 | 4 | 96.83% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 2 | 4 | 96.83% | 5.81% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 2 | 4 | 96.83% | 3.97% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 2 | 4 | 96.83% | 27.33% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 2 | 4 | 96.83% | 34.73% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 4 | 94.05% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 4 | 4 | 92.46% | 4.92% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 4 | 4 | 93.25% | 3.13% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 4 | 4 | 91.67% | 23.59% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 4 | 4 | 91.67% | 32.17% |

* + 1. UL power consumption
       1. InH Scenario

**InH, pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 46 Power consumption results of pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR1 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 20 | >20 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_1) | 20 | >20 | 94.31% | 26.33% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_3\_1) | 20 | >20 | 93.33% | 36.83% |

**InH, scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 47 Power consumption results of scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR1 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 7 | 13 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 7 | 13 | 100.00% | 8.39% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 7 | 13 | 100.00% | 5.21% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 7 | 13 | 100.00% | 35.41% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 7 | 13 | 100.00% | 39.50% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 13 | 13 | 93.59% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 13 | 13 | 92.22% | 7.98% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 13 | 13 | 92.86% | 5.02% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 13 | 13 | 92.38% | 33.54% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 13 | 13 | 92.56% | 38.89% |

**InH, pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB) + scene/video/data/voice-stream (10Mbps, 30msPDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 48 Power consumption results of pose/control (0.2Mbps) and scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR1 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 6 | 12 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 6 | 12 | 100.00% | 3.45% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 6 | 12 | 100.00% | 2.04% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 6 | 12 | 100.00% | 22.16% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 6 | 12 | 100.00% | 27.83% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 12 | 12 | 93.29% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 12 | 12 | 92.13% | 3.36% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 12 | 12 | 92.59% | 1.84% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 12 | 12 | 91.90% | 21.37% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 12 | 12 | 92.36% | 25.59% |

* + - 1. DU Scenario

**DU, pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 49 Power consumption results of pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR1 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 20 | >20 | 99.99% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_1) | 20 | >20 | 94.84% | 26.62% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_3\_1) | 20 | >20 | 93.81% | 37.27% |

**DU, scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 50 Power consumption results of scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR1 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 5 | 9 | 97.14% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 5 | 9 | 97.14% | 7.13% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 5 | 9 | 97.14% | 4.49% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 5 | 9 | 95.56% | 32.48% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 5 | 9 | 97.14% | 36.32% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 9 | 9 | 92.95% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 9 | 9 | 91.35% | 6.89% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 9 | 9 | 91.17% | 4.37% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 9 | 9 | 91.60% | 29.49% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 9 | 9 | 91.77% | 34.87% |

**DU, pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB) + scene/video/data/voice-stream (10Mbps, 30msPDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 51 Power consumption results of pose/control (0.2Mbps) and scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR1 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 7 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 4 | 7 | 100.00% | 3.17% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 4 | 7 | 100.00% | 1.74% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 4 | 7 | 100.00% | 20.92% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 4 | 7 | 100.00% | 23.97% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 7 | 7 | 92.29% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 7 | 7 | 90.70% | 3.11% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 7 | 7 | 92.06% | 1.42% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 7 | 7 | 90.48% | 19.58% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 7 | 7 | 91.16% | 22.65% |

* + - 1. Uma Scenario

**Uma, pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 52 Power consumption results of pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR1 UL Uma scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 20 | >20 | 97.70% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_1) | 20 | >20 | 94.37% | 28.10% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_3\_1) | 20 | >20 | 92.94% | 38.93% |

* + 1. DL and UL evaluating together
       1. InH Scenario

**InH, CG:** **DL video-stream (30Mbps, 15ms PDB) + UL pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 53 Power consumption results of DL CG (30Mbps) and UL pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR1 InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UE** | **% of satisfied UE in DL** | **% of satisfied UE in UL** | **Average PS gain (%)** | **Notes** |
| MTK | AlwaysOn - baseline | 9 | 9 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 0% |  |
| Cross slot scheduling | 9 | 9 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 20.56% |  |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 9 | 9 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 15.29% |  |
| Custom R17 PDCCH skipping + cross slot | 9 | 9 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 28.60% |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | AlwaysOn-baseline | 12 | 12 |  | 96.53% | 100% |  |  |
| AlwaysOn-baseline | 12 | 12 |  | 96.53% | 100% |  | Note 1 |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_3) | 12 | 12 |  | 88.19% | 100% | 21.40% |  |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_3) | 12 | 12 |  | 88.19% | 100% | 21.30% | Note 1 |
| QC | AlwaysOn - baseline | 11 | 11 | 91.97% | 91.97% | 100% |  |  |
| Note 1: Option 1: two-step Qauntization | | | | | | | | |

**InH, VR: DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 54 Power consumption results of DL VR (30Mbps) and UL pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR1 InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UE** | **% of satisfied UE in DL** | **% of satisfied UE in UL** | **Average PS gain (%)** | **Notes** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | - |  |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 3.71% |  |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 3.64% |  |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 25.12% |  |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 35.23% |  |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 10 | 10 | 92.50% |  |  | - |  |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 10 | 10 | 91.25% |  |  | 3.45% |  |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 10 | 10 | 91.81% |  |  | 2.33% |  |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 10 | 10 | 90.70% |  |  | 23.56% |  |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 10 | 10 | 91.25% |  |  | 31.78% |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | AlwaysOn-baseline | 11 | 11 |  | 93.18% | 100% |  |  |
| AlwaysOn-baseline | 11 | 11 |  | 93.18% | 100% |  | Note 1 |
| AlwaysOn-baseline | 10 | 11 |  | 93% | 100% |  |  |
| AlwaysOn-baseline | 10 | 11 |  | 93% | 100% |  | Note 1 |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_3) | 11 | 11 |  | 83% | 100% | 22.60% |  |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_3) | 11 | 11 |  | 83% | 100% | 22.60% | Note 1 |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_3) | 10 | 11 |  | 85.83% | 100% | 21.50% |  |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_3) | 10 | 11 |  | 85.83% | 100% | 21.40% | Note 1 |
| QC | AlwaysOn - baseline | 9 | 9 | 92.196% | 92.196% | 100% | 0% |  |
| Note 1: Option 1: two-step Qauntization | | | | | | | | |

**InH, VR: DL video-stream (45Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 55 Power consumption results of DL VR (45Mbps) and UL pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR1 InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UE** | **% of satisfied UE in DL** | **% of satisfied UE in UL** | **Average PS gain (%)** | **Notes** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | AlwaysOn-baseline | 7 | 7 |  | 91% | 100% |  |  |
| AlwaysOn-baseline | 7 | 7 |  | 91% | 100% |  | Note 1 |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_3) | 7 | 7 |  | 81% | 100% | 21.40% |  |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_3) | 7 | 7 |  | 81% | 100% | 21.30% | Note 1 |
| Note 1: Option 1: two-step Qauntization | | | | | | | | |

**InH, AR: DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL video-stream (10Mbps, 30ms PDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 56 Power consumption results of DL AR (30Mbps) and UL video (10Mbps) application in FR1 InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UE** | **% of satisfied UE in DL** | **% of satisfied UE in UL** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 4.20% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 2.59% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 23.61% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 31.34% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 10 | 10 | 92.50% |  |  | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 10 | 10 | 91.67% |  |  | 2.62% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 10 | 10 | 91.94% |  |  | 1.69% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 10 | 10 | 90.83% |  |  | 14.77% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 10 | 10 | 91.39% |  |  | 19.90% |

**InH, AR: DL video-stream (45Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL video-stream (10Mbps, 30ms PDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 57 Power consumption results of DL AR (45Mbps) and UL video (10Mbps) application in FR1 InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UE** | **% of satisfied UE in DL** | **% of satisfied UE in UL** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| MTK | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 0% - baseline |
| Cross slot scheduling | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 23.87% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 17.65% |
| Custom: R17 PDCCH skipping + cross slot | 4 | 4 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 31.56% |

**InH, AR: DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL two-stream (pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB)+video-stream (10Mbps, 30ms PDB))**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 58 Power consumption results of DL AR (30Mbps) and UL pose/control (0.2Mbps) and UL video (10Mbps) application in FR1 InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UE** | **% of satisfied UE in DL** | **% of satisfied UE in UL** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 1.81% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 1.02% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 16.65% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 5 | 10 | 100.00% |  |  | 19.98% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 10 | 10 | 92.22% |  |  | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 10 | 10 | 90.83% |  |  | 1.59% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 10 | 10 | 91.67% |  |  | 0.83% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 10 | 10 | 90.56% |  |  | 13.96% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 10 | 10 | 91.11% |  |  | 16.13% |
| QC | AlwaysOn - baseline | 3 | 3 | 89.72% | 99.44% | 90.28% | 0% |

**InH, AR: DL video-stream (45Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL two-stream (pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB)+video-stream (10Mbps, 30ms PDB))**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 59 Power consumption results of DL AR (45Mbps) and UL pose/control (0.2Mbps) and UL video (10Mbps) application in FR1 InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UE** | **% of satisfied UE in DL** | **% of satisfied UE in UL** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| MTK | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 4 | 91.67% | 91.67% |  | 0% - baseline |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_5\_5) | 4 | 4 | 70.83% | 70.83% |  | 4.45% |
| Custom : cross-slot + MIMO layer adaptation by BWP switching | 4 | 4 | 88.73% | 88.73% |  | 8.84% |
| Custom : cross-slot + MIMO layer adaptation +PDCCH skipping by BWP switching | 4 | 4 | 84.80% | 84.80% |  | 9.31% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 4 | 4 | 90.00% | 90.00% |  | 14.41% |

* + - 1. DU Scenario

**DU, CG: DL video-stream (30Mbps, 15ms PDB) + UL pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 60 Power consumption results of DL CG (30Mbps) and UL pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR1 Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UE** | **% of satisfied UE in DL** | **% of satisfied UE in UL** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| Ericsson | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 4 | 90.00% |  |  |  |
| Genie | 4 | 4 | 90.00% |  |  | 17.00% |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_3\_0) | 4 | 4 | 84.00% |  |  | 7.00% |
| eCDRX (16.666\_13\_0) | 4 | 4 | 88.00% |  |  | 6.00% |
| MTK | AlwaysOn - baseline | 13 | 13 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 0% - baseline |
| Cross slot scheduling | 13 | 13 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 20.48% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 13 | 13 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 15.32% |
| Custom : R17 PDCCH skipping + cross slot | 13 | 13 | 100.00% |  | 100.00% | 28.58% |
| QC | AlwaysOn - baseline | 15 | 15 | 91.94% | 91.94% | 99.87% | 0% |

**DU, VR: DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 61 Power consumption results of DL VR (30Mbps) and UL pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR1 Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UE** | **% of satisfied UE in DL** | **% of satisfied UE in UL** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 7 | 13 | 100.00% |  |  | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 7 | 13 | 100.00% |  |  | 3.56% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 7 | 13 | 100.00% |  |  | 2.44% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 7 | 13 | 100.00% |  |  | 23.49% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 7 | 13 | 100.00% |  |  | 33.57% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 13 | 13 | 92.43% |  |  | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 13 | 13 | 90.11% |  |  | 3.31% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 13 | 13 | 91.58% |  |  | 2.24% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 13 | 13 | 91.21% |  |  | 21.93% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 13 | 13 | 91.21% |  |  | 29.18% |
| QC | AlwaysOn - baseline | 11 | 11 | 94.37% | 94.37% | 99.74% | 0 |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_6\_4) | 11 | 11 | 38.96% | 75.07% | 50.82% | 11.7333% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_4\_6) | 11 | 11 | 92.47% | 92.47% | 99.74% | 7.0319% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_6\_6) | 11 | 11 | 92.04% | 92.04% | 99.74% | 5.3899% |
| Genie | 11 | 11 | 94.37% | 94.37% | 99.74% | 18.1882% |
| eCDRX (16/16/17\_12\_14) | 11 | 11 | 72.38% | 91.95% | 79.05% | 21.3424% |

**DU, AR: DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL video-stream (10Mbps, 30ms PDB)**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 62 Power consumption results of DL AR (30Mbps) and UL video (10Mbps) application in FR1 Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UE** | **% of satisfied UE in DL** | **% of satisfied UE in UL** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 5 | 9 | 96.51% |  |  | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 5 | 9 | 96.19% |  |  | 3.79% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 5 | 9 | 96.51% |  |  | 2.39% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 5 | 9 | 95.87% |  |  | 20.77% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 5 | 9 | 96.19% |  |  | 27.18% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 9 | 9 | 92.59% |  |  | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 9 | 9 | 91.89% |  |  | 2.58% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 9 | 9 | 92.06% |  |  | 1.62% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 9 | 9 | 90.83% |  |  | 14.04% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 9 | 9 | 91.18% |  |  | 19.12% |

**DU, AR: DL video-stream (30Mbps, 10ms PDB) + UL two-stream (pose/control-stream (0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB)+video-stream (10Mbps, 30ms PDB))**

**100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 63 Power consumption results of DL AR (30Mbps) and UL pose/control (0.2Mbps) and UL video (10Mbps) application in FR1 Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UE** | **% of satisfied UE in DL** | **% of satisfied UE in UL** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 7 | 100.00% |  |  | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 4 | 7 | 100.00% |  |  | 1.63% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 4 | 7 | 100.00% |  |  | 0.91% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 4 | 7 | 100.00% |  |  | 14.34% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 4 | 7 | 100.00% |  |  | 17.63% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 7 | 7 | 92.06% |  |  | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 7 | 7 | 91.16% |  |  | 1.51% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 7 | 7 | 91.61% |  |  | 0.79% |
| eCDRX (16\_6\_4) | 7 | 7 | 90.48% |  |  | 13.19% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 7 | 7 | 90.70% |  |  | 15.93% |
| Ericsson | AlwaysOn - baseline | 3 | 3 | 90.00% |  |  |  |
| Genie | 3 | 3 | 90.00% |  |  | 18.00% |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_3\_0) | 3 | 3 | 78.00% |  |  | 7.00% |
| eCDRX (16.6666\_13\_0) | 3 | 3 | 88.00% |  |  | 6.00% |
| QC | AlwaysOn - baseline | 3 | 3 | 91.27% | 100.00% | 91.468% | 0% |

* 1. UE Power Consumption Results: FR2
     1. DL power consumption
        1. InH Scenario

**InH, CG, 30Mbps, 15ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 64 Power consumption results of CG (30Mbps) application in FR2 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| Nokia | R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 10 | 10 | 100.00% | 25.78% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_4\_4) | 10 | 10 | 100.00% | 21.63% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_8\_8) | 10 | 10 | 97.83% | 12.97% |

**InH, VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 65 Power consumption results of VR/AR (30Mbps) application in FR2 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 4 | 8 | 99.31% | 10.06% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 4 | 8 | 99.31% | 6.28% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 4 | 8 | 98.61% | 34.89% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | 48.70% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 8 | 8 | 92.01% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 8 | 8 | 90.63% | 9.53% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 8 | 8 | 91.37% | 5.81% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 8 | 8 | 90.97% | 33.68% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 8 | 8 | 91.32% | 47.84% |
| Nokia | R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 10 | 10 | 92.50% | 25.78% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_4\_4) | 10 | 10 | 24.33% | 21.63% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_8\_8) | 10 | 10 | 0.08% | 12.97% |

**InH, VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 66 Power consumption results of VR/AR (45Mbps) application in FR2 DL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 2 | 4 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 2 | 4 | 98.61% | 9.52% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 2 | 4 | 98.61% | 5.98% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 2 | 4 | 100.00% | 29.25% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 2 | 4 | 100.00% | 47.71% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 4 | 94.44% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 4 | 4 | 91.67% | 9.15% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 4 | 4 | 93.75% | 5.73% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 4 | 4 | 91.67% | 28.37% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 4 | 4 | 90.36% | 46.96% |
| Nokia | R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_2) | 6 | 6 | 82.08% | 23.69% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_4\_4) | 6 | 6 | 9.80% | 19.75% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_8\_8) | 6 | 6 | 0.00% | 11.43% |
| QC | ALWAYS ON | 3 | 3 | 90% | 0% |
| Cross-slot scheduling | 3 | 3 | 90% | 12.2% |
| PDCCH Skipping | 3 | 3 | 90% | 29.8% |
| PDCCH Skipping + Cross-slot skipping | 3 | 3 | 90% | 30% |

* + - 1. DU Scenario

**DU, VR/AR, 30Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 67 Power consumption results of VR/AR (30Mbps) application in FR2 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 7 | 13 | 99.55% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 7 | 13 | 98.64% | 10.15% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 7 | 13 | 99.32% | 6.40% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 7 | 13 | 99.09% | 32.63% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 7 | 13 | 99.32% | 49.02% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 13 | 13 | 95.24% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 13 | 13 | 91.82% | 9.50% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 13 | 13 | 93.53% | 5.96% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 13 | 13 | 91.97% | 31.30% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 13 | 13 | 92.67% | 48.48% |

**DU, VR/AR, 45Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 68 Power consumption results of VR/AR (45Mbps) application in FR2 DL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | 9.20% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | 6.06% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | 28.57% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | 41.55% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 8 | 8 | 93.25% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 8 | 8 | 91.67% | 8.29% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 8 | 8 | 92.26% | 4.98% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 8 | 8 | 91.47% | 27.16% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 8 | 8 | 92.06% | 39.60% |

* + 1. UL power consumption
       1. InH Scenario

**InH, pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 69 Power consumption results of pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR2 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 20 | >20 | 97.69% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_1) | 20 | >20 | 95.90% | 35.99% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_3\_1) | 20 | >20 | 92.82% | 45.07% |

**InH, scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 70 Power consumption results of scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR2 UL InH scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | 10.24% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | 6.96% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | 38.35% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 8 | 8 | 100.00% | 52.35% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 8 | 8 | 95.14% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 8 | 8 | 92.71% | 9.74% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 8 | 8 | 94.10% | 6.58% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 8 | 8 | 92.36% | 36.79% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 8 | 8 | 93.06% | 51.32% |

* + - 1. DU Scenario

**DU, pose/control-stream, 0.2Mbps, 10ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 71 Power consumption results of pose/control (0.2Mbps) application in FR2 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 20 | >20 | 96.51% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (4\_2\_1) | 20 | >20 | 94.13% | 35.29% |
| R15/16CDRX (8\_3\_1) | 20 | >20 | 92.30% | 42.51% |

**DU, scene/video/data/voice-stream, 10Mbps, 30ms PDB, 100MHz bandwidth, DDDSU TDD format**

Table 72 Power consumption results of scene/video/data/voice (10Mbps) application in FR2 UL Dense Urban scenario

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source** | **Power Saving scheme** | **avg # UEs/ cell = N1** | **C1=floor(Capacity)** | **% of satisfied UEs when #UEs/cell = N1** | **Average PS gain (%)** |
| vivo | AlwaysOn - baseline | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 4 | 8 | 99.60% | 9.36% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 4 | 8 | 100.00% | 6.41% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 4 | 8 | 99.60% | 32.97% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 8 | 8 | 100.00% | 51.43% |
| AlwaysOn - baseline | 8 | 8 | 92.66% | - |
| R15/16CDRX (10\_8\_4) | 8 | 8 | 91.07% | 9.18% |
| R15/16CDRX (16\_14\_4) | 8 | 8 | 91.67% | 6.18% |
| eCDRX (16\_8\_4) | 8 | 8 | 90.67% | 31.72% |
| R17 PDCCH skipping | 8 | 8 | 91.27% | 46.21% |
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Annex A: Simulation assumptions

Table A.1-1: General parameters for FR1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| Deployment | Indoor hotspot refers to TR 38.913  Dense urban with single layer of Marco layer refers to TR 38.913  Urban Macro refers to TR 38.913 |
| Channel model | For Indoor hotspot:   * InH refers to TR 38.901   For Dense urban:   * Uma refers to TR 38.901   For Urban Macro:   * Uma refers to TR 38.901 |
| Layout | For Indoor hotspot:   * 120m x 50m, ISD = 20m, TRP numbers: 12   For Dense urban:   * 21 cells with wraparound, ISD = 200m   For Urban Macro:   * 21 cells with wraparound, ISD = 500m |
| Carrier frequency | 4GHz |
| Subcarrier spacing | 30kHz |
| System bandwidth | Baseline: 100 MHz  Optional: 20/40 MHz, 2\*100 MHz with CA  Companies should report the CA setting if CA is adopted. |
| TDD configuration | Option 1: DDDSU (S: 10D:2F:2U)  Option 2: DDDUU (The end of third ‘D’: [2]-symbol gap) |
| BS Tx power | For Indoor hotspot:   * 24 dBm per 20 MHz   For Dense urban:   * 44 dBm per 20 MHz   For Urban Macro:   * 49 dBm per 20 MHz   For system BW larger than above, Tx power scales up accordingly. |
| UE max Tx power | 23 dBm |
| BS antenna parameters | For InH scenario:   * 32 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (4,4,2,1,1;4,4) * (dH, dV) = (0.5λ, 0.5λ)   For Dense Urban/Urban Macro scenario:   * Option 1: 64 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (8,8,2,1,1;4,8) * Option 2: 32 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (8,2,2,1,1,8,2) * (dH, dV) = (0.5λ, 0.5λ) * Company to report the BS antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluation.   Other BS antenna parameters can also be optionally evaluated. |
| UE antenna parameters | Baseline: 2T/4R, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (1,2,2,1,1;1,2), (dH, dV) = (0.5, N/A)λ  Optional: 4T/4R, 1T/2R, 2T2R |
| BS height | For Indoor hotspot:   * 3m   For Dense urban:   * 25m   For Urban Macro:   * 25m |
| UE height | For InH scenario:   * 1.5m   For Dense Urban/Urban Macro scenario:   * Outdoor UEs: 1.5 m * Indoor UTs: 3(nfl – 1) + 1.5; nfl ~ uniform(1,Nfl) where Nfl ~ uniform(4,8) |
| BS antenna pattern | For Indoor hotspot:   * Ceiling-mount antenna radiation pattern, 5 dBi   For Dense urban:   * 3-sector antenna radiation pattern, 8 dBi   For Urban Macro:   * 3-sector antenna radiation pattern, 8 dBi |
| UE antenna pattern | Omni-directional, 0 dBi |
| Noise figure | BS: 5 dB, UE: 9dB |
| Downtilt | For Indoor hotspot:   * 90° (pointing to the ground)   For Dense urban:   * 12 degree * Other downtilt value can also be optionally evaluated   For Urban Macro:   * 6 degree |
| UE distribution | For InH scenario:   * 100% indoor   For Dense Urban/Urban Macro scenario:   * 80% indoor, 20% outdoor |
| UE speed | 3 km/h |
| BS receiver | MMSE-IRC |
| UE receiver | MMSE-IRC |
| Channel estimation | Realistic  Ideal (optional) |
| MCS | Up to 256QAM |
| Power control parameter | Companies should report |
| Transmission scheme | Companies should report |
| Scheduler | SU/MU-MIMO PF scheduler (company to report SU or MU),  other scheduler (e.g., delay aware scheduler) is up to companies report |
| CSI acquisition | Realistic  Both CSI feedback and SRS are considered  Companies should report  •          CSI feedback delay, CSI report periodicity, whether using CSI quantization, CSI error model or not,  •          Assumptions on SRS: periodicity, processing gain, processing delay, etc  and etc. |
| PHY processing delay | Baseline: UE PDSCH processing Capability #1  Optional: UE PDSCH processing Capability #2    Companies should report gNB processing delay, e.g. DL NACK to retransmission delay, UL previous transmission to current transmission delay and etc. |
| PDCCH overhead | Companies should report |
| DMRS overhead | Companies should report |
| Target BLER | Companies should report |
| Max HARQ transmission | Companies should report |

Table A.2-1: General parameters for FR2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| Deployment | Indoor hotspot refers to TR 38.913  Dense urban with single layer of Marco layer refers to TR 38.913 |
| Channel model | For Indoor hotspot:   * InH refers to TR 38.901   For Dense urban:   * Uma refers to TR 38.901 |
| Layout | For Indoor hotspot:   * 120m x 50m, ISD: 20m, TRP numbers: 12   For Dense urban:   * 21cells with wraparound, ISD: 200m |
| Carrier frequency | 30GHz |
| Subcarrier spacing | 120KHz |
| System bandwidth | Option 1: 100 MHz  Option 2: 400 MHz  Companies should report the CA setting if CA is adopted. |
| TDD configuration | Option 1: DDDSU (S: 10D:2F:2U)  Option 2: DDDUU (The end of third ‘D’: [2]-symbol gap) |
| BS Tx power | For Indoor hotspot:   * 23 dBm per 80 MHz. EIRP should not exceed 58 dBm   For Dense urban:   * 40 dBm per 80 MHz. EIRP should not exceed 73 dBm   For system BW larger than above, Tx power scales up accordingly. |
| UE max Tx power | 23 dBm, maximum EIRP 43 dBm, |
| BS antenna parameters | For InH scenario:   * 2 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (16, 8, 2,1,1;1,1) * (dH, dV) = (0.5λ, 0.5λ)   For Dense urban scenario:   * 2 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (4,8,2,2,2;1,1) * (dH, dV) = (0.5λ, 0.5λ) |
| UE antenna parameters | Option 1 (Follow Rel-17 evaluation methodology for FeMIMO in R1-2007151)   * (M, N, P) = (1, 4, 2), 3 panels (left, right, top) * (Mp, Np) is up to company.   Option 2 (from TR 38.802 – developed in Rel-14)   * 4Tx/4Rx: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (2,4,2,1,2;1,2), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.5)λ, the polarization angles are 0° and 90°   Company to report the UE antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluation.  Other UE antenna parameters can also be optionally evaluated. |
| BS height | For Indoor hotspot:   * 3m   For Dense urban:   * 25m |
| UE height | For InH scenario:   * 1.5m   For Dense Urban/Urban Macro scenario:   * Outdoor UEs: 1.5 m * Indoor UTs: 3(nfl – 1) + 1.5; nfl ~ uniform(1,Nfl) where Nfl ~ uniform(4,8) |
| BS antenna pattern | For Indoor hotspot:   * Ceiling-mount antenna radiation pattern, 5 dBi   For Dense urban:   * 3-sector antenna radiation pattern, 8 dBi |
| UE antenna pattern | UE antenna radiation pattern model 1, 5dBi |
| BS noise figure | 7 dB |
| UE noise figure | 13 dB |
| Downtilt | For Indoor hotspot:   * 90° (pointing to the ground)   For Dense urban:   * 12 degree   Other downtilt can be optionally evaluated |
| UE distribution | For indoor scenario:   * 100% indoor   For outdoor scenario:   * 100% outdoor   Other UE distribution can be evaluated optionally |
| UE speed | 3 km/h |
| BS receiver | MMSE-IRC |
| UE receiver | MMSE-IRC |
| Channel estimation | Realistic  Ideal (optional) |
| MCS | Up to 256QAM |
| Power control parameter | Companies should report |
| Transmission scheme | Companies should report |
| Scheduler | SU/MU-MIMO PF scheduler (company to report SU or MU),  other scheduler (e.g., delay aware scheduler) is up to companies report |
| CSI acquisition | Realistic  Both CSI feedback and SRS are considered  Companies should report  •          CSI feedback delay, CSI report periodicity, whether using CSI quantization, CSI error model or not,  •          Assumptions on SRS: periodicity, processing gain, processing delay, etc  and etc. |
| PHY processing delay | Baseline: UE PDSCH processing Capability #1  Optional: UE PDSCH processing Capability #2    Companies should report gNB processing delay, e.g. DL NACK to retransmission delay, UL previous transmission to current transmission delay and etc. |
| PDCCH overhead | Companies should report |
| DMRS overhead | Companies should report |
| Target BLER | Companies should report |
| Max HARQ transmission | Companies should report |

Annex B: Traffic model

Table B.1-1: Traffic model for DL

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Traffic model** | **CG** | **VR/AR** |
| Data rate | baseline: 8Mbps, 30Mbps | baseline: 30Mbps, 45Mbps  optional: 60Mbps |
| PDB | baseline: 15ms | baseline: 10ms |
| Frame per second | baseline: 60fps  optional: 120 fps | |
| Packet size | Truncated Gaussian distribution for packet size  baseline: [STD, Max, Min]: [10.5, 150, 50] % of Mean packet size  optional: [STD, Max, Min] = [4, 112, 88] % of Mean for single eye buffer, [3, 109, 91] % of Mean for dual eye buffer | |
| Jitter | J is drawn from a truncated Gaussian distribution  baseline: Mean: 0 ms; STD: 2 ms; Range: [-4, 4] ms  optional: Mean: 0 ms; STD: 2 ms; Range: [-5, 5] ms | |

Table B.2-1: Traffic model for UL

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Traffic model** | **pose/control** | **scene/video/data/audio aggregating streams** |
| Data rate | baseline: 0.2Mbps | baseline: 10 Mbps  optional: 20 Mbps |
| Frame per second | baseline: 250fps | baseline: 60fps |
| PDB | baseline: 10ms | baseline: 30ms  optional: 10ms, 15ms, 60ms |
| Packet size | baseline: Fixed 100 bytes | Truncated Gaussian distribution with the parameter values same as for DL |
| Jitter | baseline: no jitter | optional: same model as for DL |