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# Introduction

This triggers the email discussion of the following:

|  |
| --- |
| [110bis-e-R18-NW\_ES-01] Email discussion on performance evaluation by October 19 – Yi (Huawei)   * Check points: October 14, October 19 |

Please search for ‘FL4’ for input, and the input is expected by UTC 14:00pm, Oct. 13th, except for the question in section 2.5 can be earlier, preferably by UTC 9:00am, Oct. 13th.

## Recommendations for GTW/email approval:

|  |
| --- |
|  |

## Outcome of GTW/email discussion

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Energy consumption model for BS

## Inter-sleep mode transition and handling of low-power UL signal

FUTUREWEI considers that agreement from RAN1#110 on the assumption of a non-sleep mode between adjacent sleep modes are strictly for the purpose of evaluations, and from BS operations flexibility perspective transition between any sleep modes and between sleep and non-sleep modes is supported in the BS. A WUS signal may also be received at e.g. deep sleep mode that lead to power state change.

China Telecom discusses the transition between sleep modes and illustrates how it may have impact on the calculation of additional transition energy (see section 2.2).

InterDigital considers a separate power state for the purpose of detection of WUS can be added in between light sleep and active UL.

Ericsson does not explicitly propose to model inter-sleep mode transition, while there is a similar consideration in calculation of the additional transition energy, using summation of effect of different sleep modes.

### Initial round (closed)

Based on the above, it seems that for evaluation purpose including the calculation of total additional transition energy, the inter-sleep mode transition is not strictly required. From BS operation perspective, it is also FL understanding that inter-sleep mode transition is not/cannot be precluded. What matters to RAN1 may be how the potential techniques can be investigated if it is specific to the inter-sleep mode transition.

For the use of a low power UL signal, there is a relevant agreement allowing companies to report such details including receiver and other impact on the power consumption model. In other words, this allows to optionally report a different/lower P5’ as WUS reception, with other details subject to companies report, which may be sufficient already. For the mentioned signaling via BH, if there is no other RAN1 impact and the benefits in terms of BS energy saving gain come from the triggered change of BS power states, it might be possible to be studied in RAN3 in terms of e.g. specific parameters to be sent. The details will be up to RAN3 study.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FL1 Proposal 2.1.1:**  Inform RAN3 that the study of potential signaling/trigger over BH that changes the BS power state defined in RAN1 is not precluded by the following RAN1 agreements, which is for RAN1 evaluation purpose:  *Agreement*  *For initial evaluations, there is always a non-sleep mode assumed between adjacent sleep modes.* | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We are reluctant to agree on the necessity of sending LS to RAN3 since RAN1 still do not intend to restrict inter-sleep mode transition from gNB’s implementation while RAN1 restrict it only for evaluation purpose. Otherwise, if RAN1 agree some restriction from gNB’s implementation perspective, we can trigger the discussion on sending LS to RAN3. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/Nsb | OK |
| Spreadtrum | Fine.  In addition, for handling of low-power UL signal, we are not sure how a gNB can detect UL signal with the main receiver during sleep, but if the gNB has a separate LP-WUR, it is sure. |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree. |
| Futurewei | Support |
| Samsung | We don’t see the need for sending LS to RAN3. Above RAN1 agreement (with “For initial evaluation”) does not restrict any RAN3 study. |
| OPPO | support |
| CATT | We are OK for the proposal but don’t see the urgency in sending the LS at this time. |
| Vodafone | OK |
| Intel | OK |
| FL2 | According to the first GTW and clarification from Chair, this can be closed without explicit agreement/action. |

## Power values per reference configuration

For reference configuration Set 1, working assumption was made for relative power values and the total transition time.

For the relative power values for Set 2 and Set 3, some companies input are available. Further, there is consideration on how to determine the values for Set 2 due to the dependency on reference configuration. For example, the smaller number of TxRU of Set 2 implies a smaller power value. On the other hand, some companies consider this cross-comparison is not needed, since both Set 1 and Set 2 use relative power value of 1 for deep sleep and companies’ input are anyway relative values based on each own results. Companies positions are shown as below.

For Set 1 reference configuration,

* The following companies consider that the relative power values and transition time as working assumption can be confirmed:
  + Huawei/HiSilicon, [Nokia/NSB], vivo, ZTE, CMCC, Rakuten, Samsung, Ericsson, Qualcomm (and clarify the value is per symbol-level)
* The following companies think small adjustment can also be considered:
  + Huawei/HiSilicon (2nd, for the purpose of aligning power values among Set 1-Set 3), NTT DOCOMO(2nd, for the purpose of aligning additional transition energy).

For Set 2/Set 3 reference configuration, apart from the agreements to use the same transition time as that for Set 1, for relative power values,

* Option 1: the values for Set 2/3 should be smaller than those for Set 1. Supported by
  + Huawei/HiSilicon (2nd), Nokia/NSB, vivo, OPPO, Ericsson, NTT DOCOMO(2nd), Qualcomm
* Option 2: the values can be based on companies input with averaging approach (similar to the approach for obtaining the values for Set 1), supported by
  + Huawei/HiSilicon, ZTE(2nd), MediaTek, Rakuten, Samsung, NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo
* Option 3: same values as Set 1 can be reused, supported by
  + ZTE, CMCC

Other reference configuration seems to be proposed by Qualcomm, see section 3.2.

The following summarizes the proposed power values for each reference configuration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon, ZTE, MediaTek, Rakuten, Samsung (for Cat 2 only), NTT DOCOMO, Lenovo, | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Light sleep | 23 | 20 | 2.6 | 1.8 | | Micro sleep | 50 | 38 | 5 | 3 | | Active DL | 240 | 152 | 40 | 8.4 | | Active UL | 90 | 80 | 5.8 | 4.2 | |
| Nokia, NSB | **Table 1: Relative Power for FR1 Set 2 Cat.2**   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Power State** | | **Relative power consumption** | | **Sleep State** | Deep sleep | P1=1 | | Light sleep | P2=1.7 | | Micro sleep | P3=4,2 | | **Active state** | Active DL | P4=12 | | Active UL | P5=4,6 | |
| Ericsson | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Operation/state** | *Power level, relative units (FR1 TDD)* | **Power level, relative units (FR1 FDD)** | **Power level, relative units (FR2 TDD)** | | Active DL | *280* | **[160]** | **[70]** | | Active UL | *110* | **[90]** | **[40]** | | “Micro”-sleep | *55* | **[50]** | **[20]** | | “Light”-sleep | *25* | **[23]** | **[15]** | | “Deep”-sleep | *1* | **1** | **1** | |
| Qualcomm | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **BS operation** | **Set 2 FR1** | | Active transmission (100% PRB utilization) | [270] | | Active reception (100% PRB utilization) | [80] | | Micro sleep | [50] | | Light sleep | [20] | | Deep sleep | 1 |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **BS operation** | **Set 3 FR2** | | Active transmission (100% PRB utilization) | [74] | | Active reception (100% PRB utilization) | [46] | | Micro sleep | [15] | | Light sleep | [8] | | Deep sleep | 1 | |
| Intel | Since reference configurations for Set 2 and 3 includes parameters that are different than Set 1, active states values can be different to some extent, which can be further discussed. As first step, we can agree to adopt same relative power (as agreed for Set 1) and transition energy (to be agreed) values for sleep modes. Note that same transition time is already agreed across all Sets. For the active state, we have following suggestions (taken from proposed version in post-RAN1 110 email discussion)   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Light sleep | 25 | 25 | 2.1 | 2.1 | | Micro sleep | 55 | 55 | 5.5 | 5.5 | | Active DL | 240 | 152 | 40 | 8.4 | | Active UL | 90 | 80 | 5.8 | 4.2 | |

### Initial round

The relative power values are closely implementation related, and when reported they are relative values so may not need to clarify it is symbol level or slot level.

When cross check the values between Set 1 and Set 2 it is reasonable to take smaller ones for Set 2/3. Thus the averaged values based on companies input for Set 2 and Set 3 has some discrepancy when cross-comparing different sets, although it gains slightly majority support.

The root cause for this discrepancy come from the input from some companies who use the same values for Set 1 and other Sets. Thus there could be several approaches for addressing this:

**Approach 1**: Do not count the input of source(s) who use same values across sets. However, this may cause another question on how to deal with the WA where the same source(s) also contributes to the relative power values, and why the values of other sources could be more practical/justified/accurate.

**Approach 2**: Revisit the relative power values/transition times in the WA for Set 1, e.g. re-assigning the values of some sources from Cat 1 to Cat 2, then the issue could also be mitigated. This although seems to be the most consistent approach, FL feels reluctant to re-open the discussion for Set 1 which is the effort/compromise from last meeting.

**Approach 3**: Use the same values for all Sets of reference configurations. This may be a further compromise given no company objects the WA for Set 1, although it may lack some insights from attempting different value ranges point of view.

FL considers Approach 1 and 2 may just cause more potential issues when addressing one. Approach 3 has a potential issue that could possibly occur if the observation for a given technique is significantly different between FDD and TDD, or between FR1 and FR2 when using different values across sets. On the other hand, the different reference configurations now are functionally incorporated into different SLS assumptions, and the evaluations can still benefit from e.g. different antenna configurations, BW etc. Thus, whether the relative power values among the sets is same or different may not be such critical. The impact on the conclusion in case of TDD/FDD or FR1/FR2 may still be investigated with individual companies’ input of relative power values, if found needed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FL1 Proposal 2.2.1:**  **Confirm the Working Assumption with the following udpate:**   * **For RAN1 evaluation purpose, for reference configuration set 1/2/3, the values are provided as below. ~~FFS set2 and set 3.~~** * **Other values can be optionally reported.**  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P*** | | **Total transition time *T*** | | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | Cat 1:  50ms | Cat 2:  10s | | Light sleep | Cat 1: 25 | Cat 2: 2.1 | Cat 1: 6 ms | Cat 2: 640 ms | | Micro sleep | Cat1: 55 | Cat 2: 5.5 | 0 | 0 | | Active DL | Cat 1: 280 | Cat 2: 32 | N.A. | N.A. | | Active UL | Cat 1: 110 | Cat 2: 6.5 | N.A. | N.A. | | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Although these values may not reflect the exact values of product, they can be used as a starting point for evaluation. We are fine with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Considering the parameters (such as a total number of DL TX RUs, bandwidth, and total DL power level) of the agreed reference configuration, it would be more practical that the relative power values for reference configuration set 2 and set 3 is lower than those for set 1. However, we can agree with the proposal if the majority supports this proposal. |
| DOCOMO | Although we prefer Approach 2 to mitigate the issue on the additional transition energy, we could live with the proposal. As mentioned by FL, it may not be critical whether the relative power values among the sets is same or different as scaling factor can still be applied for different sets. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not agree.  To our view, using the same values for all 3 sets of reference configuration is too much simplification, where the scaling of antenna, BW, and Tx power configurations should be captured in different relative power values correspond to different reference configuration set and it should be coherent with the scaling method(s) discussed in section 2.4.  Moreover, the BS configuration for Macro and small cell are quite different, some companies may need different set of values to make the proper evaluation, such as a small cell being woken up while UE is covered by a macro layer. And in such case, the transition energy for a macro cell and a small cell shall not be identical.  Thus, we prefer to have different set of values for Set /1/2/3. |
| Spreadtrum | We have no strong position. It is important we have the realistic values to guide the evaluation, otherwise, we may be in vain finally. |
| vivo | Considering the number of TxRUs and transmission power in reference configuration, the power value should be smaller than that for set 1. One possible way is to introduce scaling factor for set 2 and set 3 to calculate the relative power value for the power state other than deep sleep. We can live with this proposal if majority supports. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree.  The network power consumption model is a relative power consumption model instead of absolute power consumption model, and the power values of other states are defined in relative to the deep sleep mode. Even the absolute power values are different for FR1 TDD BS and FDD BS, the ratio between other state and deep sleep state is similar based on the current implementation at least for FR1 BS.  Considering the limited TU left, using the same values for all the sets is fine for us. |
| Samsung | * We are okay to use the common values for all sets. * Further, we would like to suggest smaller value, e.g., 65 for the active UL in Cat1. We think both categories should show similar tendency while evaluating NWES techniques. However, there is discrepancy on active UL. From our understanding, the BS power consumption difference * between micro sleep and active UL comes from mainly low noise amplifier, which takes minor portion of total power consumption. Therefore, we would like to change the value of active UL for Cat1 with smaller value as 65. |
| OPPO | We do not support the proposal. According to the agreed reference configuration, the total DL power level of Set 1/2/3 is different, i.e. 55dBm/49dBm/33dBm respectively, due to the smaller number of Tx/Rx RUs and BW for Set 2 and Set 3. This tendency should be at least embodied in the relative power value of active state. However, the relative power of sleep states and transition for Set 1/2/3 can be the same, which is similar to UE power consumption model. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal to have common values for Reference configuration Sets 1/2/3. Since this is only a abstracted network power model, Sets 2 and 3 should not be much different to that of Set 1. For simplicity and the progress, we don’t see the need of further discussion on the values of Sets 2 and 3. |

### Second round

Although FL agree with CATT, based on the discussion via GTW, the following can be considered in order to handle different comments for Set 1, Set 2 and Set 3 respectively. For Set 1, if we reduce the value of power of active UL to e.g. 65, it will also cause the issue that power of Set 1 is even smaller than that of other sets, which may be undesirable.

So, if the proposal in initial round is not agreeable, with respect to all companies input, the general principle is to use the averaged values as much as possible, similar to the determination of values in Set 1.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FL2 Proposal 2.2.2:**  **Confirm the previous Working Assumption with the following update**   * **For RAN1 evaluation purpose, for reference configuration set 1/2/3, the values are provided as below.** * **The transition time is confirmed without update.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | | | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Light sleep | 25 | 23 | 20 | 2.1 | ~~2.6~~ 2 | 1.8 | | Micro sleep | 55 | 50 | 38 | 5.5 | 5 | 3 | | Active DL | 280 | 240 | 152 | 32 | ~~40~~ 30 | 8.4 | | Active UL | ~~110~~ 100 | 90 | 80 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4.2 | | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | We think the active state DL and UL relative power values can be different for the Set1/2/3 reference configurations whereas sleep mode power model can be same. We are OK with active state and micro-sleep power values but suggest to keep same relative power values for at least light sleep modes.   * **The transition time is confirmed without update.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | | | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Light sleep | 25 | 25 | 25 | 2.1 | ~~2.6~~ 2.1 | 2.1 | | Micro sleep | 55 | 50 | 38 | 5.5 | 5 | 3 | | Active DL | 280 | 240 | 152 | 32 | ~~40~~ 30 | 8.4 | | Active UL | ~~110~~ 100 | 90 | 80 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4.2 | |
| InterDigital | We are fine to confirm the WA for both set 1 and set 2 (FR1). For Cat-1 Active UL, we are also fine with the updated lower value. |
| CMCC | Although we think it is simple and reasonable to use same value for set 1/2/3, if majority support, we are fine to use the averaged values. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the WA, and Intel’s modification seems more make sense. |
| FL2 | Please all also check Intel’s modifications above. |
| Ericsson1 | For Set 1, the WA should be kept as is, including for Active UL for Cat 1.  For Set 2, we are OK to select based on following options for Cat 1. We prefer Option 2 (Alt 2 as 1st preference, Alt 3 second).   * Option 1: Derive based on Set 1 value and applying scaling formula (from sec 2.4) with (freq/power/antennas) between FDD and TDD. Keep same micro/deep/light sleep as Set 1. * Option 2:  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Power state | **Set 2** | | Deep sleep | 1 | | Light sleep | 25 | | Micro sleep | 50 | | Active DL | Select one of following Alternatives.  Alt 1: 240  Alt 2: 160  Alt 3: 200 | | Active UL | 90 |   For Set 3, we are OK to select based on following options for Cat 1, we prefer Option 2.   * Option 1  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | | Light sleep | 25 | | Micro sleep | 38 | | Active DL | 152 | | Active UL | 80 |  * Option 2  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | | Light sleep | 15 | | Micro sleep | 20 | | Active DL | 70 | | Active UL | 40 | |
| QC1 | The operator’s intention for simplicity and for moving forward quickly is appreciated. However, oversimplifying the assumptions, maybe results are misleading. Agreement with OPPO especially for Set 3. The reference point is different from Set 1 in terms of DL power and the whole RF structure is different than in Set 1. |
| FL2-2 | **FL2 Proposal 2.2.2-rev1:**  **Confirm the previous Working Assumption with the following update**   * **For RAN1 evaluation purpose, for reference configuration set 1/2/3, the values are provided as below.**    + **to down select the values in square bracket**   + **to down select the values between Option 1 and Option 2 for Set 3 category 1.** * **The transition time is confirmed without update.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | | | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3**  **Option 1** | **Set 3**  **Option 2** | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Light sleep | 25 | 25 | 25 | 15 | 2.1 | ~~2.6~~ 2.1 | 2.1 | | Micro sleep | 55 | 50 | 38 | 20 | 5.5 | 5 | 3 | | Active DL | 280 | [240, 160, 200] | 152 | 70 | 32 | ~~40~~ 30 | 8.4 | | Active UL | [~~110~~ 100] | 90 | 80 | 40 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4.2 | |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think that using the same values for set 1/2 is a good choice considering the limited TU left. But we also agree the values for set 3 would be quite different from set1/2.  While if majority think that the smaller values should be used for set 2/3, we are fine to have some adjustment.  For sleep modes, we think the values of different states can be the same. However, we can go with majority views to keep at least the same values for light sleep.  For the active states, minor updates based on the average values suggested by FL is acceptable to us. But more adjustment would re-open the door of more controversial discussion, which is not preferred. |
| Samsung | We are okay with the FL2 Proposal 2.2.2 for the progress. |
| MediaTek | While we understand the intuition to set a common value for light sleep, we also notice that there is dependency with the sleep time threshold value and additional transition energy (because of the formula ). **With the proposed setting, there will be issue for *Category 1 and Set 1 BS* and *Category 2 and Set 2/3 BS*, where the total energy for deep sleep is always higher than light sleep, making deep sleep not worthy to select**. One solution to jointly converge the sleep power values and additional transition energies is to slightly revise light sleep and micro sleep values for the above BS setting. The following table illustrates the issue and the suggested solution for Category 2 and Set 2 BS (as an example):   |  | | --- | | **Category 2 BS (Set 2; 15kHz SCS)** | | * Assumption: (Micro, Light, Deep) sleep power = (5, 2,1, 1) as FL2-2 proposal   + Additional transition energy for deep sleep is = 928   + Additional transition energy for deep sleep is = 20000   + Note: Additional transition energy is calculated by * Issue with larger light sleep energy   + Light sleep energy consumption for 10000 ms = 2.1 \* 10000 (ms) + 928 = 21928   + Deep sleep energy consumption for 10000 ms = 1 \* 10000 (ms) + 20000 = 30000 **> 21928** | | * Assumption: (Micro, Light, Deep) sleep power = (**4.5, 2,7**, 1) as FL2-2 proposal   + Additional transition energy for deep sleep is = 576   + Additional transition energy for deep sleep is = 17500 * Issue resolved with the revised values for micro and light sleeps for Category 2 and Set 2 BS:   + Light sleep energy consumption for 10000 ms = 2.7 \* 10000 (ms) + 576 = 27576   + Deep sleep energy consumption for 10000 ms = 1 \* 10000 (ms) + 17500 = 27500 **< 27576** |   With the above, the following revision (in blue color) is suggested  **Confirm the previous Working Assumption with the following update**   * **For RAN1 evaluation purpose, for reference configuration set 1/2/3, the values are provided as below.**    + **to down select the values in square bracket**   + **to down select the values between Option 1 and Option 2 for Set 3 category 1.** * **The transition time is confirmed without update.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | | | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3**  **Option 1** | **Set 3**  **Option 2** | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Light sleep | **~~25~~ 27** | 25 | 25 | 15 | **~~2.1~~ 3** | ~~2.6~~ **2.7** | 2.1 | | Micro sleep | 55 | 50 | 38 | 20 | ~~5.5~~ 5 | **~~5~~  4.5** | 3 | | Active DL | 280 | [240, 160, 200] | 152 | 70 | 32 | ~~40~~ 30 | 8.4 | | Active UL | [~~110~~ 100] | 90 | 80 | 40 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4.2 | |
| Nokia/Nsb | We have the following proposal for the relative power consumption of Set 2   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Power State** | | **Relative power consumption**  **Set 2** | | **Sleep State** | Deep sleep | P1=1 | | Light sleep | P2=1.7 | | Micro sleep | P3=4,2 | | **Active state** | Active DL | P4=12 | | Active UL | P5=4,6 | |
| DOCOMO | We are OK with Proposal 2.2.2-rev1 for the progress. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the revised proposal for the sake of progress. |
| LG Electronics | Considering the limited time, we think that it is fine to use the same relative power values for all sets. But, we are also fine with the revised proposal and the minor updates to the values as long as the relative power values for reference configuration set 2 and set 3 are lower than those for set 1.  In addition, as we pointed out during the GTW, the time scale (e.g., slot-level or symbol-level) for the above relative power values should be clarified to calculate scaling and additional transition energy. |
| vivo | We are generally fine with the revised proposal but the value of active DL for set 3.  If we look at the power value ratio between set 1 and set 3 for cat 1 and cat 2, most of them are similar but the value of active DL for set 3 in Cat 2.  For Cat 1, the ratio is 152/280=0.55  For Cat 2, the ratio is 8.4/32=0.25.  The difference is large. We suggest to have the same scaling, i.e. 32\*0.55=17.6, i.e. with the following change in green.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | | | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3**  **Option 1** | **Set 3**  **Option 2** | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Light sleep | 25 | 25 | 25 | 15 | 2.1 | ~~2.6~~ 2.1 | 2.1 | | Micro sleep | 55 | 50 | 38 | 20 | 5.5 | 5 | 3 | | Active DL | 280 | [240, 160, 200] | 152 | 70 | 32 | ~~40~~ 30 | ~~8.417.6~~ | | Active UL | [~~110~~ 100] | 90 | 80 | 40 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4.2 |   We are also fine with MTK’s adjustment. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We prefer to keep a common value across Set1, 2 and 3 for the sake of progress. But we are also fine FL2 Proposal 2.2.2. To add too many options in Cat1 just makes the Cat1 value useless for the evaluation. Maybe we could just consider Cat.2 for the evaluation. |
| QCOM2 | As we discussed in our Tdoc and online, it is important to clarify the granularity of the power consumption: is it measured/averaged over 1ms, slot duration, or symbol duration? It is also related to the following discussion:  **FL1/FL2 Proposal 2.4.1:**   * **The BS power consumption in a slot is provided by**   + - For slot-level modelling, represents the ratios of the number of active DL and UL symbols within a slot to the number of symbols within a slot and ; for symbol-level modelling, represents the number of active DL and UL symbols within a slot and .   Assume there is no answer the above question and that text is agreed. How should companies use the power model? Some companies will use slot-level modelling by treating the relative power as the slot-level power while the others will use symbol-level modelling by treating the relative power as the symbol-level power. The evaluations and related observations may not be aligned across two different modelling approaches – similar to the comment/concern on having two categories for Set 1 FR1 power numbers.  Now talking about symbol-level vs. slot-level modelling. Let’s start with slot-level modelling and an example scenario where a slot has PDSCH for 3 UEs:   * + **Allocation 1**: Sym0 and Sym1: PDCCH occupying 40MHz   + **Allocation 2**: Syms 2-7: UE1 PDSCH occupies 25MHz while UE2 PDSCH occupies 25MHz. UE1 PDSCH and UE2 PDSCH are FDMed (no frequency overlap but there could be frequency gap in between).   + **Allocation 3**: Syms 8-13: UE1 PDSCH occupies 25MHz, UE2 PDSCH occupies 20MHz, and UE3 PDSCH occupies 20MHz. PDSCH from 3 UEs are FDMed.   Now it is our understanding that we need to scale the reference power model in time/frequency (& possible power) domain for each of the above allocations for computing the power for each one. Then the slot energy consumption is the summation of the energy consumption of each allocation. The computation complexity becomes higher when we have more complicated slot composition. Note that simply counting the number of DL symbols or UL symbols in a slot is not sufficient.  For symbol-level modelling, one can average the power per slot based on the power of symbols in the slot or compute the energy for each symbol and then sum up all the energy in a slot. No scaling in time is needed. This approach is simpler and saves time on scaling in time domain.  So, we propose to include the following bullet in the **FL2 Proposal 2.2.2-rev1:**   * The power consumption is averaged in symbol-level. |
| Apple | We are generally fine with the proposed power model. We think it is reasonable to keep the same values at least for light sleep mode for all 3 sets.  For active DL power for Set 2 in Cat 1, it seems that 240 is more reasonable considering the transmit power in the 3 sets, and the ratio between set 1 and set 2 seems more consistent with Cat 2.  We tend to agree with vivo’s observation on the active DL power for set 3 in Cat 2.  On whether we need to clarify the values are per-symbol or per-slot, I assume it won’t affect the final results as all the numbers are relative. The energy consumption assuming per-symbol definition will 14 times the energy consumption assuming per-slot definition. This should not affect the relative energy saving gain.  However, it matters when we determine the transition energy, because it is calculated by multiplying the power values by the transition duration (which is defined in ms – the absolute time). Given how the transition energy is calculated in section 2.3, we should clarify that the relative power values are defined per ms. Otherwise, some changes are needed in calculating the transition energy. |

### Third round (closed)

Thanks for all the discussion and good points you made. Several comments are raised this round:

1. Whether to use a scaling approach across different sets of reference configurations.
2. Whether to apply adjustment so as to make the additional transition energy match the transition decision.
3. Whether the power values is symbol level, or slot level.

For the first two points, both makes sense although the first one seems equivalent to just define one set of reference configurations but implement multiple sets of SLS parameters. Two or three companies mentioned this so far.

Towards addressing the issue from additional transition energy, MTK further did some fantastic work and provide a new set of values, which is also second by one or two companies.

When FL tried to list another option from E// for potential down-selection, Nokia also proposed preferred results. So this approach– adding a whole set of options - does not help.

As a matter of fact, although FL is trying to accommodate all comments one by one, and most of them are technical reasonable – the averaged values are averaged values. FL believes the values were proposed with sufficient consideration behind that from each source company, and when they were put on the table, they are already not the real ones matching any single company’s measurements anyway. So there is no strong need to make it looks “valid”, needless to say matching individual company’s preference. My suggestion is below. Two options for down-selection. For option 1, we take minimized changes to the averaged values based on companies input and the logic that smaller values for Set 2/3, however no change to the working assumption, nor the averaged values that have no cross-Set issue. Option 2 contains a bit more adjustments, in order to approximate a same trend across categories by changes on limited individual entries, and simplify our evaluation by having same values for sleep modes, so that we all can benefit from. FL thanks MTK for the work for accommodating the transition energy issue. As the suggestions in blue have more changes on the working assumption, I may refer to that only if sufficient support is observed.

For 3), FL has some comments in section 2.6 (but similar to Apple’s comments).

**Please indicate your preference(s) among these two. Companies can still propose new values/changes, however FL plans to take these two for GTW, if no convergence given the time left.**

**FL3 Proposal 2.2.3: *(Moderator Note:*** *For power unit discussion, please use section 2.4****)***

**Confirm the previous Working Assumption with the following update**

* **For RAN1 evaluation purpose, for reference configuration set 1/2/3, the values are provided as below.**
* **The transition time is confirmed without update.**
* **Option 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | |
| **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** |
| Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Light sleep | 25 | 23 | 20 | 2.1 | ~~2.6~~ 2 | 1.8 |
| Micro sleep | 55 | 50 | 38 | 5.5 | 5 | 3 |
| Active DL | 280 | 240 | 152 | 32 | ~~40~~ 30 | 8.4 |
| Active UL | 110 | 90 | 80 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4.2 |

* **Option 2**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | |
| **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** |
| Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Light sleep | 25 | ~~23~~ 25 | ~~20~~ 25 | 2.1 | ~~2.6~~ 2.1 | ~~1.8~~ 2.1 |
| Micro sleep | 55 | 50 | 38 | 5.5 | 5 | 3 |
| Active DL | 280 | ~~240~~ 200 | 152 | 32 | ~~40~~ 30 | ~~8.4~~ 17.6 |
| Active UL | 110 | 90 | 80 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4.2 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QCOM3 | @Apple on slot vs. symbol-level power consumption: It impacts both energy consumption computation for active and sleep power states. Although the power number is unit-less, we need to know how to compute the energy consumption for a slot.  @FL3: No, the reply in Section 2.6.2 does not address our concern.  We understood the numbers in table are unit-less. It is important to clarify the granularity of the power consumption so that we can discuss scaling in time domain. |
| Intel | Option 2. Also, for clarity, we could confirm that the relative power values expressed in the table are per slot. |
| Samsung | We prefer Option 2 with common value for light sleep for all sets.  For the Active DL, we share similar view as vivo for similarity between categories.  Regarding the Active UL, as mentioned during GTW, it seems high, because the difference between active UL and micro sleep is whether includes the power consumption of LNA. Also, there is gap between Micro sleep and Active UL according to categories.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | For Set 1:  For Cat 1, the ratio is 110/55=2  For Cat 2, the ratio is 6.5/5.5=1.25 | For Set 2:  For Cat 1, the ratio is 90/50=1.8  For Cat 2, the ratio is 5.8/5=1.16 | For Set 3:  For Cat 1, the ratio is 80/38=2.1  For Cat 2, the ratio is 4.2/3=1.4 |   Similar as to align the Active DL for set 3, we would like to align the Active UL value in Cat A updated as below.  **Updated FL3 Proposal 2.2.3:**  **Confirm the previous Working Assumption with the following update**   * **For RAN1 evaluation purpose, for reference configuration set 1/2/3, the values are provided as below.** * **The transition time is confirmed without update.** * **Option 2**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | | | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Light sleep | 25 | ~~23~~ 25 | ~~20~~ 25 | 2.1 | ~~2.6~~ 2.1 | ~~1.8~~ 2.1 | | Micro sleep | 55 | 50 | 38 | 5.5 | 5 | 3 | | Active DL | 280 | ~~240~~ 200 | 152 | 32 | ~~40~~ 30 | ~~8.4~~ 17.6 | | Active UL | ~~110~~ **65** | ~~90~~ **60** | ~~80~~ **52** | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4.2 | |
| vivo | We prefer Option 2. Maintaining the same value for light sleep is good for evaluation especially considering that the same additional transition energy of light sleep is defined for all sets. Besides, the trends are aligned between different sets. |
| MediaTek | We thank FL’s hard work in coordinating discussion and understand converging the model is more critical than enforcing some principles. In this regard, FL proposal is acceptable. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Considering the values of sleep modes and the gap between active states and sleep states, we think option 2 is more aligned with the current implementation. |
| DOCOMO | Slightly prefer Option 2. As the same value is assumed for the transition time of light sleep, values for relative power of light sleep can be same for evaluation purpose. |
| Nokia/Nsb | We support option 1.  Generally, we are OK with the values of sleep states. But for the Active DL, we propose to lower the value to **22** for set 2 and **6,3** for set 3 (justified by reduced number of Tx and reduced Tx power).   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | | |  | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Light sleep | 2.1 | 2 | 1.8 | | Micro sleep | 5.5 | 5 | 3 | | Active DL | 32 | 22 | 6,3 | | Active UL | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4,2 | |
| LG Electronics | We support Option 2, which has a common relative power value for light sleep for all sets. In addition, based on the FL’s explanation in 2.4.2, it has to be added clearly in Proposal 2.2.3 that the relative power values in the power model table are slot/ms level.  **Updated FL3 Proposal 2.2.3:**  **Confirm the previous Working Assumption with the following update**   * **For RAN1 evaluation purpose, for reference configuration set 1/2/3, the values are provided as below.** * **The transition time is confirmed without update.** * **Note: the values in the table are defined as slot-level.**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | | | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Light sleep | 25 | ~~23~~ 25 | ~~20~~ 25 | 2.1 | ~~2.6~~ 2.1 | ~~1.8~~ 2.1 | | Micro sleep | 55 | 50 | 38 | 5.5 | 5 | 3 | | Active DL | 280 | ~~240~~ 200 | 152 | 32 | ~~40~~ 30 | ~~8.4~~ 17.6 | | Active UL | 110 | 90 | 80 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4.2 | |
| China Telecom | We slightly prefer Option 2 which seems more reasonable. |

## Additional transition energy

For the calculation of additional transition energy, there are a few possible approaches.

* Option 1: as discussed in RAN1#110 meeting and similar to the methodology of UE power saving study, i.e.
* + where is the difference of the relative power between sleep mode and micro sleep active state and is the corresponding total transition time to sleep mode , accounting for both ramping down and ramping up
* This is supported by Nokia/NSB, vivo, OPPO, CATT, CMCC, LGE, Samsung,
* Option 2: in addition to the formula used in Option 1, need to apply further adjustment in order to meet certain constraints, mainly considering the situation that BS entering into a deeper sleep may preferably be able to obtain more energy savings.
  + This is supported by Huawei/HiSilicon, Spreadtrum, Intel, ZTE, MediaTek
  + Although consider the logic makes sense, NTT DOCOMO proposes alternatively to revisit the transition time in the working assumption such that the formula in Option 1 applies without manual change, e.g. 6 ms-> 10 ms for light sleep.
* Option 3: if inter-sleep mode transition is not allowed E\_tran (n)=(2P\_n+P\_a0+P\_a1 )\*T\_n/2 where Pa0 and Pa1 refers to the power level of the previous and subsequent active state (DL or UL); otherwise E\_tran (m,n)=(P\_m+P\_n )\*(T\_m-T\_n)/2. With a similar consideration of stepwise mode transition but different formula, the transition energy can also be calculated as
  + This is supported by China Telecom (former), Ericsson(later)
* Note some companies also consider that the additional transition energy for three sets of reference configurations can be the same, especially if the total transition time (as agreed) and relative power values are the same across sets.
  + ZTE, CMCC

The following summarizes the transition energy values proposed in contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | *Proposal 8: The additional transition energy of Set 1 is recommended as follow.*   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Power state | Additional transition energy | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1326 | 13172 | | Light sleep | 150 | 2173 |   For Set 2 FR1 FDD and Set 3 FR2, the same calculation method can be applied.  *Proposal 9: For Set 2 and Set 3, the additional transition energy is recommended as follow.*   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Power state | Additional transition energy | | | | | | Set 2 Category 1 | Set 2 Category 2 | Set 3 Category 1 | Set 3 Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1213 | 17533 | 1021 | 8767 | | Light sleep | 135 | 1534 | 90 | 767 | |
| Nokia/NSB, vivo, OPPO, CATT,CMCC, LGE | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Power State | | Additional Energy (relative power\*duration in ms) | | | Set 1 FR1  (as per agreed power consumption values, cat 2) | Set 2 FR1  (as per proposed power consumption values) | | Sleep State | Deep sleep | 22500 | 96 | | Light sleep | 1088 | 3500 | | Micro sleep | 0 | 0 | | Active state | Active DL | NA | NA | | Active state | Active UL | NA | NA |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Power state | Additional transition energy | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1350 | 22500 | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 | |
| Intel | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Power state | Additional transition energy  (unit in relative power\*ms) | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1350 | 13000 | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 | |
| ZTE | Table 2 Additional transition energy calculated by the shadow area   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Power state | Additional transition energy | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1350 | 22500 | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 |   Or  Table 3 Additional transition energy for different reference configuration sets   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Power state | Additional transition energy | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1250 | 12000 | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 | |
| MediaTek | |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Power state | Additional transition energy | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1350 | ~~22500~~ 17000 | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 | |
| Samsung (with set 1 values same as Nokia/NSB, vivo… etc.) | * **For set 1, the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in *ms*)) is**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Additional transition energy** | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1350 | 22500 | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 |  * **For set 2, the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in *ms*)) is**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Additional transition energy** | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1225 | 20000 | | Light sleep | 81 | 768 |  * **For set 3, the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in *ms*)) is**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Additional transition energy** | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 925 | 10000 | | Light sleep | 54 | 384 | |
| Ericsson | |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Transitions** | **Additional transition energy (Relative power x ms)** | | | *Transition time (ms)*  *(incl. ramp down/up)*  *shown for completeness* | | FR1-TDD  Set 1 | FR1-FDD  Set 2 | FR2  Set 3 | | Active  microsleep | **0** | **0** | **0** | *0* | | Active  light-sleep | **[90]** | **[80]** | **[15]** | *6* | | Active  deep-sleep | **[810]** | **[760]** | **[330]** | *50* | |
| Qualcomm | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Sleep state** | **Additional transition energy**  **(relative power x ms)** | | **Transition time**  **(ms)** | | **Set 1 FR1 for Category 1** | **Set 2 FR1** | | Micro sleep | 0 | 0 | 0 | | Light sleep | [90] | [90] | 6 | | Deep sleep | [760] | [620] | 50 | |

### Initial round

Option 1 itself has already been justified in previous UE power saving study. It is mostly because of the averaged power values and transition time that lead to potential issue, instead of the formula itself. If companies are ok with the averaged power values and transition times for Set 1, there seems to be no strong issue to reuse the same formula as used in UE power saving for calculating the transition energy.

Option 2 attempts to address an issue in Option 1 by further adjustments on some individual entries. However, such adjustment in Option 2 will not be needed in other cases, e.g. whenever a single company wants to do energy consumption calculation based on their own measurements without being averaged with other companies input. So such adjustment would only be useful for RAN1 group evaluation purpose.

Option 3 provides a new method that also makes some technical sense, and seems to be able to address the potential issue caused by Option 1. Thus if it is adopted it would be useful for future use as well. On the other hand, it may not be necessarily always true even from some implementation point of view, since when a BS decides to go to deep sleep directly, it may use a different approach of components shut-down compared to the case that BS goes to light sleep first then deep sleep, e.g. components can be shut-down parallelly without being step wise. In this case, Option 1 still holds and is aligned with the initial assumptions.

Nevertheless, the root cause seems not to be the formula in Option 1 but more about the averaged transition times/power values, and it would be good to take a consistent assumption for evaluations. Given this is mainly concerned for the case of deep sleep, allowing an optional handling could be considered.

Further, it could be useful that the determination formula can be captured in TR instead of only the values, as in UE power saving study. This on one hand can be good reference for future use, and on the other hand may help companies explain, if other values are used, how they are differently obtained from the formula in Option 1.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FL1 Proposal 2.3.1:**   * **For set 1/2/3, the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in ms)) is**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Additional transition energy** | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1350 | 22500 | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 |  * **Other values for deep sleep transition can be optionally used and reported.**   **Capture the following in TR:**   * **The additional transition energy in the above tables are determined based on the following for evaluation purpose, assuming that BS enters from non-sleep mode to a sleep mode and BS leaves the same sleep mode to non-sleep mode.** * **where is the difference of the relative power between sleep mode and micro sleep, and is the corresponding total transition time of sleep mode .** * **Other values, if reported, may be possible for deep sleep transition in order to account for step-wise transition, or help BS decide to enter deep sleep with less transition energy.** | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Option 2 but can live with Option 1. |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We support the FL proposal. |
| Nokia/NSB | Although the values from the equation are not the perfect ones, we are OK to utilize it, at least there is a technical sense on how to derive the additional energy by utilizing the equation. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK.  The additional transition energy can be the same for the three reference configuration sets similar to the UE power saving model. |
| Samsung | Fine in principle to simplify the evaluation. |
| OPPO | Applying stepwise sleep can address the issue on the inconsistency between energy consumption and sleep mode, i.e., the energy consumption of deep sleep is larger than that of light sleep for sleep duration of 50ms(Cat 1)/10s(Cat 2).   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Cat 1 | Cat 2 | | Micro sleep for 6ms = 55\*6 = 330  Light sleep for 6ms = 25\*6 + 90 = 240 | Micro sleep for 640ms = 5.5\*640 = 3520  Light sleep for 640ms = 2.1\*640 + 1088 = 2432 | | Light sleep for 50ms = 25\*50+90 = 1340  Deep sleep for 50ms = 1\*50+1350 = 1400  Stepwise sleep for 50ms = (55-25)/2\*6+25\*6+(25-1)/2\*(50-6)+1\*(50-6)=812 | Light sleep for 10s = 2.1\*10000 + 1088 = 22088  Deep sleep for 10s = 1\*10000+22500 = 32500  Stepwise sleep for 10s = (5.5-2.1)/2\*640+2.1\*640+(2.1-1)/2\*(10000-640)+1\*(10000-640)=16940 | |
| CATT | We support the proposal. The proposal is similar to what was defined in UE power saving. All other proposed values do not have any justification. |

### Second round

If the power values for Set 2 and Set 3 are different from those of Set 1, the additional energy would be different as well.

We can determine the values for Set 1 first as well as the formula. FL will come up with the numbers for other sets.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **FL2 Proposal 2.3.2:**   * **For set 1~~/2/3~~, the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in ms)) is**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Additional transition energy** | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1350 | 22500 | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 |  * **Other values for deep sleep transition can be optionally used and reported.**   **Capture the following in TR:**   * **The additional transition energy in the above tables are determined based on the following for evaluation purpose, assuming that BS enters from non-sleep mode to a sleep mode and BS leaves the same sleep mode to non-sleep mode.** * **where is the difference of the relative power between sleep mode and micro sleep, and is the corresponding total transition time of sleep mode .** * **Other values, if reported, may be possible for deep sleep transition in order to account for step-wise transition, or help BS decide to enter deep sleep with less transition energy.** | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | As some companies raised concern that if transition time only is considered for entering sleep mode, then for Cat 2, there is chance entering deep sleep based on the proposed model following the formula may result in increased energy consumption if sufficient sleep duration is not ensured. To this end, we can accept the above model if a note is added that *It is expected that when BS transitions to sleep mode, it would stay in the sleep mode for a certain minimum duration so that energy consumption during the sleep duration is minimized.* |
| InterDigital | We are fine with FL’s proposal |
| CMCC | Support |
| China Telecom | We support the proposal. |
| FL2 | Intel’s suggestion has an aligned intention about the following that was already in the proposal, but with a different behavior which is no change to the values but ensure a sufficient time is used for transition to deep sleep.  ***Other values, if reported, may be possible for deep sleep transition in order to account for step-wise transition, or help BS decide to enter deep sleep with less transition energy.***  In FL understanding, with Intel’ suggestion, then there is no need have optional values with less transition energy since Intel’s wording would be up to gNB implementation according to the possible minimum duration to decide whether to go into deep sleep. While with the last bullet in FL proposal, it is intends to allow optional report a value so that BS can safely go to deep sleep, even if such minimum duration is not guaranteed.  FL is fine with either one, but not necessarily to have both of the below:   * + Intel adding:   **It is expected that when BS transitions to sleep mode, it would stay in the sleep mode for a certain minimum duration so that energy consumption during the sleep duration is minimized.**   * + FL adding:   **Other values for deep sleep transition can be optionally used and reported.**  **Other values, if reported, may be possible for deep sleep transition in order to account for step-wise transition, or help BS decide to enter deep sleep with less transition energy.**  Companies are invited to share which one you prefer. |
| Ericsson1 | In our assessment, the 1350 units for deep sleep transition is quite large. We think the value should be around 800 units – drawing a straight line for very long transition times on order of 50ms or seconds to calculate area under one triangle does reflect the transition energy correctly. Also, we do not see the need to add the additional transition energy expression in the TR. |
| FL2-2 | Please continue the check the FL proposal and Ericsson1 response.  From FL perspective, capturing the calculation procedure does not harm and even is beneficial as part of the outcome of the study.  Addionally,   * + drawing a straight line for very long transition times on order of 50ms or seconds to calculate area under one triangle does reflect the transition energy correctly   Is it saying that using option 1 with a straight line leads to the same calculation as Option 3? If that is the case, we can choose whatever option can get the same value.  I understand the value does not fit Ericsson assessment, but this is the same situation for all other companies input.  To further do a fair change, the following option is explicitly captured in the proposal:  **FL2 Proposal 2.3.2-rev1:**   * **For set 1~~/2/3~~, the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in ms)) is**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Additional transition energy** | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1350  Optional: 800 | 22500  Optional: 17000 | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 |  * **~~Other values for deep sleep transition can be optionally used and reported.~~**   **Capture the following in TR:**   * **The additional transition energy in the above tables are determined based on the following for evaluation purpose, assuming that BS enters from non-sleep mode to a sleep mode and BS leaves the same sleep mode to non-sleep mode.** * **where is the difference of the relative power between sleep mode and micro sleep, and is the corresponding total transition time of sleep mode .** * **~~Other~~ The optional values, if reported, may be possible for deep sleep transition in order to account for step-wise transition, or help BS decide to enter deep sleep with less transition energy. Otherwise, it is expected that when BS transitions to sleep mode, it would stay in the sleep mode for a certain minimum duration so that energy consumption during the sleep duration is minimized.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Okay with FL proposal for the sake of progress. |
| Samsung | We are fine with FL’s proposal. |
| MediaTek | As our comment to FL2-2 Proposal 2.2.2, if we would like to achieve the following targets, there requires some revision to micro and light sleep values for Category 2 and Set 2 BS:   * Apply the common formula, , **for Set 1/2/3** to produce the additional transition energy * Ensure that, with the given time threshold for a deeper sleep type, BS can achieve lower energy consumption with the deeper sleep type   We have checked that the following revised sleep power value table (with new revision in **blue color**) can achieve the above targets and extend the proposal to be valid also for Set 2 and Set 3 BS. But, the optional values will not be necessary because of the conflict with the target to calculate the value via formula. Yet the corresponding additional transition energy of deep sleep for Category 1 and Set 3 (FR2) BS will be 925 which may be acceptable for Ericsson.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P* for Category 1** | | | | **Relative Power *P* for Category 2** | | | | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3**  **Option 1** | **Set 3**  **Option 2** | **Set 1** | **Set 2** | **Set 3** | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Light sleep | **~~25~~ 27** | 25 | 25 | 15 | **~~2.1~~ 3** | ~~2.6~~ **2.7** | 2.1 | | Micro sleep | 55 | 50 | 38 | 20 | ~~5.5~~ 5 | **~~5~~  4.5** | 3 | | Active DL | 280 | [240, 160, 200] | 152 | 70 | 32 | ~~40~~ 30 | 8.4 | | Active UL | [~~110~~ 100] | 90 | 80 | 40 | 6.5 | 5.8 | 4.2 |   With the above, we suggest to approve the revised sleep power table together with the following revised proposal on additional transition energy:  **FL2 Proposal 2.3.2-rev2:**   * **For set 1/2/3, the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in ms)) is**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Additional transition energy** | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | 1350  ~~Optional: 800~~ | 22500  ~~Optional: 17000~~ | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 |  * **~~Other values for deep sleep transition can be optionally used and reported.~~**   **Capture the following in TR:**   * **The additional transition energy in the above tables are determined based on the following for evaluation purpose, assuming that BS enters from non-sleep mode to a sleep mode and BS leaves the same sleep mode to non-sleep mode.**    + **where is the difference of the relative power between sleep mode and micro sleep, and is the corresponding total transition time of sleep mode .** * **Note: With the given transition time threshold for a deeper sleep type, BS can achieve lower energy consumption with the deeper sleep type** * **~~Other~~ ~~The optional values, if reported, may be possible for deep sleep transition in order to account for step-wise transition, or help BS decide to enter deep sleep with less transition energy. Otherwise, it is expected that when BS transitions to sleep mode, it would stay in the sleep mode for a certain minimum duration so that energy consumption during the sleep duration is minimized.~~** |
| Nokia/Nsb | We are OK with the original **Proposal 2.3.2** |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with Proposal 2.3.2-rev1. We think it is informative to capture the calculation procedure for future reference. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the FL’s proposal. |
| LG Electronics | We support the original FL2 proposal 2.3.2, and believe that optional values for deep sleep can be reported depending on the company. |
| vivo | We are fine with FL’s proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the original FL2 proposal 2.3.2. |
| QCOM2 | We have comment on having optional value(s): If results with different values are contradicting, it does not seem easy to have reasonable conclusion. It may be better to focus on a common value for evaluation. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal. |

### Third round (closed)

Appreciate companies’ efforts and suggestion. However, as Qualcomm pointed out, FL agrees that it is still important to take just one value whenever possible. We’ve already had many potential options that make the discussion/conclusion risky.

If Option 1 in section 2.2.3 is agreeable, FL will provide other corresponding values per the formula. If option 2 in section 2.2.3 is agreeable, then the square bracket can be removed and the proposal is applicable to all sets of reference configurations. As some other companies also considered, FL prefers to have the formula included.

Please indicate your objection if you have.

**FL3 Proposal 2.3.3:**

* **For set 1[/2/3], the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in ms)) is**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Power state** | **Additional transition energy** | |
| Category 1 | Category 2 |
| Deep sleep | ~~1350~~ 1000 | ~~22500~~ 17000 |
| Light sleep | 90 | 1088 |

**Capture the following in TR:**

* **The additional transition energy in the above tables are determined based on the following for evaluation purpose, assuming that BS enters from non-sleep mode to a sleep mode and BS leaves the same sleep mode to non-sleep mode.** 
  + **where is the difference of the relative power between sleep mode and micro sleep, and is the corresponding total transition time of sleep mode . , accounting for step-wise transition. It is expected that when BS transitions to sleep mode, it would stay in the sleep mode for a certain minimum duration so that energy consumption during the sleep duration is minimized.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QCOM3 | We don’t support to provide the formula in TR. The table should be sufficient.   * + ~~where is the difference of the relative power between sleep mode and micro sleep, and is the corresponding total transition time of sleep mode . , accounting for step-wise transition. It is expected that when BS transitions to sleep mode, it would stay in the sleep mode for a certain minimum duration so that energy consumption during the sleep duration is minimized.~~ |
| Intel | Support FL proposal |
| Ericsson2 | OK with the first bullet on the additional energy values. Having the table in TR is enough and we do not see need for adding the second bullet with formula to the TR. |
| Samsung | We can compromise the values of additional transition energy in the Table, however we are not clear about S for step-wise transition. Also, it seems contradictory with “assuming that BS enters from non-sleep mode to a sleep mode” in the 2nd main bullet. Therefore, we would like to remove the formula. |
| FL3 | As multiple companies have concern on capturing the formula, please focus on the table in the proposal with the addition of below:   * **For set 1[/2/3], the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in ms)) is**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Additional transition energy** | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | ~~1350~~ 1000 | ~~22500~~ 17000 | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 |  * **Note:**   **It is expected that when BS transitions to sleep mode, it would stay in the sleep mode for a certain minimum duration so that energy consumption during the sleep duration is minimized.** |
| vivo | We are fine with the revised proposal |
| MediaTek | There is one way to fulfill the following three targets:   * Jointly specifying additional transition energy for Category 1/2 and Set 1/2/3 * Showing the physical relation between and * Ensuring lower total energy consumption whenever selecting to a deeper sleep type.   The solution is to model , and, accordingly, we may revise the proposal as follows  **FL3 Proposal 2.3.3 (revised):**   * **For set 1[/2/3], the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in ms)) is**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Additional transition energy** | | | | | | | Category 1 | | | Category 2 | | | | Set 1 | Set 2 | Set 3 | Set 1 | Set 2 | Set 2 | | Deep sleep | ~~1350~~  675 | 612.5 | 462.5 | ~~22500~~ 11250 | 10000 | 5000 | | Light sleep | ~~90~~  45 | **37.5** | **19.5** | ~~1088~~  544 | **464** | **144** |   **Capture the following in TR:**   * **The additional transition energy in the above tables are determined based on the following for evaluation purpose, assuming that BS enters from non-sleep mode to a sleep mode and BS leaves the same sleep mode to non-sleep mode.**   **where is the difference of the relative power between sleep mode and micro sleep, and is the corresponding total transition time of sleep mode . S is a scaling factor and set to 0.25 to ensure there is lower total energy consumption whenever a deeper sleep type is selected according to the agreed transition time.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We also think the formula doesn’t need for the TR since the proposed values have been adjusted a lot.  In general, we are okay with FL3 proposal.  For the note, suggestion is as below.  **It is expected that when BS transitions to sleep mode, it would stay in the sleep mode for a certain ~~minimum~~ duration so that energy consumption during the sleep duration is minimized.** |
| OPPO | As commented in the initial round we suggest to use the following definition to refer to a more realistic calculation  Where **is the difference of the relative power between sleep mode and micro sleep; is the difference of the relative power between sleep mode and sleep mode -1; is the corresponding total transition time of sleep mode -1; is the corresponding total transition time of sleep mode ;**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Sleep mode** | **Sleep mode -1** | | **Deep sleep** | **Light sleep** | | **Light sleep** | **Micro sleep** | | **Micro sleep** | **NA** | |
| DOCOMO | Although we don’t prefer lots of manual adjustments beyond technical formula, we are fine with the revised proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | The FL proposal is fine for us. The formula can be captured as a Note in the TR for reference purpose. The intermedium process of discussion is also important for the successive design. |
| Nokia/Nsb | We understand the intention of the proposal, but it seems with S=0.75, the intended issue is not solved neither. Thus, we propose the following:   * **For set 1, the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in ms)) is**  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Additional transition energy** | | | Category 1 | Category 2 | | Deep sleep | ~~1350~~ 1000 | ~~17000~~11250 | | Light sleep | 90 | 1088 |   **Justification:**   |  | | --- | | Cat 2 | | Micro sleep for 640ms = 5.5\*640 = 3520  Light sleep for 640ms = 2.1\*640 + 1088 = 2432 | | Light sleep for 10s = 2.1\*10000 = 22088  Deep sleep for 10s = 1\*10000+11250 = 21250 (lower than 22088) |   **Capture the following in TR:**   * **The additional transition energy in the above tables are determined based on the following for evaluation purpose, assuming that BS enters from non-sleep mode to a sleep mode and BS leaves the same sleep mode to non-sleep mode.**    + **where is the difference of the relative power between sleep mode and micro sleep, and is the corresponding total transition time of sleep mode . , an adjustment factor that helps BS decide to enter deep sleep state with less transition energy as compared to light sleep state.**   + **~~It is expected that when BS transitions to sleep mode, it would stay in the sleep mode for a certain minimum duration so that energy consumption during the sleep duration is minimized.~~ [Nokia:] This is not needed with the new proposed values**   Also as agreed in 1.1, “there is always a non-sleep mode assumed between adjacent sleep modes”, so the stepwise approach for BS transitions to sleep states shall not be considered and described. |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal but it seems necessary to refine the description of the S value for step-wise transition to avoid misunderstanding. |
| China Telecom | We don’t think the parameter S is needed. What we need is only a reasonable formula and values for evaluating the energy consumption of BS easily, the original one is enough. The new formula makes it more complex since different companies may have different implement and different values. |

## Total energy consumption

OPPO clarifies that, the total BS energy can be calculated as below.

Where includes the energy consumption of each power state and additional transition energy and and are relative power value and time duration in unit of slot for power state *i*, and are transition energy and the number of transitions for sleep mode *i*.

### Initial round

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FL1 Proposal 2.6.1:**  Clarify and capture the below formula into TR as calculation of total energy consumption.  Where includes the energy consumption of each power state and additional transition energy and and are relative power value and time duration in unit of slot for power state *i*, and are transition energy and the number of transitions for sleep mode *i*. | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We generally support the proposal. However, there needs some clarification: the unit of *Ei* is (power unit\*ms). So, we think a scaling factor should be introduced in the equation to convert slot number to number of ms:  , where is the subcarrier spacing. |
| LG Electronics | We support the proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We are generally fine with the proposal and the revision by HW seems reasonable. |
| Nokia/Nsb | Not sure if we need it |
| Spreadtrum | Basically fine |
| vivo | We think that there may not be need to capture this since the total energy is the sum of energy for all slots. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Same view with Nokia, vivo, not sure whether it is needed. |
| Samsung | Share same view as Nokia. |
| OPPO | We support the proposal. |
| CATT | We don’t see the need of including this. |
| FL2 | This may have relationship with Qualcomm clarification question on power model per symbol level or not. So please QC check if the response from Huawei/HiSi can clarify that. |
| Intel | We agree with Nokia and some other companies that there is no need to agree on this. For scaling model to apply, we assume relative power values represent slot-level power according to resource usage based on reference configurations. |
| InterDigital | Ok with the proposal |
| CMCC | Not needed. |
| China Telecom | We are fine with the equation but don’t think it is needed. |
| Samsung | For the clarification on time unit, we can compromise with FL’s proposal with updates as follow:  **Updated-FL1 Proposal 2.6.1:**  Clarify and capture the below formula into TR as calculation of total energy consumption.  Where includes the energy consumption of each power state and additional transition energy and and are relative power value and time duration in unit of slot for power state *i*, given reference configuration of a set. and are transition energy and the number of transitions for sleep mode *j*. |
| MediaTek | Agree with Huawei proposal which ensures the energy components are all in the same unit of (relative power x ms) |
| Fujitsu | We are OK with the proposal. |
| QCOM2 | We don’t see the need of this proposal for now. It seems the proposal assumes the power is per slot which is not agreed yet.  @FL2: could you point to Huawei/HiSi comments? We provided our view in 2.2.2. |
| Apple | We are fine with the proposal |

### Second/Third round

Given what FL observed when discussing the transition energy, all companies including symbol level proponents use the power values defined in the power model table to multiply the transition time in millisecond. Thus, FL’ observation is the relative power values in power model table in section 2.2 are slot/ms level. In this manner, both symbol level and slot level has aligned values over a same time duration. Thus, FL considers the proposal above modified by Huawei is fine, and can clarify LGe question. Given the discussion, perhaps need to capture this clearly for evaluation.

**FL3 Proposal 2.6.2:**

Clarify and capture the below formula into TR as calculation of total energy consumption.

Where includes the energy consumption of each power state and additional transition energy , and and are relative power value and time duration in unit of slot for power state *i*, and are transition energy and the number of transitions for sleep mode *j* and is the subcarrier spacing.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QCOM3 | We don’t agree with the FL summary and don’t support this proposal at this moment. In particular, from our perspective, it is not correct to say “all companies including symbol level proponents use the power values defined in the power model table to multiply the transition time in millisecond”.  Once we have common understanding on the granularity of power consumption, we can discuss whether this proposal is needed or not. |
| Intel | Formula is not needed to be captured in TR. It is sufficient to clarify that relative power value in the table are per slot. |
| Ericsson2 | We do not see the need for this proposal. Agree with Qualcomm that the granularity of power consumption should be addressed first. |
| Samsung | Fine with the FL3 proposal. |
| FL3 | @QCOM3  *“all companies including symbol level proponents use the power values defined in the power model table to multiply the transition time in millisecond”*  The above statement is referring to the discussion in section 2.3 and previous discussion on this item, where my observation is that both QCOM3 and Ericsson2, even if prefer different number of values, have the same understanding on E=P\*T in ms.  Then, back to the granularity of power values,   * + When the values are per slot, the per-symbol value can be obtained by P\_symbol=P/14, and the P\_symbol can be used in SLS with scaling based on reference configuraions.   + Can the above address QCOM3 concern?   @ALL  On the other hand, if we assume the P values in section 2.2 is per symbol, for slot-level modeling proponents, one can obtain the values by P\_slot=P\*14. Then in the evaluations, one can still use slot-based averaged values for various scheduling resources. Is there any concern? |
| vivo | We don’t see the need of capturing this equation into TR.  On the granularity of power values, we are fine with either per slot or per symbol. Agree with FL that symbol-level and slot-level power value can be derived from each other. |
| MediaTek | We think the formula is correct and support capturing it explicitly in the TR. In previous UE power saving study, companies spent some time in calibration to ensure aligned evaluations. Given there are more complicated numerologies involved (Sets 1, 2 and 3) in NW ES evaluations, this formula helps avoid misalignment in companies’ evaluations. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. We share similar view with MTK. Capturing the formula would be helpful for future reference. |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Nokia/Nsb | Following parameter description should be revised:  is the ~~subcarrier spacing~~ numerology  @FL, still we are not convinced why this is needed for our modelling framework? |
| LG Electronics | We are fine with the proposal and it can be captured in TR if the majority supports this proposal. |
| China Telecom | Though the formula is correct, but we don’t see the need to capture it into TR. However, we can follow the majority’s view. |
| Apple | We would be fine with this proposal. Alternatively, we can simply clarify that P\_i defines the relative power per ms, given how the transition energy was derived (approximately). Once this is clarified, the equation is not needed any more, because it becomes obvious. |

### 4th round

FL’s original intention is not only to capture the equation for information, but also noticed that this equation may be able to address the discussion point about time-scale of the power values.

Since now we have a specific discussion point for that, let’s use this section for further exchange of understanding. Previous agreement is as below.

*Agreement*

*For evaluation purpose, the BS energy consumption model should at least include the power consumption of BS on slot-level.*

* *Note that symbol-level power consumption to reflect different BW (or RB utilization) / time-occupancy / tx-rx direction of different symbols in a slot is considered.*
  + *FFS details (e.g. explicit symbol-level power modelling, scaling slot-level power to symbol level power for various cases, etc.)*
  + *Note: system simulation evaluations can be per slot regardless of detailed approach for calculating symbol-level power consumption*.

And regarding the example QC provided,

*Now talking about symbol-level vs. slot-level modelling. Let’s start with slot-level modelling and an example scenario where a slot has PDSCH for 3 UEs:*

* + ***Allocation 1****: Sym0 and Sym1: PDCCH occupying 40MHz*
  + ***Allocation 2****: Syms 2-7: UE1 PDSCH occupies 25MHz while UE2 PDSCH occupies 25MHz. UE1 PDSCH and UE2 PDSCH are FDMed (no frequency overlap but there could be frequency gap in between).*
  + ***Allocation 3****: Syms 8-13: UE1 PDSCH occupies 25MHz, UE2 PDSCH occupies 20MHz, and UE3 PDSCH occupies 20MHz. PDSCH from 3 UEs are FDMed.*

*Now it is our understanding that we need to scale the reference power model in time/frequency (& possible power) domain for each of the above allocations for computing the power for each one. Then the slot energy consumption is the summation of the energy consumption of each allocation. The computation complexity becomes higher when we have more complicated slot composition. Note that simply counting the number of DL symbols or UL symbols in a slot is not sufficient.*

**FL4 Question 2.4.3-1: Can the scaling by symbol-level and scaling by slot-level derived by each other?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QCOM4 | It can but they have different complexities in implementing in evaluation especially when symbols in the same slot have different spatial, frequency and power allocations. We found out slot-level modelling is simpler and we don’t need to have discussion on time domain scaling in Section 2.5. Note that since symbols in the same slot have different spatial, frequency and power allocations, the formula () in the proposal in Section 2.5 is not always correct. It will be much involved than that.  Furthermore, companies should use the same framework for evaluation. If some companies use slot-level modelling while others use symbol-level modelling, it may be possible that the observations across companies may not be consistent – just similar to the concerns from some companies on inconsistent observations in power model Cat 1 and power model Cat 2. |
| Intel | In our view, the agreed relative power values are expressed at the slot level (i.e., energy consumed over a slot) based on the reference configurations. Then, in the scaling formula, symbol level energy consumption can be obtained based on the slot level relative power model. We think this is cleaner approach. |
| Samsung | Please see our comments for the details in Q2.4.3-3. |
| Apple | We need to clarify the time unit for the defined P\_i. Given how the transition energy was defined (approximately), our assumption is that P\_i is the energy consumption over one ms. If no transition energy were involved, symbol-level or slot-level does not really matter. But we have the transition energy defined in certain way, and we need to be consistent. Otherwise the results would not be correct.  QC’s comment that the formula is not always correct is not clear to us. Maybe QC can elaborate what they consider as the right way to do it. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think the scaling by symbol and by slot are convertible. However,we tend to agree with Apple that for the agreed transition energy, it is more like slot level power consumption model is assumed. Otherwise, the energy defined in millisecond with symbol level power consumption model will be much larger. |
| vivo | Yes, we think the power value in symbol-level and slot-level can be derived from each other. The scaling is better to be in symbol level to handle the case QC mentions whether the table is in symbol-level or slot-level.  According to current discussion, there are the following two different alternatives:  Alt .1: Power value is in unit of symbol and where is the power in the *i*th symbol after scaling corresponding to the power state;  Alt. 2: Power value is in unit of slot. The symbols with the same power state and the same allocation in frequency, spatial and power domain are grouped together, i.e.  **+ where**  is the ratio of symbols in power state *i*, is the ratio of symbols of the kth DL allocation and is the ratio of symbols of the mth UL allocation. is the power of the kth DL allocation after scaling and is the power of the mth UL allocation after scaling. Note =1  We agree that the final total energy value for one technique is different by adopting the above two alternatives. Actually, the total energy value resulting from Alt. 1 is always 14 times over that from Alt. 2 for a certain evaluation. If power saving gain is reported for one technique over baseline, the gain will be the same for both the above two alternatives.  We are fine with either alternative and slightly prefer Alt. 1 for simplicity. If it is hard to achieve a consensus between these two, we suggest to agree these two alternative implementation approach that will result in the same results for power saving gain. |
| LG Electronics | We share the same view with Intel and Apple. When we calculating the transition energy based on the formula, we think that multiplying the relative power by the total transition time in ms (i.e., relative power\*(duration in ms)) means that the implicitly agreed relative power values are slot/ms level. |

**FL4 Question 2.4.3-2: Can the slot-level scaling be able to reflect different BW (or RB utilization) / time-occupancy / tx-rx direction of different symbols in a slot?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QCOM4 | See our reply in Question 2.4.3-1 and the listed example. |
| Intel | Yes. For example, if there are two DL transmissions in a slot occupying different BW, then  would need to be calculated separately for each DL transmission and weighted separately based on number of symbols occupied for calculating overall scaled energy consumption in the slot. Such as  ,where holds |
| Samsung | Please see our comments for the details in Q2.4.3-3. |
| Apple | We think it is possible, like what Intel described. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Slot-level scaling is enough to reflect different BW (or RB utilization) / time-occupancy / tx-rx direction of different symbols in a slot.  In the discussion of the slot level modeling, the power consumption of a slot can be calculated based on the proportion of DL symbols, UL symbols and unoccupied symbols in the slot, as it is provided by Intel. Each field is scaled for only occupied symbols. Therefore, for the slot-level scaling , different BW (or RB utilization) / time-occupancy / tx-rx direction of different symbols in a slot has been already considered. |
| LG Electronics | Yes, and we think Intel has explained that it is possible with a good example. What’s important is that we should have a common scaling method for consistent observations in the evaluation |

**FL4 Question 2.4.3-3: Is any additional handling required on previously agreed power values/additional transition energy for any/both of symbol-level scaling and slot-level scaling? E.g., the power value needs to be divided by 14? Note the energy value is agreed as unit in relative power\*(duration in ms)).**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QCOM4 | Regarding the note: No, the unit of the energy value is for the duration of the transition latency. It does not mean that the power is measured in ms or slot or symbol at this stage. The agreed energy number was agreed as compromise for progress – It did not mean the number follows any equation.  Without clarification, companies may have different modelling approaches; leading to different energy consumption computation. Please see our reply in Question 2.4.3-1. |
| Intel | We do not think any additional handling is needed. Our understanding is that the relative power values based on following agreement is at the slot level. Per symbol level power can be obtained by scaling based on the slot-level power model.  Agreement  For evaluation purpose, the BS energy consumption model should at least include the power consumption of BS on slot-level. |
| Samsung | From our point of view, as the calculation mechanism for transition energy, e.g. relative power \* transition time[ms], we are assuming relative power is also per 1ms. Under the assumption, if we evaluate set1 with SCS = 30kHz, we think half of relative power are considered per slot. In the slot level, to consider the symbol level scaling as case mentioned by QC, total power consumption per slot would be calculated, like (2/14)\*half of (Pstatic+Pdynamic,1)+ (6/14)\*half of (Pstatic+Pdynamic,2)+ (6/14)\*half of (Pstatic+Pdynamic,3) for DL slot. In the BS perspective, we don’t need to consider each of power consumption of channels and signals which are FDMed, but the total activated TxRUs and thecombined BW and PSD should be taken into account for the scaling. For S slot and U slot, we are considering same mechanism to calculate the total power consumption. Lastly, we can calculate the total energy consumption over duration except for transition per slot level. Based on the above mechanism, we can reflect the whole time/frequency domain for evaluation purpose. |
| Apple | Given how the transition energy was defined (approximately), our assumption is that P\_i is the energy consumption over one ms. We need to be consistent in the calculation. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The additional transition energy of the sleep states is approximated by the formula in time units of ms. Therefore, the currently defined power states value does not match the additional transition energy if the symbol level power consumption model is used. There are two solutions to solve this problem. Solution 1: define new additional transition energy for symbol-level NW power consumption model. For example, the additional transition energy of symbol level is 14 times that of slot level.  Solution 2: the same additional transition energy is used, but the power state value needs to be divided by 14.  But for slot level power consumption model, no additional handling is needed. |
| LG Electronics | No additional handling is needed. We think it is only necessary to clearly specify that the agreed relative power values are slot-level. |

## Scaling details

Two alternatives (Alt 1 or its variation, and Alt 3 or its variation) were extensively discussed in the post meeting email discussion of RAN1#110 in R1-2208312.

*Conclusion*

*Companies are encouraged to check discussion in section 2.2.2 of* [*R1-2208312*](file:///D:\Users\erdem.bala\Downloads\Docs\R1-2208312.zip) *for scaling discussion in the next meeting.*

According the contributions submitted in this meeting:

**Based on (revised) Alt 1,**

* Huawei/HiSilicon considers the power of static part shall equal to the power of micro sleep mode, i.e. given no scaling applied for the static part and it is no active transmission (same definition as micro sleep) when the dynamic part power is zero. It also considers that the PA efficiency can be non-linearly modelled if needed, with formula provided in this case.
* Nokia/NSB considers the power of static part shall not equal to the power of BS in Micro sleep mode as Tx may still be scalable in BS micro sleep, and there is a BW factor applied to the dynamic part of active DL power (which can be assumed to be 1 for evaluations). Also, the dynamic Tx antenna element adaptations may require a further delay/interruption which may needs to be considered when performing scaling or calculating the energy consumption.
* Spreadtrum wants to discuss the profile of each part of e.g. Alt 1 on .e.g., whether the static part power include the transmission for common signal and consider it could be beneficial if the power consumption of micro sleep is lower than that of the static part.
* vivo, MediaTek, NTT DOCOMO consider and other dynamic parts for DL should meet the constraint that the sum of all components equals (similar constraints applies to UL).
* China Telecom considers both Alt 1 and Alt 3 has similar structure and need to consider some constraints similar to vivo.
* As a second preference, CATT could also consider this approach with consideration that 1) the power of static part should include additionally power consumed by cross-symbol processing, network control function, and data processing, in addition to the power of BS in micro sleep, 2) PA can be 1 or 0.34 and 3) value s\_f should be defined as the ratio of RF BW and maximum system BW.
* Fujitsu shares that in Alt 1 the Pstatic can be set as a same or close value with the relative power of micro sleep, which is also useful considering the gap of P3 and P4 is similar between two categories and the results can be more aligned.
* Intel proposes an unified scaling including both UL and DL split by time domain symbols, and considers and PA efficiency can be 1 by default.
* ZTE consider Pstatic can be the power of BS in micro sleep, and that the same scaling factors applies between Cat 1 and Cat 2.
* CMCC consider Pstatic can be the power of BS in micro sleep.
* MediaTek consider the PA efficiency can be set as 0.5 from RAN1 evaluation perspective and LS to RAN4 for providing suggested power consumption scaling for PA-related transceiver processing enhancements.
* Samsung consider Pstatic can be the power of BS in micro sleep, PA efficiency of 0.34 as a reasonable/practical value, and provides candidate values for scaling factors of each domain.
* Ericsson (2nd) considers adjustment is needed in order to better reflect the antenna scaling w.r.t. network load for the interest of this study. In time domain, since symbol level is proposed the total energy consumption is the summation of powers of symbols in a slot, so as to reflect the effects of different BW per symbol, etc.

**Based on (revised) Alt 3,**

* Vivo, NTT DOCOMO consider it can be optionally reported.
* China Telecom consider that there is conflicts in the current Alt 3 formula and modification is needed to satisfy the constraint P3<0.03\*P4.
* OPPO supports this approach and consider the power of static part equals P3.
* LGE and Rakuten consider this approach is easier/simpler and accurate enough from discussion point of view compared to Alt 1.
* Qualcomm consider this is applied in DL, and the static power is P3 and the total power is P4. With that the dynamic part power (P4-P3) is further scaled jointly (or separately when scaling factor for some domain=1). A ratio between a reference PA efficiency and actual PA efficiency is defined and used.

**Other Alternatives, e.g. Alt 2 where power scaling in time, frequency, spatial, and power domain are defined based on the framework of the power model defined for UE power consumption in TR38.840**

* Supported by CATT(1st), Ericsson(1st), Qualcomm (for UL)

The following summarizes the scaling approaches and relative power values submitted from contributions.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Proposals** |
| Huawei/HiSilicon | *Proposal 5:* *For active DL with revised Alt1-update, and are recommended to set as 7.3 and 9.6 respectively, while or a fixed value.*  *Proposal 6: For active UL, the BS power consumption can be provided as , where and is recommended as 1.*  *Proposal 7: For Set 2 and Set 3 reference configuration, the same scaling formula as Alt 1 is reused and*  *where is the respective relative power value of BS micro-sleep. Other parameters are recommended as below:*   * *For Set 2, ,,* * *For Set 3, ,,* * *can be either non-linearly modelled or a fixed value, for simplicity.* |
| Nokia/NSB | and assuming the following parameters:   * fixed feeder loss=0,8 dB * fixed PA efficiency factor =35%   Table 3: DL power scaling coefficients with Set 1 and Set 2 for Cat.2   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Parameters | Set 1 FR1 | Set 2 FR1 | |  |  |  | |  |  |  | |  |  |  |   Table 4: UL power scaling coefficients with Set 1 and Set 2   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Parameters | Set 1 FR1 | Set 2 FR1 | |  |  |  | |  |  |  |   In time domain,  +  For CA,  where >1  For multi-TRP, |
| vivo | *Proposal 6: Value of in the Revised Alt 1-update is the same as power value of Micro sleep power state.*  *Proposal 7: Value of*  and  *in the Revised Alt 1-update should meet the condition that the sum of and* *is the same as power value of Active DL power state.*  *Proposal 8: Support the following scaling method for BS UL reception*   * + - = power *value of Micro sleep power state (i.e. P3)*     - =*power value of Active UL power state (i.e. P5) - power value of Micro sleep power state (i.e. P3)*   *Proposal 9: For time domain scaling, the following formula is used when slot level model is provided:* (1-alpha-beta)\*P3 + alpha\*P4+beta\*P5 |
| China Telecom | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  |  |  | | Category 1 | 55 | 100 | 180 | | Category 2 | 5.5 | 10 | 22 | |
| OPPO | Proposal 5: When a slot-level model is used, the BS power consumption over a slot can be scaled by , where is the ratio of the number of active DL symbols within a slot. |
| CATT | * + - : a static part of which the power is not scaled based on reference configurations. Value is to be determined based on       * Category 1: [140]       * Category 2: [16]     - : a dynamic part of the power that is scaled based on reference configurations based on , where       * + is   Category 1: [110]  Category 2: [12]   * + - * + is   Category 1: [30]  Category 2: [4]   * + - * + is the PA efficiency   For initial evaluations, ,  The and should be reported along with , which may not be perfectly the candidate values in the current list  FFS whether/how to use a non-linear function to represent.   * + - * + , , is the percentage of active TxRUs, the radio of RF bandwidth and maximum system BW in frequency domain and the ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration, respectively. |
| Intel | ,  where,   * = P3, a static part for which the power does not scale based on the reference configurations. P3 refers to Micro-sleep state power value.   + should be 55 and 5.5 for Category 1 and Category 2 models, respectively. * and represents the ratios of the number of active DL and UL symbols within a slot to the number of symbols within a slot, respectively. * , where   + , , refer to the percentage of active TRxRUs, the ratio of RF bandwidth and maximum system BW and the ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration, respectively.   + is the PA efficiency, for which default value is 1. Other values < 1 can be optionally evaluated   + refers to component of dynamic power that is scaled based on number of active set of antennas only     - We suggest value of 110 for this part for Category 1   + refers to component of dynamic power that is scaled based on both number of active set of antennas and amount of occupied BW     - We suggest value of 115 value for this part for Category 1 * , where P5 refers to active UL state relative power for the reference configuration. |
| ZTE | * : * Category 1: [55] * Category 2: [5.5]  * : * Category 1: [103] * Category 2: [12.5]  * : * Category 1: [61] * Category 2: [7] * as the PA efficiency: * =0.5   Proposal 10: The time domain scaling is (1-alpha)\*P3 + alpha\*P4 where alpha represents the ratio of the number of active DL symbols within a slot to the number of symbols within a slot  Proposal 11: In frequency domain, for at least inter-band CA, the total power consumption of BS is calculated as the sum of the power consumption of each cell. |
| LGE | Proposal #3: For the time domain scaling, the formula α\*P4+(1-α)\*P3 can be used, wherein P4 is the power for active DL, P3 is the power of micro-sleep, α is the ratio of active DL symbols within a slot.  Proposal #4: For the frequency domain scaling, the power consumption can be calculated as the sum of the power consumption of each cell for inter-band CA while a proper scaling factor for dynamic power can be considered for the intra-band CA. |
| MediaTek | DL   * is chosen so that Active DL power when = 1 while = 0   + Accordingly, the following values are utilized for different BS categories and Set 1/2/3  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Value of | | | | | | | Category 1 BS | | | Category 2 BS | | | | Set 1 | Set 2 | Set 3 | Set 1 | Set 2 | Set 3 | | 57 | 46 | 22.8 | 7.3 | 11 | 0.36 |  * is chosen so that Active DL power when   + Accordingly, the following values are utilized for different BS categories and Set 1/2/3  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Value of | | | | | | | Category 1 BS | | | Category 2 BS | | | | Set 1 | Set 2 | Set 3 | Set 1 | Set 2 | Set 3 | | 84 | 72 | 45.6 | 9.6 | 12 | 2.52 |   UL   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Value of | | | | | | | Category 1 BS | | | Category 2 BS | | | | Set 1 | Set 2 | Set 3 | Set 1 | Set 2 | Set 3 | | 55 | 40 | 42 | 1 | 0.8 | 1.2 |   Time domain |
| Samsung | * the BS power consumption for active DL is provided by   + - : a static part of which the power is not scaled based on reference configurations. Value is to be determined based on       * Category 1: 55       * Category 2: 5.5     - : a dynamic part of the power that is scaled based on reference configurations based on , where       * + is   Category 1: 15  Category 2: 1.5   * + - * + is   Category 1: 71  Category 2: 8.5   * + - * + is the PA efficiency   For initial evaluations, 0.34   * + - * + , , is the percentage of active TRxRUs, the ratio of RF bandwidth and maximum system BW and the ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration, respectively.         + The percentage of active TRxRUs : {1 for 64 TRxRUs, 0.67 for 32 TRxRUs, 0.67^2 for 16 TRxRUs, 0.67^3 for 8 TRxRUs}         + The ratio of RF bandwidth : 0.35+0.65\* Xf /100MHz, Xf [MHz] = {10, 20, 40, 50, 80, 100}         + The ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration : 0.67^(Xp /3[dB]), Xp = {0, 3[dB], 6[dB]} * the BS power consumption for active UL is provided by   + - : a static part of which the power is not scaled based on reference configurations. Value is to be determined based on       * Category 1: 55       * Category 2: 5.5     - : a dynamic part of the power that is scaled based on reference configurations based on       * Category 1: [FFS]       * Category 2: 1         + The percentage of active TRxRUs : {1 for 64 TRxRUs, 0.67 for 32 TRxRUs, 0.67^2 for 16 TRxRUs, 0.67^3 for 8 TRxRUs} |
| Ericsson | For Set 1, downlink Cat 1, downlink active power P = P4 \* ( [0.4] + [0.6] \* sf\*sp) \* ([0.4] + [0.6]\*sa), where , , is the percentage of active TRxRUs, the ratio of RF bandwidth and maximum system BW and the ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration, respectively  [Alternate proposal to Proposal 5 ] For Set 1, downlink Cat 1, downlink active power with the dynamic power defined as ,   * 1. *, , is the percentage of active TRxRUs, the ratio of RF bandwidth and maximum system BW and the ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration, respectively.*   2. *is the PA efficiency*   Antenna adaptation delay is explicitly modeled with a transition time of [1-3] ms.  For Set 1, uplink Cat 1, uplink active power P = P5 \* ( [0.8] + [0.2] \* sf) \* ([0.4] + [0.6]\*sa), where , , is the percentage of active TRxRUs, the ratio of RF bandwidth and maximum system BW, respectively |
| NTT DOCOMO | * + In CA case     - For intra-band CA, a scaling factor is applied to considering RF is shared among CCs.     - For inter-band CA, the power consumption is the sum of the power consumption of each cell considering different RFs are used among CCs. |
| Qualcomm | DL   * *and are relative power values of micro sleep and active DL transmission based on reference configuration, respectively* * *is the ratio between the actual number of TxRUs and the reference number of TxRUs for DL transmission* * *is the ratio between the actual number of frequency resources and the reference number of frequency resources for DL transmission* * *is the ratio between PSD of the actual DL transmission and PSD of the reference DL transmission.* * *is the ratio between a reference PA efficiency and actual PA efficiency*   + - *when = 1*     - *α and are provided in the below table*  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | *Parameters* | *FR1* | *FR2* | |  | *[31%]* | *[8%]* | |  | *[0.86]* | *[0.24]* | |  | *[0.025]* | *[0.01]* |   UL  *Power consumption of an active UL reception is adapted in spatial and frequency domain as*   * *is the power consumption of the active UL reception based on the reference configuration.* * *is the ratio between the actual number of RxRUs and the reference number of RxRUs for UL reception* * *is the ratio between the actual number of frequency resources and the reference number of frequency resources for UL reception.*   *For CA, the total power consumption is the sum of the power consumption of configured cells*   * + *For intra-band CA with contiguous CCs, the power consumption of the Scell is scaled by [0.75].*   *For multi-TRP, the total power consumption is the sum of the power consumption of configured active TRPs.* |

### Initial round

Based on the above, general support of Alt 1 can be observed while there is slightly increased support for Alt 3 compared to last meeting. Majority including the proponents of Alt 3 consider a static part shares the power as BS in micro sleep. This could be a baseline for evaluations while we allow for other values for the interest of study. Regarding the component values of , it is observed that companies of Cat 2 have proposals for Cat 1 while companies of Cat 1 mainly propose a different/modified scaling (modified Alt 1 or Alt 3). Therefore, FL does not pick up the values proposed by Cat 2 companies for Cat 1 while only take one value directly from a Cat 1 company. It might be beneficial to allow for different values in small, medium or larger level respectively to further account for different implementations and various PA efficiency, therefore multiple candidate values remain without down-selection at this stage. Particularly, one or an averaged one is taken for each PA efficiency to reduce the workload. DL and UL can be unified based on majority preference, and also due to the fact that UL does not contribute to a significant part of power consumption at least for the study of this release.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FL1/FL2 Proposal 2.4.1:**   * **The BS power consumption in a slot is provided by**   + - For slot-level modelling, represents the ratios of the number of active DL and UL symbols within a slot to the number of symbols within a slot and ; for symbol-level modelling, represents the number of active DL and UL symbols within a slot and .     - : a static part of power for BS in active, which is not scaled based on reference configurations.       * Baseline:       * Other values can be optionally reported     - : a dynamic part of power for BS in active, which is scaled based on reference configuration.       * Baseline: , where , , is the percentage of active TRxRUs, the ratio of RF bandwidth and maximum system BW and the ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration, respectively, and         + is the PA efficiency. For evaluation purpose, .         + : [1.5] for , [9.9] for , [110] for         + : [8.5] for , [8.3] for , [115] for       * Other values can be optionally reported, satisfying when , ,.       * Optional for other approaches, e.g. **,** or where  is the ratio between a reference PA efficiency and actual PA efficiency, up to company report       * Baseline:       * Other values can be optionally reported, satisfying when .   + For multi-carrier: for inter-band multi-CC, the total power consumption of BS is calculated as the sum of the power consumption of each CC; for intra-band with contiguous CCs, the power consumption of each additional CC is scaled by [0.75].   + For multi-TRP with separate RF chains, the total power consumption of BS is assumed as the sum of the power consumption of each TRP   + Antenna adaptation delay is explicitly modelled with a transition time of [1-3] ms, if not fall into micro-sleep.   + Other scaling, e.g. cell-load dependent scaling can also be reported. * Send LS to RAN4 about the above, and ask for feedback, with details of proposed in Alt 3 also captured in the LS. | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are in general fine with the framework and proposal, with the following detailed comments:   1. For the PA efficiency of , we are wondering this is realistic value and can be achievable. Therefore, we propose not to assume in the evaluation. We are fine to keep 0.34 and 1 as typical PA efficiency values; 2. Antenna adaptation delay may or may not zero depends on whether fall into micro sleep. Therefore,    * Antenna adaptation delay is zero if the transition-to state if micro-sleep state. Antenna adaptation delay can be reported ~~is explicitly modelled~~ with a transition time of [1-3] ms, if not fall into micro-sleep. 3. For intra-band CC, we think the value of 0.65 would be more accurate.    1. For multi-carrier: for inter-band multi-CC, the total power consumption of BS is calculated as the sum of the power consumption of each CC; for intra-band with contiguous CCs, the power consumption of each additional CC is scaled by [0.~~7~~65]. |
| LG Electronics | We are generally fine with the proposal but we would like to clarify the follows.   * + Why is the baseline in ?   + Whether the scaling for the power consumption of each additional CC is applied only to the dynamic part for the intra-band CA case   + Which formula Alt 3 in the last bullet refers to?   In addition, if is up to company report, isn't there no need to send LS to RAN4? |
| DOCOMO | We are basically fine with the proposal. For PA efficiency, we share similar view with HW that may not be realistic value. |
| Nokia/Nsb | Regarding “P\_static”, we propose to use “P\_static = P3 - A”, where the factor A depends on the reference configuration, and companies may report different values, i.e. A=0 or other values.  Regarding “multi-carrier”, we propose to have the following to be captured:  For inter-band CA, separate RFs are used, so the total power consumption of BS is calculated as the sum of the P\_dynamic of each CC. The P\_static should be accounted once.   * + For intra-band CA, the scaling factor of 0,75 is to be applied on the P\_dynamic (by considering that some RF components are shared), and P\_static factor is accounted once.   Regarding “multi-TRP”, we could like to clarify that, the P\_static is assumed common for all TRPs.  Regarding “Antenna Adaptation Delay”,   * + Antenna adaptation delay is explicitly modelled with a transition time of [1-3] ms~~, if not fall into micro-sleep~~. E.g. if there is the antenna adaptation applied in the active state, or if there is transition to micro-sleep with antenna configuration change, it shall include an Additional Antenna Adaptation delay of (1-3) ms.   + Moreover, we may need to discuss whether there is the BS Tx/Rx interruption during such antenna adaptation delay? And what could be the transition energy when BS turns on and off the spatial elements.   Apart from the adaptation delay in spatial domain, the adaptation delay in other domain, i.e. frequency adaptation delay, should also be discussed. |
| Spreadtrum | Generally fine. Some comments:   1. We still like static part is higher than P3, otherwise, we do not understand the so-called symbol-level sleep has additional gain, since gNB does not transmission is equal to micro sleep. Is there any possibility that an advanced gNB can enter a more power efficient state than static part for duration of several symbols? 2. Joint equation for DL/UL may not meaningful |
| vivo | We are generally fine with the direction of the proposal and with the following comments:   1. It seems the static power part is missing for DL and UL symbols, the equation should be   ) that can be simplified as  )   1. For value of PA efficiency , if it is a fixed value, there is no need to have multiple values since it is anyway a scaling value over **.** We suggest to adopt =0.5. Meanwhile, and should be determined for Cat 1 and Cat 2 value respectively. Here is our proposal:   Cat 1 (=0.5): =110, =57.5  Cat 2 (=0.5): =9.9, =8.3  For , the baseline should be =55 for Cat 1 and =1 for Cat 2 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are okay with the principle of proposal. The comments are   1. We also think =1 is too idealist. The value of 0.34, 0.5 is closer to implementation.   For the calculation of , the value of , and should be defined for cat1 and cat 2 respectively, because of the different power values for the active states.  In addition, considering that the resultant scaling factors for DL power consumption calculated by Category 1 and Category 2 should be similar in different domain adaptation.Therefore, the proposal can be modified as follows.   * + - * + is the PA efficiency. For evaluation purpose, (if considered):   for cat 1: [75] for , [80 ~~9.9~~] for , [110] for  for cat 2: [11.5 ~~1.5~~] for , [9.9] for , [13.5 ~~110~~] for   * + - * + :   for cat 1: [51] for , [72.5 ~~8.3~~] for , [115] for  for cat 2: [5.1 ~~8.5~~] for , [8.3] for , [13 ~~115~~ ] for   1. For inter-band CA, we think the total power consumption is separately calculated for each CC, including the static part. 2. Transition time of zero should also be considered.   For Antenna adaptation delay is explicitly modelled with a transition time of [0-3] ms~~, if not fall into micro-slee~~p. |
| Samsung | We are fine with FL’s proposal in general. For our understanding on , ,, we would like to further clarify how to calculate the , ,. |
| OPPO | For the baseline approach of the dynamic part, we have a concern that when there is no transmission, e.g., , the dynamic part of the power will be . However, according to our agreed BS power consumption model, the BS can enter into micro sleep immediately when there is no transmission. In this case, the dynamic part should be instead of . Thus, we prefer Alt3 to avoid this issue. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon2 | Some feedback on OPPO’s comment:  In the agreed template table agreed in RAN1#110, it was agreed that for micro sleep, There is neither DL transmission nor UL reception.  Therefore, during micro sleep, besides to be zero, the should be also zero because is also zero. Therefore, in this case, both  **and** are zero. So the micro sleep power is still **Pstatic.** There is no issue. |
| CATT | We don’t agree with the proposal to incorporate both DL and UL power consumptions in the formula since the DL Tx and UL Rx chains are separated and both active at the time. The gNB power consumption for both DL and UL are in active state in Tx, Rx or standby in each OFDM symbol. Thus, the proposal is not technical correct to have scale the value based on the ratio of DL and UL symbols. In addition, we agree the power model is based per slot power consumption. Even for TDD with DL/UL symbols in a slot, components related for DL Tx and UL Rx are all active (e.g., coupler in switching the Tx/Rx path, controller). There are other signal processing cross-symbols, such channel coding, with power consumption within a slot.  For the static component, the power consumption of active transmission should be higher than the P3 value (micro sleep) since power consumptions of components for signal processing are static component and required for both with and without scaling in time/frequency/spatial/power domain, such as baseband processing, controller, and RF components (e.g., filter, ADC). Thus, the value of P3 for static component ignores the fact of those static components for active transmission/reception. The values should be between micro sleep and DL active transmission (e.g., 140 which is about 38% of added power from micro sleep power consumption 55 to active DL Tx power consumption 280)  If we can agree the power scaling similar to that defined for UE power saving, it will be simpler to use a table for each domain and not the joint formula. |
| Vodafone | For the modelling of the PA in Alt.1, for clarification, how will depend on if it is assumed fixed values for the evaluation? |
| FL2 | To LGe:   * + because the Pstatic=5.5 and P5=6.5   + I think what QC proposes is for the entire SCell.   + Please also refer to QC proposal which is   *is the ratio between a reference PA efficiency and actual PA efficiency*  To Nokia:   * + Ok to introduce a factor, however the baseline should still be A=0 in order to reflect the majority preference and for alignment in evaluation as much as possible   + I will wait for a bit for QC to clarify as LGe also commented. Note it is still to be multi-CC instead of CA to be inclusive, since some techniques are not replied on CA.   + I’m not sure it is the intention, as the sum of each TRP means P\_static is not shared?   + I’m a bit unsure on the comments for antenna adaption delay. What is the difference if we assume dynamic antenna adaptation is applied at symbol level, such that the BS go to micro sleep without explicit transition time? What is the further difference between antenna adaptation delay and interruption delay? Is it talking about UE side not BS side?   To Spreadtrum:   * + It is not so clear what is the concern. Regarding the statement that symbol level sleep has ‘additional’ gain – what is compared to as “additional”? When BS does not perform transmission, even symbol level, it goes to micro sleep, and has corresponding energy savings. For example, for a transmission with 4 SSB symbols and no other transmissions within a slot, the BS is active at the 4-OS with SSB and immediately goes to micro sleep at remaining OS within that slot. That is the assumption and that is not a technique being proposed - technique that has additional gain would be e.g. use even reduced number of SSBs to enable more time duration without SSB transmission.   + In order to consider the TDD slot with both UL and DL in a slot, it is needed. Of course, we can still separately discuss DL and UL, but if the technical logic is the same, it may be rather simpler to determine DL and UL at the same time.   To vivo   * + Thanks for spotting. Will reivew the formula in next round of update.   + Ok to narrow down the candidate values for PAE and ok to have respective values for Cat 1 and Cat 2. For now because Cat 1 companies mainly propose other Alternatives, I’m not sure there could be values suitable for them, so in the initial round, just picked up Intel’s value without differing categories. Thus, PAE=0.34 and 0.5 is from Cat 2 and PAE=1 is from Intel, Cat 1. This can be clarified and differed later.   To ZTE,   * + For Cat 1 vs. Cat 2, see FL response to vivo above.   + [11.5 ~~1.5~~] for ==> the original value is picked up from Samsung proposal, without adjustment. I will wait for a bit more response. |
| Intel | We are OK in principle with the above framework. Few suggestions for corrections/revisions   1. For the following:    * + For slot-level modelling, represents the ratios of the number of active DL and UL symbols within a slot to the number of symbols within a slot and ; for symbol-level modelling, represents the number of active DL and UL symbols within a slot and .   For to hold, we think and should be replaced by and , respectively, which include both static and dynamic components. Revised equation should be either one of the following   * + (1)   + (2),   + where  1. For the following, we prefer that it is clarified which combinations apply for which Category of power model.    * + - * : [1.5] for , [9.9] for , [110] for          * : [8.5] for , [8.3] for , [115] for 2. Similarly, for the following, proposed value seem to apply for Category 2 only. We need a separate value of for Category 1, such as 55.      * + - * Baseline:  1. It is not clear how the following can be incorporated with the agreed model, where transition time only applies to light and deep sleep modes. We suggest to put this in bracket and more discussion is needed.   Antenna adaptation delay is explicitly modelled with a transition time of [1-3] ms, if not fall into micro-sleep |
| InterDigital | We are generally ok with FL’s proposal. We also share similar view with ZTE and vivo on having the values scaled for and for Cat 2. |
| CMCC | 1. We also share similar view with ZTE and vivo on having separate values of and for Cat 1 and Cat 2. 2. Regarding the formula, we support to use the original version in FL’s proposal. represents the static power when BS neither transmission nor reception but is ready for transmission or reception without transition time. For the symbols of DL transmission or UL reception, or part is enough.      1. Regarding the antenna adaptation delay, since the transition time is 0 for micro sleep, if BS transit from micro sleep to active DL/UL, no additional antenna adaptation delay is needed. |
| China Telecom | We are generally fine with the proposal. We agree with vivo’s motivation of modification on the equation, but it’s better not to simplify the equation for easier comprehension the meaning of each part and coefficient ‘a’ is not a constant. Just keep the equation as  )  Or the equation can be as follows since the static part always exists.  Also, we agree with ZTE, vivo, InterDigital that the values should be separately defined for Cat1 and Cat 2. |
| Ericsson1 | An initial comment :  On the a,b, c formulation for DL, UL, empty symbols : This does not reflect the setting where different symbols may have different BW occupancy, which was discussed in previous meetings. *Note that symbol-level power consumption to reflect different BW (or RB utilization) / time-occupancy / tx-rx direction of different symbols in a slot is considered.*  Symbol-level modeling should also be captured – “*In time domain, If an explicit symbol level model is provided, scaling is not applied*”. |
| QC1 | Reiterating our response from multiple times in last meeting, is NOT the PA efficiency since some reference PAE is already captured in the power consumption  In a similar manner as to the scaling factors in other domains, it is important to see how the actual PAE is relative to the reference PAE; hence PAE scaling factor is the ratio between a reference PA efficiency and actual PA efficiency depending on the actual transmit power and actual frequency domain usage. Therefore we support the optional approach.  Taking indicates that the reference PA efficiency, that was captured in the power consumption **,** is the same in all the scaling conditions. Most companies agree that PA efficiency changes with transmit power. Modeling PA efficiency to be constant (hence, linear), would provide misleading evaluation for the PA power consumption:   * + For TX power reduction of 3dB and 6dB, keeping PA efficiency as constant (, linear) would have the PA power consumption to be scaled to 0.5 and 0.25 respectively   + Our calculations (and measurements), provided by our formula have the PA power consumption to be scaled to 0.66 and 0.48 respectively, largely different than the linear     - Taking Samsung’s formula from its Tdoc (0.67^(Xp/3[dB])), would have similar results as ours - the PA power consumption to be scaled to 0.67 and 0.45 respectively   We therefore suggest the following, after aligning definition amongst companies   * + - : a dynamic part of power for BS in active, which is scaled based on reference configuration.       * Baseline: , where , , is the percentage of active TRxRUs, the ratio of RF bandwidth and maximum system BW and the ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration, respectively, and         + is the PA scaling factor. For evaluation purpose, would indicate that the reference PA efficiency is constant value throughput the scaling factors (e.g., frequency, power)         + : [1.5] for , [9.9] for , [110] for         + : [8.5] for , [8.3] for , [115] for       * Other values can be optionally reported, satisfying when , ,.       * Optional for other approaches, e.g. **,** or where  is the ratio between a reference PA efficiency and actual PA efficiency, up to company report         + In order to simplify, instead of a formula, several numbers for can be used for certain ,:   For :  For :  For : |
| FL2-2 | To Vodafone: the proposed LS to RAN4 intends to ask for guidance whether a fixed value is sufficient, or a more detailed non-linear modeling is required.  To Qualcomm: the in Alt 1 might have different definition as that in Alt 3 – thus, FL has explicitly capture the fitting definition for Alt 3 in the optional case. There may be no need to revise the definition for other approach now.  Given several companies input, FL will consider to down select some values in the next update, per Category, and also try to address comments about symbol level vs slot level, scaling factors calculation. |
| Samsung | We are fine with FL’s proposal in general.  Regarding the , we considered it was (P4 - ) for both categories. With the in Cat 2, we determined 1.5 for based on the portion of power consumption between and calculated by the measured power consumption of gNB with 64T64R (i.e. ). Afterwards, we derived as 8.5 under the and the fixed PAE 0.34, which is averaged value of products. Based on our assumption, took small portion of , and most of power was consumed in related to PA.  In terms of the last sub-bullet for LS to RAN4, we are wondering whether we can reflect the RAN4’s response within the limited time for SID. So, we’d like to use the fixed candidate values for PAE.  For the multi-TRP, as mentioned by Nokia, we also would like to be clear whether can be same for all TRPs. From our assumption, can be same for all TRPs for simplification. Hence, in m-TRP case, the can be updated as below:  , where nrofTRP is the number of TRPs during m-TRP operation. |
| MediaTek | Regarding FL1/FL2 Proposal 2.4.1,   * For DL transmission power consumption scaling   + Support as a good starting point to merge Alt 1 and Alt 3   + Support setting a baseline model with first set to a constant (of multiple candidate values). **To include more sophisticated model on , we agree with FL to send LS for RAN4’s check and potential input because RAN4 has dedicated experts on BS RF** (and it is strange for RAN1 to make decision without checking with the respective RAN4 experts)   + For deciding the values and , we would suggest to consider two boundary conditions so that the values can be “calculated” for Category 1/2 and Set 1/2/3 BS settings (too slow to be decided one-by-one). The following can be potentially considered:     - **Power low bound for few RBs, e.g., = [0.4] Active DL power when and , which determines**     - **Full-RB power condition, i.e., = Active DL power when and , which further determines** * For UL reception power consumption scaling   + Setting is more reasonable since we have a common sleep model across DL and UL   + With **,** can be calculated by the boundary condition:  **Active UL power when** |
| Nokia/Nsb | To FL:  Regarding “I’m not sure it is the intention, as the sum of each TRP means P\_static is not shared?”, to our view and proposal, in case of multi-TRP, even with separate RF, the BB is shared among TRPs, and it should be accounted once (as part of the P\_static) and should not be cumulated when aggregating TRPs.  Regarding “I’m a bit unsure on the comments for antenna adaption delay”, our intention is proposing on how to include the antenna adaptation delay in the modeling.  For instance, if there is the antenna adaptation from 64Trx to 32 Trx, the [1~3]ms antenna adaptation delay can be considered similarly as gNB entering the micro-sleep state, where during the micro-sleep state period, the gNB will turn-off the Tx-Rx chains from 64-to-32. And after the antenna adaptation delay, the gNB re-enters the active-state with 32Trx and resumes its normal activity  We may need to discuss and agree on the BS behavior during the time of spatial elements (de-)activation, such that the BS operation with transmission/reception could be interrupted during this time period. And that could be exactly modelled as gNB in micro-sleep state, with no Tx and Rx services available (as assumed and explained above). |
| Fujitsu | We are fine the principle of the proposal.  It seems that the definitions of a, b and c are only applicable for TDD case. Then it should make it clear in this proposal. We suggest the following modifications:   * **The BS power consumption in a slot is provided by**   + - For the TDD with slot-level modelling, represents the ratios of the number of active DL and UL symbols within a slot to the number of symbols within a slot and ; for the TDD case with symbol-level modelling, represents the number of active DL and UL symbols within a slot and .   Regarding “Antenna adaptation delay”, we share the same view with ZTE that the value of zero should also be considered. |
| Vivo2 | The simplified equation is not correct in our previous comment and it should be updated in red as follows, which is also mentioned by China Telecom.  It seems the static power part is missing for DL and UL symbols, the equation should be  ) that can be simplified as |
| QCOM2 | **Discussion on**  Reiterating our response from multiple times in last meeting, is NOT the PA efficiency since some reference PAE is already captured in the power consumption . In a similar manner as to the scaling factors in other domains, it is important to see how the actual PAE is relative to the reference PAE; hence PAE scaling factor is the ratio between a reference PA efficiency and actual PA efficiency depending on the actual transmit power and actual frequency domain usage.  Taking indicates that the reference PA efficiency, that was captured in the power consumption **,** is the same in all the scaling conditions. Most companies agree that PA efficiency changes with transmit power. Modeling PA efficiency to be constant (hence, linear), would provide misleading evaluation for the PA power consumption:   * + For TX power reduction of 3dB and 6dB, keeping PA efficiency as constant (, linear) would have the PA power consumption to be scaled to 0.5 and 0.25 respectively   + Our calculations (and measurements), provided by our formula have the PA power consumption to be scaled to 0.66 and 0.48 respectively, largely different than the linear     - Taking Samsung’s formula from its Tdoc (0.67^(Xp/3[dB])), would have similar results as ours - the PA power consumption to be scaled to 0.67 and 0.45 respectively   As a summary, from PAE modelling perspective, we should consider the PAE ratio between reference PAE and actual PAE – similar to and . In addition, the PAE ratio should not be limited to just a single value. Instead, the power model should have support for multiple PAE ratio values depending on (). The values can be based on a formula (e.g., ones proposed by Huawei, Samsung, our Tdoc or some new function) or directly based on a set of values for some combinations of () e.g., for the case of scaling in power domain:   * For : * For :   **Overall active power consumption discussion**   * We do not agree to putting all UL/DL together in “” at this stage since we still don’t have answer on the power granularity yet – please see our related discussion in 2.2.2. * We suggest separately discussing active DL/UL power consumption in spatial, frequency and power domains first. We agree on the principle of scaling which considers all dimensions: frequency, power, number of antennas and PAE. Scaling in time domain can be decided later if needed. * We suggest discussing a scaling methodology that should be generic for all configuration sets. * For the dynamic part of active DL power consumption as , could the proponents show which BS components are being used to come up with the numbers for and , respectively? We understood as the constraint for these numbers. * Alternatively, we can simply design scaling for each domain similar to UE power mode or the scaling proposal from E/// with the update. This approach is generic and could be at appliable to all configuration sets.   where is the ratio between a reference PA efficiency and actual PA efficiency.  Therefore, the FL’s proposal needs revision. |
| Ericsson2 | To add to our previous comment, if intention is to have simpler model for scaling, we are OK to consider updates to our proposed model. It avoids getting into the detailed calculations of several variables such as for each set and category. |
| Spreadtrum | Generally fine. Response for the earlier FL’s answer: it seems the so-called “symbol-level turning off” is just micro sleep. It is fine for us. Thanks for clarification.  As a suggestion, if some variables are divergent, we may have the rough formulation of the scaling model with the details FFS. |
| LG Electronics 2 | Thanks, FL for the clarification. We have a few additional comments as below.   * We also share similar view with ZTE and vivo on having separate values of and for Cat 1 and Cat 2. * The equation for the BS power consumption in a slot should be updated as to reflect the static power part for DL and UL symbols, as mentioned by vivo and China Telecom. * Regarding the antenna adaptation delay, the value of zero (i.e., 0 ms) should also be considered for the transition time. * For LS to RAN4, it seems that there is not enough time to receive the response and reflect it. Therefore, it is recommended that RAN1 determine a fixed candidate value for parameters including and report what value was used to evaluate. |

### Second/Third/4th round

FL thanks for all the very good discussion and comments.

@QCOM2, Ericsson2,

Thanks QCOM for the detailed explanation.

FL understanding is that PA efficiency is different thing as PAE strictly speaking. Nevertheless, no objection is observed for the change of PA efficiency for now. Updated as suggested.

As for the comments below and a similar comment from Ericsson and CATT,  the modeling itself below from UE power saving has its benefits in simplicity. However the discussion when adapting for BS energy saving, from discussion point of view, the parameters in square bracket is also questionable in terms of how it comes and is determined per BS components. It might be more questionable if it does not fit BS components which could be quite different from UE.

* *For the dynamic part of active DL power consumption as , could the proponents show which BS components are being used to come up with the numbers for and , respectively? We understood as the constraint for these numbers.*
* *Alternatively, we can simply design scaling for each domain similar to UE power mode or the scaling proposal from E/// with the update. This approach is generic and could be at appliable to all configuration sets.*

@Fujitsu,

For FDD case, the UL part is omitted per previous agreements. So time domain scaling of the formula still holds.

@MTK

Thanks for providing the good suggestions for progress. FL was thinking a similar, hence the following is suggested.

@ALL

In order to avoid cumbersome discussion on determination of , , and considering we are for study purpose, FL tends to directly suggest some candidate values based on estimate of company’s proposals. For example, in Samsung and Nokia proposed values, the part can be very small. In Huawei/MTK/ZTE proposals or Intel proposal, a relative medium value is observed. For CATT’s value, when focusing on the part of  , , seems contributes to a very large portion of dynamic part. Therefore, in order to be comprehensive while keep reasonable workload, three candidate values are proposed for determining the power factor within the dynamic part.  FL consider to avoid concrete number of values in order to be able to be used whatever BS category and set of reference configurations.

**FL3/FL4 Proposal:**

* **The BS power consumption for active DL transmission is provided by**
  + - : a static part of power for BS in active, which is not scaled based on reference configurations.
      * Baseline:
    - : a dynamic part of power for BS in active, which is scaled based on reference configuration.
      * Baseline: ,
        + where , , is the percentage of active TRxRUs, the ratio of RF bandwidth and maximum system BW and the ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration, respectively,
        + is the PA ~~efficiency~~ scaling factor.
        + For evaluation purpose,

.

= **A\*** ~~when~~ ~~and~~ , where A=[0.1, 0.4, 0.7]

* + - Other values for the above scaling formula, and other scaling approaches can be optionally reported, satisfying when ,,, e.g.
      * **,** or
      * where  is the ratio between a reference PA efficiency and actual PA efficiency, up to company report.
* **The BS power consumption for active UL transmission is provided by**
  + - : a static part of power for BS in active, which is not scaled based on reference configurations.
    - : a dynamic part of power for BS in active, which is scaled based on reference configuration and is the percentage of active TRxRUs
    - Baseline
      * when no scaling is applied (i.e. scaling factor is 1)
    - Other values can be optionally reported
* For multi-carrier: ~~for inter-band multi-CC,~~ the total power consumption of BS is calculated as is the sum of the power consumption of each CC;
  + for intra-band multi-carrier with contiguous CCs, the power consumption of each additional CC is scaled by [0.75].
  + ~~Company to report whether Pstatic is shared among CCs (if shared, Pstatic is accounted once)~~
* For multi-TRP, the total power consumption of BS is assumed as is the sum of the power consumption of each TRP
  + Company to report whether Pstatic is shared among TRPs (if shared, Pstatic is accounted once)
* Company to additionally report whether antenna adaptation delay is explicitly modelled with a transition time of [1-3] ms, if not assumed as immediate transition.
* In time domain,
  + If an explicit symbol level model is provided, scaling is not applied. The power of BS in a slot is the sum of the power of each symbol within that slot.
  + If slot level modeling is provided, , where represents the ratios of the number of active DL and UL symbols within a slot to the number of symbols within a slot and
* [Send LS to RAN4 about the above, and ask if there is concern for the above, with details of proposed in Alt 3 also captured in the LS]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QCOM4 | In general, we should have a common scaling method for consistent observations in evaluation. Hence, we strive to avoid statement like “other values are optionally reported” in the proposal.  **On dynamic part of active DL transmission power consumption**  We appreciate FL’s effort on the updated proposal especially on defining as PA scaling factor. From our perspective, it is beneficial to provide the meaning of PA scaling factor. In particular, similar to definition of other scaling factors (, ,), we propose to clarify that is the ratio between the PA efficiency at evaluation point and the PA efficiency at reference configuration i.e., . From our understandings, the value of η =0.34 in the previous discussions of the proponents meant for absolute PA efficiency. For simplicity and progress, we think that the following values of should be used (depending on the power scaling factor ).   * *,* = 0.76 and = 0.52   Another update is on computing and , we think that partition i.e., the dynamic power consumption at the reference config for and by parameter A. In our proposal, A = 0 while other A values are borrowed directly from the FL proposal – we are open to discuss/select one value from the list for evaluation.  Hence, we suggest the following update on the baseline:   * + - where , , is the percentage of active TRxRUs, the ratio of RF bandwidth and maximum system BW, ~~and~~ the ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration and the ratio between the PA efficiency at evaluation point and the PA efficiency at reference configuration respectively,     - For evaluation purpose,       * *,* = 0.76 and = 0.52       * = ()       * – to be down-selected to a single number in this meeting.   With this update, we can remove the following bullet in “Other values for the above scaling formula”   * + - * ~~where~~ ~~is the ratio between a reference PA efficiency and actual PA efficiency, up to company report.~~   **On time domain scaling**  We prefer to have just one common modelling to have consistent observations later.  “If slot level modeling is provided, , where represents the ratios of the number of active DL and UL symbols within a slot to the number of symbols within a slot and ” – This is not accurate. Counting the number of UL or DL symbols in a slot is not sufficient since different symbols in a slot can have different frequency and/or power allocations – see our explanation in 2.2.2 and 2.4.  This discussion and discussion in Section 2.4 are highly correlated. We suggest discussing it together with discussion in Section 2.4. Alternatively, we can come back to this discussion after getting some conclusion in Section 2.4.  **On scaling in CA**  We suggest making the following update:   * For multi-carrier, the total BS power consumption is calculated as is the sum of the power consumption of each configured CC.   + For intra-band multi-carrier with contiguous CCs, the power consumption of each additionally configured CC is scaled by [0.75].   **On scaling in mTRP**  We suggest making the following update:   * For multi-TRP, the total power consumption of BS is assumed as the sum of the power consumption of each configured TRP   **On LS on details of**  We don’t see the need of the LS. The value is not an absolute value. It is just like other scaling in frequency, antenna and power domains. |
| Intel | We have concern on the following formulation  = **A\*** when and , A=[0.1, 0.4, 0.7]  First of all, we need to include values of and in general for non-zero values of scaling factors. We suggest to use values used in previous round   * + - * + is the PA efficiency. For evaluation purpose, .         + : [1.5] for , [9.9] for , [110] for         + : [8.5] for , [8.3] for , [115] for   Moreover, it is not clear what implies. In our view, scaling factors are non-zero. We agree with other companies that antenna adaptation delay should not be treated differently than micro-sleep. |
| Samsung | We are generally fine with FL4’s Proposal.  According to the value of A, we think the effectiveness of and would be affected. So, if A is 0.7, we may not acquire any gains from adaptation of and . In addition, the difference observations would be shown due to different values of A. So, we would like to select a value of A in candidates [0.1, 0.4, 0.7], and we suggest 0.1 for A. |
| FL4 | There seems to be a mistake in the formula that when determining A, “when and ” is not needed. Updated in blue in the proposal which somewhat similar as QC suggested.  Some other update per QC suggestions as well, except: a bit unclear whether each CC/TRP is ‘configured’ CC/TRP as that is from UE perspective.  Before further changes are made per QC suggestions, FL thinks two points are pending:   1. **Definition of the ,** which could have impact on the candidate values/approaches for down selection. Companies are invited to check QC detailed elaboration. 2. **Scaling granularity**, as separately questioned in 2.4.3. They are related so it’s reasonable to discuss them together. However, it seems for the moment the focus of the above is the value and relationship with . Thus, if needed, FL can combine them later. |
| Ericsson3 | If intention is to include multiple options, instead of the compromise formulation that we attempted (based on Pstatic, etc), we prefer our earlier proposed simpler formulation below.  PUL = P5 ([0.8] + [0.2] sf) \* ([0.4] + [0.6]sa)  We are also OK to include update suggested by Qualcomm for DL into it, i.e.  For antenna adaption, we suggest below update.   * Company to additionally report the assumption for ~~whether~~ antenna adaptation delay, e.g. immediate, ~~is explicitly modelled~~ with a transition time of [1-3] ms, etc ~~if not assumed as immediate transition~~. |
| FL4-2 | Multiple options are definitely possible and to be allowed, if cannot converged. But clearly not the intention by FL to encourage such. Therefore, if Ericsson prefers the proposal below most, it can be used as the optional case instead of the current optional one in FL proposal.  PUL = P5 ([0.8] + [0.2] sf) \* ([0.4] + [0.6]sa)  Additionally, FL would like to check with Ericsson whether of below shares the same definition with QC suggestion above – as such this formula is converged a bit more.  The other comments will be reflected. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are okay with current formula for unified framework for cat 1 and cat 2.  For , it is better to clarify =P4-P3, as UL.  For the following A value set [0.1, 0.4, 0.7], will we down select with one value, or keep all on the table? |
| vivo | We are generally fine with the proposal. It seems how to obtain is missing in the proposal. We suggest the following update to guarantee that when ,,   * + - * + For evaluation purpose,   .  = **A\*** ~~when~~ ~~and~~ , where A=[0.1, 0.4, 0.7]  = \*(1-**A**) **\*** where A=[0.1, 0.4, 0.7] |
| Nokia/Nsb | We are generally fine with the proposal in which  We note that by assuming the following, the static part of power for BS in active would be scaled based on reference configurations (if option 1 in 2.2 is agreed).  =  We would like to clarify the values of and to be considered for evaluation purpose.  We could use the proposed formula = **A\*** when , , and =1, where A=0,1 is our preferred value and defines the contribution of the factor in the total dynamic power . With that, (1-A) **\*** refers to the contribution of the factor in the total dynamic power which reflects the PA power consumption expected to be the most energy consuming part of the BS.  In general, we shall use the following formulation:   * = **A\*** * = **(1-A)\*** |
| Vodafone | We agree with the QC statements on dynamic part of active DL transmission power consumption for the common definition for the scaling factors, thus we agree with QC’s definition for the factor . |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For the Baseline: , the is in the denominator. Therefore, it is not a scaling factor.  We still think in the baseline it is a PA efficiency, and the recommended value is {0.34, 0.5}.  It is fine to take as PA scaling factor if is taken and reported by a company.  We suggest the following update:   * + - * Baseline: ,         + where , , is the percentage of active TRxRUs, the ratio of RF bandwidth and maximum system BW and the ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration, respectively,         + is the PA ~~efficiency scaling factor~~ efficiency.         + For evaluation purpose,   . |

## Power model feasibility/applicability

Nokia observes that the different Categories defined for BS power model may lead to different conclusions for a given technique, and propose to discuss the practical hardware feasibility of two types of implementations. Nokia also proposes that the TR to capture that the discussed BS power model is a simplified model from real BS power consumption, and is applicable to single-RAT BS only.

OPPO wants to discuss whether power scaling and sleep mode is supported by legacy BS to align the evaluation baseline for BS energy saving study.

Fujitsu observes similarly as Nokia w.r.t. the difference of categories, and further notes that the difference on the power of active DL compared to micro sleep is relatively small.

Samsung observes that the gap between micro and active UL in Cat 1 seems a bit high thus may need to be further investigated.

### Initial round

It was FL observation, based on previous discussion, that the different power states are closely related to implementations, and companies may not be able to dig into details on how each state is achieved, BS component wise. For now, it is unsure what FL can do for this discussion point to address companies concern. The following can be a starting point.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **FL1/FL2 Proposal 2.5.1:**   * Capture in TR that, the BS power model defined in this study is a simplified model of the real BS power consumption, considering single-RAT NR BSs only. This does not mean a BS cannot benefit from the identified techniques when serving multi-RAT. * In TR, explicitly capture companies input of relative power values and transition times for different sets of reference configurations, as collected in the excel sheet of R1-xxx (*NOTE: if no update from source comapnies, this will be x8312*), and Add a note in TR that an approximate average is performed for determining the entries of the power model table. * Capture that, different power states and transition times is possible for BS today, although different BS types with different number of power state levels, relative power values and transition times can exist. * Companies are invited to share more that can be discussed about feasibility of each category. For example, whether/how to capture hardware operations for state transition. | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia/NSB | By implementation, the multi-RAT BS can utilize the identified techniques defined in this study, even the study is targeting only on the single-RAT.  We could like the proponents of Cat-1 to clarify the HW feasibility in reality.  To our view, the hardware for supporting of the Category 2 can be achieved with the state-of-art components, where the hardware for supporting of the Category 1 targets on more advanced components, which is expected to be feasible in coming few years.  We would like to capture the discussion outcome in the TR for future reference. |
| Spreadtrum | Supportive. We suspect the evolution of gNB is quite fast. There could be some places to be deployed with newly developed gNB. The current power model may not reflect the future gNB. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Okay for the discussion. |
| Samsung | As mentioned in 2.2.1, we are wondering if each of category gives different tendency on evaluation of NWES techniques, how to make the observation on the NWES techniques? |
| OPPO | As pointed out in our contribution, the power-consumption difference with and without power scaling/sleep mode is obvious even for the BS today, which may have an impact on the energy saving gains when evaluating the potential energy saving techniques. Therefore, for evaluations, whether power scaling and sleep mode can be used for legacy BS needs further discussion. |
| CATT | Both Cats 1 and 2 are the abstract power model for evaluation without any specific design. Thus, we should wait for the evaluation results to determine the outcome without any pre-set conclusion. |
| Vodafone | We are supportive of this proposal |
| Intel | Agree with first bullet. Second to fourth bullets do not seem strongly necessary. We may capture only agreed values of the model in TR |
| FL2 | The following modified texts can be considered:  **Capture in TR that,**   * The BS power model defined in this study is a simplified model of the real BS power consumption, considering single-RAT NR BSs only. This does not mean a BS cannot benefit from the identified techniques when serving multi-RAT. * Different power states and transition times is possible for BS today, although different BS types with different number of power state levels, relative power values and transition times can exist. * A reference to tdoc, instead of the explicit table, which contains companies input of relative power values and transition times for different sets of reference configurations, and a note that an approximate average is performed for determining the entries of the power model table, with minimized adjustment on individual entries in order to align with the dependency of different sets of reference configurations.   Company can continue the discussion on other feasibility aspect. |
| Ericsson1 | Regarding FL2 proposal, first bullet is OK. Other bullets don’t seem necessary - it is sufficient to capture the agreed model in the TR. |
| QC1 | The proposal is fine. Good to add though that even if the model is simplified, correct modeling in terms of factors affecting power consumption and the scaling of these factors is necessary. |
| FL2-2 | FL wants to clarify that the second bullet does not refer to the reported values and states, but a general statements that BS has different power states per different BS types is possible. This can be clarified if needed in TR.  The third bullet, FL considers it is now business as usual - the companies input (prior to averaging) should be recorded somewhere, at least with a reference. This is rather an editorial action which avoid companies outside the session to refer to each individual contribution. |
| Samsung | For the 3rd bullet, we would like to revise as follow for being clear:  **FL1/FL2 Proposal 2.5.1:**   * Capture in TR that, the BS power model defined in this study is a simplified model of the real BS power consumption, considering single-RAT NR BSs only. This does not mean a BS cannot benefit from the identified techniques when serving multi-RAT. * In TR, explicitly capture companies input of relative power values and transition times for different sets of reference configurations, as collected in the excel sheet of R1-xxx (*NOTE: if no update from source comapnies, this will be x8312*), and Add a note in TR that an approximate average is performed for determining the entries of the power model table. * Capture that, transition among different power states, each associated with different transition time, is possible for a BS in today’s technology. It is noted that different BS types may support a different number of power states with different characteristics, i.e., power consumption values and required transition time. ~~different power states and transition times is possible for BS today, although different BS types with different number of power state levels, relative power values and transition times can exist.~~ * Companies are invited to share more that can be discussed about feasibility of each category. For example, whether/how to capture hardware operations for state transition. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with proposal modified by Samsung. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Regarding FL2 proposal, we are okay to capture these into the TR for clarification.  For the determination of average values in the WA, some companies’ category was adjusted during the online session in the last meeting, which should also be reflected in reference Tdoc. |
| Apple | We feel the first bullet might be sufficient already, otherwise we may be just complicating things.  It is not clear to us how to discuss the feasibility of Cat 1/2. Probably the only possible way is to have the proponents of each category to describe on a high level which components are turned off in different states. It may be useful for our own understanding, but may not be an easy discussion and may be difficult to document. |

### Second/Third round

**FL3 Proposal 2.5.2:**

**Capture in TR that,**

* The BS power model defined in this study is a simplified model of the real BS power consumption, considering single-RAT NR BSs only. This does not mean a BS cannot benefit from the identified techniques when serving multi-RAT.
* Transition among different power states, each associated with different transition time, is possible for a BS in today’s technology. It is noted that different BS types may support a different number of power states with different characteristics, i.e., power consumption values and required transition time.
* A reference to tdoc, instead of the explicit table, which contains companies input of relative power values and transition times for different sets of reference configurations, and a note that an approximate average is performed for determining the entries of the power model table, [with minimized adjustment on individual entries in order to align with the dependency of different sets of reference configurations].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | OK |
| Ericsson2 | From our perspective it is sufficient to capture that model is for evaluation purposes. We prefer to avoid discussion on specific gNB implementation aspects.  Regarding the 3rd bullet, we don’t see utility of “approximate average”, which itself is a bit imprecise. Listing tdocs as reference is enough, and it would be clear to a reader that the model is based on inputs and discussions in RAN1.  Based on this our suggested updates are as follows:   * The BS power model defined in this study is a simplified model for the purposes of evaluations, considering single-RAT NR BSs only. This does not mean a BS cannot benefit from the identified techniques when serving multi-RAT. * A reference to tdoc, instead of the explicit table, which contains companies input of relative power values and transition times for different sets of reference configurations. |
| Samsung | Okay |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are okay to capture these into the TR for clarification.  As we suggested before, some companies’ category was adjusted during the online session in the last meeting, which should also be reflected in reference Tdoc, otherwise, how to derive the final values by average operation is confusing by reading the reference Tdoc. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Nokia/Nsb | We propose to have the following re-wording:  **FL3 Proposal 2.5.2:**  **Capture in TR that,**   * The BS power model defined in this study is a simplified model of the real BS power consumption, considering single-RAT NR BSs only. This does not mean a BS cannot benefit from the identified techniques when serving multi-RAT. * Transition among ~~different~~certain power states, each associated with ~~different~~certain transition time, ~~is~~may be possible for a BS in today’s technology. It is noted that different BS types may support a different number of power states with different characteristics, i.e., power consumption values and required transition time. * A reference to tdoc, instead of the explicit table, which contains companies input of relative power values and transition times for different sets of reference configurations, and a note that an approximate average is performed among the values of companies for determining the entries of the power model table, [with minimized adjustment on individual entries in order to align with the dependency of different sets of reference configurations]. |

### 4th round

@Ericsson, ZTE

FL shares that “approximate average” now may become imprecise given the adjustment we made for evaluation purpose.

However, the second bullet which is proposed to be removed from Ericsson might worthwhile being kept, as some companies view the power states/transition time/scaling etc are not supported today. The intention is to convey that today’s BS implementation can already do that, and possibly, FL feel a bit pity not be able to handle various types of BS that were originally interested and proposed by many companies. With the sentence in second bullet, it records that such interest.

**FL4 Proposal 2.6.3:**

**Capture in TR that,**

* The BS power model defined in this study is a simplified model for the purposes of evaluations, considering single-RAT NR BSs only. This does not mean a BS cannot benefit from the identified techniques when serving multi-RAT.
* Transition among certain power states, each associated with certain transition time, may be possible for a BS in today’s technology. It is noted that different BS types may support a different number of power states with different characteristics, i.e., power consumption values and required transition time.
* A reference to tdoc, instead of the explicit table, which contains companies input of relative power values and transition times for different sets of reference configurations.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | ok |
| Samsung | Fine |
| Apple | OK |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Okay for the proposal. There is one typo in the original reference Tdoc x8312, our value of DL active should be cat 2, not cat1. |
| vivo | OK |
| Vodafone | We’re generally fine with the proposal, however the last bullet on the previous proposal 2.5.1 seems to have been removed:   * Companies are invited to share more that can be discussed about feasibility of each category. For example, whether/how to capture hardware operations for state transition.   Would it be possible to clarify the concern on keeping this bullet? |

# Methodology

## KPI and traffic model

Nokia consider that we should be able to benefit from using some multi-dimensional EE KPIs that jointly consider the energy consumption of the network and system/UE performance for a given technique, such as

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric ​** | **Metric formula​** | **Unit** | **Description​** |
| **UPT-aware EE** |  | [Mbps] | The ratio of the UPT (defined as packet size divided by the total time spent to deliver the packet) to the network power consumption. Cell edge (5-ile) UPT and average UPT to be considered. |
| **Cell throughput-aware EE** |  | [Mbps] | The ratio of the average cell throughput to the network power consumption. ​ |
| **Cell-edge UE throughput-aware EE** |  | [Mbps] | The ratio of the cell-edge UE (instantaneous) throughput to the network power consumption.  Note: This metric corresponds to the coverage aware EE KPI defined by ETSI. |
| **Data Volume-aware EE** |  | [Mbit] | The ratio of the data volume carried during an observation time to the average network power consumption during the observation time. |

Furthermore,

* Huawei/HiSilicon, Nokia, Samsung: multiple QoS target values, e.g. UPT loss can be defined.
* Nokia: minimum QoS target per deployment scenario is needed and shall be defined.
* Vivo: two options can be considered for evaluations of BS energy saving gains for better fitting certain traffic model with meaningful comparison, two approaches can be considered for performing non-uniform UE distributions and a hearbeat traffic model is further proposed for potential assumption for UE in RRC-idle state.
  + *Option 1: The energy saving gain of the energy saving scheme compared to the baseline scheme, when the average UPT loss/latency or 5% UPT loss/latency meets the threshold requirement.*
  + *Option 2: The energy saving gain of the energy saving scheme compared to the baseline scheme, when the proportion of packets meeting latency requirements is greater than X%, X = 95 or 99.*
  + *Approach 1: UE dropping is only allowed in part of the cells which are selected randomly from cells within simulation area.*
  + *Approach 2: UE dropping is only allowed in several cluster area that is randomly generated within the simulation area.*
* China Telecom: no need to define exact requirements/QoS target while an universal EE can be used, defined as where *V\_K* refers to the focused evaluated performance KPI and *EC* refers to the energy consumption (in Joule).
* Fujitsu: no need to define exact requirements/QoS target for UPT impact, while propose that both average UPT and 5% UPT are reported along with gains.
* ZTE: FTP3 with the packet size of 20K Bytes can be used for evaluation and UPT is reported as where average UPT is assumed.
* LGE: new energy efficiency is defined as the ratio of throughput to reference power consumed by gNB, as one of KPIs for this study. Additionally, both of gNB’s performance gain and UE’s performance loss compared to the reference scenario (i.e. scenarios without network energy saving techniques) can be reported.
* Samsung: use KPIs of Energy saving gain, Latency (packet latency and scheduling latency), UPT, Coverage, UE power consumption.

### Initial round (closed)

There has been rounds of attempt for almost all of the above points while no consensus could be made. FL consider those could be up to company report.

On the other hand, it may be useful to agree on a template for collection of company’s results next meeting. Note the Editor Note does not serve a requirement, but they are informative and can be kept.

**FL1 Proposal 3.1.1:**

* **Use the following table as a draft template for collection of simulation results, when appropriate.**
* **The template can be further adjusted with input, and when captured into TR.**
* **Other formats are not precluded.**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Company | NW energy saving scheme | ES Gain | ES gain for each configuration | UPT/latency  (Optional: Energy Efficiency) | Other impact | Evaluation methodology/baseline assumption | Note |
|  |  | *Editor Note: includes a range for different configurations, if possible.* | *Editor Note: include gain for each configuration, if possible. For example, per Load, configurations of common signals etc.* | *Editor Note: may include average UPT, target UPT (95%/50%/5%) and UPT loss per ES techniques.*  *May also include scheduling latency, user plane latency etc.*  *Optionally, results with EE can be included with clear definition reported.* | *Editor Note: include coverage, UE power consumption etc.* | *Editor Note: include selected parameters/baselines etc, if there are multiple.* | *Editor Note: other important setting that needs to be reported, e.g. the selected options/approaches as mentioned in* [R1-2208654](file:///C:\Users\w00250081\AppData\Local\Docs\R1-2208654.zip)*.* |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the template. We think energy efficiency can be moved to column of “other impact”, considering “Energy efficiency” belongs to some other impacts rather than impact on UE performance.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Company | NW energy saving scheme | ES Gain | ES gain for each configuration | UPT/latency  (Optional: Energy Efficiency) | Other impact | Evaluation methodology/baseline assumption | Note | |  |  | *Editor Note: includes a range for different configurations, if possible.* | *Editor Note: include gain for each configuration, if possible. For example, per Load, configurations of common signals etc.* | *Editor Note: may include average UPT, target UPT (95%/50%/5%) and UPT loss per ES techniques.*  *May also include scheduling latency, user plane latency etc.*  *~~Optionally, results with EE can be included with clear definition reported.~~* | *Editor Note: include coverage, UE power consumption, Energy efficiency etc.* | *Editor Note: include selected parameters/baselines etc, if there are multiple.* | *Editor Note: other important setting that needs to be reported, e.g. the selected options/approaches as mentioned in* [R1-2208654](file:///C:\Users\w00250081\AppData\Local\Docs\R1-2208654.zip)*.* | |
| LG Electronics | We are generally ok with the proposal. But it is necessary to clarify what is the difference between ES Gain and ES gain for each configuration, and if there is no difference, it can be combined into one column. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia/Nsb | We may also need to highlight which Category (Cat-1 or Cat-2) the simulation is applied  Regarding “Other impact”, is it optional to report coverage and UE power consumption? Or it is mandatory to do so? |
| vivo | For UPT/latency part, a target QoS requirement can also be considered and the ratio of packets that meets the QoS requirement (e.g. target UPT or latency) is reported. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 1. The difference between the two columns of ES gain is unclear. 2. For the UPT impact, do all the “*average UPT, target UPT (95%/50%/5%) and UPT loss per ES techniques.*” need to be reported? In addition, some scheme may have UPT gain, suggestion is as below   “*UPT loss/gain*”   1. Agree with Nokia the cat of power model also needs to be captured. |
| Samsung | Fine |
| CATT | We are generally fine with the table since it is similar to that used in Rel-16 UE power saving in TR38.840. One important aspect of system impact in NES is the system capacity/throughput comparing to the aspect of system overhead in UE power saving. We would suggest to replace the column of “other impact” to “system capacity/throughput” based on the given traffic model. Components of other impact, such as coverage and UE power saving could be included in the “note” column. |
| Vodafone | Agree with CATT’s comments above |
| BT | Support for ES gain to be included. , is energy consumed, and is all BS components active. |
| Intel | We suggest following revisions   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Company | NW energy saving scheme |  | Energy consumption for each configuration | UPT | Other impact | Evaluation methodology/baseline assumption | Note | |  |  |  | *Editor Note: In addition to reporting energy consumption, companies may include % gain for each configuration, with respect to a benchmark* | *Editor Note: may include average UPT, target UPT (95%/50%/5%) and UPT loss per ES techniques.*  *.*  *~~Optionally, results with EE can be included with clear definition reported.~~* | *Editor Note: include coverage, UE power consumption, cell throughput, Energy efficiency, access latency etc.* | *Editor Note: include assumption on Category 1 or 2 used, selected parameters/baselines etc, if there are multiple.* | *Editor Note: other important setting that needs to be reported, e.g. the selected options/approaches as mentioned in* [R1-2208654](file:///C:\Users\w00250081\AppData\Local\Docs\R1-2208654.zip)*.* | |
| FL2 | According to the first GTW and Chair’s comments, the table can be recorded in Chair’s note for information. Thus the discussion point of the template is closed.  However, companies can continue if consider there is chance/need to agree on further KPIs explicitly. |
| Samsung | We would like to add the latency in the column of UPT as the previous version. We still prioritize the latency same as UPT, and we think it is the most important KPI when we evaluate the energy saving techniques. Therefore, latency should be prioritized same as UPT at least, and target latency increase per ES techniques should be included. |
| MediaTek | Given the table format will be important for comparing companies results, will it be possible to adopt excel file so that we can generate comparisons for any targeted combination of Category 1/2 and Set 1/2/3. It will be useful for companies to directly input the BS power consumption values and UPT/latency values, while leaving the “gain” computations automatically done by excel. |
| Apple | Fine with the proposal in general |
| Ericsson2 | 1. Given below agreement, our preference is to keep the 3rd column or update the note in 4th column as follows   *In addition to reporting energy consumption, companies ~~may~~ to include % gain for each configuration,*  ***Agreement***   * *Similar to UE power saving study, percentage of energy consumption reduction from the baseline is used to express BS energy saving gain.*  1. UPT column should be updated to “UPT/latency (if applicable)” since there may be some techniques (such as dynamic adaptation of common signals/etc) for which UPT might not be fully applicable. |
| China Telecom | Fine. |

## Simulation assumption

Huawei/HiSilicon and Intel: add channel model for FR1.

Nokia: proposes SLS assumptions for different sets of reference configurations.

OPPO: clarify the channel model and percentage of high loss and low loss building type.

CATT: baseline configuration and normal network operation should be defined in order to obtain the energy consumption of normal network operation and to identify the potential network energy saving technique.

MediaTek: propose detailed configurations for common signals of SSB and SIB1.

Nokia provides a relatively complete table includes FR2 SLS assumptions, and Samsung, Lenovo consider the proposal in the FFS of previous agreements is reasonable and considerable, with small clarification for BS antenna configurations traffic model, and total Tx power etc in order to address potential concern raised in the previous discussion w.r.t. prioritized Urban Micro. Ericsson view Table A2.1-1 of TR 38.802 can be used as the baseline for FR2.

Qualcomm consider that***:*** *the actual total DL transmission power is adjusted according to the actual bandwidth and the number of active TxRUs as follows*

* *, and are total DL power level, bandwidth, and the number of TxRUs in the reference configuration, respectively.*

*and are the actual bandwidth and the number of active TxRUs, respectively*.

### Initial round

For FR1, since there are baseline SLS assumptions ready, FL tends to identify the delta parts that would be additionally needed. Given what Nokia/NSB is proposing, it seems more configurations can be clarified, which meanwhile can be partially served as a ‘normal network operation’ as preferred by CATT, except that the paging transmission, CORESET configuration, UL control resources, CA/DC configurations (including PDCCH and CSI-RS configuration in SCell) are still missing.

For FR2 SLS assumptions, proposals are available based on a few contributions. FL takes Nokia’ proposal which is a complete set on the table.

As for the reference configuration, if there are other parameter used than the agreed reference configurations, Qualcomm proposed formula could be considered. Note if we can agree on a set of unified power values and transition time as being proposed by FL in section 2.2, the proposal from Qualcomm will not have impact on other relevant calculation, e.g. transition energy, scaling etc.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Companies are invited to share your view on which of the rows are needed for alignments; otherwise, the corresponding parameters could be up to company report.  **FL1/FL2 Proposal 3.2.1-rev1:**   * **For FR1 SLS assumptions, add parameters in the below table as additional SLS parameters.**  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  |  | Set 1 FR1 | Set 2 FR1 | | **1** | **Channel model** | 3D-Uma as in TR 38.901 | 3D-Uma as in TR 38.901 | | **2** | **percentage of high loss and low loss building type** | 100% low loss | 100% low loss | | **3** | **Guard band ratio on simulation bandwidth** | TDD: 2.08% (272 RB for 30kHz SCS and 100 MHz bandwidth) | FDD: 6.4% (104RB for 15kHz SCS and 20 MHz BW) | | **4** | **HARQ scheme** | Ideal | Ideal | | **5** | **Max HARQ retransmission** | 3 | 3 | | **6** | **Target BLER** | 1~~2~~0% of first transmission | 1~~2~~0% of first transmission | | **7** | **Power control parameters** | Open loop, Alpha=1, P0=-106 dBm | Open loop, Alpha=1, P0=-106 dBm | | **8** | **CSI acquisition** | Periodic, CQI on 2 ms period | Periodic, CQI on 2 ms period | | **9** | **SSB periodicity** | 20 ms, 80ms, 160ms | 20 ms, 80ms, 160ms | | **10** | **SS blocks per SSB burst** | 8 for 3 GHz < FR1 <= 6 GHz | 4 for FR1<=3GHz | | **11** | **SSB time resource** | 2 SSBs per slot  4 symbols for each SSB | 2 SSBs per slot  4 symbols for each SSB | | **12** | **SSB frequency resource** | 20 RBs | 20 RBs | | **~~13~~** | **~~Number of SIB1~~** | ~~1 SIB1 per SSB~~ | ~~1 SIB1 per SSB~~ | | **14** | **SIB1 transmission repetition periodicity** | 20 ms, ~~or~~ 80 ms, 160ms  multiplexing pattern 1 with SSB | 20 ms, ~~or~~ 80 ms, 160ms  multiplexing pattern 1 with SSB | | **15** | **SIB1 time resource** | 1 slot | 1 slot | | **16** | **SIB1 frequency resource** | 24 RBs for 20 ms periodicity,  48 RBs for 80 ms periodicity | 24 RBs for 20 ms periodicity,  48 RBs for 80 ms periodicity | | **~~17~~** | **~~RO periodicity~~** | ~~20 ms~~ | ~~20 ms~~ | | **~~18~~** | **~~RO time resource~~** | ~~2 slots~~ | ~~2 slots~~ |  * **For (Set 3) FR2 SLS assumptions, use Table 9 in x8518 as baseline assumptions** * **Other parameters can be optionally reported.** * **~~The actual total DL transmission power can be optionally adjusted according to the actual bandwidth and the number of active TxRUs as follows~~** * ~~, and are total DL power level, bandwidth, and the number of TxRUs in the reference configuration, respectively.~~ * ~~and are the actual bandwidth and the number of active TxRUs, respectively.~~ | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | There are cases where gNB could reduce the PSD and increase the bandwidth to keep the same transmission power. This cannot be covered by the equation of Pt. So, we would suggest not to agree the following bullet and ask company to report.   * **~~The actual total DL transmission power can be optionally adjusted according to the actual bandwidth and the number of active TxRUs as follows~~** * ~~, and are total DL power level, bandwidth, and the number of TxRUs in the reference configuration, respectively.~~ * ~~and are the actual bandwidth and the number of active TxRUs, respectively.~~ |
| LG Electronics | In general, we support the proposal, but we have two comments.  Firstly, the last bullet doesn’t seem to be necessary since the effects of the actual bandwidth and the number of active TxRU are already reflected by the scaling method. Secondly, for row 6, we think 10 % BLER for the first transmission is more typical value.. |
| DOCOMO | We have several comments.   * For “6. Target BLER 20%”, usually we use 10%. If there is no specific reason, we can set target BLER as 10%.   For the calculation of “The actual total DL transmission power”, as we have power scaling discussion in AI 2.4 of this material, the sentence here is not necessary. |
| Nokia/Nsb | We would like to update the following parameters   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **9** | **SSB periodicity** | 20 ms | 20 ms | | **10** | **SS blocks per SSB burst** | 8 for 3 GHz < FR1 <= 6 GHz | 4 for FR1<=3GHz | |
| Spreadtrum | Basically support. Comment: if we define the common signal/channel which is not accounted into the load, we should also provide OSI/paging assumption? |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal. For the transmission power, agree with Huawei that it could be reported by company. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The following two rows are not consistent, i.e., the SIB periodicity in row 14 can be larger than SSB, but in row 13, it implies the periodicity is the same. Therefore,the row 13 can be removed.   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **13** | **Number of SIB1** | 1 SIB1 per SSB | 1 SIB1 per SSB | | **14** | **SIB1 transmission repetition periodicity** | 20 ms or 80 ms,  multiplexing pattern 1 with SSB | 20 ms or 80 ms,  multiplexing pattern 1 with SSB | |
| Samsung | Fine with FL’s proposal. The very last subbullet contains typos – they should be ‘B’ and ‘N’. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal |
| Intel | We suggest to update the following:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **9** | **SSB periodicity** | 20 ms, 80ms, 160ms | 20 ms, 80ms, 160ms | | **14** | **SIB1 transmission repetition periodicity** | 80 ms, 160ms  multiplexing pattern 1 with SSB | 80 ms, 160ms  multiplexing pattern 1 with SSB | | **17** | **RO periodicity** | Depends on paging configuration | Depends on paging configuration | |
| InterDigital | We share same view with LG and DOCOMO that target BLER (row 6) should be 10% |
| FL2 | Please continue to check the **Proposal 3.2.1-rev1** above.  For Spreadtrum comments: it might be difficult to have a commonly agreeable configurations for OSI/paging. Thus they could be up to company report.  As for Intel comments: added more candidate values to be representative. However, if we modify the RO periodicity as suggested, there may be no need to have this row, as it would up to report.  As for BT comment below: this was discussed in previous meetings but not agreeable to majority. Instead, FL added that other optional values can be reported, such that companies can simulate and report configurations with 4T. |
| Ericsson1 | Rows 8-18, we think should be left for proponents to report. The settings proposed do not appear to be suitable configurations for current system from energy efficiency perspective (e.g., aperiodic CSI can be used, SIB1 periodicity can be longer).  Rows 5,6,7 should also be left to proponents to report. |
| FL2-2 | Rows 8-18: FL consider having candidate values for at least some of the rows can reduce the workload significantly. Meanwhile, the current candidates, e.g. SSB up to 160ms can already reflect the possible cases.  Rows 5-7 are also very typical and widely used in many 3GPP studies. It is really unclear how this cause concern. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For row 8~16, more candidates values are added in the table, which seems no difference in letting companies to report these values. Therefore, we suggest to remove these rows.  For the row 7 of power control, we are not sure about the source of these values.  In TR 36.897, table A.4, the following values are assumed, which can be reused.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | Power control | P0=-80dBm, alpha=0.8 | |
| Samsung | Also, we would like to add SSB periodicity: 20 ms for Set 2 in row 9. |
| QCOM2 | @ Huawei, HiSilicon: Intention of the last bullet that you crossed out is to have fair comparison between the baseline and the enhancement in the evaluation. It does not prevent gNB implementation – similar to all other discussions in this modelling and evaluation methodology item. If the formula is not preferred, we can update the bullets as   * **Companies report the actual total DL transmit power allocation for the baseline and the proposed technique.**   For TDD frame structure of DDDSU, we suggest clarifying the structure of the S slot as S = 10 DL symbols : 2 Guard symbols :2 UL symbols. |
| Ericsson2 | Rows 8-18: while we understand the FL intention to reduce workload, our concern is that some proposed settings do not appear to be suitable configurations for current system from energy efficiency perspective (e.g., aperiodic CSI can be used, SIB1 periodicity can be longer).  Regarding the proposal for FR2, perhaps it would be helpful if an explicit list of entries of table 9 is shown.   * For example, some of the entries should be left to proponent– at least CSI * There are a few items such as ISD, traffic model and CDRX configuration (Table 7?), etc that might need to be clarified. |

### Second/Third/4th round

Based on the comments above, the following is suggested. Please also provide your view on Ercisson2 comments on the Table 9 for FR2.

**FL3/FL4 Proposal 3.2.2:**

* **For FR1 SLS assumptions, add parameters in the below table as additional SLS parameters.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Set 1 FR1 | Set 2 FR1 |
| **1** | **Channel model** | 3D-Uma as in TR 38.901 | 3D-Uma as in TR 38.901 |
| **2** | **percentage of high loss and low loss building type** | 100% low loss | 100% low loss |
| **3** | **Guard band ratio on simulation bandwidth** | TDD: 2.08% (272 RB for 30kHz SCS and 100 MHz bandwidth) | FDD: 6.4% (104RB for 15kHz SCS and 20 MHz BW) |
| **4** | **HARQ scheme** | Ideal | Ideal |
| **5** | **Max HARQ retransmission** | 3 | 3 |
| **6** | **Target BLER** | 1~~2~~0% of first transmission | 1~~2~~0% of first transmission |
| **7** | **Power control parameters** | Open loop, ~~Alpha=1, P0=-106 dBm~~  P0=-80dBm, alpha=0.8 | Open loop, ~~Alpha=1, P0=-106 dBm~~  P0=-80dBm, alpha=0.8 |
| **~~8~~** | **~~CSI acquisition~~** | ~~Periodic, CQI on 2 ms period~~ | ~~Periodic, CQI on 2 ms period~~ |
| **~~9~~** | **~~SSB periodicity~~** | ~~20 ms(for alignment purpose)~~  ~~Other values are up to report~~ | ~~20 ms(for alignment purpose)~~  ~~Other values are up to report~~ |
| **10** | **SS blocks per SSB burst** | 8 for 3 GHz < FR1 <= 6 GHz | 4 for FR1<=3GHz |
| **11** | **SSB time resource** | 2 SSBs per slot  4 symbols for each SSB | 2 SSBs per slot  4 symbols for each SSB |
| **12** | **SSB frequency resource** | 20 RBs | 20 RBs |
| **~~13~~** | **~~Number of SIB1~~** | ~~1 SIB1 per SSB~~ | ~~1 SIB1 per SSB~~ |
| **~~14~~** | **~~SIB1 transmission repetition periodicity~~** | ~~20 ms(for alignment purpose), Other values are up to report~~  ~~multiplexing pattern 1 with SSB~~ | ~~20 ms (for alignment purpose), Other values are up to report~~  ~~multiplexing pattern 1 with SSB~~ |
| **~~15~~** | **~~SIB1 time resource~~** | ~~1 slot~~ | ~~1 slot~~ |
| **~~16~~** | **~~SIB1 frequency resource~~** | ~~24 RBs for 20 ms periodicity,~~  ~~48 RBs for 80 ms periodicity~~ | ~~24 RBs for 20 ms periodicity,~~  ~~48 RBs for 80 ms periodicity~~ |
| **~~17~~** | **~~RO periodicity~~** | ~~20 ms~~ | ~~20 ms~~ |
| **~~18~~** | **~~RO time resource~~** | ~~2 slots~~ | ~~2 slots~~ |

* **For (Set 3) FR2 SLS assumptions, use Table 9 in x8518 with update below as baseline assumptions**
* Table 9: System-level simulation parameters and assumptions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **BS type** | Micro [9] |
| **Network layout and inter-site distance [6]** | 21 cells Wraparound (ISD=FFS) |
| **Channel model** | UMi |
| **Link direction** | Downlink |
| **Frequency range** | 30GHz |
| **Duplex** | TDD |
| **Frame structure** | DDDSU (S: 10D:2G:2U) |
| **Subcarrier spacing** | 120 kHz |
| **Simulation bandwidth** | 100 MHz |
| **Number of carriers** | 1 CC |
| **Slot size** | 14 OFDM symbols |
| **BS antenna configuration [7]** | ~~2Tx~~  ~~(M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = FFS~~   2 TxRU (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (4,8,2,2,2;1,1)   (dH, dV) = (0.5λ, 0.8λ) (dg,H, dg,V) = (4.0λ, 3.6λ) |
| **Total Tx power** | 33 dBm, EIRP limited to 63 dBm |
| **BS height [7]** | 10m |
| **BS noise figure** | FR2: 7 dB |
| **BS antenna element gain** | 8 dBi |
| **UE antenna configuration** | 2T/4R, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (1,2,2,1,1;1,2),  (dH, dV) = (0.5λ, N/Aλ) |
| **UE max transmit power [7]** | 23 dBm |
| **UE BWP** | 100 Mhz |
| **UE height** | 1.5m |
| **UE noise figure** | FR2: 10 dB |
| **UE antenna element gain** | 5 dBi |
| **UE receiver** | MMSE-IRC |
| **UE deployment** | 20% Outdoor in cars: 30km/h,  80% Indoor in houses: 3km/h |
| **Traffic model and C-DRx configuration** | FTP traffic (as per Table 7) |
| **UE density/NW Load** | Follow previous RAN1 agreements |
| **Maximum supported Modulation and coding scheme** | Up to 256QAM |
| **Guard band ratio on simulation bandwidth** | FFS |
| **Channel estimation** | Ideal |
| **HARQ scheme** | Ideal |
| **Max HARQ retransmission** | 3 |
| **Target BLER** | 20% of first transmission |
| **Power control parameters** | Open loop, Alpha=1, P0=-106 dBm |
| **Scheduling algorithm** | PF |
| **Cell selection algorithm** | RSRP Slow Fading |
| **~~CSI acquisition~~** | ~~Periodic, CQI on 2 ms period~~ |
| **SSB periodicity** |  |
| **SS blocks per SSB burst** | 64 for FR2 |
| **SSB time resource** |  |
| **SSB frequency resource** |  |
| **Number of SIB1** |  |
| **SIB1 transmission repetition periodicity** |  |
| **SIB1 time resource** |  |
| **SIB1 frequency resource** |  |
| **RO periodicity** |  |
| **RO time resource** |  |

* **Other parameters can be optionally reported.**
* **Companies report the actual total DL transmit power allocation for the baseline and the proposed technique.**
* **For TDD frame structure of e.g. DDDSU, the S slot is assumed as S = 10 DL symbols : 2 Guard symbols :2 UL symbols.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Intel | If we intend to perform calibration of results, we can understand capturing 20ms SSB and SIB1 periodicities. Otherwise, we suggest these to be up to companies to report. From our perspective, we do not have enough meeting cycles to calibrate first (which is difficult to perform in SLS) and then check for enhancements. |
| Samsung | Generally, we are okay with the proposal.  For FFS in BS antenna configuration, we would like to suggest as below:   2 TxRU (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (4,8,2,2,2;1,1)   (dH, dV) = (0.5λ, 0.8λ) (dg,H, dg,V) = (4.0λ, 3.6λ) |
| FL4 | Updated in blue.  Per Intel comments and previously Ericsson/ZTE’s, configurations for common signals are mostly removed. However, FL realized that SSB periodicity 20ms is already agreed last meeting, thus can also be removed from the proposal aiming for ‘delta’ part – please check whether it is possible to agree on some time/frequency SSB resource configurations.  For some of Ericsson comments for FR2, e.g. ISD=200m is what FL assumes as previously agreed in the prioritized FR2 scenario.  For consistency, perhaps the i\_BLER for FR2 should also be 10%.  I will wait for the proponents to further clarify. |
| vivo | For Table 9, we have the following comments:   * **ISD** = 200m based the agreements in RAN1#110 meeting. * **UE noise figure** could be 13dB for FR2 aligned with 38.802 A.2.1 for baseline UE * **Traffic model and C-DRx configuration:** Suggest to change to “follow previous RAN1 agreement” * **Target BLER** should be 10% for first transmission that is consistent with FR1 |

# Others for performance evaluation, if any

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| BT | Base station 4T antenna configuration should be included in evaluation. |
| Vodafone | We’re also keen on including 4T antenna configurations in the evaluation |
|  |  |

# Preliminary results

Many companies have provided their preliminary simulation results to this meeting. It would be good to take a look into those while it may be premature to capture observations into TR at this stage. Therefore, after discussed with Intel, FLs consider the preliminary results can be used as a discussion panel for companies to share questions/comments/clarifications, such that in future the simulations can be adjusted/verified if needed. When comments are received, it is preferred that proponents can clarify when possible. Note some results submitted to A.I. 9.7.2 are also gathered here. Before making comments/questions, companies are also invited to read each individual tdoc for details from the source companies.

### Initial round (FL1/FL2 with low priority)

#### Source 1: Nokia/NSB

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Single carrier**   1. **Relaxed periodicity for both SIB1/SSB/RO**     Figure 1: ES gain and impact on UPT from relaxing SSB/SIB/RO periodicity   1. **Reduced number of SSBs per SS Blocks and per slot**     Figure 2: ES gain from reducing the number of SSBs  **Multi-carrier**   1. **SSB-less operation in the ES CC (as per release 17)**     Figure 3: ES gain and impact on UPT from SSB-less operation in ES CC   1. **SIB1-less operation in the ES CC**     Figure 4: ES gain and impact on UPT from SIB1-less operation in ES CC   1. **SSB&SIB1-less operation in the ES CC**      1. *RO periodicity=20 ms*      1. *RO periodicity=160 ms*   Figure 5: ES gain and impact on UPT from SSB&SIB1-less operation in ES CC | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 2: vivo

(Additionally, vivo has more results submitted also in [R1- 2208655](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2208655.zip) in AI 9.7.2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table 2. Network resource utilization of different traffic loads   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Load** | **Zero load** | **Low load** | **Light load** | **Medium load** | | **RU** | 0.0% | 6.2% | 20.3% | 36.3% |   Table 3. The UPT and transmit latency performance under different loads   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Load** | **Transmit latency (ms)** | | | | **UPT (Mbps)** | | | | | **Mean** | **5%** | **50%** | **95%** | **Mean** | **5%** | **50%** | **95%** | | **Baseline** | Low load | 8.18 | 5.08 | 6.19 | 15.82 | 616.02 | 250.57 | 689.30 | 789.96 | | **ES scheme** | 9.23 | 5.83 | 7.43 | 16.30 | 541.83 | 251.79 | 588.92 | 719.47 | | **Baseline** | Light load | 12.05 | 5.52 | 8.50 | 26.58 | 524.03 | 216.85 | 535.17 | 750.73 | | **ES scheme** | 13.69 | 6.43 | 9.49 | 27.07 | 469.77 | 202.96 | 482.78 | 668.89 | | **Baseline** | Medium load | 21.56 | 6.22 | 12.72 | 53.88 | 436.73 | 165.77 | 424.40 | 699.71 | | **ES scheme** | 21.58 | 7.11 | 13.48 | 54.12 | 401.10 | 162.97 | 393.80 | 634.67 |   Table 4. Power consumption performance under different loads   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Load** | **BS power consumption** | | | | **UE power consumption** | | | | | **Mean** | **5%** | **50%** | **95%** | **Mean** | **5%** | **50%** | **95%** | | **Baseline** | Zero load | 75.52 | 75.52 | 75.52 | 75.52 | 89.00 | 89.00 | 89.00 | 89.00 | | **ES scheme** | 63.32 | 63.32 | 63.32 | 63.32 | 89.00 | 89.00 | 89.00 | 89.00 | | **ES gain** | 16.15% | 16.15% | 16.15% | 16.15% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.00% | | **Baseline** | Low load | 86.27 | 81.79 | 84.85 | 94.55 | 95.06 | 92.02 | 93.88 | 100.77 | | **ES scheme** | 74.23 | 69.59 | 72.72 | 83.28 | 94.95 | 92.01 | 93.88 | 100.33 | | **ES gain** | 13.96% | 14.92% | 14.30% | 11.92% | 0.11% | 0.01% | 0.00% | 0.44% | | **Baseline** | Light load | 110.61 | 98.72 | 108.07 | 123.93 | 96.09 | 92.22 | 94.74 | 103.39 | | **ES scheme** | 99.97 | 86.60 | 97.08 | 114.55 | 96.06 | 92.28 | 94.78 | 103.01 | | **ES gain** | 9.62% | 12.28% | 10.17% | 7.57% | 0.03% | -0.07% | -0.04% | 0.37% | | **Baseline** | Medium load | 138.35 | 121.48 | 136.23 | 161.79 | 97.76 | 92.73 | 96.18 | 106.74 | | **ES scheme** | 129.75 | 111.17 | 126.45 | 156.58 | 97.82 | 92.73 | 96.22 | 107.12 | | **ES gain** | 6.22% | 8.49% | 7.18% | 3.22% | -0.06% | 0.00% | -0.04% | -0.36% |   Figure 2. SLS result curves for baseline and energy saving scheme | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 3: OPPO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fig 3. RU, BO and ρ comparison for FTP3 model with 0.5MB packet size and 200ms inter-arrival time    Fig 4. Latency, UPT and energy consumption comparison for FTP3 model with 0.5MB packet size and 200ms inter-arrival time    Fig 5. RU, BO and ρ comparison for FTP3 model with 0.5MB packet size and 200ms inter-arrival time    Fig 6. Latency, UPT and energy consumption comparison for FTP3 model with 0.5MB packet size and 200ms inter-arrival time    Fig 7. Latency, UPT and energy consumption comparison for FTP3 IM model with 0.1MB packet size and 2s inter-arrival time      Fig 8. Latency, UPT and energy consumption comparison for FTP3 IM model with 0.1MB packet size and 2s inter-arrival time | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 4: CATT

(Additionally, CATT has more results submitted also in [R1-2208988](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2208988.zip) in AI 9.7.2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Reduction in the transmission of common control channel/signal in time domain Table 3: Energy saving gain of increasing common control channel periodicity with different system loads   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | SSB/SIB transmission periodicity | System loads | | | | | **Zero** | **9%(low)** | **15%(light)** | **30%(Medium)** | | Energy saving gain | 20ms(baseline) | - | - | - | - | | 40ms | 18.8% | 9.0% | 6.5% | 4.9% | | 80ms | 67.7% | 24.9% | 12.3% | 8.5% | | 160ms | 82.6% | 27.1% | 14.0% | 9.6% | | Note:  a) Category 1 power model is applied.  b) Relative power of SSB and SIB1 =280.  c) For number of beam sweeping L=4, i.e., 4 SSB within one SSB burst for FR1. | | | | | |  gNB DTX/DRX scheme Table 4: The energy saving gain (ESG) of the gNB DTX transmission under different system loads   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | System load = 9% | System load = 15% | System load = 30% | | Average ESG of gNB DTX/DRX | 75.3% | 66.1% | 50.1% |  Cell ON/OFF scheme Table 5: The energy saving gain (ESG) of semi-static/dynamic cell ON/OFF   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | Percentage of Cell ON | Network Energy Saving gain of Cell ON/OFF scheme | | Cell without DTX | 63.1% | 23.8% | | Cell with DTX | 65.5% | 47.3% |   Spatial domain  Table 6: The energy saving gain (ESG) of the gNB with TxRU dynamic adaptation under different system loads   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | System load | Average ESG | Average UPT loss | Average latency loss | | 9.0% | 6.9% | 1.2% | 1.7% | | 15.0% | 10.9% | 1.8% | 2.6% | | 30.0% | 10.8% | 1.7% | 2.88% | | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 5: ZTE

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Time domain  Figure 2 Evaluation results of SSB-less and SIB-less scheme  Frequency domain  Figure 3 Evaluation results of SSB-less for inter-band CA  Spatial domain  Figure 4 Energy saving gain and UPT impact of antenna reduction | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 6: InterDigital

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Table 2: Downlink Evaluation results**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | User traffic load 1: { = {0.14, 0.33} | | | | User traffic load 2: { = {0.33, 0.67} | | | | | Baseline  (Always ON)  Mean UPT(Mbps) | NES  Mean UPT  (Mbps) | UPT gain/loss  (NES vs Baseline)  (%) | ESG  (NES vs Baseline)  (%) | Baseline  (Always ON)  Mean UPT  (Mbps) | NES  Mean UPT  (Mbps) | UPT gain/loss  (NES vs Baseline)  (%) | ESG  (NES vs Baseline)  (%) | | 47.51 | 45.27 | -4.93% | 54.59% | 23.81 | 22.67 | -4.78% | 25.65% |   **Table 3: Uplink Evaluation results – 40 ms gNB sleep cycle**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | User traffic load: = 0.24 | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | |  | | | | | | | NES  (Sleep w/o WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | Enhanced NES  (Sleep with WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | UPT gain/loss  (Enhanced NES vs NES)  (%) | ESG  (Enhanced NES vs. NES)  (%) | NES  (Sleep w/o WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | | | Enhanced NES  (Sleep with WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | UPT gain/loss  (Enhanced NES vs.  NES)  (%) | ESG  (Enhanced NES vs. NES)  (%) | | 21.35 | 23.77 | +11.34% | -3.00% |  |  | 21.92 | 22.92 | +4.56% | -3.12% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | User traffic load: = 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | |  | | | | | | | NES  (Sleep w/o WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | Enhanced NES  (Sleep with WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | UPT gain/loss  (Enhanced NES vs NES)  (%) | ESG  (Enhanced NES vs. NES)  (%) | NES  (Sleep w/o WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | | | Enhanced NES  (Sleep with WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | UPT gain/loss  (Enhanced NES vs.  NES)  (%) | ESG  (Enhanced NES vs. NES)  (%) | | 23.03 | 24.11 | +4.70% | -1.67% |  |  | 22.20 | 22.90 | +3.15% | -1.82% |   **Table 4: Uplink Evaluation results – 160 ms gNB sleep cycle**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | User traffic load: = 0.24 | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | |  | | | | | | | NES  (Sleep w/o WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | Enhanced NES  (Sleep with WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | UPT gain/loss  (Enhanced NES vs NES)  (%) | ESG  (Enhanced NES vs. NES)  (%) | NES  (Sleep w/o WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | | | Enhanced NES  (Sleep with WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | UPT gain/loss  (Enhanced NES vs.  NES)  (%) | ESG  (Enhanced NES vs. NES)  (%) | | 17.51 | 23.84 | +36.14% | -5.95% |  |  | 17.37 | 23.07 | +32.78% | -6.20% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | User traffic load: = 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | |  | | | |  | | | | | | | NES  (Sleep w/o WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | Enhanced NES  (Sleep with WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | UPT gain/loss  (Enhanced NES vs NES)  (%) | ESG  (Enhanced NES vs. NES)  (%) | NES  (Sleep w/o WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | | | Enhanced NES  (Sleep with WUS)  Mean UPT (Mbps) | UPT gain/loss  (Enhanced NES vs.  NES)  (%) | ESG  (Enhanced NES vs. NES)  (%) | | 19.76 | 24.27 | +22.83% | -3.03% |  |  | 18.83 | 23.56 | +25.14% | -3.08% | | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 7: Samsung

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Time domain  Table 3: Preliminary evaluation results of SSB adaptation   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | NW energy saving scheme | ESG for each traffic loads | | Evaluation methodology/baseline assumption | Note | | **Category 1** | **Category 2** | | SSB adaptation  From 8 SSBs to 2 SSBs | Light\_0 load: 5.20 %  Light\_1 load: 7.25 %  Low load: 10.60 % | Light\_0 load: 3.61 %  Light\_1 load: 4.71 %  Low load: 6.24 % | Baseline: {8 SSBs in burst, ssb-periodicity: 20 ms}  Reduced: {2 SSBs in burst, ssb-periodicity: 20 ms} | Traffic loads [RU]:  {28.56%, 17.42%, 6.03%} | | Light\_0 load: 2.82 %  Light\_1 load: 3.89 %  Low load: 6.30 % | Light\_0 load: 1.89 %  Light\_1 load: 2.43 %  Low load: 3.40 % | Baseline: {8 SSBs in burst, ssb-periodicity: 40 ms}  Reduced: {2 SSBs in burst, ssb-periodicity: 40 ms} | Traffic loads [RU]:  {28.56%, 17.42%, 6.03%} | | Light\_0 load: 1.01 %  Light\_1 load: 1.58 %  Low load: 3.66 % | Light\_0 load: 0.48 %  Light\_1 load: 0.62 %  Low load: 0.88 % | Baseline: {8 SSBs in burst, ssb-periodicity: 160 ms}  Reduced: {2 SSBs in burst, ssb-periodicity: 160 ms} | Traffic loads [RU]:  {28.56%, 17.42%, 6.03%} |   Frequency domain  Table 4: Preliminary evaluation results of BWP adaptation   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | NW energy saving scheme | ESG | UPT loss | Scheduling latency | Packet latency | Evaluation methodology/baseline assumption | Note | | BWP adaptation  from 100 MHz to 60 MHz. | Cat 1 with deep sleep: 39.41 % | 29.93 % | No increase | 41.34% | Baseline: 100MHz with 55 dBm  Reduced: 60 MHz with 53 dBm. | Baseline traffic load:  28.56 % RU  Reduced BW traffic load: 20.42 % RU | | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 8: NTT DOCOMO

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Evaluation on sleep modes     1. Relative power consumption (b) Packet throughput   Fig. 1 Power consumption and throughput performance on different sleep modes  Evaluation on power domain techniques    (a) Relative power consumption (b) Packet throughput  Fig. 2 Power consumption and throughput performance on static power reduction | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 9: Qualcomm

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Dynamic antenna port adaptation  Figure 1: Network energy consumption  Chart  Description automatically generated  Figure 2: Impact on UPT and coverage (DL SINR)  Dynamic TRP adaptation    Figure 3: Network energy consumption & UPT  Dynamic DL Tx power adaptation  Figure 4: NW energy consumption  Chart  Description automatically generated    Figure 5: Impact on UPT and coverage (DL SINR)  Dynamic UE-group PCell switching      **33%**  Figure 6: Comparison between 1-CC case and 2-CC case depending on cell loading | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| QC1 | What is missing is the result on “Light SSB” combined with cell WUS.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | ***Energy/Power Consumption*** | ***“Light SSB” combined with on-demand SSB/RMSI/RACH*** | ***Compact SSB/PRACH bursts*** | | ***gNB Avg Power saving with respect to a legacy baseline*** | ***-28%*** | ***-14%*** | | ***UE’s Initial Access Power Consumption penalty or saving*** | ***+0.16 %*** | ***-4%*** | |
|  |  |

#### Source 10: Huawei/HiSilicon

([R1-2208425](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2208425.zip), submitted in AI 9.7.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Figure 4 Initial system-level simulation results for SSB/SIB1-less operation | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 11: Fujitsu

([R1-2209023](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2209023.zip), submitted in AI 9.7.2)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| グラフ, 棒グラフ  自動的に生成された説明グラフ, 棒グラフ  自動的に生成された説明  Figure 5. Simulation results in terms of energy consumption and energy efficiency with and without TxRU adaptation  Table I. UPT performance with and without TxRU adaptation   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | 30% RUR | | 50% RUR | | | Baseline | Dynamic TxRU adaptation | Baseline | Dynamic TxRU adaptation | | 5% UPT [Mbps] | 27.1 | 27.5 | 17.6 | 17.6 | | 50% UPT [Mbps] | 55.2 | 53.5 | 42.3 | 41.6 | | Average UPT [Mbps] | 64.6 | 63.1 | 51.6 | 50.7 | | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 12: Intel

([R1-2209064](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2209064.zip), submitted in AI 9.7.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Time domain        Figure 17. Comparison of cell throughput and power consumption in load, light, and medium load scenarios with 20 or 160 msec SSB periodicity (Cat 1 BS Power Model)  Frequency domain    Figure 27. Comparison of slot utilization with average of 0.57 user per cell (corresponding to very low load of RU of 1.1% in case of full BW usage) and using 100%, 50%, and 25% of the system bandwidth    Figure 28. Comparison of slot utilization with average of 3.29 user per cell (corresponding to low load of RU of 7.9% in case of full BW usage) and using 100%, 50%, and 25% of the system bandwidth      Figure 29. Comparison of slot utilization with average of 7 user per cell (corresponding to light load of RU of 20.9% in case of full BW usage) and using 100%, 50%, and 25% of the system bandwidth  Spatial domain    Figure 30. Comparison of slot utilization with average of 3.28 user per cell (corresponding to low load of RU of 7.9% in case of full BW and full TxRx usage) and using 100%, 50%, and 25% of the number of antenna elements.    Figure 31. Comparison of slot utilization with average of 7 user per cell (corresponding to light load of RU of 20.9% in case of full BW and full TxRx usage) and using 100%, 50%, and 25% of the number of antenna elements.    Figure 32. Comparison of slot utilization with average of 11 user per cell (corresponding to medium load RU of 38.3% in case of full BW and full TxRx usage) and using 100%, 50%, and 25% of the number of antenna elements.  Power domain    Figure 33. Comparison of slot utilization with average of 3.28 user per cell (corresponding to low load of RU of 7.9% in case of full BW and full TxRx usage) and using 100%, 25%, and 6.25% of maximum transmit power.    Figure 34. Comparison of slot utilization with average of 7 user per cell (corresponding to light load of RU of 20.9% in case of full BW and full TxRx usage) and using 100%, 25%, and 6.25% of maximum transmit power.    Figure 35. Comparison of slot utilization with average of 11 user per cell (corresponding to medium load RU of 38.3% in case of full BW and full TxRx usage) and using 100%, 25%, and 6.25% of maximum transmit power. | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 13: MediaTek

([R1-2209501](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2209501.zip), submitted in AI 9.7.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Ref.  10.6%↓  Ref.  28.5%↓  Figure 2: BS power consumption comparison with aligned UE DRX offsets (VoIP traffic)  3.0%↓  Ref.  7.4%↓  0.3%↓  0.1%↓  Ref.  Figure 7: BS power consumption comparison with SSB/SIB1-less SCell (video traffic for CA setting)  Ref.  21.7%↓  20.3%↑  4.8%↑  Ref.  19.1%↓  Ref.  15.8%↓  16.3%↓  Figure 8: BS power consumption and data latency comparison with reduced #TxRU in light load (15% - 30%) case with video traffic  Ref.  6.8%↑  31.3%↓  25.3%↓  81.1%↑  36.6%↓  Ref.  Ref.  26.8%↓  Figure 9: BS power consumption and data latency comparison with reduced #TxRU in medium load (30% - 50%) case with video traffic  Figure 10: BS power consumption and data latency comparison with reduced PDSCH power/PSD-level in light load (15% - 30%) case with video traffic  Figure 11: BS power consumption and data latency comparison with reduced PDSCH power/PSD-level in medium load (30% - 50%) case with video traffic | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### Source 14: CEWiT

([R1-2210113](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/TSG_RAN/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_110b-e/Docs/R1-2210113.zip), submitted in AI 9.7.2)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Fig. 1: Energy savings by mandating transmission of lighter version of SSB by inactive gNBs for various loads | |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
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# Annex –

## A. Agreements@AI 9.7.1

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| @RAN1#109-e  [**R1-2205308**](file:///C:\Users\w00250081\AppData\Local\Temp\Docs\R1-2205308.zip) **FL summary#1 for performance evaluation for NR NW energy savings Moderator (Huawei)**  Agreement  For evaluation purpose, the energy consumption modeling for a BS includes at least the following:   * Reference configuration   + FFS other details   + Note FR1 and FR2 to be separately considered for detailed parameters * Multiple power state(s) including sleep/non-sleep mode(s) with relative power, and associated transition time/energy * Scaling method to be applied at least for non-sleep mode.   + FFS other details including scaling for sleep mode   [**R1-2205402**](file:///C:\Users\w00250081\AppData\Local\Temp\Docs\R1-2205402.zip) **FL summary#2 for performance evaluation for NR NW energy savings Moderator (Huawei)**  Agreement  For evaluation purpose, the BS energy consumption model should at least include the power consumption of BS on slot-level.   * Note that symbol-level power consumption to reflect different BW (or RB utilization) / time-occupancy / tx-rx direction of different symbols in a slot is considered.   + FFS details (e.g. explicit symbol-level power modelling, scaling slot-level power to symbol level power for various cases, etc.)   + Note: system simulation evaluations can be per slot regardless of detailed approach for calculating symbol-level power consumption.   Agreement   * For evaluation, at least for non-sleep mode and TDD, the BS powerconsumption for DL and UL are separately modelled, allowing DL-only transmission or UL-only reception.   + FFS: whether UL-only reception energy consumption model can be derived/simplified from DL-only transmission energy consumption model * FFS: the impact of UL reception and/or DL transmission on sleep modes and associated transition time/energy * FFS: whether/how to define an idle state, where BS is neither transmitting nor receiving but also doesn’t enter into any sleep mode or define it as sleep mode * FFS: whether the model for FDD can be based on the model for TDD   Agreement   * For evaluation purpose,   + Study how to define sleep modes and determine the characteristics for each mode from one or multiple of the below     - Relative power     - Transition time     - Transition energy     - Other approaches are not precluded     - Note: BS components that can be turned off can be considered for discussion purpose when defining the specific values of the characteristics for sleep modes.   + Study whether sleep mode is defined for DL(TX) and UL(RX) jointly or separately   + Study the assumption of order for BS entering/resuming from a sleep mode to another mode (sleep or non-sleep) and the associated transition time and energy, i.e. state machine which may have impact on the transition energy.   Agreement   * For evaluation, the scaling in a BS energy consumption model can be considered based on one or more of the following,   + Number of used physical antenna elements, or TX/RX chains     - FFS: Mapping between used TX/RX chains and used antenna ports     - FFS: Mapping between physical antenna elements and TX/RX chains   + Occupied BW/RBs for DL and/or UL in a slot/symbol in one CC   + number of CCs in CA     - FFS dependency of RF sharing   + number of TRPs   + PSD or transmit power     - FFS dependency on BW scaling     - FFS: PA energy efficiency value   + number of DL and/or UL symbols occupied within a slot   + FFS other domain scaling   + FFS scaling is linearly or else, for each domain * Above does not necessarily imply that BS energy consumption model that takes into account all listed scaling factors will be developed   Agreement  For BS energy consumption evaluation, in addition to the energy saving gain,   * At least UPT/UE power consumption/access delay/latency should be considered for performance impact evaluation * Note: this doesn’t necessarily mean that all the above are considered for all evaluation results. However, multiple KPIs are expected to be evaluated for a given technique. And this does not preclude to consider other KPIs when found appropriate for certain techniques/scenarios.   Agreement  At least urban macro is prioritized for FR1. FFS the baseline deployment assumption for FR2.  Agreement   * FTP3 (0.5MB as packet size, 200ms as mean inter-arrival time), FTP3 IM (0.1MB as packet size, 2s as mean inter-arrival time) and VOIP can be considered in the evaluation * FFS: with possible further prioritization, different model between DL and UL, and/or other traffic models that can be optionally considered. * FFS associated scenarios/configurations, e.g. C-DRX.   [**R1-2205468**](file:///C:\Users\w00250081\AppData\Local\Temp\Docs\R1-2205468.zip) **FL summary#3 for performance evaluation for NR NW energy savings Moderator (Huawei)**  Agreement  For evaluation and BS energy consumption modeling purpose, for single CC case, at least the following in table should be considered for reference configuration   * + Note: other TX-RX RU number and corresponding BS antenna configuration can be considered in SLS assumptions  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Set 1 FR1 | Set 2 FR1 | Set 3 FR2 | | Duplex | TDD | FDD | TDD | | System BW | 100 MHz | 20 MHz | 100 MHz | | SCS | 30 kHz | 15 kHz | 120 kHz | | Number of TRP | 1 | 1 | 1 | | Total number of DL TX RUs | 64 | (working assumption) 32 | 2 | | Total DL power level | 55dBm | [49dBm] – to be further discussed and finalized in future meetings | 43dBm – to be further discussed and finalized in future meetings  EIRP limited to 78dBm – to be further discussed and finalized in future meetings | | Total number of UL Rx RUs | 64 | (working assumption) 32 | 2 |   Agreement  As a starting point,   * macro cell BS for FR1 is assumed for energy consumption model. * FFS: micro cell BS for FR2 is assumed for energy consumption model.   Agreement  The evaluation baseline for energy saving study/evaluation for BS includes at least NR R15 mandatory without capability features. Optional features from R15 onwards (e.g. CA, MIMO) as well as implementation-based energy saving techniques should be explicitly reported and described if used in the evaluation baseline.   * FFS: need of alignment for certain configurations/implementation-based schemes.   Agreement   * Similar to UE power saving study, percentage of energy consumption reduction from the baseline is used to express BS energy saving gain. * SLS is considered as baseline evaluation method. Other method, including numerical analysis and LLS can also be considered. At least one of the methods should be selected and used for evaluation of a specific technique (selection and criteria is up to proponent).   Working assumption  For evaluation, for energy consumption modelling for FDD and the case of simultaneous DL transmission and UL reception for non-sleep mode, study the following with potential down-selection in RAN1#110   * Option 1: the power consumption is the total of DL and UL power consumption * Option 2: the power consumption for UL is neglected * Other option is not precluded * Note the DL (or UL) power consumption can be obtained using a same approach as that obtained from the DL (or UL)-only in TDD model   Final summary in [R1-2205551](file:///C:\Users\w00250081\AppData\Local\Temp\Docs\R1-2205551.zip).  @RAN1#110  **Agreement**  For non-sleep mode, the relative power value in power model table for UL reception and/or DL transmission is provided based on reference configuration.  **Agreement**  For set 2 FR1 FDD TxRx reference configuration, confirm the WA as 32 in reference configuration.  **Agreement**  The total DL power level is 49 dBm for set 2 FR1 FDD reference configuration.  **Proposal 2.1.6-1 –rev2**  **For the purpose of evaluation, adopt the following as BS power consumption model. These entries for this table is per reference configuration set.**   * **FFS: One or multiple values for relative power and transition time.**  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Characteristic** | Relative Power | Additional transition energy3 | **Total transition time** | | Deep sleep1 | There is neither DL transmission nor UL reception.  Time interval for the sleep should be larger than the total transition time entering and leaving this state. | P1=1 | E1 | T1 | | Light sleep | There is neither DL transmission nor UL reception.  Time interval for the sleep should be larger than the total transition time entering and leaving this state.  (P2>P1) | P2 | E2 | T2 | | Micro sleep | There is neither DL transmission nor UL reception.  Immediate transition is assumed for network energy saving study purpose from or to a non-sleep state. | P3 | 0 | 0 | | Active DL | There is only DL transmission. | P4 | NA | NA | | Active UL | There is only UL reception.  ~~FFS: Whether multiple P5 values are needed to address low power UL mode~~ | P5 | NA | NA | | Note 1: Depending on implementations, there could be a state that the power is lower than deep sleep and requires larger total transition time, e.g. hibernating sleep or Quasi-off, which is not explicitly modeled in this study for evaluation purpose.  Note 3: Unit in relative power times duration. FFS: Details on how transition energy is defined. | | | | |  * For simultaneous DL and UL transmission for FDD, the power for UL reception is neglected in this study. * FFS: Optionally, a state machine where BS may transit between sleep modes without entering non-sleep mode can be considered. Companies are to report the involved sleep modes and the assumptions for inter-sleep mode transition time used in their evaluations. * FFS: Details on how to use the above table for low power uplink reception (e.g. for WUS).   **Working Assumption**  **For reference configuration set 1, the values are provided as below. FFS set2 and set 3.**   |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Power state** | **Relative Power *P*** | | **Total transition time *T*** | | | Deep sleep | 1 | 1 | Cat 1:  50ms | Cat 2:  10s | | Light sleep | Cat 1: 25 | Cat 2: 2.1 | Cat 1: 6 ms | Cat 2: 640 ms | | Micro sleep | Cat1: 55 | Cat 2: 5.5 | 0 | 0 | | Active DL | Cat 1: 280 | Cat 2: 32 | N.A. | N.A. | | Active UL | Cat 1: 110 | Cat 2: 6.5 | N.A. | N.A. |   **Alternative Proposal 3.1.1.1-1**  For evaluation purpose,   * a load (L) of a cell is a percentage of resources used for UE specific PDSCH / PUSCH * The following load scenarios are considered  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Load scenario | Characteristics | | Idle/empty load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * L = 0 | | low load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * 0 < L≤15 | | Light load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * 0 < L≤ ~~[~~30~~]~~ | | Medium load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * ~~[~~30~~]~~ < L≤ ~~[~~50~~]~~ | | For CA, the companies report whether the load is defined per CC or across all CCs. | |   **Proposal 3.3.1.1-1:**   * **For FR1, urban micro can be optionally considered.** * **For FR2, urban micro is prioritized, with ISD=200 m is assumed.**   **FL1 Proposal 3.2-1:**  **It is up to company report which traffic model is used among the agreed three traffic models in their evaluations.**   * **Other models may be used as well. Parameter (e.g. packet size and arrival rate) adjustment can be optionally considered and reported.**   **Proposal 2.3.1-1:**  **For set 3 FR2 reference configuration, the total DL power level and EIRP limit is set as 33 dBm and 63 dBm respectively. Note EIRP limit is also scaled with the number of TxRU.**  **Alternative Proposal 3.1.3-1:**  **For evaluation purpose, network energy saving gain is computed based on the energy consumptions for a technique and the baseline over the same duration.**  **Agreement**  **For initial evaluations, there is always a non-sleep mode assumed between adjacent sleep modes.**  **Agreement**  **Companies to report the assumption details for the reception of a low-power UL channel/signal, if used, including power states, additional transition energy, and transition times, receiver details (e.g. architecture and receiver sensitivity), and other impact/change on the power consumption model.**  **Agreement**  **Update the RAN1 agreements with the following changes**  In the evaluation,   * a load (L)% of a cell is a percentage of resources used for UE specific PDSCH/PUSCH. * The following load scenarios are considered.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | Load scenario | Characteristics | | Idle/empty load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * L = 0 | | low load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * 0 < L≤15 | | Light load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * 15~~0~~ < L≤30 | | Medium load | * Include cell-specific signals and channels, and * 30 < L≤50 | | For CA, the companies report whether the load is defined per CC or across all CCs. | |   **Proposal 2.1.3.2-1-rev2:**   * **During the transition time period,** **relative power of sleep mode is assumed to be consumed. Additional transition energy and total transition time also include energy and time for both ramping down and ramping up ~~spent in two-way (ramping down and up) during the transition period is considered~~.** * ~~(Working Assumption) for set 1, the additional energy (unit in relative power\*(duration in~~ *~~ms~~*~~)) is~~  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | ~~Power state~~ | ~~Additional transition energy~~ | | | ~~Category 1~~ | ~~Category 2~~ | | ~~Deep sleep~~ | ~~1350~~ | ~~22500~~ | | ~~Light sleep~~ | ~~90~~ | ~~1088~~ |   **Proposal 2.1.4.2-1-rev1:**   * **The total transition time for set 2 and set 3 is the same as that for set 1.** * **Companies are encouraged to check the input and values provided in section 2.1.4.2 of R1-2208312 for further determination.**   **Conclusion**   * **Companies are encouraged to check discussion in section 2.2.2 of R1-2208312 for scaling discussion in the next meeting.**   **Proposal 3.1.2-1-rev2:**   * **FFS whether to set exact requirements/QoS target for UPT and/or latency impact** * **Other KPIs can be optionally reported, conditioned with clear definition/descriptions provided.** * **Note for potential new channel/signals, e.g. WUS from UE, the assumption for detection reliability at BS side is reported (performance and complexity impact would subject to results and further discussion).**   **Proposal 3.2.2-1-rev1:**  **It is up to company report the use of UE C-DRX.**   * **the baseline configuration (for alignment/calibration) for C-DRX, if reported, can be as below;** * **Other inactivity timer values can be optionally reported**  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Traffic type** | **FTP** | **IM** | **VoIP** | | Model | FTP model 3 | FTP model 3 | As defined in R1-070674.  Assume max two packets bundled. | | Packet size | 0.5 Mbytes | 0.1 Mbytes | | Mean inter-arrival time | 200 ms | 2 sec | | DRX Period | 160 ms | 320 ms | 40 ms | | DRX Inactivity timer | 100 ms | 80 ms | 10 ms | | On duration | FR1: 8 ms  FR2: 4 ms | FR1: 10 ms  FR2: 5 ms | FR1: 4 ms  FR2: 2 ms |   **Proposal 3.3.2-1-rev2:**   * **For FR1, adopt the Reference SLS configurations in Annex-A in R1-2208312 as baseline SLS assumptions.**   + **Other carrier frequencies can be optionally considered.** * **FFS For FR2 adopt the Reference SLS configuration used in Dense Urban Config.B in Table2 of RP-180524 for IMT-2020 with the following clarification/update as initial SLS assumption.**   + **BS antenna configurations**     - **2 TxRU (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (4,8,2,2,2;1,1)**     - **(dH, dV) = (0.5λ, 0.8λ) (dg,H, dg,V) = (4.0λ, 3.6λ)**   + **Traffic model & UE density**     - **Follow previous agreements with adjusted UE density**   + **Total transmit power per TRxP**     - **Value scaled from that in set 3 reference configuration considering BW** * **Further adjustment/clarification can be discussed in the next meeting.** |

## B. Agreed SLS configurations for FR1

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

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Parameters | | |
| Basic parameters | Channel model | ~~3D/HF-Uma based on TR 38.901~~  (low-loss O2I penetration model) | ~~3D/HF-Uma based on TR 38.901~~  (low-loss O2I penetration model) |
| Device deployment | 80% indoor, 20% outdoor | 80% indoor, 20% outdoor |
| Inter-site distance | 500m | 500m |
| Network Topology | 7\*3 Sector | 7\*3 Sector |
| Carrier Frequency | 2.1GHz | 4.0GHz or 2.6GHz |
| Multiple access | OFDMA | OFDMA |
| Duplexing | FDD (for set 2 ref. config) | TDD (for set 1 ref. config.) |
| Numerology | 15KHz,  14 OFDM symbol slot | 30kHz,  14 OFDM symbol slot |
| Guard band ratio on simulation bandwidth | FDD: 6.4% (104RB for 15kHz SCS and 20 MHz BW) | TDD: 2.08% (272 RB for 30kHz SCS and 100 MHz bandwidth) |
| Simulation bandwidth | Follow reference configuration, (equal split of 10 MHz for UL and DL) | Follow reference configuration |
| Frame structure | ~~Full downlink~~ | DDDSU |
| UT attachment | Based on RSRP | Based on RSRP |
| Wrapping around method | Geographical distance based wrapping | Geographical distance based wrapping |
| Traffic model | Follow previous RAN1 agreements | Follow previous RAN1 agreements |
| BS parameters | BS antenna height | 25 m | 25 m |
| BS noise figure | 5 dB | 5 dB |
| BS antenna element gain | 8 dBi | 8 dBi |
| Antenna configuration at TRxP | For 32T: (M,N,P,Mg,Ng; Mp,Np) = (8,8,2,1,1;2,8) (dH, dV)=(0.5, 0.8)λ | For 64T:  ~~(M,N,P,Mg,Ng; Mp,Np) = (12,8,2,1,1;4,8) (dH, dV)=(0.5, 0.8)λ;~~  (M, N, P, Mg, Ng, MP, NP,) = (8, 8, 2, 1, 1, 4, 8).  based on 38.802 |
| UE parameters | UE power class | 23dBm | 23dBm |
| UE noise figure | 9 dB | ~~7~~ 9 dB |
| UE antenna element gain | 0 dBi | 0 dBi |
| UE antenna height | Outdoor UEs: 1.5 m; Indoor Uts: 1.5m or consider floor height | Outdoor UEs: 1.5 m; Indoor Uts: 1.5m or consider floor height |
| Antenna configuration at UE | For 4R: (M,N,P,Mg,Ng; Mp,Np)= (1,2,2,1,1; 1,2)  (dH, dV)=(0.5, N/A)λ | For 4R: (M,N,P,Mg,Ng; Mp,Np)= (1,2,2,1,1; 1,2)  (dH, dV)=(0.5, N/A)λ |
| Transmission parameters | Modulation | Up to 256 QAM | Up to 256 QAM |
| Transmission scheme | SU-MIMO | SU-MIMO |
| SU dimension | For 4Rx: Up to 4 layers | For 4Rx: Up to 4 layers |
| DL CSI measurement | Non-precoded CSI-RS based | Precoded CSI-RS based |
| DL codebook | Type I/II codebook | non-PMI transmission |
| SRS transmission | N/A | For UE 4 Tx ports: Non-precoded SRS |
| CSI feedback | Company to report the assumptions | Company to report the assumptions |
| Interference measurement | SU-CQI; CSI-IM for inter-cell interference measurement | SU-CQI; CSI-IM for inter-cell interference measurement |
| Scheduling | PF | PF |
| Receiver | MMSE-IRC | MMSE-IRC |
| Channel estimation | Non-ideal | Non-ideal |
| Common RS | SSB~~/SIB1~~ period | 20ms | 20ms |
| ~~SSB time resource~~ | ~~Slot#0~slot#3, Slot#0, slot#1, 2 SSB per slot~~  ~~4 symbols for each SSB~~ | ~~Slot#0, slot#1 Slot#0~slot#3, 2 SSB per slot~~  ~~4 symbols for each SSB~~ |
| ~~SSB frequency resource~~ | ~~20RB~~ | ~~20RB~~ |
| ~~SIB1 time resource~~ | ~~slot#10 ~ slot#17~~  ~~slot#10 ~ slot#13~~ | ~~slot#10 ~ slot#13~~  ~~slot#10 ~ slot#17~~ |
| ~~SIB1 frequency resource~~ | ~~40RB~~ | ~~40RB~~ |

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

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

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

- P: Number of polarizations

- Mg: Number of panels in a column;

- Ng: Number of panels in a row;

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

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

## C. SID abstraction

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

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

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

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