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# Introduction

This summary contains discussion for the following email discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| [110-R18-NW\_ES] To be used for sharing updates on online/offline schedule, details on what is to be discussed in online/offline sessions, tdoc number of the moderator summary for online session, etc |

Companies can search ‘FL2’ for the updated proposal.

## Recommendations for possible online/GTW treatment/email approval:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Alternative proposal to FL2 Proposal 3.1.1.1-1**   * For evaluation purpose,   + a load (L) of a cell is a percentage of resources used for UE specific PDSCH / PUSCH   + The following load scenarios are considered  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Load scenario | Characteristics | | Idle/empty load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * L = 0 | | Light load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * 0 < L≤ [30] | | Medium load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * [30] < L≤ [50] | | For CA, the companies report whether the load is defined per CC or across all CCs. | |   **Alternative proposal Proposal 3.1.3-1**   * For evaluation purpose, network energy saving gain is computed based on the energy consumptions for a technique and the baseline over the same duration.   **FL2 Proposal 2.4-2-rev1:**  **The study in this release does not specifically consider modeling or optimization in component level for BH, repeater, power system, e.g., DC-DC converter loss, main power supply loss, active cooling.**  **FL2 Proposal 3.3.1.1-1:**   * **For FR1, urban micro can be optionally considered.** * **For FR2, urban micro is prioritized, with ISD=200 m is assumed.**   **FL2 Proposal 3.2.1.1-2:**  **It is up to company report the use of UE C-DRX.**   * **for alignment, the configuration if reported can be**  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Traffic type** | **FTP** | **IM** | **VoIP** | | Model | FTP model 3 | FTP model 3 | As defined in R1-070674.  Assume max two packets bundled. | | Packet size | 0.5 Mbytes | 0.1 Mbytes | | Mean inter-arrival time | 200 ms | 2 sec | | DRX Period | 160 ms | 320 ms | 40 ms | | DRX Inactivity timer | **FFS** 100 ms/20ms | **FFS** 80 ms/20ms | 10 ms | |

## FL2 For information

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Alternative proposed by Hung**  For non-sleep mode, the relative power value in power model table for UL reception and/or DL transmission is provided based on reference configuration.  **FL1 Proposal 2.3-2:**  For set 2 FR1 FDD TxRx reference configuration, confirm the WA as 32 in reference configuration.  **FL1 Proposal 2.3-3:**  The total DL power level is 49 dBm for set 2 FR1 FDD reference configuration.  Please have a look at the RAN3 approved LS on “skeleton of TR 38.864 for NR network energy savings”.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **TDoc** | **Title** | **Type** | **Release** | **Related WIs** | **To** | **Cc** | | R3-225203 | LS on skeleton of TR 38.864 for NR network energy savings | LS out | Rel-18 | FS\_Netw\_Energy\_NR | RAN1 | RAN2 | |

# Energy consumption model for BS

## Power states and transition time/energy

### Sleep mode definition

In order to proceed on the BS power states in multiple modes, including sleep mode, active mode and/or other mode, a first question to be addressed is how to define a sleep mode. Companies view can be summarized as below.

For a sleep mode,

* Option 1: a BS does not perform DL transmission nor UL reception [2] [6][10][14][19][20][21][22]
* Option 2: a BS can still stay in sleep mode for one direction (e.g. UL reception)-only [1][4][5][12][16][19]

**FL1 Proposal 2.1.1-1:**

**Down select between Option 1 and Option 2 for defining a sleep mode in RAN1#110.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Support Option 2.  Especially for TDD, where DL and UL do not occur simultaneously, there is no reason or benefit to tie DL and UL together, especially for light/micro sleep modes. Another aspect to consider is that Option 1 leads us to not considering UL power savings at all, which we don’t think is the right approach.  A side comment is that seems like the above should lead to decision in Proposal 2.1.1-2? |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal and Option 2 is preferred. From our understanding, Option 2 means that gNB does not need to switch time/energy to wake up for UL reception for simplicity of modeling. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Slightly prefer Option 1 which is like UE power model. For UL power saving, similar to UE power saving, the small power unit for WUS detection can be defined. The clear boundary of sleep mode and non-sleep mode can avoid the confusion in the further discussion. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal and prefer Option 1. |
| Samsung | We think each option may be depending on sleep modes, for example, if PAs are turned off in micro sleep mode, then Option 2 can be applied. However, for deep sleep mode, if common components for DL/UL are turned off, Option 1 can be applied. It can be discussed later after defining sleep modes. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes.  In the last meeting, the agreement was achieved that at least for non-sleep mode and TDD, the BS power consumption for DL and UL are separately modelled, allowing DL-only transmission or UL-only reception. Therefore, at least for the case that the DL and UL are separately modelled, the option 2 should be supported.  Furthermore, the definition of sleep mode for UL and DL is also relevant to the power consumption of a slot where has simultaneous UL reception and DL transmissions. For example, if the power value of a slot with simultaneous UL reception and DL transmissions = power of UL+power of DL, it implies that UL and DL components are decoupled. In this sense, the sleep states for DL and UL will also be different.  Therefore, the definition of sleep states and actives states should be consistent regarding the implementation assumption. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1  In our view, when we define the sleep modes, there is no uplink reception or downlink transmission. Any state with uplink reception and/or downlink transmission can be defined as active state. |
| CMCC | Support Option 1.  From our perspective, we consider to define three sleep modes, where in deep sleep mode and light sleep mode, part of IRF units are turned off, BS could not perform UL reception. In micro sleep mode, BS could ramp up to non-sleep mode in symbol level for UL reception, so we suggest when BS does not perform DL transmission nor UL reception is defined as micro sleep mode, when BS perform DL transmission or UL reception is defined as non-sleep mode. |
| OPPO | We prefer Option 1. Considering some components of BS power consumption for DL transmission and UL reception are entangled, it may be not realistic to define a sleep mode for one direction only. |
| NOKIA/NSB | As proposed in our Tdoc, the BS reception could still be maintained for micro-sleep state with symbol level BS DTX. But for deep sleep and standby sleep states, the BS does not perform neither DL nor UL. |
| MediaTek | Agree. We prefer Option 1 to simplify sleep definition. |
| intel | Option 1. We think Option 1 is simpler and has higher potential for network energy saving |
| vivo | We prefer Option 2. In this case, there is no need to switch time/energy for UL reception. |
| InterDigital | Support option 2, as UL only savings can be more applicable to TDD carriers or some RRC states. |
| Panasonic | We support Option 1 but not oppose to define a state supporting UL reception-only operation. |
| Xiaomi | As commented earlier online, we think both option 1 and option 2 can be considered, and the important thing is to determine the power consumption values for both option, since both option 1 and 2 can be possible scenario for energy saving techniques. And from our view, they are all sleep modes, but different sleep modes. |
| China Telecom | We prefer Opt2. We define the BS sleep mode to simplify the evaluation of energy consumption. With on direction BS, the energy consumption of network can be evaluated separately for DL and UL, which will be much easier for evaluation. |

One related issue is whether there could be an IDLE state separately defined. Companies view can be summarized as below

* Option 1: a sleep mode 1. [2],[4], [5 for unused DL symbols], [6, 3rd preference] [10],[13][15][21][22]
* Option 2: active mode [6, 1st preference][15]
* Option 3: a separate state [4], [6, 2nd preference] [11, with relative power scaled from active mode][16]

Considering relatively large support of Option 1, the following can be suggested

**FL1 Proposal 2.1.1-2:**

**A state that BS does not perform DL transmission nor UL reception is considered as a sleep mode (FFS which).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | See our comments above for Proposal 2.1.1-1, in which we support Option 2. Since DL is the primary power consumer, it should be allowed to sleep at any opportunity, regardless of what may need to happen on UL. |
| LG Electronics | The idle state can be defined as there is no loaded data but gNB’s hardware remains active. However, if the BS can switch quickly between the micro sleep mode and the active state without additional transition time, the micro sleep mode 1 can be treated as the idle state (i.e., Option 1). |
| Spreadtrum1 | IDLE state is not clear. Only SSB is also IDLE state? We do not need to introduce the extra terminologies. If there is a signal channel, it is non-sleep state, which is similar to UE power model. |
| Qualcomm1 | We prefer discussing this proposal after making more progress in FL1 Proposal 2.1.1-1. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. IDLE state should have no DL transmission or UL reception. If there is no DL transmission or UL reception, it should be categorized into sleep mode. |
| Fujitsu | We are open to not define idle state and always consider inactive symbols at least in micro sleep mode. |
| Samsung | Support FL’s proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes. The idle state is quite similar with the micro sleep state. The BS can quickly enter into a micro sleep state and switch to the active state. Thus, there is no need to define an idle state, and the micro sleep mode can be treated as the idle state. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1，and we think it can be micro sleep. |
| CMCC | Support, same as micro sleep.  The sleep state can be used to model short inactivity gaps when BS does not perform DL transmission nor UL reception, the transition time from this sleep mode to non-sleep mode is almost 0ms, and the transition energy from this sleep mode to non-sleep mode is almost zero.  But the BS components that can be turned off in this sleep state can be further clarified. From our understanding, to realize 0ms transition time and 0 transition energy, none of BS components could be disable, but power savings can still be made by putting inactive logic into a low power mode. |
| OPPO | The proposal seems to be related to the definition of micro sleep mode. We can support the proposal if immediate transition is assumed between active mode and micro sleep mode. |
| NOKIA/NSB | The IDLE state does not need to be separately defined. If there is no DL activity, the BS could be operated with micro-sleep mode. Thus,  Option 1 is preferred. |
| MediaTek | Agree. Option1 matches real implementations better. |
| Intel | Support |
| vivo | If micro sleep is defined as 0 transmission time and energy, idle state could be equivalent to micro sleep. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal |
| Panasonic | The gNB activity/operation should be clarified in this context, e.g. Whether some data processing is ongoing. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the Proposal. |
| China Telecom | Support. |
| CEWiT | The longer sleep mode should consider the BS switching off its components, whereas idle state is quite similar with the micro sleep state but without any components being off. The Sleep mode categorization in section 2.1.2 doesn’t talk about any mode/state in which no components used for transceiving is turned OFF, thus idle state need to be defined. The longer sleep mode should be separate than the idle state. |

### Sleep mode categorization

Given the large range that BS power state could vary in different conditions, sleep mode can be further split into multiple levels, corresponding to different levels of components shutdown as well as resulted transition times that are required for a BS to enter/leave. The view from companies are quite different. Some companies propose to classify sleep modes by separation of RF and BB parts, some propose to classify those by transition times similar to what has been done in UE power savings, some consider the power levels from typical cases while some others may prefer to consider future trend of hardware/software development. Also, different BS types even today may differ the modes. More specifically, it seems

* A sleep mode 1 that a subset of the components used for transceiving is turned OFF: supported by [1][2][3][4][5][6][8][9][12] [13][14][15][16][17][18][19][20][22]
* A sleep mode 2 that some/most components are turned OFF: supported by

[1][2][3][4][5][6][8][9][12] [13][14][15][16][17][18][19][20][22]

* A sleep mode 3 that (almost) all of BS components is turned OFF: supported by

[1][2][3][4][5][8][9][12][13][14][15][16][17][18][19][20][22]

* A sleep mode 4 (numbered for discussion purpose) that is in between/addition to the above modes. [4][16][22]

Also, four modes for macro, and two for micro/small form BS is proposed in [10].

FL had tried to start from a common state – micro sleep as all seem to agree with in the last meeting but was not proceeded. There was preference to directly consider how many sleep modes can be defined. However, simply taking a number may cause confusion. For example, most companies that prefer 3 sleep modes consider the deep sleep (SM 3 above) of BS does not maintain UE connection (i.e. completely BS OFF), while the consideration of 4 sleep modes may refer to hibernating mode for that case. To that end, it may need to first align the understanding of what a given sleep mode refers to, which can be critical for evaluating certain schemes.

Additionally, this has to be determined in a way forward. FL currently consider there could be two solutions:

* The first one is to rely on the group to discuss and agree on a set of modes as well as profiles for each mode, likely with compromise from each side. The pros of this approach is we can have comparable results based on a single set of mode profile, while the cons is it may not be able to match the implementations of any company.
* The second one is to agree on multiple sets (hopefully two) of modes corresponding to different implementations. The cons is clear, while it may benefit from the fact that results can be closer to real implementations – whatever are proposed.

**FL1 Proposal 2.1.2-1:**

**Determine multiple sleep modes profiles in RAN1#110.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | One set of modes for evaluation. Being able to compare result is the primary purpose of evaluation. |
| LG Electronics | We agree with FL's evaluation that it may need to first align the understanding of what a given sleep mode refers to, which can be critical for evaluating certain schemes. However, if the number of profiles is too large, it becomes difficult to compare the evaluation results between companies, so it is preferred to unify as one or to agree only as few profiles as possible. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Just one set of sleep modes. Otherwise, it is very hard to compare the evaluation results. |
| Qualcomm1 | It makes sense to discuss which components can be turned off for a particular sleep mode. However, different implementations may have different components turned off. From our perspectives, it is more important to discuss transition time and then define the corresponding sleep mode.  At least support two sleep modes (e.g., one with a very short transition time and another with a longer transition time). FFS additional sleep modes. |
| DOCOMO | One set of sleep modes should be preferred to minimize the evaluation work. |
| Fujitsu | We are supportive of defining only a set of sleep modes. |
| Samsung | Fine with FL’s proposal.  We support to define the multiple sleep modes. In addition, regarding the characteristics of sleep modes, it seems vague to define multiple sleep modes in accordance with which BS components is turned off. So, we think each sleep modes can be described with the required BS sleep duration or comparing with transition time, e.g. duration of sleep mode 1 should be longer than total transition time of sleep mode 1. It will be a more spec-friendly way to define the multiple sleep modes. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support.  For the implementation of a base station, different components can be de-activated to achieve different energy saving. Therefore, multiple sleep modes (micro, light, deep sleep) are reasonable and effective for network energy consumption modeling. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It would be better to have a single power model, i.e. solution 1 is preferred. However, if the group cannot compromise to a value for solution 1, solution 2 seems also a way forward to fallback. |
| CMCC | Support |
| OPPO | We support to define one set of modes to ensure the evaluation results comparable. |
| NOKIA/NSB | A generic BS sleep mode definition is preferred for Macro, Micro, and small cell.  Three sleep modes are sufficient, where:   * Sleep Mode-1 (Micro-sleep mode): BS transmission with symbol-level DTX, while BS reception is always-ON. * Sleep Mode-2 (Deep-sleep mode): There is No BS transmission and reception, meaning that the hardware components for both BS transmission and reception are mostly being turned-off and/or in energy saving mode.   Sleep Mode-3 (Standby-sleep mode): There is No BS transmission and reception, meaning that the hardware components for both BS transmission and reception are almost all being turned-off. |
| MediaTek | A single model is good, but we are okay to have at most two profiles, one for Marco and one for micro/small BS. |
| Intel | Perhaps we could revise as follows which seems to be intention of the proposal  **Support multiple sleep modes profiles in RAN1#110 for evaluation purposes.** |
| vivo | One or two sets of sleep modes are preferred to compare the evaluation results. |
| InterDigital | Agreeing on a set of modes and associated profiles can simplify the results and allow easier comparison. 2 sleep modes is sufficient. |
| Panasonic | We are basically okay with the proposal but not necessarily all 4 modes listed above. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal. |
| China telecom | Fine with the proposal. And we support to define one set of modes. |

### Non-sleep modes

For non-sleep mode, how to obtain the power consumption of transmission/reception is to be determined. Slot type is discussed. The current view of companies are summarized as below:

* Option 1: Slot type specific to certain channels/signals (for active mode) is not to be defined. [1][2][3][4][5][8][10][15, partially except for SSB-olny][17][21]
* Option 2: Background activities with SSB/RS transmission can be defined as a separate mode from normal active mode [13] [15, partially, SSB-only not as a separate mode but serve as an indicator for small calibration]
* Option 3: Slot type at least for separation of SSB/RS and other control/data channels. [16]

As opposed to sleep mode, there is at least SSB transmission in DL. It may not be strongly needed to consider SSB or RS transmission as a new state from active mode even if some consideration is needed. The following may be addressed, assuming no separate active mode per SSB/RS transmission.

**FL1 Question 2.1.3-1:**

**Is there a need to separate SSB/CSI-RS and other control/data channels for BS power consumption model in active mode?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | No, for now we like to discuss what are the benefits of doing so. Scaling of the power consumption according to power/bandwidth should take care of it. |
| LG Electronics | As the power state of SSB or CSI-RS and PDCCH+PDSCH was defined separately in the UE power saving model, at least the power consumption for control/data slot (such as PDCCH+PDSCH) and the reference signal slot (such as SSB or CSI-RS) may need to be defined separately. However, low to moderate loading scenarios are mainly considered for evaluation purposes, it may not be necessary to define a separate slot type if there is no significant difference between signal transmission such as SSB and CSI-RS and coded transmission such as PDCCH/PDSCH in terms of overall energy consumption perspective. |
| Spreadtrum1 | No. The characteristic of SSB/CSI-RS is just the “always-on” like aspect, instead of the scaling of power consumption. |
| Qualcomm1 | No, there is no need to separate SSB/CSI-RS and other control/data channels for BS power consumption model in active mode.  It would be good to consider the fact that there are different types of DL slots in which PDSCH only is transmitted and separate it from the cases in which PDSCH and SSB and PDCCH is transmitted. |
| DOCOMO | No channel/RS-specific model is needed as gNB transmits several channels/RSs simultaneously. |
| Fujitsu | We prefer to define the scaling in frequency domain first. As far as the scaling according to the number of used RBs per symbol is reflected in BS power consumption model, there is no need to explicitly separate SSB/CSI-RS and other control/data channels. |
| Samsung | We think it is necessary to define the power consumption of SSB/CSI-RS for evaluating the amount of energy saving gain from enhancement on SSB or RS transmission. However, if it can be derived from DL power consumption with scaling, we are fine not to separate it for BS power consumption model. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | No.   1. If there is downlink transmission, no matter whether the transmission content is SSB/RS or data, the base station needs to keep the downlink transmission components active. Therefore, it should be considered as active states. 2. From network power consumption perspective, there is little difference among encoding for PDCCH/PDSCH and DL reference signal generation. What really affects the power consumption of DL transmission is the number of symbols and bandwidth occupied by the transmission in a slot. 3. Therefore, there is no need to separate SSB/CSI-RS and other control/data channels for BS power consumption model in active mode. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 1 is preferred.  We don’t think this differentiation makes sense. Considering we shall define the scaling rules, the energy consumption to transmit SSB or CSI-RS can be obtained based on the scaling rules from the reference configuration.  The power consumption difference due to the base band processing of SSB/CSI-RS or some other channels shall be marginal. |
| CMCC | Not need.  We suggest to define a unified energy consumption model for SSB/RS and control/date channels, where the energy consumption model can be simplified to be defined by RB utilization in a slot. For SSB/RS transmission only mode, the energy consumption can be also simplified to be defined by RB utilization. |
| OPPO | No. The power consumption will be further determined based on the power scaling method, so there is no need to differentiate signals/channels in active mode. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Not needed |
| MediaTek | Yes. Consider SSB only in active mode for model alignment. For example, PDCCH only is set to 100 in Rel-16 power saving for model alignment. |
| Intel | Although we think based on type of signal/channel, processing blocks and correspondingly power consumption at the BS could be different but for simplicity, we are OK to adopt a single active state per direction. |
| vivo | No. There is no much difference between transmitting SSB/CSI-RS and PDCCH. Scaling method can handle this. |
| InterDigital | No strong need for a separate mode for SSB/CSI-RS |
| Panasonic | No need. |
| Xiaomi | Not needed. scaling can be used to calculate the power consumption of SSB/CSI-RS |
| China Telecom | No need. What matters for the energy consumption is whether the transmitting happens and how much resources are used, what is transmitted has no impact on the energy consumption. The scaling method can handle the differences between transmitting different information. |

Other remaining issues include UL modeling for FDD and TDD.

For UL reception and DL transmission in TDD,

* Option 1: Same model applies, [1], [2], [3], [4],[10]
* Option 2: The UL power consumption is the same as that for a DL-only slot with no DL transmission [5]
* Option 3: one single value regardless scaling domains nor UL channels [17]

For simultaneous UL reception and DL transmission in FDD,

* Option 1: The power consumption is the total power of DL and UL. [2][3][6][15][19][20, while should allow for (up to companies) separating DL and UL in evaluations] [21]
* Option 2: UL part is neglected [5][22]

There is a slightly majority view for each question. The following may be suggested

**FL1 Proposal 2.1.3-2:**

**For active mode, the BS power consumption in UL reception is modeled the same as that for DL transmission. When there is simultaneous UL reception and DL transmission, the power consumption is the total power of DL and UL. FFS details of scaling, accounting for the common part of UL reception and DL transmission.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | The BS power consumption in UL reception s should be modeled the different from that for DL transmission considering that the DL-only transmission requires PA’s power consumption while the UL-only reception does not. However, once UL reception is modeled, other modeling, such as scaling, can be applied as well as DL transmission. |
| Spreadtrum1 | DL/UL can be separately modelled. The efforts are expected not so large, if the DL model is simple enough. UL power consumption could be a scaling of DL power consumption. |
| Qualcomm1 | “For active mode, the BS power consumption in UL reception is modeled the same as that for DL transmission.” should be removed |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal and fine to discuss scaling for UL from DL. |
| Samsung | Support FL’s proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Compared with DL transmission, the power consumption of UL reception is very low, which is quite similar with micro sleep state.when the same power consumption model as the DL is used, for example, multiple UL receiving states are distinguished in accordance with the scaling rules, the impact on the energy consumption results is small, and the modeling complexity is greatly increased.  Therefore, for UL reception states, there is no need to set multiple UL reception states.  And the scaling same as DL is not applicable to UL reception.  When there is simultaneous UL reception and DL transmission, we think that the power consumption is similar with the power consumption of the DL only, option 2 is preferred for FDD.  Furthermore, the power consumption of a slot where has simultaneous UL reception and DL transmission is also relevant to the definition of sleep mode for UL and DL. For example, if the power value of a slot with simultaneous UL reception and DL transmissions = power of UL+power of DL, it implies that UL and DL components are decoupled. In this sense, the sleep states for DL and UL will also be different.  Therefore, the definition of sleep states and actives states should be consistent regarding the implementation assumption. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For UL in TDD，choose Option 1：  For UL+DL in FDD，choose Option 1; |
| CMCC | Support Option 3 for TDD and Option 1 for FDD.  For UL reception, the energy from LNA is much smaller than DL, according to the statistics, the energy consumption for UL reception and processing only accounts about 10% of BS energy consumption. So, Option 1 that same model for DL and UL is not suitable.  The UL power consumption including LNA, RF, and baseband parts, which is higher than a DL-only slot with no DL transmission. So, Option 2 use the DL-only slot with no DL transmission is not suitable.  We suggest to use a single value for UL reception. Considering the relatively small energy consumption of UL, no scaling is needed for network energy Consumption model. |
| NOKIA/NSB | As noted in our view the UL reception contribution would not need to be separated from micro-sleep, but if the UL reception is modeled separately from DL transmission and to be modeled the similar manner as that for DL transmission, care should be taken with scaling (of DL and UL) in time/freq/spatial domains to avoid inconsistencies. |
| MediaTek | Option 1 for UL in TDD. Option 1 for UL+DL in FDD.  However, the sentence “the same as that for DL transmission” is unclear. If the BS power consumption in DL transmission includes “SSB only” or “PDSCH,” it is unclear what is the same model for UL reception.  [Suggested TP] For active mode, the BS power consumption model for UL reception reuses the structure (e.g., RS, Data) for DL transmission |
| Intel | In our view, relative power value per slot of UL reception is smaller than DL reception. Was the intention of first sentence was to consider same model for UL applies for FDD and TDD ? If yes, some revision may be need for clarity.  Ok to consider proposal in second sentence for simplicity. |
| vivo | Several questions to clarify on the proposal:  Q1: What is the meaning of “**UL reception is modeled the same as that for DL transmission**”? Does this mean a separate active mode for UL reception only is defined but the relative value could be different with that for DL transmission only;  Q2: What does the FFS mean, especially scaling accounting for the common part of UL reception and DL transmission?  Q3: Is this proposal applied to TDD, FDD, or both? |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposals, as uplink power consumption needs to be accounted for |
| Panasonic | We think active mode for DL and UL should be individually modelled. But the methodology share some common parts. At least the RF part energy consumption is different for UL and DL. |
| China Telecom | For TDD, it is confused that what the UL reception is modelled the same as DL transmission mean. Does it refer to the sleep modes or the scaling methods? Since the energy consumption in DL and UL can be quiet different, and the energy consumption of UL is relative low, we think a single value is enough, the scaling methods is not needed. We prefer Option3.  For FDD, option 1. |

### Transition procedure

The state machine was agreed for further study and relevant observations/proposals are provided this meeting. Initial summary can be found below. Note some contributions do not directly express a view on the state machine, i.e. transition among sleep modes while consider that the sleep duration should be larger than the total transition time, which sounds like that the BS won’t transit from one sleep mode to another sleep mode since otherwise the sleep duration could be shorter. In view of this, it is considered as Option 2.

* Option 1: transition among SMs is allowed: [1][12][15][21]
* Option 2: transition based on state machine among SMs is deprioritized (i.e. not supported in the study of this release), only transition between a SM and active mode is considered [3][4][6][8][10][13][14][17][22]

Slight majority supports not to model the transition among different sleep modes, and there seem to be questions raised by [15] if a state machine is not adopted. Also, transition time needs to be defined clearly. It could be the total time for a UE entering into a sleep mode and leaving that sleep mode [8][10][17], or that time is relative to a micro sleep mode although no state machine is assumed [2]. On the other hand, if a state machine is adopted, transition time definition could also be different from that in UE power saving. The following is suggested.

**FL1 Proposal 2.1.4-1:**

**Down select between Option 1 and Option 2 in RAN1#110**

* **Option 1: transition among SMs is allowed**
* **Option 2: transition based on state machine among SMs is deprioritized (i.e. not supported in the study of this release), only transition between a SM and active mode is considered**

**Note transition time definition should be clarified in either option.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Option 1. We do not see the saving in deprioritizing this. |
| LG Electronics | We prefer to adopt Option 1 since gNB doesn’t need to predict traffic pattern. However, for the simplicity, we can accept Option 2 as well. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Option 2. We do not understand the intention. BS can decide a sleep mode definitely. If there is a successive power ramp up or ramp down (like transition b/w sleep modes), it has been absorbed in each transition energy/time already in our view. For example, the transition from light sleep state to non-sleep mode has include the transition from light sleep to micro sleep (RF switched on, ready for transmission and reception) and the transition from micro sleep to non-sleep mode (performing transmission or reception) |
| Qualcomm1 | When transitioning from active mode to a sleep mode, gNB can transition through sleep modes with shorted transition time. However, when transitioning from a sleep mode to active mode, no transition through other sleep modes is necessary. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with Option 2 for simplicity. If we take Option1, different transition energy and time should be defined for different transitions among sleep modes. |
| Fujitsu | We prefer option 2. |
| Samsung | Fine with FL’s proposal, and prefer Option 2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Option 2 is preferred. For network power consumption modeling and evaluation, transition among SMs doesn’t result in significantly difference in evaluation results, but greatly increases the simulation complexity. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Option 2.  In option 2, the transition time is defined as the total time used for ramp up and ramp down to enter and leave the sleep mode, which is the same as that in UE power saving.  We didn’t see additional benefit to model complicated transitions between sleep modes. |
| CMCC | Support Option 2. |
| OPPO | We slightly prefer Option2 for simplicity of the BS power consumption model. For Option 1, it seems that the transition time and transition energy between different sleep states should be further determined. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Option 2 is preferred, and it should be sufficient for the study of this release |
| MediaTek | Option 1. We have concerns on Option 2. It is unclear how to evaluate UPT, scheduling latency, and UE power consumption if a gNB determines to enter sleep based on ideal/perfect traffic prediction. |
| Intel | Although we think Option 1 maybe more practical BS implementation, but for evaluation purposes, we are OK to consider Option 2 for simplicity. |
| Vivo | We prefer Option 2 for simplicity. |
| InterDigital | Option 2, as the most considerable energy consumption comes from the transient response upon going into active state. |
| Panasonic | We support Option 2.  But this is closely implementation dependant. We are open to hear opinions from gNB vendors. |
| Xiaomi | It depends on how we define sleep mode. And currently, since we have not defined what are the sleep modes, we think it is a little early to choose from the two options. |
| China Telecom | For simplification of evaluation, we can accept the Option 2. |

Some other transition related assumptions are also discussed, e.g. how a gNB determines to enter sleep, on handling of WUS as proposed in [4] etc. These may somehow be clear once the transition procedure and definition of transition time is clarified/adopted, e.g. a BS shall not go to sleep if the time duration left for a sleep mode is no longer than the corresponding transition time. Nevertheless, it is worthwhile to check that

**FL1 Question 2.1.4-2:**

**Any other assumptions you think shall also be clarified or captured about transition assumption/algorithms?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We would like to discuss if and whether a single transition time/algorithm can capture or represent the different approaches the network can implement in the sleep mode. |
| LG Electronics | In addition to the transition time, additional transition energy consumed during transition between sleep modes should be considered. |
| Qualcomm1 | No |
| Fujitsu | The transition time/energy related to adaptive ON/OFF of TXRU also need to be discussed somewhere. |
| OPPO | We would like to discuss how to determine the time duration left for a sleep mode in advance for the BS, e.g., according to the specific signals/channels or DRX configuration. |
| NOKIA/NSB | If the transition time provided by companies accounts for the delay from entering and leaving a sleep state (two-ways delay) or the delay from entering a sleep state (one-way delay).  Do we account for a minimum time to spend in a sleep state in the transition time, e.g. x ms as a threshold to stay in deep sleep state. |
| MediaTek | Companies shall clarify whether a gNB determines to enter sleep based on 1) perfect traffic prediction, 2) pre-defined SSB and DRX configurations, and 3) pre-defined traffic monitoring time (idle time rather than transition time). |
| Vivo | The details on how to determine sleep mode should be aligned or reported, e.g., according to periodical signaling or others. |

### Relative power of each mode and additional energy/time for transition

The relative power value is discussed and exact values are provided in some contributions.

For sleep modes, the relative power value would be closely related to the categorization and sleep mode profiles, thus can be discussed together in section 2.1.2, including which mode can be taken as reference with power value set=1. As a record, the following options can be observed according to contributions.

The relative power value of SM-X is taken as 1 for evaluation,

* Option 1: X=most energy saving mode [2][5][8][10][17][18][19]
* Option 2: X= a deep sleep mode other than the most energy saving mode [4][22]
* Option 3: X is the deep sleep mode of UE [3]

For active mode, it is clarified that the relative power value is provided with transmission/reception using full BW and total number of Tx/Rx as in reference configuration [8][17][19][22]. This can be determined with

**FL1 Proposal 2.1.5-1:**

**For active mode, the relative power value is provided with transmission/reception using full BW and total number of Tx/Rx as in reference configuration.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Option 1 |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. Besides, it is not clear why deep sleep mode and most energy saving mode are different. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Option 3. The hibernate or stand-by or ultra-deep sleep mode can use the fractional number, e.g. 0.1 |
| Qualcomm1 | Support |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal but share the same question as LGE on the difference between the most energy saving mode and deep sleep mode. In our understanding, the deep sleep mode is the most energy saving mode. |
| Samsung | Support with minor update.  **FL1 Proposal 2.1.5-1:**  **For active mode, the relative power value is provided with transmission/reception using total DL power level, full BW and total number of Tx/Rx as in reference configuration.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For DL transmission, the PSD/total power also has impact on the power consumption. Therefore, we think we need to consider it in DL power.  Besides, we think we can take the reference configuration is used for the definition of active state, where the parameters are sufficiently clear. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. For relative power value, support Option 1. |
| CMCC | Symbol domain occupation may be also needed to consider, we suggest to add it as follows:  **For active mode, the relative power value is provided with transmission/reception using full BW, number of active symbols, and total number of Tx/Rx as in reference configuration.** |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Apart from full BW (in freq.) and total number of Tx/Rx (in spatial/antenna), the relative power value is provided also with transmission/reception using full symbol occupancy, and using the total DL power as in the reference configuration. |
| MediaTek | Okay. But we have concerns on how to measure the full power case. Different modulation types may result differently. On the other hand, SSB/RS has specific transmission signal, better as a reference for BS power consumption measurement. Thus, we slightly prefer to consider SSB transmission with typical configurations as the baseline to derive relative power values in active mode. |
| Intel | Option 1. Support the proposal |
| vivo | Support the proposal.  For relative power value options, we prefer option 2 if a hibernate-like sleep is defined |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Panasonic | We are okay. |
| China Telecom | We support the proposal. And for the convenience of evaluation, we prefer Option1 if 3 SMs are defined. |

The additional transition energy/transition time is also closely related to sleep mode categorization and adoption of state machine, thus can be determined later.

### Second round

The following proposal can be considered for BS power consumption model which is an attempt to show a whole picture of BS power consumption model with consideration of potential compromise for different issues. The values of relative power, additional transition energy and total transition time are highly implementation related. Given the input so far implies a majority preference to have a single set of values for the model, a template as below is created and exact values are to be further discussed in this meeting. Also, FR1 is assumed since the only difference for FR2 might be the values and can be determined after the table is more stabilized.

**FL2 Proposal 2.1.6-1: Adopt the following as BS power consumption model ~~for FR1.~~ FFS values of P2, P3, E1, E2, T1 and T2 and whether there can be two values as candidate.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power state** | **Characteristic** | Relative Power  ~~(FR1)~~ | Additional transition energy4 | **Total transition time5** |
| Deep sleep1 | (Almost) all of BS components is turned OFF.  There is neither DL transmission nor UL reception. Accurate timing may not be maintained.  Time interval for the sleep should be larger than the total transition time entering and leaving this state. | P1=1 | E1 | T1 ~~s~~ |
| Light sleep2 | Some of the BS components are turned OFF.  There is neither DL transmission nor UL reception.  Time interval for the sleep should be larger than the total transition time entering and leaving this state. | P2 | E2 | T2 ~~ms~~ |
| Micro sleep | There is neither DL transmission nor UL reception. An IDLE state is considered in the sleep.  Immediate transition is assumed for network energy saving study purpose from or to a non-sleep state. | P3 | 0 | 0 |
| Active DL | There is only DL transmission. | P4 | NA | NA |
| Active UL3 | There is only UL reception. | P5 | NA | NA |
| Note 1: Depending on implementations, there could be a state that the power is lower than deep sleep and requires larger total transition time, e.g. hibernating sleep or Quasi-off, which is not explicitly modeled in this study for evaluation purpose. In some implementations, the state is not called sleep.  Note 2: Depending on implementations, there may not exist a light sleep. Companies to report whether light sleep is assumed or not in the evaluations.  Note 3: For simultaneous DL and UL transmission, the power for UL reception is neglected in this study.  Note 4: product of relative power and duration in second.  Note 5: the total time for BS entering and leaving from a sleep mode to FFS micro sleep/non-sleep.  Optionally, a state machine where BS may transit between sleep modes without entering non-sleep mode can be considered. Proponents to report the assumption for transition time and additional transition energy based on the values of referred sleep modes. | | | | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | Regarding **FL2 Proposal 2.1.6-1:**   * About Micro-sleep state: currently it does not allow BS reception, then how do we simulate the on-demand SSB/SIB1 schemes and UE WUS-triggering scheme as companies proposed in Time-domain techniques in AI9.7.2? Instead, as we proposed, we should allow BS to have the reception capability in micro-sleep state together with BS µDTX. By doing so, the sleeping gNB can be waked-up by either on demand signals/sequences or WUS signals/sequences, following by BS state transition from micro-sleep state to active state. In short, we need one of the sleep state to support BS reception capability, and that is micro-sleep state with zero transition time and energy to active state.   Regarding unit of T2 (transition time), the “ms” level is a bit too optimistic for hardware on-off in case most components are down. Thus, we propose to use in the unit of second.  Regarding Note-4, with E1=P1\*T1 as proposed is a bit too aggressive value to our view. Instead, the average power between two sleep states should be considered, with E1=(P1+P3)/2\*T1, which is (average power\*transition time). |
| Samsung | Regarding the characteristic of sleep modes, we have same question as Nokia. So far, gNB WUS is considered as one of potential NWES techniques, but with current definition of SM, it seems to be impossible to apply the gNB WUS.  In our point of view, all the NWES techniques should be studied with well-balanced performance between ESG and UPT/Latency. If gNB totally sacrifices UPT/Latency to save power consumption, it’s simply turn-off by implementation. So, we still have concerns on UL latency performance during sleep mode. It would be further investigated how to ensure the UL latency during SM. |
| CMCC | Firstly, we agree with “Note 1” that there could be a hibernating sleep. In out network, we have a sleep state that BS turns off almost all the hardware units, which is similar to power off modes. For example, when there are no users at night in shopping mall or office buildings, BS enters hibernating sleep state for long time network energy saving. The transition time is minute level.  Secondly, based on the agreement, the relative power for “Active DL” is provided with transmission using full BW. Regarding “Note 3”, if simultaneous DL and UL transmission is assumed, how to defined the BW for DL transmission? Is the intention of “Note 3” means that the BW for UL is neglected? Furthermore, if “Note 3” is agreed, the power state of “Active DL” may change to “Active DL or Active simultaneous DL and UL”  Thirdly, regarding “Note 5”, we think the transition time/energy is defined from a sleep state to non-sleep state. The transition time mainly comes from the time for BS to turn on baseband and IRF parts, and the time for BS to turn on PA or turn on LNA is almost same. So, the transition time from a sleep state to Active DL or Active UL state is almost same.  Besides, we have one thing for clarification, for the evaluation of spatial domain, when BS mutes some TxRU, it is still in active DL or UL mode, and the power consumption is modeled based on scaling factor? |
| Rakuten | We generally support the proposal.  Regarding Nokia’s comment, we think WUS is more beneficial for light or deep sleep states. For micro sleep, the duration is very short anyway. We do not think WUS is needed.  We agree with Samsung that UPT and latency should be considered. They may be treated in the methodology/KPI section. |
| Xiaomi | Generally OK with the proposal. Wonder if another power state, that both DL/UL is ongoing, should be added. |
| DOCOMO | We also have the same question as Nokia/Samsung on the UL reception in sleep modes. The door to evaluate on-demand SSB/SIB1 and gNB WUS should be open for fair comparison. gNB should be allowed to receive UL channels/signals/sequences in at least on sleep mode or add additional micro sleep mode with UL reception. |
| MediaTek | Support for simplicity. FFS on single or multiple value(s) for P, E and T.  For example, in micro sleep, if companies want to model PA off for UL reception (LNA on), Active UL may have a lower P4 value. If companies want to model a case with both PL and LNA on for UL reception, Active UL may have a higher P4 value. In light sleep, some companies could support short transition time (T2<10ms), and some companies could support long transition time (T2 = 400ms). Reported values should depend on implementations. |
| FL2 | The UL reception due to WUS is open by the proposal. If a BS is in a micro sleep it can quickly wake up for WUS and go to sleep again. If a BS is in light or deep, if the WUS reception timing is T2/T1 ahead, then gNB attempt to wake up for WUS purpose in advance and after reception, go to sleep (any mode) again. It is just difference of saving gains in different implementations/modes.  For FDD, UL and DL BW is equal split so I think in this case, whatever UL is neglected (or not, if the above is not agreed), the DL BW is half of simulation BW (this BW is also clarified in SLS parameter). |
| OPPO | We basically support the proposal.  Firstly, regarding the characteristic of sleep mode, nether DL transmission nor UL reception should be allowed, otherwise it can be classified as a sleep state because some BS components are shared for DL and UL. For the evaluation of potential energy saving schemes in time domain, e.g., on-demand SSB/SIB1 or UE WUS-triggering, it should be simulated based on the Active UL state in the proposal in our understanding.  Secondly, considering the IDLE state concept is not introduced in the BS energy consumption model, the text “An IDLE state is considered in the sleep” in the characteristic of micro sleep can be removed.  Thirdly, for the additional transition energy, we wonder if a definite value can be provided in the BS consumption model similar to the study of UE power saving. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 1. At least for the micro-sleep state,we think uplink reception should be considered. 2. We think the last sentence in the first note is not needed. 3. For the note 4, we agree with Nokia that the current suggestion is too aggressive. Even in UE power consumption model, it it not derived by simple product. The transition energy should be less than 1/2\*transition time\*(P3 or P2-P1). And we should also guarantee that if the transition time is fulfilled, it should be more energy efficient for gNB to enter into a deeper sleep. Otherwise, it is a broken design. 4. For the Note 5, we think the transition should between sleep modes and non-sleep modes, otherwise, more discussion is needed about the transition mechanism and associated energy. |
| InterDigital | We have the same view as Docomo, Nokia, and Samsung, in that it should be possible to simulate an UL reception opportunity during sleep modes. The above FL2 comment is not clear to us, as it suggests that the WUS can only be received when the gNB is in a non-sleep mode. Therefore, we suggest that the model definition allows WUS reception in sleep modes. |
| China Telecom | We just wonder that if the uplink reception is allowed, the what’s the difference between the micro-sleep state and the UL only active state. We prefer the FL2’s comment that if the WUS is needed in micro-sleep state, the gNB can wake up quickly and transit to the UL-only state since the transition time of micro-sleep state is defined as 0.  For the note 4, we share the similar view as NSB on the transition energy calculation. |
| FL2 | According to the online session, the table is partially stable, leaving the note and power values for further determination. Please continue your input for other questions with ‘FL2’ and for the notes of this proposal.  In addition, a template for your input on power values/transition time is separately uploaded.  [Power state and transition time-offlineThursday\_v00.docx](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110/Inbox/drafts/9.7(FS_Netw_Energy_NR)/9.7.1/FLS3/Power%20state%20and%20transition%20time-offlineThursday_v00.docx)  Some companies already commented on the values using offline of offline while I may miss some as well when sorting them. Please all check and have your input to the table. Note in the template, I removed the characteristics part and additional energy consumption which can be later calculated based on the relative power value and transition time. |

## Scaling

### General aspect

As a general question of whether scaling can be applied for sleep mode, although related to whether sleep mode can be applied only on one transmission direction (e.g. DL), there is less contribution mentioned [2][12]. FL consider to conclude this as

**FL1 Proposal 2.2.1-1:**

**In the BS energy consumption modeling and evaluation, scaling does not apply to any sleep mode.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | Decision on this should be taken together with 2.2.2-1 below |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Different form UE power saving, the symbol-level scaling is agreed to be introduce at least for non-sleep modes. Thus, it can be also applied to sleep modes. For example, 1 slot micro-sleep has different power consumption from 4 symbols micro-sleep. |
| Qualcomm1 | We can discuss this later after making progress on modelling sleep mode in Section 2.1 |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | We would like to defer to discuss after determining the sleep modes. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Support |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| NOKIA/NSB | We agree. |
| MediaTek | Agree. |
| Intel | We have agreed that reference configuration include 1 TRP. When multiple TRPs are implemented, we think it is possible that some TRPs, e.g., N, are in micro-sleep, some are communicating in a slot. To this end, for the TRPs in micro-sleep, N x micro-sleep power should be assumed for the slot. This needs to be clarified how SM configurations could be realized when multiple TRPs are configured. |
| Vivo | We support the proposal |
| Panasonic | We support. |
| Xiaomi | Support the proposal |
| China Telecom | Support the proposal |

### Scaling details

Various scaling details are proposed, for each domain or just reuse of the scaling as in UE power saving [CATT(R1-2206411, for non-sleep mode)], [LG(R1-2207037, for Antenna part)].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| BWP in DL | MTK (R1- 2206979, 0.4 + 0.6 \* (X – 20) / 80)  OPPO(R1-2206308, X MHz = [0.5] + [0.5] \* X / Y)  CATT(R1-2206411, X MHz = a + b \* X / 100)  Intel(R1-2206595, [0.6] + [0.4]· X/100)  SS(R1-2206838, [0.4] + [0.6] \* (X – 20) / 80)  CMCC(R1-2206925, with RB utilize)  ZTE(R1-2207059, 0.6+0,4\*X/B\_ref)  Rakuten(R1-2207079, [0.5] + [0.5] x [X/100])  QC(R1-2207245, for x% PRB and BO dB, the power is  E///(R1-2207437, X MHz = [0.4] + [0.6] \* X /100 for set1) |
| BWP in UL | Vivo(R1-2206053, lpha + (1-alpha) \* (Y – 20) / 80)  QC(R1-2207245, X MHz = 0.8 + 0.2 \* (X – 20) / 80)  E///(R1-2207437, X MHz = [0.8] + [0.2] \* X /100 for set1) |
| CA in DL | HW/HiSi (R1-2205860, depends on whether the RF/PA is sharing)  MTK (R1-2206979, X CC=(1+0.7\*(X-1))×1CC)  Vivo(R1-2206053, the sum of per RF power value)  Nokia(R1-2206074, as=)  OPPO(R1-2206308, 2 CCs = [1.7] \* 1CC/4 CCs = [3.4] \* 1CC)  CATT(R1-2206411, 1.3/1.9 for 2/4CC FR1; 1.5/2.5 FR2)  Intel(R1-2206595, M CCs = 1.3\*(M –1))  SS(R1-2206838, 1.7 for 2CC/3.4 for 4CC)  CMCC(R1-2206925, α for 2CC and β for 4CC)  ZTE(R1-2207059, P1+P2 for inter-band and beta\*(P1+P2) for intra-band)  QC(R1-2207245, 2 CCs = [1.7] \* 1CC/4 CCs = [3.4] \* 1CC)  E///(R1-2207437, [1.7]\*0.5\*n) |
| CA in UL | HW/HiSi (R1-2205860, depends on whether the RF/PA is sharing)  MTK (R1-2206979, X CC=(1+0.7\*(X-1))×1CC)  Vivo(R1-2206053, 2CC is beta x1CC, 4CC is 2\*beta x1CC)  QC(R1-2207245, 2 CCs = [1.7] \* 1CC/4 CCs = [3.4] \* 1CC)  Intel(R1-2206595, 1.3/2.6 for 2/4CC) |
| Spatial in DL | Vivo(R1-2206053, FR1 with gamma1 while FR2 with gamma2)  MTK(R1-2206979, 0.1+0.9\*X/64)  Nokia(R1-2206074,)  OPPO(R1-2206308, M Tx/ Rx Rus = [0.5] + [0.5] \* M / N)  CATT(R1-2206411, 0.75/0.625 for 32/16tx from 64tx)  Intel(R1-2206595, N antenna = 0.7^(64/N – 1))  SS(R1-2206838, 0.7 for 32Tx)  CMCC(R1-2206925, α for 32tx and β for 16tx)  ZTE(R1-2207059, 0.2+0.8\*X)  Rakuten(R1-2207079, [0.35]+[0.65] x(Tx/64))  QC(R1-2207245, [0.1] + [0.9] \* X/N) |
| Spatial in UL | Vivo(R1-2206053, FR1 with sigma1 as while FR2 with sigma2)  Intel(R1-2206595, N antenna = 0.7^(64/N – 1))  SS(R1-2206838, 0.7 for 32Tx)  QC(R1-2207245, [0.1] + [0.9] \* X/N)  E///(R1-2207437, [0.4] + [0.6]\*(x/64) at least for FR1) |
| PSD | MTK(R1-2206979, , PDSCH offset)  Vivo(R1-2206053, (P/P0)\*(X4-X3)+X3)  Nokia(R1-2206074,)  CATT(R1-2206411, [Y+(1-Y)\* (PT/Pmax), Y=~[0.8-0.95]]  ZTE(R1-2207059, 0.6+0.4\*X)  E///(R1-2207437, FFS max Pout)  QC(R1-2207245 for x=100% PRB and BO dB for a new PSD: |
| Time domain | MTK (R1-2206979, X/14)  Vivo(R1-2206053, in simple superposition based on previous setting)  Nokia(R1-2206074, P\_(α% load)=P\*α+P\_microsleep\* (1-α))  Fujistu(R1-2206172,)  OPPO(R1-2206308, Z symbols = Z/14 + (Pmicro / Pactive) \* (14 – Z))  Intel(R1-2206595, 0.25 for symbol 1–4: 0.5 for 5–8: 1 for 9–14)  CMCC(R1-2206925, X symbols=α\*X/14)  ZTE(R1-2207059, P1\*α+P2 \* (1-α)) |
| Load | Spreadtrum, InterDigital, QC (for DL only?) |
| TRP | HW/HiSi (R1-2205860, calculated for each TRP), ZTE(R1-2207059, sum as γ\*(P1+P2)), QC(R1-2207245, 2TRP is 2x 1TRP), |

The view does not seem to have quick common part in detail, while generally it seems to acknowledge that there is a static part in most cases/domains accounting for the power which is anyway maintained as long as there is transmission or reception, and in time, the scaling can be somehow (piece-wise) linear with the number of active symbols. For spatial domain, the power can be considered to be linearly scaled with active number of TxRx over the number of TxRx in full load of reference configuration. For frequency domain and power domain, in line with the previous agreement/FFS, they can be co-related to each other, accounting for a non-linear part due to PA, corresponding to certain number of active TxRx. Nevertheless, some discussion may be needed during the meeting.

**FL1 Proposal 2.2.2-1:**

* **The scaling of BS power consumption includes at least a static part regardless of other domain configurations.**
* **In time domain, the scaling is linearly scaled with number of active symbols within a slot.**
* **FFS other domain scaling rules in RAN1#110, including whether some of them can be scaled jointly or separately.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | A question for clarification for the FL. The FFS of this proposal seems to imply that scaling can still apply to the sleep mode? If so, is there contradiction to the implication of agreeing to Proposal 2.2.1-1? |
| LG Electronics | We are generally OK with the proposal. Meanwhile, it needs to discuss whether the formula for linear scaling with the number of TX Rus can be applied to gNB power consumption model, by clarifying how gNB implementation for power amplifier can be assumed for evaluation purpose. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Basically agree. The different scaling for different domain could be accurate but with a little large discussion efforts. |
| Qualcomm1 | * **In time domain, the scaling is linearly scaled with number of active symbols within a slot:**   We do not support this bullet since this is only applicable if the BS power consumption is provided per slot. However, we will need to discuss first whether the BS power consumption is provided per slot or per symbol.   * **FFS other domain scaling rules in RAN1#110, including whether some of them can be scaled jointly or separately.**   In our view, power domain and frequency domain are jointly scaled, constituting a (non-linear) PAE scaling factor. The aim is to provide a correct model, addressing both dynamic adjustment of transmission power (PSD) and frequency domain (BW) scaling.  We propose to make the following update: “**power domain and frequency domain are jointly scaled in a nonlinear manner**” |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | Fine with FL’s proposal in principle. For a static part, we would like to clarify the definition of static part. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the first bullet, we are not sure whether it is helpful for the scaling factor determination.  For the second and third bullet, we are okay in general. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with the proposal, which is a good starting point.  For FFS, in our view, a joint scaling method of bandwidth, antenna and PSD should be considered, to avoid non-linear part like PA and static power. |
| CMCC | Support |
| OPPO | We support the proposal basically, and the parameters in the reference configuration can be considered to be taken as baseline for power consumption scaling. |
| NOKIA/NSB | We propose the following re-wording of the first bullet point:  The scaling of BS power consumption includes at least a static part regardless of other the scaling domain configurations. |
| MediaTek | Agree with the following TP  [Suggested TP]  **The scaling of BS power consumption for a given domain includes at least a static part regardless of other domain configurations.** |
| Intel | We think the intention of first bullet is to suggest that relative power value per slot of active state includes a static part which we support as well. Hence, we suggest revision for clarity.   * **The scaling of BS power consumption for the active state includes at least a static part regardless of other domain configurations.** * **In time domain, the scaling is linearly applied with number of active symbols within a slot.** * **FFS other domain scaling rules in RAN1#110, including whether some of them can be scaled jointly or separately.** |
| Vivo | We are generally OK with the proposal. The value of a static part could be the value of Micro sleep. For hybrid slot with d DL symbols and u UL symbols in TDD case, the value could be X\_microsleep+(d/14)\*(X\_DL- X\_microsleep)+(u/14)\* (X\_UL- X\_microsleep)  For the power domain scaling for Tx, our proposal is to perform scaling on the total transmission power instead of PSD and bandwidth. |
| InterDigital | For the power domain, PA efficiency and non-linearity should also be considered to determine consumed energy, as suggested by QC.  For the time domain, a discussion is needed to determine whether power consumption can be computed per symbol based on linear scaling. |
| Panasonic | As the scaling methodology is important for all the domains, our thinking is it is important to consider how to do scaling for multiple domains, rather than just agreeing for each domain at first. |
| China Telecom | Support. |

### Second round

To FUTUREWEI: the intention is to capture the possibility of scaling based on load.

To Samsung, ZTE, Nokia/NSB, MTK: the static part here is assumed not specific to any domain, as the static part does not necessarily scaled together with each other.

To QC/Intel/InterDigital: the time domain handling is a bit unstable. My thinking is that previous agreement at least ensure a slot level is doable for most companies while symbol level is also allowed for considerations. Perhaps what is needed is that for slot level modelling, scaling is applied while for symbol level, the power is summed up along with symbols. What matters is actually the results is normalized at slot level via SLS which has been agreed.

To frequency and power domain: joint scaling seems gain a bit support.

My feeling is it may be rather complicated to discuss each domain and the scaling factors. Is it possible to start with a framework that

**FL2 Proposal 2.2.3-1**

* **The BS power consumption for non-sleep mode is provided by**
  + **P = P\_static + P\_trx+P\_PA**
    - **P\_static: a static part of which the power is not scaled based on reference configurations. FFS the power is based on that of BS in micro sleep.**
    - **P\_trx: in spatial domain, the power is scaled with # of TRx with factor of *f\_trx***
    - **P\_PA: frequency domain and power domain can be jointly scaled with factor of *f\_PA***
      * **FFS spatial domain can be also jointly scaled together**
      * **FFS linearly or non-linearly**
* **In time domain,** 
  + **when slot level model is provided, the scaling, when needed, is linearly applied with number of active symbols within a slot**
  + **If an explicit symbol level model is provided, scaling is not applied** 
    - **Note: system simulation evaluations can be per slot regardless of detailed approach for calculating symbol-level power consumption (already agreed).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | About:  For P\_trx: apart from #of TRx, should we also consider the number of CCs/TRPs when doing the scaling?  P\_PA: similarly, apart from frequency and power domain, shall we also consider the carrier-domain (i.e. number of CCs) and/or spatial domain with number of TPRs? |
| Samsung | Regarding the P\_static, we think the FFS in P\_static seems unnecessary.  In addition, we think the scaling of time domain can be in conjunction with the scaling of other domains. Therefore, we would like to suggest the following revised proposal.  **Revised FL2 Proposal 2.2.3-1**   * **The BS power consumption for non-sleep mode is provided by**   + **P = P\_static + (P\_trx+P\_PA)×time domain scaling factor**     - **P\_static: a static part of which the power is not scaled based on reference configurations. ~~FFS the power is based on that of BS in micro sleep.~~**     - **P\_trx: in spatial domain, the power is scaled with # of TRx with factor of *f\_trx***     - **P\_PA: frequency domain and power domain can be jointly scaled with factor of *f\_PA***       * **FFS spatial domain can be also jointly scaled together**       * **FFS linearly or non-linearly**     - **Time domain scaling factor: when slot level model is provided, the scaling, when needed, is linearly applied with number of active symbols within a slot**       * **If an explicit symbol level model is provided, scaling is not applied**   **Note: system simulation evaluations can be per slot regardless of detailed approach for calculating symbol-level power consumption (already agreed).** |
| CMCC | Firstly, we agree that a static part is needed.  Secondly, could moderator to clarify the detailed impact factors of frequency domain and power domain? For frequency domain, whether and how to scale system bandwidth or PRB utilization or CA case in frequency domain?  Thirdly, for time domain, we support slot level model. But how to scale for a slot that including both DL and UL symbols may be also considered. |
| Rakuten | We think a static part is needed but could vary between different sleep states.  Generally support the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| DOCOMO | We share the similar question that carrier-domain needs to be considered in other domains such as frequency?  Besides, regarding the FFS point on P\_PA, non-linear is preferred for accuracy. But the tradeoff between modeling accuracy and discussion effort should be well considered. Otherwise, we would fail to complete the model construction work in 9.7.1. |
| MediaTek | Okay this this proposal. We slightly prefer scaling per domain. The beauty of scaling per domain is that simplifying evaluation, e.g., comparing case 1 (100BW, 64TxRU) and case 2 (50BW, 64 TxRU), takes only one scaling factor in the frequency domain. To compare case 1 (100BW, 55dBm) to case 2 (100BW, 49dBm) needs only one scaling factor in the power domain. This joint scaling model can support a complex comparison such as case 1: (100BW, 64TxRU) vs. case 2: (20BW, 8TxRU), but we wonder whether it is necessary for this SI. |
| OPPO | The proposed scaling formula seems a bit complicated, we also prefer to consider the scaling method of BS power consumption in frequency, spatial and time domain separately similar to the study of UE power saving. |
| Qualcomm2 | * On the first bullet, we should clarify it is for scaling the power consumption for active DL transmission.   We support joint scaling of frequency and power domains, as the PA power consumption depends on the transmitted power. Transmission power is the PSD over the BW.  PA power consumption constitutes the majority of the gNB power consumption and therefore should be modeled correctly. PA power consumption is scaled by a nonlinear factor PAE (PA efficiency). Therefore, we support nonlinear scaling  Hence, we make the alternative proposal for the first bullet as follows:  **Alternative proposal**   * For an DL transmission over x resource usage, the relative power P(x) = (1-x)\*P3 + x\*(a + (1-a)\*PA)\*P4, where a is percentage of power consumption due to non-PA components in P4 and PA is a function of PA efficiency.   + a = [0.3]   + Discuss function PA in RAN1#110      * On the first sub-bullet of the 2nd bullet, how could we determine the scaling for symbols with different frequency domain allocations? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer to scaling per domain. In this case, multiple domain scaling is considered, the lower bound is micro-sleep, which is similar with the suggestion above. We are also okay with the current suggestion if it is the majority support.  We think the scaling for CA should be considered. Suggestion as below:  For inter-band CA, the total power consumption is the sum of the power consumption of each cell. |
| Vodafone | We share similar views with Qualcomm. We would like the PA power consumption to be modeled correctly. We need to produce more accurate results. We support non-linear scaling. The alternative approach proposed by Qualcomm is reasonable and we do support it. |
| InterDigital | The model should be capable of accurately modelling and assessing the gain of some power domain NES techniques. Therefore, for the FFS under P\_PA, we think non-linear scaling is required. We suggest removing "linearly" and utilizing only a non-linear scaling that reflects actual PA power consumption. The model provided by Qualcomm is fine with us. |
| China Telecom | We agree with companies that more details of frequency factors especially about the inter-band CA should be added.  Besides, we wonder that which part of energy consumption of P\_trx includes? Does it mean that the power consumption of PA is not included? Otherwise, why the P\_trx and P\_PA can be added together? |

## Reference configuration

The view for the remaining issues of reference configuration is summarized as below.

[5] proposes to clarify the total number of TxRx and total DL power level is per RU.

For FR1 FDD TxRx:

* Option 1: Confirm the Working Assumption: [2][4, or based on typical implementations],[14][15][17][21][22]
* Option 2: 4 [5]

For FR1 FDD total DL power level:

* Option 1: 52 dBm [2]
* Option 2: 49 dBm [4][5][8, and should be further scaled down with simulation BW], [13][14][15][17][19][21][22]

For set 3 FR2 TDD, for those who provided concrete numbers, the setting for {total DL power level, EIRP limit} in dBm

* Option 1: 34, 63 [2][14]
* Option 2: 37, 63 [5, considering micro BS]
* Option 3: 43, 78 [8][13][17][19]
* Option 4: 40, 73 [10][21, for macro]
* Option 5: 40, 68 [15, considering micro BS]
* Option 6: 33, 78 [19, as set 4]
* Option 7: 33, 68 [21, for micro]
* Option 8: 63 for EIRP is sufficient [22]

The setting for FR2 may also be related to the target scenarios including BS types [5]. As this may be coupled with the discussion of evaluation scenario in section 3.3, the setting for FR2 can be determined later. Therefore,

**FL1 Question 2.3-1:**

**Shall we clarify that** **the total number of TxRx and total DL power level is per RU?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Spreadtrum1 | Maybe it could be absorbed in the scaling in spatial domain, e.g. the scaling factor is different for different number of TRx RUs. |
| Qualcomm1 | Is this question for FR1 only? What is the purpose of this question? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t understand why we need to introduce this RU. It seems the number of TxRx chains per gNB is sufficient. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Yes. We think this issue should be clarified, and to have common understanding among companies. |
| MediaTek | Not sure. Is it per 100MHz for Set1 FR1 instead of per RU? |

**FL1 Proposal 2.3-2:**

**For set 2 FR1 FDD TxRx reference configuration, confirm the WA as 32 in reference configuration.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm1 | Support |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | Fine |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Okay. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| CMCC | Support |
| OPPO | We support the proposal |
| MediaTek | Yes. |
| Intel | OK |
| vivo | Support |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |

**FL1 Proposal 2.3-3:**

**The total DL power level is 49 dBm for set 2 FR1 FDD reference configuration.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm1 | Support |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | Fine |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Okay. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For downlink transmission power, it mainly depends on the number of PAs used. Considering the number of TRX chains are reduced by half compared with Set1 FR1 TDD, we think the total transmission power should be 55dbm-3dB= 52dBm. All these power can be transmitted within 20Mhz bandwidth. |
| CMCC | Support.  According to Table A.2.1-1 in TR 38.802, 49dBm BS Tx power is assumed with the simulation bandwidth of 20MHz for urban macro below 6GHz. Hence, we suggest to use 49dBm as reference configuration for the total DL power level for FR1 FDD. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal in principle, but for FDD, the simulation BW is generally split equally between UL and DL, where power scaling down is needed. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Fine |
| MediaTek | Agree. |
| Intel | OK |
| vivo | Support |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
|  |  |

### Second round

It is likely that for FR2, urban micro can be prioritized given the discussion in section 3.3. Therefore, looking at the view for FR2 assuming micro BS, it might be ok to suggest the below. It is not clear how to apply scaling, if DL total power level is not provided as one company proposed.

**FL2 Proposal 2.3.1-1:**

**For set 3 FR2 reference configuration, the total DL power level and EIRP limit is set as 33 dBm and 63 dBm respectively. Note EIRP limit is also scaled with the number of TxRU.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | For FR2, there is no need to define the total DL power level, with defining of EIRP only is sufficient.  Therefore, we propose the following re-wording:   * **For set 3 FR2 reference configuration, the EIRP limit is set as 63 dBm. Note EIRP limit is also scaled with the number of TxRU** |
| Samsung | Fine |
| CMCC | In Table A.2.1-1 of TR 38.802, 33dBm of BS Tx power is assumed with the simulation bandwidth of 80MHz for urban micro above 6GHz. When system BW is higher than 80MHz simulation BW, scaled down with simulation BW is needed. However, we have agreed that the 100 MHz of system BW is assumed as reference configuration for FR2. Hence, we suggest to scale down the PA with bandwidth of 100MHz, such as linearly scaling, then 34dBm is assumed as the total DL power level for FR2.  According to Table A.2.1-1, EIRP should not exceed 68dBm for the micro layers, so we suggest the EIRP is limited to 68dBm for FR2. |
| DOCOMO | Fine. |
| MediaTek | Agree with CMCC. |
| OPPO | As per Table A.2.1-1 in TR 38.802, the BS Tx power and EIRP limit is set as 33dBm and 68dBm separately for micro BS. |
| Qualcomm2 | OK |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Okay. |

## Other general aspects for the framework

One general aspect related to the BS energy consumption modeling is the slot/symbol level calculation detail.

* Support slot-level, while allow symbol-level BS power consumption by linearly scaling within a slot. [1][2][3][4][5][15][16][17, at least for SSB/CSI-RS][20]
  + Resource utilization, i.e. frequency domain resource used for symbols, should also be considered [7][10, with weighted average]
* Symbol level modeling should be defined. [6, instead of scaling from slot-level model] [19, averaging of symbol-level relative power consumption results in slot-level calculation][22, with slot level calculation obtained by the sum of the power level of each symbol]

With the agreements achieved in the last meeting and what is to be discussed in the scaling session, it is not so clear what additionally needs to be agreed on for evaluation purpose.

**FL1 Question 2.4-1:**

**Can we agree that in the evaluation, symbol-level BS power consumption calculation, when needed, is obtained by linearly scaling from the power consumed based on the referred number of symbols within a slot?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | We support the slot-level BS power consumption as a baseline and symbol-level modeling can be additionally considered on top of it if necessary. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Yes |
| Qualcomm1 | No support |
| DOCOMO | Yes |
| Samsung | Agree, it seems to overlap with discussion in section 2.2.2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes. For the power states which need to be distinguished in symbol-level operations, for example, SSB/CSI-RS transmission, the power consumption value can be derived by scaling the slot-level power based on time and frequency occupancy. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support this proposal. |
| OPPO | Yes, the power can be linearly scaled by the actually occupied symbols within a slot. |
| NOKIA/NSB | We do not need an explicit symbol level modelling, where the symbol-level BS power consumption can be derived by linearly scaling within a slot is sufficient. |
| MediaTek | Agree. |
| Intel | OK |
| vivo | Support |
| Panasonic | We are okay. |
| China Telecom | Support |

Some proposals mention BH [10] and power system [19]. It is more realistic to consider that

**FL1 Proposal 2.4-2:**

**The study of BS energy consumption model in this release does not specifically account for BH, repeater, power system, e.g., DC-DC converter loss, main power supply loss, active cooling.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum1 | It seems being absorbed into the power model. |
| Qualcomm1 | Support |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| Samsung | Okay |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support. For this part, it is not within the scope of 3GPP. |
| NOKIA/NSB | The Total BS power consumption is provided in this release, and no need for a per components/sub-components power consumption. |
| MediaTek | Agree. |
| Vivo | Support |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
|  |  |

Also [5] propose that the study should be limited to single RAT. FL consider this is reflected by SID discussion that specification work is only expected for NR. On the other hand, proposals for LTE and NR co-existence with spec work on NR-only is allowed, according to FL understanding. If this is the intention of [5], perhaps

**FL1 Proposal 2.4-3:**

**There is no specification change for LTE expected for the study of this release.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm1 | Support |
| Samsung | Support |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Agree |
| MediaTek | Agree. |
| Vivo | Support |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Panasonic | We support |
| China Telecon | Support. |

### Second round

Symbol level or slot level is to be addressed in scaling section.

Mr. Chair suggest to come up with a better wording for **FL1 Proposal 2.4-2**. The following is suggested

**FL2 Proposal 2.4-2-rev1:**

**The study in this release does not specifically consider modeling or optimization in component level for BH, repeater, power system, e.g., DC-DC converter loss, main power supply loss, active cooling.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | OK |
| Samsung | Fine |
| DOCOMO | Fine |
| MediaTek | Ok |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Okay. |

# Methodology

## KPI and metrics

### Load definition

The discussion for load definition is summarized.

* Option 1: below (FFS further refinement), [2], [5], [9], [17]
* Option 2: in addition to resource utilization ratio, include traffic density and/or number of UEs per cell [4]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Load definition: resource usage by data (UE specific PDSCH / PUSCH).  Note: resource allocation for common signal can be treated as overhead when evaluating UPT/throughput. | |
| Empty load | Recommend range: X%  [X=0, 5, 10 or PRBs are only used for SSB/SIB] |
| Light/medium load | Y%  [Y=10, 15, 20, 30, 35, 50] |
| Heavy/full load | Z%  [Z=50, 70, 100] |
| For multi CCs, the load should be calculated among the total CCs. Unbalanced load among CCs can be showed in evaluation results | |

The number of UEs can be provided in SLS to reflect the load. Also, traffic density can be reflected by traffic model used in the evaluations, possibly with re-adjustment as to be discussed in section 3.2. Therefore,

**FL1 Proposal 3.1.1-1:**

* **The traffic load for BS energy saving evaluation is considered as**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Load definition: resource usage by data (UE specific PDSCH / PUSCH).  Note: resource allocation for common signal can be treated as overhead when evaluating UPT/throughput. | |
| Empty load | Recommend range: X%  [X=0, 5, 10 or PRBs are only used for SSB/SIB] |
| Light/medium load | Y%  [Y=10, 15, 20, 30, 35, 50] |
| Heavy/full load | Z%  [Z=50, 70, 100] |
| For multi CCs, the load should be calculated among the total CCs. Unbalanced load among CCs can be showed in evaluation results | |

* **FFS the value of X, Y, Z (to be determined in RAN1#110).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | We are generally OK with the proposal. However, Z values may not be necessary, considering that the load scenario where BS can save energy is mainly low to medium loads. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Empty load is nothing transmission/[reception] which only includes the static part. The common signal/channel (e.g. SSB/SIB/paging) takes 10%. Light/medium load is 30% load. Heavy/full load is 50%. |
| Qualcomm1 | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine to define empty/low/mid/high traffic load for evaluation. For simplicity, the proposal could be summarized as follow.   * **The following traffic load levels are considered for evaluation**   + **Empty load: RU 0%**   + **Light load: RU 10%**   + **Medium load: RU 30%**   + **Heavy load: RU 50%**   **For multi CCs, the load should be calculated among the total CCs. Unbalanced load among CCs can be showed in evaluation results** |
| Fujitsu | In empty load, PRBs are only used for SSB/SIB. The range of light/medium load is specified after the range of empty load is agreed. |
| Samsung | We are fine with FL’s proposal with small updates:  **FL1 Proposal 3.1.1-1:**   * **The traffic load for BS energy saving evaluation is considered as**  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Load definition: resource usage by data (UE specific PDSCH / PUSCH).  Note: resource allocation for common signal can be treated as overhead when evaluating UPT/throughput. | | | Empty load | Recommend range: less than X%  ~~[X=0, 5, 10 or PRBs are only used for SSB/SIB]~~ | | Light/medium load | Recommend range : X% ≤ RU < Y%  ~~[Y=10, 15, 20, 30, 35, 50]~~ | | Heavy/full load | Recommend range : Y% ≤ RU ~~Z%~~  ~~[Z=50, 70, 100]~~ | | Note: For empty load, [X=0, 5, 10 or PRBs are only used for SSB/SIB], and for light/medium load, [Y=10, 15, 20, 30, 35, 50].  For multi CCs, the load should be calculated among the total CCs. Unbalanced load among CCs can be showed in evaluation results | |   **FFS the value of X, Y~~, Z~~ (to be determined in RAN1#110).** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Similar with Samsung, instead of exact value for X, Y, Z, like 10, 15, 20, 30, 35, 50, etc, we prefer to defining a range since it is not easy to make sure the load would be same as the particular values in the SLS. Some suggestions are X<=10; 10<Y<=50, Z>50. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The recommend value from us is Y=30% Z=50% |
| CMCC | Support the FL1 proposal. For X, no UE specific data transmission, and 5 can be supposed.  Usually, for light load and medium load, Y is 10 and 30 respectively.  For heavy load, Z=50%. |
| NOKIA/NSB | OK |
| MediaTek | Based on SID scope, the empty, light, and medium loads are sufficient. No need to have heavy/full load. Prefer X = 0 and Y = 10 (light) /30 (medium). |
| Intel | We think light and medium loads can be separate category. Also, we think for evaluation purposes, 50% is a bit high for medium load. We suggest following range  **Light load: 5%< RU < 15%**  **Medium load: 15%< RU < 35%** |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Panasonic | We support DOCOMO’s proposal on numbers of different loads. |

#### Second round

Based on what was discussed in online session, the following is further suggested

**FL2 Proposal 3.1.1.1-1:**

* **The traffic load for BS energy saving SLS evaluation is considered as**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Load definition: resource usage (RU) by UE specific PDSCH / PUSCH only | |
| Idle/empty load | Recommend range: less than X%  X=5 |
| Light load | Recommend range: X% ≤ RU < Y%  Y=30 |
| Medium load | Recommend range: Y% ≤ RU < Z%  Z=50 |
| For multi CCs, the load can be reported either for each CC or for among total CC. | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Support |
| MediaTek | Okay |
| Qualcomm2 | We propose an alternative proposal:  **Alternative proposal to FL2 Proposal 3.1.1.1-1**   * For evaluation purpose,   + a load (L) of a cell is a percentage of resources used for UE specific PDSCH / PUSCH   + The following load scenarios are considered  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Load scenario | Characteristics | | Idle/empty load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * L = 0 | | Light load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * 0 < L≤ [30] | | Medium load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * [30] < L≤ [50] | | For CA, the companies report whether the load is defined per CC or across all CCs. | | |

### KPI

A set of KPIs has been agreed in the last meeting. In this meeting, [2][16] propose to use joint KPIs of those agreed KPIs (which already includes consideration of both gNB and UE side performance gain/impact).

In addition, multiple QoS target (e.g. UPT) [2][5][13, and also latency requirement] is proposed, which sounds reasonable for evaluation and real implementation.

A few other proposals include to define/add (new form of) KPI for

* Option 1: network energy saving evaluation, e.g. multi-dimensional EE KPIs, or a KPI as aggregated UPT divided by normalized energy consumption [5][7], certain performance KPI over energy consumption (in Joule) [12][16]
* Option 2: new channel/signal in terms of performance, complexity, overhead, detection reliability etc.[9]
* Coverage [13]

And load should be also reported [2][3][9] associated with those KPIs.

**FL1 Proposal 3.1.2-1:**

* **To determine limited set of UPT target/requirement (e.g. 5%, 10%, 15% UPT loss) in the energy saving gain evaluation, corresponding to the reported load and evaluated technique(s).**
  + **FFS latency requirements**
* **Coverage, overhead and other new KPIs can be optionally reported**
* **For potential new channel/signals, e.g. WUS from UE, the performance/complexity/detection reliability in terms of e.g. miss-detection rate at BS side can be considered**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | It seems that the first bullet and “overhead” in the second bullet in the proposal need to be clarified. Besides, Energy efficiency should be included to second bullet as one of KPIs in evaluation methodology for network energy savings. |
| Qualcomm1 | More discussion is needed |
| NTT DOCOMO | We have a slight concern on the simulation workload of defining a UPT target (e.g. x% loss). To achieve a specific loss the of UPT, we need to try several evaluations with different parameters. Any supplementary statements to reduce the simulation workload is highly appreciated. |
| Samsung | We are fine with FL’s proposal, with small updates.  **FL1 Proposal 3.1.2-1:**   * **To determine limited set of UPT target/requirement ~~(e.g. 5%, 10%, 15% UPT loss)~~ in the energy saving gain evaluation, corresponding to the reported load and evaluated technique(s).**   + **FFS target UPT loss**   + **FFS latency requirements** * **Coverage, overhead and other new KPIs can be optionally reported** * **For potential new channel/signals, e.g. WUS from UE, the performance/complexity/detection reliability in terms of e.g. miss-detection rate at BS side can be considered**   For the coverage, we think it should be reported, if it was changed by NWES techniques.  For latency, we think the any NWES technique should ensure the latency requirement. Several other companies also mentioned the latency should not be impacted, we should find a way to evaluate the latency impact, either restrict the latency is always met, or define a probability threshold that the latency is not met. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 1. We think that UPT loss is observed in some NW energy saving techniques, e.g. TxRUs reduction. And for schemes such as SSB/SIB-limited, or SSB/SIB-less, the UPT will be increased. Therefore, the proposal should be generic to cover both cases. Furthermore, the UPT impact depends on many factors, limit to some particular value sets will increase the SLS workload.   If the first bullet is needed in SI, we think it is better to determine some value range, for example, <= 5%, <=20%, etc.  (2) The miss-detection rate has been included in detection reliability.  Suggestions as below.   * For potential new channel/signals, e.g. WUS from UE, the performance/complexity/detection reliability ~~in terms of e.g. miss-detection rate~~ at BS side can be considered |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Agree with it. We think maybe coverage performance can be also reflected by using 5% UPT performance. |
| CMCC | Y |
| NOKIA.NSB | OK |
| MediaTek | Agree. |
| vivo | Support |
| InterDigital | The third bullet is not really a KPI, but rather a simulation assumption. We prefer not listing it as a KPI. |
| Panasonic | Okay. |
| China Telecom | Generally fine with the proposal. But by determine a set of UPT target first then evaluate the energy consumption, there may be too many independent values considering that the latency may also have requirement and the network load is also important, the summary of evaluation results can be rather complicated. |

One reason to FFS latency is that clarification may be needed to define accurate latency KPI, including [13]

* Option 1: user plane latency increase
* Option 2: scheduling latency increase

**FL1 Proposal 3.1.2-2:**

**To determine in RAN1#110 whether specific latency type (e.g. user plane latency, scheduling delay, access delay etc.) should be clarified and included for evaluation of certain techniques.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Spreadtrum1 | UE power saving gain can be reported as an additional benefit. In our view, BS DTX can be aligned to UE DRX. |
| Qualcomm1 | More discussion needed |
| NTT DOCOMO | It can be reported by companies on how latency is calculated in their evaluation. |
| Samsung | Support to define the user plane latency and scheduling delay.  The latency is one of key factor for system performance, so to evaluate the NWES techniques, latency should be reported. Therefore, we think it is needed to define RAN1 specific latency.  For latency, we are considering the following two types of latency.  User plane latency, = ,  Scheduling latency, = ,  We think the user plane latency defined similar as in 38.913. For simplicity and RAN1 specific discussion, we assumed inter layer latency can be ignored, because it may take small faction of latency. It is calculated as the delay between the time when a packet arrivals and the time when the packet is decoded for the service performance. However, when we are evaluating the NWES techniques, like BWP adaptation, it seems not suitable KPI, because portion of adaptation will be directly translated as latency increases. In addition, it’s not key performance under low traffic scenario.  Hence, the scheduling delay used in UE PS can be used to show the performance impact on scheduling. It is calculated as the delay between the time when a packet arrivals and the time when the packet is scheduled. It would be desirable KPIs to evaluate the performance under low traffic scenarios for NWES. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC | To see delay performance of power saving schemes in practical deployment, the delay is evaluated by ping delay. For radio access part, may be user plane latency can be considered. |
| OPPO | User plane latency can be considered as KPI from a UE-experience perspective. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Apart from what has been listed in Proposal 3.1.2-2, the hardware activation/deactivation delay when applying energy saving techniques should also be clarified, i.e. for dynamic antenna port adaptation, the (de-)activation delay of spatial elements should be clarified and carefully evaluated. |
| MediaTek | Agree |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Panasonic | We are okay. |

#### Second round

There is already agreement last meeting that “*And this does not preclude to consider other KPIs when found appropriate for certain techniques/scenarios*.” Also, UE power consumption is already included. Given the input so far, the following can be considered.

**FL2 Proposal 3.1.2.1-1:**

* **In the energy saving gain evaluation, along with the reported load and evaluated technique(s), one or more of the following UPT targets are considered**
  + **Less than 5%, less than 10%, less than 15%**
* **In the energy saving gain evaluation, along with the reported load and evaluated technique(s), one of more of the following latency type are considered**
  + **User plane latency,** **calculated as the delay between the time when a packet arrivals and the time when the packet is decoded for the service performance**
  + **Scheduling latency,** **calculated as the delay between the time when a packet arrivals and the time when the packet is scheduled**
  + **Other latency e.g. (de-)activation of spatial element**
* **Coverage can be optionally reported**
* **EE (energy efficiency) can be optionally considered with clarified definition, if reported.**
* **Note for potential new channel/signals, e.g. WUS from UE, the assumption for detection reliability at BS side is reported (performance and complexity impact would subject to results and further discussion).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Support with minor updates in 1st bullet as follow:  **FL2 Proposal 3.1.2.1-1:**   * **In the energy saving gain evaluation, along with the reported load and evaluated technique(s), one or more of the following UPT loss targets are considered**   + **Less than 5%, less than 10%, less than 15%**   For the target user plane latency requirement, we suggest less than 10 ms or less than 20 ms. |
| MediaTek | Okay |
| Qualcomm2 | We are not ready to accept the proposal yet. Here are some comments:   * For UPT target, 5 percentile and 50 percentile should be sufficient. * For latency, there is no need to consider user plane latency since it is already captured in UPT. Furthermore, the scheduling latency should be optionally reported since it may depend on scheduler implementation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think not all the energy saving solution has UPT loss, for example, to reduce the transmission of some signal/channel, it will beneficial to UPT improvement. Therefore, we think the current wording of UPT is sufficient.  Furthermore, the restriction of UPT loss can be more relaxed, for example, 20%, 25%.  And for the UP latency, we don’t think the current traffic are so latency sensitive. And if DRX is configured, the latency impact will be larger. |
| ZTE, Sanechips 2 | We think not all the energy saving solution has UPT loss, for example, to reduce the transmission of some signal/channel, it will beneficial to UPT improvement. Therefore, we think the current wording of UPT is sufficient.  Furthermore, the restriction of UPT loss can be more relaxed, for example, 20%, 25%. And we also think it is better report 5% UPT, 50% UPT, 95% UPT, or average UPT impact is sufficient.  And for the UP latency, we don’t think the current traffic are so latency sensitive. And if DRX is configured, the latency impact will be larger.  We don’t think we should close the door for other KPIs, suggestions as below.   * **EE(energy efficiency) and other metrics can be optionally considered with clarified definition, if reported.** |
| China Telecom | We are generally fine with the proposal. However, we think different energy saving techniques may have the best trade-off between performance and energy gain in different UPT loss, it may be difficult to see which techniques is better. Besides, in this way we can only evaluate the performance loss in one dimension at a time. This is why we think a EE method is needed and convenient. |

### Gain definition

The gain definition was discussed last meeting. It seems whether it is averaged per slot is concerned. FL understanding is that the energy saving gain is described as relative power, which is normalized by the energy calculation over a time duration (not necessary a slot). [2][17]

**FL1 Proposal 3.1.3-1:**

**The energy saving gain is described as relative power, which is normalized by the energy calculation over a time duration (not necessary a slot).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Fine. |
| Qualcomm1 | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | Support |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal. |
| CMCC | The time duration should be as long as enough to reflect the related completed transmission or reception procedure, such as no shorter than the periodicity of channels/signals. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Agree with FL’s understanding |
| MediaTek | Agree. |
| Intel | In our view, it is calculated as summation of energy (e.g., relative power value/slot of a state *times* number of slots the state is observed) observed over a time duration. In the end, it is expressed as average relative power, hence division by the time duration is needed. |
| Vivo | Support |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Panasonic | We support. |
| China Telecom | Support. |

#### Second round

The same proposal seems agreeable, as in **FL2/FL1 Proposal 3.1.3-1:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Support |
| MediaTek | Okay |
| Qualcomm2 | We took another look at the proposal and felt that the proposal is not clear yet since the gain can be computed as G = 1 – En/Eb where En and Eb are the energy consumptions of the enhanced technique and the baseline, respectively. We should normalize the computed energy for both En and Eb over the same duration to have a fair comparison.  Furthermore, “relative power” in the proposal could be confused with the relative power used in the power model.  **Alternative proposal**   * For evaluation purpose, network energy saving gain is computed based on the energy consumptions for a technique and the baseline over the same duration. |

## Traffic model

On the traffic model to be assumed for evaluation, views from contributions include

* Option 1: no further prioritization among the agreed models is to be considered. [2][13][21, same model for DL and UL]
* Option 2: prioritize certain traffic model. [5, DL traffic to be prioritized, or FTP model with re-adjusted packet size/inter-arrival rate], [17, FTP models], [19, FTP3]
* Option 3: new model, or additional modifications for certain traffic model can be considered.
  + Heartbeat (TR38.875) [4, with modified arrival rate],
  + XR or other model with varied packet size [9]

The current models seems typical enough, also covering various packet sizes. Any modification, refinement or new models may have values on its own. Thus,

**FL1 Proposal 3.2-1:**

**It is up to company report which traffic model is used among the agreed three traffic models in their evaluations.**

* **Other models as well as parameter (e.g. packet size and arrival rate) adjustment can be optionally considered and reported.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm1 | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | Support |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | All kinds of packet size listed in the agreed model are typical and worth investigating, including big packet (FTP3), middle packet (FTP3 IM) and small packet (VoIP). Especially for middle packet (FTP IM) and small packet (VoIP), since in the SID it is agreed to focus on the study on idle/empty and low/medium load scenario.  In our view, it is better to evaluate at least the FTP IM and VoIP traffic. |
| CMCC | Y |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| NOKIA/NSB | OK |
| MediaTek | Agree. |
| Vivo | Support |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Panasonic | Okay. |
| China Telecom | Support. |

Regarding UE C-DRX configurations,

* Option 1: should be included in the baseline [9][15]
  + With shorter inactive timer compared to TR 38.840 [15]
* Option 2: when reported, the following configurations are assumed for alignment
  + As per TR 38.840 [5][19]

One thing FL has different understanding is that the C-DRX seem to be mandatory with capability signaling, thus not mandated to be in the baseline. This could be similarly reported up to proponent, as the traffic model.

**FL1 Proposal 3.2-2:**

**It is up to company report the use of UE C-DRX.**

* **for alignment, the configuration if reported is as per TR 38.840.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Qualcomm1 | We should agree on a set of C-DRX configs so that KPI analysis can be aligned across companies. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | Support |
| ZTE, Sanechips | okay. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal, and it is not reasonable to enforce gNB to always apply C-DRX for UEs if the gNB wants to apply the gNB power saving techniques in Rel-18. |
| CMCC | To reflect the practical C-DRX parameters, we suggest the following parameters for C-DRX cycle 160msec,  FR1 On duration:10ms  Inactivity timer:60~100ms, e.g. 60ms, 80ms. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| NOKIA/NSB | OK |
| MediaTek | Disagree. We have concerns about how companies evaluate UE power consumption and latency if there is no UE C-DRX. Without C-DRX, any NWES techniques may underestimate their impacts on UE power saving because UE power will be always high due to non-necessary PDCCH monitoring. Note that companies have agreed at least UE power consumption shall be considered for performance impact evaluation.  **Agreement** in RAN1#109-e  For BS energy consumption evaluation, in addition to the energy saving gain,  At least UPT/**UE power consumption**/access delay/latency should be considered for performance impact evaluation |
| vivo | Support |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Panasonic | Okay. |

#### Second round

The overall supporting companies are not many. FL consider it is useful to align some parameters for evaluations but may not be proper to mandate it. Also, proposals for update of DRX inactivity timer is added while there are also proposal to keep those as TR 38.840

**FL2 Proposal 3.2.1.1-2:**

**It is up to company report the use of UE C-DRX.**

* **for alignment, the configuration if reported can be**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Traffic type** | **FTP** | **IM** | **VoIP** |
| Model | FTP model 3 | FTP model 3 | As defined in R1-070674.  Assume max two packets bundled. |
| Packet size | 0.5 Mbytes | 0.1 Mbytes |
| Mean inter-arrival time | 200 ms | 2 sec |
| DRX Period | 160 ms | 320 ms | 40 ms |
| DRX Inactivity timer | **FFS** 100 ms/20ms | **FFS** 80 ms/20ms | 10 ms |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | We are wondering why “on-duration timer” configuration is NOT there in the above table as part of the CDRX configuration? |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| MediaTek | We encourage companies to consider using UE C-DRX as the evaluation baseline, which has two benefits 1) better evaluating UE power consumption and scheduling delay, and 2) simplifying the criteria for a BS to enter a sleep mode. |
| OPPO | Support. 100ms and 80ms Inactivity time can be considered for FTP and IM traffic model separately. |

The same proposal as **FL2/FL1 Proposal 3.2-1** seems agreeable

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Samsung | Fine |
| MediaTek | Okay |
| OPPO | Support. |

## Evaluation scenario

It has been prioritized to study FR1 urban macro BS. Further considerations in this meeting include:

For FR1, the BS to be assumed for study is

* Option 1: urban macro as prioritized is sufficient [2], [5]
* Option 2: additionally, urban micro [3], [4, including TDD massive MIMO], [21, optional with details referring to micro layer in Dense urban per TR38.802]
* Option 3: additionally, rural macro [4, without DSS],
* Option 4: additionally, small cell [3]

For FR2, the BS to be assumed for study is:

* Option 1: macro [2]
* Option 2: beam-based scenarios [4]
* Option 3: (urban) micro [5?][19][21, with details referring to micro layer in Dense urban per TR38.802]

Also single-carrier in homo deployment and multi-carrier in HetNet deployment scenarios is considered [9],[10].

Given the interest of study,

**FL1 Proposal 3.3-1:**

* **For FR1, urban micro can be optionally considered.**
* **For FR2, urban micro is prioritized.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| LG Electronics | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Fine. |
| Qualcomm1 | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | Fine |
| ZTE, Sanechips | okay. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Macro or urban macro scenario for both FR1 and FR2 should be studied as high priority than other. For FR1, macro scenario is already the typical commercial deployment. For FR2, there is not too much commercial deployment, and we think urban macro for FR2 is more attractive considering it could reuse the existing sites, especially in early commercial deployment. |
| CMCC | Y |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| NOKIA/NSB | For Proposal 3.3-1, FR1 urban micro should be de-prioritized. And urban macro with FR1 should be sufficient  And FR2 urban micro can be considered |
| MediaTek | Agree. |
| Intel | OK. We also suggest to confirm ISD = 200m for FR2 |
| vivo | Support |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal |
| Panasonic | We are okay. |
| China Telecom | Support. |

#### Second round

It seems the same proposals can be considered. The ISD parameter can also be provided in SLS assumptions for FR2 however a bit progress can be helpful.

**FL2 Proposal 3.3.1.1-1:**

* **For FR1, urban micro can be optionally considered.**
* **For FR2, urban micro is prioritized, with ISD=200 m is assumed.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/Nsb | OK |
| Samsung | Fine |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Okay |
| OPPO | Support. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | okay |

## Simulation assumption

### SLS assumptions

There is an FFS on the potential alignment needed for SLS. There are also proposals on reusing SLS assumptions in previous study in e.g. IMT-2020 [2][9], TR 38.802 [8][22] or TR 38.840[4][9] or direct proposals on SLS parameters [15]. Nevertheless, to avoid potential confusion, it may be good to clearly agree on a set of parameters.

Also, baseline setting for SSB & SIB1 is proposed in [2][17] and also mentioned as background activities in e.g. [13]. As a whole, companies are invited to check the Annex-A reference SLS configurations as baseline for FR1, and comment on the part that you prefer to change/add/clarify. For FR2, SLS parameter is also expected after determination of questions in section 3.3.

**FL1 Proposal 3.4.1-1:**

**Companies are invited to check Annex-A reference SLS configurations as baseline for FR1, and share your comments. FFS FR2 (to be determined in RAN1#110).**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Parameter** | **Comments** |
| *Company A* | *Channel model* | *The channel model should xxx.* |
| *Device deployment* | *The parameter is yyy.* |
| NTT DOCOMO | CSI feedback | The feedback periodicity of RI is usual 100/200 slots in the network. Current setting of RI periodicity of 5 slot is not reasonable. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Antenna configuration at TRxP | We suggest that the antenna configuration should be (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,8,2,1,1) for FR1 TDD according to the antenna configurations for Urban macro in Table A.2.1-4 in TS 38.802 as below.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | BS (M, N, P, Mg, Ng) | **4GHz:**  Dense urban and Urban macro:  - Baseline: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng) = (8, 8, 2, 1, 1).  - Note that for Urban macro, companies are also encouraged optionally to investigate larger panels, e.g. (8, 16, 2, 1, 1)  Indoor hotspot:  - Baseline: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng) = (4, 4, 2, 1, 1) | **30GHz:**  Dense urban and Urban macro:  - Baseline: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng) = (4, 8, 2, 2, 2).  Indoor hotspot:  - Baseline: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng) = (4, 8, 2, 1, 1)  **70GHz:**  Dense urban:  - Baseline: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng) = (8, 16, 2, 2, 2)  Indoor hotspot:  - Baseline: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng) = (8, 16, 2, 1, 1) |   For the carrier frequency, we think other carrier such as 3.5G, 2.6G, 2.3G, 800MHz/900MHz can be also considered in the evaluation. |
| UE noise figure | We suggest that the UE noise figure should be 9dB for fc=4GHz according to the general system evaluation assumption for sUMa in Table A.2.1-1 in TS 38.802 as below.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | UE receiver noise figure | Below 6GHz: 9dB Above 6GHz: 13dB (baseline performance), 10dB (high performance) | |
| Common RS | According to the description on the time location of SS/PBCH blocks in clause 4.1 in TS 38.213 as follows, it is specified that 4slots for TDD with {SCS=30KHz, Fc=4GHz} and 2 slots for FDD with {SCS=15KHz, Fc= 2.1GHz}.   |  | | --- | | **Clause 4.1 in TS 38.213**  - Case A - 15 kHz SCS: the first symbols of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes of .  - For operation without shared spectrum channel access:  - For carrier frequencies smaller than or equal to 3 GHz, .  - For carrier frequencies within FR1 larger than 3 GHz, .  - For operation with shared spectrum channel access, as described in [15, TS 37.213], .  - Case B - 30 kHz SCS: the first symbols of the candidate SS/PBCH blocks have indexes . For carrier frequencies smaller than or equal to 3 GHz, . For carrier frequencies within FR1 larger than 3 GHz, . |   So we suggest that the following configurations for common RS in blue.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | FDD | TDD | | SSB time resource | ~~Slot#0~slot#3,~~ Slot#0, slot#1 2 SSB per slot  4 symbols for each SSB | ~~Slot#0, slot#1~~ Slot#0~slot#3, 2 SSB per slot  4 symbols for each SSB | | SIB1 time resource | ~~slot#10 ~ slot#17~~  slot#10 ~ slot#13 | ~~slot#10 ~ slot#13~~  slot#10 ~ slot#17 | |
| CMCC | Carrier Frequency | In TR38.802 the FR1 carrier frequencies considered are 700M and 4GHz. Here for FDD, 2.1GHz is adopted instead of 700MHz, and we understand it is for urban macro consideration. While for TDD scenario, 4GHz is adopt for evaluation at initial NR phase and is not widely used in practical, so we prefer to consider practical carrier frequency with large scale deployment, e.g,2.6GHz. |
| OPPO | Simulation bandwidth | The simulation bandwidth is 10MHz for FDD since the 20MHz is generally split equally between UL and DL. |
| NOKIA/NSB | UE noise figure | Why there is the difference between FDD (9dB) and TDD (7dB)? |
| FL2 | Response | To DOCOMO: Originally based on TR37.910 and also used in 38802 for some other scenarios.  To ZTE: revised and other carrier frequency can be optionally considered.  To CMCC: if this change does not need to change other parameters then fine to revise. Done.  OPPO: Done  Nokia/NSB: Done.  **Companies are invited to provide a set of assumptions for FR2.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For the carrier frequency, we can make it clear the other options can be considered.  Suggestion as below.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Carrier Frequency | 2.1GHz  Other values can be also considered. | ~~4GHz~~ 2.6GHz  Other values can be also considered. | |

### Other EVA assumptions/settings

There are other issues as below.

1. [1] considers that details or assumptions of the different power savings techniques deployed should be provided or accompany the evaluation results to justify the different power consumption levels of the various sub-state(s).
2. [4] Determination of non-uniform UE distribution.
3. [14] propose that for CA, propose to set the CC combinations from {2.6GHz, 2.6GHz}, {2.6GHz, 4.9GHz}, {2.6GHz, 700MHz},{700MHz, 900MHz}, {1.8GHz, 1.9GHz}.
4. [22] evaluation of the energy saving gain should consider overall network energy usage for performing a certain operation (e.g., equal to several FTP sessions) as opposed to instantaneous power consumption.
5. [22] the average value across multiple cells can be considered for the qualitative analysis via SLS; average values of each cell and other statistics may also be added.

**FL1 Proposal 3.4.2-1:**

**Companies are invited to choose from the above about issues to be further determined/captured for discussion in RAN1#110.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Issue** | **Comments** |
| NTT DOCOMO |  | Set low priority items at least for this meeting.  If discussion time is limited, and above issues are not discussed, the related setting can be reported by each companies. |
| vivo |  | UE distribution is not discussed in the above proposals. We think both uniform and non-uniform UE distribution should be considered. |
| FL2 | To vivo | FL2 consider a similar approach as DOCOMO suggested. |

# Other issues/discussion points/missing proposals

If there is any other issue/discussion point/missing proposal that you consider should be discussed but not captured above, please share your proposal below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Domain (optional, for potential categorization)** | **Issue content/comments/questions** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
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| [20] | [R1-2207343](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110/Docs/R1-2207343.zip) | On NW energy savings performance evaluation | Apple |
| [21] | [R1-2207418](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110/Docs/R1-2207418.zip) | Discussion on NW energy savings performance evaluation | NTT DOCOMO, INC. |
| [22] | [R1-2207437](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110/Docs/R1-2207437.zip) | Network energy consumption modeling and evaluation | Ericsson |

# Annex –

## A. Reference SLS configurations

**Table A The evaluation assumption for BS power consumption model**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Parameters | | |
| Basic parameters | Channel model | 3D/HF-Uma based on TR 38.901 | 3D/HF-Uma based on TR 38.901 |
| Device deployment | 80% indoor, 20% outdoor | 80% indoor, 20% outdoor |
| Inter-site distance | 500m | 500m |
| Network Topology | 7\*3 Sector | 7\*3 Sector |
| Carrier Frequency | 2.1GHz | ~~4GHz~~ 2.6GHz |
| Multiple access | OFDMA | OFDMA |
| Duplexing | FDD | TDD |
| Numerology | 15KHz,  14 OFDM symbol slot | 30kHz,  14 OFDM symbol slot |
| Guard band ratio on simulation bandwidth | FDD: 6.4% (104RB for 15kHz SCS and 20 MHz BW) | TDD: 2.08% (272 RB for 30kHz SCS and 100 MHz bandwidth) |
| Simulation bandwidth | FDD: 20 MHz, (equal split of 10 MHz for UL and DL) | TDD: 100 MHz |
| Frame structure | Full downlink | DDDSU |
| UT attachment | Based on RSRP | Based on RSRP |
| Wrapping around method | Geographical distance based wrapping | Geographical distance based wrapping |
| Traffic model | Burst buffer with load <10%, 30%, 50%  Packet size: 0.5M, 0.1M | Burst buffer with load <10%, 30%, 50%  Packet size: 0.5M, 0.1M |
| BS parameters | BS antenna height | 25 m | 25 m |
| BS noise figure | 5 dB | 5 dB |
| BS antenna element gain | 8 dBi | 8 dBi |
| Antenna configuration at TRxP | For 32T: (M,N,P,Mg,Ng; Mp,Np) = (8,8,2,1,1;2,8) (dH, dV)=(0.5, 0.8)λ | For 64T:  ~~(M,N,P,Mg,Ng; Mp,Np) = (12,8,2,1,1;4,8) (dH, dV)=(0.5, 0.8)λ;~~  (M, N, P, Mg, Ng) = (8, 8, 2, 1, 1).  based on 38.802 |
| UE parameters | UE power class | 23dBm | 23dBm |
| UE noise figure | 9 dB | ~~7~~ 9 dB |
| UE antenna element gain | 0 dBi | 0 dBi |
| UE antenna height | Outdoor UEs: 1.5 m; Indoor Uts: 1.5m or consider floor height | Outdoor UEs: 1.5 m; Indoor Uts: 1.5m or consider floor height |
| Antenna configuration at UE | For 4R: (M,N,P,Mg,Ng; Mp,Np)= (1,2,2,1,1; 1,2)  (dH, dV)=(0.5, N/A)λ | For 4R: (M,N,P,Mg,Ng; Mp,Np)= (1,2,2,1,1; 1,2)  (dH, dV)=(0.5, N/A)λ |
| Transmission parameters | Modulation | Up to 256 QAM | Up to 256 QAM |
| Transmission scheme | SU-MIMO | SU-MIMO |
| SU dimension | For 4Rx: Up to 4 layers | For 4Rx: Up to 4 layers |
| DL CSI measurement | Non-precoded CSI-RS based | Precoded CSI-RS based |
| DL codebook | Type I/II codebook | non-PMI transmission |
| SRS transmission | N/A | For UE 4 Tx ports: Non-precoded SRS |
| CSI feedback | PMI, CQI, RI: every 5 slot;  Subband based | CQI, RI: every 5 slot; Subband based |
| Interference measurement | SU-CQI; CSI-IM for inter-cell interference measurement | SU-CQI; CSI-IM for inter-cell interference measurement |
| Scheduling | PF | PF |
| Receiver | MMSE-IRC | MMSE-IRC |
| Channel estimation | Non-ideal | Non-ideal |
| Common RS | SSB/SIB1 period | 20ms | 20ms |
| SSB time resource | ~~Slot#0~slot#3,~~ Slot#0, slot#1, 2 SSB per slot  4 symbols for each SSB | ~~Slot#0, slot#1~~ Slot#0~slot#3, 2 SSB per slot  4 symbols for each SSB |
| SSB frequency resource | 20RB | 20RB |
| SIB1 time resource | ~~slot#10 ~ slot#17~~  slot#10 ~ slot#13 | ~~slot#10 ~ slot#13~~  slot#10 ~ slot#17 |
| SIB1 frequency resource | 40RB | 40RB |

(M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np)

- M: Number of vertical antenna elements within a panel, on one polarization

- N: Number of horizontal antenna elements within a panel, on one polarization

- P: Number of polarizations

- Mg: Number of panels in a column;

- Ng: Number of panels in a row;

- Mp: Number of vertical TXRUs within a panel, on one polarization

- Np: Number of horizontal TXRUs within a panel, on one polarization

## B. Agreements for EVM@RAN1#109-e

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [**R1-2205308**](file:///C:\Users\w00250081\AppData\Local\Temp\Docs\R1-2205308.zip) **FL summary#1 for performance evaluation for NR NW energy savings Moderator (Huawei)**  Agreement  For evaluation purpose, the energy consumption modeling for a BS includes at least the following:   * Reference configuration   + FFS other details   + Note FR1 and FR2 to be separately considered for detailed parameters * Multiple power state(s) including sleep/non-sleep mode(s) with relative power, and associated transition time/energy * Scaling method to be applied at least for non-sleep mode.   + FFS other details including scaling for sleep mode   [**R1-2205402**](file:///C:\Users\w00250081\AppData\Local\Temp\Docs\R1-2205402.zip) **FL summary#2 for performance evaluation for NR NW energy savings Moderator (Huawei)**  Agreement  For evaluation purpose, the BS energy consumption model should at least include the power consumption of BS on slot-level.   * Note that symbol-level power consumption to reflect different BW (or RB utilization) / time-occupancy / tx-rx direction of different symbols in a slot is considered.   + FFS details (e.g. explicit symbol-level power modelling, scaling slot-level power to symbol level power for various cases, etc.)   + Note: system simulation evaluations can be per slot regardless of detailed approach for calculating symbol-level power consumption.   Agreement   * For evaluation, at least for non-sleep mode and TDD, the BS powerconsumption for DL and UL are separately modelled, allowing DL-only transmission or UL-only reception.   + FFS: whether UL-only reception energy consumption model can be derived/simplified from DL-only transmission energy consumption model * FFS: the impact of UL reception and/or DL transmission on sleep modes and associated transition time/energy * FFS: whether/how to define an idle state, where BS is neither transmitting nor receiving but also doesn’t enter into any sleep mode or define it as sleep mode * FFS: whether the model for FDD can be based on the model for TDD   Agreement   * For evaluation purpose,   + Study how to define sleep modes and determine the characteristics for each mode from one or multiple of the below     - Relative power     - Transition time     - Transition energy     - Other approaches are not precluded     - Note: BS components that can be turned off can be considered for discussion purpose when defining the specific values of the characteristics for sleep modes.   + Study whether sleep mode is defined for DL(TX) and UL(RX) jointly or separately   + Study the assumption of order for BS entering/resuming from a sleep mode to another mode (sleep or non-sleep) and the associated transition time and energy, i.e. state machine which may have impact on the transition energy.   Agreement   * For evaluation, the scaling in a BS energy consumption model can be considered based on one or more of the following,   + Number of used physical antenna elements, or TX/RX chains     - FFS: Mapping between used TX/RX chains and used antenna ports     - FFS: Mapping between physical antenna elements and TX/RX chains   + Occupied BW/RBs for DL and/or UL in a slot/symbol in one CC   + number of CCs in CA     - FFS dependency of RF sharing   + number of TRPs   + PSD or transmit power     - FFS dependency on BW scaling     - FFS: PA energy efficiency value   + number of DL and/or UL symbols occupied within a slot   + FFS other domain scaling   + FFS scaling is linearly or else, for each domain * Above does not necessarily imply that BS energy consumption model that takes into account all listed scaling factors will be developed   Agreement  For BS energy consumption evaluation, in addition to the energy saving gain,   * At least UPT/UE power consumption/access delay/latency should be considered for performance impact evaluation * Note: this doesn’t necessarily mean that all the above are considered for all evaluation results. However, multiple KPIs are expected to be evaluated for a given technique. And this does not preclude to consider other KPIs when found appropriate for certain techniques/scenarios.   Agreement  At least urban macro is prioritized for FR1. FFS the baseline deployment assumption for FR2.  Agreement   * FTP3 (0.5MB as packet size, 200ms as mean inter-arrival time), FTP3 IM (0.1MB as packet size, 2s as mean inter-arrival time) and VOIP can be considered in the evaluation * FFS: with possible further prioritization, different model between DL and UL, and/or other traffic models that can be optionally considered. * FFS associated scenarios/configurations, e.g. C-DRX.   [**R1-2205468**](file:///C:\Users\w00250081\AppData\Local\Temp\Docs\R1-2205468.zip) **FL summary#3 for performance evaluation for NR NW energy savings Moderator (Huawei)**  Agreement  For evaluation and BS energy consumption modeling purpose, for single CC case, at least the following in table should be considered for reference configuration   * + Note: other TX-RX RU number and corresponding BS antenna configuration can be considered in SLS assumptions  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Set 1 FR1 | Set 2 FR1 | Set 3 FR2 | | Duplex | TDD | FDD | TDD | | System BW | 100 MHz | 20 MHz | 100 MHz | | SCS | 30 kHz | 15 kHz | 120 kHz | | Number of TRP | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Total number of DL TX RUs | 64 | (working assumption) 32 | 2 | | Total DL power level | 55dBm | [49dBm] – to be further discussed and finalized in future meetings | 43dBm – to be further discussed and finalized in future meetings  EIRP limited to 78dBm – to be further discussed and finalized in future meetings | | Total number of UL Rx RUs | 64 | (working assumption) 32 | 2 |   Agreement  As a starting point,   * macro cell BS for FR1 is assumed for energy consumption model. * FFS: micro cell BS for FR2 is assumed for energy consumption model.   Agreement  The evaluation baseline for energy saving study/evaluation for BS includes at least NR R15 mandatory without capability features. Optional features from R15 onwards (e.g. CA, MIMO) as well as implementation-based energy saving techniques should be explicitly reported and described if used in the evaluation baseline.   * FFS: need of alignment for certain configurations/implementation-based schemes.   Agreement   * Similar to UE power saving study, percentage of energy consumption reduction from the baseline is used to express BS energy saving gain. * SLS is considered as baseline evaluation method. Other method, including numerical analysis and LLS can also be considered. At least one of the methods should be selected and used for evaluation of a specific technique (selection and criteria is up to proponent).   Working assumption  For evaluation, for energy consumption modelling for FDD and the case of simultaneous DL transmission and UL reception for non-sleep mode, study the following with potential down-selection in RAN1#110   * Option 1: the power consumption is the total of DL and UL power consumption * Option 2: the power consumption for UL is neglected * Other option is not precluded * Note the DL (or UL) power consumption can be obtained using a same approach as that obtained from the DL (or UL)-only in TDD model   Final summary in [R1-2205551](file:///C:\Users\w00250081\AppData\Local\Temp\Docs\R1-2205551.zip). |

## C. SID abstraction

Study Item (SI) for network energy savings for NR is approved in [1]. For the study of performance evaluation for this SI, the relevant objectives include below

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Definition of a base station energy consumption model [RAN1]  * Adapt the framework of the power consumption modelling and evaluation methodology of TR38.840 to the base station side, including relative energy consumption for DL and UL (considering factors like PA efficiency, number of TxRU, base station load, etc), sleep states and the associated transition times, and one or more reference parameters/configurations.  1. Definition of an evaluation methodology and KPIs [RAN1]  * The evaluation methodology should target for evaluating system-level network energy consumption and energy savings gains, as well as assessing/balancing impact to network and user performance (e.g. spectral efficiency, capacity, UPT, latency, handover performance, call drop rate, initial access performance, SLA assurance related KPIs), energy efficiency, and UE power consumption, complexity. The evaluation methodology should not focus on a single KPI, and should reuse existing KPIs whenever applicable; where existing KPIs are found to be insufficient new KPIs may be developed as needed.   Note: WGs will decide KPIs to evaluate and how.  The study should prioritize idle/empty and low/medium load scenarios (the exact definition of such loads is left to the study), and different loads among carriers and neighbor cells are allowed.  The following example scenarios (mapping between scenarios and network loads is left to the study) including single-carrier and multi-carrier deployments are used as the starting point for discussion on prioritized scenarios for the study.  The following example scenarios are listed in no particular order.   * Urban micro in FR1, including TDD massive MIMO (note: this scenario can also model small cells) * FR2 beam-based scenarios (note: this scenario can also model small cells) * Urban/Rural macro in FR1 with/without DSS (no impact to LTE expected in case of DSS) * EN-DC/NR-DC macro with FDD PCell and TDD/Massive MIMO on higher FR1/FR2 frequency   Note 1: legacy UEs should be able to continue accessing a network implementing Rel-18 network energy savings techniques, with the possible exception of techniques developed specifically for greenfield deployments.  Note 2: the study of energy savings specifically for IAB is not part of the scope.  The study should coordinate with RAN4 as needed. |

## D. Contact list per RAN1#109-e

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact** | **Email address** |
| Apple | Sigen Ye | sigen\_ye@apple.com |
| NOKIA/NSB | Naizheng Zheng | naizheng.zheng@nokia-sbell.com |
| Samsung | Junyung Yi | junyung.yi@samsung.com |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Mengzhu CHEN | chen.mengzhu@zte.com.cn |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Youjun HU | hu.youjun1@zte.com.cn |
| Panasonic | Hongchao LI | Hongchao.Li@eu.panasonic.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yi Wang | wangyi6@huawei.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Xiaolei TIE | tiexiaolei@huawei.com |
| MediaTek | Weide Wu | weide.wu@mediatek.com |
| Xiaomi | Fu Ting | futing@xiaomi.com |
| CMCC | Yan Li | liyanwx@chinamobile.com |
| CMCC | Lijie Hu | hulijie@chinamobile.com |
| China Telecom | Hang Yin | [yinh6@chinatelecom.cn](mailto:yinh6@chinatelecom.cn) |
| vivo | Gen Li | [reagan.li@vivo.com](mailto:reagan.li@vivo.com) |
| DOCOMO | Yugen Takahashi | yugen.takahashi@docomo-lab.com |
| DOCOMO | JIANG Yu | jiangy@docomolabs-beijing.com.cn |
| QC | Konstantinos Dimou | kdimou@qti.qualcomm.com |
| InterDigital | Erdem Bala | erdem.bala@interdigital.com |
| Spreadtrum | Huayu Zhou | huayu.zhou@unisoc.com |
| OPPO | Hao Lin | lin.hao@oppo.com |
| OPPO | Zuomin Wu | wuzuomin@oppo.com |
| Fujitsu | Tsuyoshi Shimomura | tcsimomura@fujitsu.com |
| Intel | Toufiqul Islam | [toufiqul.islam@intel.com](mailto:toufiqul.islam@intel.com) |
| Ericsson | Ravikiran Nory | [Ravikiran.Nory@ericsson.com](mailto:Ravikiran.Nory@ericsson.com) |
| Ericsson | Ajit Nimbalker | Ajit.Nimbalker@ericsson.com |