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# Introduction

This document summarizes the contributions [1 - 25] for AI 9.13.1 and email discussions.

The issues in this document are tagged and color coded with [H] or [M].

The previous FL summaries can be found in section 8.
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# Discussion

## Issue 1: Use cases and KPIs

### 1A: Use case descriptions

**Use cases can be considered for the study are as follows,**

**IoT cases (supported according to SID), e.g,** Actuator control, On-demand sensing application (the case age of sensed information matters), On-demand location tracking

* power-sensitive,
  + Huawei, vivo(last at least few years), Nokia
* small form devices,
  + Huawei
* latency-insensitive
  + vivo (several or tens of seconds)
* latency-sensitive
  + vivo (1 or 2 seconds), Nokia, Sony
* Mobility
  + Vivo (static or nomadic)

**Wearable cases (supported according to SID)**

* power-sensitive,
  + Huawei, vivo (last a few weeks), MediaTek (multiple days (up to 1-2 weeks)), Qualcomm
* small form devices,
  + Huawei, Sony
* Latency-sensitive
  + Vivo (several seconds), MediaTek (Hundreds of milliseconds), Qualcomm (low latency and low power), Sony(delay requirement or device reachability in time is short)
* Mobility
  + Vivo (low/medium speed)

**eMBB cases, e.g., XR, smartphone,**

* General support
  + Huawei, vivo, Nokia(can be considered), ZTE, MediaTek, Apple, Samsung, Ericsson, Qualcomm
* Higher power saving gain,
  + Huawei, vivo, MediaTek (device's battery should last multiple hours. (up to 1-2 days))
* Low latency,
  + Huawei, vivo(in the order of milliseconds), MediaTek (Several milliseconds), Ericsson(tight delay requirements (e.g., XR))
* Mobility
  + Vivo (low/medium speed)

#### [H] Proposals 1A-v1:

The following target use cases are considered in the study item:

* IoT cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc, including the following characteristics,
  + latency sensitive
  + small form devices
  + power-sensitive, e.g., the battery should last at least few years for standby.
  + targeting for limited data activity
  + static, normadic or limited mobility
* Wearable cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,
  + Latency sensitive
  + small form devices,
  + power-sensitive, the battery should last multiple days (up to 1-2 weeks) for standby.
  + targeting for limited data activity
  + low/medium speed
* eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,
  + Latency sensitive
  + provide even higher power saving gains compared to the legacy solutions with acceptable latency impact of some typical NR services
  + targeting for intensive traffic arrival with delay requirements (e.g., XR)
  + low/medium speed

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | regarding eMBB use-case, it is not clear whether target is IDLE or RRC connected, or more precisely which of sub-bullets of eMBB are IDLE and which RRC connected. This should be clarified. |
| Futurewei | We agree with the proposal with prioritization of IoT/Wearable use case and one clarification that for a power-sensitive use case, it can be latency-insensitive unless indicated that it can also be latency-sensitive. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | According to the SID, the IoT cases and wearable should have higher priority. As for the medium speed and Latency sensitive, more details should be clarified, e.g., the specific value for latency and speed. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| Vivo | Regarding Nordic’s comments, for our understanding, it should be connected state for eMBB case. We are open to clarify this in this section or any other places.  Since it is for study purpose, we think all use cases can be equally studied during the SI. It can be based on contribution driven. |
| Panasonic | We share similar view on the target use cases with the top down priority order in general. However, we are not sure about the usage of term “latency sensitive” in each use cases. As per the SID, the context of latency sensitivity is to compare with the cycle of eDRX. In addition, considering the LP-WUR/WUS design and procedure, we would like to clarify the latency range, e.g. at least not the same level as URLLC. |
| Intel | Agree with Futurewei that a power-sensitive use case may not necessarily be latency-insensitive |
| Nokia1 | In general the list of proposed device types seems good, but there probably should be some level of prioritization. E.g. the SI defines as:   |  | | --- | | * + Primarily target low-power WUS/WUR for power-sensitive, small form-factor devices including IoT use cases (such as industrial sensors, controllers) and wearables |   For the detailed use-cases description, like noted by Nordic it might be good to consider these in context of e.g. RRC state. I.e. term latency sensitive could have different meaning for e.g. IoT and eMBB use cases, as the latter is clearly more directed towards CONNECTED mode. Correspondingly this would be reflected in the expected data activity/traffic model. Also, it is not clear if we need to add the power sensitive as a bullet as it is the scope of whole work. For eMBB the bullet about power saving seems to be more target oriented, rather than use case related. |
| FL | Modified the proposal in order to address the comments so far,  To ZTE, since no one has proposed the specific value of speed, I left it open. For latency, several companies proposed and I updated.  To Futurewei, if I understand correctly, the modified has been made as follows.  To Panasonic, to address your concern, adding range of the latency.  Regarding the prioritization, it seems to have different opinions. Since it is the first meeting, keep it for consideration before any results being discussed may be friendly. If needed and agreed by most companies, we can down-prioritize any time. [H] Proposals 1A-v1(modified): The following target use cases are considered in the study item:   * IoT cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc, including the following characteristics,   + latency sensitive (e.g., in the order of seconds) or latency in-sensitive   + small form devices   + power-sensitive, e.g., the battery should last at least few years for standby.   + targeting for limited data activity   + static, nomadic or limited mobility * Wearable cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,   + Latency sensitive (e.g., in the order of seconds)   + small form devices,   + power-sensitive, the battery should last multiple days (up to 1-2 weeks) for standby.   + targeting for limited data activity   + low/medium speed * eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,   + Latency sensitive (e.g., in the order of milliseconds)   + provide even higher power saving gains compared to the legacy solutions with acceptable latency impact of some typical NR services   + targeting for intensive traffic arrival with delay requirements (e.g., XR for RRC connected mode)   + low/medium speed |
| Rakuten Symphony | Ok with the proposal. |
| Sony | The IoT and wearable use cases are of most interest. It is not clear what benefit LP-WUS would bring to XR use cases, but we can study this, if there is sufficient support.  Under the IoT bullet, “normadic” should read “nomadic”. |
| CATT | We are general fine with the proposal. However, we don’t see use case of the LP-WUS used for periodic traffic arrival, such as XR or video gaming, VoIP |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. In general, we think it is sufficient to just agree the three main bullets. For the sub-bullets, they can be handled in detailed evaluation or modelling agreements. Also as the following questions, we think the sub-bullets are a bit vague and may not be able to converge in this discussion. 2. A question for clarification: what would be the relationship of different sub-bullets for each device type. All the aspects need to be fulfilled in the study or just some of them could be satisfied. 3. Some question for clarification. For the three types of devices, latency sensitive is actually difficult to define whether a device is latency sensitive or not. Also, for some wearable device, for example, for smart watches, short message or voice message may not be very latency sensitive. We think the bullet of “latency sensitive” is not proper here. 4. For both IoT and wearable devices, we don’t understand why they are limited to small form device. How this would impact our RAN1 discussion? We don’t think we need this bullet, which seems not useful 5. For traffic type, we don’t understand why IoT and wearable only targeting limited data activity and eMBB only targeting the intensive traffic arrival. At least for smart phone, it is not reasonable to target for intensive traffic arrival. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| MediaTek | We support FL’s updated proposal. For IoT use-cases, the power target for LP-WUR should be low enough, e.g., 1mW may not be sufficient. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | In the IOT use cases please add asset tracking  We can study latency insensitive IOT use case as priority  We can mention prioritization of IOT/wearable use cases |
| Samsung | We are OK with the modified proposal. |
| Ericsson1 | Use case description should reflect below SID text (as also commented by other companies)  If moderator intention is to have this discussion later, suggest updating main bullet to e.g., – “Consider following characteristics for the target use cases mentioned in the SID~~The following target use cases are considered in the study item~~”  For some of the IoT/wearable use cases, latency requirements could be in hundreds of milliseconds range or smaller (e.g., description in section 4 of 38.875). Since required latency is a key aspect for characterizing the use cases – suggest making it FFS for now to give time for companies to converge Suggest updating the sub-bullets to “Latency sensitive (~~e.g., in the order of seconds~~ details FFS”)  Do not see need for mentioning RRC state in use case description. This can be separate discussion. Suggest updating the sub-bullet to “targeting for intensive traffic arrival with delay requirements (e.g., XR ~~for RRC connected mode~~) “  Suggest removing “for standby” as it does not have clear meaning – “power-sensitive, e.g., the battery should last at least few years ~~for standby~~”, “power-sensitive, the battery should last multiple days (up to 1-2 weeks) ~~for standby~~” |
| Apple | From the value range for latency that is added in the updated proposal, it seems that for IoT and wearable, we are looking at idle/inactive state, but for eMBB, we are looking at connected state. At least from our side, we would like to cover eMBB use cases also for idle/inactive UEs.  If there is strong interest to study connected state, maybe we could have two separate sub-bullets, one for idle/inactive state, and one for connected state. This would basically combine it with Proposal 1E. However, it may be necessary because we are not interested in connected state e.g. for IoT devices.  On speed, especially for wearable and eMBB use cases, we may not want to put specific mobility restriction at this stage, because there could certainly be high mobility scenarios. If the outcome of the study shows that we cannot support high mobility case, that is fine, but we do not see why this needs to be limited at the very beginning of the study.  The following target use cases are considered in the study item:   * IoT cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc, including the following characteristics,   + latency sensitive (e.g., in the order of seconds) or latency in-sensitive   + small form devices   + power-sensitive, e.g., the battery should last at least few years for standby.   + targeting for limited data activity   + static, nomadic or limited mobility * Wearable cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,   + Latency sensitive (e.g., in the order of seconds)   + small form devices,   + power-sensitive, the battery should last multiple days (up to 1-2 weeks) for standby.   + targeting for limited data activity   + low/medium speed * eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,   + RRC idle/inactive state     - Latency sensitive (e.g., in the order of seconds)     - Power-sensitive, the battery should last multiple days for standby.   + RRC connected state     - Latency sensitive (e.g., in the order of milliseconds)     - ~~provide even higher power saving gains compared to the legacy solutions with acceptable latency impact of some typical NR services~~     - targeting for intensive traffic arrival with delay requirements (e.g., XR for RRC connected mode) |
| CMCC | OK with the proposal, and propose to add periodic traffic arrival to IoT power-sensitive cases. LP-WUR can be used to monitor the possible periodic traffic in DRX mode to further improve the power consumption performance of LP-WUR. |
| FL2 | From Editor perspective, I think we need some high-level description of the use cases for better understanding the situation of this study. Only keeping the main-bullet of this proposal would be too broad and not specific. For the detailed values, we can handled in the evaluation or modelling.  To response the following comments,   * A question for clarification: what would be the relationship of different sub-bullets for each device type. All the aspects need to be fulfilled in the study or just some of them could be satisfied. -> answer: depending on the design, not sure we can determine this issue now. It depends on other discussions, such as architecture and design. The text now does not address this issue. * Some question for clarification. For the three types of devices, latency sensitive is actually difficult to define whether a device is latency sensitive or not. Also, for some wearable device, for example, for smart watches, short message or voice message may not be very latency sensitive. We think the bullet of “latency sensitive” is not proper here. -> answer: change the wording to ‘latency is required within…’ * For both IoT and wearable devices, we don’t understand why they are limited to small form device. How this would impact our RAN1 discussion? We don’t think we need this bullet, which seems not useful - > answer: small form devices is being widely used in the Redcap TR, which may has some impact to the assuptions, such as Rx number and etc. * For traffic type, we don’t understand why IoT and wearable only targeting limited data activity and eMBB only targeting the intensive traffic arrival. At least for smart phone, it is not reasonable to target for intensive traffic arrival. > answer: this is of course the most interested ones which reading from the contributions. Open for others if any. Adding a note at the end. * We are general fine with the proposal. However, we don’t see use case of the LP-WUS used for periodic traffic arrival, such as XR or video gaming, VoIP -> answer: this is reading from the contributions, that XR is one of the interested for the connected mode LP-WUS usage. We can make further conclusion is no gains showed. But for study perspective, I think it get some attraction. * propose to add periodic traffic arrival to IoT power-sensitive cases. LP-WUR can be used to monitor the possible periodic traffic in DRX mode to further improve the power consumption performance of LP-WUR. -> answer: all the use case does not include any characteristics whether it is aperiodic or periodic for simplicity. * For RRC idle and connected, since it need further discussion, I just leave it apart from this proposal.  [H] Proposals 1A-v1(modified2): The following characteristics for target use cases are considered in the study item:   * IoT cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc, including the following characteristics,   + latency is required within e.g., the order of seconds, or latency in-sensitive   + small form devices   + power-sensitive, e.g., the battery should last at least few years for standby.   + targeting for limited data activity   + static, nomadic or limited mobility * Wearable cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,   + latency is required within, e.g., [the order of seconds or hundreds of milliseconds]   + small form devices,   + power-sensitive, the battery should last multiple days (up to 1-2 weeks) for standby.   + targeting for limited data activity   + low/medium speed * eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,   + latency is required within e.g., the order of milliseconds   + provide even higher power saving gains compared to the legacy solutions with acceptable latency impact of some typical NR services   + targeting for intensive traffic arrival with delay requirements (e.g., XR ~~for RRC connected mode~~)   + low/medium speed   Note: other use cases are not precluded if any. |
| QC | We agree with target use cases with the understanding that IoT use cases with low power and low latency under idle/inactive RRC as higher priority uses cases  In addition, we are open to consider XR/eMBB use cases.  We think of the following:   * For IoT / wearable 🡪 Idle mode is more prioritized. * For XR 🡪 connected mode is prioritized.   Note that design/performance requirement for Idle mode and connected mode could be different. |
| FL | Removal of ‘standby’ as commented by Ericsson in Proposals 1A-v1(modified2). |
| EURECOM | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK |
| Everactive | For IoT use cases, we prefer an absolute power target rather than a battery lifetime. Battery lifetimes depend on too many factors outside of our control.   * power-sensitive, e.g. <10µW average power   IoT should target a huge range of applications, so it’s important that the WUS solution be flexible and programmable so specs such as latency and power can be traded off in the deployed solution. And the spec should allow for this flexibility.   * Flexibility to trade off specs (e.g. latency, average power, and mobility) |

The latest version of the proposal are as follows,

#### [H] Proposals 1A-v2:

The following characteristics for target use cases are considered in the study item:

* IoT cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc, including the following characteristics,
  + latency is required within e.g., the order of seconds, or latency in-sensitive
  + small form devices
  + power-sensitive, e.g., the battery should last at least few years ~~for standby~~.
  + targeting for limited data activity
  + static, nomadic or limited mobility
* Wearable cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,
  + latency is required within, e.g., [the order of seconds or hundreds of milliseconds]
  + small form devices,
  + power-sensitive, the battery should last multiple days (up to 1-2 weeks) ~~for standby~~.
  + targeting for limited data activity
  + low/medium speed
* eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,
  + latency is required within e.g., the order of milliseconds
  + provide even higher power saving gains compared to the legacy solutions with acceptable latency impact of some typical NR services
  + targeting for intensive traffic arrival with delay requirements (e.g., XR ~~for RRC connected mode~~)
  + low/medium speed

Note: other use cases are not precluded if any.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We suggest using the same latency order for both IoT and Wearables use cases, i.e.,  “latency is required within, e.g., [the order of seconds or hundreds of milliseconds]” |
| Sharp | Similar view as Futurewei. IoT cases here can include devices other than LPWA, their latency requirement may be the same level as wearable devices. |
| QC | **Latency in-sensitive**  Regarding the added “latency in-sensitive” part, we think power saving for latency in-sensitive use cases can be already supported with eDRX only (i.e., without the need for LP-WUR).  **Latency sensitive**  Our understanding is that use cases with low power and low latency under idle/inactive RRC will benefit the most from the LP-WUR. Thus, we think that use cases with low power and low latency could have higher priority.  **XR/eMBB**  In addition, we are open to consider XR/eMBB use cases under connected mode.  **Use case/RRC state association**  We think of the following association is necessary to reduce too many combinations of use cases and RRC states.   * For IoT / wearable 🡪 Idle mode is prioritized. * For XR/eMBB 🡪 Connected mode is prioritized.   Note that design/performance requirement for Idle mode and connected mode could be different. |
| CATT | The proposal of LP-WUS for eMBB, such as XR, is to replace DCI format 2\_6 by the LP-WUS during GTW session, We need to clarify the use case and the latency requirements of eMBB in CONNECTED mode. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Similar view as Futurewei, actually, the latency requirement for industrial sensor is less than 100ms according to the Rel-17 RedCap WI, and it is fine with  ‘latency is required within, e.g., [the order of seconds or hundreds of milliseconds]’  Additionally, for the eMBB use case, latency requirement and corresponding use cases should be further clarified. For example, for XR, the latency may be tens milliseconds instead of the order of milliseconds. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. we don’t know what is the impact of “small form device” on the evaluation study. For moderator’s feedback it may impact the number of Rx. If it is for main receiver, we have already the agreement on the power consumption model based on RedCap and eMBB. TR 38.875 and 38.840 have already defined the number of Rx chains. If it is for LP-WUR, we have already the agreement yesterday. 2. Don’t understand why eMBB case only targets for intensive traffic type. We shall have the traffic model discussion in other proposals. So, we should not list the traffic type here. 3. We have not agreed that we shall have the absolute values for target. We have already agreed to reuse the power model in TR 38.875 and TR 38.840 for evaluation, which does not have any assumption of absolute power values. Therefore, we don’t have a way to evaluate whether this few years/several days battery life can be achieved or not, and we further note the SID does not ask to set a battery life target, which is anyway very difficult without discussing what type and capacity of batteries are in each type of device. We don’t think it is needed to list this hard target for day of use.   Some revisions are made as following:  The following characteristics for target use cases are considered in the study item:   * IoT cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc, including the following characteristics,   + latency is required within e.g., the order of seconds, or latency in-sensitive   + ~~small form devices~~   + ~~power-sensitive, e.g., the battery should last at least few years for standby.~~   + targeting for limited data activity   + static, nomadic or limited mobility * Wearable cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,   + latency is required within, e.g., [the order of seconds or hundreds of milliseconds]   + ~~small form devices,~~   + ~~power-sensitive, the battery should last multiple days (up to 1-2 weeks) for standby~~.   + targeting for limited data activity   + low/medium speed * eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,   + latency is required within e.g., the order of milliseconds   + provide even higher power saving gains compared to the legacy solutions with acceptable latency impact of some typical NR services   + ~~targeting for intensive traffic arrival with delay requirements (e.g., XR for RRC connected mode)~~   + low/medium speed   Note: other use cases are not precluded if any. |
| vivo | Support the modified proposal. We are open to discuss the latency requirements for IoT and decide it later. |
| Nokia3 | As an afterthought, as we don’t determine the battery size, while do refer to small form factor, the time definition seems bit arbitrary, thus should we just restrict to:   * + power-sensitive~~, e.g., the battery should last at least few years for standby~~.   + power-sensitive~~, the battery should last multiple days (up to 1-2 weeks) for standby~~.   Also, we tend to agree with the other comments raised by Huawei, thus would be fine with the updated version from Huawei |
| Panasonic | Thanks FL for clarifying the latency for each use case. We are basically okay with the current version. Regarding the value range of the latency, although it looks a bit aggressive to us for eMBB to require order of milliseconds in this SI, we are open to study that. So perhaps it is clearer to say, “e.g. potentially starting from the order of milliseconds” |
| Samsung | We would like to clarify even if the different characteristics of use cases are determined, we will strive for targeting the common design of WUR. |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal |
| SONY | Our understanding is that the use of a LP-WUR is most beneficial for use-cases with low-traffic and tight latency requirements, as described in the SID justification: “*the intention is to study ultra-low power mechanism that can support low latency in Rel-18, e.g. lower than eDRX latency*”. We therefore do not support adding **“latency in-sensitive”** as low-power consumption can be fulfilled by allowing the device to sleep longer with eDRX configuration (i.e. via techniques that are not motivated by the justification section of the SID).  We do not necessarily need to add latency ranges for any of the use-cases here but discuss them when deciding on *“power evaluation and related assumptions”*. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Ericsson2 | As commented earlier, required latency is a key aspect for characterizing the use cases – suggest making it FFS for now and strive to agree on a more concrete range of values after more discussion. |
| Apple | Agree to remove battery related statement.  We are fine to consider connected mode for eMBB/XR use cases, but we do not see any reason to exclude idle/inactive mode for eMBB/XR use cases. The curret description is obviously for connected mode only, even though it is not mentioned explicitly. Given that we have already agreed to consider both idle/inactive and connected mode, we don’t see any reason to avoid mentioning it. We also think the bullet “on higher power saving gain” doesn’t seem necessary as it doesn’t belong to use case description. It is about performance metrics and does not seem to belong here.   * eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,   + latency is required within, e.g., [the order of seconds or hundreds of milliseconds] for RRC idle/inactive mod   + latency is required within e.g., the order of milliseconds for RRC connected mode   + ~~provide even higher power saving gains compared to the legacy solutions with acceptable latency impact of some typical NR services~~   + ~~targeting for intensive traffic arrival with delay requirements (e.g., XR for RRC connected mode)~~   + low/medium speed |
|  |  |

### 1B: target power for LP-WUR

* vivo (30-500uW),
* CATT(<100uW),
* Intel(active: 100uW-1000uW, inactive: 1-10uW),
* MediaTek (100 to 500 W),
* Apple (sub-mW level)
* Rakuten Symphony (500uW)
* Samsung (hundreds of uW or below)
* Qualcomm (1mW)

#### [H] Proposals 1B-v1:

The targeting maximum power consumption of low power-wake up receiver for active state is [100 ~ 500] .

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | < 1mW should be the target. And need FFS on “how to map to relative power units” |
| Futurewei | We would like to know the purpose of this proposal in light of the discussed power model for LP-WUR in Proposal 2C-v1. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Less or equal to 1mW |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Considering the different requirement for coverage, power saving gain, data rate from different types of devices, 100uW~1 mW can be considered in the early stage for study. |
| vivo | We are OK with the target power consumption of LP-WUR ON. As we analyzed in our contribution [R1-2208668], the average power consumption of a legacy UE in idle/inactive mode is on several to tens of mW. To achieve substantial power saving gain, a reasonable target power consumption of LP-WUR need to be at the level of 1/100~1/1000 of the main receiver, corresponding to tens to hundreds of μW. Besides, according to our simulation verification, if the LP-WUR power consumption is 30μW~500μW, UE battery life can be increased by 3~7 times compared with legacy UEs. Thus, no more than 500μW LP-WUR power consumption is a reasonable target. |
| Panasonic | We are open to starting point of around or below 1mW. |
| Intel | It is a bit earlier to conclude upper bound of 500uW. However, we expect it can be commonly agreed that the target must be <1mW.  Agree with Nordic to add an FFS for relative power unit determination |
| Nokia1 | It may be bit premature to agree to fixed target value, until we have more concrete understanding of the LP-WUR architecture. Also the option of having duty cycle can be used to limit the impact of higher active state power consumption. |
| Rakuten S. | Ok with the proposal. |
| Sony | Power consumption in this range is reasonable. The final value will depend on considerations from the LP-WUR architecture study.  We could potentially agree on a value now for the purposes of initial evaluation results. A more concrete value (after LP-WUR study) could be decided at a future meeting. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal in order to help the progress of identifying LP-WUS solution. |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t know the purpose of the proposal. Do we want to set a hard target with absolute values here?  In our understanding, a discussion in power model would be enough. We don’t see the necessity of the proposal. |
| MediaTek | We support this proposal. 1mW can be a fine target for wearables or eMBB use-cases. For IoT use-cases, however, it may not provide reasonable power saving gains for the study. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | We can mention broadly less than 1mW |
| Samsung | We would like to know the intention that the targeting maximum power consumption of LP-WUR is indicated by the certain range instead of the specific target maximum value, e.g., 500uW.  Also, We wonder where the target maximum power consumption values come from. It seems that the power consumption values of the LP-WUR suggested by each company are derived in different way. Therefore, we think how to derive the target power consumption of the LP-WUR should be discussed first. |
| Ericsson1 | Our understanding is absolute units will not be defined for main radio and only relative units will be used. Then we do not see how agreeing to a particular range of absolute values for LP-WUR will help with evaluations without knowing relative power consumption with respect to main radio,  The assumptions behind the proposed specific target power consumption range are also unclear. For the example, it is unclear if aspects like frequency tunability for operation in more than one band, ability to handle interference, etc. are considered. So, it is premature to agree to this as also indicated by Nokia. |
| Apple | We support the target of <= 1mW, or 100uW~1mW. |
| CMCC | We prefer to set the target active power as [100 ~ 500] as proposed by FL. However, we are OK with the target power for LP-WUR active mode being <1mW to facilitate the progress.  However, we propose to emphasize that when evaluating the power consumption of low-power WUR, both the power consumption of the “core parts” and the “assisted parts” shall be taken into consideration, including VCO/Oscillator, IF Amp, Envelop Detector, BB Amplifier, Digital Circuit, Bias, PMIC, Bandgap voltage reference, GPIO, etc.  In most existing referenced papers, only the power consumption of “core parts” have been taken into consideration, including VCO/Oscillator, IF Amp, Envelop Detector, BB Amplifier, Digital Circuit, Bias. Suggest the power consumption of “assisted parts” also to be taken into consideration, including PMIC, Bandgap voltage reference, GPIO, etc. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| QC | We suggest to keep the power target as **wide range** to keep solution space wide.  In addition, we don’t agree to limit to 500uW since this effectively preclude certain receiver architectures and schemes.  Moreover, **performance requirements** (e.g., coverage/sensitivity, selectivity) should be studied before power consumption requirement – these are specified in RAN4 spec. On the other hand, power consumption requirement is not to be specified in RAN4 spec – implementation issue. |
| FL3 | [H] Proposals 1B-v1(modified): The low power-wake up receiver with its active power consumption more than 1000 is not considered in this SI.   * FFS detailed value of target maximum active power consumption. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| EURECOM | In our opinion the target power consumption should not be constraint too much, <=1mW is fine with us. |
| Everactive | We prefer to separate active power from average power, like in Intel’s suggestion.  <1mW active power for the WUR is achievable for OOK, FSK with better than <100dBm sensitivity and better than 30dB adjacent channel rejection (ACR)  <200µW active power for the WUR would limit to OOK with additional limitations on sensitivity and selectivity.  <10µW average power is required for some IoT use cases |

To follow up the discussion during the GTW, companies are encouraged to provide your views regarding whether the design target of maximum power for LP-WUR is absolute value or relative value.

#### [H] Proposals 1B-v2:

Alt 1

Design target for a low power-wake up receiver is active power consumption not more than [1000 uW].

* FFS detailed value of target maximum active power consumption.

Alt 2:

Design target for a low power-wake up receiver is to have active power consumption that is X times that of deep sleep

* FFS: Detailed value of target maximum active power consumption.
* FFS: Whether to have design target for absolute active power consumption
* FFS: Value of X

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We agree with Alt 1 where the target maximum active power consumption can be further discussed. |
| QC | We think coverage requirement should be discussed and determined first, then the target power consumption of the LP-WUR should be discussed.  Coverage is more important since it has specification impact in terms of the sensitivity requirement, which won’t change once it is specified. While, power consumption is an implementation issue, which is not specified in spec.  Therefore, we think it is important to discuss/decide coverage requirement first and give more room/flexibility in power consumption (which is implementation issue).  We think proposal 1B (target power) and proposal 1C (target coverage) should be discussed together considering the tradeoff between the two. We think 1C should not be closed for this reason.  In Alt2, we think the value X should be the outcome of the study after evaluating various candidate values of X. Through evaluations, we can identity acceptable values of X for given total power consumption (including power of main radio and that of LP-WUR). |
| CATT | We could combine Alt 1 and Alt 2 to define the target absolute value [y] µW and relative value [x] |
| Spreadtrum | We share the similar view as QC to treat proposal 1B and 1C together.  For Alt1 and Alt2, we don’t think the absolute value is so meaningful. In some companies’ paper (R1-2210011), the power consumption can be a value by averaging energy over a long time, e.g. over the LP-WUS duty cycle which could be about 1 or several second. So, we are confused whether the target 1mW is the average value for a long time or short time. For example, if the LP-WUS can be detected with 1W\*1ms energy in a millisecond in which the high precision RF/ADC/BB (e.g. main radio) is turned on shortly in a millisecond, the power consumption is still 1mW in average for 1 second LP-WUS duty cycle. Usually we assume the power consumption is the value by averaging energy over a slot or millisecond, when we talk about NR eMBB in which every signal/channel is within a slot or millisecond, but we still have no common understanding that a single LP-WUS is within a slot or millisecond.  For the relative value (Alt2), at least it is a slot or millisecond based energy consumption in common understanding. Thus, we support Alt2. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer Alt 1. Active power consumption is related to receiver architecture. We think it is reasonable to have absolute value as the design target. Even for the relative value, it does not come from any casual assumption, it comes from absolute value for power consumption. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | From our understanding, the active power target is used to converge on the architecture design. And the relative power is used to evaluate the power consumption. Therefore, at least the target active power should be assumed for converging on the architectures. As for the target relative power, actually it is reflected in the proposal 2C and also can be determined by the target active power based on the mapping relationship between the active power and relative power. Therefore, Alt 1 should have higher priority to be discussed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This agenda item is not required to set design targets. Here, we are supposed to be constructing an evaluation methodology, which would have a power consumption as its output, not as its input. This proposal does not fit this agenda item.  The above understood, we answer more generally:  We can agree Alt.2, and cannot agree Alt.1. We have agreed power models in TR 38.840 and 38.875 are reused for evaluation in this study. So, it is useless to agree this absolute number/target of Alt.1 because we have no way to evaluate whether this target can be achieved. We even don’t have a common assumption regarding the absolute value for deep sleep of main receiver, because Rel-16/Rel-17 power saving study cannot provide a converged absolute value for that.  In evaluation, we just need to agree the proper ratio among different power states and based on that evaluate the power saving gains for each studied technique. The absolute value would depend on implementation much and this is actually not a part of evaluation and we don’t think we are able to align the absolute values among vendors due to different implementations.  Rel-16, Rel-17 UE power saving and Rel-18 network energy saving are using the relative power model for evaluation and there is no absolute power consumption value. We should follow the similar way for evaluation.  For the Alt.2, we are fine to keep X<1. |
| vivo | Prefer Alt 1, it is the design target, that is related to the receiver architecture choice. If it is written as relative power, we think it should be less than 0.3 (considering 1 unit translated to 3-5mW). |
| Nordic | Neither of above, as SID states that what matters is significant improvement in power consumption. As we commented online, in fact having active power consumption while receiving paging comparable to main radio deep sleep would be already be significant improvement.  We agree with QC, that we need to have design that matches NR deployments. And not set power consumption limit and then figure out that it is not usable further than 100m from gNB. |
| Nokia3 | As noted earlier, other design aspects such as duty cycle etc. can impact to the overall power consumption and attainable battery life. Thus, as the absolute active time power consumption is a more of an architecture selection and may affect the feasibility of the overall design, we would feel that the architecture discussion should be allowed to converge a bit. Therefore, we think that if we want to progress with this discussion, alt 2 would be preferable. Though noting that we don’t have agreed reference (deep sleep power consumption) to that either, hence not sure where it leads us. |
| InterDigital | We prefer Alt. 1, however, we agree with Qualcomm that the coverage requirement should be discussed first. |
| Spreadtrum | One thing we want to emphasize that difference of x00uW and 1000uW is just several times for the LP-WUR. The difference of total power consumption at the LP-WUR is not so huge if duty cycle is assumed. However, if the power consumption is set too low, the MDR/FAR of the LP-WUR may be high, and the main receive may wake up unintendedly, which provide more power consumption, e.g. 2000~20000 power unit each time. |
| Panasonic | We think Alt 1 should be supported. Meanwhile, we are also good with having some conclusion on Alt 2, which will provide some guidance on power modelling definition for this SI. |
| Samsung | We prefer Alt 2 between the two options. Because we can determine the relative power model for the LP-WUR on-state easily based on the value X. Also, we think that the detailed absolute power consumption value can be discussed after all companies have a common understanding of the candidates of the LP-WUR architecture. It seems that the power consumption value from each company can be different even though a similar LP-WUR architecture is considered.  In addition, clarification for ‘deep sleep’ is necessary. e.g., “deep sleep state defined for main radio in TR38.840”. |
| Intel | Comparing Alt 1 and Alt 2, we believe Alt 1 is the more basic one. A relative power value can be determined based the absolute power consumption of LP-WUR and power consumption of MR. Eventually, the relative power value is used in power consumption evaluation. |
| SONY | We support both alternatives. But we do agree with QC that the proposal 1B and 1C needs to be treated together as there is a strong connection between the receiver architecture, its power consumption, noise-figure/sensitivity and data rate, thereby the resulting/supported coverage.  When it comes to relative power, this value is only needed when performing total power consumption calculation when analyzing power saving gains. It can easily be calculated relative to the main receiver power consumption and with respective to the target use-case when deciding on *“power evaluation and related assumptions”.* |
| OPPO | We prefer Alt1.  The absolute value of maximum power for LP-WUR should be determined. Then the relative value in power consumption model for evaluation can be determined based on the absolute value of power consumption for LP-WUR. |
| Ericsson2 | For purpose of evaluations Alt2 formulation is more useful.  Absolute values can vary based on implementation and not sure why RAN1 should try to converge on this at this point.  We also agree that discussion on coverage should progress together with this. |
| Apple | Since this proposal is about the design target, using relative power as in Alt 2 does not seem to be very meaningful, because we don’t even know what the power consumption of deep sleep state is. So the target would become useless.  In this sense, the design target, if any, should be defined in absolute value.  We do agree that for the power modeling in evaluation, a relative value needs to be defined, but that is different from the design target (even though it may be derived from the design target). |
|  |  |

### 1C: target coverage for LP-WUR

* FutureWei (limited coverage scenario)
* Vivo (NR bottleneck channel, e.g., PUSCH)
* CATT (Receiver sensitivity of Low-power wakeup receiver – [-80] dBm or maximum coupling loss at [126 dB])
* ZTE (equal or better than that of the limited channel evaluated in NR Rel-15/16/17)
* Rakuten Symphony (sensitivity of -80 dBm or better)
* Lenovo (Consider similar coverage level for the LP-WUR implemented in a supplementary chip and the main NR receiver)
* Samsung (Coverage of LP-WUS/WUR should be similar to that of main radio, PUSCH or PDSCH)
* Rakuten Mobile (Coverage by LP-WUS should be kept to the same level as existing cell coverage by NR)
* Ericsson (candidate LP-WUS/WUR designs should be compared to that of NR-PDCCH link budget for various deployment scenarios (e.g., those identified in TR 37.910))
* Sony (LP-WUS coverage target is based on the coverage analysed in the Rel-17 coverage enhancements SI, RAN1 considers fallback mechanisms for UEs that are out of coverage of the LP-WUS.)
* InterDigital(As shown in Fig. 1 [3], a trend line with a slope of -1 decade / 20dBm of power consumption vs. receiver sensitivity is observed. The trend line implies that there is 20 dB degradation in sensitivity for every 10x power consumption reduction.)



* OPPO(Same/close to NR DL control channels)
* Apple(Coverage of LP WUS can be evaluated and compared in two ways: 1 ) Compare the link budget of LP WUS vs PDCCH. 2 )Compare the link budget of LP WUS vs the weakest channel in the system. The same coverage for WUS and PDCCH would be ideal, and it can simplify the design a lot. However, depending on the power consumption and performance target, it may or may not be feasible to achieve such target. In this case, the 2nd approach can be taken.)
* Nordic (In our opinion LP-WUS should target the same coverage as R17 NR. However, what the R17 coverage is should be further discussed)

#### [M] Proposals 1C-v1:

The targeting coverage of LP-WUS is comparable to that of the NR bottleneck channel.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | OK |
| Futurewei | There is a clear trade-off between ability to achieve full coverage, resource utilization, and achievable power saving gain, therefore we think that the target can be the outcome of the feasibility study considering the different use cases and potentially multiple LP-WUR architecture categories. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine, although it seems DL channel always needs a margin of target coverage compared to UL channel. Also, from cell (re-)selection and RLM perspective, DL signal/channel quality should be guaranteed at first. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| vivo | Support this proposal |
| Panasonic | We agree with Futurewei that tradeoff needs to be considered for at least system resource overhead, power value of LP-WUR and sensibility. It is also good to make it clear that the intention of the proposal is to match the LP-WUS coverage to the NR bottleneck channel of **downlink or uplink.** Our current position is it seems sufficient to match to NR bottleneck channel of downlink for LP-WUS. |
| Intel | In the typical case of LP-WUS, i.e., idle/inactive mode, UE doesn’t transmit PUSCH at all, so using PUSCH of main radio as a reference needs some discussions. In idle/inactive mode, the UE will still monitor SSB, SIB1, OSI, Type0/0A/1/2 CSS, paging PDSCH, and maybe RACH msg1/2/3/4 and common PUCCH if being paged. Therefore, it seems a reference can be selected from the above listed channel.  If two or multiple parts of LP-WUS is defined, the target coverage should consider the performance of the two or multiple parts jointly. |
| Nokia1 | We think that due to the differences in the expected use case, it would be more appropriate to carry out the coverage comparison to DL channels, PDCCH if we aim to e.g. enhance paging. The need for UL data rate could be different/limited in certain use cases, and thereby the PUSCH coverage would be different, thus it would not give single target for coverage evaluation. |
| Rakuten S. | We also think that coverage of LP-WUS should be compared to DL channels. |
| CATT | We don’t agree with the proposal. The target coverage had been defined for NR, RedCap or NB-IoT had a specific maximum coupling lose and minimal achievable data rate. We should have same definition. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Futurewei and Panasonic. There is a trade-off between sensitivity/coverage, resource utilization and power consumption. Deciding comparable coverage with the bottleneck channel of the main radio should be done after considering all these aspects. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | There needs to be a conclusion on what the NR bottleneck channel is, or some indication that this remains to decide. Additionally, the LP-WUS needs to be evaluated when deployed in the same scenario as the NR system.   * The target coverage of LP-WUS is comparable to an NR bottleneck channel (FFS: which channel this is) in a same deployment scenario. |
| Sharp | The coverage of LP-WUS should not be worse than any DL common channel. Considering that the NR bottleneck channel is PUSCH with a specific data rate in CovEnh SI. If LP-WUS is targeting PUSCH coverage, it may lack reliability for lower data cases. |
| MTK | Not okay. At the cell edge, the main radio must be woken up for performing at least neighboring cell RRM. When the main radio is active, there is no gain from utilizing LP-WUR. The comparable coverage target to NR is NOT reasonable/necessary. Comparison with NR channels, e.g., PDCCH and PUSCH, can be conducted for a better understanding in a trade-off between coverage and power consumption. With this regard, we propose the following revision.  [MTK] Proposals 1C-v1:  The targeting coverage of LP-WUS is ~~comparable~~ **compared** to at least NR PDCCH and PUSCH. FFS: configurations on PDCCH and PUSCH |
| OPPO | We prefer that the coverage of LP-WUS is comparable to DL control channels. |
| Lenovo | Target comparable to WUS based on NR PDCCH |
| Samsung | We agree with this proposal, in general. When we decide the NR bottleneck channel, it can be different depending on which RRC state is assumed. For example, in case of RRC\_IDLE only, PDSCH is the bottleneck channel because there is no UL transmission from UE side. If both RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE are considered, PUSCH should be the bottleneck channel. |
| Ericsson1 | LP-WUS reception impacts paging performance for Idle mode UEs and DL scheduling assignment/UL grant reception for Connected mode UEs. These procedures are based on PDCCH monitoring. Considering this, the achievable coverage for different LP-WUS/WUR designs should be compared to PDCCH coverage for same scenario.  The current SI is for studying LP-WUS for power savings and should not result in devices with reduced coverage than what is already achievable for NR. |
| Apple | We feel this target may be a blank check at this time, as we would only know the achievable coverage after the study. If we really want to have such an agreement, it may be better to use the wording “strive to”, instead of setting it as a somewhat hard target. We suggest:  Strive to achieve the coverage comparable to that of the NR bottleneck channel.   * Note that whether this is achievable and/or the tradeoff between coverage and other factors will be the outcome of the study.   On whether the NR bottleneck channel should be e.g. PDCCH or bottleneck UL channel, we think the bottleneck UL channel can be used, assuming this is how the network deployment is planned. |
| CMCC | OK with to have the coverage of LP-WUS to be comparable to DL channels. As for the specific DL channels to be compared, it is ok to be FFS for the time being.  However, other metrics should also be taken into consideration for the determination of coverage target, including the achievable power saving gain and cost. |
| QC | We think since WUS is a DL channel, its coverage has to match the PDCCH coverage. In addition, 1B-v1 and 1C-v1 need to be jointly considered due to tradeoff between power and sensitivity. |
| FL3 | It seems not stable yet. |
| EURECOM | Target coverage should be comparable to PDCCH. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If LP-WUS has the function to replace the paging or wake up the UE similar as PEI, we think the coverage should target at the NR PDCCH. |
| Everactive | We need to define what the NR bottleneck is.  Agree the coverage of the LP-WUS should be the same as the main radio (MR) |

#### [close][M] Proposals 1C-v2:

FL recommends the following forward to proceed:

* Considering the comments received from the last round, FL recommend pending the discussion until know the achievable coverage after the study.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We agree with FL recommendation. |
| QC | Regarding FL comments “pending the discussion until know the achievable coverage”, we have comments. Target coverage is a design choice, e.g., by choosing lower data rate, NW can always extend the coverage. There is fundamental tradeoff between coverage(sensitivity) and data rate. Thus, this is design choice. Therefore, we think we should continue the discussion of target coverage discussion in 1C.  We make following proposal.  **Proposal 1C**   * The targeting coverage of LP-WUS is comparable to that of the NR bottleneck channel X.   + FFS:X   As pointed out in 1B, we think it is important to discuss/decide coverage requirement first (since it is specified in spec) and then give more room/flexibility in power consumption (which is implementation issue). |
| Spreadtrum | We are confused how we can discuss the power consumption without coverage target. The sensitivity target is also unknown. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Maybe more general wording can be used as follows:  **Proposal 1C**   * The targeting coverage of LP-WUS is comparable to that of the NR ~~bottleneck~~ channel X.   + FFS:X |
| Nordic | Support QC proposal |
| Nokia3 | It can be hard to progress e.g. in terms of LP-WUR architecture and other related procedures, if we don’t have some target for this. Fundamentally it is a choice whether we will aim for similar coverage as other DL channels to ensure that power saving benefit can be attained at full coverage can be met, or whether we are fine to restrict the coverage of LP-WUS and fallback to legacy procedures. Thus would be bit hesitant to postpone the discussion till end of study, but maybe some time to consider could be given. |
| Samsung | We don’t agree with the proposal. We have the same view as QC. To discuss and design the LP-WUS/WUR, the target coverage should be determined. We think the target coverage of LP-WUS is comparable to that of the NR bottleneck channel. Because we have to consider the data transmission and reception using the main radio after waking up by the LP-WUS. |
| SONY | As stated earlier, this proposal and proposal 1B need to be treated together and it should not be closed. We support the suggestion by ZTE, i.e.,  **Proposal 1C**   * The targeting coverage of LP-WUS is comparable to that of the NR ~~bottleneck~~ channel X.   FFS:X |
| Ericsson2 | This discussion should not be postponed. It is one of key issues to converge on for other aspects of study to progress. |

### 1D: target BW for LP-WUS

* Vivo (1.4MHz ~ 4MHz)
* Lenovo (Consider candidate LP-WUS bandwidth similar to RedCap bandwidth, SSB bandwidth)
* Sharp (The system configurations used to evaluate R16 power saving can be reused and should be extended with the configuration with 20MHz system bandwidth extended.)

#### [M] Proposals 1D-v1:

The design target of the maximum LP-WUS bandwidth should be no more than X MHz, where X<=20.

* FFS value of X and whether more than one value can be considered.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | OK, but this is more an 9.13.3 topic, in our opinion |
| Futurewei | This can be discussed after the LP-WUR architecture study. |
| Spreadtrum1 | OK. Too narrow bandwidth may lead to low power if PSD is constant, i.e. no power boosting. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Better to wait for further study, especially considering the difference between FR1 and FR2 or SCS design for LP-WUS.  Additionally, why this proposal with Med priority is highlighted with yellow? |
| Vivo | We are open to be discussed in 9.13.3 |
| Panasonic | Agree with Nordic. |
| Intel | Not sure the proposal (up to 20MHz) is for evaluation or target design. Due to the impact of channel delay spread, an OOK symbol duration cannot be too short, otherwise, there will be inter-OOK symbol interference that the power of OOK-ON symbol leaks to an OOK-OFF symbol. That is, the capability to carry wake-up information in time domain will be limited. Therefore, we expect that the BW of LP-WUS should not be large, otherwise it consumes much resource overhead. Our preference is to use 4MHz for evaluation purpose. |
| Nokia1 | As the LP-WUR architecture determines the needed guardband this should be also accounted in the design target, i.e. the total bandwidth required by LP-WUS/WUR should not be more than X including any guard band or frequency reservation required by the LP-WUS. |
| Rakuten S. | We think X should be in the order of 4-5 MHz. But we are ok to discuss it later. |
| Sony | Agree with other companies that this can be studied in other agenda items. The LP-WUS bandwidth will have influence on the WUR architecture and its power consumption and on system overhead. It’s not clear that target bandwidth on its own is a KPI. Maximum LP-WUS bandwidth can be discussed after LP-WUR architecture study and initial study on LP-WUS design. |
| CATT | We are OK to have BW less than 20 MHz with potential multi-tone operation. |
| InterDigital | The proposal should focus on LP-WUS for evaluation not the design target. We are fine with bandwidth less than 20 MHz. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This would be closely related with the design. We think this should be kept open for the time being. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| MediaTek | Okay for not precluding RedCap-type UE. |
| OPPO | We are ok to discuss it later. |
| Lenovo | This is too early to consider this proposal considering different SCS but for simulation assumption we can take Redcap, SSB BW as baseline |
| Samsung | The maximum BW supported by LP-WUR is highly related to it's receiver architecture. So, the discussion on this issue should be done after candidate WUR architectures are determined. |
| Ericsson1 | Identifying target power consumption values (relative to main radio) seems to be sufficient. How to achieve power savings is part of the study. Not clear why having ‘only narrow BW’ should be a ‘design target’. We are however OK to assume BW<=20MHz as starting point for evaluation. |
| Apple | We are fine to use 20 MHz as the upper bound considering RedCap UEs. There may not be a need to fix one or multiple values at this point. This can be part of WUS design discussion. Maybe simply say:  The LP-WUS bandwidth should not be more than 20 MHz. |
| CMCC | Considering Rel-17 RedCap and Rel-18 eRedCap also has been included in IoT use cases, for LP-WUR/S, we share the opinion that X should be less than 20MHz and maybe even smaller with the order of less than 5MHz. We also prefer to discuss it later after LP-WUR architecture study and LP-WUS design. |
| QC | We agree with FL proposal. |
| FL2 | The LP-WUS bandwidth should not be more than 20 MHz. |
| Everactive | Agree is should be <20MHz  Propose we also define a minimum bandwidth (which will define the frequency accuracy spec for the LP-WUR)  Proposal:  LP-WUS bandwidth should be Y<=BW<=X where e.g. X=20MHz and Y=1MHz |

#### [M] Proposals 1D-v2:

* The design target of the maximum LP-WUS bandwidth should be no larger than 20MHz.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We agree with proposal but we suggest adding a note that the LP-WUS BW of the actual design may be much smaller than 20MHz. |
| Sharp | We support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal for FR1. The BW values for FR2 can be FFS. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Supportive |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with this proposal for FR1, FFS FR2. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This should not be a design target, under evaluation methodologies. Rather, it should be an evaluation assumption which might get changed depending what 9.13.3 (and/or 9.13.2 potentially) come up with.  Thus, we are fine to assume this as an upper bound for LP-WUR, and we do not make any statement as to *actual* designs. This assumption may be only applicable for FR1? |
| Vivo | OK |
| Nordic | This is quite a high upper bound, but we need to start somewhere 😊 |
| Nokia3 | This is probably a good starting point, while accounting that Rel-18 eRedCap could benefit from lower BW. Also, it might be good to note that this would be for FR1 (at least). Also it would be good to add a note that this also accounts the needed guard band, if any.  Note: The considered LP-WUS bandwidth accounts the needed guard band if any. |
| Samsung | We have the same opinion as Futurewei. The LP-WUS BW should be much smaller than 20MHz to reduce the power consumption of the LP-WUR. |
| Intel | We are OK for the proposal. We share the view from Futurewei that the actual BW of LP-WUS can be much less than 20MHz. it is better to capture such a note, otherwise, the current proposal seems implying LP-WUS can be of 20MHz.  Another question, how many bandwidths will be supported for LP-WUS? It can be included in this proposal. |
| SONY | We support the proposal but we suggest adding a bullet or a note that the LP-WUS actual BW may be much smaller than 20MHz. The actual smaller value is FFS. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Ericsson2 | We prefer similar formulation to the agreement made earlier on antenna configuration. i.e.,    Suggest reformulating as below  For evaluation, LP-WUS bandwidth <= 20MHz is baseline.  Design targets can be limited to aspects like coverage, capacity, power savings etc. |
| Apple | Agree with it for FR1, fine with FFS for FR2. Also agree that this is just an upper bound, and the actual design can use a smaller number. |
|  |  |

### [close]1E: applicable RRC states

* Alt 1 (prioritize RRC idle/inactive mode): Huawei, Lenovo,Apple
* Alt 2 (study for both RRC idle and connected mode): **MTK, vivo, Nokia, CATT (only mentioned), Intel, ZTE (if consider XR use case), xiaomi**
* Alt 3 (need to study feasibility in RRC connected mode): Ericsson

#### [H] Proposals 1E-v1:

Both RRC IDLE/INACTIVE and CONNECTED mode are considered for study in the LP-WUS/WUR SI.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | We are OK with studying also Connected mode, but IDLE/Inactive should have more priority. For example, when it comes to optimization of LP-WUS. Or would connected mode have separate LP-WUS design? |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal but would like to prioritize RRC IDLE/INACTIVE states in the study. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Because of study item, there is no need to exclude any state. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Considering the different requirement for coverage, power saving gain, data rate from different types of devices, 100uW~1 mW can be considered in the early stage for study. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal |
| vivo | We agree with the proposal since there are target use cases for both RRC idle/inactive and connected scenarios. Since it is for study purpose, we think all use cases can be equally studied during the SI. It can be based on contribution driven. |
| Panasonic | We would like to prioritize RRC IDLE/INACTIVE and okay to study also CONNECTED mode. |
| Intel | We support the proposal |
| Nokia1 | We are supportive of considering both, IDLE/Inactive and CONNECTED mode. That being said, having one common LP-WUS design baseline for all RRC states would be preferable, thus it would be good to consider if the RRC IDLE/Inactive state requirements would be driving the design. |
| Rakuten S. | We are ok with the proposal but think Idle mode should have higher priority. |
| Sony | Prioritize IDLE / INACTIVE mode. We can also see whether LP-WUS would be useful for CONNECTED mode |
| CATT | We support the proposal |
| InterDigital | We prefer to Idle/Inactive mode. Connected mode can be further studied if available. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | “Considering” both is acceptable, but when it comes to prioritizing evaluations and designs, the priority would go to IDLE/INACTIVE. It’s not immediately clear if this proposal intends to treat them equally. |
| Sharp | We are open to study both |
| MediaTek | Support to study how to benefit LP-WUS/WUR to all RRC modes, with no/less performance impact to LP-WUS/WUR in RRC Idle/Inactive. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal but would like to prioritize RRC IDLE/INACTIVE states. |
| Lenovo | Prioritize Idle/inactive mode in this study.. if there is time left then we can consider connected mode |
| Samsung | We are fine to consider both RRC states in this study, but we prefer to prioritize the evaluation for RRC idle/inactive state at first. Because most of the gain will come from RRC idle/inactive state and it can make the workscope manageable. RRC connected state can be studied if the time is allowed. |
| Ericsson1 | OK to consider both RRC Connected and RRC Idle/active as a starting point for discussion. |
| Apple | Given that there seems to be strong interest to study connected mode from companies, we are fine to study it also. But we still prefer to prioritize idle/inactive mode. Maybe we can add a sub-bullet:  “RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode can be prioritized if there is a need for prioritization during the course of the study.” |
| CMCC | We support the proposal |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal |
| QC | We are OK w/ proposal. Idle/inactive mode could be considered w/ higher priority. |
| FL2 | [H] Proposals 1E-v1(modified): Both RRC IDLE/INACTIVE and CONNECTED mode are considered for study in the LP-WUS/WUR SI.   * FFS further prioritization if needed during the study Item. |
| DOCOMO | We support the proposal |
| EURECOM | OK, priority given to RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE if required |
| Everactive | Agree |

During the GTW session, related issue is agreed according to [ChairNote]. Therefore it can be close.

### 1F: more deisgn targets

* FutureWei
  + a model capturing LP-WUR’s limited coverage scenario and the behavior/protocol of LP-WUR/Main Radio need to be defined for proper evaluation of the LP-WUS/WUR power saving gain
* Vivo
  + Around 100kbps data rate can be considered as design target for LP-WUS
  + The overall design target of coexistence is to support multiplexing between LP-WUS with legacy NR signals/channels and to allow reuse of unused LP-WUS resources for other DL transmissions
* Nokia
  + Down prioritize the sidelink related studies for time being
  + LP-WUS design and LP-WUR architecture support flexible placement in frequency domain.
  + The wake-up signal design and wake up receiver architecture defined, allows efficient reuse of gNB hardware for signal generation.
  + The LP-WUS signal design and LP-WUR architecture should be defined so that efficient multiplexing with existing NR signals and channels is possible to limit the resource reservation.
  + Coverage and mobility implications should be accounted for in LP-WUS design and LP-WUR architecture assumptions.
  + Consider in LP-WUS design and LP-WUR architecture the possibility to accommodate use cases with some degree of limited mobility.
* CATT
  + Minimum achievable data rate – [160] bps
* Samsung
  + The design of LP-WUS should strive to minimize the impact to the gNB.
* Rakuten Mobile
  + For the assumption of framework of LP-WUS, minimum impact to the network deployment should be assured.
  + Regarding frequency assumption, in-band operation can be the baseline.
* Ericsson, following general framework should be used as starting point for WUS evaluations:
  + transmission of LP-WUS should not require new gNB hardware and should not trigger new emissions/compliance requirements for gNBs
  + it should be possible to dynamically reuse unused LP-WUS resources for other NR transmissions (i.e., dedicated time/frequency resource reservation for WUS should be avoided)
  + it should be possible to multiplex LP-WUS with other NR transmissions in time or frequency domain without causing interference
  + LP-WUS is transmitted on Uu interface from gNB to UE
* Sony
  + RAN1 considers fallback mechanisms for UEs that are out of coverage of the LP-WUS

#### [M] Proposals 1F-v1:

The following design targets of LP-WUS/WUR should be taken into account,

* Flexible placement of the LP-WUS in frequency domain,
* Reuse of existing gNB hardware to generate LP-WUS related signals
* Allow in-band operating with legacy NR system.
* Allow multiplex with legacy NR signals/channels, e.g., TDM/FDM.
* Down prioritize the sidelink related studies.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | These topics belong more to 9.13.3 AI. In addition main bullet should be reformulated. to “**At least** the following ……” |
| Futurewei | The third and fourth bullets can be combined as allowing in-band operation already implies multiplexing with legacy NR signals/channels whether in time or frequency domain. For example:  Allow in-band multiplexing with legacy NR signals/channel, e.g., TDM/FDM.  We would also like to suggest including handling of inter-cell interference in the evaluation. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Fine. Regarding the data rate mentioned by companies, we fail to understand how to calculate it, if we do not have modulation order, OFDM symbol duration or the number of modulation symbols per OFDM symbol (1 modulation symbol per OFDM symbol). May I ask a question that what the data rate of eMBB in NR is? We can answer it only if we have SCS, bandwidth, modulation order and code rate etc. It seems a complicated equations in peak data rate shown in 38.306(?). |
| Xiaomi | Generally OK with the proposal. Also think these topics belong more to 9.13.3 AI. |
| vivo | In principle, we agree with the proposed design targets. Besides, allow reuse of unused LP-WUS resources for other DL transmissions can also be considered. BTW, we are OK with Futurewei’s suggestion on combining the third and fourth bullets. |
| Panasonic | Agree with Futurewei. |
| Intel | Similar to deprioritize sidelink operation, unlicensed operation should also be deprioritized, otherwise, due to LBT, UE cannot assume LP-WUS always happen in a configured timing. Alternatively, if UE is configured to monitor multiple LP-WUSs in a window which is similar to DRS transmission window in NR-U, it increases the power consumption for of LP-WUR .Further, as commented by Futurewei, inter-cell interference may need to be included. |
| Nokia1 | In general we are fine, but would propose following:  “Allow efficient multiplexing with legacy NR signals/channels, e.g., TDM/FDM”  The last bullet regarding the SL, would be probably more suited in earlier use case agreement? |
| Sony | These topics belong more to 9.13.3 AI. Agree with Nordic on starting the sentence with “at least…”. Agree with Futurewei that tolerance of inter-cell interference is a design target. We could also include “support for mobility”. |
| CATT | We are OK with the following targets  - Flexible placement of the LP-WUS in frequency domain,  - Allow multiplex with legacy NR signals/channels, e.g., TDM/FDM.  - Down prioritize the sidelink related studies.  It is too early to agree on the following target since there is no existing hardware of the potential new waveform of LP-WUS or legacy NR system.  - Reuse of existing gNB hardware to generate LP-WUS related signals  - Allow in-band operating with legacy NR system. |
| InterDigital | We agree with CATT. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | These points are not related to evaluation methods, etc. They belong in other agenda item(s).  Or, if the evaluation methods relevance is to have some kind of reporting on these points, then the proposal would need to be reformulated.  ~~The following design targets of LP-WUS/WUR should be taken into account~~ Companies to report the following aspects when provide the evaluation results,   * ~~Flexible placement of the LP-WUS in frequency domain,~~ * Assumption (if any) on reuse of existing gNB hardware ~~to generate LP-WUS related signals~~ * ~~Allow~~If in-band operating with legacy NR system is modelled. * ~~Allow m~~Multiplexing assumption with legacy NR signals/channels, e.g., TDM/FDM. * ~~Down prioritize the sidelink related studies.~~   However, these points seem quite natural for a proponent to report to allow any kind of understanding of their results, so it may not be necessary to list them in an agreement. |
| MediaTek | It is unclear why the second bullet is a design target. It can be up to gNB implementation whether to reuse existing gNB hardware. There is no performance impact if the OOK can be generated properly. |
| OPPO | Generally OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Interference handling should be added in the target e.g., inter-cell interference and interference to other PHY channel in FDM due to clock sync error and gap resource blocks needed  Allow out of band operation to address the coverage |
| Samsung | We would like to know whether flexible placement of the LP-WUS in frequency domain means that LP-WUR should support multi-band operation or LP-WUS can be transmitted in any frequency resource within the certain frequency band regardless of supporting multi-band operation. |
| Ericsson1 | We are generally supportive and suggest below wording changes.  At least the following design targets of LP-WUS/WUR should be taken into account,   * Flexible placement of the LP-WUS in frequency domain, * Reuse of existing gNB hardware to ~~generate~~ support LP-WUS ~~related signals~~ * Allow in-band operating with legacy NR system. * Allow efficient multiplexing with legacy NR signals/channels, e.g., TDM/FDM. * Allow reuse of unused LP-WUS resources for other DL transmissions   Down prioritize the sidelink related studies. |
| Apple | We are generally fine with the proposal, and the merge of the 3rd and 4th bullet.  For sidelink or unlicensed as mentioned by Intel, do we only de-prioritize, or the intention is not to study in this SI? We prefer not to study. |
| QC | * Agree on Down prioritize the sidelink related studies. * Other points are part of design to study. |
| FL2 | The above discussion for information, FL suggest it will be further handled in the AI9.13.3 next meeting. |
| EURECOM | Fine with us |
| ZTE, Sanechips | PAPR impacts also need to be considered, sine the PAPR may impact the amplifier efficiency. Additionally, to minimize the impacts on legacy UE scheduling, the congestion by introducing LP-WUS also should be minimized.  At least the following design targets of LP-WUS/WUR should be taken into account,   * Flexible placement of the LP-WUS in frequency domain, * Reuse of existing gNB hardware to ~~generate~~ support LP-WUS ~~related signals~~ * Allow in-band operating with legacy NR system. * Allow efficient multiplexing with legacy NR signals/channels, e.g., TDM/FDM, minimum congestion in time/frequency domain. * Low PAPR |
| Everactive | Agree with these proposals   * Flexible placement of the LP-WUS in frequency domain, * Reuse of existing gNB hardware to generate LP-WUS related signals * Allow in-band operating with legacy NR system.   The following will need to evaluate the impact on the LP-WUR complexity and power consumption.   * Allow multiplex with legacy NR signals/channels, e.g., TDM/FDM. * Down prioritize the sidelink related studies. |

#### [M] Proposals 1F-v2:

By the comments received, FL suggest it will be further handled in the AI9.13.3 next meeting. And the discussion for 1F can be closed this meeting.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the suggestion. |
| Sharp | We are fine with this proposal. |
| QC | Agree and discuss next meeting |
| CATT | We are OK to discuss at next meeting |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the suggestion, since this agenda item is evaluation methods, not designs. |
| vivo | OK. |
| Samsung | We agree. |
| Intel | We are OK to discuss at next meeting |
| SONY | Agree |
| OPPO | OK |

### [close]1G: Terminology

* **vivo:** terminology

**Proposal 14: Adopt the following terminology for future discussion,**

* **Main radio: the Tx/Rx module operating for legacy system**
* **LP-WUR: The Rx module operating for receiving/processing LP-WUS**

#### [M] Proposals 1G-v1:

Adopt the following terminology for future discussion,

* Main radio: the Tx/Rx module operating for legacy signals/channels.
* LP-WUR: The Rx module operating for receiving/processing LP-WUS.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | OK |
| Futurewei | We agree with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Partial Yes. Main receiver may be better. Radio seems we only talk about the RF frontend, but indeed we may pay lots of efforts on baseband, which is the reason for RAN1 lead instead of RAN4 lead. |
| Xiaomi | OK |
| Vivo | Support |
| Panasonic | We are basically okay but just need to clarify that it is not prevented that Main radio (or part of) is capable of receiving LP-WUR as per implementation on modem design. Thus we propose the below change:  Main radio: the Tx/Rx module **capable of** operating for legacy signals/channels. |
| Intel | Support |
| Nokia1 | We are OK with the terminology, but this should not preclude LP-WUR sharing any elements with the main receiver if so determined. |
| FL | Regarding Panasonic and Nokia’s comment, from implementation perspective, that’s always true. [M] Proposals 1G-v1(modified): Adopt the following terminology for future discussion,   * Main radio: the Tx/Rx module operating for legacy signals/channels. * LP-WUR: The Rx module operating for receiving/processing LP-WUS.   Note: whether one or some of the components can be reused between main radio or LP-WUR is implementation. |
| Sony | OK |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal with the following suggestion  Adopt the following terminology for future discussion,   * Main radio: the Tx/Rx module operating for ~~legacy~~ NR signals/channels. * LP-WUR: The Rx module operating for receiving/processing LP-WUS.   Note: whether one or some of the components can be reused between main radio or LP-WUR is implementation. |
| InterDigital | Fine |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It seems the terminology is described from UE perspective? Use of “legacy” is not quite appropriate since Rel-18 NR is also being standardized. Also, “radio” seems not a Tx/Rx module. Some suggestions are made  **Proposal 14: ~~Adopt~~ Use the following terminology for future discussion in the study item,**   * **Main ~~radio~~ receiver: the Tx/Rx module operating for NR apart from LP-WUS on UE** * **LP-WUR: The Rx module operating for receiving/processing LP-WUS on UE**   Note: whether one or some of the components can be reused between main radio or LP-WUR is implementation.  In general, however, this is not obviously needing any agreed definitions as there is not divergence among companies. |
| Sharp | Support |
| MediaTek | Okay. Prefer shorter, if possible, e.g., Main radio (MR) and LP-WUR (LR). |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | We agree with the proposal with following modification  **LP-WUR: The Rx module only operation for receiving/processing LP-WUS** |
| Samsung | OK with the modified proposal. |
| Ericsson1 | Suggest following update (add Note2) to make it clear that the terminology is for ease of discussion and does not imply any particular spec impact at this point.  Adopt the following terminology for future discussion,   * Main radio: the Tx/Rx module operating for legacy signals/channels. * LP-WUR: The Rx module operating for receiving/processing LP-WUS.   Note: whether one or some of the components can be reused between main radio or LP-WUR is implementation.  Note2: Above terminology is for ease of discussion and does not imply any particular split of UE into separate LP-WUR and main-radio parts. |
| Apple | We are fine with the modified proposal, and the new note from Ericsson also looks good. |
| FL2 | To address comments, the followings are proposed,   * I do not see the motivation why other study items/work items can not make use of this terminology? Perhaps the current wording is enough. * I added ‘for a UE’ in the note. I think it is minor issue so far. * The main receiver only refers to Rx part. And I think it also includes Tx part. So main radio is preferred unless there are any better wording. * For note2 as Ericsson commented, I think it has been addressed by Note1. Whether it is split or not is implementation. * To response to Lenovo’s comments, adding ‘only’ for LP-WUR, is your intension to preclude LP-WUR to process NR signals/channel? I fully agree with you. But just keep the current wording is concise and enough.  [M] Proposals 1G-v1(modified2): **~~Adopt~~ Use** the following terminology for future discussion,   * Main radio **(MR)**: the Tx/Rx module operating for **~~legacy~~ NR** signals/channels **apart from LP-WUS.** * LP-WUR **(LR)**: The Rx module operating for receiving/processing signals related to low-power wake-up.   Note: whether one or some of the components can be reused between main radio or LP-WUR **for a UE** is implementation. |
| QC | 1. Agree with Nokia comment.. 2. Suggest the following modification:   LP-WUR: The Rx module operating for receiving/processing new LP signals (e.g., WUS or sync/beacon). |
| FL3 | To address Qualcomm’s comments, the following is suggested, [M] Proposals 1G-v1(modified3): **~~Adopt~~ Use** the following terminology for future discussion,   * Main radio **(MR)**: the Tx/Rx module operating for **~~legacy~~ NR** signals/channels **apart from** signals/channel related to low-power wake-up**.** * LP-WUR **(LR)**: The Rx module operating for receiving/processing signals/channel related to low-power wake-up.   Note: whether one or some of the components can be reused between main radio or LP-WUR **for a UE** is implementation. |
| EURECOM | We are ok, LR seems a bit too short, perhaps we can consider WUR. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK |
| Everactive | Agree with the original proposal: Main Radio (MR) and LP-WUS and LP-WUR  For reference, wakeup receivers are commonly called WRX in literature. |
|  |  |

During the GTW session, related issue is agreed according to [ChairNote]. Therefore it can be close.

## Issue 2: Power evaluation related assumptions

### 2A: General: performance metrics

#### [H] Proposals 2A-v1:

For Power evaluation of the LP-WUS, the following performance metrics are considered to be provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Performance Metric** | **Note** |
| Power consumption | Relative power consumption in units per ms. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. For comparison, the relative power consumption for baseline schemes should also be provided. |
| System overhead | Expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS among all resources. |
| Latency | For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time and the time of the PO it is paged.  For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time and the time of the first PDCCH for PDSCH scheduling. |
| FFS: Capacity impact | [Evaluate the system capacity impact due to introduce of LP-WUS] |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | Need some text update  For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time and the time of the first PO UE can monitor.  For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time and the time of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor |
| Futurewei | We agree with the metrics considered for the evaluation but would like to have the following suggestions on the notes/definitions.   * For power consumption, this metric is dependent on the considered traffic model, so for reporting we can consider the relative power consumption in a transaction cycle, i.e., average inter-arrival time. * For latency, the definition for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state might be limiting if we consider existing/legacy definition of a PO. The evaluation of latency should be able to capture the impact of LP-WUR always monitoring operation and potential of considering unique addressing via the LP-WUS. New definition/note: For RRC IDLE/INACTIVE state, latency is the time interval between data arrival time and time a unique identifier is determined.   BTW, we suggest changing the title of section 2.2 to be more than power evaluation related. |
| Spreadtrum1 | For system overhead, it should be coverage and resource overhead. Mentioning about resource overhead without the coverage requirement is meaningless. In R17 PEI discussion, the resource overhead is coupled with the coverage requirement.  Mobility should be addressed. Many companies mentioned a large portion of power saving comes from the skipping of measurement. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For latency part, we share similar view with Nordic.  For system overhead part, text update is needed:  Expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS among all resources in a time interval. |
| Xiaomi | As to the time unit of relative power consumption, slot unit is adopted in TR 38.840 “*Power values are averaged over the operations within a slot*” .We think it is better to keep the same as TR 38.840 |
| vivo | We think Futurewei’s proposal is valid, it can be general performance metrics, for example, the overhead may not related to power evaluation.  Proposal 2A-v1, 3A-v1, 3B-v1 includes the related to power, coverage or link-level simulation. For better understanding, the following categorization can be made,  For Power evaluation of the LP-WUS, the following metrics are considered,   * Power consumption (power saving gain) * Latency   For coverage evaluation (i.e., link-budget) , the following metrics are considered,   * MIL, compared with other bottleneck channel   For link-level simulation, the following metrics are considered,   * FAR, MDR target should be considered   For other evaluation, the following metrics are considered,   * System overhead * Capacity |
| Panasonic | We are okay with the proposal. |
| Intel | On power consumption for LP-WUR, it is preferred to clarify both absolute and relative power consumption of LP-WUR.  For the definition of latency, depending on LP-WUS design, UE may not need to monitor a PO at all. Therefore, the first sentence needs modification |
| Nokia1 | For power consumption; is it assumed that the power consumption would be independent of the sub-carrier spacing applied i.e. constant over ms? If not should we consider this per slot?  For overhead; the overhead should account both the RE required by the LP-WUS and any guard band (or time) required by the LP-WUR architecture.  For latency; we think that this should account also the time that is needed to ‘re-activate’ the main receiver, so that the UE is actually reachable. This could be the related PO or even the associated RACH, depending on the LP-WUS design. |
| FL | TO address the comments from multiple companies, FL made the following revision, and will update according to any latest comments. [H] Proposals 2A-v1(modified): For system impact analysis, the following performance metrics are considered to be provided,   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | System overhead | Expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS (including guard band or time if any) among all resources within a period. | | FFS: Capacity impact | [Evaluate the system capacity impact due to introduce of LP-WUS] |   For Power evaluation of the LP-WUS, the following performance metrics are considered to be provided.     |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | Power consumption | Relative power consumption in units. ~~per ms~~. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. For comparison, the relative power consumption for baseline schemes should also be provided, as well as the power saving gain. | | Latency | For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time and the time of the first PO UE can monitor.   * FFS: if UE does not have PO monitoring after wake-up   For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time and the time of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor | |
| Rakuten S. | Ok with the proposal. |
| Sony | OK with list of performance metrics. Agree with the update from Nordic. |
| CATT | We are OK with the power consumption and latency. For system overhead and system capacity impact, they should be addressed with WUS signal is transmitted in-band. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Spreadtrum. Coverage should be considered in line with resource overhead. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. The title of section 2.2 should be changed to e.g. system evaluation methodology and assumptions; 2. For the reporting of power consumption companies may have different values considering different simulated time. It is better to directly use the power saving gain, which is already used in Rel-16/17 power saving SI/WI. If the FL is suggesting that (in addition to power saving gain) we will express power consumption in relative units, this is ok, but a new row is needed in the table if so, i.e. two rows are needed for power consumption unit and power saving gain respectively 3. For the latency definition, regarding whether it is defined based on the reception of PO, we have different views. It would be possible that the procedures after LP-WUS detection to be directly transmit PRACH, depending on the procedure design. It may be until a unique identifier is obtained or may be a slight false alarm is allowed. So, we think the following would be better to be considered for the definition of latency for IDLE mode:   ***For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is defined as the duration from the time when traffic arrives at gNB to the time when UE is ready to transmit PRACH or receive paging PDSCH;***   1. For the system overhead, the metric is already an percentage, so there is no need for any definition of period. We think “within a period” needs to be removed.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | System overhead | Expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS (including guard band or time if any) among all resources ~~within a period~~. | |
| Sharp | OK with the updated proposal |
| MediaTek | We support FL’s update. We are concerned about whether the first PO/PDCCH monitoring occasion is associated with the data. With this regard, we have the following recommendations.  the time of the first PO UE can monitor the data  the time of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor the data |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposed text from Nordic |
| Samsung | OK with the modified proposal. To clarify the definition of data arrival time, the text can be updated as follows.  For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PO UE can monitor.  For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor |
| Ericsson1 | Suggest below updates for power evaluation. The delay should not be to just to first available MO (as in FL proposal) but should consider synchronization and other aspects that may be needed for enabling UE to detect the paging message/PDCCH.  At least the following are considered for power evaluation. Additional metrics FFS   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | Power consumption | Relative power consumption in units. ~~per ms~~. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. For comparison, the relative power consumption for baseline schemes should also be provided, as well as the power saving gain. | | Latency | For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at gNB and the time of the first PO UE can monitor and detect paging PDCCH and any associated PDSCH   * FFS: if UE does not have PO monitoring after wake-up   For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at gNB and the time of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor and detect PDCCH |   Suggest below updates for system impact evaluation  At least the following are considered for system impact. Additional metrics FFS   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | System overhead | Expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS (including guard band or time if any) among all resources within a period. | | ~~FFS: Capacity impact~~ | ~~[Evaluate the system capacity impact due to introduce of LP-WUS]~~ | |
| Apple | For the modified proposal v1,  On the capacity impact, if the intention is for connected mode, can we clarify so? For idle/inactive mode, we do not see the need to evaluate capacity impact. System overhead would be sufficient.  For the definition of latency for idle/inactive state, we do not think we should limit it the PO monitoring either. We suggest:  “For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time and the time when the UE is aware that there is data for it.”  Strictly speaking, latency does not belong to power evaluation either. Maybe there is no need to categorize different performance metrics. |
| CMCC | Ok with the FL proposal. |
| FL2 | Update the latency definition according to MTK and Samsung’s comments.  Regarding removal of the capacity as suggested by Ericsson, since the SID objective include this, from rapporteur perspective, it’s better to let the companies have such change to report if any.   * *Study potential UE power saving gains compared to the existing Rel-15/16/17 UE power saving mechanisms, the coverage availability, as well as latency impact of low-power WUR/WUS. System impact, such as network power consumption, coexistence with non-low-power-WUR UEs, network coverage/capacity/resource overhead should be included in the study [RAN1]*  [H] Proposals 2A-v1(modified2): For system impact analysis, the following performance metrics are considered to be provided,   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | System overhead | Expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS (including guard band or time if any) among all resources ~~within a period.~~ | | FFS: Capacity impact | [Evaluate the system capacity impact due to introduce of LP-WUS] |   For Power evaluation of the LP-WUS, the following performance metrics are considered to be provided.     |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | Power consumption | Relative power consumption in units. ~~per ms~~. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. For comparison, the relative power consumption for baseline schemes should also be provided, as well as the power saving gain. | | Latency | For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PO UE can monitor the data.   * FFS: if UE does not have PO monitoring after wake-up   For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor | |
| DOCOMO | Ok with the revised FL proposal. |
| QC | We are fine with proposal. |
| FL3 | [H] Proposals 2A-v1(modified3): For system impact analysis, the following performance metrics are considered to be provided,   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | System overhead | Expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS (including guard band or time if any) among all resources ~~within a period.~~ | | FFS: Capacity impact | [Evaluate the system capacity impact due to introduce of LP-WUS] |   For Power evaluation of the LP-WUS, the following performance metrics are considered to be provided.     |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | Power consumption | Relative power consumption in units. ~~per ms~~. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. For comparison, the relative power consumption for baseline schemes should also be provided, as well as the power saving gain. | | Latency | For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PO UE can monitor the ~~data~~paging message.   * FFS: if UE does not have PO monitoring after wake-up   For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor | |
| EURECOM | Ok with the latest proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the latency metric, it is a little bit vague to say ‘UE can monitor the data’. We suggest to remove ‘the data’ based on the assumption that congestion is not considered in idle mode.  Considering the realistic scheduling congestion in connected mode, the delay defined before the first PDCCH can not reflect the real delay. Therefore, it is suggest to update as :  For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the transmitted time of the PDSCH for the data ~~first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor~~ |
| Nokia2 | For latency in IDLE/Inactive, a question for clarification that is the intent of the wording “UE can monitor the data” suggest that also the time required for sub-systems boot-up, calibration, and re synchronization? Would it be clearest to add a note that the latency needs to account also the time needed to sub-systems boot-up, calibration, and re synchronization? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | Regarding the system level impact analysis, we should add in the note that the system overhead should be reported with the assumed data rate, which is also the assumption used in the corresponding link level simulation. Also, we still cannot understand why system overhead, as a ratio, needs to be defined in a period. [H] Proposals 2A-v1(modified): For system impact analysis, the following performance metrics are considered to be provided,   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | System overhead | Expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS (including guard band or time if any) among all resources ~~within a period~~, and is reported with the corresponding data rate (which is assumed/simulated in the link level simulation). | | FFS: Capacity impact | [Evaluate the system capacity impact due to introduce of LP-WUS] | |
| Everactive | Power consumption needs to be absolute numbers, not relative number. And we should differentiate between active power when the LP-WUR is on, and average power considering different use cases.  Proposal:  “Active and average power consumption in units of Watts. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. Active power refers to the power of the LP-WUR when receiving a LP-WUS. Average power refers to the power of the LP-WUR and main radio averaged over time for specific use cases.” |

The latest proposals are as follows,

#### [H] Proposals 2A-v2:

For system impact analysis, the following performance metrics are considered to be provided,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Performance Metric** | **Note** |
| System overhead | Expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS (including guard band or time if any) among all resources ~~within a period.~~ |
| FFS: Capacity impact | [Evaluate the system capacity impact due to introduce of LP-WUS] |

For Power evaluation of the LP-WUS, the following performance metrics are considered to be provided.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Performance Metric** | **Note** |
| Power consumption | Relative power consumption in units. ~~per ms~~. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. For comparison, the relative power consumption for baseline schemes should also be provided, as well as the power saving gain. |
| Latency | For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PO UE can monitor the ~~data~~paging message.   * FFS: if UE does not have PO monitoring after wake-up   For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal but have the following editorial suggestions   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | Power consumption | Relative power consumption in units. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. For comparison, the relative power consumption and evaluation period for baseline schemes should also be provided, as well as the power saving gain. | | Latency | For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PO UE can monitor the paging message.   * FFS: if UE ~~does not have~~ is not required to monitor a PO ~~monitoring~~ after wake-up   For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor | |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal |
| QC | We support the modified proposal. |
| CATT | For system overhead and system capacity impact, they should be addressed with WUS signal is transmitted in-band.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | System overhead for in-band operation of LP-WUS | Expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS (including guard band or time if any) among all resources ~~within a period.~~ | | FFS: Capacity impact | [Evaluate the system capacity impact due to introduce of LP-WUS] | |
| Spreadtrum | We think mobility should be considered. In R17 PEI, we do not assume any measurement relaxation, so the mobility is automatically satisfied. But, in the discussion of LP-WUS, almost all companies assume the measurement is relaxed at the main radio since the main radio is turned off. However, is this realistic for wearable and eMBB use cases? We doubt. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the Futurewei’s update. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | According to the TR 38.838, the latency is defined as following:   |  | | --- | | The latency requirement of XR traffic in RAN side (i.e., air interface) is modelled as packet delay budget (PDB). The PDB is a limited time budget for a packet to be transmitted over the air from a gNB to a UE.  For a given packet, the delay of the packet incurred in air interface is measured from the time that the packet arrives at the gNB to the time that it is successfully transferred to the UE. If the delay is larger than a given PDB for the packet, then, the packet is said to violate PDB, otherwise the packet is said to be successfully delivered.  The value of PDB may vary for different applications and traffic types. |   Then we should use the similar definition for connected mode,  For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time that the data is successfully transferred to the UE ~~of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor~~ |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. We should add a note to take care that the system overhead should correspond to the coverage evaluation in the link level simulation. Otherwise, companies may have different sets of assumptions for the two simulations. 2. We have some concern on the way how latency is defined. “the time of the first PO UE can monitor the ~~data~~paging message.” means until a PO configured by the serving cell. We think there is some companies proposing receive paging on PO/monitoring occasions other than the PO of the UE. Also, UE may directly send PRACH or until the paging early indication is received. 3. Add a reference to TR 38.840 to clearly define the UE power saving gain.   Some revisions are as following:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | System overhead | Expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS (including guard band or time if any) among all resources ~~within a period.~~  System overhead is reported with the LP-WUR raw data rate evaluated in the coverage evaluations. | | FFS: Capacity impact | [Evaluate the system capacity impact due to introduce of LP-WUS] |   For Power evaluation of the LP-WUS, the following performance metrics are considered to be provided.     |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | Power consumption | Relative power consumption in units. ~~per ms~~. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. For comparison, the relative power consumption for baseline schemes should also be provided, as well as the power saving gain defined in section 8.2 of TR 38.840. | | Latency | For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time ~~of the first PO~~ when the UE can monitor the ~~data~~paging ~~message~~indication or can transmit the PRACH.   * ~~FFS: if UE does not have PO monitoring after wake-up~~   For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor | |
| vivo | We are OK with the modified proposal and CATT’s, Futurewei’s revision |
| Nokia3 | As commented earlier, for latency we should add a note for the IDLE/Inactive that the time needed for boot-up and re-synchronization needs to be accounted, e.g.  Note: The latency needs to account also the time needed to sub-systems boot-up, calibration, and re synchronization. |
| Panasonic | We are okay with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We think it is necessary to provide the latency performance of baseline schemes in the same way as the power consumption metric to compare the performance such as Rel-16 UE PS study. If the latency for baseline is necessary, the following sentence can be added for the latency e.g., For comparison, the latency for baseline schemes should be provided.  In terms of power consumption, we also think that the same evaluation period should be applied to evaluate the power consumption of the LP-WUS and baseline schemes. |
| Intel | We support the modified proposal |
| SONY | We are OK with proposal and support the modification made by Futurewei.  FYI --- suggestion by Futurewei   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Performance Metric** | **Note** | | Power consumption | Relative power consumption in units. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. For comparison, the relative power consumption and evaluation period for baseline schemes should also be provided, as well as the power saving gain. | | Latency | For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PO UE can monitor the paging message.   * FFS: if UE ~~does not have~~ is not required to monitor a PO ~~monitoring~~ after wake-up   For CONNECTED state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PDCCH monitoring occasion a UE can monitor | |
| OPPO | OK with the modified proposal and Futurewei’s update. |
| Ericsson2 | Latency definitions need to be modified. The end point should not just be the point where UE can ‘monitor’ PDCCH but it should point where UE can actually detect it and receive paging. E.g., if UE needs to receive sync signals before successful detection, that extra delay should be reflected in the latency. We provided suggestion for this in Ericsson1 comments.  Also, it needs to be noted that this is initial list and more metrics can be considered later. |
| Apple | We are fine with Futurewei’s update. |
|  |  |

### 2B: Power model for main radio

* **Futurewei:** relative power: 0.015 [0.05]---transition time: 200 ms [25 ms]----transition energy: 10000 [1250]

Table : UE Power Consumption Model for Main Radio.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Characteristics** | **Relative Power [100 MHz BW]** | **Relative Power [20 MHz BW]** |
| Standby | Power consumption of the main radio when LP-WUR is used for LP-WUS monitoring | 0.015 [0.05] | 0.015 [0.05] |
| Deep Sleep | Time interval for the sleep should be larger than the total transition time entering and leaving this state. Accurate timing may not be maintained. | 1  (Optional: 0.5) | 1  (Optional: 0.5) |
| Light Sleep | Time interval for the sleep should be larger than the total transition time entering and leaving this state. | 20 | 20 |
| Micro sleep | Immediate transition is assumed for power saving study purpose from or to a non-sleep state | 45 | 45 |
| PDCCH-only | No PDSCH and same-slot scheduling; this includes time for PDCCH decoding and any micro-sleep within the slot. | 100 | 50 |
| SSB or  CSI-RS processing | SSB can be used for fine time-frequency sync. and RSRP measurement of the serving/camping cell. TRS is the considered CSI-RS for sync. | 100 | 50 |
| PDCCH + PDSCH | PDCCH + PDSCH. | 300 | 120 |

Table : UE Power Consumption for Main Radio during the State Transition.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sleep type** | **Additional transition energy:**  **(Relative power x ms)** | **Total transition time** |
| **Standby** | 50x200ms [25ms] = 10000 [1250] | 200 ms [25 ms] |
| **Deep sleep** | 450 | 20 ms |
| **Light sleep** | 100 | 6 ms |
| **Micro sleep** | 0 | 0 ms\* |
| \* Immediate transition is assumed for power saving study purpose from or to a non-sleep state | | |

* **Huawei:** relative power: [0]---transition time: 1 or several seconds----transition energy: need to be discussed.

1. ***For evaluation purposes, capture the following table in the TR and reuse other power states of main receiver in TR 38.840.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Power state** | **Relative Power** | **Note** |
| **Ultra-deep sleep (main receiver)** | **[0]** | **The main receiver sleeps deeper than ‘Deep sleep’, and the power consumption is ultra-low.** |

1. **Current power model defined in TR 38.840 does not account for how to model the transition for a new deeper sleep state.**
2. ***RAN1 to investigate how to model the transition energy for ultra-deep sleep state of main receiver for evaluation purpose.***
3. ***For evaluation purposes, the transition time of main receiver for ultra-deep sleep is assumed to be about one to several seconds.***

* **Spreadtrum:** no new state define for main radio

***Proposal 1: The power model for the main receiver can reuse that defined in TR 38.840.***

* **vivo:** relative power: 0.015---transition time: 400ms ----transition energy: [2000-20000]

**Proposal 15: For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation, the following power model of the ultra-deep sleep state agreed in R18 positioning SI for LPHAP is reused for main radio.**

* + **Note: the value of additional transition energy can be updated based on further agreement made in R18 positioning SI.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Relative Power** | **Additional transition energy:**  **(Relative power x ms)** | **Total transition time** |
| Ultra-deep sleep | 0.015 | [2000-20000] | 400ms |

* **Nokia:** relative power: [0.015]---transition time: [200ms]----transition energy: [10000]

**Table 1. UE power consumption model**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Power model  (Idle/inactive-mode operation with reception bandwidth 20 MHz) | |
| **Relative power** | **Transition time and energy**  **(if applicable)** |
| *Main receiver* |  |  |
| Power off | [0.015] \* | {[200ms], [10000]} \* |
| Note: Power scaling to 20MHz reception bandwidth follows the rule in Section 8.1.3 of TR 38.840, i.e., max{reference power \* 0.4, 50}.  []\* : Values are preliminary and to be considered further based on the LP-WUR architecture discussion.  Power accounted only for boot-up and sub-systems bring-up including internal calibration. Ramp down transition not considered. | | |

* **CATT:** relative power: “zero”; ---transition time: [2250]; ----transition energy: [100 ms]

**Proposal 5: The power model for the low-power wakeup receiver should include the following assumptions**

* **The power consumption of low-power wakeup receiver is independent to that of NR receiver.**
* **The power consumption of NR receiver should be negligibly low and assumed to be “zero” relative to the deep sleep mode value “1”.**
* **The power model of the low-power wakeup receiver is defined relative to the power state of deep sleep mode with the assumption of the negligible power consumption of NR receiver.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sleep type** | **Additional transition energy:**  **(Relative power x ms)** | **Total transition time** |
| LP-WUR | [2250] | [100 ms] |

* **Intel:** relative power: [0.015]---transition time: [400ms]----transition energy: [2000]

**Table 2: Power consumption and transition time for deeper sleep mode**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Relative Power** | **Additional transition energy** | **Total transition time** |
| Deeper Sleep | [0.015] | 2000 | [400] ms |

* **ZTE:** need study but no suggest values

***Proposal 6: The power off state of main radio should be introduced for power consumption evaluation.***

* ***The characteristics of power off state, the value of relative power and UE power consumption during the state transition should be defined.***
* **MTK:** two set of values for main radio of normal and redcap devices:

For normal UE: relative power: 0.015---transition time: 400ms----transition energy: [20000]

For redcap UE: relative power: 0.015---transition time: 400ms----transition energy: 14000

**Table 4: Rel-15 Ref UE power consumption model for FR1 (TR 38.840)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Relative Power** | **Additional transition energy:**  **(Relative power x ms)** | **Total transition time** |
| Power off | 0.015 | 50 x 400ms = 20000 | 400 ms |

**Table 5: Rel-17 RedCap UE power consumption model for FR1 (TR 38.875)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Relative power** | **Additional transition energy:**  **(Relative power x ms)** | **Total transition time** |
| Power off | 0.015 | 35 x 400ms = 14000 | 400 ms |

Note that Rel-15 reference UE shall at least stay 20.3s in “power off.” Otherwise, staying in “deep sleep” will consume

1. For UE power and latency evaluation, introduce a power consumption model for LP-WUR, including WUR on/off power states and transition time/energy.
2. For UE power and latency evaluation, introduce a new power state of "power off" for the Rel-15 reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE.

* **Ericsson:** need study but no suggest values

1. For the main radio power model

* Use existing models in TR 38.840 and TR 38.875 as starting point for evaluations
* Study whether any updates are needed for the power model (including any updates to scaling factors, transition time) when the main radio is operated in conjunction with LP-WUR
* Consider additional energy (if any) consumed to acquire synchronization

1. For power saving evaluations, consider impact of DRX/Paging configuration assumptions for the UE and impact of false wake-up of main radio due to LP-WUR false alarms.

* **Qualcomm:** [0.015\*] [20000\*] [400 ms\*]

Table Power Model for Deep Sleep and ULPS



* **OPPO**: relative power[0.01] --- transition time: [200ms]----transition energy: [5000]

**Table 2: UE power consumption model for LP-WUS/WUR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Characteristics** | **Relative Power** |
| **Main radio** | | |
| [Quasi] Power Off | Main radio can keep power off when LP-WUR not wake-up main radio. | [0.01] |

**Table 3: UE power consumption during the state transition**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sleep type** | **Additional transition energy:**  **(Relative power x ms)** | **Total transition time** |
| [Quasi] Power Off | [5000] | [200 ms] |
| Deep sleep | 450 | 20 ms |
| Light sleep | 100 | 6 ms |
| Micro sleep | 0 | 0 ms\* |
| Immediate transition is assumed for power saving study purpose from or to a non-sleep state | | |

* **Apple:**
* Main radio
  + The power consumption of the main radio in ultra-deep sleep state
  + The transition time and transition energy for the main radio to go from non-sleep state to ultra-deep sleep state
  + The transition time and transition energy for the main radio to go from ultra-deep sleep state to non-sleep state
  + Note that these depends on the assumptions on what information is maintained at the main radio during the ultra-deep sleep state, and what steps the main radio needs to take before performing regular operation (such as acquisition, synchronization, etc).
  + There may be different implementations that allow the main radio to go into different levels of ultra-deep sleep state. Multiple models can be potentially considered.

***Proposal 4: For WUS evaluation, use the evaluation methodology and power model defined in TR 38.840 as the baseline. Additionally, define the following parameters for UE power model:***

* **The power consumption of the main radio in “ultra-deep sleep state”**
* **The transition time and transition energy for the main radio to go from/to non-sleep state to/from ultra-deep sleep state**
* **The power consumption of WUR during active monitoring**
* **The power consumption of WUR when it is not actively monitoring**
* **Apple:**
* **CMCC:**

***Proposal 2: The transient period between “main radio turned on” and “main radio turned off/deep sleep” shall be taken into consideration in the evaluation methodology.***

Ultra-deep sleep state power model,

Transition time in the order of hundreds of milliseconds (100ms-400ms),

* relative power: 0.015 [0.05]; transition time: 200 ms [25 ms]; transition energy: 10000 [1250]: FutureWei, Nokia
* relative power: 0.015; transition time: 400ms; transition energy: [2000-20000]: vivo, Intel, MTK, Qualcomm
* relative power: “0”; transition time: [100 ms]; transition energy: [2250]: CATT
* relative power[0.01]; transition time: [200ms]; transition energy: [5000]: OPPO

Transition time in the order of several seconds (1 or several seconds),

* relative power: [0]; transition time: 1 or several seconds; transition energy: need to be discussed: Huawei

#### [H] Proposals 2B-v1:

Take the following power model for main radio for evaluation in LP-WUS/WUR SI,

* For IoT and Wearable cases, reusing TR38.875 power model as baseline.
* For eMBB cases, reusing TR38.840 Power model as baseline.
* Introduce ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio and reusing power model option 1 value of ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’for LPHAP evaluation, i.e.,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Relative Power (unit/ms) | Additional transition energy(Note1):  (Relative power x ms) | Total transition time |
| Ultra-deep sleep | **0.015** | **[2000-20000]\*** | **400ms** |

* Note1: transition time /energy consists of the procedure for [main radio hardware tune on, coarse sync, cell search…]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| FL | Considering transition time and outcome of LPHAP, 400ms is proposed. |
| Nordic | No, in our opinion LPWA power model should be used as baseline for IOT. This because it could be easily used as WUR. WUR should do better than LPWA paging |
| Futurewei | We agree with FL proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Too early to draw conclusion. The main receiver behavior after wakeup is unclear and has different understandings across companies, in our view. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | If coarse sync is included in the transition time, the exact sync accuracy should be clarified. Additionally, why cell search is included in the transition time also needs to be clarified. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal. |
| Vivo | In RAN-97, it is agreed that,  **Conclusion:**   * The Rel-18 study on low-power WUS/WUR is for NR only and LTE NB IoT/MTC is not in scope of the SI, no need for SID update. * Endorse a revised SID with the following editorial changes.  |  | | --- | | * Study potential UE power saving gains compared to the existing Rel-15/16/17 UE power saving mechanisms ~~and their~~ , the coverage availability, as well as latency impact of low-power WUR/WUS. System impact, such as network power consumption, coexistence with non-low-power-WUR UEs, network coverage/capacity/resource overhead should be included in the study [RAN1]   + Note: The need for RAN2 evaluation will be triggered by RAN1 when necessary. |   Hence, using RedCap power model is preferred from our understanding. |
| Panasonic | We support the proposal of reusing power state for low power high accuracy positioning evaluation. |
| Intel | The value for additional transition energy should be further down selected. |
| Nokia1 | In earlier modelling we defined the relative power units per slot, rather than per ms. Now as raised above, it would be good to understand whether there is any dependency to sub-carrier spacing (slot duration) or whether this can be sub-carrier agnostic. Hence we would like to understand if we should change from the earlier approach (slot based) or whether we can assume sub-carrier spacing agnostic value.  For the transition time, like explained in our paper (R1-2208698, Section 4.2,) it would seem that basing this value to earlier LTE based assumption would not seem entirely justified. It is not fully clear to me either whether LPHAP considered level of synchronization is only for relative measurements Thus, as noted in our contribution, when we re-activate the main receiver, it is assumed that all frequency and timing synchronization is lost, thus they need to be re-acquired. This maybe dependent on the signal to noise ratio. Hence it would be probably simpler to assume that transition time only covers only the time for boot-up and sub-systems bring-up including internal calibration when main receiver is woken up (as given in the note of our paper). Then we could have separate timeline, similarly as discussed in Rel-17, to determine the additional time needed to re-acquire synchronization. This re-synchronization time, basically cell search time could be then confirmed from RAN4.  Please note also that we assumed only the time for ramp-up in our evaluation, not ramp-down. The time for ramp-up and ramp-down could be separated at least for latency perspective. |
| FL | The re-acquire synchronization (which I called it like ‘cold start’) can be added to the transition time to simplify the model itself. Of course different SINR may lead to different re-acquire synchronization time. But as for simplicity, LPHAP assumes a fixed value for it. To progress, how about to consider it as tentative and further modification FFS until the next meeting? (unless we can bring up a concrete proposal)  To response to use LPWA issue, In RAN-97, it is agreed that,  **Conclusion:**   * The Rel-18 study on low-power WUS/WUR is for NR only and LTE NB IoT/MTC is not in scope of the SI, no need for SID update. * Endorse a revised SID with the following editorial changes.  |  | | --- | | * Study potential UE power saving gains compared to the existing Rel-15/16/17 UE power saving mechanisms ~~and their~~ , the coverage availability, as well as latency impact of low-power WUR/WUS. System impact, such as network power consumption, coexistence with non-low-power-WUR UEs, network coverage/capacity/resource overhead should be included in the study [RAN1]   + Note: The need for RAN2 evaluation will be triggered by RAN1 when necessary. |   Hence, using RedCap power model is preferred from our understanding for IoT and wearable case. |
| Sony | OK with the model. Is the intention to decide on a single value for the “additional transition energy”?  Not clear what Nordic are discussing. Our understanding is that this proposal is about the power consumption of the main radio. Our understanding of the SI is that it applies to NR and not eMTC/NB-IoT. |
| CATT | We would like to clarify that the power model for ultra-deep sleep state is the power consumption of the main NR radio for the NR signal processing. The power consumption of LP-WUR is not included. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the first two bullets but do not agree the third bullet.  The device type discussed for main radio of wearable devices/smart phone are very different from that of LPHAP. For example, the memory size needs to be loaded for wearable and smart phone would be different compared with LPHAP. We cannot understand the reason/logic to use option 1 of LPHAP device, directly. More discussion is needed to consider the considered device types of main receiver in this study item.  Before the discussion, could we firstly clarify the following basic questions as we commented online in GTW meeting:   1. Regarding the defined transition time, what is the transition-to state? It is deep sleep or micro sleep or active state? 2. Whether synchronization is included. This may be related with the first question. If the transition-to state is deep sleep, the re-synchronization may not be needed to considered in the transition time here. |
| MediaTek | Agree with the total transition time of 400ms, considering at least micro-processors booting up, significant amount of synchronizations. For additional transition energy, we could consider a higher value, e.g., 20000, based on TR 38.840 with the following calculations:   * 50 (> micro sleep as 45, considering transition between micro sleep to ultra-deep sleep) x 400ms (transition time) = 20000 * 100 (PDCCH/SSB) x 400ms /2 (ramp up from Ultra-deep sleep to PDCCH/SSB) = 20000 |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung | In general, we are okay to reuse the power saving model in TR38.875 and TR38.840.  Regarding the transition time, we would like to clarify the definition of total transition time, e.g. whether transition time includes time for both ramping down and ramping up for transition from non-sleep state to sleep Ultra-deep sleep similar as UE PS.  For the additional transition energy, we would like to reuse the calculation method used in UE PS. |
| Ericsson1 | OK with first two bullets.  3rd bullet - suggest keeping FFS until details are stable. UE assumptions for this new state should be clarified further including e.g., whether each transition results in a new cell search or not (as also indicated by Nokia), and any other impact to idle mode procedures. |
| Apple | It seems that LPHAP inherited some values from NB-IoT study, but we are not sure whether this is reasonable for NR devices or not. Even a RedCap device is much more complicated than a NB-IoT device, which can require larger values in our view. Here is what we would like to propose:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Power State | Relative Power (unit/slot) | Additional transition energy(Note1):  (Relative power x slot) | Total transition time | | Ultra-deep sleep | **[0.03~0.05]** | **[30000-40000]** | **400ms** |   Here the transition time account for the hardware turn-on and the loading of necessary information. The cell acquisition and synchronization is counted separately. For the transition energy, we think it can be more power consuming to turn-on the hardware/modem than signal reception. Therefore we propose a somewhat larger value. |
| CMCC | A clear definition for “Ultra-deep sleep” is needed to align the understandings. For example, when in “Ultra-deep sleep”, only Real Time Clock (RTC) and the GPIO is active in the main radio. |
| FL2 | Regarding the transition-to state? I would assume micro sleep/active state. So that UE need some time for the re-acquire synchronization (which I called it like ‘cold start’). It can be included in the transition time to simplify the model itself.  And to CATT’s comment, yes, the power of ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ is for main radio. [H] Proposals 2B-v1(modified): Take the following power model for main radio for evaluation in LP-WUS/WUR SI,   * For IoT and Wearable cases, reusing TR38.875 power model as baseline. * For eMBB cases, reusing TR38.840 Power model as baseline. * Introduce ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio ~~and reusing power model option 1 value of ‘~~*~~Ultra-deep sleep~~*~~’for LPHAP evaluation, i.e.,~~ * The following power models are used ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio for evaluation  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Power State | Relative Power (unit~~/ms~~) | Additional transition energy(Note1):  (Relative power x ms) | Total transition time | | Ultra-deep sleep | **0.015** | **[2000-20000]** | **[400ms]** |  * Note1: transition time /energy consists of the procedure for [main radio hardware tune on, coarse sync, cell search…] * Other values for ‘Total transition time’ can be considered and report. |
| QC | The exact numbers require further investigation / discussion. But as a starting point, we have the following view.   * The device type we consider is not LPHAP. So, there is no need to be tied to numbers assumed for LPHAP. * Transitional energy   + We don’t agree with 2000. This is unrealistic for NR main radio.   + It would be good to consider **range** of transition energy of **[**20000~40000]. * Transition time of **[**400~1000]ms could be reasonable **range** to consider. |
| FL3 | Regarding the transition-to state? I would assume micro sleep/active state. So that UE need some time for the re-acquire synchronization (which I called it like ‘cold start’). It can be included in the transition time to simplify the model itself.  And to CATT’s comment, yes, the power of ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ is for main radio.  Considering the comments by Nokia and Ericsson on re-sync, the total transition time are considered into two parts, one is for fixed and the other depends on the re-sync time.  The original proposal are split into Proposals 2B and Proposals 2B1. Consider to be finalized this week. [H] Proposals 2B-v1(modified2): Take the following power model for main radio for evaluation in LP-WUS/WUR SI,   * For IoT and Wearable cases, reusing TR38.875 power model as baseline. * For eMBB cases, reusing TR38.840 Power model as baseline. * Introduce ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio ~~and reusing power model option 1 value of ‘~~*~~Ultra-deep sleep~~*~~’for LPHAP evaluation, i.e.,~~   [H] Proposals 2B1-v1(modified):  **Alt1**   * The following power models are used ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio for evaluation  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Power State | Relative Power (unit~~/ms~~) | Additional transition energy(Note1):  (Relative power x ms) | Total transition time | | Ultra-deep sleep | **0.015** | **[2000-20000]** | **[400ms]** |  * Note1: transition time /energy consists of the procedure for [main radio hardware tune on, coarse sync, cell search…] * Other values for ‘Total transition time’ can be considered and report. * The total transition time is for main radio transition from ultra-deep sleep to active   **Alt 2**   * The following power models are used ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio for evaluation  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Power State | Relative Power (unit~~/ms~~) | Additional transition energy(Note1):  (Relative power x ms) | Total transition time | | | Transition time 1 | Transition time 2 | | Ultra-deep sleep | **0.015** | **[2000-20000]** | **[200ms]** | **X** |  * Note1:   + transition time1 consists of the procedure for [main radio hardware tune on, e.g., boot, memory load and etc.]   + transition time2 consists of the procedure for [main radio cell search and etc],     - FFS: X and whether can have different values depending on other factors, e.g., signal-to-noise ratio     - Companies can report the assumption of X in the initial evaluation. * Total transition time is the sum of Transition time 1 and Transition time 2. * The total transition time is for main radio transition from ultra-deep sleep to active. |
| EURECOM | Ok with the updated proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | After transition time, whether the UE need to receive the SSB may have impacts on power consumption calculation. Therefore, more details, e.g., procedure in transition time, should be further discussed. And the following FFS is suggested to make the discussion broader.   * FFS procedure during transition time and definition for additional transition energy and total transition time. * ~~Note1: transition time /energy consists of the procedure for [main radio hardware tune on, coarse sync, cell search…]~~ * ~~Other values for ‘Total transition time’ can be considered and report.~~ |
| Nokia2 | As noted earlier we have some concerns for the proposed total transition time and related note (note1).  In my understanding it contains both ramp-up and ramp-down (as per Rel-16), typically assumed as half and half to each end of the ‘Ultra-deep sleep’. Thus considering only 200ms (or even 400ms), seems bit short for a general assumption for all conditions (radio/SNR), considering that, in the light of the relevant reference for re-synchronization time is 960ms in minimum (based on RAN4 requirement), while we would assume that do not need to do PSS search etc. thus can at least in good SNR operate somewhat faster.  Thus note1 should be only for main radio “boot-up and sub-systems bring-up including internal calibration” and we would need a separate note/wording that the afore value does not include time needed for re-acquiring synchronization. Then the re-synchronization time could be considered in a associated time line, in similar manner as it was considered in Rel-17 power saving evaluations. |
| Everactive | Power should be absolute numbers, not relative. Or, specify the baseline in an absolute power number. |

During the GTW, some basic part has been agreed with some remaining details to be solved. The latest proposals are as follows,

#### [H] Proposals 2B1-v2:

**Alt1**

* The following power models are used ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio for evaluation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Relative Power (unit) | Additional transition energy(Note1):  (Relative power x ms) | Total transition time |
| Ultra-deep sleep | **0.015** | **[2000-20000]** | **[400ms]** |

* Note1: transition time /energy consists of the procedure for [main radio hardware tune on, coarse sync, cell search…]
* Other values for ‘Total transition time’ can be considered and report.
* The total transition time is for main radio transition from ultra-deep sleep to active

**Alt 2**

* The following power models are used ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio for evaluation

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Relative Power (unit) | Additional transition energy(Note1):  (Relative power x ms) | Total transition time | |
| Transition time 1 | Transition time 2 |
| Ultra-deep sleep | **0.015** | **[2000-20000]** | **[200ms]** | **X** |

* Note1:
  + transition time1 consists of the procedure for [main radio hardware tune on, e.g., boot, memory load and etc.]
  + transition time2 consists of the procedure for [main radio cell search and etc],
    - FFS: X and whether/how to have different values depending on other factors, e.g., signal-to-noise ratio
    - Companies can report the assumption of X in the initial evaluation.
* Total transition time is the sum of Transition time 1 and Transition time 2.
* The total transition time is for main radio transition from ultra-deep sleep to active.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are fine with Alt 2 but would suggest to just define “Transition time 1” as “Total transition time” and “Transition time 2” as “Re-Sync time” as we believe that the main radio will already be in an active power state performing PSS/SSS and/or SSB measurements. |
| QC | Transition time depends on the FR, i.e., FR1 may have different value compared to FR2.  We suggest the following modification:  **We do not agree with including 2000 in the transition energy given that device type is clearly different from LPHAP.**   * The following power models are used ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio for evaluation  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Power State | Relative Power (unit) | Additional transition energy(Note1):  (Relative power x ms) | Total transition time | | **Ultra-deep sleep** | **0.015** | **[20000-40000]** | **[400 ms]** | |
| CATT | We prefer Alt 2. We also need to discuss the transition time for UE out-of-sync handling |
| Spreadtrum | Prefer Alt 2. For out-of-sync, if UE stays in idle/inactive state, the main receiver needs to preform cell search once after wake-up or just evaluate the cell (re-)selection criterion? We are confused. |
| Xiaomi | One question, is the additional transition energy include the energy for cell search/Re-sync? If yes, the total transition time in Alt 1 should also include the time for [main radio cell search and etc].If no, then we should have power model for [main radio cell search and etc]. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | * If coarse sync is included in the cell search procedure, then it is OK to be not present in alt 2. Similar, in Note 1 of Alt1, we also need to remove the coarse sync if cell search also exist. * Alt2 is preferred since the procedure during the transition time is clearer and it is more open to discuss the transition time 2 in future. * Additionally, the transition time/energy from active to ultra-deep sleep also needs to be defined. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think Nokia’s point in the last round makes sense. Actually, we think that what we should define is just transition time 1, which consists of the procedure for {main radio hardware tune on to be capable of receiving paging and transmit RACH, e.g., boot, memory load and etc.}. For the time to re-synchronize with the gNB, i.e. the transition time2, it may depend on the LP-WUR design and procedures. Therefore, we think it could be reported by companies.  Regarding the detailed value, we would like to keep one smaller value 100ms and another value 400ms for further study. Also, it should be clarified that the transition time1 is only the ramp-up time.  In our understanding, we should also make clear that this Ultra-deep sleep state is only used in IDLE mode. If considering connected mode, UE needs to load large amount of code into the memory by a quite a long transmission time. We should also clarify that the following transition time is used for IDLE mode.  We could further discuss and converge the value of additional transition energy when we have progress on the power values and transition time.  **Alt 2**   * The following power models are used ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio for evaluation  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Power State | Relative Power (unit) | Additional transition energy(Note1):  (Relative power x ms) | Total transition time | | | Transition time 1 | Transition time 2 | | Ultra-deep sleep | **0.015** | **[2000-20000]** | **[~~2~~100ms, 400ms]** | **X** |  * Note1:   + transition time1 consists of the procedure for [main radio hardware tune on to be capable of receiving paging and transmit RACH, e.g., boot, memory load and etc.], i.e. the ramp-up time.   + transition time2 consists of the procedure for [main radio ~~cell search and~~ to re-synchronization with the serving gNB etc., which may or may not need cell search.],     - FFS: X and whether/how to have different values depending on other factors, e.g., signal-to-noise ratio     - Companies can report the assumption of X in the initial evaluation. * Total transition time is the sum of Transition time 1 and Transition time 2. * The total transition time is for main radio transition from ultra-deep sleep to ~~active~~ micro state in IDLE mode. |
| vivo | Alt1 which is agreed in R18 positioning SI is simpler for companies to perform evaluation. Alt2 can also be considered. And the value X of transition time 2 needs to be reported and explained by companies. |
| Nordic | Even with more details in Alt 1 and Alt2, it is still not clear to us what is difference of ultra-deep sleep from deep sleep/PSM here. “tune on, coarse sync, cell search” is done as well when waking-up from PSM. |
| Nokia3 | The background for the proposed numbers in Alt1 (i.e. 200ms etc.) seems to originate from NB-IoT discussions (R1-1714993), which determines only time needed to ramp-up from deep-sleep (no ramp-down) and does not appear to contain any time for re-synchronization neither (apologizes if I missed it).  As discussed in our paper, the fundamental difference between LTE based systems and NR based system is the amount and frequency of the signals that can be used to synchronize. I.e. in LTE the PSS/SSS come every 5ms and in every slot CRS can be assumed to be present. Thus, it might be appropriate to consider this a bit so that in the end, we have realistic understanding how much earlier e.g. PO, the LP-WUS needs to be send.  As commented earlier, similarly as we did in the e.g. Rel-17 paging enhancement evaluations the transition time covered for hardware related aspects and other, synchronization etc. where covered as a separate time line. Also traditionally the transition time covers both ramp-up and down only. Side note that not sure if it (transition time) needs to be 200ms+200ms or whether some other time is more appropriate to ramp-down.  Hence following modification would be proposed to Alt1:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Alt1**   * The following power models are used ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio for evaluation  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Power State | Relative Power (unit) | Additional transition energy(Note1):  (Relative power x ms) | Total transition time | | Ultra-deep sleep | **0.015** | **[2000-20000]** | **[400ms]** |  * Note1: transition time /energy consists of the procedure for [main radio hardware boot-up, reload memory etc. ~~tune on, coarse sync, cell search…~~] * Note2: Time needed for req-acquiring the synchronization is not included in transition time and needs to be considered in time line (FFS: dependency on other factors, e.g., signal-to-noise ratio) * Other values for ‘Total transition time’ can be considered and report. * The total transition time is for main radio transition from ultra-deep sleep to active | |
| Panasonic | Alt 2 is preferable to us. |
| Samsung | We prefer to define only one transition time which includes hardware booting, memory load and etc. We don’t understand why the cell search procedure should be included in the transition time. Whether cell search is necessary or not can be different according to LP-WUS/WUR design and RRC states of the main radio.  After the transition time is determined, the additional transition energy can be calculated from the transition time. We think that the additional transition energy can be calculated in the same way used in Rel-16 UE PS study.  In addition, the time interval of deep seep state was defined to be larger than the total transition time entering and leaving this state in Rel-16 UE PS. Therefore, we would like to apply the same characteristic for the Ultra-deep sleep. |
| Intel | We prefer Alt 1 and fine with Alt 2. For Alt 2, it is preferred to agree a single X value to align the evaluation assumptions. It can be done by next meeting. |
| SONY | Alt2 seems more reasonable.   * Does “transition time 2” also include synchronization procedure via PSS/SSS and/or SSB measurements? * The transition time/energy from active to ultra-deep sleep should also be defined. * For the additional transition energy, what does “relative power x ms” mean? Are we just saying that the transition energy is measured in ‘unit x ms’? |
| OPPO | We prefer Alt 2. Re-Sync time should be considered in transition time. |
| Apple | The framework suggested by Nokia could be a good way to go, i.e., only the hardware ramp-up time is defined as transition time, and cell search/synchronization is discussed separately. Nokia also had a good point that the ramp off time needs to be considered somehow, so I suggest we add a note for it a least to remind ourselves.  But as we commented earlier, we think 2000 for the transition energy is too small, and we could be fine with the tentative range proposed by QC.  **Alt1**   * The following power models are used ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio for evaluation  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Power State | Relative Power (unit) | Additional transition energy(Note1):  (Relative power x ms) | Total transition time | | Ultra-deep sleep | **0.015** | **[20000-40000]** | **[400ms]** |  * Note1: transition time /energy consists of the procedure for [main radio hardware boot-up, reload memory etc. ~~tune on, coarse sync, cell search…~~] * Note2: Time needed for req-acquiring the synchronization is not included in transition time and needs to be considered in time line (FFS: dependency on other factors, e.g., signal-to-noise ratio) * Other values for ‘Total transition time’ can be considered and report. * The total transition time is for main radio transition from ultra-deep sleep to active. The transition time for main radio transition from active to ultra-deep sleep state is separately considered. |
|  |  |

### 2C: Power model for LP-WUR

* **Futurewei:**

Table : UE Power Consumption Model for LP-WUR.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Characteristics** | **Relative Power** |
| Off | WUR power consumption when turned off | 2e-5 [up to 0.003]\* |
| On | WUR power consumption when turned on | 0.005 [up to 0.15]\* |
| \* Exact value will be dependent on the studied architecture | | |

* **Huawei:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Power state** | **Relative Power** | **Note** |
| **LP-WUR working state** | **0.01 ~ 0.02** | **The architectures proposed in [2] can achieve such a power consumption range, where the one without LO usually consumes more power than the one with LO.** |
| **LP-WUR non-working state** | **0** | **The wakeup receiver is turned off.** |

* **Spreadtrum:** depends on WUR architecture, transition time of LP-WUR should be defined.

***Proposal 2: The power consumption of detection of the LP-WUS can be defined.***

***Proposal 3: At least one type of sleep mode can be defined for the LP-WUR.***

***Proposal 4: The number of categories of power model for the LP-WUR depends on the outcome of discussion of architectures of the LP-WUR.***

***Proposal 5: The transition energy/time should be defined for transition between a sleep mode and active mode for the LP-WUR.***

* **vivo:**

**Proposal 16: For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation, the following power model of LP-WUR is considered.**

* **Note: these value in brackets can be further confirmed based on the progress of LP-WUR architecture.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Absolute Power** | **Relative Power** | **Additional transition energy** | **Total transition time** |
| LP-WUR sleep | [2] μW | **[0.002]** | **0** | **0** |
| LP-WUR monitoring | [30~500] μW | **[0.03~0.5]** | **-** | **-** |

* **Nokia:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Power model  (Idle/inactive-mode operation with reception bandwidth 20 MHz) | |
| **Relative power** | **Transition time and energy**  **(if applicable)** |
| *LP-WUR* |  |  |
| LP-WUS monitoring (LNA ON) | [0.1]\* | [TBD] |
| *LP-WUS monitoring (LNA Off)* | [0.05]\* | [TBD] |
| LP-WUR sleep | [TBD] | [TBD] |

* **CATT:** two types of LP-WUR

**Table 1: Power model for LP-WUR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Characteristics | Relative Power |
| Periodic low power WUS | Front end wakeup receiver is configured to detect the wakeup signals periodically associated with C-DRX or PO. | [0.01 – 0.1] |
| On-demand low-power WUS | Front end wakeup receiver with free-running clock in the active device or passive device monitoring of wakeup signals continuously | [0.001 – 0.01] |

* **Intel:**

**Table 3: Power consumption of LP-WUR**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Active state** | **Inactive state** |
| Deeper Sleep | [100uW – 1mW] | [1-10uW] |

* **ZTE:** need study but no suggest values

***Proposal 7: For LP-WUS, the relative power of WUR on state, WUR off state and the power consumption of WUR on-off transition state should be defined.***

* **MTK:**

**Table 3: LP-WUR power consumption model for FR1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Power (mW)** | **Additional transition energy:**  **(Relative power x ms)** | **Total transition time** |
| WUR off | 2 W |  |  |
| WUR on | 100-500 W | 0 | 0 ms |
| The reference configurations: frequency = 2.6 GHz, BW = 4MHz | | | |

* **Ericsson:** need study but no suggest values

1. For each LP-WUR architecture considered in the study, consider at least the below aspects as part of the LP-WUR power model

* LP-WUR active power when monitoring LP-WUS
* LP-WUR sleep power when not monitoring LP-WUS (when a duty cycle for LP-WUS detection is applicable for the LP-WUR)
* Transition energy and transition time (if any) between above two states
* Transition time and transition energy (if any) for triggering the main radio from a given main-radio sleep state.
* Additional energy (if any) consumed to acquire synchronization for detecting LP-WUS
* **Scaling factors if variable BW operation is supported**
* **Qualcomm:** need study, LP-WUR transition energy and time are assumed to be zero.

**Table 2 WUR Power Model**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sleep type | Relative power | Transition energy:  (Relative power × ms) | Total transition time |
| LP-WUR monitoring power | TBD | 0 | 0 |
| LP-WUR sleep power | TBD |

* **OPPO:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **LP-WUR** | | |
| LP-WUS monitor | Monitoring of low power wake-up signals.  [Two possible working mechanism, i.e., monitor lower power wake-up signals by always on or periodically on manner.] | [0.5] |
| [LP-WUR sleep] | Lower power wake-up radio keeps sleep state when no lower power wake-up signals.  [Monitoring LP-WUS by periodically manner] | [0.01] |

* **Apple:**
* LP WUR
  + The power consumption of WUR during active monitoring
    - It can be further discussed whether the power consumption needs to be differentiated between continuous monitoring and periodic monitoring.
  + The power consumption of WUR when it is not actively monitoring
  + The power consumption of WUR greatly depends on the WUR architecture (related to WUS design) and the performance requirements. Multiple models can be potentially studied to cover different levels of trade-off between power consumption and performance.
* Alt 1 (WUR on: 0.005 [up to 0.15]\*; WUR OFF: 2e-5 [up to 0.003]\*): FutureWei
* Alt 2 (WUR on: 0.01 ~ 0.02; WUR OFF: 0): Huawei
* Alt 3 (WUR on: [0.03~0.5]; WUR OFF: [0.002]): vivo
* Alt 4 (WUR on: [0.1 or 0.05]; WUR OFF: [TBD]): Nokia
* Alt 5 (WUR on: [100uW – 1mW]; WUR OFF: [1-10uW]): Intel
* Alt 6 (WUR on: [100uW – 500uw]; WUR OFF: [2uW]): MTK
* Alt 7 (WUR on: [0.5]; WUR OFF: [0.01]): OPPO

#### [H] Proposals 2C-v1:

* The following power model for LP-WUR/WUS evaluation is considered,
  + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘off’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR does not perform monitoring:
    - [0.001]
  + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring:
    - Option 1: [0.01]
      * *Editor’s Note: adding details if needed*
    - Option 2: [0.5]
      * *Editor’s Note: adding details if need*
  + No additional transition energy and transition time between ‘on’ and ‘off’ state.

Note: A unit of power is defined to be the same for main receiver and LP-WUS receiver.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | if 100uW - 1mW should be 0.01unit then PDCCH monitoring according to 38.840 would consume 1-10W corresponding to 100units?  This does not sound correct. As we pointed out PSM floor in LPWA could be 2.7uA\*3.7V=10uW (there was typo in our contribution). This corresponding to 0.1unit. So 100uW = 1unit, and PDCCH monitoring would then be 10mW which is more realistic. |
| Futurewei | We can consider the evaluation of few LP-WUR architecture categories and their fitness to the different considered use cases.  For example, we can consider the following:  ***Consider evaluation of three receiver architecture categories with active state power consumption defined as***  ***LP-WUR-cat1: [0.5, 1] mW***  ***LP-WUR-cat2: [0.1, 0.5[ mW***  ***LP-WUR-cat3: [0.03, 0.1[ mW***  Note: exact power consumption value for each category is to be determined. |
| Spreadtrum1 | It is tightly coupled with the architecture. Due to the first meeting, we may not draw any conclusion of power model, but we can provide the absolute values of power consumption of the LP-WUR. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | It depends on the outcome of proposal 1B and the mapping relationship between relative power and absolute power should be clarified. |
| vivo | In principle we are fine with FutureWei’s proposal. Perhaps it’s better to provide relative power unit/ms value this meeting in order that companies can perform power analysis.  We consider 1 relative power unit corresponds to 1 mW. |
| Panasonic | Just to clarify the relation between the LP-WUR ’on’ state and Ultra-deep sleep [0.015] for main radio. So the option 1 [0.01] means that when LP-WUR monitors LP-WUR, the power consumption is still lower than the ultra-deep sleep for main radio? |
| Intel | We think Nordic had a good observation. 0.01 unit is too optimistic for LP-WUR  We are fine with Futurewei proposal to evaluation multiple power level of LP-WUR |
| Nokia1 | It is not quite clear if these are meant to be separate LP-WUR architectures or whether these would be operation modes of the same LP-WUR architecture? The number of steps/levels would evidently be dependent on the LP-WUR architecture e.g. of having LNA or not and whether it can or needs to be disabled. So probably we should first attempt to clarify that what is e.g. the expected coverage (while other aspects also matter to the power consumption) and then determine whether we need to consider alternative states/modes for the LP-WUR ‘monitor’ -phase. It maybe sufficient for the first power consumption evaluations to have (initial) conservative value for the LP-WUR consumption and revise that further if needed based on the LP-WUR architecture assumptions. |
| FL | To Nordic,  In power target discussion, different companies proposes the LP-WUR active state power ranges in be 30uW ~ 1mW. And some companies proposing 0.005/0.01/0.03 (that’s why option 1, i.e., 0.01, comes from)as the relative power unit. If 30uW corresponds 0.01 unit, then PDCCH monitoring according to 38.840 would consume 300mW corresponding to 100units. Which in my understanding is still a reasonable power consumption.  To Spreadtrum, ZTE  We still need to provide some options for LP-WUR. It motivates us to know the power saving gain by setting different power consumption targets. Whether it is feasible or not can be decided by architecture studies. Otherwise, we are stopped here because the feasibility study outcome of the architecture may be finished at the end of this SI.  To Panasonic,  For option 1 with 0.01 unit, LP-WUR and main radio can be two different hardware setup, do we need to assume the power consumption with any relation with the ultra-deep sleep for main radio? |
| Sony | The value of LP-WUR power consumption will depend on the outcome of the LP-WUR architecture study. At this stage, maybe we could consider the power consumption of different categories of LP-WUR, for instance in the range of proposal 1B-v1. However, LP-WUR relative power unit needs to be defined to the main radio power units of the respective use-case. It is not very clear how the LP-WUR relative power is calculated. |
| CATT | If the target power of LP-WUS in 1B-v1 is 100 – 500 µW, the relative power of LP-WUS ON state should not be 0.01. Thus, we should be consistent between Proposal 2C-v1 and 1B-v1 by replacing option 1 with value 0.1. If the LP-WUR could achieve lower power consumption, such as 30 µW or 100 nW. the value should also be reasonable. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer finally just to agree relative power values in the power model.  We think the power unit of working state for LP-WUR should depend on the detailed receiver architecture design. Also, we think we could firstly achieve some consensus on the order of 0.0x. Regarding the detailed value of x, we could further make decision after receiver architecture have some progress.   * + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring:     - Option 1: [0.0~~1~~x]       * *Editor’s Note: adding details if needed*       * FFS: x depends on the discussion in receiver architecture   Regarding 0.5, we don’t know what kind of receiver architecture it corresponds to. We need further clarification.  We think some involvement of AI 9.13.2 is needed here to determine the power values. For the time being, it would be sufficient for companies to report their LP-WUR on-state consumption, while waiting for progress in 9.13.2. |
| MediaTek | The value of 0.01 is a challenging target considering it is 1% of eMBB (relative power = 1) and 1.25% of RedCap (relative power =0.8) deep sleep power. We recommend LP-WUR monitoring = 0.1 (optional: 0.05), considering realistic power consumption mapping. |
| OPPO | The target power of LP-WUS should be determined firstly. Then we can discuss the relative power unit for LP-WUR after the clarification of the power consumption corresponds to 1 relative power unit. |
| Samsung | When it comes to calculating the power saving gain, both power consumptions of main radio and the LP-WUR should be jointly considered over same duration. Therefore, as mentioned in the Note, it is desirable to align the unit of relative power of LP-WUS power states and that of the main radio’s power states as investigated in R1-1811897 (Tdoc related to the agreement on the power modeling in Rel-16 UE PS study item).  We think that how the relative power for the LP-WUR can be calculated from the target maximum power consumption of the LP-WUR in the proposal 1B-v1 should be discussed first, if the target maximum power consumption is agreed.  One possible way is that the power consumption per relative power 1 unit which is used for the power model for main radio is determined first. And then, the relative power unit for LP-WUR can be calculated based on the amount of power consumption per 1 unit.  Also, we are wondering how the relative power unit for the LP-WUR off state “0.001” is investigated. What components in LP-WUR are assumed to be operated during the LP-WUR off state. |
| Ericsson1 | Different LP-WUR/WUS designs would result in different LP-WUR power model assumptions. So, the architecture discussion should progress a bit more before agreeing to LP\_WUR power model. In our view, a specific LP-WUR power model should be associated with a set of WUR characteristics such a noise figure etc. to enable proper investigation of different trade-offs. |
| Apple | I think there are two issues here: (1) the absolute power consumption target, which is covered by P1-B. (2) how to covert the absolute power consumption into relative power consumption.  On (1), since the absolute power consumption depends on the WUR architecture, one possible approach to take during the evaluation is to select two or three values to cover the range. For example, if our target is 100uW to 1mW, we could select 3 values: 100 uW, 500 uW and 1 mW. Once the picture of WUR architecture and the corresponding power consumption becomes clearer, we can map to one or more values being evaluated. This can greatly remove the dependency of the power saving evaluation on the architecture discussion.  On (2), this is indeed very important for the power model. For example, according to FL, 300 mW is considered as a reasonable power consumption for PDCCH (which we also tend to agree on the ballpark), this translates into 3 mW for 1 relative power unit. Such kind of assumption is necessary for the conversion. Assuming we use 3 mW as 1 unit, then 100 uW, 500 uW and 1 mW become roughly 0.03, 0.17, 0.3, respectively. |
| CMCC | A clear definition for LP-WUR ‘off’ state is needed to align the understandings. For example, when in LP-WUR ‘off’ state, only Real Time Clock (RTC) and the GPIO is active in the LP-WUR. |
| FL2 | The values here are for the purpose of studying the power saving gain by comparing different options from design target perspective. And whether which options are more feasible or perhaps all are feasible can be discussed in the receiver architecture.  So far, I see mainly categories  Cat 1: 0.005/0.01~0.02/0.03/0.05  Cat 2: 0.1/0.5  Based on these, I propose the followings [H] Proposals 2C-v1(modified):  * The following power model for LP-WUR/WUS evaluation is considered,   + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘off’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR does not perform monitoring:     - [0.001]   + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring:     - Option 1: [0.005/0.01~0.02/0.03/0.05]       * *Editor’s Note: choose a value within the range, e.g., 0.02*     - Option 2: [0.1/0.5]       * *Editor’s Note: Editor’s Note: choose a value within the range, e.g., 0.3*   + No additional transition energy and transition time between ‘on’ and ‘off’ state.   Note1: A unit of power is defined to be the same for main receiver and LP-WUS receiver.  Note2: the values provided is for the purpose of studying power saving gain, and whether it is feasible or not from LP-WUR perspective are depending on the receiver architecture discussion. |
| QC | The relative power number for LP-WUR is used just for evaluation of total power consumption for feasibility study.  We think it is important to consider **wide range** of LP-WUS monitoring power in study since it can later tell us about **what are the acceptable ranges of power consumption for LP-WUR, i.e., power budget for LP-WUR compared to main radio power consumption**.  Another reason we need range of power is uncertainty in mapping between relative number and absolute number.  Assuming rough mapping from relative power of 1 to 1mW, we suggested wide ranges of relative powers for LP-WUR monitoring: [0.01, …, 0.1, 1, 2, 4]. |
| FL3 | The values here are for the purpose of studying the power saving gain by comparing different options from design target perspective. And whether which options are more feasible or perhaps all are feasible can be discussed in the receiver architecture.  So far, I see mainly categories  Cat 1: 0.005/0.01~0.02/0.03/0.05  Cat 2: 0.1/0.5  Based on these, I propose the followings [H] Proposals 2C-v1(modified2):  * The following power model for LP-WUR/WUS evaluation is considered,   + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘off’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR does not perform monitoring:     - [0.001]   + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring:     - Option 1: [0.005/0.01~0.02/0.03/0.05]       * *Editor’s Note: suggest to choose a value within the range, e.g., 0.02 as baseline,*     - Option 2: [0.1/0.5/1]       * *Editor’s Note: suggest to choose a value within the range, e.g., 0.5 as baseline,*     - Others values are not precluded to be evaluated.   + No additional transition energy and transition time between ‘on’ and ‘off’ state.   Note1: A unit of power is defined to be the same for main receiver and LP-WUS receiver.  Note2: the values provided is for the purpose of studying power saving gain, and it can be further revisit depending on the receiver architecture discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For option2, [0.1/0.5] can be changed as [0.1~0.5]  For additional transition energy and transition time between LP-WUR ‘on’ and ‘off’ state, whether it can be ignored especially for periodic LP-WUS should be further studied. For always-on LP-WUS, it can be ignored.   * + No additional transition energy and transition time between ‘on’ and ‘off’ state for always-on LP-WUS.     - FFS periodic LP-WUS |
| Nokia2 | I assume the option1 and option2 could also be seen as a different modes of the LP-WUR e.g. LNA ON and LNA OFF? |
| Everactive | LP-WUR Power consumption:  <1mW for LP-WUR active power (receiver on, receiving LP-WUS or synchronizing to signal)  <10µW for LP-WUR idle power (but with oscillator running, and retaining state)  Also agree we need to study transition time between LP-WUR states, and the transition from LP-WUR to MR receiving. |

The latest proposal is as follows,

#### [H] Proposals 2C-v2:

* The following power model for LP-WUR/WUS evaluation is considered,
  + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘off’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR does not perform monitoring:
    - [0.001]
  + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring:
    - Option 1: [0.005/0.01~0.02/0.03/0.05]
      * *Editor’s Note: suggest to choose a value within the range, e.g., 0.02 as baseline,*
    - Option 2: [0.1/0.5/1]
      * *Editor’s Note: suggest to choose a value within the range, e.g., 0.5 as baseline,*
    - Others values are not precluded to be evaluated.
  + No additional transition energy and transition time between ‘on’ and ‘off’ state.

Note1: A unit of power is defined to be the same for main receiver and LP-WUS receiver.

Note2: the values provided is for the purpose of studying power saving gain, and it can be further revisit depending on the receiver architecture discussion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal of considering, e.g., 0.02 and 0.5, as two baseline values and other values can be reported during evaluation. |
| QC | The original intention is well captured in following FL comment.  “The values here are for the purpose of studying the power saving gain by comparing different options from design target perspective. And whether which options are more feasible or perhaps all are feasible can be discussed in the receiver architecture.”  **Since this is just for studying various ranges of power values** and investigating impact on total power consumption and power saving gain, wider range of LP-WUR power consumption should be allowed.  There is no need to have two Options. Instead, we suggest unifying the options by having one set with different values.  [0.01, 0.03, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 2, 4]  We think there is no valid reason not to include values like 2 or 4 for study purpose.  FFS: LP-WUR power consumption values for FR2. |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposed value. |
| Spreadtrum | We support Option 2 for “on” state. Also, QC’s version is fine for us. |
| Xiaomi | To decide the relative values for LP WUR, we need to know the absolute power values corresponding to relative value “1”.(Maybe R16 Power Saving expert can clarify about this since TR 38.840 is developed in R16.)  Since we already have a proposal about the absolute value for LP WUR, it is necessary to match the absolute and relative values for LP WUR. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For additional transition energy and transition time between LP-WUR ‘on’ and ‘off’ state, whether it can be ignored especially for periodic LP-WUS with high relative power, e.g.1, should be further studied. For always-on LP-WUS, it can be ignored.   * + No additional transition energy and transition time between ‘on’ and ‘off’ state for always-on LP-WUS.     - FFS periodic LP-WUS |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For option 2, ZTE’s last round comment is correct. We should revise it to a range, as the editor note claimed. For option 2, we can be fine to pick a value in the range of [0.1~0.5]. [H] Proposals 2C-v2 revised by HW:  * The following power model for LP-WUR/WUS evaluation is considered,   + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘off’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR does not perform monitoring:     - [0.001]   + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring:     - Option 1: [0.005/0.01~0.02/0.03/0.05]       * *Editor’s Note: suggest to choose a value within the range, e.g., 0.02 as baseline,*     - Option 2: [0.1~~/~~ ~ 0.5~~/1~~]       * *Editor’s Note: suggest to choose a value within the range, e.g., 0.3~~5~~ as baseline,*     - Others values are not precluded to be evaluated.   + No additional transition energy and transition time between ‘on’ and ‘off’ state.   Note1: A unit of power is defined to be the same for main receiver and LP-WUS receiver. |
| vivo | We are OK in principle. Besides, there are lots of candidate values for both two options, considering the simulation workload, we suggest to restrict the categorizations and choices, only e.g. 0.02 and 0.5. |
| Nordic | As part of agreement must be that  [0.01, 0.03, 0.1, 0.5, 1, 2, 4]  maps roughly to  [30uW, 90 uW, 300 uW, 1.5mW ….]  and PDCCH monitoring of 100units then would be 300mW. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Panasonic | As which option is very much dependent on the assumed architecture of LP-WUR, for evaluation purpose, it is sufficient to have a range with a lower bound and upper bound for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, e.g. 0.02~1. |
| Samsung | For the relative power unit for LP-WUR on-state, we are ok to choose one value among suggested values within the range.  For the relative power unit for LP-WUR off-state, it is not clear the basis of the relative power unit for the LP-WUR off state “0.001”. Because the power consumption can be different depending on which components in the LP-WUR are assumed to be operated during the LP-WUR off state. Also, it can affect whether additional transition energy and transition time can be ignored or not. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposed value. QC proposal on evaluating more values is fine for us too, which give us better insight on LP-WUS based operation. |
| SONY | Support the proposal.  We understand that the different options would relate to different LP-WUR architectures. By performing the power saving evaluation with the two options, RAN1 can decide whether we need to go for a really, really low power WUR (option 1) or simply a low power WUR (option 2). |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson2 | Agree with suggestions to unify the options by having one set with different values. The range indicated by QC would be good starting point for the evaluations. |
| Apple | We slightly prefer the approach that QC suggested to have a few more numbers to cover the range. It will make it easier for us to map the actual power consumption to the relative number later. But to avoid overwhelming evaluation load, we would suggest something like 0.02, 0.1, 0.5, 1. |
|  |  |

### 2D: Assumptions for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE

**a) parameters setting, including paging rate, paging cycle, eDRX cycle, traffic model, RRM, cell search, sync procedure**

* paging DRX cycle (1.28s): Futurewei, vivo, spreadtrum
* paging rate (1% or 10%): Huawei, spreadtrum, vivo
* eDRX cycle (48 DRX cycles = 61.44s): Futurewei, vivo, Nokia
* PTW duration (8 DRX cycles =10.24s): Futurewei, vivo, Nokia
* Traffic model (reuse that of 38.875 or 38.840):
  + 38.875 traffic models including heartbeat or instant messaging: vivo, Futurewei, MTK, Ericsson , OPPO
  + 38.840 traffic models including FTP3 or VoIP: CATT, sharp
  + Qualcomm (IoT traffic model: inter-arrival time: [tens of min to hours])
  + interD (FTP 3: mean arrival🡪 200ms or 2s)
* RRM measurement: Nokia, Apple, ZTE
* Cell search: Nokia, spreadtrum,
* Sync procedure: Nokia, Ericsson
* Other assumptions: R17 PEI assumptions. 38.802, 38.840—Apple, CATT, Ericson, QUALCOMM

**b) Total latency introduced by LP-WUS or LP-WUS processing timeline related assumptions:**

* depends on whether UE should do PO monitoring after wakeup—Huawei; spreadtrum, Nokia, Intel, ZTE, vivo (PO need to be monitored), Xiaomi (consider both legacy PO or enhanced PO monitoring)
* depends on RRM measurement—spreadtrum (relaxed if or not), ZTE (should be assumed)
* depends on whether the main receiver needs to perform cell search after wakeup.—spreadtrum
* depends on LP-WUR always-on vs. periodically-on –spreadtrum, CATT, OPPO, vivo
* depends on whether LP-WUS can be used to support/assist re-synchronization or time/frequency tracking—Nokia, Ericsson
* **Futurewei:**

**Table 4: List of Initial Evaluation Parameters and Values**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Definition / Description** | **Value** |
| *T* | Transaction Cycle – average inter-arrival time. | 60 (s) |
| *A* | DRX Cycle. | 1.28 (s) |
| *B* | eDRX Cycle. | 61.44 (s) |
| *PTW* | Paging Time Window - on period/duration of eDRX cycle when eDRX cycle is radio frames. | 10.24 (s) |
|  | Total relative power for each RRC connection duration. | 3000 (unit.ms) |
| *BW* | System Bandwidth. | 20 (MHz) |
| *D* | Total time required to process a LP-WUS and wake-up the main radio (i.e., from standby power state). | 101 (ms) |

***Proposal 4: A set of use cases and corresponding traffic models and power saving schemes parameters needs to be defined for proper evaluation/comparison with power consumption and latency of LP-WUS.***

* **Huawei:** paging rate per UE =1%, total latency introduced by LP-WUS depends on whether it should do PO monitoring.

1. ***For evaluation purposes, the per-UE paging rate is assumed to be 1%, which is the same as in earlier releases.***

Depending on the detailed design of LP-WUS, the total latency introduced by LP-WUS and its subsequent procedures is different. For example, if LP-WUS carries per UE paging information, the latency is just the transition time above. As another example, if LP-WUS carries per UE group paging information, after turning on the main receiver the UE may need to receive legacy PO, then latency includes transition time and legacy paging reception.

1. ***RAN1 needs to agree assumptions for the total latency introduced by LP-WUS, depending on the information the signal conveys, i.e. depending on the subsequent procedures assumed in the UE.***

* **Spreadtrum: need to consider the following four assumptions:**

1. whether the main receiver should still monitor PO after wakeup,
2. whether the measurement is relaxed or not at the main receiver, and
3. whether the main receiver needs to perform cell search after wakeup.
4. LP-WUR always-on vs. periodically-on

* Paging rate is 1%
* Group-paging-rate is 10% (assuming 10 UEs in a group)
* Paging cycle is 1280ms or above

***Proposal 8: The baseline evaluation assumptions should be determined, e.g.***

* ***paging rate,***
* ***group-paging-rate,***
* ***paging cycle,***
* ***link-level performance requirement for the LP-WUR, and***
* ***CFO requirement and the number of SS bursts to be processed for the main receiver.***

***Proposal 9: The additional evaluation assumptions should be studied and determined as much as possible, e.g.***

* ***always-on vs. periodically-on,***
* ***whether the LP-WUS supports beam sweeping or not,***
* ***whether the main receiver should still monitor PO after wakeup,***
* ***whether the measurement is relaxed or not at the main receiver, and***
* ***whether the main receiver needs to perform cell search after wakeup.***

***Observation 6: Assumption of always-on or periodically-on impacts KPIs widely.***

***Observation 7: Assumption of whether the LP-WUS supports beam sweeping or not impacts at least the resource overhead and the coverage.***

***Observation 8: Assumption of whether the main receiver should still monitor PO after wakeup impacts KPIs widely.***

***Observation 9: Assumption of whether the measurement is relaxed or not at the main receiver at least impacts the mobility.***

***Observation 10: Assumption of whether the main receiver needs to perform cell search after the main receiver is turned on at least impacts the latency and the power saving gain.***

***Observation 11: If the main receiver needs to perform cell search after wakeup, the main receiver can stay in a completely-off state before wakeup.***

* **vivo:**

**Table 5. Key evaluation assumptions for I-DRX paging and PEI**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Value** |
| Paging cycle length | 1.28s |
| Number of SSB before PO | 1, 2 or 3, (used for AGC adjustment, T/F tracking, serving cell and intra-F measurement) |
| Number of SSB after PO | 1, (used for inter-F measurement);  0, (for High SINR case). |
| Number of SSB before PEI | 1, (used for PEI PDCCH receiving) |

**Table 6. Evaluation assumptions for traffic model or paging rate**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Option 1: Traffic model**  (based on TR 38.875[4]) | Heart beat traffic model   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Model** | FTP3 | | **Packet size** | 100 Bytes | | **Mean inter-arrival time** | 60s (per UE paging rate≈2%) | |
| **Option 2:**  **Per PO/UE paging rate** | 10%; 1% |

**Table 7. eDRX configuration**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Value** |
| PTW length | 8 paging cycles, i.e. 10.24 s |
| eDRX cycle length | 48 paging cycles, i.e. 61.44s |

**Proposal 18: The evaluation assumptions given in Table 4~7 should be considered for R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation in RRC idle/inactive mode.**

* **Nokia**: detect a number of SSBs for re-synchronization; serving cell evaluations; Beacon, Paging procedure

**Table 2. Power saving evaluation assumptions.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| *Numerology* | |
| Subcarrier spacing | 30 kHz |
| Bandwidth | 20 MHz |
| TDD frame structure | 6 DL : 4 UL, repeated every 5 ms |
| Number of beams | 8 |
| *Paging* | |
| DRX cycle | 1.280 seconds (2560 slots) |
| eDRX cycle | 48 DRX cycles |
| PTW | 8 DRX cycles |
| Paging probability per DRX cycles | [10/48] % (unless noted otherwise) |
| Number of PDCCHs/PDSCHs/EPI received per PEI-O/PO | 8 |
| Number of EPI slots used for detection | 1 |
| Number of subgroups | 1 (unless noted otherwise) |
| *Synchronization* | |
| SSB periodicity | 20 ms |
| SSB burst duration | 2 ms (4 slots) |
| Number of SSB bursts received prior to PO | 1/2/3 for high/med/low SINR |
| Time duration for serving cell SSS acquisition if main receiver was in power off state Note1 | 4(80)/8(160)/12(240) SSB periods (slots) |
| Number of SSB bursts received prior to PEI-O | 1 |
| Offset from SSB to PO | 10 ms |
| Offset from SSB to PEI-O | 2 ms |
| *Measurements* | |
| SMTC window for intra-frequency RRM measurements | 2 ms (4 slots) |
| SMTC window for inter-frequency RRM measurements | 5 ms (10 slots) |
| Time to switch frequency layer | 0.5ms (1 slot) |
| Cell search rate | 25 % |
| Note1: Power based on neighbor cell search power per freq. layer, Pinter, search-only, per slot is assumed for the duration. | |



Figure : Timeline of set of process followed by 5G modem upon receiving wake-up interrupt from LP-WUR.

**Observation 3: The power consumption model developed in Rel-16 and Rel-17 would need to be updated to account LP-WUR power consumption, based on the selected LP-WUR reference architecture**

**Observation 4: For Idle/Inactive mode enhancements, if main receiver is assumed to be in power off state deep sleep for the duration of inactivity, the time line would need to accommodate the time taken to detect a number of SSBs for re-synchronization prior full reception capabilities are resumed.**

The minimum time for PSS/SSS detection, SSB index acquisition and SSB measurement (Tidentify\_intra\_with\_index = (TPSS/SSS\_sync\_intra + TSSB\_measurement\_period\_intra + TSSB\_time\_index\_intra)) is 600ms+120ms+200ms(=960ms), or greater if SMTC period is long. However, these requirements are only for the situation that UE is already synchronised to a (serving) cell in CONNECTED mode and searching for a new neighbouring cell. Hence, it is assumed that the UE already has a fine synchronisation to the network. **Thus, it would seem that rather long time may need to be reserved for the main receiver to re-acquire synchronisation.** This would of course depend on for example on the LP-WUR architecture and LP-WUS design, if they can facilitate e.g. tracking the timing and oscillator accuracy.

**Observation 5: If power off state (below deep sleep state) is considered for the main receiver, sufficient time would need to be assumed to allow the (main) receiver to acquire synchronization. This would be dependent on the time tracking capability/support of the LP-WUR/WUS.**

**Observation 6: For both, Idle/Inactive and Connected mode evaluations, the needed serving cell evaluations would need to be accounted.**

**Proposal 8: Account the evaluation assumptions presented in Table 1 and Table 2 for definition of power saving evaluation assumptions including the timeline for re-synchronisation after main receiver wake-up from power off.**

Re-Synchronisation Signal

**Proposal 11: Consider the feasibility of using the LP-WUS to support/assist re-synchronization or time/frequency tracking.**

Beacon style signal

**Proposal 12: Consider the feasibility of using the LP-WUS to support coverage determination.**

Paging procedure

**Proposal 13: Consider the feasibility of different paging procedures for LP-WUS.**

* **CATT:**  38.802+38.840 simulation assumptions; continuously or with duty-cycle of LP-WUR monitoring.

**System level simulation assumptions: 38.802**

**Traffic model used for the low-power wakeup receiver**

**Table 5: Parameters of Traffic model used for the evaluation of LP-WUR**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **FTP traffic** | **Instant messaging** | **VoIP** |
| Model | FTP model 3 | FTP model 3 | 40 bytes payload (AMR12.2 kbps) with inter-arrival time of 20 ms  50% activity factor; |
| Packet size | 0.5 Mbytes | 0.1 Mbytes |
| Mean inter-arrival time | 200 ms | 2 sec |
| DRX setting | Period = 160 ms  Inactivity timer = 100 ms | Period = 320 ms  Inactivity timer = 80 ms | Period = 40 ms  Inactivity timer = 10 ms |

Note: For ON duration setting, following reference DRX configurations as previously agreed.

**System Configurations:**

**Table 6: Reference DRX configuration for the evaluation of LP-WUR**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Configuration** | | |
| DRX Cycle | On duration | Inactivity Timer |
| DRX configuration | 320msec | FR1: 10 msec  FR2: 5 msec | {200, 80} |
| 160 msec | FR1: 8 ms  FR2: 4 ms | {100, 40} |
| 40 ms | FR1: 4 ms  FR2: 2 ms | {25, 10} |
| eDRX configuration | 10.24 sec | Paging Occasion |  |
| 40.96 sec | Paging Occasion |  |

**Proposal 2: The wakeup receiver could be configured to monitor wake up signals continuously for on-demand access or with duty-cycle to align with the periodicity of DRX for CONNECTED mode UE or PO for IDLE/Inactive mode UE**

* **Intel:** LP-WUS is assumed to replace PEI, further LP-WUS carry more information than PEI such as PO information.



Figure 2: LP-WUS to replace PEI PDCCH

* In Figure 2A, the UE detects a valid indication of the LP-WUS (ON) that the paging sub-group for the UE is triggered. Then, the UE can wake up the main receiver for the detection in the associated paging occasion (PO). The UE may need to detect multiple SSBs for serving cell RRM and/or fine time/frequency synchronization which are required prior to the reception of paging PDSCH.
* In Figure 2B, the difference from Figure 2A is the availability of TRS for IDLE/INACTIVE state. After the main receiver is turned on, UE may detect one SSB for RRM and one additional TRS for fine time/frequency synchronization for the reception of paging PDSCH.
* If LP-WUS can provide a RRM measurement or no RRM is necessary in the current paging cycle, the UE may detect only the TRS for fine time/frequency synchronization for the reception of paging PDSCH in Figure 2C.
* Finally, if a UE doesn’t detect a wake-up signal for the UE in Figure 2D, the UE may not wake up the main receiver at all.

**Proposal 1:** For idle/inactive mode

* Performance metrics include ratio of power consumption reduction, latency reduction
* In the modeling, LP-WUS is assumed to replace PEI PDCCH
* Study LP-WUS to provide more information than PEI PDCCH
* **ZTE:** RRM measurement should be assumed. paging latency: data arrival time to its PO.

***Proposal 8: For LP-WUS, RRM measurement assumptions should be determined.***

***Proposal 10: For LP-WUS latency evaluation, paging arrival time, position relationship between LP-WUS and corresponding PO, and LP-WUS monitoring mechanism should be determined.***



Figure 2 Paging delay

* **MTK:** reuse the traffic model in TR 38.875 including heartbeat and instant messaging.

**Table 6: baseline traffic models for FR1**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Instant messaging** | **Heartbeat** | **VoIP** |
| Model | FTP model 3 | FTP model 3 | As defined in R1-070674. Assume max two packets bundled. |
| Packet size | 0.1 Mbytes | 100 Bytes |
| Mean inter-arrival time | 2 seconds | 60 seconds |
| DRX setting | Period = 320 ms Inactivity timer = **20** ms 'On' duration: 10 ms | C-DRX cycle 640 ms Inactivity timer **80** ms 'On' duration: 10 ms | Period = 40 ms Inactivity timer = **10** ms 'On' duration: 4 ms |

Details of SLS parameters are in the appendix.

1. For UE power and latency evaluation, reuse the traffic model in TR 38.875 as the baseline.

* **Ericsson:** reuse **TR 38.875 traffic models; reuse TR 38.838 and TR 38.840 traffic models;** **Additional energy (if any) consumed to acquire synchronization; paging latency (define from traffic arrival time to its PO) for both RRC idle and RRC connected modes.**

**Proposal 1 For evaluating IoT and wearable use cases, consider the mMTC traffic model in ITU M.2412, and the heartbeat and instant messaging traffic models in 3GPP TR 38.875. For evaluating other use cases (e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones), the corresponding traffic models in TR 38.838 and TR 38.840 can be considered.**

1. For each LP-WUR architecture considered in the study, consider at least the below aspects as part of the LP-WUR power model

* LP-WUR active power when monitoring LP-WUS
* LP-WUR sleep power when not monitoring LP-WUS (when a duty cycle for LP-WUS detection is applicable for the LP-WUR)
* Transition energy and transition time (if any) between above two states
* Transition time and transition energy (if any) for triggering the main radio from a given main-radio sleep state.
* Additional energy (if any) consumed to acquire synchronization for detecting LP-WUS
* **Scaling factors if variable BW operation is supported**

1. For power saving evaluations, consider impact of DRX/Paging configuration assumptions for the UE and impact of false wake-up of main radio due to LP-WUR false alarms.
2. For RRC-Idle mode evaluations, impact of LP-WUS/WUR operation on paging latency (e.g., time between the arrival of paging message at gNB and the reception of PDCCH with P-RNTI and any associated PDSCH by the UE) should be considered.
3. For RRC-Connected mode evaluations, impact of LP-WUS/WUR operation on scheduling latency (e.g., time between arrival of DL data at gNB and the corresponding PDCCH scheduling the data to UE) should be considered.

* **Qualcomm:** reuse 38.840; IoT traffic model

**Proposal 3: Use existing 38.840 power model and discuss/agree on additional assumptions based on evaluation done during Rel-17 UE power saving WI as starting point.**

**Additional assumptions made during R17 power saving (UEPS) WI include**

* + **Idle mode wakeup timeline in low/high SNR**
  + **SSB monitoring for RRM (serving cell / neighbor cell)**
  + **PO monitoring**

**Proposal 7: Introduce IoT traffic model with very sparse traffic arrival.**

**Group paging**

**Poisson page arrival with average paging inter-arrival time: [tens of min to hours]**

**Latency requirements to be considered.**

* + **E.g., [0.5]sec for actuator control/wearable, [1-60]sec for location tracking and on-demand sensing**
* **Samsung:** latency defined as from gNB transmits LP-WUS to main radio receives the PDSCH
* **OPPO:** reuse 38.875 traffic models; LP-WUR monitor LP-WUS by always on or periodically manner;

Traffic model used for the UE power saving scheme evaluation

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Instant messaging | Heartbeat | VoIP |
| Model | FTP model 3 | FTP model 3 | As defined in R1-070674 [7]. Assume max two packets bundled. |
| Packet size | 0.1 Mbytes | 100 Bytes |
| Mean inter-arrival time | 2 seconds | 60 seconds |
| DRX setting | Period = 320 ms  Inactivity timer = 80 ms | C-DRX cycle 640 ms  Inactivity timer {200, 80} ms | Period = 40 ms  Inactivity timer = 10 ms |

**Proposal 2: Working mechanism for LP-WUR should be determined first, i.e. it need to determine LP-WUR monitor LP-WUS by always on or periodically manner**

* **InterDigital:** use FTP traffic and Instant messaging

Traffic model

* + FTP traffic and Instant messaging used for power saving (Table 3) can be used as baseline. Other traffic models can be considered as optional if needed.

Table 3 Traffic model

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | FTP traffic | Instant messaging |
| Model | FTP model 3 | FTP model 3 |
| Packet size | 0.5 Mbytes | 0.1 Mbytes |
| Mean inter-arrival time | 200 ms | 2 sec |
| DRX setting | Period = 160 ms  Inactivity timer = 100 ms | Period = 320 ms  Inactivity timer = 80 ms |

***Proposal 5: FTP traffic and Instant messaging used for power saving (Table 3) can be used as baseline.***

* **Xiaomi:** whether consider PO after detected LP-WUS: 1, legacy PO monitoring, 2, enhanced PO monitoring.



Fig.1 Case 1, LP WUS and legacy paging mechanism



Fig.2 Case 2, LP WUS and enhanced paging mechanism

***Proposal 1: For RRC idle/inactive state, two use cases can be considered for evaluation:***

***Case 1, LP WUS combined with legacy paging mechanism;***

***Case 2, LP WUS combined with enhanced paging mechanism***

* **Sharp:** reuse 38840 FTP 3 traffic model
* **Traffic model**

In the R16/R17 UE power saving study, the mandatory traffic model is FTP model 3 with 0.5Mbyte payload and mean inter-arrival time of 200 milliseconds.

**Observation 4: The traffic model can use the same assumptions as the R16 power savings study.**

* **Apple: 38.840 assumptions,** RRM measurements enhancement need to be considered.

***Proposal 4: For WUS evaluation, use the evaluation methodology and power model defined in TR 38.840 as the baseline. Additionally, define the following parameters for UE power model:***

***Proposal 6: RRM measurement enhancements should be considered as part of LP WUS/WUR evaluation.***

* **Nordic:** R16 LPWA is a power consumption reference

The WID states that LP-WUS power saving should be compared with the “existing Rel-15/16/17 UE power saving mechanisms”. We think that benchmark should not be R17 NR PEI, but R16 LPWA, such as NB-IoT or LTE-M.

***Proposal-3: R16 LPWA is a power consumption reference for LP-WUS.***

**c) baseline schemes setting, e.g. paging I-DRX and/ or eDRX; with PEI or not.**

* Alt 1 (paging DRX and eDRX, w/wo PEI): FutureWei, vivo, ZTE, OPPO, Nokia
* Alt 2 (R17 PEI and TRS for paging): Huawei, spreadtrum, CATT (R16 CDRX+DCP for connected mode),
* **Futurewei:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Power Saving Scheme** | |
|
| *LP-WUS* | - |
| *DRX* | w/o PEI |
| w/ PEI |
| *eDRX* | w/o PEI |
| w/ PEI |

* **Huawei:** Rel-17 PEI and potential TRS occasions are taken as baseline mechanism

1. ***Rel-17 PEI and potential TRS occasions are taken as baseline mechanism for power saving gain evaluation.***

* **Spreadtrum:**  R17 PEI

***Proposal 7: The power saving gain can be the additional power saving gain compared with R17 UE power saving techniques, e.g. R17 PEI.***

* **vivo:** I-DRX paging and eDRX

**Table 4. The evaluation power saving schemes for RRC idle/inactive mode.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Schemes** | **Description** |
| **Baseline 1-1: I-DRX Paging without PEI** | Assume low, medium, high SINR cases |
| **Baseline 1-2: I-DRX Paging with PEI** | Assume low, medium, high SINR cases |
| **Baseline 2-1: eDRX without PEI** | Assume low, medium, high SINR cases |
| **Baseline 2-2: eDRX with PEI** | Assume low, medium, high SINR cases |
| **LP-WUS/WUR** | After receiving the LP-WUS, UE’s main radio will be turned on and the UE is required to monitoring its PO. |

**Proposal 17: For comparison with R18 LP-WUS/WUR, both I-DRX paging and eDRX can be taken as baseline schemes.**

* **CATT:**  R17 paing+PEI; R16 CDRX+DCP for connected mode

**Proposal 7: The baseline configuration for the study of low-power wakeup receiver should be the latest power saving techniques as follows,**

* **CONNECTED mode: Rel-16 DRX adaptation with UE wakeup indication from DCI format 2\_6**
* **IDLE/Inactive mode: Rel-17 paging enhancement with Paging Early Indication from DCI format 2\_7**
* **ZTE:**  reuse 38.840. eDRX configuration

Table 2 Paging rate

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| paging rate per PO | Paging rate per group | | Paging rate per UE |
| 4 | 8 |
| 10% | 2.6% | 1.3% | 0.3% |

***Proposal 9: System configurations including paging rate and DRX cycle configuration in TR38.840 can be reused. eDRX configuration(s) can be chosen from existing eDRX configurations.***

* **OPPO:**  Paging cycle with PEI and eDRX with PEI can be the baseline scheme.

#### [H] Proposals 2D-v1:

For RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, the i-DRX and eDRX are considerd as baseline schemes. The following is assumed for evaluation,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Value** |
| i-DRX cycle length | 1.28s, consider both with PEI/ without PEI |
| e-DRX cycle length | 20.48s, 61.44s, company to report which value(s) are used |
| # POs | 1 |
| # PTW | 4 |
| i-DRX cycle length | 1.28s |
| Number of SSB before PO / PEI | 1, 2 or 3, (used for e.g., AGC adjustment, T/F tracking, serving cell and intra-F measurement)  company to report which value(s) are used |
| Number of SSB after PO | 1, (used for inter-F measurement);  0, (for High SINR case). |
| RRM Measurement | Company to report how the RRM measurement is assumed, e.g., RRM performed by main radio or LP-WUS receiver. |
| LP-WUS monitoring | Option 1: continuously monitoring  Option 2: discontinuously monitoring, with [T] ms as the period for complete an on-and-off cycle, and [D] ms as the active time for monitoring LP-WUS every cycle. |
| Traffic | Option 1:  Per PO/UE paging rate = ([10%], [1%])  Option 2:  Reusing TR 38.875 heart beat traffic model   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Model | FTP3 | | Packet size | 100 Bytes | | Mean inter-arrival time | 60s (per UE paging rate≈2%) |   Model RRC connection phase power consumption as follows,   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RRC connection duration | 30ms | | Relative enery consumption of RRC connection block (Relative power x ms) | 30ms\*100 =3000 | |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | for baseline study only the case with PEI (if NR is the choice of baseline ). And only Option 1 traffic model. OK to make “without PEI” and “Option 2 traffic model” as optional. |
| Futurewei | We are in general OK with the listed assumptions but would like to clarify the behavior of the main radio in conjunction with LP-WUR as the main radio’s behavior and the content of the LP-WUS can have an impact on the power consumoption and latency evaluation results. For example, if the LP-WUS contains the paged UE’s unique address, the main radio does not have to monitor the PO and the per PO paging rate is irrelevant. So, we suggest considering the following options for the evaluation:  LP-WUS Option 1: Uniquely-addressed  LP-WUS Option 1: Group-addressed and a group paing rate X  Main Radio Option 1: Monitors legacy PO after wake-up  Main Radio Option 2: Monitors newly configured PO after wake-up  Main Radio Option 3: Does not need to monitor any POs after wake-up |
| Spreadtrum1 | Generally agree. Share the similar view as Futurewei, some assumptions needs multiple options before we have consensus. More assumptions:  Measurement relaxation Option 1: Measurement relaxed by the main receiver.  Measurement relaxation Option 2: Measurement is not relaxed by the main receiver.  Beam sweeping of the LP-WUS Option 1: Yes  Beam sweeping of the LP-WUS Option 2: No |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Some basic assumptions for RRM measurement should be listed. If it is up to company report, the simulation results would be quite different. For example, following assumptions can be considered   1. No RRM measurement 2. Measurement based on LP-WUS 3. Relaxed RRM measurement   For the traffic part,   * RRC IDLE/INACTIVE in assumed for this proposal. Model of RRC connection phase power consumption is not related to this proposal. It is better to be removed. * The relationship between paging rate and traffic should be clarified., i.e., how to obtain ‘per UE paging rate≈2%’   Additionally, how to calculate the time for LP-WUS and time for main radio may need further clarification. For example, whether LP-WUS is turned off when main radio is turned on, the power consumption for SSB sync is included in transition energy or additionally added, whether the transition energy during transition time includes the power consumption for LP-WUS and main radio. |
| Xiaomi | About the main radio part, share similar views as Futurewei |
| vivo | Support. For the UE behavior after woke up by LP-WUS, we think the legacy UE behavior, i.e. UE need to monitor legacy PO after woke up by LP-WUS should be considered as a baseline assumption at least. And other proposed UE behaviors after wake up can be left to company report. Since there is no related reference modelling for other UE behaviors, company needs to provide detailed assumptions accordingly. |
| Panasonic | We are okay with the proposal. |
| Intel | We share Futurewei’s view to evaluate different cases with assumption that LP-WUS identifies a paging group, paging sub-group (as PEI) or a single UE with different behavior for main radio.  b.t.w., there are two rows of ‘i-DRX cycle length’ in the proposal. It would be helpful if the FL can clarify the difference of these two rows. |
| Nokia1 | Like explained in our paper assumption/parameter “Number of SSB before PO / PEI” would relate only to the case when main receiver is kept in deep sleep, and does not apply for ‘ultra-deep sleep’. This should be clarified. And also like noted earlier we should introduce time line assumption for the ‘re-synchronization of main receiver after waking from ‘ultra-deep sleep’.  It would be good to clarify what is meant by #PTW (and what is the PTW length for sake of completeness).  For paging rate/traffic assumption;  Over which duration we assume the paging rate? If this assumed to be per PO, should this be aligned between normal DRX and eDRX? If we evaluate the probability of paging in every DRX also for eDRX UEs the cumulative probability is rather high.  Also is it correct to assume that option1 and option2 would not be for comparison but as different cases. Should we try to narrow down to one option, or is there strong reasoning to have two options? For the RRC CONNECTED mode model in option2, I assume we would at least need to account also UL data in few slots (e.g. 700 for PUSCH) as well data reception in DL (e.g. 300 for PDCCH+PDSCH)? |
| Sony | One of the main benefits of LP-WUS is that the UE can be reached with low latency for MT traffic. Studying long iDRX / eDRX cycles doesn’t seem to be consistent with this use case.  Maybe one thing that we would want to do is to consider by how much we can reduce the latency (e.g. by supporting shorter DRX cycles) at the same power consumption, rather than consider the power consumption at the DRX cycles given here. Or we can study how much power we can save by using a LP-WUR in a latency sensitive scenario. |
| CATT | We are OK with the assumption. However, the number of SSB before PEI should be set to 3 only |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | * + - 1. The number of PF and PO, i.e. Ns and N, should be also aligned which may impacts the paging load in the cell and may impact on the data rate of LP-WUS;       2. The number of SSB required for PEI and PO should be different. Therefore, we prefer a separate rows for PEI and POs.       3. Regarding the way of “Model RRC connection phase power consumption as follows”, we are wondering we need this modelling. In Rel-16/Rel-17 evaluation for IDLE mode, we didn’t model the connected mode power consumption. |
| MediaTek | Okay. We slightly prefer to agree a baseline setting to simplify evaluation. For example, a LP-WUS with the minimum function, e.g., 1-bit wake-up indication, with legacy settings, such as PEI, RRM performed by main radio, continuous monitoring and using Per PO/UE paging rate. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the futurewei proposed options |
| Samsung | A baseline for simulation can be first determined (e.g., a value of for e-DRX cycle, w/ PEI and option 1 for traffic) in order to align simulation assumptions. Whether other values are additionally evaluated is up to each company. |
| Ericsson1 | We will provide input later after checking details |
| Apple | We are generally fine with the assumptions. For traffic, we think option 1 is sufficient.  In R17 PEI study, the number of SSBs before PEI was assumed to be 1. But in this case, as the main receiver needs to perform acquisition and synchronization, the assumption should be changed. 3 SSBs, as suggested by CATT could be a good starting point. |
| CMCC | We suggest to set different paging rate (1% or 10%) for different use cases. For example, paging rate (1%) for IoT use cases, and paging rate (10%) for eMBB use cases. |
| QC | * Lower group page rate could be evaluated to cover wide range of page arrival rate: 0.01%, 0.1%, 1%, 10% * Need to clarify how group page rate maps to UE page rate and group size. * In traffic model, Option 1 is good enough to capture performance.   The assumption on synchronization of LP-WUR needs to be reported. It could be based on additional sync signal, say LP-SS, which could be also used for RRM by LP-WUR, or preamble attached to LP-WUS. |
| FL3 | Number of SSB: 3 as suggested by MTK/CATT could be considered if no one object.  Removal of the redundant row ‘i-DRX cycle length’  Adding more paging rate options as suggested by Qualcomm and CMCC  For beam sweeping, measurement and nonitors newly configured PO, since it is more related to solution/implementation perspective, suggest to reported by companies. [H] Proposals 2D-v1(modified):  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Parameters** | **Value** | | i-DRX cycle length | 1.28s, consider both with PEI/ without PEI | | e-DRX cycle length | 20.48s, 61.44s, company to report which value(s) are used | | # POs | 1 | | # PTW | 4 | | Number of SSB before PO / PEI | 1, 2 or 3(baseline), (used for e.g., AGC adjustment, T/F tracking, serving cell and intra-F measurement)  company to report which value(s) are used | | Number of SSB after PO | 1, (used for inter-F measurement);  0, (for High SINR case). | | RRM Measurement | Company to report whether and how the RRM measurement is assumed, e.g., whether RRM performed by main radio or LP-WUR, whether RRM is relaxed or not. | | LP-WUS monitoring | Option 1: continuously monitoring  Option 2: discontinuously monitoring, with [T] ms as the period for complete an on-and-off cycle, and [D] ms as the active time for monitoring LP-WUS every cycle. | | Traffic | Option 1 (baseline):  Per PO/UE paging rate = ([10%], [1%]) or ([1%], [0.1%]) or ([0.1%], [0.01%])  Option 2 (optional):  Reusing TR 38.875 heart beat traffic model   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Model | FTP3 | | Packet size | 100 Bytes | | Mean inter-arrival time | 60s (per UE paging rate≈2%) |   Model RRC connection phase power consumption as follows,   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RRC connection duration | 30ms | | Relative energy consumption of RRC connection block (Relative power x ms) | 30ms\*100 =3000 | | | Others | Reported by companies | |

The latest proposal is as follows,

#### [H] Proposals 2D-v2:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Value** |
| i-DRX cycle length | 1.28s, consider both with PEI/ without PEI |
| e-DRX cycle length | 20.48s, 61.44s, company to report which value(s) are used |
| # POs | 1 |
| # PTW | 4 |
| Number of SSB before PO / PEI | 1, 2 or 3(baseline), (used for e.g., AGC adjustment, T/F tracking, serving cell and intra-F measurement)  company to report which value(s) are used |
| Number of SSB after PO | 1, (used for inter-F measurement);  0, (for High SINR case). |
| RRM Measurement | Company to report whether and how the RRM measurement is assumed, e.g., whether RRM performed by main radio or LP-WUR, whether RRM is relaxed or not. |
| LP-WUS monitoring | Option 1: continuously monitoring  Option 2: discontinuously monitoring, with [T] ms as the period for complete an on-and-off cycle, and [D] ms as the active time for monitoring LP-WUS every cycle. |
| Traffic | Option 1 (baseline):  Per PO/UE paging rate = ([10%], [1%]) or ([1%], [0.1%]) or ([0.1%], [0.01%])  Option 2 (optional):  Reusing TR 38.875 heart beat traffic model   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Model | FTP3 | | Packet size | 100 Bytes | | Mean inter-arrival time | 60s (per UE paging rate≈2%) |   Model RRC connection phase power consumption as follows,   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RRC connection duration | 30ms | | Relative energy consumption of RRC connection block (Relative power x ms) | 30ms\*100 =3000 | |
| Others | Reported by companies |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We would just like to clarify that #PTW refers to the number of POs per PTW. We would also like to clarify whether some assumption should be considered for RRC connection for Traffic Model – Option 1 or if it can just be ignored in this option during power saving gain evaluation. |
|  |  |
| QC | **Group page rate**  Lower group page rate could be evaluated to cover wide range of page arrival rate: 0.01%, 0.1%, 1%, 10%  Please add ([0.01%], [0.001%])  Very low paging rate is possible in IoT use case. For example, sensors are installed, and they communicate with network only a few times a day based on request.  **Group size**  Need to clarify how group page rate maps to UE page rate and group size.  **Last row in the table**  We suggest modifying the last row entry in the table to include  “Others (e.g., synchronization signals and assumptions) Reported by companies” |
| CATT | We prefer a general traffic model. LP-WUS is not customized for RedCap. Thus, we don’t need to use any RedCap traffic model |
| Spreadtrum | Keeping the same assumptions as R17 PEI is better for us to compare R17 PEI and R18 LP-WUS. It is important in our view. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For paging rate 0.01%, it is assumed that the packet arrival is quite sparse in time domain. Based on this, the configuration for DRX and eDRX should be matched, otherwise, limited power gain for LP-WUS would be caused. Therefore, if more paging rate values are added, we need to keep it open for the DRX and eDRX configuration. Therefore, the following modification is needed.   1. DRX cycle length, 1.28s or other values company report, consider both with PEI/ without PEI   e-DRX cycle length, 20.48s, 61.44s or other values, company to report which value(s) are used  Additionally, it is better to clarify what procedures are included in RRC connection phase. And the  RRC connection duration and relative power also should be further discussed, since the whole RRC connection procedure, including RACH procedure, UE capability report, and so on, may exceed 30ms.  Model RRC connection phase power consumption as follows,   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RRC connection duration | [30ms] | | Relative energy consumption of RRC connection block (Relative power x ms) | [30ms\*100 =3000] | | FFS the procedure in RRC connection phase | | |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The number of SSB(s) needed for PO and PEI is different. They should be two rows. For PEI, we think 1 SSB is sufficient. For number of SSB before the PO, it can be reported among 1,2 and 3.  It is not clear what does #POs and #PTW means. It is within a radio frame or with a PF or something else? Suggest to use the parameter used in the specification i.e. N, Ns to define the parameters.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Parameters** | **Value** | | i-DRX cycle length | 1.28s, consider both with PEI/ without PEI | | e-DRX cycle length | 20.48s, 61.44s, company to report which value(s) are used | | # POs | 1 | | # PTW | 4 | | Number of SSB before PO / PEI | 1, 2 or 3~~(baseline)~~, (used for e.g., AGC adjustment, T/F tracking, serving cell and intra-F measurement)  company to report which value(s) are used | | Number of SSB before ~~PO /~~ PEI | 1~~, 2 or 3~~(baseline), (used for e.g., AGC adjustment, T/F tracking~~, serving cell and intra-F measurement~~)  company to report which value(s) are used | | Number of SSB after PO | 1, (used for inter-F measurement);  0, (for High SINR case). | | RRM Measurement | Company to report whether and how the RRM measurement is assumed, e.g., whether RRM performed by main radio or LP-WUR, whether RRM is relaxed or not. | | LP-WUS monitoring | Option 1: continuously monitoring  Option 2: discontinuously monitoring, with [T] ms as the period for complete an on-and-off cycle, and [D] ms as the active time for monitoring LP-WUS every cycle. | | Traffic | Option 1 (baseline):  Per PO/UE paging rate = ([10%], [1%]) or ([1%], [0.1%]) or ([0.1%], [0.01%])  Option 2 (optional):  Reusing TR 38.875 heart beat traffic model   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Model | FTP3 | | Packet size | 100 Bytes | | Mean inter-arrival time | 60s (per UE paging rate≈2%) |   Model RRC connection phase power consumption as follows,   |  |  | | --- | --- | | RRC connection duration | 30ms | | Relative energy consumption of RRC connection block (Relative power x ms) | 30ms\*100 =3000 | | | Others | Reported by companies | |
| vivo | We are supportive to the modified proposal. And agree with QC that low paging rate is possible for some IoT cases. |
| Nokia3 | Few questions/comments:  “**Per PO/UE paging rate = ([10%], [1%]) or ([1%], [0.1%]) or ([0.1%], [0.01%])**”  Over which duration we assume the paging rate? If this assumed to be per PO, evaluating the probability of paging in every DRX cycle also for eDRX UEs results that the cumulative probability is rather high. This of course aligns the cases.  **Option1/option2**  Also is it correct to assume that option1 and option2 would not be for comparison but as different cases. Should we try to narrow down to one option, or is there strong reasoning to have two options? For the RRC CONNECTED mode model in option2, I assume we would at least need to account also UL data in few slots (e.g. 700 for PUSCH) as well data reception in DL (e.g. 300 for PDCCH+PDSCH)?  **Timeline**  For the number of SSBs prior e.g.PO and PEI, we think that the timeline to re-acquire synchronization after ‘ultra-deep sleep’ should be considered separately as it resembles cell search. Thus we would propose add following to the ‘Others’-row;  Companies to report the timeline assumed to re-acquire synchronization after ‘Ultra-deep sleep’.  For PO and PEI, from ‘Deep-sleep’ we can use the assumptions used in Rel-17 (i.e. 1/2/3 and 1, respectively. Thus propose following change to the corresponding row:  “Number of SSB before PO / PEI when MR wakes from ‘Deep sleep’”  Finally, is it correct understanding that ‘# PTW’ implies the number of Pos monitored in PO, or how should we understand this parameter? |
| InterDigital | We believe that the traffic model for RedCap is not general enough and prefer to support more general traffic model (e.g., from power saving). |
| Samsung | We would like to know whether all pairs for per PO/UE paging rate in Traffic Option 1 are considered. We prefer only one pair is used for the baseline and other pairs can be evaluated optionally. |
| Intel | Prefer to align the assumption on the number of paging sub-groups. |
| SONY | As we stated in the previous round one of the main benefits of LP-WUS is that the UE can be reached with low latency for MT traffic. Studying long iDRX / eDRX cycles doesn’t seem to be consistent with this use case. Since long sleep time will lead to low power consumption independent of the active radio power consumption. Hence, we would prefer:   * Shorter iDRX lengths * eDRX is not considered   This would satisfy the SIB justification “to study ultra-low power mechanism that can support low latency in Rel-18, e.g. lower than eDRX latency” |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | For the number SSBs before PO, we do not see the need to use 3 as baseline. We can perform the evaluation using all 3 values, representing high/medium/low SNR UEs. Huawei/HiSi’s suggestion on separating PO and PEI makes sense to us.  Is it correct that “Per PO/UE paging rate” is not the group paging rate? Then we also need an assumption on group paging rate (as in R17 PEI study)?  For option 1 vs option 2, we also think it is better to narrow down to a single option. Our preference is option 1, which follows the same approach as in R17 PEI. Otherwise, the result can be skewed very differently depending on the power consumption in RRC connected.  Nokia’s suggestion on the adding the note for ultra-deep sleep state also makes sense. |
|  |  |

### 2E: Assumptions for RRC CONNECTED

* **vivo:** reuse 38.838 assumption and additional jitter model

**Proposal 19: For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation in RRC connected mode, R17 evaluation methodologies and assumptions captured in TR 38.838 (for XR) should be reused as baseline. And the jitter model (jitter range is [-8, +8]ms and jitter STD is 5ms) should be considered.**

**Proposal 20: For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation in RRC connected mode, during the LP-WUS monitoring by separate receiver, the power state of main radio can be micro or light sleep.**

* **Ericsson:**  the evaluation methodology in TR 38.838 can be reused.
* **Intel:**  for XR or FTP traffic; LP-WUS function is similar to DCP. Monitoring LP-WUS during DRX on.

**Proposal 2:** For connected mode

* Two modes can be considered for evaluations
  + Model 1: LP-WUS detection in DRX ON for XR operation having periodic traffic with jitter in packet arrival time
  + Model 2: LP-WUS to trigger active PDCCH monitoring or SSSG switching assuming aperiodic traffic, e.g., ftp traffic is configured to the UE
* Performance metrics include ratio of power consumption reduction, latency reduction
* LP-WUS may provide a function that is similar to DCI format 2\_6
* Monitoring LP-WUS is further extended in the DRX ON time.
* **ZTE:**  the evaluation methodology in TR 38.838 can be reused.

***Proposal 4: If XR service is considered in LP-WUS study, the evaluation methodology in TR 38.838 can be reused.***

* ***FFS parameters, such as jitter range, need to be updated.***
* **Xiaomi:**

*For RRC connected state, three use cases can be considered for evaluation:*

*Case 1, LP WUS used as DCP;*

*Case 2, LP WUS used during C-DRX on duration;*

*Case 3, LP WUS used without C-DRX.*



Fig.3 Case 1, LP WUS used as DCP



Fig.4 Case 2, LP WUS used during C-DRX on duration



Fig.5 Case 3, LP WUS used without C-DRX

***Proposal 2: For RRC connected state, three use cases can be considered for evaluation:***

***Case 1, LP WUS used as DCP;***

***Case 2, LP WUS used during C-DRX on duration;***

***Case 3, LP WUS used without C-DRX.***

Reuse 38.838 assumptions: vivo (with additional jitter model ), Ericsson, Intel (mentioned XR traffic), ZTE (with additional jitter model), xiaomi (mentioned XR traffic)

#### [H] Proposals 2E-v1:

For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation in RRC connected mode, evaluation methodologies and assumptions captured in TR 38.838 (for XR) should be reused as baseline. Company can further report the followings,

* Parameters (e.g., frame rate, data rate, jitter range, DRX configurations and etc.)
* How to use LP-WUS, e.g., LP-WUS to trigger/adapt PDCCH monitoring

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with proposal. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Fine |
| ZTE, Sanechips | System level simulation is expected for the evaluation of RRC connected mode . We are OK with this proposal.  Power consumption for LP-WUS and main radio state,e.g.,light sleep or micro sleep, in connected mode may need further clarification. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the Proposal |
| vivo | Support. Besides, the evaluation methodologies and assumptions agreed in R18 XR study can also be reused, if any. |
| Panasonic | We are okay. |
| Intel | The FL proposal means to simulate LP-WUS only in DRX ON duration. Then our question is whether/how to evaluate the operation in DRX OFF or when DRX is not configured? |
| Nokia1 | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Sony | As discussed earlier we support prioritizing LP-WUS in IDLE / INACTIVE mode. We can also see whether LP-WUS would be useful for CONNECTED mode. When studying LP-WUS for CONNECTED mode, the baseline scenario should be selected for the respective use-cases and not only be based on XR. |
| CATT | We don’t know why we don’t use evaluation methodology for CONNED mode in TR38.840 for Rel-16 UE power saving instead of XR since the periodic arrival type traffic, such as XR, has no benefit of using LP-WUR. Moreover, most companies proposed to use evaluation assumption in TR38.840. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We don’t agree. The traffic model in Rel-16 and Rel-17 UE power saving, i.e. VoIP, FTP and Instant messaging, should be taken as baseline. XR could be considered in addition. |
| MediaTek | We are okay. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Reuse 38.840 connected mode PS instead of XR as the IoT is the main use case but the last sub-bullet is not necessary, this is too early to consider such proposal |
| Samsung | We think that the other use cases for UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state can be considered as well as XR use case. Because the traffic models in TR 38.840 are assumed based on the unique characteristics of XR traffic, we think it can’t reflect the general traffic model for supporting UEs in RRC\_CONNECTED state. Therefore, we prefer to consider that TR 38.840 is used as baseline. TR 38.838 can be applied for only considering XR use case. |
| Ericsson1 | For general evaluation methodology in connected mode, OK to consider the methodology agreed in XR TR as starting point.  For traffic models for connected mode evaluation, we propose considering the heartbeat and instant messaging traffic models in 3GPP TR 38.875. and also models in TR 38.838 and TR 38.840 after use case discussion progresses. |
| Apple | A question: is there any particular reason that we choose XR evaluation assumptions over the ones in TR 38.840? |
| CMCC | OK with FL proposal. |
| DOCOMO | similar view as Sony and CATT. We think the baseline scenario should not be restricted to XR only. |
| QC | We are ok with the proposal. |
| FL3 | Considering companies asking to consider also other traffic types, the following changes are made. [H] Proposals 2E-v1(modified): For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation in RRC connected mode,   * For XR traffic: evaluation methodologies and assumptions captured in TR 38.838 are baseline. Company can further report the followings,   + Parameters (e.g., frame rate, data rate, jitter range, DRX configurations and etc.)   + How to use LP-WUS, e.g., LP-WUS to trigger/adapt PDCCH monitoring * Other traffic models can also be evaluated, e.g.,   + heartbeat and instant messaging traffic models in 3GPP TR 38.875.   + traffic models in 3GPP TR 38.840.   + Company can further report details if any |

The latest proposal is as follows,

#### [H] Proposals 2E-v2:

For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation in RRC connected mode,

* For XR traffic: evaluation methodologies and assumptions captured in TR 38.838 are baseline. Company can further report the followings,
  + Parameters (e.g., frame rate, data rate, jitter range, DRX configurations and etc.)
  + How to use LP-WUS, e.g., LP-WUS to trigger/adapt PDCCH monitoring
* Other traffic models can also be evaluated, e.g.,
  + heartbeat and instant messaging traffic models in 3GPP TR 38.875.
  + traffic models in 3GPP TR 38.840.
  + Company can further report details if any

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are fine with proposal. |
| QC | We are ok with the proposal. |
| CATT | We don’t agree Proposal 2E-v2 using XR traffic for LP-WUS since the wakeup mechanism is used to trigger UE wakeup for the robust traffic arrival not periodic traffic. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Xiaomi | OK with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | To align the evaluation results, it is better to discuss the parameters and have the a baseline assumption, instead of totally depending on company report. A minor update is suggested.   * For XR traffic: evaluation methodologies and assumptions captured in TR 38.838 are baseline. Company can further discuss ~~report~~ the followings, |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In Wednesday GTW session, it was already agreed for eMBB and other cases, power model in TR 38.840 is reused. We should propose the evaluation methodology corresponding to the agreed power model.  A number of companies have already commented that TR 38.840 should be the baseline. We can take XR traffic in addition.  Some suggested revisions are as following: [H] Proposals 2E-v2 revised by HW For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation in RRC connected mode,   * For eMBB traffic: evaluation methodologies and assumptions captured in TR 38.840 are baseline. Company can further report the followings,   + Traffic models in TR 38.840   + Parameters (e.g., DRX configurations and etc.)   + How to use LP-WUS, e.g., LP-WUS to trigger/adapt PDCCH monitoring   + For XR traffic: evaluation methodologies and assumptions captured in TR 38.838 can be used. ~~are baseline. Company can further report the followings,~~     - ~~Parameters (e.g., frame rate, data rate, jitter range, DRX configurations and etc.)~~     - ~~How to use LP-WUS, e.g., LP-WUS to trigger/adapt PDCCH monitoring~~ * Other traffic models can also be evaluated, e.g.,   + heartbeat and instant messaging traffic models in 3GPP TR 38.875.   + ~~traffic models in 3GPP TR 38.840.~~   + Company can further report details if any |
| vivo | Support. |
| Nokia3 | The revision from Huawei would seem reasonable from us. |
| Samsung | We agree with the proposal revised by Huawei. |
| Intel | We are ok with the proposal. |
| SONY | We are fine with this proposal. We do support prioritizing studying LP-WUR for IDLE/INACTIVE state.  Our preference is for study of the “other traffic models” than XR. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | The concern from our side is that there are too many options listed, and it will be difficult to compare results across companies. |
|  |  |

## Issue 3: Link Performance related assumptions

### 3A: Performance metric in LLS

* Metric 1: FAR
  + Supported by Huawei, spreatrum, vivo, interdigital, intel, ZTE, samsung, sony
  + Reported by companies: Huawei
  + 0.1%: vivo, Xiaomi, E///
  + 1%: intel (often used for PUCCH detection and other channels)
  + <<0.1%: Qualcomm
  + Determined based on the power consumption: Samsung, E///
* Metric 2: MDR
  + Supported by Huawei, vivo, spreatrum, interdigital, intel, ZTE, Samsung, sony
  + 1%: Huawei, vivo, E///, Qualcomm
  + 0.1% : intel (miss detection is even more harmful to the communication), Xiaomi
  + Determined based on their impact on the latency: Samsung

#### [H] Proposal 3A-v1:

For the performance evaluations of LP-WUS candidate designs, it is assumed that

* The miss-detection rate (MDR) of LP-WUS should be no worse than [1%],
* The false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS should be no large than [0.1%]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | It depends, if LP-WUS would replace paging, 1% MDR would be enough. |
| Futurewei | We agree on MDR but suggest relaxing the requirement on FAR to and evaluate the impact on power consumption and coverage. |
| Spreadtrum1 | It related to SINR required, and also related to sensitivity required. If we draw a conclusion, the architecture should provide the sensitivity required, or equivalently the coverage target is fixed with a given architecture. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK. |
| vivo | 1% MDR is preferred which is usually used for PDCCH. For FAR, 1% are also acceptable for trade-off between power consumption and coverage especially when the LP-WUS is monitored discontinuously |
| Panasonic | We agree on the proposal. |
| Intel | If false alarm happens, it means waste some UE power. On the other hand, if miss detection happens, it means further delay to UE connection. We believe the impact on other functionalities should be minimized by the introduction of LP-WUS. This is the reason we prefer low MDR.  In our understanding, if LP-WUS consists of two parts or even multiple parts, the proposed MDR/FAR should take into account the reception performance of the two or more parts jointly. We prefer to explicitly clarify it in the proposal. |
| Nokia1 | We think that lower MDR is preferable but <[1%] would be acceptable starting point. The target FAR is heavily affected by the design and selected approach (e.g. duty cycle), thus we should maybe consider bit the FAR value based on design approach (e.g. always-on versus duty cycle). |
| Sony | MDR =% and FAR=% would be enough but of course the performance evaluation of LP-WUS is not limited to these two parameters. When evaluating a LP-WUS the amount of power saving gain and system overhead when fulfilling the same coverage and latency requirements need to also be taken into account. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal. However, the lower miss detection rate and false alarm rate needs to be modelled in the simulation of obtaining the power saving gain when UE has high probability of miss detection of LP-WUS. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | MDR depends on the following procedure after the LP-WUS detection. If LP-WUS can replace paging, 1% MDR is enough.  For FAR, it does not make sense to keep such low value of 0.1%. Companies should report the optimized value that can trade-off between power saving gain and coverage of LP-WUS.  For connected mode LP-WUS, the FAR and MDR can follow the requirement that was used in Rel-16 WUS evaluation. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal |
| MediaTek | Okay. FAR and MDR targets impact the required SNR that determines coverage capability and power consumption of LP-WUR. On the other hand, FAR impacts how often the main radio would be woken up mistakenly. It seems a reasonable starting point as MDR <1% and FAR <0.1%. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | For coverage evaluation, MDR and FAR to |
| Samsung | We are fine this proposal. |
| Ericsson1 | OK with first bullet.  For second bullet – suggest updating as below –   * The false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS should be no large than [0.1%]   + Alternately FAR can be determined during the evaluations to optimize power saving gain and assumed value should be reported by proponent. |
| Apple | The MDR of 1% is a reasonable target, but we may be more flexible on FAR when evaluating the various trade-offs. |
| CMCC | OK. |
| QC | We think the impact of FAR requirement on power consumption and overhead should be studied first, and then determine their requirement. We suggest evaluating following values;  FAR = [0.1%, 1%] |
| FL3 | [H] Proposal 3A-v1(modified): For the performance evaluations of LP-WUS candidate designs, it is assumed that   * The miss-detection rate (MDR) of LP-WUS should be no worse than [1%], * The false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS should be no large than   + Option 1: [0.1%],   + Option 2: [1%] * Note: if LP-WUS consists of two parts or even multiple parts, the proposed MDR/FAR should take into account the reception performance of the two or more parts jointly * FFS how power saving gain related to FAR |
| EURECOM | OK |

The latest version is as follows,

#### [H] Proposal 3A-v2:

For the performance evaluations of LP-WUS candidate designs, it is assumed that

* The miss-detection rate (MDR) of LP-WUS should be no worse than [1%],
* The false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS should be no large than
  + Option 1: [0.1%],
  + Option 2: [1%]
* Note: if LP-WUS consists of two parts or even multiple parts, the proposed MDR/FAR should take into account the reception performance of the two or more parts jointly
* FFS how power saving gain related to FAR

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| QC | We are OK with the proposal w/ following additional Note.   * Note: Determine FAR requirement based on the study outcome of the impact of FAR on power consumption. * ~~FFS how power saving gain related to FAR~~ |
| CATT | We are fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Generally fine.  In our memory, the MDR/FAR target is more complicated in R17 PEI, e.g. the joint MDR. But, the SS burst processing for PEI/PO has achieve the real common understanding in R17 PEI discussion. For now, the SS burst processing at the main radio may not so important for the final power saving gain likely. To be honest, we still think the behavior of the main radio is also important for evaluate power saving gain and latency. We still concern about the SS burst processing (e.g. cell search or not) at the main radio after wake-up. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | It is assumed that the metrics are applied in both idle mode and connected mode. Then we are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | As we commented in the last round, the assumption should be separated for IDLE mode and connected mode: [H] Proposal 3A-v2 revised by HW For the performance evaluations of LP-WUS candidate designs, it is assumed that   * The miss-detection rate (MDR) of LP-WUS should be no worse than [1%], * The false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS should be:   + For IDLE/inactive RRC state: reported with corresponding power saving gains.   + For Connected RRC state: no larger than   + Option 1: [0.1%],   + Option 2: [1%] * Note: if LP-WUS consists of two parts or even multiple parts, the proposed MDR/FAR should take into account the reception performance of the two or more parts jointly * FFS how power saving gain related to FAR |
| vivo | Support this proposal |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal. And we have the same opinion as ZTE. The metrics can be applied in both idle mode and connected mode. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal |
| SONY | We are fine with this proposal.  Can we use “larger” rather than “large” in the FAR bullet:   * The false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS should be no larger than |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Talking about idle vs connected mode, we wonder if MDR for connected mode should be even lower. If the UE misses WUR, it cannot receiver any data. Maybe 0.1% would be a more suitable target.  For FAR, it is not clear us the separation between idle/connected mode. Why cannot we use the same two options for idle state also? |
|  |  |

### 3B: Performance metric for coverage and methodology

For coverage evaluation, there are many assumptions should be provided, e.g., frequency bands, channel model, data rates for data channels (e.g., PUSCH, PDSCH), gNB antenna structures. Several companies proposed to reuse the basic assumptions defined in TR38.830, which is the outcome of Rel-17 CovEnh SI, as the starting point. And some companies propose to reuse the assunptions defined in TR 38.875(Redcap), which also largely reuse the assumptions agreed in Rel-17 CovEnh SI.

* Reuse R17 CovEnh: Huawei, vivo, Qualcomm
* Reuse R17 Redcap: ZTE(TR 38.875, deployment scenario similar to redcap), MTK
* Reuse assumptions including channel model in TR38.901: Samsung
* Reuse assumptions in TR37.910(ITU self evaluation): E///
* Reuse the evaluation assumptions for defined in TR 38.802: interDigital

Most companies proposed to reuse the coverage evaluation metric and methodoly in TR38.840 (TR of R17 CovEnh SI) or TR 38.875 (TR of R17 RedCap SI). Except for limited parameters, e.g., channel BW and UE Rx numbers, and data rates for DL channels are separated discussed in Redcap SI, other assumptions and methodology in Redcap SI are directly reused from CovEnh SI. Besides, a limited set of scenarios, e.g. dense urban at 2.6GHz for FR1, is prioritized in coverage evaluation in R17 Redcap.

For coverage evaluation for LP-WUS, moderate suggest to reuse the assumptions and methodology in TR38.830 or TR 38.875, which are well discussed in last release. We can further discuss subset of the metrics and assumptions to be prioritized for evaluation in this SI.

**Discussion point 1: Metrics for coverage evaluation.**

Coverage is one of the important evaluation aspects for LP-WUS. There are company proposals on the metric for coverage evaluation. The following metrics are raised by companies.

* Alt 1: MCL.
  + Huawei,…
* Alt 2: MIL
  + Huawei, vivo, intel, MTK, Nordic, [E///],

**Discussion point 2: Reference NR channels for coverage comparison.**

The coverage of LP-WUS should be compared to existing NR channels. The comparison of coverage between existing NR channels and LP-WUS is a good way to evaluate the coverage of LP-WUS. For the existing NR channels used as reference for comparison, company proposals are summarized as follows.

Alt-1: PUSCH with certain data rates.

* vivo, intel, ZTE(Equal or better than PUSCH), Nordic, Samsung

Alt-2: Paging PDCCH/CSS PDCCH

* Nokia, OPPO(Same/close to NR DL control channels, -80~-60dBm Receiver sensitivity), ZTE (FFS), E///, Nordic

Alt-3: SSS

* Nokia

Alt-4: PDSCH

* Samsung

#### [H] Proposal 3B-v1:

For evaluation of the coverage of LP-WUS, the methodology and assumptions in R17 CovEnh SI (described in TR38.830) is reused as baseline.

* MIL is used as the metric for LP-WUS coverage evaluation;
* LP-WUS should be compared with NR bottle neck channel, i.e., PUSCH [1Mbps].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | If not mistaken PUSCH bottle neck depends on Scenario, excerpt from 38.830  Urban: DL 10Mbps, UL 1Mbps  Rural: DL 1Mbps, UL 100kbps  Rural with long distance: DL 1Mbps, UL 100kbps, 30kbps (optional) |
| Futurewei | We are OK with proposal. |
| Spreadtrum1 | Need further discussion |
| ZTE, Sanechips | As Nordic mentioned, the data rate is related to the scenarios.  Additionally, the following aspects should be taken into account for the link budget.   * Noise figure * Amplification factor |
| vivo | Support the proposal.  According to TR 38.830, PUSCH has worst coverage in almost all scenarios evaluated. Thus, existing NR deployments is limited by PUSCH coverage. Hence, we suggest coverage of PUSCH, with certain data rates reused from TR 38.830, is used as reference channel to compare with LP-WUS. |
| Panasonic | We think it needs further discussion on which channel (DL and also UL) should be compared with LP-WUS. Also agree with Nordic that the details are scenario dependent. |
| Intel | The second bullet seems overlap with proposal 1C-v1. We think it is more proper to select a channel from SSB, SIB1, OSI, Type0/0A/1/2 CSS, paging PDSCH, RACH msg1/2/3/4 and common PUCCH of NR |
| Nokia1 | Like commented earlier, this would make the coverage evaluation dependent on the assumed UL traffic model. Not sure if 1Mbps UL would be a requirement for the considered cases. Thus, it would be probably most straight forward to consider the coverage of DL broadcast, e.g. paging PDCCH. Again if the intent is to enhance power consumption of paging monitoring, this would seem relevant reference. |
| Sony | Do not support the proposal. We should be looking at IoT and wearable use cases where the data rates are lower than those considered in the R17 CovEnh SI |
| CATT | WE don’t agree with the proposal. This will limit the LP-WUR design. It should have maximum coupling loss defined with the supported minimum data rate. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are OK with the proposal. We agree that we should discuss the scenarios first and correspondingly the simulation assumptions of the scenarios are used. |
| Sharp | As we commented in 1C-v1, the baseline of comparison can be the bottleneck of the DL common channels. |
| MediaTek | The second bullet is not needed for evaluation assumptions, which is irrelevant to methodology, but a given KPI. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | NR WUS PDCCH channel should be used for comparison |
| Samsung | We are OK in general. As mentioned in the proposal 1C-v1, the NR bottleneck channel can be different depending on which RRC state is assumed. |
| Ericsson1 | Repeating comment from 1C-v1 below.  LP-WUS reception impacts paging performance for Idle mode UEs and DL scheduling assignment/UL grant reception for Connected mode UEs. These procedures are based on PDCCH monitoring. Considering this, the achievable coverage for different LP-WUS/WUR designs should be compared to PDCCH coverage for same scenario.  The current SI is for studying LP-WUS for power savings and should not result in devices with reduced coverage than what is already achievable for NR. |
| Apple | It may be better to come back to this proposal after Proposal 1C. |
| CMCC | Suggest to discuss 3B-v1 after “1C-v1: target coverage for LP-WUR”. |
| DOCOMO | We think it need further discussion. We are open that which channel should be compared with LP-WUS. |
| QC | We support the coverage study.  Regarding the evaluation method, we think it needs further discussion e.g., physical channel, noise figure, metric, etc. |
| FL2 | [H] Proposal 3B-v1(modified): For evaluation of the coverage of LP-WUS, the methodology and assumptions in R17 CovEnh SI (described in TR38.830) is reused as baseline.   * MIL is used as the metric for LP-WUS coverage evaluation; * LP-WUS should be compared with ~~NR bottle neck channel, i.e.,~~ at least PDCCH for paging, PUSCH ~~[1Mbps]~~. |

The latest proposal is as follows,

#### [H] Proposal 3B-v2:

For evaluation of the coverage of LP-WUS, the methodology and assumptions in R17 CovEnh SI (described in TR38.830) is reused as baseline.

* MIL is used as the metric for LP-WUS coverage evaluation;
* LP-WUS should be compared with ~~NR bottle neck channel, i.e.,~~ at least PDCCH for paging, PUSCH ~~[1Mbps]~~.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| QC | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | We don’t agree with the proposal. The coverage would depend on the UE receiver sensitivity. We should not use TR38.830 as the baseline. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For the wearables and industrial uses cases, it is better to reuse the TR 38.875 or TR38.865 as the starting point. For the eMBB use case, it is OK to be based on TR38.830. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think only the bottle neck of PUSCH should be considered. For PDCCH, the coverage would be over the bottleneck of the coverage, according to the evaluation in Rel-17 CE SI. |
| vivo | We support to this proposal.  To CATT, the metrics used for coverage evaluation, e.g., MCL or MIL, not only depends UE receiver sensitivity, but also depends on the other common assumptions, e.g., gNB/UE Tx power, antenna configuration, we do not think we need to duplicate these common assumptions in this SI. TR 38.830 is good starting point. |
| Nokia3 | We are fine with the proposal. As we don’t have yet any target for the coverage, this would be mostly informative to compare different designs. |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | After waking up by the LP-WUS/WUR, UEs in RRC connected mode should be able to transmit PUCCH and PUSCH. Because considering both RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE was agreed, PUSCH should be used for evaluation of the coverage of LP-WUS. Therefore, we want to choose PUSCH as baseline for evaluation. Then, we are fine with this proposal. |
| Intel | Should we consider methodology/assumptions from R17/R18 RedCap especially for IoT/wearable device?  Regarding the reference channel, PUSCH of Main Radio is not a proper channel for comparison, at least for idle/inactive mode since unicast PUSCH is not involved in idle/inactive operation. In evaluation of Rel-18 eRedCap, PUSCH actually has a better MIL than Rel-15/17 UE since we assume a smaller data rate. |
| SONY | We support the proposal |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Apple | Maybe we can remove the 2nd bullet for now because it is not very useful. |
|  |  |

### 3C: LLS common assumptions

* **Huawei**

Depending on detailed design of the LP-WUS, which shall impact the link budget calculation.

Comparing the coverage of different design, the data rate should be aligned or reported to fulfill the requirement to get fair comparison.

* **Intel**

**Table 4: Common evaluation assumptions**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **FR1, Urban** | **FR1, Urban** | **FR1, Rural** |
| Carrier Frequency | 2.6 GHz (TDD) | 4 GHz (TDD)  (Low priority) | 0.7 GHz (FDD) |
| SCS | 30 kHz | 30 kHz | 15 kHz |
| Frame structure for TDD | DDDDDDDSUU (S: 6D:4G:4U) | DDDSUDDSUU (S: 10D:2G:2U) | N/A |
| # of gNB TX chains | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| # of gNB RX chains | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| Channel Model | TDL-C, NLOS | TDL-C, NLOS | TDL-C, NLOS |
| UE antenna correlation | low | low | low |
| delay spread | 300 ns | 300 ns | 300 ns |
| UE velocity | 3 km/h | 3 km/h | 3 km/h |
| Modulation | MC-OOK, MC-FSK | | |
| Initial error of LO frequency or sampling clock | Up to [200ppm] | | |
| Main Radio of UE | | | |
| BW | 100MHz (273 PRBs)  20MHz (51 PRBs)  5MHz (11 PRBs) | 100MHz (273 PRBs)  20MHz (51 PRBs)  5MHz (11 PRBs) | 20MHz (106 PRBs)  5MHz (25 PRBs) |
| # of TX chains | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| # of RX chains | 4, 1 | 4, 1 | 2, 1 |
| LP-WUR of UE | | | |
| BW | [4MHz] | [4MHz] | [4MHz] |
| # of UE RX chains | [4, 1] | [4, 1] | [2, 1] |

* **MTK**

**Figure 1: general baseband model for LP-WUR LLS evaluation**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Definition** | **Reference** |
| 3GPP channel | TDL-C, NLOS | TR 38.875 |
| Intra-cell Interference | NR data is sent with LP-WUS in the frequency domain. Interference power level depends on guild band and LPF. | R1-1902940  R1-2109954 |
| Inter-cell interference | An interference cell shares the same RE with LP-WUS. Interference power level = 10.45 dB (for single interfering cell). | TR 38.833 |
| Low-pass Filter | Use a 2nd order Butterworth low-pass filter with cutoff frequency at approximately 2.5 MHz | IEEE 802.11-17/0188r10 |
| Carrier frequency offset | The tx oscillator has an inaccuracy of 20ppm, and the Rx oscillator has an inaccuracy of 180ppm. The total frequency offset is 200 ppm. | IEEE 802.11-17/0188r10 |

**Table 7: WIFI-like configurations**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item** | **Value** | **Comments** |
| Total carrier bandwidth | 4 MHz | The same as IEEE 802.11ba |
| Receiver noise figure | 18 dB | 8 dB margin to a WIFI main receiver [9] |
| Occupied channel bandwidth | 3.6 MHz | 2RB/4RB margin for guard bands |
| Number of received chains | 1 | The same as NR Rel-17 RedCap |
| Required SNR | 3.7 dB | 32 bits payload without the use of I/Q [9] |

* **Rakuten Symphony**

Table 1 WUS/WUR evaluation assumptions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Features** | **Assumptions** |
| Waveform | MC-OOK, MC-FSK |
| Carrier frequency | 2.4 GHz, 5 GHz (TBD) |
| SCS | 15 kHz, 30 kHz |
| WUS bandwidth | [4] MHz |
| Simulation type | Link level, system level (optional) |
| Channel model | AWGN, TDL-A, TDL-C |
| Packet size | TBD |
| WUS frequency location | In-band |
| Channel bandwidth | 20 MHz |
| Adjacent channel interference | WUS and NR legacy channels adjacent in the same channel (Guard band TBD) |
| Frequency offset | 200 ppm |
| Phase noise model | [802.11ba model] |
| UE mobility | 0 km/h and 3 km/h |

**Channel models:**

**Reuse that in 38.830 as starting point:** Huawei, vivo

**TDL-C 300ns:** vivo, Nokia, qualcomm, Eurecom

**AWGN:** vivo, Nokia, Eurecom

**Others:**

* TDL-C-30ns, TDL-C-100ns, TDL-D 30ns
* CDL-C and TDL-A (for FR2)

**Interference modeling:**

**ZTE:** FDMed LP-WUS

**vivo:** PDSCH mapped on RBs not used for LP-WUS and guard band; EPRE of LP-WUS vs EPRE of PDSCH = 1:1.

**MTK:** NR data is sent with LP-WUS in the frequency domain. Interference power level depends on guild band and LPF.

**Qualcomm:** placement of other DL signals on both sides of the LP-WUS BW to evaluate interference rejection capability of different receiver architectures

**Filter**

**Nokia:** 6-th order butterworth.

**Vivo:** 5-th order butter worth.

**MTK:** 2nd order Butterworth low-pass filter with cutoff frequency at approximately 2.5 MHz(IEEE 802.11-17/0188r10)

**ZTE：**should be considered.

**Eurecom:** 3rd order Butterworth (LPF Cut-off Frequency: 2\*(K/2+0.5)\*SCS Hz assuming WUS BW is 64 subcarriers)

**Guard band**

* Nokia: company report.
* MTK: should consider in LLS baseband model
* Vivo: should consider

**Co-channel interference**

* **Nokia:** NR (OFDM signal) channel transmitted before and after the LP-WUS and also instead the LP-WUS signal for false alarm and robustness evaluation.
* **ZTE:** DL signal/LP-WUS of neighboring cell.

#### [H] Proposal 3C-v1:

The following should be described for the link-level evaluation:

* Structure of LP-WUS signals/channels
* Information conveyed by the LP-WUS
* Modulation and coding schemes if any
* ACI modelling: DL channels FDMed with LP-WUS, including Resource allocation, power and guardband, etc.
* ACI rejection methods: e.g., parameter of the filters

The following assumptions for link performance evaluation for LP-WUS is used,

**Assumptions for link performance evaluation for LP-WUS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attributes** | **Assumptions** |
| Channel structure | Company to report, e.g., Preamble +data +CRC: 32 chips+ 32 bits +8 CRC bits |
| Coding scheme | Company to report |
| LP-WUS raw data rate | Company to report |
| SCS | 30kHz |
| gNB Channel BW | 20MHz, 100MHz |
| WUS Bandwidth | Compay to report, e.g., 12RB ~ 4.32MHz, 5RB ~ 1.8MHz |
| Guard band | [N] RB on each side of LP-WUS bandwidth, company to report N |
| ACI | PDSCH mapped on RBs not used for LP-WUS and guard band;  EPRE of LP-WUS vs EPRE of PDSCH = Q, company to report Q, |
| Filter | [X]-th order Butterworth low-pass filter with cutoff frequency at [Y] MHz, company to report |
| Sampling Rate | S = [1/4, 1/2, 1, 2, 4,…] times of LP-WUS raw data rate, company to report S |
| ADC | D = 1bit (comparator), or D = 2bits / 4bits ADC, subject to company report D |
| Channel Model | TDL-C 300ns |
| Number of Rx for LP-WUS | 1 Rx |
| UE speed | 3 km/h |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | This is good starting point, but we believe it will be difficult to compare results, there is too much freedom. We assume we will be able to refine above assumption in later rounds. |
| Futurewei | We would like to clarify that specified SCS is for the generation of PDSCH for ACI and that details on how to generate the LP-WUS, i.e., the utilized SCS and considered TX architecture {OFDM, DFT} are to be reported by company. We also suggest including additional channel model, e.g., TDL-C 30ns, for the evaluation.  Further, we would appreciate if you can elaborate on how we can consider a sampling rate defined as a fraction of raw data rate for the evaluation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The following parameters also should be captured:   * Duplex mode * gNB antenna configuration * Waveform * Frequency drift   It should be clarified whether the SCS is for LP-WUS or gNB. For the SCS of LP-WUS, other configurations also should not be precluded.  Additionally, does coding scheme mean OOK, FSK or other coding scheme, or just mean waveform, e.g., Manchester? |
| vivo | Support these assumptions as starting point. We can further refine these assumptions later. |
| Panasonic | We are basically okay but think it is not necessary to mandate the SCS as just 30 kHz. We can make 30kHz as baseline and companies may report the SCS used. |
| Intel | Thanks for good summary/proposal. we should align a proper payload size for LP-WUS. Then, the time duration of LP-WUS should be aligned too. suggest to add SCS 15kHz for low frequency |
| Nokia1 | While we see this as a good starting point, as commented by Nordic, it might be worthwhile to first try to converge a bit in assumptions. Also the assumed frequency error would need to be accounted as well. |
| Sony | Basically, support the proposal. However, in order to compare results, there need to be fewer options. |
| CATT | The evaluation methodology is not consistent with LP-WUR BW assumption of 20 MHz. We need to align the assumption. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think the SCS is the subcarrier spacing for both LP-WUS and NR signal. We are fine to evaluate 1Rx, and UE speed of 3km/h.  The maximum frequency offset should be also considered in the link level simulation.  In-band existing NR signal transmission should be also modelled for the potential co-channel interference. |
| MediaTek | Okay, but prefer to further simplify, e.g., whether ACI can be a given value rather than a simulation-based results varied with PDSCH configurations. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Consider Tx waveform and BW should be reported |
| Samsung | In general, we are fine with having the assumptions in the table. Possibly, some parameters (e.g., WUS BW, sampling rate and etc.) can be further down-selected |
| Ericsson1 | Will provide input later after checking details |
| Apple | We are generally fine with the proposal as a starting point, and expect more refinement as the evaluation moves forward. |
| FL3 | According to companies’ comments, the revised proposal for LP-WUS specific assumptions are provided as follows. Besides, some assumptions common for legacy channels and LP-WUS, e.g., gNB antenna configurations which can be reuse that in 38.830 as baseline (as mentioned in updated proposal 3B), are not further described in this proposal. [H] Proposal 3C-v1(modified): The following should be described for the link-level evaluation:   * Structure of LP-WUS signals/channels * Information conveyed by the LP-WUS * Modulation and coding schemes if any * ACI modelling: DL channels FDMed with LP-WUS, including Resource allocation, power and guardband, etc. * ACI rejection methods: e.g., parameter of the filters   The following aassumptions for link performance evaluation for LP-WUS is used,  **Assumptions for link performance evaluation for LP-WUS**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Attributes** | **Assumptions** | | Channel structure | Company to report, e.g., Preamble +data +CRC: 32 chips+ 32 bits +8 CRC bits | | Coding scheme | Company to report | | Waveform | Company to report | | LP-WUS raw data rate | Company to report | | SCS | SCS for LP-WUS generation (if applicable) and SCS for ACI (if modeled), can be same or different values, which are up to company report. | | gNB Channel BW | 20MHz, 100MHz | | WUS Bandwidth | Company to report; | | WUS waveform | Company to report; | | Guard band | [N] RB on each side of LP-WUS bandwidth, company to report N | | ACI | PDSCH mapped on RBs not used for LP-WUS and guard band;  EPRE of LP-WUS vs EPRE of PDSCH = Q, company to report Q, | | Filter | [X]-th order Butterworth low-pass filter with cutoff frequency at [Y] MHz, company to report | | Sampling Rate | S ~~= [1/4, 1/2, 1, 2, 4,…]~~ times of LP-WUS raw data rate, company to report S | | Frequency error/drifts | Company to report which value is used. | | ADC | D = 1bit (comparator), or D = 2bits / 4bits ADC, subject to company report D | | Channel Model | TDL-C 300ns | | Number of Rx for LP-WUS | 1 Rx | | UE speed | 3 km/h | |
| EURECOM | That looks fine to us as a starting point. Once we progress on the WUS design we hopefully converge to a common set of parameters to compare results. |
| QC | We support these assumptions as starting point. |

The latest version is as follows,

#### [H] Proposal 3C-v2:

The following should be described for the link-level evaluation:

* Structure of LP-WUS signals/channels
* Information conveyed by the LP-WUS
* Modulation and coding schemes if any
* ACI modelling: DL channels FDMed with LP-WUS, including Resource allocation, power and guardband, etc.
* ACI rejection methods: e.g., parameter of the filters

The following aassumptions for link performance evaluation for LP-WUS is used,

**Assumptions for link performance evaluation for LP-WUS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attributes** | **Assumptions** |
| Channel structure | Company to report, e.g., Preamble +data +CRC: 32 chips+ 32 bits +8 CRC bits |
| Coding scheme | Company to report |
| Waveform | Company to report |
| LP-WUS raw data rate | Company to report |
| SCS | SCS for LP-WUS generation (if applicable) and SCS for ACI (if modeled), can be same or different values, which are up to company report. |
| gNB Channel BW | 20MHz, 100MHz |
| WUS Bandwidth | Company to report; |
| WUS waveform | Company to report; |
| Guard band | [N] RB on each side of LP-WUS bandwidth, company to report N |
| ACI | PDSCH mapped on RBs not used for LP-WUS and guard band;  EPRE of LP-WUS vs EPRE of PDSCH = Q, company to report Q, |
| Filter | [X]-th order Butterworth low-pass filter with cutoff frequency at [Y] MHz, company to report |
| Sampling Rate | S ~~= [1/4, 1/2, 1, 2, 4,…]~~ times of LP-WUS raw data rate, company to report S |
| Frequency error/drifts | Company to report which value is used. |
| ADC | D = 1bit (comparator), or D = 2bits / 4bits ADC, subject to company report D |
| Channel Model | TDL-C 300ns |
| Number of Rx for LP-WUS | 1 Rx |
| UE speed | 3 km/h |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the updated proposal. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| QC | We are OK |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| ZTE, Sanechips | gNB antenna configuration and Duplex mode can be added. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | * + - 1. LP-WUS transmitter should reuse the existing gNB hardware and existing waveform. Therefore, only CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM based waveform is allowed.       2. It is a bit unclear about the terminology “ACI”. If the LP-WUS is deployed in-band of the NR band, it should be in-band co-channel interference, rather than adjacent channel interference, right?  [H] Proposal 3C-v2 revised by HW: The following should be described for the link-level evaluation:   * Structure of LP-WUS signals/channels * Information conveyed by the LP-WUS * Modulation and coding schemes if any * ACI modelling: DL channels FDMed with LP-WUS, including Resource allocation, power and guardband, etc. * ACI rejection methods: e.g., parameter of the filters   The following aassumptions for link performance evaluation for LP-WUS is used,  **Assumptions for link performance evaluation for LP-WUS**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Attributes** | **Assumptions** | | Signal/Channel structure | Company to report, e.g., Preamble +data +CRC: 32 chips+ 32 bits +8 CRC bits, or periodic synchronization signal + data;  NOTE: This does not make any assumption on LP-WUS/WUR design. | | Coding scheme | Company to report | | Waveform | Company to report between CP-OFDM and DFT-s-OFDM | | LP-WUS raw data rate | Company to report | | SCS | SCS for LP-WUS generation (if applicable) and SCS for ACI (if modeled), can be same or different values, which are up to company report. | | gNB Channel BW | 20MHz, 100MHz | | WUS Bandwidth | Company to report; | | WUS waveform | Company to report; | | Guard band | [N] RB on each side of LP-WUS bandwidth, company to report N | | ACI | PDSCH mapped on RBs not used for LP-WUS and guard band;  EPRE of LP-WUS vs EPRE of PDSCH = Q, company to report Q, | | Filter | [X]-th order Butterworth low-pass filter with cutoff frequency at [Y] MHz, company to report | | Sampling Rate | S ~~= [1/4, 1/2, 1, 2, 4,…]~~ times of LP-WUS raw data rate, company to report S | | Frequency error/drifts | Company to report which value is used. | | ADC | D = 1bit (comparator), or D = 2bits / 4bits ADC, subject to company report D | | Channel Model | TDL-C 300ns | | Number of Rx for LP-WUS | 1 Rx | | UE speed | 3 km/h | |
| vivo | Support this proposal |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We would like to know why only low-pass filter is considered for the Filter. According to the LP-WUR architecture, band-pass filter can be used and LP-WUS can pass through 2~3 filters. Also, we are wondering that all filters which are used for evaluation should be reported. |
| Intel | Generally fine with the proposal. Regarding ADC, is it intended to limit to up to 4 bits? b.t.w., there seems two duplicated rows for ‘waveform’ and ‘WUS waveform’ |
| SONY | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson2 | Prefer to remove e.g., in first row – “Company to report, ~~e.g., Preamble +data +CRC: 32 chips+ 32 bits +8 CRC bits~~” |
| Apple | OK  A minor suggestion for Filter: “Company to report, e.g., [X]-th order Butterworth low-pass filter with cutoff frequency at [Y] MHz” |
|  |  |

### 3D: Frequencies and scenarios

**Frequencies**

The Frequency range/band directly impacts the coverage of the LP-WUS. Some companies provided some initial proposals on Frequency range/band.

**Huawei:** [assumptions in TR38.830 as starting point]

**vivo:** [900MHz and 2GHz]

**Interdigital:** Focus on FR1 for evaluation in Rel-18 and study FR2 later if needed.

* Most receivers consuming low power operate at frequencies below 3 GHz as required power consumption generally increases as carrier frequency increases.

**Nokia:** 4GHz

**Intel/Nordic:** 2.6GHz/4GHz for Urban, 0.7GHz for Rural.

**MTK:** 2.6GHz for Urban, 0.7GHz for Rural.

**Lenovo:** Consider FR1

* Since most of the frequencies deployed in IoT scenarios are in the C-band i.e., 3.5GHz carrier frequency or even lower frequency band, i.e., 700MHz-800MHz, which should be prioritized compared to higher mmWave frequencies in FR2.

**Qualcomm:** 700MHz, 4GHz

**Urban/dense/indoor/rural**

Huawei

1. ***The deployment scenarios of LP-WUS at least include dense urban, rural macro and indoor hotspot.***

Vivo

**About -80 dBm Receiver sensitivity is required for LP-WUS, to achieve same coverage as PUSCH with 1Mbps data rates in Urban scenario.**

CATT

* Proposal 4: The study of low-power wakeup receiver should prioritize the single layer dense urban and indoor hotspot scenarios

ZTE

***Proposal 3: The deployment scenarios for LP-WUS includes Urban, Rural and Indoor.***

* ***Further discuss and decide which deployment can be optionally evaluated.***

Nordic

RAN1 to study and decide what target MIL should be for LP-WUS in the following scenarios; (i) Rural (700MHz), (ii) Urban scenario (2.6 GHz) and (iii) Urban scenario (4GHz).

#### [H] Proposal 3D-v1:

For evaluation of LP-WUS, the frequencies / scenarios in TR38.830 are baseline.

* Priortize urban (2.6GHz?4GHz?) scenario for FR1,
* Others not precluded.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | not OK, 700MHz is must for IoT use-case, not sure why TDD bands should be prioritized. |
| Futurewei | We are open but prefer to be more inclusive at this stage. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | All the 0.7G, 2.6G, and 4G frequencies should be considered. |
| vivo | Support the proposal.  We are also fine to include other scenarios, e.g. 700MHz carrier frequency. However, the number of scenarios to be evaluated should be limited. We can down select in the scenarios evaluated in TR 38.830. |
| Panasonic | Agree with Futurewei. |
| Intel | 700MHz should be included which is proposed by companies too |
| Sony | There is a trade-off between antenna size/device form factor, operating frequency and propagation loss. We support prioritizing urban scenario for 2.6GHz |
| CATT | We prefer to use TR38.840 assumption with dense urban and indoor hot spot. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine to prioritize FR1. Indoor hotspot should be also considered.  Maybe a clear table based on TR 38.830 or 38.802 can be proposed by moderator for further discussion. |
| MediaTek | Okay to prioritize urban for FR1. 700MHz should be included. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | 700MHz in addition should be studied |
| Samsung | We are OK with the main bullet. But, we don’t see a reason to prioritize Urban scenario. |
| Apple | We think we should include 2.6GHz and 4GHz urban scenarios. We are open to consider other scenarios. |
| CMCC | Prefer 2.6GHz and 700MHz to be included. |
| QC | We agree with baseline in TR 38.830 which contains freq and scenarios for both FR1 and FR2 with FR1 prioritized. We agree with Intel and Vivo that 700 MHz should be considered as well. |
| FL3 | Most companies are OK with urban (2.6GHz/4GHz) and rural(700MHz). For indoor, most likely it is not coverage limited, but companies can report their results. Therfore, the following changes are made for the proposal. [H] Proposal 3D-v1(modified): For coverage evaluation of LP-WUS,.   * urban (2.6GHz/4GHz), rural(700MHz) and indoor(4GHz) scenario for FR1 are considered to be evaluated, others not precluded.   + Reuse assumptions in TR38.830 as baseline |
| EURECOM | OK, 700MHz should be included too. |

The latest proposal is as follows,

#### [H] Proposal 3D-v2:

For coverage evaluation of LP-WUS,.

* urban (2.6GHz/4GHz), rural(700MHz) and indoor(4GHz) scenario for FR1 are considered to be evaluated, others not precluded.
  + Reuse assumptions in TR38.830 as baseline

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are fine with proposal. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | FR2 is not precluded per the SID and should also be included in the study. Hence, we suggest the following modified   * urban (2.6GHz/4GHz), rural(700MHz) and indoor(4GHz) scenario for FR1 are considered to be evaluated, others **(e.g., FR2) are** not precluded. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK with Qualcomm’s update. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the assumption. |
| vivo | We support this proposal. |
| InterDigital | Fine with Qualcomm’s update. |
| Samsung | We are ok. |
| Intel | For IoT/wearable device, using Rel-17 RedCap as baseline seem better choice. However, if companies want to be more conservative, we are fine to use 38.830 which means better MIL for MR. |
| SONY | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson2 | We are OK. |
| Apple | OK |
|  |  |

### 3E: impairments

**Frequency error:**

* **Uniform distribution in the range [-X, +X]ppm:** Nokia
* **[200] PPM:** vivo, intel, MTK
* **Should be considered:** E///

MTK: (The tx oscillator has an inaccuracy of 20ppm, and the Rx oscillator has an inaccuracy of 180ppm. The total frequency offset is 200 ppm.)

Qualcomm: Introduce clock error parameters, e.g.,

* + Clocks frequency drift (ppm/s) [X, Z].
  + Clocks maximum frequency error (ppm) [Y, L].

#### [M] Proposal 3E-v1:

Maximum LO frequency error for LP-WUR, when not relying on DL synchronization signals is assumed to be [200ppm] for evaluation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | LC-DCO / LC-VCO should do better. Those were not yet ruled out, per se. For ring oscillator 200ppm sound right. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with proposal which should cover all potential evaluated LP-WUR architecture categories. |
| vivo | Support this proposal. |
| Panasonic | Just to clarify our understanding, we think it is +/- 100ppm error drifting, which is intended for 200ppm error. Or the intention is +/- 200 ppm? |
| Intel | We support the FL proposal. |
| Nokia1 | While this could be used in initial evaluations, this would need to be aligned with the LP-WUR architecture as it progresses. |
| FL | To Panasonic,  For clarification, 200ppm means, frequency error is within the range of [- 200, 200] ppm in my understanding. |
| Sony | Depends on the LP-WUR architecture.  Can we just talk about “maximum frequency error for LP-WUR” as there are LP-WUR architectures that don’t rely on LO? |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This is closely related with the power values used in power model. We should have joint determination which may depend on some architecture discussion. For example, we are not sure, whether the power consumption of [0.5] in power model proposal also assumes the 200 ppm frequency error. |
| MediaTek | We support this proposal. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with 200PPM but to prefer to postpone this discussion until the architecture discussion is progressed |
| Samsung | Fine to further discuss after progress on the LP-WUR architecture. |
| Apple | This could be the starting point for the evaluation. |
| QC | The clock assumption depends on presence of synchronization mechanism (e.g., additional DL sync signal) / receiver of interest / power state.  Company can report clock assumptions made in their evaluation. |
| FL | Pending to the next meeting, depending on the outcome of the receiver architecture. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK with this proposal as the starting point. |

#### [M] Proposals 3E-v2:

FL recommend postpone to the next meeting, depending on the outcome of the receiver architecture.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the recommendation. |
| QC | OK to postpone to next meeting |
| CATT | OK |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK |
| InterDigital | Fine |
| Samsung | We agree. |
| Intel | Agree. |
| SONY | We are fine with the recommendation. |
| OPPO | OK |

### 3F-v1: Noise Figure

Noise figure is one of the parameters used in link budget for coverage evaluation. Due to WUR is separated from the main radio for low power consumption, the RF components e.g., LNA, used for WUR is not as good as that for the main radio. The noise figure assumed for the WUR may be worse than that in the main radio, which is 7dB assumed in [TR38.830]. Companies provided initial proposals on the value for the noise figure, which are summarized as follows.

* 18 dB: Huawei(for architecture with LO), MTK (8dB higher than wifi main receiver)
* 23 dB: Huawei(for architecture without LO)
* 15 dB: vivo (8 dB higher than NR main receiver with 7dB NF.)
* Depending on Rx architectures/ Company report/FFS: Nordic, Ericsson, Qualcomm

**Huawei:** To keep a low power consumption, usually a lower power LNA would be used and the corresponding noise figure is larger than that of main receiver. A larger noise figure would cause a worse sensitivity, which impacts the coverage of the receiver. More analysis can be found in [2].

#### [M] Proposal 3F-v1:

For evaluation,

* the noise figure is [15-18]dB for mixer-first LP-WUS receiver.
* the noise figure is [23]dB for rectifier-first LP-WUS receiver without LO.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | This suggests that these two architecture are further studied. We should first make progress in 9.13.2 |
| vivo | Noise figure for LP-WUR should be different from that of main radio.  We supported this proposal, and also open to other values if justified in 9.13.2. |
|  |  |
| Intel | Fine with proposal for evaluation purpose. The value can be updated after a progress in 9.13.2 as proposed by Nordic |
| Nokia1 | Agree with Nordic, that there is definitely some consideration needed under LP-WUR architecture |
| Sony | The amount of noise figure depends on the WUR architecture. We suggest we wait for this until some progress is made is 9.13.2. This proposal assumes the above two architectures are selected to be further studied. |
| CATT | We are OK with the assumption with bracket |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Similar comments as that for frequency offset. This should be jointly determined with power values in the power model. This agenda item should not make assumptions yet on any particular Rx architecture, until progress in 9.13.2. In general, proposals such as this can wait and be reported by companies for the time being. |
| MediaTek | Mixer-first’s numbers look right, but rectifier-first’s numbers may be too high due to including LNA or other RF amplifiers. Details may need more discussions in the RX architecture agenda item. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal |
| Samsung | Fine to further discuss after progress on the LP-WUR architecture. |
| Ericsson1 | We suggest to consider WUR characteristics (noise figure, frequency error/drift etc.) and associated power consumption (i.e., LP-WUS power model) together. Suggest to adapt current proposals 3E-3G and 2C in that direction. |
| Apple | Similar to LP WUR power consumption, we could choose two or three representative values to start with the analysis. These values may be adjusted later pending the architecture discussion. The can minimize the dependency.  However, if we go this direction, only certain pairs of values would make sense for power consumption and noise figure, due to the trade-off between the two. |
| QC | NF depends on receiver architecture and the choice of RF components. Each company can report NF assumed for the receiver architecture being studied. |
| FL | In order to start coverage analysis, the following two representative values are assumed with bracket. [M] Proposal 3F-v1(modified): For LP-WUS coverage evaluation , the noise figure of LP-WUR is   * + Option 1: [15 -18]dB   + Option 2: [23]dB * FFS: how this associated with for LP-WUR architecture * The values provided is for the purpose of studying coverage of LP-WUS, and it can be further revisit depending on the receiver architecture discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | It can be discussed together with the architectures in 9.13.2. |

The latest proposal is as follows,

#### [M] Proposal 3F-v2:

For LP-WUS coverage evaluation , the noise figure of LP-WUR is

* + Option 1: [15 -18]dB
  + Option 2: [23]dB
* FFS: how this associated with for LP-WUR architecture
* The values provided is for the purpose of studying coverage of LP-WUS, and it can be further revisit depending on the receiver architecture discussion.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal |
| QC | For the purpose of evaluation and study, wide range should be allowed. We suggest following modification.  For LP-WUS coverage evaluation, the noise figure of LP-WUR is   * + Options : [9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24] * FFS: how this associated with for LP-WUR architecture * The values provided is for the purpose of studying coverage of LP-WUS, and it can be further revisited depending on the receiver architecture discussion. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Can we discuss this jointly with the power consumption value of LP-WUR? E.g. the corresponding Noise Figure for option1 and option 2 LP-WUR power model values, respectively. |
| vivo | We support this proposal |
| Nordic | Each company should report. |
| InterDigital | We believe that this proposal is a bit premature. We suggest that each company can report their report their assumption for now and further discuss the values later. |
| Samsung | Given all values in options are still in the bracket, we think there is no need to rush into having the agreement. Instead, we prefer to see further progress in 9.13.2. |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal |
| SONY | We are basically fine with the proposal, but think that the FFS wording needs cleaning up. For example:  For LP-WUS coverage evaluation , the noise figure of LP-WUR is   * + Option 1: [15 -18]dB   + Option 2: [23]dB * FFS: ~~how this associated with for~~ association between noise figure and LP-WUR architecture * The values provided are ~~is~~ for the purpose of studying coverage of LP-WUS, and ~~it~~ they can be further revisited depending on the receiver architecture discussion. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | QC’s proposal could be a starting point. Providing a finite set could be better than completely leaving it to company report. |
|  |  |

### [close]3G: LP-WUR Rx

Rx number is one of the parameters that has impacts on coverage. For NR DL channels, 2 or 4 antennas are required for different bands. For LP-WUS channel, how many antennas are used can be further discussed. Companies provided initial proposals on the number of receiving antennas, which are summarized as follows.

* Alt 1：1Rx
  + Huawei, vivo, [intel], [MTK], Lenovo(the baseline can be taken from that of RedCap), Qualcomm
* Alt 2: 4Rx
  + [intel]

#### [M] Proposal 3G-v1:

For evaluation, 1 Rx for LP-WUS receiver is baseline.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nordic | Support |
| Futurewei | We agree with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | OK with the Proposal |
| vivo | Support. |
| Panasonic | We are okay. |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal |
| Nokia1 | We are fine with this assumption. |
| Sony | Support the proposal. The value we agree on here should be consistent with 3C-v1 |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is not clear on the 1Rx. It is 1 Rx chain or 1 antenna?  We think it should be 1 Rx chain.   * For evaluation, 1 Rx chain for LP-WUS receiver is baseline. |
| MediaTek | We support this proposal. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | 1Rx should be prioritized 4Rx may be optional |
| Samsung | Agree with the proposal. |
| Apple | 1Rx can be the baseline. 2Rx may be additionally considered if we need to balance different metrics. |
| CMCC | OK. |
| DOCOMO | We support this proposal. |
| QC | Agree |
| FL3 | Majority’s preference is 1Rx. Hence, starting from 1Rx is reasonable. For my understanding, for FR1, 1 Rx antenna actually means 1 Rx chain and vice versa in the simulation. [M] Proposal 3G-v1(modified): For evaluation, 1 Rx chain for LP-WUS receiver is baseline. |
| EURECOM | OK |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK |

During the GTW session, related issue is agreed according to [ChairNote]. Therefore it can be close.

### 3H-v1: Others

**Other proposal related to coverage evaluation** are summarized as follows:

**Spreadtrum:** Assumption of whether the LP-WUS supports beam sweeping or not impacts at least the resource overhead and the coverage.

**ZTE:** it is suggested to **simplify the evaluation for each deployment to reduce the workload** if all the scenarios, Urban, Rural and Indoor deployment scenario, are considered for study.

The deployment scenarios for LP-WUS includes **Urban, Rural and Indoor.**

* Further discuss and decide which deployment can be optionally evaluated.
* The system level simulation for NW capacity can be deprioritized.

**CMCC**

With the existing Rel-15/Rel-16/Rel-17 5G NR network deployment, compared with the sensitivity of the main radio, low-power WUR with worse sensitivity has less applicable areas.

**Other proposal related to coverage evaluation**

**Nokia**

We assumed TDL-C-300ns channel, with 3kmh and 30kHz sub-carrier spacing. SSS was defined as per TS38.211 and PDCCH was assuming 48RB CORESET with 1 symbol (AL8, 41 bits + 24 CRC bits). As a LP-WUS signal a 14 OFDM symbols long MC-OOK sequence **(seven on/off symbol pairs) was used,** where ‘on’-durations were SSS signals (127-len). For LP-WUS a time domain envelope detector was considered with 6th order Butterworth filter followed by down sampling and averaging to determine the threshold. The sequence envelope is illustrated in Figure 6.



**ZTE:** The parameters should be selected based on the actual LP-WUS receiver architectures;

**Qualcomm:** FFS Receiver model based on receiver architecture study; prefer to have a unified receiver model for different low-power receiver architectures for non-OFDM based LP-WUS

# Summary of the previous agreements

## RAN1#110bis-e

# Proposals from companies’ submitted contributions

## FUTUREWEI

**R1-2208378 Evaluation of Low Power WUS and initial performance results FUTUREWEI**

Performance Metrics and Models

***Proposal 1: A set of relative power values and corresponding low-power receiver characteristics, e.g., sensitivity, needs to be defined for proper evaluation of power saving gains/losses.***

***Proposal 2: If LP-WUR’s full coverage is not a target design, a model capturing LP-WUR’s limited coverage scenario and the behavior/protocol of LP-WUR/Main Radio need to be defined for proper evaluation of the LP-WUS/WUR power saving gain.***

***Proposal 3: A set of signal design options and corresponding time/frequency resource requirements needs to be defined for proper evaluation of the network resource overhead in support of LP-WUS/WUR***

Assumptions and Use Case

***Proposal 4: A set of use cases and corresponding traffic models and power saving schemes parameters needs to be defined for proper evaluation/comparison with power consumption and latency of LP-WUS.***

Initial Results for Power Consumption and Latency

***Observation 1: LP-WUS can provide a significant power saving gain of compared to DRX but may provide a power saving loss of compared to eDRX.***

***Observation 2: Despite the slight power saving loss, LP-WUS can provide a significant latency reduction of compared to eDRX power saving scheme.***

***Observation 3: LP-WUS may suffer latency increase/penalty of for a DRX cycle-restricted main radio but can provide latency reduction of for a non DRX cycle-restricted main radio compared to DRX power saving scheme.***

***Observation 4: LP-WUS/WUR can enable a new power consumption vs. latency trade-off region that may not be achievable by either of the DRX and the eDRX power saving schemes.***

## Huawei, HiSilicon

**R1-2208417 Evaluation methodology for LP-WUS Huawei, HiSilicon**

1. **LP-WUR allows the main receiver to change between off/ultra-deep sleep state, and ‘on’ state.**
2. **The average power consumption of LP-WUR should be lower than the deep sleep power consumption of the main receiver to provide significant power saving gain.**
3. **Current power model defined in TR 38.840 does not account for how to model the transition for a new deeper sleep state.**
4. ***Evaluations should include traffic models applicable to smartphones.***
5. ***LP-WUS for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is prioritized at first.***
6. ***The deployment scenarios of LP-WUS at least include dense urban, rural macro and indoor hotspot.***
7. ***The power saving gain is evaluated by***

***where i is the slot index, is the power consumption of enhanced scheme in slot i, and is the power consumption of baseline scheme in slot i.***

1. ***For system level simulation, the assumptions specified in Table A2.1-1 in TR 38.802 can be the starting point, with necessary updates.***
2. ***For evaluation purposes, capture the following table in the TR and reuse other power stables of main receiver in TR 38.840.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Power state | Relative Power | Note |
| LP-WUR working state | 0.01 ~ 0.02 | The architectures proposed in [2] can achieve such a power consumption range, where the one without LO usually consumes more power than the one with LO. |
| LP-WUR non-working state | 0 | The wakeup receiver is turned off. |
| Ultra-deep sleep (main receiver) | [0] | The main receiver sleeps deeper than ‘Deep sleep’, and the power consumption is ultra-low. |

1. ***RAN1 to investigate how to model the transition energy for ultra-deep sleep state of main receiver for evaluation purpose.***
2. ***For evaluation purposes, the per-UE paging rate is assumed to be 1%, which is the same as in earlier releases.***
3. ***Rel-17 PEI and potential TRS occasions are taken as baseline mechanism for power saving gain evaluation.***
4. ***For coverage evaluation of LP-WUS, link budget, e.g. MCL or MIL, can be used as the metric.***
5. ***The following link simulation assumption is used for LP-WUS coverage evaluation***

***1 receive chain for LP-WUS***

***Noise figure is [18] dB / [23 ]dB for wakeup receiver with/without LO***

***Missed detection rate: 1%***

***False alarm rate: reported by companies***

***Other parameters are dependent on detailed design and reported by companies***

1. ***For evaluation purposes, the transition time of main receiver for ultra-deep sleep is assumed to be about one to several seconds.***
2. ***RAN1 needs to agree assumptions for the total latency introduced by LP-WUS, depending on the information the signal conveys, i.e. depending on the subsequent procedures assumed in the UE.***
3. ***Evaluations assuming the same SCS for legacy NR signal and LP-WUS transmitted by gNB are mandatory and the baseline. Evaluations with different SCSs for legacy NR and LP-WUS transmitted by gNB are optional, and companies to report the SCSs used.***
4. ***For evaluation purpose, the resource overhead of LP-WUS occupying REs is evaluated by , in a carrier of REs***

## Spreadtrum Communications

**R1-2208572 Discussion on evaluation on low power WUS Spreadtrum Communications**

KPI

***Observation 1: Using R17 PEI as baseline for the additional power saving gain of the LP-WUR can make comparison easy.***

***Observation 2: The latency may a key benefit of the LP-WUR.***

***Observation 3: The resource overhead to meet the coverage requirement may be a tradeoff for the power saving gain.***

***Observations 4: The coexistence between the legacy signal/channel and the LP-WUS may cause increase of the resource overhead.***

***Observation 5: The mobility may be affected by turning off the main receiver.***

Evaluation assumptions

***Observation 6: Assumption of always-on or periodically-on impacts KPIs widely.***

***Observation 7: Assumption of whether the LP-WUS supports beam sweeping or not impacts at least the resource overhead and the coverage.***

***Observation 8: Assumption of whether the main receiver should still monitor PO after wakeup impacts KPIs widely.***

***Observation 9: Assumption of whether the measurement is relaxed or not at the main receiver at least impacts the mobility.***

***Observation 10: Assumption of whether the main receiver needs to perform cell search after the main receiver is turned on at least impacts the latency and the power saving gain.***

***Observation 11: If the main receiver needs to perform cell search after wakeup, the main receiver can stay in a completely-off state before wakeup.***

We have the following proposals.

Evaluation methodology

***Proposal 1: The power model for the main receiver can reuse that defined in TR 38.840.***

***Proposal 2: The power consumption of detection of the LP-WUS can be defined.***

***Proposal 3: At least one type of sleep mode can be defined for the LP-WUR.***

***Proposal 4: The number of categories of power model for the LP-WUR depends on the outcome of discussion of architectures of the LP-WUR.***

***Proposal 5: The transition energy/time should be defined for transition between a sleep mode and active mode for the LP-WUR.***

KPI

***Proposal 6: The following KPIs for the LP-WUR can be used, e.g.***

* ***the power saving gain,***
* ***the latency,***
* ***the resource overhead to meet the coverage requirement, and***
* ***the mobility in terms of the measurement relaxation at the main receiver.***

***Proposal 7: The power saving gain can be the additional power saving gain compared with R17 UE power saving techniques, e.g. R17 PEI.***

Evaluation assumptions

***Proposal 8: The baseline evaluation assumptions should be determined, e.g.***

* ***paging rate,***
* ***group-paging-rate,***
* ***paging cycle,***
* ***link-level performance requirement for the LP-WUR, and***
* ***CFO requirement and the number of SS bursts to be processed for the main receiver.***

***Proposal 9: The additional evaluation assumptions should be studied and determined as much as possible, e.g.***

* ***always-on vs. periodically-on,***
* ***whether the LP-WUS supports beam sweeping or not,***
* ***whether the main receiver should still monitor PO after wakeup,***
* ***whether the measurement is relaxed or not at the main receiver, and***
* ***whether the main receiver needs to perform cell search after wakeup.***

## vivo

**R1-2208668 Evaluation methodologies for R18 LP-WUS/WUR vivo**

**Observation 1: For RRC connected mode, the additional latency by adopting LP-WUS/WUR is up to 3ms**

**Observation 2: For RRC idle/inactive UEs, the average UE power consumption is currently on several to tens of mW.**

**Observation 3: To achieve substantial power saving gain, a reasonable target power consumption of LP-WUR need to be at the level of 1/100~1/1000 of the main receiver, corresponding to tens to hundreds of μW.**

**Observation 4: When the LP-WUR power consumption is 30μW~500μW, UE battery life can be increased by 3~7 times compared with legacy UEs.**

**Observation 5: When the LP-WUR power consumption is 30μW~500μW, the standby time of IoT devices can be extended to up to 10 years with the use of a button battery for power supply.**

**Observation 6: The main contribution of latency comes from the LP-WUS monitoring cycle and the transition time of main radio.**

**Observation 7: With the assistance of a separate receiver i.e., LP-WUR, the main radio has the opportunity to enter an ultra-deep sleep state (i.e., deeper than the existing deep sleep).**

**Observation 8: Compared with existing deep sleep mode, the main radio in ultra-deep sleep state consumes longer transition time and more energy for the transition from the ultra-deep sleep state to normal operation.**

**Observation 9: Comparing with I-DRX paging, LP-WUR/WUS can largely reduce the UE power consumption (5x or 7x), with similar latency performance.**

**Observation 10: Comparing with eDRX, LP-WUR/WUS can largely reduce the latency (26x), with even lower UE power consumption.**

**Observation 11: Comparing with I-DRX paging and eDRX, LP-WUR/WUS provides a much better trade-off between latency and power consumption.**

**Observation 12: Comparing with Always-On LP-WUS monitoring, duty-cycled LP-WUS monitoring can further reduce power consumption while sacrificing latency performance.**

**Observation 13: The motivation to study LP-WUS/WUR in RRC connected mode for XR service is to reduce the excessive PDCCH monitoring due to unpredictable jitter.**

**Observation 14: Compared to the existing R15/16/17 power saving schemes, LP-WUS monitoring combined with main receiver micro sleep can bring {6%~15%} additional UE power saving gain with no capacity loss in both low load and high load cases.**

**Observation 15: Compared to the existing R15/16/17 power saving schemes, LP-WUS monitoring combined with main receiver light sleep can bring {10%~22%} additional UE power saving gain, with acceptable capacity loss at least in low load case.**

**Observation 16: About -80 dBm Receiver sensitivity is required for LP-WUS, to achieve same coverage as PUSCH with 1Mbps data rates in Urban scenario.**

**Observation 17: The bandwidth of the filter for suppressing ACI may be wider than the signal bandwidth to accommodate the frequency error at WUR.**

**Proposal 1: Study the following use cases for LP-WUS/WUR:**

1. **For IoT devices (e.g., sensors and controllers): The battery should last at least few years; Latency would be within several or tens of seconds; For latency sensitive sensors/actuators, the latency requirement is 1 or 2 seconds; The mobility would be stationary or nomadic.**
2. **For wearable devices: The battery should last a few weeks; Latency need to be within several seconds; Support of low/medium speed is required.**
3. **For XR devices or smart phones: power saving in CONNECTED mode is desirable; Latency which is critical for RRC CONNECTED state need to be in the order of milliseconds; Support of low/medium speed is required.**

**Proposal 2: Study the application of LP-WUS/WUR in both RRC idle/inactive mode and RRC connected mode.**

**Proposal 3: The target KPI for LP-WUR power consumption should be tens to hundreds of μW.**

**Proposal 4: The latency introduced by LP-WUR/WUS needs to consider two parts: wake-up delay and transition time of main radio.**

**Proposal 5: Target KPI of latency should be as follows.**

* **Depends on the length of LP-WUS monitoring cycle for RRC idle/inactive mode**
* **Wake up delay: depends on the length of LP-WUS monitoring cycle, e.g. hundreds of milliseconds**
* **Transition time: hundreds of milliseconds**
* **Several milliseconds for RRC connected mode**
* **Wake up delay: 0 (assuming continuous monitoring of LP-WUS)**
* **Transition time: up to 3ms**

**Proposal 6: Coverage of the LP-WUS should be comparable to the NR bottleneck channel.**

**Proposal 7: Around 100kbps data rate can be considered as design target for LP-WUS.**

**Proposal 8: The overall design target of coexistence is to support multiplexing between LP-WUS with legacy NR signals/channels and to allow reuse of unused LP-WUS resources for other DL transmissions.**

**Proposal 9: Adopt the following power consumption evaluation methods for R18** **LP-WUS/WUR study:**

* **For RRC idle/inactive mode, the simulation assumptions for R17 Power saving paging enhancement evaluation can be reused.**
* **For RRC connected mode, the simulation assumptions for R17/18 XR power evaluation can be reused.**

**Proposal 10: The latency can be roughly caculated as 1/2 LP-WUS monitoring cycle length + transition time of main radio.**

**Proposal 11: FAR and MDR is used as the performance metric for LP-WUS in link level simulation,**

* **{FAR, MDR}: {0.1%, 1%} can be assumed as starting point.**

**Proposal 12:**  **MIL metric defined in Coverage Enh SI can be reused as the metric for relative comparison between coverage of LP-WUS and NR channels.**

**Proposal 13: Resource overhead and network power consumption are evaluated by numerical analysis, using the outcome of NW energy saving study. Capacity impact is evaluated by system level simualtion using XR evaluation methodlogy for RRC CONNECTED.**

**Proposal 14: Adopt the following terminology for future discussion,**

* **Main radio：the Tx/Rx module operating for legacy system**
* **LP-WUR: The Rx module operating for receiving/processing LP-WUS**

**Proposal 15: For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation, the following power model of the ultra-deep sleep state agreed in R18 positioning SI for LPHAP is reused for main radio.**

* + **Note: the value of additional transition energy can be updated based on further agreement made in R18 positioning SI.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Relative Power | Additional transition energy:  (Relative power x ms) | Total transition time |
| Ultra-deep sleep | 0.015 | [2000-20000] | 400ms |

**Proposal 16: For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation, the following power model of LP-WUR is considered.**

* **Note: these value in brackets can be further confirmed based on the progress of LP-WUR architecture.**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Absolute Power | Relative Power | Additional transition energy | Total transition time |
| LP-WUR sleep | [2] μW | **[0.002]** | **0** | **0** |
| LP-WUR monitoring | [30~500] μW | **[0.03~0.5]** | **-** | **-** |

**Proposal 17: For comparison with R18 LP-WUS/WUR, both I-DRX paging and eDRX can be taken as baseline schemes.**

**Proposal 18: The evaluation assumptions given in Table 4~7 should be considered for R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation in RRC idle/inactive mode.**

**Proposal 19: For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation in RRC connected mode, R17 evaluation methodologies and assumptions captured in TR 38.838 (for XR) should be reused as baseline. And the jitter model (jitter range is [-8, +8]ms and jitter STD is 5ms) should be considered.**

**Proposal 20: For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation in RRC connected mode, during the LP-WUS monitoring by separate receiver, the power state of main radio can be micro or light sleep.**

**Proposal 21: For evaluation of the coverage of LP-WUS, the methodology and assumptions in R17 CovEnh SI should be reused.**

* **MIL is used as the metric for coverage evaluation;**
* **LP-WUS should be compared with NR bottle neck channel, i.e., PUSCH.**
* **PUSCH coverage is evaluated with the certain data rates as in CovEnh SI, e.g., 1Mbps for urban;**
* **LP-WUS specific evaluation assumptions and parameter, can be further discussed in the study.**

**Proposal 22: 15dB noise figure can be assumed for MIL calculation for LP-WUS.**

**Proposal 23: OOK/ASK based waveform, which are widely used for ultra-lower power receiver, can be assumed in link level simulation.**

**Proposal 24: Channel structure/coding/data rate should be reported in link level simulation,**

* **Channel Structure like {[Sync field] + information bits + [CRC]} can be assumed;**
* **Simple coding scheme, e.g., Manchester coding, can be used as starting point;**
* **~10 to ~100kbps raw data rate can be evaluated in the simulation.**

**Proposal 25: For frequency domain resources for LP-WUS, following can be assumed in link level simulation**

* **Around 1.4MHz ~ 4MHz channel bandwidth can be assumed as stating point;**
* **[1~2] RB Guard band reserved on each side of LP-WUS bandwidth can be assumed as starting point.**

**Proposal 26: For modeling adjacent interference, PDSCH can be mapped on RBs not used for LP-WUS and guard band.**

**Proposal 27:** **Around [4/2/1/0.5] MHz sampling rate can be considered in evaluation.**

**Proposal 28: [1] receiving antennas can be assumed for WUR in evaluation.**

**Proposal 29: 1-bit comparator or 2/4-bits ADC can be assumed for WUR in LLS.**

## InterDigital, Inc.

**R1-2208686 Discussion on evaluation on LP-WUS InterDigital, Inc.**

***Observation 1:*** *Most receivers consuming low power operate at frequencies below 3 GHz as required power consumption generally increases as carrier frequency increases.*

***Observation 2:*** *Link level simulation is a tool for evaluating coverage as well as false alarm rate and misdetection rate.*

***Proposal 1:*** *Focus on FR1 for evaluation in Rel-18 and study FR2 later if needed.*

***Proposal 2:*** *Support link level evaluation as baseline evaluation for LP-WUS.*

***Proposal 3:*** *Link level evaluation assumptions used for power saving (Table 4 in Appendix) can be a starting point for further discussion.*

***Proposal 4:*** *To evaluate power saving gain from LP-WUS, relative power, additional transition energy and total transition time should be additionally defined with a newly defined power state for LP-WUS*.

***Proposal 5:*** *FTP traffic and Instant messaging used for power saving (Table 3) can be used as baseline.*

***Proposal 6:*** *For system level simulation, the evaluation assumptions used for power saving (Table 5 in Appendix) can be a starting point for further discussion.*

## Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell

**R1-2208698 Low power WUS Evaluation Methodology Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell**

In section 2 we discussed study item scope and raised following observations and proposals:-

Observation 1: Many of the target use cases for the new WUS, are the same as those for the Reduced Capability devices developed for Release 17 and the being developed for Release 18.

Proposal 1: The SI considers the constraints of RedCap devices.

Proposal 2: Down prioritize the sidelink related studies for time being.

In section 3 we looked at the different deployment scenarios and make following proposals:-

Proposal 3: LP-WUS design and LP-WUR architecture support flexible placement in frequency domain.

Proposal 4: The wake-up signal design and wake up receiver architecture defined, allows efficient reuse of gNB hardware for signal generation.

Proposal 5: The LP-WUS signal design and LP-WUR architecture should be defined so that efficient multiplexing with existing NR signals and channels is possible to limit the resource reservation.

Proposal 6: Coverage and mobility implications should be accounted for in LP-WUS design and LP-WUR architecture assumptions.

Proposal 7: Consider in LP-WUS design and LP-WUR architecture the possibility to accommodate use cases with some degree of limited mobility.

Simulation and evaluation assumptions are addressed in section 4, with focus on the power saving and link level assumptions. In section 4 we observe following on the key performance indicators:-

Observation 2: Different key performance indicators need to be considered in the study should cover: power consumption, latency, coverage, selectivity/robustness data rate/capacity (from LP-WUS and system perspective).

Further in section 4.1 and 4.2 we discuss the assumptions related to the power saving evaluations, together with preliminary results and conclude:-

Observation 3: The power consumption model developed in Rel-16 and Rel-17 would need to be updated to account LP-WUR power consumption, based on the selected LP-WUR reference architecture

Observation 4: For Idle/Inactive mode enhancements, if main receiver is assumed to be in power off state deep sleep for the duration of inactivity, the time line would need to accommodate the time taken to detect a number of SSBs for re-synchronization prior full reception capabilities are resumed.

Observation 5: If power off state (below deep sleep state) is considered for the main receiver, sufficient time would need to be assumed to allow the (main) receiver to acquire synchronization. This would be dependent on the time tracking capability/support of the LP-WUR/WUS.

Observation 6: For both, Idle/Inactive and Connected mode evaluations, the needed serving cell evaluations would need to be accounted.

Observation 7: The latency involved with LP-WUR reception of LP-WUS is ≈5ms. However, the overall service/paging latency including sub-systems boot-up, calibration, and re synchronization, incurs the average delay of 960ms, which is bit more than DRX latency of 640ms.

Proposal 8: Account the evaluation assumptions presented in Table 1 and Table 2 for definition of power saving evaluation assumptions including the timeline for re-synchronisation after main receiver wake-up from power off.

Link level simulation assumptions, together with preliminary results are discussed in section 4.3 with a proposal:-

Proposal 9: Account assumptions presented in Table 3 in definition of the link level simulation assumptions

In Section 4.4 we discuss on the system level simulation assumptions:-

Observation 8: Overhead analysis should be considered for different LP-WUS designs and LP-WUR architectures, accounting any guard needed. Detailed system level simulation assumptions should be discussed once there is consensus on the focus use cases and related assumptions.

Finally in section 5 we touch upon on some other potential use cases for LP-WUS:-

Proposal 10: Consider the possible use cases of the LP-WUS in Connected mode.

Proposal 11: Consider the feasibility of using the LP-WUS to support/assist re-synchronization or time/frequency tracking.

Proposal 12: Consider the feasibility of using the LP-WUS to support coverage determination.

Proposal 13: Consider the feasibility of different paging procedures for LP-WUS.

## OPPO

**R1-2208843 Evaluation discussion on lower power wake-up signal OPPO**

***Observation 1****: Rel-18 lower power WUS/WUR could apply in many use cases, such as Industrial Wireless Sensor Network, Smart Wearable, Smart Home, Medical Health, etc.*

***Proposal 1: KPIs in table1, such as power consumption of LP-WUR, power saving gain, latency, coverage of LP-WUS, resource overhead, UE receiver sensitivity, etc. should be considered when study LP-WUS/WUR.***

***Proposal 2: Working mechanism for LP-WUR should be determined first, i.e. it need to determine LP-WUR monitor LP-WUS by always on or periodically manner.***

***Proposal 3: New power states and power consumption values should be defined in UE power consumption model for main radio and LP-WUR, respectively.***

***Proposal 4: UE power consumption model in TR38.840 can be modified as table 2 for Rel-18 LP-WUR/WUS.***

Table 2: UE power consumption model for LP-WUS/WUR

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Characteristics** | **Relative Power** |
| **Main radio** | | |
| [Quasi] Power Off | Main radio can keep power off when LP-WUR not wake-up main radio. | [0.01] |
| Deep Sleep | Time interval for the sleep should be larger than the total transition time entering and leaving this state. Accurate timing may not be maintained. | 1 (Optional: 0.5) |
| Light Sleep | Time interval for the sleep should be larger than the total transition time entering and leaving this state. | 20 |
| Micro sleep | Immediate transition is assumed for power saving study purpose from or to a non-sleep state | 45 |
| PDCCH-only | No PDSCH and same-slot scheduling; this includes time for PDCCH decoding and any micro-sleep within the slot. | 100 |
| SSB or CSI-RS proc. | SSB can be used for fine time-frequency sync. and RSRP measurement of the serving/camping cell. TRS is the considered CSI-RS for sync. FFS the power scaling for processing other configurations of CSI-RS. | 100 |
| PDCCH + PDSCH | PDCCH + PDSCH. ACK/NACK in long PUCCH is modeled by UL power state. | 300 |
| **LP-WUR** | | |
| LP-WUS monitor | Monitoring of low power wake-up signals.  [Two possible working mechanism, i.e., monitor lower power wake-up signals by always on or periodically on manner.] | [0.5] |
| [LP-WUR sleep] | Lower power wake-up radio keeps sleep state when no lower power wake-up signals.  [Monitoring LP-WUS by periodically manner] | [0.01] |

***Proposal 5: The power consumption and transition time during the state transition which main radio goes into power off should be considered.***

***Proposal 6****:* ***Following******Performance metrics should be evaluation.***

* + - ***UE power saving gain,***
    - ***Latency and Scheduling delay***
    - ***Overhead for reception of the LP-WUS***
    - ***Coverage performance***
    - ***False alarm rate and miss-detection rate***

## CATT

**R1-2208960 Deployment scenarios and evaluation methodologies for low-power WUS CATT**

* Proposal 1: The UE power consumption of preparation and detection of wakeup signal/channel should be significantly lower comparing to the wakeup indication by DCI formats 2\_6 and 2\_7 in the target study of low power wakeup receiver.
* Proposal 2: The wakeup receiver could be configured to monitor wake up signals continuously for on-demand access or with duty-cycle to align with the periodicity of DRX for CONNECTED mode UE or PO for IDLE/Inactive mode UE
* Proposal 3: The target requirements of UE power consumption, the receiver sensitivity and the minimum achievable data rate of Low-power wakeup should be defined as follows,
  + UE power consumption < [100] µW
  + Receiver sensitivity of Low-power wakeup receiver – [-80] dBm or maximum coupling loss at [126 dB]
  + Minimum achievable data rate – [160] bps
* Proposal 4: The study of low-power wakeup receiver should prioritize the single layer dense urban and indoor hotspot scenarios
* Proposal 5: The power model for the low-power wakeup receiver should include the following assumptions
  + The power consumption of low-power wakeup receiver is independent to that of NR receiver.
  + The power consumption of NR receiver should be negligibly low and assumed to be “zero” relative to the deep sleep mode value “1”.
  + The power model of the low-power wakeup receiver is defined relative to the power state of deep sleep mode with the assumption of the negligible power consumption of NR receiver.
* Proposal 6: The link and system level simulation assumptions are based on the system parameters of selected deployment scenarios of those scenarios with limited inter-site distance in Rel-16 UE power saving in TR38.840.
* Proposal 7: The baseline configuration for the study of low-power wakeup receiver should be the latest power saving techniques as follows,
  + CONNECTED mode: Rel-16 DRX adaptation with UE wakeup indication from DCI format 2\_6
  + IDLE/Inactive mode: Rel-17 paging enhancement with Paging Early Indication from DCI format 2\_7
* Proposal 8: The key performance index of LP-WUR study should include the UE power saving gain, system performance and overhead, the miss-detection/false alarm of the wakeup signaling detection.

## Intel Corporation

**R1-2209075 Discussion on evaluations on LP WUS Intel Corporation**

**Proposal 1:** For idle/inactive mode

* For the deeper sleep mode of main radio, the power consumption, additional transition energy and transition time can be respectively assumed as 0.015, 2000 and 400ms for the evaluation of power saving and latency reduction.
* The power consumption for the active or inactive state of LP-WUR is assumed to 100uW – 1mW and 1-10uW for the evaluation of power saving and latency reduction
* Performance metrics include ratio of power consumption reduction, latency reduction
* In the modeling, LP-WUS is assumed to replace PEI PDCCH
* Study LP-WUS to provide more information than PEI PDCCH

**Proposal 2:** For connected mode

* Two modes can be considered for evaluations
  + Model 1: LP-WUS detection in DRX ON for XR operation having periodic traffic with jitter in packet arrival time
  + Model 2: LP-WUS to trigger active PDCCH monitoring or SSSG switching assuming aperiodic traffic, e.g., ftp traffic is configured to the UE
* Performance metrics include ratio of power consumption reduction, latency reduction
* LP-WUS may provide a function that is similar to DCI format 2\_6
* Monitoring LP-WUS is further extended in the DRX ON time.

**Proposal 3:**

* Two performance metrics, false alarm rate of 1% and mis detection rate of 0.1% can be used in LP-WUS evaluation.
* If LP-WUS consists two parts, the link performance of the two parts need to be jointly considered to derive the final performance metrics
* The sensitivity for LP-WUS can be derived by the required SINR for LP-WUS detection

**Proposal 4:**

* Adopt Table 4 as a start point for the detailed link-level simulation assumptions for LP-WUS detection.

## ZTE, Sanechips

**R1-2209199 Evaluation on LP-WUS ZTE, Sanechips**

***Proposal 1: The following aspects should be considered for any studied use case for LP-WUS***

* ***Traffic model***
* ***Power consumption ratio of idle mode and connected mode***

***Proposal 2: The following KPIs of LP-WUS should be considered***

* ***For UE side***
* ***Power saving gain***
* ***Latency***
* ***Complexity increase***
* ***For gNB side***
* ***Coverage***
* ***Co-existence***
* ***Network power consumption/resource overhead/capacity***
* ***For LP-WUS***
* ***False alarm rate***
* ***Miss detection rate/BLER***
* ***Sync performance***

***Proposal 3: The deployment scenarios for LP-WUS includes Urban, Rural and Indoor.***

* ***Further discuss and decide which deployment can be optionally evaluated.***

***Proposal 4: If XR service is considered in LP-WUS study, the evaluation methodology in TR 38.838 can be reused.***

* ***FFS parameters, such as jitter range, need to be updated.***

***Proposal 5: The method to calculate the total power consumption can be based on the power consumption of main radio, the power consumption for LP-WUS receiver, and the power consumption for RRM measurement.***

***Where,***

**or**

***Proposal 6: The power off state of main radio should be introduced for power consumption evaluation.***

* ***The characteristics of power off state, the value of relative power and UE power consumption during the state transition should be defined.***

***Proposal 7: For LP-WUS, the relative power of WUR on state, WUR off state and the power consumption of WUR on-off transition state should be defined.***

***Proposal 8: For LP-WUS, RRM measurement assumptions should be determined.***

***Proposal 9: System configurations including paging rate and DRX cycle configuration in TR38.840 can be reused. eDRX configuration(s) can be chosen from existing eDRX configurations.***

***Proposal 10: For LP-WUS latency evaluation, paging arrival time, position relationship between LP-WUS and corresponding PO, and LP-WUS monitoring mechanism should be determined.***

***Proposal 11: Regarding network coverage evaluation for LP-WUS, the parameters/simulation assumptions of the deployment scenarios defined in TR38.875 can be used as references.***

***Proposal 12: Regarding network coverage evaluation for LP-WUS, its coverage performance should be equal or better than that of the limited channel evaluated in NR Rel-15/16/17.***

* ***Whether its coverage performance is consistent with that of paging message needs to be further considered.***

***Proposal 13: The following aspects need to be considered in LP-WUS design.***

* ***Network resource overhead, network power consumption can be evaluated and compared with NR signal, e.g., SSB.***
* ***Coexistence with non-low-power-WUR UEs can be further analyzed based on the outcome of LP-WUS design***
* ***The system level simulation for NW capacity can be deprioritized.***

***Proposal 14: Regarding LLS assumptions for LP-WUS receiver, the aspects such as system configuration, LP-WUS transmission configuration, LP-WUS receiver configuration and performance metrics should be considered and studied.***

* ***For system configurations, LLS /link budget parameter in TR38.875 can be used as reference.***
* ***For LP-WUS transmission configuration, LP-WUS receiver configuration and performance metrics, they depend on LP-WUS designs and corresponding LP-WUS receiver architectures.***

## xiaomi

**R1-2209270 Evaluation on low power WUS xiaomi**

***Proposal 1: For RRC idle/inactive state, two use cases can be considered for evaluation:***

***Case 1, LP WUS combined with legacy paging mechanism;***

***Case 2, LP WUS combined with enhanced paging mechanism.***

***Proposal 2: For RRC connected state, three use cases can be considered for evaluation:***

***Case 1, LP WUS used as DCP;***

***Case 2, LP WUS used during C-DRX on duration;***

***Case 3, LP WUS used without C-DRX.***

***Proposal 3:*** ***For RRC idle/inactive state, numerical calculation or statistics to evaluate power consumption and latency.***

***Proposal 4:*** ***For RRC connect state, system level or link level simulation to evaluate power consumption, latency and throughput.***

***Proposal 5:*** ***Link level simulation to evaluate miss detection rate/false detection rate of LP WUS sequence, and set the target miss detection rate/false detection rate as 10-3.***

***Proposal 6: Reuse power model/traffic model and simulation assumptions for power saving defined in TR 38.840 as much as possible. And extra model for LP WUS monitoring power consumption and the related wake up delay should be developed.***

## CMCC

**R1-2209361 Discussion on evaluation methodology and applicable scenarios for low power WUR CMCC**

**Observation 1: In the real world outside lab, “assisted parts” also need to be considered for low-power WUR. And the total power consumption of low-power WUR might be high up to the order of hundreds of uW or even mW, which is much higher than the power consumption of the “core parts” only.**

**Proposal 1: When evaluating the power consumption of low-power WUR, both the power consumption of the “core parts” and the “assisted parts” shall be taken into consideration, including VCO/Oscillator, IF Amp, Envelop Detector, BB Amplifier, Digital Circuit, Bias, PMIC, Bandgap voltage reference, GPIO, etc.**

**Observation 2: The transient period may be high up to the order of 10ms when the main radio to be turned on from the status of “turned off” or “deep sleep”.**

**Proposal 2: The transient period between “main radio turned on” and “main radio turned off/deep sleep” shall be taken into consideration in the evaluation methodology.**

**Observation 3: With the existing Rel-15/Rel-16/Rel-17 5G NR network deployment, compared with the sensitivity of the main radio, low-power WUR with worse sensitivity has less applicable areas.**

**Observation 4: To balance among the die area/benefits of power saving/complexity/cost, etc., the less bands supported, the more benefits can be obtained from the low-power WUR solution.**

**Proposal 3: Observation 3 and Observation 4 shall be taken into consideration when analyzing the applicable scenarios for low-power WUR.**

## MediaTek Inc.

**R1-2209502 Evaluation on low power WUS MediaTek Inc.**

**Proposal 1 Use cases can at least include wearables and XR for LP WUR/S.**

**Proposal 2 KPI can includes power consumption, data latency, coverage (MIL), and robustness (MDR and FAR) for LP WUR/S.**

**Proposal 3 For UE power and latency evaluation, introduce a power consumption model for LP-WUR, including WUR on/off power states and transition time/energy.**

**Proposal 4 For UE power and latency evaluation, introduce a new power state of "power off" for the Rel-15 reference UE and Rel-17 RedCap UE.**

**Proposal 5 For UE power and latency evaluation, reuse the traffic model in TR 38.875 as the baseline.**

**Proposal 6 For coverage evaluation, at least consider carrier frequencies of 700MHz and 2.6GHz.**

**Proposal 7 For coverage evaluation, reuse a template in R1-2009293 for Rel-18 RedCap.**

**Proposal 8 For coverage evaluation, LP WUR/WUS link-level simulation (LLS) is essential to evaluate the required SNR and the occupied LP-WUS bandwidth.**

**Proposal 9 For LP WUR/WUS LLS evaluation, consider a general baseband model including interference, low-pass filter, and frequency error.**

**Proposal 10 L1 signal and procedure design for LP WUR/WUS should consider coexistence and overhead impact.**

## Apple

**R1-2209605 On performance evaluation for low power wake-up signal Apple**

**Proposal 1: All the use cases can be considered for the study.**

**Proposal 2: RRC idle/inactive mode can be prioritized for the study.**

**Proposal 3: For performance evaluation of LP WUS/WUR for idle/inactive UEs, the following KPIs should be considered:**

* **WUS detection performance, including missed detection rate and false alarm rate**
* **Coverage**
* **UE power saving gain**
* **Paging latency**
* **WUS overhead**

**Proposal 4: For WUS evaluation, use the evaluation methodology and power model defined in TR 38.840 as the baseline. Additionally, define the following parameters for UE power model:**

* **The power consumption of the main radio in “ultra-deep sleep state”**
* **The transition time and transition energy for the main radio to go from/to non-sleep state to/from ultra-deep sleep state**
* **The power consumption of WUR during active monitoring**
* **The power consumption of WUR when it is not actively monitoring**

**Proposal 5: Set a preliminary target of sub-mW level power consumption for WUR during active monitoring.**

**Proposal 6: RRM measurement enhancements should be considered as part of LP WUS/WUR evaluation.**

## Rakuten Symphony

**R1-2209621 Discussion on low power WUS evaluation Rakuten Symphony**

**Proposal 1: Consider MC-OOK and MC-FSK waveforms as candidates for the low power WUS.**

**Proposal 2: Assume maximum power of 0.5 mW and sensitivity of -80 dBm or better.**

**Proposal 3: Consider the parameters in Table 1 for simulation analysis.**

Table 1 WUS/WUR evaluation assumptions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Features** | **Assumptions** |
| Waveform | MC-OOK, MC-FSK |
| Carrier frequency | 2.4 GHz, 5 GHz (TBD) |
| SCS | 15 kHz, 30 kHz |
| WUS bandwidth | [4] MHz |
| Simulation type | Link level, system level (optional) |
| Channel model | AWGN, TDL-A, TDL-C |
| Packet size | TBD |
| WUS frequency location | In-band |
| Channel bandwidth | 20 MHz |
| Adjacent channel interference | WUS and NR legacy channels adjacent in the same channel (Guard band TBD) |
| Frequency offset | 200 ppm |
| Phase noise model | [802.11ba model] |
| UE mobility | 0 km/h and 3 km/h |

## Lenovo

**R1-2209665 Discussion on the evaluation methodology for low power WUS Lenovo**

Proposal 1: RAN1 study prioritize latency tolerant low sensitive use case for evaluation

* IIoT use case: Sensor and actuator control, condition monitoring sensors in factories, environmental monitoring sensors such as temperature, pressure etc.,, and low power asset tracking applications
* Commercial use case: Wearable devices such as smart watch, smart meter etc.,

Proposal 2: Prioritize duty cycle-based LP-WUR application compared to always-on LP-WUR

Proposal 3: Prioritize studying the LP-WUR for idle/inactive mode UEs

Proposal 4: Consider FR1 and single receive antenna for coverage evaluation

Proposal 5: Consider similar coverage level for the LP-WUR implemented in a supplementary chip and the main NR receiver

Proposal 6: Consider both in-band and out of band combination to evaluate the cost, complexity, and coverage of LP-WUR and LP-WUS

Proposal 7: LP-WUR device capabilities can include receive-only LP-WUR and transmit-receive LP-WUR. For evaluation framework, consider the evaluation of receive-only LP-WUR at the beginning

Proposal 8: Consider candidate waveform based on MC-OOK and FSK with their respective receiver architecture to evaluate power consumption, coverage, data rate, sensitivity and selectivity

Proposal 9: Consider candidate LP-WUS bandwidth similar to RedCap bandwidth, SSB bandwidth

Proposal 10: Consider LP-WUS to be FDMed with the existing NR signal/channel including the requirement for guard resource blocks

Proposal 11: Consider reporting the latency from the successful reception of the LP-WUS in the supplementary chip to the waking up of the main receiver to successfully receive PDCCH

Proposal 12: Consider reporting paging reception delay with and without LP-WUR

## Sharp

**R1-2209685 Discussion on evaluation for low power WUS Sharp**

**Observation 1**: The power consumption models for R16 power saving can be reused for LP-WUS evaluation.

**Observation 2**: The power consumption model for LP-WUS receive can include two states at least, and the details need more study.

**Observation 3:** The system configurations used to evaluate R16 power saving can be reused and should be extended with the configuration with 20MHz system bandwidth extended.

**Observation 4:** The traffic model can use the same assumptions as the R16 power savings study.

## Samsung

**R1-2209756 Evaluation on LP-WUS/WUR Samsung**

**Proposal 1: Add XR, smart glasses and smartphones as target use cases.**

**Proposal 2: Power consumption of LP-WUR should target to achieve hundreds of uW or below.**

**Proposal 3: The design of LP-WUS should strive to minimize the impact to the gNB.**

**Proposal 4: Power consumption model defined in TR38.840 is reused with the following enhancements for LP-WUR/WUS evaluation:**

* **Power unit needs to be defined for the cases that LP-WUR is on, LP-WUR detects LP-WUS, and LP-WUR wakes up the main radio;**
* **A new state for the main radio needs to be defined for the case that the main radio is turned off;**
* **Transition time and power unit need to be defined for transition between the off state of the main radio and other states.**

**Proposal 5: Target probabilities of false alarm and misdetection should be determined based on their impact on the latency and the power consumption.**

**Proposal 6: Coverage of LP-WUS/WUR should be similar to that of main radio.**

**Proposal 7: Latency is defined as the time duration from the point that the gNB transmits LP-WUS to the point that main radio receives the PDSCH.**

**Proposal 8:  Evaluation assumptions in TR38.901 are reused for link level simulation.**

**Proposal 9: Evaluation assumptions in TR38.840 are reused for evaluation of UE power saving gain.**

## Rakuten Mobile, Inc

**R1-2209766 Initial view on evaluation of low-power WUS Rakuten Mobile, Inc**

**Proposal 1**  
Power consumption reduction gain of LP-WUS should be evaluated.

**Observation 1**  
Overall framework of application of LP-WUS needs to be clarified to evaluate overall power consumption gain.

**Proposal 2**

For the assumption of framework of LP-WUS, minimum impact to the network deployment should be assured.

**Proposal 3**For the evaluation of the power consumption gain of LP-WUS, power consumption modelling of the Rel-16/17 WUS can be utilized.

**Proposal 4**Link level performance should be evaluated.

**Proposal 5**

Coverage by LP-WUS should be kept to the same level as existing cell coverage by NR.

**Proposal 6**System-level evaluation should be conducted.

**Proposal 7**  
Regarding frequency assumption, in-band operation can be the baseline.

## Ericsson

**R1-2209862 Evaluation framework for low power WUS Ericsson**

[Proposal 1 For evaluating IoT and wearable use cases, consider the mMTC traffic model in ITU M.2412, and the heartbeat and instant messaging traffic models in 3GPP TR 38.875. For evaluating other use cases (e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones), the corresponding traffic models in TR 38.838 and TR 38.840 can be considered.](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442420)

[Proposal 2 For evaluating use cases with tight delay requirements (e.g., XR), feasibility of LP-WUR waking up the main radio with low latency should be studied also considering the associated power consumption for the main radio.](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442421)

[Proposal 3 Following general framework should be used as starting point for WUS evaluations:](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442422)

[· transmission of LP-WUS should not require new gNB hardware and should not trigger new emissions/compliance requirements for gNBs](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442423)

[· it should be possible to dynamically reuse unused LP-WUS resources for other NR transmissions (i.e., dedicated time/frequency resource reservation for WUS should be avoided)](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442424)

[· it should be possible to multiplex LP-WUS with other NR transmissions in time or frequency domain without causing interference](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442425)

[· LP-WUS is transmitted on Uu interface from gNB to UE](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442426)

[Proposal 4 For the main radio power model](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442427)

[· Use existing models in TR 38.840 and TR 38.875 as starting point for evaluations](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442428)

[· Study whether any updates are needed for the power model (including any updates to scaling factors, transition time) when the main radio is operated in conjunction with LP-WUR](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442429)

[· Consider additional energy (if any) consumed to acquire synchronization](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442430)

[Proposal 5 For each LP-WUR architecture considered in the study, consider at least the below aspects as part of the LP-WUR power model](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442431)

[· LP-WUR active power when monitoring LP-WUS](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442432)

[· LP-WUR sleep power when not monitoring LP-WUS (when a duty cycle for LP-WUS detection is applicable for the LP-WUR)](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442433)

[· Transition energy and transition time (if any) between above two states](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442434)

[· Transition time and transition energy (if any) for triggering the main radio from a given main-radio sleep state.](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442435)

[· Additional energy (if any) consumed to acquire synchronization for detecting LP-WUS](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442436)

[Proposal 6 For power saving evaluations, consider impact of DRX/Paging configuration assumptions for the UE and impact of false wake-up of main radio due to LP-WUR false alarms.](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442437)

[Proposal 7 For coverage evaluations, link-budget for candidate LP-WUS/WUR designs should be compared to that of NR-PDCCH link budget for various deployment scenarios (e.g., those identified in TR 37.910)](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442438)

[· LP-WUS/WUR designs should strive to match the coverage for NR PDCCH](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442439)

[Proposal 8 Network overhead should be evaluated for each LP-WUS design proposal considering the time/frequency resources used for LP-WUS transmission (including any guard-bands) and any additional resources used for synchronization.](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442440)

[Proposal 9 For RRC-Idle mode evaluations, impact of LP-WUS/WUR operation on paging latency (e.g., time between the arrival of paging message at gNB and the reception of PDCCH with P-RNTI and any associated PDSCH by the UE) should be considered.](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442441)

[Proposal 10 For RRC-Connected mode evaluations, impact of LP-WUS/WUR operation on scheduling latency (e.g., time between arrival of DL data at gNB and the corresponding PDCCH scheduling the data to UE) should be considered.](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442442)

[Proposal 11 Impact of LP-WUS/WUR operation on NW Energy Efficiency should be considered especially if LP-WUS transmissions require significantly more time/frequency resources compared to PDCCH or require additional always-on transmissions from gNB.](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442443)

[Proposal 12 For link-level evaluation of LP-WUS](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442444)

[· Target a joint missed detection probability of LP-WUS and paging/scheduling PDCCH to be ~ 10-2](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442445)

[· Evaluate false alarm probability both in the absence of gNB transmissions, and in the presence of other gNB transmissions, e.g., random QAM symbols](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442446)

[o False alarm probability value can be assumed to be 1e-3 or alternately determined during the evaluations to optimize power saving gain (in which case the assumption should be reported)](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442447)

[· Minimum SNR required to achieve required mis-detection performance should be reported](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442448)

[Proposal 13 Impact of LP-WUR characteristics/impairments (e.g., oscillator error/drift) should be considered for link-level evaluations.](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442449)

[Proposal 14 Noise figure assumed for a particular LP-WUR architecture should be reported.](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442450)

[Proposal 15 Following KPIs should be considered for LP-WUS/WUR evaluations.](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115442451)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **KPI** | **Idle mode evaluations** | **Connected mode evaluations** |
| UE Energy consumption | Energy consumption for paging reception | Energy consumption for data reception |
| Latency/UPT | Paging delay: Time between the paging message arrives at gNB and the reception of PDCCH with P-RNTI and any associated PDSCH by the UE. | Scheduling delay: Time between the arrival of DL data to be scheduled at gNB and the corresponding PDCCH reception at the UE.  Scheduling delay impact on UPT. |
| Coverage | Link-budget for candidate LP-WUS/WUR designs compared to that of NR-PDCCH (e.g., using assumptions in TR 37.910) | |
| Network overhead and Network energy consumption | Time/frequency resources used for WUS transmission (including any guard-bands) and any additional resources used for synchronization.  Impact of LP-WUS/WUR operation on energy consumption. | |
| Link level aspects to ealuate LP-WUS/WUR | * Minimum SNR required to achieve required mis-detection performance   + Noise figure and other receiver impairments (e.g., clock accuracy/drift) assumed for LP-WUR should be reported * Mis-detection rate   + ~1e-02 (Joint missed detection probability of LP-WUS and paging/scheduling PDCCH) * False alarm rate   + 1e-03 or alternately determined during the evaluations to optimize power saving gain (in which case the assumption should be reported). Should be studies both in the absence of gNB signals, and in the presence of other gNB signals (e.g., random QAM symbols can be considered) | |

We also make the following observation based on initial evaluation results

[Observation 1 WUR power saving gains are larger especially for cases where shorter DRX cycles are needed and is therefore most beneficial for use cases with tighter requirements on DL latency (e.g., actuators, alarms, sirens).](file:///D:\My%20Documents\002.Report\5G%20NR-vivo\Rel-18\AZP接收机\3GPP\RAN1%23110bis-e\contributions\docs\Ericsson_R1-2209862_lpwus_eval_v0.docx#_Toc115432099)

## Qualcomm Incorporated

**R1-2210010 Evaluation methodology for LP-WUS Qualcomm Incorporated**

**Proposal 1: RAN1 considers following use cases for the evaluation of LP-WUR.**

* IoT use cases with low latency and low power requirement, e.g.,
  + Actuator control
  + On-demand sensing application (the case age of sensed information matters)
  + On-demand location tracking
  + Wearable device
* IoT use case with low power requirement, e.g.,
  + Sensing
  + Metering
* Other use cases: eMBB/XR

**Proposal 2: Include following KPIs: power consumption, latency, sensitivity, data rate, false wakeup probability (due to grouping and false alarm), and misdetection probability.**

**Proposal 3: Use existing 38.840 power model and discuss/agree on additional assumptions based on evaluation done during Rel-17 UE power saving WI as starting point.**

* Additional assumptions made during R17 power saving (UEPS) WI include
  + **Idle mode wakeup timeline in low/high SNR**
  + **SSB monitoring for RRM (serving cell / neighbor cell)**
  + **PO monitoring**

**Proposal 4: Introduce ULPS state with** **power consumption, transition time and energy as shown in Table 1.**

**Proposal 5: Introduce LP-WUR monitoring and sleep state.**

* Power numbers for each state are part of study.
* LP-WUR transition energy and time are assumed to be zero.

**Proposal 6: Introduce clock error parameters, e.g.,**

* Clocks frequency drift (ppm/s) [X, Z].
* Clocks maximum frequency error (ppm) [Y, L].

**Proposal 7: Introduce IoT traffic model with very sparse traffic arrival.**

* Group paging
* Poisson page arrival with average paging inter-arrival time: [tens of min to hours]
* Latency requirements to be considered.
  + E.g., [0.5]sec for actuator control/wearable, [1-60]sec for location tracking and on-demand sensing

**Observation 1**

* Sensitivity is a function of receiver’s noise figure, required SNR, and data rate.

**Proposal 8: Study potential values for WUR’s NF, including the case when the WUR’s NF is similar to MR.**

**Proposal 9: Adopt the above link-level simulations assumptions.**

## EURECOM

**R1-2210051 Discussion on Evaluation on Low power WUS EURECOM**

**Observation 1: Manchester coding significantly improves performance of ED.**

**Observation 2: For MC-OOK, the number of allocated sub-carriers is a trade-off between SNR gain and multi-path diversity gain.**

**Observation 3: Jointly encoding multiple bits results in significant performance gain.**

**Observation 4: More elaborate coding strategies significantly increase spectral efficiency while maintaining moderate decoding complexity.**

## NTT DOCOMO, INC.

**R1-2210169 Discussion on evaluation methodology for low power WUS NTT DOCOMO, INC.**

**Proposed 1: Mobility and measurement procedure with LP-WUS/WUR should be further studied.**

**Proposed 2: Reuse the following UE power model in Rel-17 agreement.**

**Proposed 3: New power consumption should be modelled for deep sleep mode at least.**

* + Transition from/to deep sleep mode
  + monitoring LP-WUS by WUR

## Nordic Semiconductor ASA

**R1-2210197 On LP-WUS evaluation Nordic Semiconductor ASA**

***Proposal-1:*** *RAN1 to study and decide what target MIL should be for LP-WUS in the following scenarios; (i) Rural (700MHz), (ii) Urban scenario (2.6 GHz) and (iii) Urban scenario (4GHz).*

***Proposal-2:*** *For considered LP-WUS architectures, estimate the achievable Noise Figures.*

***Proposal-3:*** *R16 LPWA is a power consumption reference for LP-WUS.*

***Proposal-4:*** *To rigorously benchmark LP-WUS, discuss how to map LP-WUS power consumption to 3GPP relative power units. Consider conversion ratio of 1unit =10uW.*

***Proposal-5:*** *Target that LP-WUS power consumption with T/10 latency is better than that of (e)DRX with latency T.*

## Sony

**R1-2210222 Evaluation for low power WUS Sony**

The following observation is made:

***Observation 1 – When designing a low-power WUR, there is a trade-off between WUR power consumption and its level of noise figure and sensitivity.***

The following proposals are made:

***Proposal 1 – Support to target low-power WUS/WUR for power-sensitive, low-traffic, small form factor devices such as RedCap devices addressing IoT use cases (such as industrial sensors, controllers) and wearables where delay requirement or device reachability in time is short.***

***Proposal 2 – Update the NR power model and include low-power WUR characteristics in terms of power consumption and transition times.***

***Proposal 3 – The power model for LP-WUR should cater for different LP-WUR architectures.***

***Proposal 4 – LP-WUS coverage target is based on the coverage analysed in the Rel-17 coverage enhancements SI.***

***Proposal 5 – RAN1 considers fallback mechanisms for UEs that are out of coverage of the LP-WUS.***

***Proposal 6 – Update performance evaluation assumption and include latency, coverage and mobility requirement as well as requirements on low-power WUS probabilities of miss-detection and false-alarm into list of assumptions.***

***Proposal 7 – LP-WUS power saving performance is compared against reference power saving mechanisms that are applicable to RedCap devices.***

# SID

[*RP-222644*](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_97e/Docs/RP-222644.zip)

**The study item includes the following objectives:**

* Identify evaluation methodology (including the use cases) & KPIs [RAN1]
  + Primarily target low-power WUS/WUR for power-sensitive, small form-factor devices including IoT use cases (such as industrial sensors, controllers) and wearables
    - Other use cases are not precluded
* Study and evaluate low-power wake-up receiver architectures [RAN1, RAN4]
* Study and evaluate wake-up signal designs to support wake-up receivers [RAN1, RAN4]
* Study and evaluate L1 procedures and higher layer protocol changes needed to support the wake-up signals [RAN2, RAN1]
* Study potential UE power saving gains compared to the existing Rel-15/16/17 UE power saving mechanisms, the coverage availability, as well as latency impact of low-power WUR/WUS. System impact, such as network power consumption, coexistence with non-low-power-WUR UEs, network coverage/capacity/resource overhead should be included in the study [RAN1]
  + Note: The need for RAN2 evaluation will be triggered by RAN1 when necessary.
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