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# Introduction

This document summarizes the contributions [1 - 19] for AI 9.11.1 and email discussions.

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

# Evaluation methodologies

## Issue 1: Simulation assumptions

### 1A: Link-level assumptions

#### 1A-1: FAR/MDR

In last meeting, following agreements are made, and definition of FAR is still not converged.

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreement*** The false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS
	+ [0.1%, 1%]
	+ Other values are not precluded for studying, reported by companies
	+ Further discuss on the following alternatives for FAR target
		- Alt 1: FAR target is determined per single WUS attempt/trial,
		- Alt 2: FAR target is determined across a reference time duration of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials
			* FFS: possible values for reference time durations
		- Companies to report details, e.g., receiver behaviour, how to compute MDR, detection threshold
	+ Companies to report the selected reference time duration values and the associated number of WUS attempts/trials
 |

**Summary of company views:**

**Alt 1:** FAR target is determined per single WUS attempt/trial,

* Supported by Futurewei (For Coverage evaluation), OPPO, interdigital, LG (for duty cycle monitoring), Ericsson, MTK

**Alt 2:** FAR target is determined across a reference time duration of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials

* Supported by Futurewei (For power evaluation), Huawei, vivo, LG (for continuous monitoring), ZTE, Samsung

Proposals from contributions are as follows,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Futurewei** | * Number of false alarms in any duration T cannot simply be determined as the product of FAR and number of LP-WUS monitoring occasions in that duration T for ‘always-on’ and short ‘duty-cycled’ monitoring modes.
* For power evaluation, only one false alarm is expected in any duration corresponding to MR’s wake-up, determination of false alarm, and return back to sleep.
* Support definition of a simulation step size of, e.g., one subframe, for the evaluation of ‘always-on’ LP-WUS power saving gain using system level simulation, where the step size corresponds to the LP-WUS duration.
* For the same FAR and reference time duration in FAR Alt 2, LP-WUS design under ‘always-on’ monitoring may require a longer sequence and/or a longer CRC compared to the LP-WUS design under ‘duty-cycled’ monitoring.
* For power saving gain, support using FAR Alt 2 to simplify the evaluation and consider the impact on LP-WUS design for ‘always-on’ and ‘duty-cycled’ monitoring modes.
 |
| **Huawei** | * if the FAR value per single WUS attempt/trial is $p$, and during a time duration there are $N$ attempts/trials, the joint FAR value for this time duration is $1-(1-p)^{N}$ since the attempt/trials are independent.
* Alt.2 can be generally used to compare different designs, e.g. the continuous monitoring and duty cycle based monitoring. The main impact of FAR is the false-wakeup of MR which consumes additional power. By setting the FAR target within a duration for different modulation/waveform or operation mode (e.g. continuous monitoring or duty cycle mode monitoring), the power saving gain can be aligned by maintaining proper FAR target with in the same duration for fair comparison of other metrics, e.g. miss-detection performance of the LP-WUS.
 |
| **vivo** | * Reporting per attempt FAR is not necessary
* UE power consumption mainly depends on reference duration FAR.
* The detection results from multiple attempts may be highly correlated, per attempt FAR cannot be easily derived from the per reference duration FAR.
* The reference time duration can be T, e.g., one DRX cycle, during which UE detect N WUS occasions,
* For always on monitoring, N>1, is the number of occasions within T.
* For duty cycled monitoring, value N depends on WUS periodicity. N=1, if reference time duration is WUS periodicity.
 |
| **OPPO** | For evaluation of power consumption, FAR target is determined per single WUS attempt/trial. |
| **interdigital** | Alt 1 provides a simple FAR target per single WUS attempt/trial, Alt 2 defines an FAR target across a reference time duration. Alt 2 requires further discussion on possible values for reference time durations as captured as FFS, benefits of Alt 2 are not clear. |
| **LG** | For evaluation, only one alternative for FAR should be considered for each monitoring behavior of LP-WUR. E.g., Alt 1 for duty cycle based monitoring and Alt 2 for continuous monitoring. |
| **Ericsson** | False alarm probability is defined per detection attempt/trial. And if each WUR detection duration is *D* ms, then during *T* ms active time the WUR has [*T*/*D*] attempts for detecting WUS, where false alarm can occur in each attempt with a certain probability. |
| **ZTE** | FAR P is defined in a time duration T* The FAR for each detection is LLS is less than x0, where x0 is the FAR for the detection when the step size for sliding is the sequence length L, satisfying P=$1-\left(1-x\_{0}\right)^{T/L}$
* The reference time duration is a DRX cycle.
* MDR has the similar definition.
 |
| **Samsung** | * When the finer sliding granularity for LP-WUS detection is considered, how to count the number of wake-up can affect to calculate FAR.
* For calculation of FAR, FAR target is determined across a reference time duration of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials
* The number of wake-up within the reference time is 1 even if the multiple wake-ups are indicated by multiple attempts/trials.
* Propose to consider three cases for something that gNB can transmit within the LP-WUS monitoring window: 1) LP-WUS, 2) Other NR signal(s)/channel(s) (PDSCH, PDCCH, …), 3) the absence of gNB transmission (only considering channel noise).
 |
| **MTK** | * Clarify the baseline of [0.1%, 1%] for the false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS agreed in RAN1#112 is defined by FAR per single WUS attempt/trial, otherwise, non-feasible FAR targets will be included.
* Support of Alt 2 (FAR target is determined across a reference time duration of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials) may result in the target FAR values below 1% or below 0.1%, which may not be feasible if there is no CRC for further confirmation.
 |

Based on company inputs, moderator would like to **align the understanding on UE behaviors and terminologies** to facilitate further discussion and down selection on Alt-1/Alt-2

Firstly, moderator would like to **align the understanding on detection behavior** for duty cycle and continuous monitoring for LP-WUS.

* Time drifting: considering time drifting, UE may start detection of LP-WUS earlier than the actual transmission occasion of LP-WUS. For LP-WUS with sequence part, either sequence only or with subsequent payload, UE performs correlation to search for the sequence part within certain sliding window, in which the correlation is performed multiple times
* Continuous monitoring: It means WUR does not know when gNB will start transmission of LP-WUS, and UE monitors the LP-WUS in continuous manner, UE will monitor the LP-WUS multiple times within certain durations. Note that, although UE monitors continuously, it does not mean gNB can start WUS transmission anytime, e.g., sample Ts level. The gNB transmission still follows existing time domain resource grid, e.g., slot can be considered transmission unit for a LP-WUS for evaluation purpose. In other words, the continuous monitoring is actually short duty cycled monitoring. Thus, the number of LP-WUS transmission occasions can be obtained within a time duration.

Further, moderator would like to **align following understanding and terminologies** among companies.

* **Per single WUS attempt/trial,** means ONE trial/attempt to detect ONE LP-WUS transmission occasion.
	+ The output of Multiple correlations/hypothesis may be highly correlated due to oversampling of OOK chips. Hence, it is difficult to derive per correlation FAR from per attempt FAR. [R1-2302948, ZTE], [R1-2303150, Samsung], [R1-2302526, vivo]
	+ Note: If UE performs multiple correlations for detection the potential LP-WUS transmission in that transmission occasion, it can be considered as UE implementation in ONE trial/attempt, rather than multiple attempts/trials.
* **Number WUS attempts/trials across a reference time duration,** if each detection duration/LP-WUS occasion duration is D ms, then during T ms reference time duration, and the WUR has [T/D] attempts for detecting WUS.
	+ Similarly, each detection duration/LP-WUS occasion duration may require multiple correlations/hypothesis at WUR receiver.
	+ Similar view can be found in [R1-2302339, Huawei], [R1-2303759, Ericsson], [R1-2302506, vivo], [R1-2302948, ZTE], [R1-2302331 FUTUREWEI].

Based on above clarification, moderator have the following understanding

* For duty cycled LP-WUS monitoring, and if the reference time duration is equal to LP-WUS periodicity and only one LP-WUS transmission per LP-WUS period, UE only need to monitor LP-WUS once. In this case, the per single attempt FAR(Alt-1) is identical to per reference duration FAR(Alt-2).
* For always-on/continuous monitoring, if false alarm occurs at any occasion within the reference time duration, UE would wake up. Hence, Alt 2, FAR target determined across a reference time duration of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials is more intuitive for UE power consumption for Always on/Continuous monitoring.
* For always-on/continuous monitoring, each attempt on different WUS occasions can be assumed as independent, the per single attempt FAR and per duration FAR can be derived from each other.
* The per attempt FAR would be varied if companies report different assumptions on the duration for each attempt, which depends on WUS configurations. FAR target determined across a reference time duration of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials can be more easily aligned.

For the reference time duration used for evaluation

* + Typical DRX cycle can be assumed as the reference time duration. [R1-2302506, vivo], [R1-2302339, Huawei], [R1-2302948, ZTE].

A brief depicts of FAR calculation Alt-1 and Alt-2 is provided in the following figure.

 

***Hence, moderator have the following proposal which covers both duty-cycled and continuously monitoring,***

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

For evaluation purpose, FAR target is determined across a reference time duration T of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials,

* UE have N attempts within T, where N is the number of LP-WUS transmission occasions with in T.
	+ N is the number of attempts within T.
	+ where T is {1.28s, 2.56, …}
	+ Company to report (FAR, T, N)
		- Note: FAR = {0.1%, 1%} as agreed in RAN1#112
* Note 1: For example, if UE performs multiple correlations for sequence part for potential LP-WUS transmission in that monitor occasion, these correlations are considered as UE implementation in ONE trial/attempt.
* Note 2: If UE performs multiple non-overlapping attempts within the reference time duration, the false alarm event for the attempts are assumed as independent.
* Note 3: Number of Attempts per second ($λ$) can be calculated from T and N, i.e., $λ={N}/{T}$.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | This FAR definition may be used for continuous monitoring. We don’t see the need to change the FAR definition for duty cycle.For evaluation purpose of continuous monitoring of LP-WUS, |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine in general with moderator’s analysis and the proposal, with some following:1. Considering it was not agreed that LP-WUS always includes a sequence/preamble, therefore Note 1 should be updated as e.g.:

Note 1: For example, if LP-WUS transmission is agreed to include a sequence/preamble part, for which UE performs multiple correlations ~~for sequence part for potential LP-WUS transmission~~ in that monitor occasion, these correlations are considered as UE implementation in ONE trial/attempt. |
| QC | Agree on this proposal. With this proposal, we think we have no need to discuss Alt 1 and Alt 2 any more. We think correlation can be done to detect a sequence only (which does not necessarily require preamble). |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are generally OK. Additionally, in a time duration, we think 10% also can be optionally considered. In our simulation, in some cases, FAR 10% still has some power saving gain. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia1 | As discussed in last meeting, we should have some common understanding of the side-conditions that are needed FAR e.g. in terms of LP-WUS design. The assumed design for (FAR=0.1%, T=1.28s, N=1) would be very different that the design (FAR=0.1%, T=1.28s, N=1280). Thus if the resulting false alarm probability per one detection attempt (of the N) is very low, the assumed side conditions should also be disclosed. Minor note that N is defined at end of first sub-bullet as number of transmissions occasions, and in second sub-bullet (and implied start of first sub-bullet) as number of attempts within T. While these could be the same, would it be simplest just define N as the number of WUS detection attempts within T. |
| Intel | We are OK with the proposal. Regarding N, we’d like to clarify whether N is non-overlapped attempts. In our understanding, if N can be overlapped attempts, there is no simple relation between per-attempt FAR and the FAR in duration T. In other words, reporting N in the 3rd sub-bullet doesn’t help, if N can be overlapped attempts.  |
| InterDigital | We understand the point of the FL, but the proposal needs some clarification. In our understanding, Note 1 and Note 2 are important information, so they shouldn’t be notes but a part of agreements. In addition, “N is the number of attempts within T.” is duplicated information. Therefore, it’s better to remove as well. Having said that, the below is our updated proposal. [H] Proposals 1A-1-v1:For evaluation purpose, FAR target is determined across a reference time duration T of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials, * UE have N attempts within T, where N is the number of LP-WUS transmission occasions with in T.
	+ ~~N is the number of attempts within T.~~
	+ where T is {1.28s, 2.56, …}
	+ Company to report (FAR, T, N)
		- Note: FAR = {0.1%, 1%} as agreed in RAN1#112
* ~~Note 1: For example, i~~If UE performs multiple correlations for sequence part for potential LP-WUS transmission in that monitor occasion, these correlations are considered as UE implementation in ONE trial/attempt.
* ~~Note 2:~~ If UE performs multiple non-overlapping attempts within the reference time duration, the false alarm event for the attempts are assumed as independent.
* Note ~~3~~: Number of Attempts per second ($λ$) can be calculated from T and N, i.e., $λ={N}/{T}$.
 |
| Samsung | For Note 1, our understanding is that multiple attempts for single LP-WUS transmission due to time drifting are treated as single attempt and the wording “monitor occasion” is not clear to us. Therefore, we suggest to modify Note 1 for clarification as follow:* Note 1: For example, if UE performs multiple correlations for sequence part for potential single LP-WUS transmission ~~in that monitor occasion~~, these correlations are considered as UE implementation in ONE trial/attempt.

For Note 2, we would like to clarify the definition of non-overlapping attempts. Considering the Note 1, non-overlapping attempts can be defined as attempts performed for different potential LP-WUS transmission (occasion). In our understanding, it does not mean that LP-WUS detection duration is not overlapped in time domain. For example, it is assumed that LP-WUS can be transmitted from the first OFDM symbol for every slot and time duration for LP-WUS is longer than 1 slot, then multiple attempts for different LP-WUS occasion can be overlapped in time domain. Is our understanding correct?For understanding the figure to explain FAR calculation, we would like to check that “FAR across k monitor occasion” in (c) can be calculated using the same equation in (a) e.g., 1%=1-(1-x)k |
| CATT | We are not OK with Proposals 1A-1-v1.* Regarding **the align the understanding on detection behavior:** Per our understanding, monitoring behavior is related with the behavior of receiver. The difference between duty cycle monitoring and continuous monitoring is whether UE LP-WUR would turn ON/OFF at each duty cycle or stay ON to monitor at the event.
* The false alarm probability is the collected event of false outcome of wakeup when the transmitted LP-WUS is to indicated not to wakeup over total events. Thus, we don’t need to define a reference time duration
 |
| Apple | We are generally fine with proposal in principle. But Note 1 is confusing for continuous monitoring. |
| LGE | We don’t have strong preference for which Alt should be used but think only one Alt should be used for each monitoring behavior for fair evaluation. We are okay with moderator’s analysis and proposal. As moderator analyzed, we also think duty-cycle monitoring is super-set of continuous monitoring. So, if we can evaluate both monitoring behaviors with common definition of FAR target, it would be the best for collecting observations.  |
| FL | @ZTE, in RAN1#112, we agreed the followings* The false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS
	+ [0.1%, 1%]
	+ Other values are not precluded for studying, reported by companies

So perhaps we can remove ~~Note: FAR = {0.1%, 1%} as agreed in RAN1#112~~@Spreadtrum, to address your comment, can we add a note saying it is at least for @Huawei, I modified the note 1 to be more generic. Hope that address your comment.@Nokia, InterDigital, removing “N is the number of attempts within T.”, it is duplicated information. @Nokia, Yes, side conditions can be reported by other assumptions such as payload, CRC and etc. and I think it is part of the LLS assumptions which has been included in the Karol’s provided excel sheet.@Samsung, Intel, regarding non-overlapped attempts, it does not mean the duration can or cannot be overlapped. @ InterDigital, removing note according to your suggestion.@CATT, I understand your intension. If companies want’s to keep the same FAR for each attempts irrespective of the transmission occasions, the current proposal does not preclude to do so. For example, for duty-cycled monitoring, you can report (FAR=0.1%, T=1.28s, N=1), and for continuous monitoring, you can report* (FAR=0.1%, T=1ms, N=1) when LP-WUS monitoring occasion are back-to-back monitored with each duration is 1ms, or
* (FAR=0.1%, T=1.28s, N=100) when every 100ms out of 1.28s are continuously monitored for potential LP-WUS.

Not sure which continuous monitoring case you are referring, but the current proposal does not preclude to do so.@Apple, perhaps we can take note 1 as example. If there are particular unclear thing for continuous monitoring, we can fixed it later.Please see a revised version Proposals 1A-1-v2 |

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

For evaluation purpose, FAR target is determined across a reference time duration T of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials,

* UE have N attempts within T, where N is the number of LP-WUS transmission occasions with in T.
	+ ~~N is the number of attempts within T.~~
	+ where T is {1.28s, 2.56, …}
	+ Company to report (FAR, T, N)
		- ~~Note: FAR = {0.1%, 1%} as agreed in RAN1#112~~
* ~~Note 1:~~ For example, if UE performs multiple correlations for a sequence ~~part for potential LP-WUS transmission in that~~ in the monitor occasion, these correlations are considered as UE implementation in ONE trial/attempt.
* ~~Note 2:~~ If UE performs multiple non-overlapping attempts within the reference time duration, the false alarm event for the attempts are assumed as independent.
* Note ~~3~~: Number of attempts per second ($λ$) can be calculated from T and N, i.e., $λ={N}/{T}$.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal. |
| Ericsson1 | We have below comments: * “monitor occasion” needs clarification – is it from UE perspective and if so, how it is linked to N transmission occasions within time duration T?
* “non-overlapping attempts” and link to monitor occasion needs clarification – does it refer to overlap/not of “time domain samples” used in a detection attempt? If so, also need to clarify partially overlapping case?
* What is considered as “ONE trial/attempt” should be left for proponent to describe with justification.
 |
| Spreadtrum2 | Fine. Sorry, I miss that N=1 means duty cycle based monitoring. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | We thank FL’s responds and explanation. Per our understanding, T can be 1ms regardless of the monitoring behaviors. If we are the only company has concern, we can accept the proposal with following updated version: For evaluation purpose, FAR target is determined across a reference time duration T of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials, * UE have N attempts within T, where N is the number of LP-WUS transmission occasions with in T.
	+ ~~N is the number of attempts within T.~~
	+ where T is {1.28s, 2.56, …}~~0.~~ Other values are not precluded for evaluation.
	+ Company to report (FAR, T, N)
		- ~~Note: FAR = {0.1%, 1%} as agreed in RAN1#112~~
* ~~Note 1:~~ For example, if UE performs multiple correlations for a sequence ~~part for potential LP-WUS transmission in that~~ in the monitor occasion, these correlations are considered as UE implementation in ONE trial/attempt.
* ~~Note 2:~~ If UE performs multiple non-overlapping attempts within the reference time duration, the false alarm event for the attempts are assumed as independent.
* Note ~~3~~: Number of attempts per second ($λ$) can be calculated from T and N, i.e., $λ={N}/{T}$.
 |
| MTK | Okay for evaluation. Maybe “~~Note 3: Number of attempts per second (λ) can be calculated from T and N, i.e., λ=N⁄T~~.” is not needed. |
| vivo | @ EricssonFor monitoring occasion, in our understanding, it is the same as the transmission occasion, but defined from UE perspective.For ‘the non-overlapping attempts’ issue, in our understanding, it is similar to the question from Samsung in last round ‘whether the different LP-WUS occasion can be overlapped in time domain?’ Such overlapped occasions may lead to overlapping samples across different occasions, however, the false alarm event for the attempts can be still assumed as independent with proper WUS channel design. Although we consider this as corner case, we can be flexible to include this case, with change mark in blue.[H] Proposals 1A-1-v2:For evaluation purpose, FAR target is determined across a reference time duration T of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials, * UE have N attempts within T, where N is the number of LP-WUS transmission occasions with in T.
	+ ~~N is the number of attempts within T.~~
	+ where T is {1.28s, 2.56, …}
	+ Company to report (FAR, T, N)
		- ~~Note: FAR = {0.1%, 1%} as agreed in RAN1#112~~
* ~~Note 1:~~ For example, if UE performs multiple correlations for a sequence ~~part for potential LP-WUS transmission in that~~ in the monitor occasion, these correlations are considered as UE implementation in ONE trial/attempt.
* ~~Note 2:~~ If UE performs ~~multiple non-overlapping~~ N attempts for the N occasions within the reference time duration, the false alarm event for the attempts are assumed as independent.
* Note ~~3~~: Number of attempts per second ($λ$) can be calculated from T and N, i.e., $λ={N}/{T}$.

For third comment from Ericsson, we feel that some alignment on terminology is needed, since in last meeting, companies have varied terminologies, understanding of attempt/correlation is not aligned among companies, this example provided here can help to clarify the difference between one trial/attempt and one sequence correlation. Companies can report more detailed information on what is performed within one trial/attempt, e.g., how many correlations are performed within one attempt to detect the sequence of the LP-WUS. Other details on receiver procedure/algorithm/settings can be reported as well. |
| Nokia2 | We would also propose to add a note in the context of power saving evaluations that companies provide the assumed side conditions to attain the used FAR over T or per one attempt e.g. CRC/sequence length in LP-WUS design. |
| Intel | We are fine with the proposal. note 3 seems straightforward and is not necessary.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Maybe the example could be removed to address Huawei’s concern? We are also not clear about this. |
| FL2 | By addressing CATT, vivo, Ericsson, MTK, Nokia’s comment, FL suggest the following modifications, see Proposals 1A-1-v3. The last added bullet from Nokia’s comment. |

##### [H] Proposals 1A-1-v3:

For evaluation purpose, FAR target is determined across a reference time duration T of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials,

* UE have N attempts within T, where N is the number of LP-WUS transmission occasions with in T.
	+ ~~N is the number of attempts within T.~~
	+ where T is {1.28s, 2.56, …}. Other values are not precluded for evaluation.
	+ Company to report (FAR, T, N)
		- ~~Note: FAR = {0.1%, 1%} as agreed in RAN1#112~~
* ~~Note 1:~~ For example, if UE performs multiple correlations for a sequence ~~part for potential LP-WUS transmission in that~~ in the monitor occasion, these correlations are considered as UE implementation in ONE trial/attempt.
* ~~Note 2:~~ If UE performs ~~multiple non-overlapping~~ N attempts for the N occasions within the reference time duration, the false alarm event for the attempts are assumed as independent.
* ~~Note 3: Number of attempts per second (~~$λ$~~) can be calculated from T and N, i.e.,~~ $λ={N}/{T}$~~.~~

Power saving evaluations that companies provide the assumed side conditions to attain the used FAR over T or per one attempt e.g. CRC/sequence length in LP-WUS design

#### 1A-2: Frequency error/drifting

In RAN1 #112 meeting, the following working assumption was made [1].

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Working Assumption*** For evaluation of LP-WUR frequency and time errors, the following is used,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| **Oscillator max frequency error [ppm], Oscillator frequency drift [ppm/s]** | option 1: (200, 0.1)option 2: (50, 0.1)option 3: (10, 0.05)option 4: (5, 0.05)Other values are not precluded for studying, reported by companies |
| **RTC max frequency error [ppm]** | 20 |

* Company to report how to use the clocks for LR on/off state**s**
	+ The above clock assumptions for LR assumes the MR is in ‘ultra-deep sleep’ power state.
	+ For Option 3/4,
		- FFS applicability when MR is in ultra-deep sleep power consumption state and associated power consumption for LR on state and LR off state,
			* e.g., option 3/4 is not applicable
				+ when MR is in ‘ultra-deep sleep state’ with [0.015] power units and LR is in off state or,
				+ when LR monitoring power less than [TBD] power unit,
		- Note: Assumptions important for achieving performance by option 1/2/3/4 clock for LR should be declared, including active on/off power, transition energy/ ramp-up time TLR, ramp-up for LR and etc.
	+ If MR is in other state than ‘ultra-deep sleep state’, the clock running for MR can be used for LR.
		- assumptions important for achieving performance by using MR clock for LR should be declared
	+ Other clock accuracy options are not precluded. Companies to report options based on a feasibility analysis of clock power consumption and UE power consumption to use the clock accuracy option
* Company to report the frequency error assumption for the detection of LP-WUS/synchronization signal,
	+ The following are examples for consideration, other approaches are not precluded,
		- Model 1:
		- The relationship between a drifted frequency error(ΔF), frequency drift ( F’) over a time (T1) is ΔF = ±F’ \* T1
		- When frequency displacement [Fd] reaches max frequency error, it is assumed to be equaled to max frequency error
		- T1 is the time from the previous frequency synchronization. T1 may take different values depending on the chosen frequency synchronization approach.
		- FFS: Frequency displacement (Fd), defined as the difference between ideal frequency and frequency due to 1) clock drifting (ΔF); and 2) residual frequency error from previous synchronization/calibration (Fr), is given as Fd (ppm)=ΔF (ppm) +Fr(ppm).
		- Model 2: random frequency drifting, FFS details
* Company to report the timing drifting error assumption for the detection of LP-WUS/synchronization signal,
	+ The following are examples for consideration, other approaches are not precluded,
		- Model 1 [R1-2301438] [R1-2301558][R1-1714993]:
		- The relationship between the maximum frequency error(Fe) and corresponding timing drift( ΔT) over a time(T) is ΔT = ±Fe \* T (linear region)
		- The relationship between a frequency drift( F’), and corresponding timing drift(ΔT) over a time(T) is ΔT = Fr\*T ±0.5 \* F’ \*T2 (transient region)
		- The transition between transient and linear region (from synchronization or calibration point/time) occurs at time [Ts= (Fe-Fr)/( F’)]

image006* + - T is the time from the previous time synchronization. T may take different values depending on the chosen synchronization approach
		- FFS: Time error (Te) before detection of a current sync signal is defined as the difference between ideal time of the current sync signal and the time error due to 1) clock time drift (ΔT); and 2) residual time error from previous synchronization/calibration (Tr); Te= ΔT+ Tr
		- Model 2: random time drifting, FFS details
* FFS: Phase noise model
 |

**Huawei:** For Model 1 of frequency error, Frequency displacement (Fd), defined as the difference between ideal frequency and frequency due to 1) clock drifting (ΔF); and 2) residual frequency error from previous synchronization/calibration (Fr), is given as Fd (ppm)=ΔF (ppm) +Fr(ppm), where Fr is:

* 1. 0.1 ppm, if MR can assist to calibrate LP-WUR to correct the frequency error
	2. 5 ppm, if LP-WUR can only correct the frequency error based on LP-WUS synchronization signal

**Vivo:** Option 3/4 cannot be used when MR is in ultra-deep sleep power consumption state and associated power consumption for LR on state and LR off state.

**Interdigital:** For high frequency error/drift case, there may be increased power consumption and therefore the agreed power consumption for MR and LP-WUR may not be applicable. However, there is no clear evidence that only Option 3/4 are not applicable with the current assumption. In that regard, applying the current assumptions for Option 3/4 as well as Option 1/2 is preferred.

**Qualcomm:** The accuracy of clock mostly depends on the cost or clock. The clock with higher power accuracy does not necessarily consumes higher power. Therefore, we suggest removing following text from working assumption. The frequency of clock correlates more with power consumption. So, it would be good to remove following FFS on option 3 and 4.

##### [H] Proposals 1A-2-v1:

For Model 1 of frequency error, Frequency displacement (Fd), defined as the difference between ideal frequency and frequency due to 1) clock drifting (ΔF); and 2) residual frequency error from previous synchronization/calibration (Fr), is given as Fd (ppm)=ΔF (ppm) +Fr(ppm), where Fr is:

a) 0.1 ppm, if MR can assist to calibrate LP-WUR to correct the frequency error

b) 5 ppm, if LP-WUR can only correct the frequency error based on LP-WUS synchronization signal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support the proposal. |
| QC | It is not clear why the Fr should be modeled as 0.1ppm or 5ppm for each case. The Fr depends on LP-SS detection and clock calibration mechanism. So, we think these should be reported by individual company. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the main bullet. For the subbullets, clarification is needed.For a), we assume that MR should wake-up and receive SSB for calibration to achieve 0.1 ppm.For b), For the OFDM receiver, SSS monitored by WUR also is included in the LP-WUS synchronization signal |
| Xiaomi | We agree to consider both 0.1 ppm and 5 ppm as Fr, which can provide more choices for UE’s implementation. But comments for each option are not necessary. We suggest the following modifications:For Model 1 of frequency error, Frequency displacement (Fd), defined as the difference between ideal frequency and frequency due to 1) clock drifting (ΔF); and 2) residual frequency error from previous synchronization/calibration (Fr), is given as Fd (ppm)=ΔF (ppm) +Fr(ppm), where Fr is:a) 0.1 ppm, ~~if MR can assist to calibrate LP-WUR to correct the frequency error~~ b) 5 ppm~~, if LP-WUR can only correct the frequency error based on LP-WUS synchronization signal~~Note: Both cases in which MR can and cannot assist to calibrate LP-WUR to correct the frequency error are taken into account. |
| Nokia1 | In principle we are fine to consider the residual frequency error. On the exact numbers, specifically point b), we share the view with QCM that the value of Fr is heavily dependent on the (possible) LP-SS design as well as on the (possible) LP-WUS design (e.g. preamble), thus the exact value could be left for FFS. |
| Intel | What is the relation between this proposal and option 1/2/3/4 in the WA? Does it intended to say, with help of MR or LP-SS, the frequency error (the first value in each value pair of Option 1/2/3/4) can be replaced by 0.1 or 5 ppm ? Then, Option 1/2/3/4 is for the case if oscillator is free run?  |
| Samsung | We think that it can be also related to power model of LR, therefore we suggest to discuss power model of LR including OFDM-based receiver first. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. However, the time interval of 3 SSB for MR clock to calibrate the MR clock frequency stability at 0.1 ppm needs to be included in the model when MR is waken up from out of sync. |
| Apple | We are fine with the main bullet. But it is not clear why we use 5ppm for case b). We also think it should be left to FFS or companies to report. |
| FL1 | It seems the main bullet is OK for all which the detail value of Fr is controversial.FL recommends the followings |

##### [H] Proposals 1A-2-v2:

For Model 1 of frequency error, Frequency displacement (Fd), defined as the difference between ideal frequency and frequency due to 1) clock drifting (ΔF); and 2) residual frequency error from previous synchronization/calibration (Fr), is given as Fd (ppm)=ΔF (ppm) +Fr(ppm), ~~where Fr is:~~

~~a) 0.1 ppm, if MR can assist to calibrate LP-WUR to correct the frequency error~~

~~b) 5 ppm, if LP-WUR can only correct the frequency error based on LP-WUS synchronization signal~~

* Companies to report Fr

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the update. |
| Ericsson1 | OK. |
| OPPO | OK with the update. |
| Samsung | We think that Fr can be assumed as 0 for ideal case. But, for cases that Fr is not 0, it may be depending on the synchronization signal or/and assumed architecture. Therefore, the reason why Fr has such an assumption should also be provided by companies. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the update. |
| CATT | OK with the update proposal.  |
| MTK | Ok. But the working assumption is not agreed yet. We cannot make new agreements based on the working assumption.  |
| Vivo | OK |
| Nokia2 | OK. |
| Intel | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It seems companies mainly not align with the exact values, but in general the two cases seems OK for companies. Can we progress a little bit:For Model 1 of frequency error, Frequency displacement (Fd), defined as the difference between ideal frequency and frequency due to 1) clock drifting (ΔF); and 2) residual frequency error from previous synchronization/calibration (Fr), is given as Fd (ppm)=ΔF (ppm) +Fr(ppm), where Fr is:a) x ppm, if MR can assist to calibrate LP-WUR to correct the frequency error b) y ppm, if LP-WUR can only correct the frequency error based on LP-WUS synchronization signal* Companies to report Fr
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK. |
| FL2 | @MTK, maybe we can take it as working assumption@Samsung, adding a sentence saying companies to report important assumptions important for achieving Fr@Huawei, adding two sub-bullet back as example for companies to consider as the important assumptions when reporting Fr. Hope it is acceptable. |

##### [H] Proposals 1A-2-v3:

Working assumption

For Model 1 of frequency error, Frequency displacement (Fd), defined as the difference between ideal frequency and frequency due to 1) clock drifting (ΔF); and 2) residual frequency error from previous synchronization/calibration (Fr), is given as Fd (ppm)=ΔF (ppm) +Fr(ppm), ~~where Fr is:~~

* Companies to report Fr and important assumptions for achieving Fr, e.g., if MR can assist to calibrate LP-WUR to correct the frequency error or if LP-WUR can only correct the frequency error based on LP-WUS synchronization signal

##### [H] Proposals 1A-3-v1:

Option 3/4 clocks is not applicable to be used when MR is in ’ultra-deep sleep state’ with [0.015] power units and LR is in off state

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | To address Qualcomm’s point, we can specify that this is true for low cost devices used for IoT use cases. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The proposal may need to be clarified first. Should it be “not applicable……when MR is in ’ultra-deep sleep state’ with [0.015] power units or LR is in off state”? |
| QC | Given that clock accuracy highly depends on cost of clock, we think option 3 and 4 clock should be able to be considered when MR is in ultra deep sleep. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are OK with this proposal. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia1 | Firstly, agree with the need to clarify as Huawei commented. Also as noted by QCM, if the cost penalty is taken in the LR, there should not be a reason to omit this when MR is in ultra deep sleep. |
| Intel | We are OK with the FL proposal  |
| InterDigital | We believe that option 3/4 clocks should be applicable with ultra-deep sleep state in general.  |
| Samsung | For LR in on-state, can option 3/4 clocks be applicable regardless of ‘on’ power of LR? I think that this proposal can be handled with proposal 1C-2-v1 together.We suggest the following change to the proposal.Option 3/4 clocks is not applicable to be used when MR is in ’ultra-deep sleep state’ with [0.015] power units ~~and LR is in off state~~ |
| CATT | OK with the proposal |
| Apple | Many companies are assuming free-running ring oscillator. But our understanding is that crystal+PLL can potentially be an option, and the power consumption can be reduced significantly compared to the main radio if the phase noise requirement is relaxed. Therefore, we do not agree with the proposal at this time. |
| FL1 | @Huawei, Nokia, the original intension is ‘and’ but not ‘or’. If LR is ‘OFF’ but the MR is deep sleep/micro sleep/active, it is still possible to provide accurate clock from MR. Considering Qualcomm’s and Samsung’s comment, we can wait a bit by proposal 1C-2-v1.Therefore, I didn’t update the proposal. And companies can provide comments below. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| SONY | Sound reasonable. Also, it is the power consumption of LR that determines these values, if the power consumption of LR is below a certain level, then it means we cannot have clocks as accurate as oprtion3/4  |
| Ericsson1 | We do not agree with the proposal. Have similar view as Apple. No need to link Option 3 or 4 only to MR. Can be applicable independently by LR.Also, do not follow meaning/applicability of clock accuracy assumption when LR is in off state. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Fine |
| vivo | We think at least the following cases, clock option 3/4 is not possible Option 3/4 clocks is not applicable to be used when * MR is in ’ultra-deep sleep state’ with 0.015 power units and
* LR is in off state with 0.001 power unit.
 |
| FL2 | It seems the discussion is also related to the power model discussion. FL suggest to temporarily stop this proposal and coming back later. |

**In the last meeting, the WA for frequency error model is agreed, companies to check whether it is agreeable this meeting. Not the FFS part is discussed separately.**

##### [H] Proposals 1A-4-v1:

Confirm the WA for the followings

**Working Assumption**

* For evaluation of LP-WUR frequency and time errors, the following is used,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| **Oscillator max frequency error [ppm], Oscillator frequency drift [ppm/s]** | option 1: (200, 0.1)option 2: (50, 0.1)option 3: (10, 0.05)option 4: (5, 0.05)Other values are not precluded for studying, reported by companies |
| **RTC max frequency error [ppm]** | 20 |

* Company to report how to use the clocks for LR on/off state**s**
	+ The above clock assumptions for LR assumes the MR is in ‘ultra-deep sleep’ power state.
	+ For Option 3/4,
		- FFS applicability when MR is in ultra-deep sleep power consumption state and associated power consumption for LR on state and LR off state,
			* e.g., option 3/4 is not applicable
				+ when MR is in ‘ultra-deep sleep state’ with [0.015] power units and LR is in off state or,
				+ when LR monitoring power less than [TBD] power unit,
		- Note: Assumptions important for achieving performance by option 1/2/3/4 clock for LR should be declared, including active on/off power, transition energy/ ramp-up time TLR, ramp-up for LR and etc.
	+ If MR is in other state than ‘ultra-deep sleep state’, the clock running for MR can be used for LR.
		- assumptions important for achieving performance by using MR clock for LR should be declared
	+ Other clock accuracy options are not precluded. Companies to report options based on a feasibility analysis of clock power consumption and UE power consumption to use the clock accuracy option
* Company to report the frequency error assumption for the detection of LP-WUS/synchronization signal,
	+ The following are examples for consideration, other approaches are not precluded,
		- Model 1:
		- The relationship between a drifted frequency error(ΔF), frequency drift ( F’) over a time (T1) is ΔF = ±F’ \* T1
		- When frequency displacement [Fd] reaches max frequency error, it is assumed to be equaled to max frequency error
		- T1 is the time from the previous frequency synchronization. T1 may take different values depending on the chosen frequency synchronization approach.
		- FFS: Frequency displacement (Fd), defined as the difference between ideal frequency and frequency due to 1) clock drifting (ΔF); and 2) residual frequency error from previous synchronization/calibration (Fr), is given as Fd (ppm)=ΔF (ppm) +Fr(ppm).
		- Model 2: random frequency drifting, FFS details
* Company to report the timing drifting error assumption for the detection of LP-WUS/synchronization signal,
	+ The following are examples for consideration, other approaches are not precluded,
		- Model 1 [R1-2301438] [R1-2301558][R1-1714993]:
		- The relationship between the maximum frequency error(Fe) and corresponding timing drift( ΔT) over a time(T) is ΔT = ±Fe \* T (linear region)
		- The relationship between a frequency drift( F’), and corresponding timing drift(ΔT) over a time(T) is ΔT = Fr\*T ±0.5 \* F’ \*T2 (transient region)
		- The transition between transient and linear region (from synchronization or calibration point/time) occurs at time [Ts= (Fe-Fr)/( F’)]

* + - T is the time from the previous time synchronization. T may take different values depending on the chosen synchronization approach
		- FFS: Time error (Te) before detection of a current sync signal is defined as the difference between ideal time of the current sync signal and the time error due to 1) clock time drift (ΔT); and 2) residual time error from previous synchronization/calibration (Tr); Te= ΔT+ Tr
		- Model 2: random time drifting, FFS details
* FFS: Phase noise model

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### 1A-5: Others

**Huawei**

* + Huawei propose to Adopt the phase noise model defined by IEEE 802.11ba for LP-WUS study.
	+ Huawei propose the random 16-QAM symbols can be mapped on the REs of the PDSCH to model the neighboring subcarrier interference.
	+ Huawei propose to consider one or two neighboring cells to transmit random 16QAM symbols on REs within the cell bandwidth in the link simulation.

**MTK**

* + In the assumption of delay spread corresponding to the TDL models, the value of 1000ns has the max delay span of 8.6us, three times larger than the CP length of 2.34us for 30kHz SCS.
	+ Change the assumption of delay spread from optional 1000ns to optional: 100ns, considering the agreed values of 300ns and 1000ns result in larger delay spans than the CP length for 30kHz SCS.

**Qualcomm** propose to discuss LLS assumptions for FR2.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value |
| Carrier frequency | 28GHz |
| SCS | 120KHz |
| Channel Model | CDL-C, TDL-A |
| Delay spread | 30ns, 100ns |
| UE speed | 3Km/h |
| Antenna configuration:  | gNB antenna: 2UE antenna: 1  |
| LP-WUS bandwidth  | TBD |
| LP-WUS payload | Same as FR1 |
| LP-WUS raw data rate |  Same as FR1 |
| Receiver Model  | [Same as FR1] |
| Performance metrics | Same as FR1 |

***Moderator suggest companies to provide feedback with respect to the above proposals***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK to adopt proposals from Huawei and MTK. However, we feel that FR2 should be deprioritized for now given the limited discussion on that aspect. |
| OPPO | OK with proposals from Huawei and MTK. |
| Xiaomi | Considering the poor coverage of LP WUS signal, we think that discussion of LP WUS in FR2 should be postponed. |
| CATT | OK with proposals. |
| Apple | We are open to consider the proposals from Huawei and MTK. But would like to deprioritized the FR2 discussion. |
| FL2 | Suggest the following proposals for Huawei and MTK’s proposal |

##### [M] Proposals 1A-5-v1:

* + As start point, adopt the phase noise model defined by IEEE 802.11ba for LP-WUS study
	+ Change the assumption of delay spread from optional 1000ns to optional: 100ns, considering the agreed values of 300ns and 1000ns result in larger delay spans than the CP length for 30kHz SCS.
	+ Regarding the adjacent subcarrier interference, on resources mapped with PDSCH, the random 16-QAM symbols can be mapped on the REs of the PDSCH to model the neighboring subcarrier interference.
	+ Regarding other cell interference, it can be modelled by considering one or two neighboring cells to transmit random 16QAM symbols on REs within the cell bandwidth in the link simulation.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 1B: Coverage evaluation assumptions

#### [Close]1B-1: Noise Figure

**Vivo** propose to assume 12dB noise figure, because 8.7dB and 11 dB NF can be achieved according to literatures.

**Samsung:** The presence of LNA should be reflected to select the NF value for link budget evaluation.

**Ericsson:**

* WUS1: sequence-based OOK WUS (1 slot WUS), WUR noise figure 6 dB worse than main receiver
* WUS2: SSS-based signal detection based WUR capable of processing I/Q samples in time-domain (4 OFDM symbols WUS), WUR noise figure 3 dB worse than main receiver

***Moderator suggest to handle the value of NF corresponds to each receiver in AI9.11.2***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We agree with moderator’s proposal. |
| DOCOMO | We support this proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | It can be left to RAN4 discussion and it is architecture specific. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is fine for us to map the noise figure and power consumption assumption for each receiver type in AI 9.11.2. |
| QC | Given that NF depends on the choice receiver types, implementation, and power consumption, it would be enough to determine two/three representative NF values to cover different receiver type/implementations. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are Okay. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia1 | Fine to concentrate the RAN1 discussion to 9.11.2, with the note that RAN1 also asked RAN4 view on the NF. |
| Intel | Agree |
| Samsung | We are OK. |
| CATT | We agree with moderator’s suggestion. |
| Apple | OK |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL1 | Close this discussion. |

#### 1B-2: Others

* + **Nokia** propose to consider whether the LR has it’s own separate antenna or whether (one of) the main receiver antenna is shared. If antenna is shared, additional loss due to possible switch could be considered, (while this could be assumed to be relatively low i.e. ~0.2dB). If separate antenna is used, it would need to be considered whether additional antennal efficiency should be considered for LR to reflect the possible constraints set by the ID of the device to the antenna design/dimensions.
	+ **Nokia** There maybe different type of deployments, which assume different type of receiver baseline for cell coverage. Redcap UE and Normal UE have different references in coverage evaluation.

### 1C: Power model

#### 1C-1: power model for MR ramp-up transition time and transition energy

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 3: The relative power of ultra-deep sleep is 0.015 unit for LP-WUS power consumption evaluation.******Proposal 4: The ramp up and down transition energy and ramp-up time of ultra-deep sleep is 15000 units\*ms and 400ms for IoT/Wearable cases and 40000 units\*ms and 800ms for eMBB cases for power consumption evaluation.*** |
| MTK | 1. Confirm Alt 2: (40000, 800ms) being the transition energy and transition time for FR1 MR ultra-deep sleep state.
 |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 3: For evaluation, at least for FR1 MR ultra-deep sleep state, (Ramp-up and down transition energy, ramp-up time) confirm following assumptions.*** **Alt 1: (15000, 400ms)**
* **Alt 2: (40000, 800ms)**
 |
| InterDigital | ***Proposal 2:*** *Confirm the relative power value 0.015 for Ultra-deep sleep of MR.****Proposal 3:*** *For ramp-up/down transition energy and ramp-up time of MR, support Alt 1 (15000, 400ms) and deprioritize Alt 2 ([40000], 800ms)).* |
| LG | **Proposal 2: Confirm Alt 2 of (Ramp-up and down transition energy, ramp-up time) for evaluation at least for FR1 MR ultra-deep sleep state.*** **It can be used as an option only applicable for eMBB cases.**
 |

##### [H] Proposal 1C-1-v1:

**Confirm Alt 2 in the following agreement**

**Agreement**

For evaluation, at least for FR1 MR ultra-deep sleep state, (Ramp-up and down transition energy, ramp-up time) is as follows,

* Alt 1: (15000, 400ms)
* Alt 2: ([40000], [800ms])

Company to report which alternative they use for which use cases.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | OK with FL’s proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine to confirm the working assumption of Alt.2, but no need to further map the alternatives to specific device types. |
| QC | agree |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Fine with the proposal. Alt 1 for IoT/Wearable cases and Alt 2 for eMBB cases |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia1 | We are OK to confirm |
| Intel | Agree |
| Samsung | We would like to clarify cases that Alt 2 is applied. If cases are not critical, we prefer to use Alt1 as baseline. |
| Apple | OK |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL1 | Based on the comments received, FL asked the followings before making any updates,Q1: can company go with the Proposal 1C-1-v1Q2: can you accept taken Alt 1 as baseline considering if cases are not critical.Q3: are you OK to ‘Alt 1 for IoT/Wearable cases and Alt 2 for eMBB cases’ |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with Alt 1 being baseline. |
| Ericsson1 | OK to confirm Alt2. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Alt 2 means MR cannot enter ultra-deep-sleep to get positive PSG for normal DRX case. It will limit the application of LR. It is questionable whether the transition energy/time of Alt 2 is actually feasible…In general view, here, ramp-up/down energy is the energy difference/gap between ultra-deep-sleep and micro sleep. Comparing wearables and eMBBs, the power for micro sleep may not be so different.Hence, we support Alt 1 as baseline. |
| Samsung | We do not support to limit to use alternative according to use case. We prefer to take Alt 1 as baseline. |
| Vivo | We are Ok to Q1-Q3. |
| Nokia2 | Q1: We are OK to confirm the proposalQ2: Alt1 can be the baselineQ3: If Alt1 is the baseline, not sure if categorizing is needed, but no strong view |
| Intel | OK to confirm Alt 1 as baseline |
| FL2 | According to the comments received, it seems majority are OK to take Alt 1 as baseline.FL suggest to take Alt 1 as baseline and confirm WA for Alt 2 |

##### [H] Proposal 1C-1-v2:

**Confirm Alt 2 in the following agreement and update as follows**

**Agreement**

For evaluation, at least for FR1 MR ultra-deep sleep state, (Ramp-up and down transition energy, ramp-up time) is as follows,

* Alt 1: (15000, 400ms) as baseline
* Alt 2: (~~[~~40000~~]~~, ~~[~~800ms~~]~~)

Company to report which alternative they use for which use cases.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

#### 1C-2: power model for OFDM-based LP-WUR

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ZTE | ***Proposal 6: For OFDM based receiver, WUR ‘on’ relative power should be no less than 20 and WUR ‘off’ relative power should be 0.01.******Proposal 7: The relative power of WUR on is 0.01, 0.5, 1, 20 and 40 for LP-WUS power consumption evaluation.***  |
| Samsung | **Proposal 5: To reflect the higher power consumption of receiver architectures for various waveform e.g., OFDMA-based signal, FSK waveform, the following approaches should be considered for LR power model.*** **Company can use higher on/off power for LR, and the details for assumed receiver architecture should be provided.**
* **Candidates of LR power model for higher power-consumed LR can be added. e.g., 10, 20, 40 for on-state of LR.**
 |
| MTK | 1. The current relative power values for LPWUR are up to 4 and they cannot reflect the need to support OFDMA-based LPWUR.
2. Add relative power values 20 and 40 for the power state ON to support OFDMA-based LPWUR and set ramp-up time to zero for OOK/FSK LPWUR with relative power values smaller than 20.
 |
| Qualcomm | For study purpose and given that it is well-understood that OFDM-based receivers will consume higher power than OOK/FSK-based receivers, we may need to consider higher range of monitoring power values for LP-WUR.**Proposal 5: For study, add following additional power numbers (0, 10,20,40) for LP-WUR power consumption in On state.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Relative Power (unit)** | **Transition energy:****(unit multiplied by ms)** | **Ramp-up timeTLR, ramp-up (ms)** |
| **Off** | **0.001** | **[TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2]** | TLR, ramp-up = FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up |
| **On** | **0/0.01/0.05/0.1/0.5/1/2/4/10/20/40****FFS: If other values are needed** |
| * **Note: 0 is for Genie LP-WUR which can be used to show the lowest power consumption (or highest PSG).**
* **Note: Ramp-up time for LP-WUR must be much lower than 15 ms since deep sleep (DS) ramp-up + ramp-down time in 38.840 is 20 ms**
* **TLR, ramp-up is FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up**
* **FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up**
* **~~FFS: whether further categorization/sub-categorization is needed and how~~**
 |

 |
| vivo | **Proposal 6: Adopt the following power model for LP-WUR for OFDMA-based signals/channels detection:*** **Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘off’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR does not perform monitoring: 0.01unit**
* **Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring: 20 or 40units**
 |

The following power model for OFDM-based LP-WUR is used for evaluation:

* Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘off’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR does not perform monitoring: [0.01 unit]
* Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring: 10, 20 or 40units

While in 9.13.2 AI , there is some proposals also related to OFDM receiver, e.g.,

* Two company propose 1-5 unit,
* One company propose 0.15-0.2 unit(only for LO with 200ppm or 50ppm, i.e., clock option 3 and 4)

##### [H] Proposal 1C-2-v1:

The following TPs is proposed for TR38.869v0.1.0 section 6.3.2

----------------------------TP start-------------------------------------------

**6.3.2 Power model for LP-WUR (LR)**

The following power model for LP-WUR is used for evaluation for FR1,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Relative Power (unit) | Transition energy:(unit multiplied by ms) | Ramp-up timeTLR, ramp-up (ms) |
| **Off[1]** | 0.001 | [0.01] | [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2] | TLR, ramp-up = FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up |
| **On[2]** | 0.01/0.05/0.1/0.5/1/2/4FFS: If other values are needed | OFDM-cat 1: FFS 5, 10, 20, 40FFS: OFDM-cat 2: 0.2 |

* FFS: whether further categorization/sub-categorization is needed and how.
* FFS: Mapping from values to a LP-WUR architecture or LP-WUR mode of operation
* FFS: LP-WUR power consumption values for FR2.
* Note1: A unit of power is defined to be the same for main receiver and LP-WUS receiver.
* Note2: the values provided is for the purpose of studying power saving gain, and the values can be further revisit and categorization depending on the receiver architecture discussion.
* Note3: For LP-WUR ‘on’ state, more than one values within the above range may be used for evaluation (e.g. for a single LP-WUR architecture)
* Note4: for OFDM-cat1, clock error option 3 or 4 is assumed, for OFDM-cat2, clock error option 1 or 2 is assumed

[1] Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘off’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR does not perform monitoring

[2] Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring

----------------------------TP End-------------------------------------------

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are in general OK with the proposal. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | For OFDM-based, it can be discussed in AI 9.11.2, since some companies have provided values. Anyway, we are fine for using two categories for OFDM-based. The specific values can be added with bracket. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are not fine with the current proposal. 1. We agreed the list of “0.01/0.05/0.1/0.5/1/2/4” for LP-WUR receiver, and we have never agreed that “0.01/0.05/0.1/0.5/1/2/4” is only for envelope-detection based receivers, and in fact the values are general across the sequence-based correlation receivers also. The higher values proposed for proposed OFDM cat 1 can be added to the end of the existing list, and the Rx architectures agenda item is the better place to perform the mapping of power consumption to architecture.
2. We should also clarify that whether the LP-WUR “On” state includes the power consumption of synchronization. Based on the discussion in previous meetings, it seems current list of “0.01/0.05/0.1/0.5/1/2/4” only considers the detection power but not consider the synchronization power consumption. On the other hand, some companies propose very high power consumption of OFDM based receiver for the purpose of only time/frequency synchronization. Therefore, there exists mis-alignment among companies. In our view, it is better to separately discuss the LP-WUS signal detection power and the synchronization power consumption, considering the power consumption of these two operations on UE shall be very different and the synchronization power consumption can be actually averaged over the long synchronization signal period with a small impact on the final power consumption.

In summary, we propose separately discuss the power consumption of LP-WUS signal detection and time/frequency synchronization:* Clarify that the agreed that the agreed value range of “[0.005/0.01/0.02/0.03/0.05/0.1/0.2/0.5/1/2/4]” only considers the power consumption due to LP-WUS signal detection. This can be reflected actually in the text in the RAN1#110bis agreement: “Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring”;
* Further discuss the power consumption due to time/frequency synchronization, this power consumption value could be much higher considering UE may need to under different hypothesis to detect the correct timing and frequency (as analyzed in MTK’s contribution.). However, it should be noted that this power consumption shall be averaged over the periodicity the UE needs to do the synchronization.
 |
| QC | Although we know that typical OFDM receiver implementation will have higher power consumption than OOK receiver, making hard boundary between the two types of receiver does not make strong sense. We prefer to just add additional power numbers in the list instead of categorizing them as separate column. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | 20, 30, 40 are possible values for OFDM receiver. 5 and 10 are more appropriate for FSK or other modulation schemes. For OFDM-cat 2, it is strange why the relative power could be lower than OOK. The difference between Zero-IF architecture for OFDMA based signal and Zero-IF architecture for OOK based signal should be clarified. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia1 | OK in principle. Noting also that in our paper for the architecture discussion we touched upon the possible saving that could be achieved. Based on that and taking the relative power consumption of 50 (for SSB/CSI processing), we considered 12 in our evaluations. Thus at least relative power of 10 could be considered. |
| Intel | We are Ok with adding relative power values for OFDM receiver.  |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Samsung | We suggest to listing all of relative power candidates together regardless of the type of receiver in this stage. We think whether the relative power value for OFDM-based receiver can be under 4 will be discussed receiver architecture agenda. And, for MC-OOK/FSK receiver, categorization of power model for each architecture can be provided by receiver architecture agenda, as well.Therefore, only larger relative power value which is not agreed yet can be discussed in this stage and we suggest to remove all FFS value e.g., 5, 0.2 in this proposal.On the other hands, Note 4 is also revised according to relative on-state power of LR. |
| CATT | Generally OK with this proposal. |
| Apple | We also prefer to just add additional numbers in the list. The power consumption of each receiver architecture can be discussed under AI 9.11.2. |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL1 | @Spreadtrum, adding [] for the new values@Huawei, removing ‘OFDM-cat’, thus companies can picked up values based on its own architecture. Also, adding a note saying ‘Note5: Up to companies to report whether same or different values are assumed for WUS monitoring and time/frequency synchronization.’@Qualcomm, in principle it’s true, but it is not easy to know the added value. Current way is easier to proceed since companies have reported the value of OFDM receiver.@ZTE, adding 30 for cat1a. @Samsung, Apple, removing the receiver type. Since different OFF values are used, Cat 0 and Cat 1. In principle it is OK to be also discussed in AI9.11.2. Since quite a lot of contributions submitted, and we discussed ED detector power model in 9.11.1, we can also make comments here. The following modified proposal does not say receiver architecture any more. FL make the following update of the proposal. Please see [H] Proposal 1C-2-v2 |

##### [H] Proposal 1C-2-v2:

----------------------------TP start-------------------------------------------

**6.3.2 Power model for LP-WUR (LR)**

The following power model for LP-WUR is used for evaluation for FR1,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Relative Power (unit) | Transition energy:(unit multiplied by ms) | Ramp-up timeTLR, ramp-up (ms) |
| **Off[1]** | 0.001 | [0.01] | [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2] | TLR, ramp-up = FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up |
| **On[2]** | Cat0: 0.01/0.05/0.1/0.5/1/2/4FFS: If other values are needed | Cat 1a: * [10, 20, 30, 40]
* FFS: 5

FFS: Cat 1b:* 0.2
 |

* FFS: whether further categorization/sub-categorization is needed and how.
* FFS: Mapping from values to a LP-WUR architecture or LP-WUR mode of operation
* FFS: LP-WUR power consumption values for FR2.
* Note1: A unit of power is defined to be the same for main receiver and LP-WUS receiver.
* Note2: the values provided is for the purpose of studying power saving gain, and the values can be further revisit and categorization depending on the receiver architecture discussion.
* Note3: For LP-WUR ‘on’ state, more than one values within the above range may be used for evaluation (e.g. for a single LP-WUR architecture)
* Note4:
	+ For cat1a, clock error option 3 or 4 is assumed,
	+ FFS for cat1b, clock error option 1 or 2 is assumed
* Note5: Up to companies to report whether same or different values are assumed for WUS monitoring and time/frequency synchronization.

[1] Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘off’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR does not perform monitoring

[2] Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring

----------------------------TP End-------------------------------------------

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are not sure why we would have a separate Cat 1b when its relative power (0.2) is very close to values already part of Cat 0 and is restricted to the same clock options 1 and 2. We would suggest updating Cat 0 with the value of 0.2 and keep only Cat 0 and Cat 1. |
| Ericsson1 | We prefer the approach suggested by Qualcomm. OK to add additional OFF power value of 0.01 for purpose of evaluation.Some proponents suggest value 40. Given below information from 38.875 (Redcap TR), even MR power consumption for 1Rx and 20MHz seems to 35. We wonder why higher value should be assumed for LP-WUR that will have lower BW and complexity compared to MR.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Relative Power (unit)** | **Transition energy:****(unit multiplied by ms)** | **Ramp-up timeTLR, ramp-up (ms)** |
| **Off** | **0.001/0.01** | **[TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2]** | TLR, ramp-up = FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up |
| **On** | **0.01/0.05/0.1/0.5/1/2/4/10/20****FFS: If other values are needed** |
| * **Note: 0 is for Genie LP-WUR which can be used to show the lowest power consumption (or highest PSG).**
* **Note: Ramp-up time for LP-WUR must be much lower than 15 ms since deep sleep (DS) ramp-up + ramp-down time in 38.840 is 20 ms**
* **TLR, ramp-up is FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up**
* **FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up**
* **FFS: whether further categorization/sub-categorization is needed and how**
 |

Overall, we would be OK with below updates.  |
| Spreadtrum2 | Fine. Also agree with E/// that value of 30 and 40 may not be feasible. |
| OPPO | OK for purpose of evaluation.  |
| Samsung | We prefer to remove Cat1b or include to Cat0. According to proposal, Cat 0 can consume higher on-state power compared to Cat 1b (e.g., 0.5, 1, 2, 4), but lower off-state power than that of Cat 1b. We think that it is not reasonable.Considering the proposal 1A-3-v1 and 1C-2-v2 proposals, our understanding is that clock 3/4 can be assumed only when LR with Cat 1 is on-state or MR is not ultra-deep sleep state. Otherwise, we wonder that clock 3/4 can be assumed for Cat0 with higher on-state power, as well. Current proposal seems that clock 3/4 is only applicable to Cat 1a. |
| CATT | We are OK with Ericsson’s version for simplicity. |   |
| MTK | Okay with Ericsson’s proposal. In our previous t-doc, we suggested 40 because considering a longer monitoring occasion 1ms than monitoring SSB. The power value can be smaller if the monitoring occasion can be shorter.For FL’s proposal, we wonder why Cat 0/1a/1b is needed. If the only intention is to associate with clock error, then clock error is still the working assumption. We need to agree it before using it.  |  |
| vivo  | * For progress, we can accept merging cat 1 into cat 0. For Off value of WUR, we would like to add another value to represent the case that oscillator is maintained for time/frequency tracking, y (e.g., y >= 0.1), because for Off value of 0.001 and 0.01, they are too low for keeping oscillator, but keeping a RTC. Further, among these Off values, companies can report which one is used.
* For ON value, our assumptions mainly come from investigation from literature, if companies have concerns on 40, then 30 can be used instead, which is smaller than the relative power consumption for SSB/CSI processing by 1RX REDCAP.

<Update - vivo>----------------------------TP start-------------------------------------------**6.3.2 Power model for LP-WUR (LR)**The following power model for LP-WUR is used for evaluation for FR1,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Relative Power (unit)** | **Transition energy:****(unit multiplied by ms)** | **Ramp-up timeTLR, ramp-up (ms)** |
| **Off[1]** | 0.001/ [0.01]/ [y, e.g., y>=0.1] | ~~[0.01]~~ | [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2] | TLR, ramp-up = FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up |
| **On[2]** | Cat0: 0.01/0.05/0.1/0.5/1/2/4/10/20/30FFS: If other values are needed | ~~Cat 1a:~~ * ~~[10, 20, 30, 40]~~
* ~~FFS: 5~~

~~FFS: Cat 1b:~~* ~~0.2~~
 |

* FFS: whether further categorization/sub-categorization is needed and how.
* FFS: Mapping from values to a LP-WUR architecture or LP-WUR mode of operation
* FFS: LP-WUR power consumption values for FR2.
* Note1: A unit of power is defined to be the same for main receiver and LP-WUS receiver.
* Note2: the values provided is for the purpose of studying power saving gain, and the values can be further revisit and categorization depending on the receiver architecture discussion.
* Note3: For LP-WUR ‘on’ state, more than one values within the above range may be used for evaluation (e.g. for a single LP-WUR architecture)
* Note4:
	+ ~~For cat1a, clock error option 3 or 4 is assumed,~~
	+ ~~FFS for cat1b, clock error option 1 or 2 is assumed~~
	+ For WUR Off value 0.001 and [0.01], oscillator option 1, 2, 3, 4 are not assumed and only RTC is maintained; For WUR Off value y [y, e.g., y>=0.1], option 1,2,3,4 can be assumed.
* Note5: Up to companies to report whether same or different values are assumed for WUS monitoring and time/frequency synchronization.
 |
| Nokia2 | We also think the updated proposal from Ericsson would be a good way forward. I agree also with the point on the value 40 (missed the 0.7 scaling in my previous comment).  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. As we commented in the first round, we should clarify that the LP-WUR “On” state is for “the power consumption of LP-WUS monitoring”. And add a note to say that the power that is assumed for synchronization shall be discussed/reported separately;
2. 0.02 should be also added in the list, considering it presents the power of sequence based correlation;
3. “Cat0” should be removed. We can discuss the power consumption of each receiver type in AI 9.11.2. no need to introduce category now.
4. For the WUR off value larger than 0.1, we didn’t see any company to propose it. And for WUR off of 0.001 and 0.01 (especially 0.01), we don’t get the point why option 1 and option 2 oscillator is not possible.
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are generally fine with some clarification.After the bandwidth and the Rx is reduced to 20MHz and 1Rx, actually it is more harder to have power reduction when the bandwidth or other components is further reduced without significant structure change. Moreover, actually if WUR is used for measurement, the relative power should be higher, therefore, relative power 30 at least would be reasonable.Therefore, for Cat 1a, we would suggest [20, 30]. As for 10 and other values between 4 and 20, we think there should be a gap between OOK receiver and OFDM receiver, which could be applicable for other receivers with a medium complexity between OOK receiver and OFDM receiver, e.g., PSK. |
| FL2 | @ Ericsson, now the table is merged as follows. Since the intension of new added 10/20/30 are for OFDM receiver, I add a sub-bullet ‘10/20/30 for LP-WUR ON power state are used for OFDM receiver’@vivo, per vivo’s suggestion (adding y for WUROFF), I understand the original intension is to describe the WUR power value when the LP-WUR oscillator clock is maintained in ‘off’ period for a duty-cycled monitoring. So far this is missing. Suggest to consider it. However, do we really need so many values other than 0.001? Suggest to simplify to Y as start point for discussion.@Huawei, 1. My intension for this table for ‘WUR ON’ includes WUS monitoring and sync/measurement, and whether they are using different value can be up to companies report. I have already updated the proposal to add a note saying ‘Up to companies to report whether same or different values are assumed for WUS monitoring and time/frequency synchronization.’
2. I think the current added value 10/20/30 is the values which are not in the range previously. However, 0.02 is already in the range.
3. Removed“Cat0”
4. The Y value is related to this. Thus can discuss the value Y in details.

Please see[H] Proposal 1C-2-v3 |

##### [H] Proposal 1C-2-v3:

----------------------------TP start-------------------------------------------

**6.3.2 Power model for LP-WUR (LR)**

The following power model for LP-WUR is used for evaluation for FR1,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Relative Power (unit)** | **Transition energy:****(unit multiplied by ms)** | **Ramp-up timeTLR, ramp-up (ms)** |
| **Off[1]** | 0.001/ [Y, e.g., Y>=0.1 or 0.01] | [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2] | TLR, ramp-up = FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up |
| **On[2]** | 0.01/0.05/0.1/0.5/1/2/4/10/20/30* ~~FFS: If other values are needed~~
 |

* FFS: whether further categorization/sub-categorization is needed and how.
* FFS: Mapping from values to a LP-WUR architecture or LP-WUR mode of operation
	+ 10/20/30 for LP-WUR ON power state are used for OFDM receiver
* FFS: LP-WUR power consumption values for FR2.
* Note1: A unit of power is defined to be the same for main receiver and LP-WUS receiver.
* Note2: the values provided is for the purpose of studying power saving gain, and the values can be further revisit and categorization depending on the receiver architecture discussion.
* Note3: For LP-WUR ‘on’ state, more than one values within the above range may be used for evaluation (e.g. for a single LP-WUR architecture)
* Note4:
	+ ~~For cat1a, clock error option 3 or 4 is assumed,~~
	+ ~~FFS for cat1b, clock error option 1 or 2 is assumed~~
	+ For WUR Off value 0.001, oscillator option 1, 2, 3, 4 are not assumed and only RTC is maintained; For WUR Off value Y, option 1,2,3,4 can be assumed.
* Note5: Up to companies to report whether same or different values are assumed for WUS monitoring and time/frequency synchronization.

----------------------------TP End-------------------------------------------

#### 1C-3: LR Ramp-up time

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| CATT | Ramp up time from LP-WUS off to ON is assumed as 1ms with the relative power of LP-WUS on to be 0.01 – 0.1.**Proposal 8: The suggested power model for LP-WUR is as follows:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Characteristics** | **Relative Power**  | **Ramp-up time** |
| Periodic low power WUS“ON” state | Front end wakeup receiver is configured to detect the wakeup signals periodically associated with C-DRX or PO.  | [0.01 – 0.1] | --- |
| Periodic low power WUS“OFF” state | Front end wakeup receiver is configured to detect the wakeup signals periodically associated with C-DRX or PO. Otherwise, the wakeup receiver is shut down. | [0.001] | [1ms] |
| Continuous low-power WUS monitoring | Front end wakeup receiver with free-running clock in the active device or passive device monitoring of wakeup signals continuously. | [0.001 – 0.01] | [0ms] |

 |
| ZTE | ***10ms*** *ramp-up time of WUR could be used as the starting point.* |
| Samsung | **Proposal 3: When the relative power value for the on-state of LP-WUR is chosen for the evaluation, the characteristics of the assumed LR architecture should be reflected.*** **E.g., the types of receiver architecture, the presence of LNA/AMP, the type of oscillator, the type of BPF/LPF filter and etc.**
* **The details of LR assumed for the evaluation are up to each company.**

**Proposal 4: Ramp-up time and transition energy from ‘off’ to ‘on’ states should be different according to the power level of ‘on’ state for LR.*** **E.g., on state for 1/2/4 relative power unit, ramp-up time should not be neglected.**
 |
| Ericsson | 10ms is assumed for ramp up time of LP-WUR on-off |
| vivo | 10ms |
| Nokia | **Table 2. WUR power consumption assumptions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *LP-WUR* | Relative power  | Transition time and energy(if applicable) |
| LP-WUS monitoring, always-on receiver  |  [0.1]\* |  |
| LP-WUS monitoring, duty cycled receiver | Monitoring: [4.0] or [12.0]Off: [0.001] | { 10ms, TLR, ramp-up \*(PON - POFF)/2 } |
| []\* : Values are preliminary and to be considered further based on the LP-WUR architecture discussion. |

 |

##### [H] Proposal 1C-3-v1:

**When the relative power of LP-WUR “on” is no less than 1unit, the ramp-up time from LP-WUR ‘off’ to ‘on’ is assumed as 10ms for evaluation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For the LP-WUR power consumption, currently the agreed power is 2 and 4, and some companies are proposing larger values, e.g. 20 and 40. It is not clear regarding the assumption of power unit for LP-WUR when we propose the corresponding ramp-up time is 10ms.Therefore, we prefer to firstly discuss Proposal 1C-2-v1 clearly, then discuss the ramp-up latency for the considered values.  |
| QC | It is not clear why the boundary is “1 unit”. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | From relative power 0.01 to 40, we do not think the 10ms is enough, since for RedCap UE from deep sleep 0.8 to PDCCH only for cross-slot scheduling with relative power 40, the transition time is 20ms. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia1 | OK. On relation to ZTE comment, in our view the transition time is more defined by the change in processing, and not solely determined by the (relative) power difference. |
| Samsung | For completeness of the proposal, ramp-up time for relative on-state power less than 1 unit should also be provided. e.g., 0ms |
| CATT | We are not OK with this proposal. We think the LP-WUR with less than 1 unit relative power should be prioritized. And, the characteristics of the LP-WUR with no less than 1 unit relative power should be clarified before the discussion of the corresponding ramp-up time.  |
| Apple | The number seems to be somewhat arbitrary, and it is not clear if assuming the same ramp-up time for all values is reasonable. We think there should be some correlation between the ramp-up time and the power consumption of LP-WUR ON. E.g. we assume 5ms for relative power 1 and 10ms for relative power 4. But if majority companies prefer this way for simplicity, we could be fine with it. |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL1 | As commented by Nokia, if the transition time is more defined by the change in processing, can we make the following proposal for simplicity. |

##### [H] Proposal 1C-3-v2:

**~~When the relative power of LP-WUR “on” is no less than 1unit,~~ The ramp-up time from LP-WUR ‘off’ to ‘on’ is assumed as 10ms for evaluation. Other values are not precluded for evaluation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are Ok with the update. |
| Spreadtrum2 | Fine |
| OPPO | OK with the update. |
| Samsung | We are fine to proposal. |
| xiaomi | Fine with the update. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | From our understanding, the ramp-up time may consist of hardware tune on e.g., boot, memory load and etc, not related to the processing, as shown in the following Note: Note1: * + Ramp-up time may consist of the procedure for [main radio hardware tune on e.g., boot, memory load and etc.],

Different receiver with different complexity actually has different ramp-up time. It is not fair to set all the receiver has the same ramp-up time. At least, for Cat 1a and Cat0, two set of values should be defined. For example,Cat 0: [6ms, 8ms, 10ms]Cat 1a:[10ms, 12ms, 14ms]Other values are not precluded.Actually, if the WUR goes to deeper sleep as relative power 0.01, the power consumption and ramp time would be higher. Therefore, we doubt the ramp time 15ms from 0.01 to 20 or 30 can not be realized. For comparison, the MR from deep sleep (power:1) to MR-on (the power may be less than 35), the transition time is 20ms. And now, the simplified OFDM receiver from deeper sleep (power:0.01) to WUR-on (the power may be 20 or 30) is less than 15ms. We are not sure it is possible. Hope more evidence could be clarified. |
| CATT | OK |
| Vivo | We are OK.  |
| Nokia2 | OK |
| Intel | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We think the ramp up time relates with the assumption of the state of LP WUR ON. We are not fine to just simply say it is 10ms w/o any details. |

#### 1C-4: measurement assumptions details

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| vivo | **Proposal 7: For RRM measurement assumptions in RRC idle/inactive mode, the following options can be considered.*** **Option 1: RRM measurement is only performed by MR.**
* **Option 2: LP-WUR performs RRM measurement based on periodic lower power signal e.g., LP-SS. MR performs relaxed RRM measurement every X I-DRX cycles, where X can be 10 or 20.**
* **Option 3: RRM measurement is only performed by LP-WUR.**

**Vivo suggest 1.28s in contributions submitted in AT9.11.3** |
| Sony | ***Proposal 4 – Consider low-power mechanism to support mobility and cell re-selection mechanism for UEs with LP-WUR.***  |
| Huawei | The periodicity of LP-SS can be assumed to be 400 ms, which can be used for the evaluation of resource overhead and network energy consumption. |
| Qualcomm | **Chart, line chart  Description automatically generated**Figure CDF of Delta RSRP = Genie RSRP – LP-SS based RSRP**Observation 15:** $\pm 2$ **dB delta RSRP relative to genie RSRP may be achievable 90% of the time using OOK based LP-SS at SNR=-3 dB and realistic clock model.**  |
| Nokia | Now as the LP-WUS maybe sent rather infrequently (depending on the paging rate and number of UEs addressed by the LP-WUS), maintaining a frequency syncronisation during these periods would still be necessary. Hence, as discussed in past meetings considering some form of periodic LP signal to facilitate maintaining the frequency synchronisation would be beneficial. However, based on the performance evaluations [5] and assumed assumed drift and maximum error models agreed in last meeting (below), the periodicity of the LP syncronisation signal can be rather long, e.g. in order of 10s.**Proposal 11: Consider LP synchronisation signal for (at least) for frequency tracking.** |

##### [H] Proposal 1C-4-v1:

The period of low power synchronization signal for evaluation can be {400ms, 1.28s, 10s(at least for frequency tracking) }

* Note: the purpose of the low power synchronization signal can be for LR synchronization (i.e., time and/or frequency tracking) or measurement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Generally OK with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Periodic synchronization can be relaxed for LP-WUS. Periodic measurement can be in the order of I-DRX cycle like that of main radio. Therefore, we think it should be no smaller than 1.28s. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are in general fine with the proposal with the following comments:1. The periodicity relates to the design of LP-SS and also the required timing error/frequency error budget for LP-WUS signal detection. Based on our study, 400ms is needed for the synchronization. Larger value may be possible if the LP-SS can provide better synchronization performance and the LP-WUS signal waveform is designed more robust w.r.t time/frequency error. Therefore, we prefer to keep 400ms as a starting point and say larger value can be considered if justified;
2. Regarding the note, it should be “Note: the purpose of the low power synchronization signal can be for LR synchronization (i.e., time and/or frequency tracking) and/or measurement”
 |
| QC | Agree on the proposal. Other values should not be precluded.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Serving cell measurement period is based on DRX cycle, i.e., 0.32s,0.64s,1.28s, 2.56s. To offload the measurement to WUR, similar measurement period can be assumed for LP-SS. Therefore, we would suggest the following values for LP-SS evaluation: {160ms, 320ms, 640ms, 1280ms, 2560ms, 5120ms, 10240ms}Regarding 160ms, we think if LP-SS can be used to replace SSB, the performance may be worse than SSB. Therefore, more frequent LP-SS could be considered to guarantee the measurement performance. |
| Xiaomi | Generally fine. But other values for periodicity should not be precluded and can be reported by companies.  |
| Nokia1 | (Based on agenda) the proposal seems to be for the purpose of power saving evaluations. We think that it would be good to clarify the purpose e.g. (…for power saving evaluation..). As noted by others, the sync performance etc. the performance together with the assumed clock drift would determine the needed periodicity, thus these could be preliminary values for power saving evaluation.A minor note that our note “(at least for frequency tracking)” related more to the purpose of the LP-SS rather than the period, thus is not needed as it is covered in sub-bullet.  |
| Intel | We are fine to take the proposed values as start point. other values should not be excluded which are subjected to further study. For the note, it may be revised as ‘for LR synchronization (i.e., time and/or frequency tracking) and/or measurement’ since a LP-SS may be used for both sync and RRM too. Then, what will be the metric in the study of proper periodicity? The example may be timing/frequency error, RRM accuracy, power consumption, and etc.  |
| Samsung | We think that we do not need to restrict the period of low power synchronization signal for evaluation. It can be reported by company. |
| Apple | We wonder why 400 ms is chosen. It does not fit into NR numerology very well. The gap between 1.28 s and 10 s seems too large. We prefer the values proposed by ZTE. |
| LGE | We share the view with ZTE, Sanechips. It would be better to reflect current periodicity of DRX. |
| FL1 | @Spreadtrum, considering the i\_DRX cycle 320ms, it should be OK to also include that value as well.@ZTE, considering some companies are concerning the value less than i-DRX, perhaps it’s better to focused on the values for i-DRX as start point, but other values are not precluded.@Nokia, adding for power evaluation to address your comment.@Intel, adding ‘and’@Samsung, the purpose of the proposal to reduce the variance of the assumptions. And Other values are not precludedMake update as follows |

##### [H] Proposal 1C-4-v2:

The period of low power synchronization signal for power evaluation can be {320ms, 640ms, 1280ms, 2560ms, 5120ms, 10240ms ~~400ms, 1.28s, 10s(at least for frequency tracking)~~}

* Other values are not precluded
* Note: the purpose of the low power synchronization signal can be for LR synchronization (i.e., time and/or frequency tracking) and/or measurement.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| SONY | OK with these values for evaluation.The periodicity should be decided based on the receiver architecture and possible frequency/clock accuracy and not independent from them. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with updates. |
| Ericsson1 | The period should include 20ms to reflect use of SSB. Our preference is removing second sub-bullet (Note), but if it is to be kept, suggest to leave the purpose description up to the proponent. <Updates>The period of ~~low power~~ synchronization signal for power evaluation can be * 20ms for evaluations assuming SSB
* For evaluations assuming LP-SS
	+ { 320ms, 640ms, 1280ms, 2560ms, 5120ms, 10240ms ~~400ms, 1.28s, 10s(at least for frequency tracking)~~}
* Other values are not precluded
* Note: companies to report the purpose of the low power synchronization signal along with evaluations , e.g. can be for LR synchronization (i.e., time and/or frequency tracking) and/or measurement.
 |
| Spreadtrum2 | OK for evaluation purpose |
| OPPO | OK with these values for evaluation. |
| Samsung | We think that the period of synchronization signal can affect the results of LLS when time/frequency errors are modeled considering the periodicity of synchronization signal. Therefore, these values can be used for detection performance evaluation as well as power evaluation. |
| xiaomi | Fine with the update. |
| CATT | OK for evaluation purpose. |
| MTK | Agree with Ericsson. Suggest including SSB and the period: ms20, ms40, ms80, ms160. |
| Vivo | In principle fine with the change by Ericsson.It should be clarified other SSb period should also be allowed.<Updates - vivo>The period of low power synchronization signal for power evaluation can be * {20ms, 40ms, 80ms, 160ms} for evaluations assuming SSB
* For evaluations assuming LP-SS
	+ { 320ms, 640ms, 1280ms, 2560ms, 5120ms, 10240ms 400ms, 1.28s, 10s(at least for frequency tracking)}
* Other values are not precluded
* Note: companies to report the purpose of the low power synchronization signal along with evaluations , e.g. can be for LR synchronization (i.e., time and/or frequency tracking) and/or measurement.
 |
| Nokia2 | We are OK with the proposal, and also with the updates proposed by Ericsson/MTK |
| Intel | OK |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with it.Regarding the periodicity of SSB, we prefer not to include in this proposal, considering this focuses on the assumed periodicity of LP-SS signal. For the use of SSB, it is up to companies' report considering SSB periodicity exists in legacy NR system and no need to agree it in this proposal for the Low power synchronization signal. |
| Futurewei | Just to clarify, is the purpose of including the SSB as a synchronization signal to capture (a) a LP-WUR that is capable of receiving SSB, (b) usage of MR with relaxed periodicity to assist in LP-WUR synchronization?Also, if SSB is being added as a synchronization signal, I think the main text needs to change to generalize to any synchronization signal instead of a low power synchronization signal. We suggest the following edits:[H] Proposal 1C-4-v2:For power evaluation, Tthe period of low power the synchronization signal used for LP-WUR synchronization for power evaluation can be follow one of the following options* Option 1: Considering SSB as the synchronization signal
	+ {20ms, 40ms, 80ms, 160ms, 320ms}
	+ FFS: whether LP-WUR is directly used to receive SSB
* Option 1: Considering a low power synchronization signal
	+ {320ms, 640ms, 1280ms, 2560ms, 5120ms, 10240ms 400ms, 1.28s, 10s(at least for frequency tracking)}
* Other values are not precluded
* Note: the purpose of the low power synchronization signal can be for LR synchronization (i.e., time and/or frequency tracking) and/or measurement.
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the proposal.We think the LP-SS includes the sync signal received by WUR, also including OFDM based WUR. Therefore, there is no need to remove ‘low power’. |
| FL2 | @Ericsson, make changes according to your comments.@vivo, MTK, adding 20ms, 40ms, 80ms, 160ms, @FutureWei, adding 320ms as suggested. Regarding whether (a) or (b) is used can be separately discussed and reported. The last note also mentions a bit. But here the proposal only focused on the possible values for each synchronization signal for power evaluation. Make changes as follows. Please see [H] Proposal 1C-4-v3 |

##### [H] Proposal 1C-4-v3:

The period of ~~low power~~ synchronization signal for power evaluation can be

* {20ms, 40ms, 80ms, 160ms, 320ms} for evaluations assuming SSB
* For evaluations assuming LP-SS
	+ { 320ms, 640ms, 1280ms, 2560ms, 5120ms, 10240ms ~~400ms, 1.28s, 10s(at least for frequency tracking)~~}
* Other values are not precluded

Note: companies to report the purpose of the ~~low power~~ synchronization signal along with evaluations , e.g. can be for LR synchronization (i.e., time and/or frequency tracking) and/or measurement.

#### 1C-5: Sync/re-sync assumption:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Futurewei | LP-WUS may imply/convey some timing and serving cell information to MR. And study two alternatives for MR sync/re-sync:* *MR Sync Alt 1: PSS/SSS search for, e.g., [40, 80, 120]ms, with no LP-WUS assistance.*
* *MR Sync Alt 2: No PSS/SSS search with LP-WUS assistance.*
 |
| CATT | at least 3 SSBs are needed for MR acquiring Time/Frequency synchronization after wakeup |
| ZTE | at least 3 SSBs are required for sync/re-sync when main radio wakes up from the state of ultra-deep sleep. |
| Qualcomm | 1 or 3SSBs for sync/re-sync considering different SNR.**Proposal 4: Use the following values for additional X time units required for sync/re-sync of the MR:*** **X = 50 ms for low SNR**
* **X= 20 ms for high SNR**
 |
| vivo | Table 1. The assumptions of Sync/re-sync time and energy

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sync/re-sync time [ms]** | **Sync/re-sync energy [ms\*units]** |
| **Number of SSBs for sync/re-sync =3[1]** | 60 | 2180 |
| **Number of SSBs for sync/re-sync =5[1]** | 100 | 3340 |
| Note 1: 10ms continuous monitoring from the beginning of sync-re-sync time is assumed. |

**Proposal 4: For sync/re-sync time and energy, Table 1 of R1-2302506 can be assumed.** |
| Spreadtrum | ***Proposal 1: 3/6/9 SSBs for sync/re-sync for ultra-deep sleep can be assumed for different channel condition respectively.*** |
| InterDigital | ***Proposal 4:*** *For total time for sync/re-sync of MR, support up to 10 SSBs for FR2 as well as FR1.* |

##### [M] Proposal 1C-5-v1:

For FR1 evaluation,

* Number of SSBs for sync/re-sync for MR can be at least 3
	+ Companies to report sync/re-sync time and energy consumption

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | The minimum number of SSBs required for sync/re-sync and timeline will depend on whether LP-WUR can assist the MR in time and frequency synchronization or not. We suggest to wait till discussions on LP-WUR synchronization and assistance to MR is progressed under AI9.11.3. |
| DOCOMO | We agree with Futurewei the number of SSBs needed depends on whether there is the ability of the WUR to transfer information about synchronization to the MR. Thus, we suggest the following modification. For FR1 evaluation,* Number of SSBs for sync/re-sync for MR can be at least 3 in cases where LP-WUR does not assist the MR in time and frequency synchronization,
	+ Companies to report sync/re-sync time and energy consumption
	+ FFS: Number of SSBs for sync/re-sync for MR in cases where LP-WUR assist the MR in time and frequency synchronization
 |
| Spreadtrum | Fine |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Not sure what’s the purpose of this proposal since it implies a large range of sync/re-sync time.The number of SSB needed could be reduced to less than 3 if LP-WUR can assist the synchronization of MR. |
| QC | As HW pointed, LP-WUR could also help MR sync.Prefer to leave company to report. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK with the proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia1 | As noted others, it would be good to clarify whether this assumption is independent of e.g. possible existence of LP-SS and related assistance information from LR. As discussed earlier, the RAN4 requirements (for CONNECTED mode UEs) give somewhat pessimistic picture of the timeline/number of SSBs, thus these numbers seem rather aggressive, but if companies are fine to commit to these from latency perspective, no strong concern. Also the time for continuous search would be good to align e.g. 20ms prior the 3 SSBs. |
| Intel | After waking-up, the MR needs to do sync/resync and do RRM too. Is the current proposal of 3 SSBs shared for both sync/resync and RRM (for both serving cell and intra-frequency cells) ?We share views from FutureWei and DoCoMo. With assistance of LP-WUS, UE can know the timing of MR (assuming LP-WUS timing is configured related to MR timing), though there is still a need for frequency synchronization.  |
| Samsung | We think that the number of SSBs can be different according to SINR and whether assistant from LP-WUR on timing determination is used (which is up to implementation), thus lower than 3 SSB can be also used for sync/re-sync of MR waked up from ultra-deep sleep state. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | OK |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL1 | At least two discussion point* Q1: Do you think the number of SSB depending on whether LP-WUR assist the MR in time and frequency synchronization? [DOCOMO][Huawei][Nokia]
* Q2: Do you think whether RRM for MR is performed for sync/resync process? [Intel]

Based on that, Q3 is askedQ3: which is preferred for you, * Alt 1: Companies to report assumptions asked in Q1 and Q2 and the number of SSBs for sync/re-sync for MR
* Alt 2: Companies to report assumptions asked in Q1 and Q2, agree on value(s) for each case
* Alt 3: Companies to report the number of SSBs for sync/re-sync for MR without clarifying anything.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We would prefer Alt 2. |
| Ericsson1 | We are OK with Alt1 at this stage.  |
| Spreadtrum2 | Alt 2 is encouraged, but Alt 1 is enough. In our assumption, 3 SSBs is suitable for good channel condition, without assumption of LP-WUR assistance, and with assumption of sync/resync is based on these 3 SSBs. In PEI discussion, 1 SSB is assumed for good channel condition, so we think there could be 2 more SSBs used for sync/resync after wakeup from ultra-deep-sleep. |
| Samsung | We prefer Alt 1. For Q1 and Q2, our answer is Yes for both question. |
| CATT | Alt2.  |
| MTK | Q1: No. LPWUR can assist SFN to reduce MR blind timing search. To save SSB, LPWUR must maintain clock and PLL when MR enters to ultra-deep sleep. However, even that MR still needs 3 SSB for AGC settling. Considering at least 3 SSBs is reasonable.Q2: YesQ3: Alt2.  |
| Vivo | Either Alt 1 or Alt 2 is OK |
| Nokia2 | Alt1 would be aligned in our thinking.On Q2, in my recollection in earlier evaluations it was assumed that the serving cell evaluation was included in pre-PO SSB detection.  |
| Intel | Alt 2 is preferred. But Alt 1 is acceptable if hard to converge on the values |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Alt.2 is preferred, but if not achieved in the meeting, Alt.1 is acceptable.  |
| FL2 | Q3:* Alt 1: Ericsson, Spreadtrum, vivo, Nokia, Intel(2nd), Huawei(2nd)
* Alt 2: Futurewei, Spreadtrum, CATT, MTK, vivo, Intel, Huawei

It seems still controversial. FL encourage companies to further comment |
| OPPO | ‘Yes’ for both Q1 and Q2.For Q3, we prefer Alt 2, and Alt1 is acceptable. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 1D: Others

* **Discussion on resource overhead or NW power consumption:**

need to be considered and modeled: Futurewei, Ericsson, ZTE,vivo, Sony

not support to consider NW power consumption as performance metric: InterDigital

* **Evaluation assumption on MR sleep state during LP-WUS monitoring for RRC connected mode**

Vivo: In RRC connected mode, Ultra-deep sleep state of main radio should not be applied. And UE main radio can enter micro, light or deep sleep state during LP-WUS monitoring.

* **Correct per UE paging probability to**RE = 1 – (1 – RE, REF )(K-L+1)Y/YREF

Nordic

* **Number of UE in each group:**

CATT: less than 8

Ericsson: 10

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Futurewei: | * Study the impact of defining a shorter DRX cycle (<320 ms), i.e., for the MR to monitor POs after waking up due to reception of LP-WUS, on latency and overall paging resource overhead.
* Resource overhead: LP-WUS design options/functions and mapping to time/frequency resource requirements need to be defined for proper evaluation of the network resource overhead in support of LP-WUS/WUR.
* Consider LP-WUR monitoring of at least a tracking and/or a RAN notification area level beacon that is transmitted with reasonable periodicity to alleviate the impact of MR’s low periodicity RRM measurements on latency.
* Latency definition: For a LP-WUS carrying a UE unique ID, the latency is defined as the average time between the arrival of data at gNB and the UE’s completion of MR synchronization upon detection of a corresponding LP-WUS.
* Ignore the latency impact of SI update on paging procedure due to its infrequent occurrence as part of paging procedure.
 |
| CATT | **Proposal 4: The Latency\_2 is mainly affected by the MR ramp-up and preparation for paging message reception with the addition of the RACH response time. The Latency\_2 is suggested in a range of 500ms~2200ms.****Proposal 5: The total latency can be divided into three independent parts associated with different dependent components: Latency\_0 for gNB preparation, Latency\_1 for LP-WUR monitoring the LP-WUS and Latency\_3 for MR waking up and detecting paging message, the expression of latency can be formulated as: Total Latency = Latency \_0 + Latency\_1 + Latency \_2.**Discussion on the maximum number of UE in each group should be less than 8**Proposal 6: The number of UE in the same group should be less than 8 for 14.8% paging group rate under 1% paging rate per UE.** **Proposal 7: The number of UE in the same group should not be more than 8 for i-DRX and e-DRX with RE, REF below 1%.**  |
| Ericsson | For evaluations, use **N=10** and the resulting range of RG={10%, 1%, 0.1%, 0.01%} for the per group paging probability.1. The following general framework should be used as starting point for WUS evaluations:
* Transmission of LP-WUS should not require new gNB hardware and should not trigger new emissions/compliance requirements for gNBs.
* It should be possible to dynamically reuse unused LP-WUS resources for other NR transmissions (i.e., dedicated time/frequency resource reservation for WUS should be avoided).
* It should be possible to multiplex LP-WUS with other NR transmissions in time or frequency domain without causing interference.
* LP-WUS is transmitted on Uu interface from gNB to UE.
1. Impact of LP-WUS/WUR operation on NW Energy Efficiency should be considered especially if LP-WUS transmissions require significantly more time/frequency resources compared to PDCCH or require additional always-on transmissions (e.g., LP-SS) from gNB.
 |
| ZTE | Discuss the assumption for system overhead and NW power evaluation.***Proposal 1: The following KPIs on LP-WUS should be further evaluated******• System overhead******• Network power consumption******• Co-existence impacts******Proposal 2: Clarify the latency definition for different RRC states.*** the latency means the time interval between LP-WUS and PRACH in idle/inactive mode. In connected mode, the latency means the time interval between LP-WUS and PDSCH with data.***Proposal 13: Discuss the LP-WUS transmission assumption in idle/inactive mode for evaluation and capture how to calculate the system overhead.******Proposal 14: For NW power evaluation, discuss the LP-WUS or LP-SS transmission assumption, and load scenarios in idle/inactive mode.*** |
| Samsung | **Proposal 2: The latency for RRC\_CONNECTED state is defined as the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first UE specific data channel reception.****Proposal 6: The power model in the Table 3.2 should be considered as a baseline to evaluate i-DRX/e-DRX operation for eMBB case.** |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 2: Following KPIs are evaluated: data rate, false wakeup probability (due to grouping and false alarm), and misdetection probability.****Proposal 5: For study, add following additional power numbers (0, 10,20,40) for LP-WUR power consumption in On state.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Relative Power (unit) | Transition energy:(unit multiplied by ms) | Ramp-up timeTLR, ramp-up (ms) |
| **Off** | **0.001** | **[TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2]** | TLR, ramp-up = FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up |
| **On** | **0/0.01/0.05/0.1/0.5/1/2/4/10/20/40****FFS: If other values are needed** |
| * Note: 0 is for Genie LP-WUR which can be used to show the lowest power consumption (or highest PSG).
* Note: Ramp-up time for LP-WUR must be much lower than 15 ms since deep sleep (DS) ramp-up + ramp-down time in 38.840 is 20 ms
* TLR, ramp-up is FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up
* FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up
* ~~FFS: whether further categorization/sub-categorization is needed and how~~
 |

**Observation 1: Possible options for LP-WUS BW configuration include 1MHz, 5MHz, and 20MHz.** **Proposal 8 : Prioritize 5MHz for LP-WUS bandwidth.****Proposal 10: For both link level and power evaluations LP-WUS, the following false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS can be assumed: ~~[~~0.1%, 1%~~, 10%~~].****Proposal 11: Target false alarm probability of LP-WUS is at most 1%.** |
| Nokia | Proposal 1: Down prioritize the sidelink related studies for time being.**Proposal 2: Consider implications to network energy efficiency in studied LP-WUS related designs.**Proposal 3: LP-WUS design and LP-WUR architecture should support flexible placement in frequency domain.Proposal 4: The wake-up signal design and wake up receiver architecture defined, allows efficient reuse of gNB hardware for signal generation.Proposal 5: The LP-WUS/WUR design should ensure that legacy receiver performance is not affected and efficient multiplexing with existing NR signals and channels is possible to limit the resource reservation.Proposal 6: Coverage and mobility implications should be accounted for in LP-WUS design and LP-WUR architecture assumptions. |
| vivo | **Observation 28:** **Additional network energy consumption caused by LP-WUS/WUR operation can be minimized, e.g., gNB can transmit LP-WUS in the slot with existing NR signal that to be transmitted.****Proposal 8: In RRC connected mode, Ultra-deep sleep state of main radio should not be applied. And UE main radio can enter micro, light or deep sleep state during LP-WUS monitoring.** |
| Xiaomi | ***Proposal 1: For RRC idle/inactive state, two use cases can be considered for evaluation:******Case 1, LP WUS combined with legacy paging mechanism;******Case 2, LP WUS combined with enhanced paging mechanism.***  |
| Nordic  | ***Proposal-3:*** *For e-DRX, per UE paging probability should corrected* *to* RE = 1 – (1 – RE, REF )(K-L+1)Y/YREF |
| Sony | ***Observation 5 – LP-WUS length, the amount information it carries, and the technique used for its multiplexing in an OFDM transmitter impact the number of resources for LP-WUS transmission and its associated system overhead.*** ***Proposal 5 – Support an adaptive configuration where the UE, depending on its delay requirement, can operate based on an always-on or a duty-cycle scheme.***Average delay = ½ sleep time + transition time + signal miss detection × average time for re-transmission |
| InterDigital | ***Proposal 1:*** *NW power consumption/energy efficiency is not adopted as a performance metric.****Proposal 5:*** *Confirm the current definition of transition energy (i.e., TLR, ramp-up \*(PON – POFF)/2) for LP-WUR.* |
| Huawei | If UE is not required to monitor a PO after wake-up, latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB, and the time of the first RO UE can transmit PRACH in after LP‑WUS detection. |

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

Update as followings for the e-DRX paging probability

Note:

* For i-DRX with cycle duration Y second,
	+ Per UE paging probability RE = 1 – (1 – RE, REF )Y/YREF
* For e-DRX with K i-DRX cycles duration, PTW duration of L i-DRX cycles, and an i-DRX cycle duration Y second
	+ Per UE paging probability is
		- RE = 1 – (1 – RE, REF )(K-L+1)Y/YREF for the first i-DRX cycle within the PTW
		- RE = 1 – (1 – RE, REF )Y/YREF for each of the remaining L-1 i-DRX cycles within the PTW
	+ L=4

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the update. |
| DOCOMO | We support this proposal. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | OK |
| QC | We prefer to have L=1 and 4. L=1 would correspond to the case of having i-DRX with much larger cycle than allowed for now. This is useful configuration for study purpose. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia1 | OK |
| Intel | We support this proposal. |
| Samsung | We are fine to update. |
| CATT | Agree with the updated proposal. |
| Apple | OK |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson1 | OK |
| MTK | Okay |
| FL1 | @Qualcomm, the purpose of the proposal is correct the formula. I would like to know if other companies can accept adding L=1 before updating. |

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

##### [M] Proposal 1D-2-v1:

Update the transition energy from [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2] to [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON-POFF)/2] for LP-WUR power model.

* Note: this assumes the power consumption during the transition time is sum of transition energy and LP-WUR OFF energy, e.g., similar definition as the transition energy in TR38.840

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the update. |
| DOCOMO | We support this proposal. |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the update. |
| QC | okay |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OK |
| Xiaomi | Fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia1 | OK |
| Intel | We support this proposal. |
| Samsung | Considering the background of update for the equation, we suggest to change wording from “the transition energy” to “additional transition energy” as follows:Update the additional transition energy from [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2] to [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON-POFF)/2] for LP-WUR power model.* Note: this assumes the power consumption during the transition time is sum of additional transition energy and LP-WUR OFF energy, e.g., similar definition as the additional transition energy in TR38.840
 |
| CATT | Agree. |
| Apple | OK |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson1 | OK |
| MTK | Ok |
| FL1 | It seems the wording proposed by Samsung is reasonable. The proposal is updated as follows, |

##### [M] Proposal 1D-2-v2:

Update the additional transition energy from [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2] to [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON-POFF)/2] for LP-WUR power model.

* Note: this assumes the power consumption during the transition time is sum of additional transition energy and LP-WUR OFF energy, e.g., similar definition as the additional transition energy in TR38.840

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Support. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Issue 2: Others

### 2A: Remaining issues for use case descriptions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Qualcomm | **Proposal 1:*** **Latency requirement for IoT Idle mode cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc.**
	+ **Order of seconds (0.64, 1.28 sec)**
* **Latency requirement for wearable Idle mode cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,**
	+ **Order of seconds (0.64, 1.28 sec)**
* **Latency requirement for eMBB Idle mode cases including e.g., smart phones and etc.,**
* **Latency requirement for eMBB/XR Connected mode cases including**
	+ **Order of milliseconds [0.5, 1, 2ms]**
 |
| Ericsson | **Observation 1 Latency requirements for use cases mentioned in the SID such as industrial controllers, actuators etc., and wearables range from tens of milliseconds, hundreds of milliseconds to several seconds. For XR, the requirements are in few milliseconds to few tens of milliseconds range.****Proposal 1 Study the following further:****• Applicability of RRC IDLE/INACTIVE vs. RRC CONNECTED mode operation of LP-WUS/WUR considering latency requirements and expected data activity for different use cases mentioned in the SID.****• Feasible latency at which LP-WUR can wake up MR while still providing power saving gain.****Proposal 2 Include ‘latency’ as a use case characteristic for IoT, Wearables, and eMBB.** |
| vivo | **Proposal 2: Consider the following as the latency target by applying LP-WUS/WUR:*** **Within 1 or 2 seconds for latency-sensitive IoT cases and within several or tens of seconds for other IoT cases;**
* **Within several seconds for wearable cases;**
* **Within several milliseconds for XR use case and within tens of milliseconds for other eMBB use cases;**
 |
| Sony | **Proposal 1 – Prioritize LP-WUS/WUR for power-sensitive, low-traffic, small form factor devices as in IoT use cases (such as industrial sensors, controllers) and wearables where delay requirement or device reachability in time is short.**  |
| LG | **Proposal 1: Update the following latency characteristic for target use cases.*** **IoT cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc, including the following characteristics,**
	+ **latency-tolerable (e.g., the order of seconds)**
* **Wearable cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,**
	+ **latency- tolerable (e.g., the order of seconds)**
* **eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,**

**latency-sensitive (e.g., the order of milliseconds)** |
| Nordic  | ***Proposal-1:*** *For the latency of industrial IoT use-case, consider 100ms to 10s as design criteria.* |

##### [M] Proposal 2A-v1:

The latency for the target use cases are considered as follows:

* IoT cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc, including the following characteristics,
	+ Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds
* Wearable cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,
	+ Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds
* eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,
	+ Latency for RRC CONNECTED mode is in the order of milliseconds

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal |
| OPPO | OK with the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Latency for RRC CONNECTED mode should be stringent for indication in scheduling PDCCH, e.g. PDCCH skipping, SSSG switching, but it can be relaxed for WUS before C-DRX like DCI format 2\_6. For RRC IDLE/INACTIVE, some companies proposed to use LP-WUS for IoT case to enable latency reduction. In this case continuous monitoring is efficient. * IoT cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc, including the following characteristics,
	+ Non time critical: Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds
	+ Time critical: Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of milliseconds
* Wearable cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,
	+ Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds
* eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,
	+ Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is already clear enough for the use cases discussion, and we have already used much time to discuss without a consensus to includes these latency target. No need to use our limited time to repeat the discussion. |
| QC | Agree with FL w/o change. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | For eMBB especially for XR traffic, to be more specific, the latency should be order of several milliseconds |
| Nokia1 | We are OK with the FL proposal. |
| Intel | We support this proposal. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Samsung | eMBB cases for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode should be added “in the order of seconds” |
| CATT | OK with the proposal. |
| Apple | We would like to add the sub-bullet “Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds” for eMBB case as well, which is a reasonable target. |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. |
| FL1 | It seems most companies are OK in principle. FL addressed the following comments,@Samsung, Apple, eMBB cases for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode added “in the order of seconds”@Spreadtrum, it is a bit confused for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode, how can the latency be achieved in the order of milliseconds. Perhaps more clarifications needed before I can update.Please see a revised [M] Proposal 2A-v2 |

##### [M] Proposal 2A-v2:

The latency for the target use cases are considered as follows:

* IoT cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc, including the following characteristics,
	+ Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds
* Wearable cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,
	+ Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds
* eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,
	+ Latency for RRC CONNECTED mode is in the order of milliseconds
	+ Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the update. |
| Ericsson1 | It is not clear to us why the time-critical scenarios that need tighter latency than ‘order of seconds’ are skipped for IoT and wearables. Could the proponents clarify? If going by FL suggested approach, suggest adding separate main bullet at the end that applies all the cases, i.e. as follows: * For above cases
	+ Latency for RRC CONNECTED mode is in the order of milliseconds
	+ Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds
 |
| Spreadtrum2 | Fine. We assume continuous monitoring for IoT case, so there could be several millisecond to detect LP-WUS and initiate RACH and then complete RACH within 100ms, if mission-critical is optimized for IoT use case. However, we miss to calculate the transition time 400ms. In our memory, IEEE 802.11ba can support mission-critical use case, since the transition time is not assume so large. We kept in mind the mission-critical use case in one of our targets. The current proposal looks like we do not pursue the latency KPI any more… From our side, we support latency reduction for IoT use case which may not have additional PSG than before. For example, it can be used for LPHAP to reduce latency. |
| Samsung | We are fine to the update. |
| CATT | Ok with the update.  |
| MTK | Okay |
| vivo | we are fine with the modification by Ericsson |
| Nokia2 | Just a note that for eMBB and IDLE/Inactive, I’m not sure if we can assume as relaxed call set-up delays as for more M2M type of use cases, thus I would be rather cautious to extend it much beyond second |
| Intel | Ok with the update.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Before the agreement, is this as a evaluation target or not? If not, why we need to it? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are generally fine. Similar with Spreadtrum, the current proposal seems does not pursue the latency KPI. Therefore, we suggest to add a Note:Note: the reduced latency is still a pursued KPI. |
| FL2 | @Huawei, we have FFS for latency in the last meeting agreement. This is proposal is try to solve this.@Spreadtrum, even without 400ms transition time, it’s still need more than several milliseconds to transmit data in IDLE. @Nokia, understand your concern. FL has no idea how to modify. Perhaps what Ericsson proposed change can be considered, since it is a general description to all. Considering majority companies are OK with this. I made changes as follows, |

##### [M] Proposal 2A-v3:

The latency for the target use cases are considered as follows:

* + Latency for RRC CONNECTED mode is in the order of milliseconds
	+ Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds

### 2B: target power for LP-WUR

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| vivo | **Observation 1: In the case that the relative power of LP-WUR “on” state is 0.03~0.5 unit, substantial power saving gain e.g., up to 80% can be achieved.****Observation 2: LP-WUR should address all traffic arrival cases for IoT/Wearable/eMBB, thus keeping the “ON” state power as low as possible is important for increasing the battery life of the device.****Proposal 1: The target relative power of LP-WUR “on” state should be less than 1 unit.**  |
| OPPO | ***Proposal 2: For I-DRX cycle, the different value of “additional transition energy from ultra-deep sleep” will case different conclusion of whether LP-WUR has power saving gain compared to I-DRX with PEI or not. Prioritize the case ‘LP-WUR on state’ is smaller than 1.*** |
| Apple  | **Proposal 1: Do not set a tight power consumption target for LP WUR at this stage. The tradeoffs should be carefully considered.** |

Moderator encourage companies to express more views on this topic and how to proceed.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | In our observations, we noticed that even with duty cycled monitoring, considering LP-WUR relative “ON” power greater than 4 units can result in a noticeable reduction in the power saving gain. Therefore, we suggest considering a target maximum “ON” relative power <4 units.  |
| Spreadtrum | There are values for evaluation purpose already. The power saving gain is more important. |
| QC | RAN1 is in the middle of studying various LP-WUS power numbers (including 1, 4, 10, 20) with duty cycled based monitoring scheme. So, we think there is no need to make premature conclusion especially toward “1 unit”. |
| Intel | The targeted relative power should be discussed together with OFDM based receiver. From the power consumption study, the high relative power cause smaller power reduction gain, and even larger power consumption compared with the baseline for certain value of relative power.  |
| Samsung | Taking into account much larger relative power values than 4 are still being discussed, we don’t prefer setting a specific relative value as the target. |
| Apple | We do not see a need to agree on a target at this point. We can further discuss the power saving evaluation results before making such a decision now. |
| FL1  | Considering the comments received, FL suggest to deprioritize this discussion |
| SONY | To have a fair evaluation, we need to have mapping between LR architecture, and its corresponding NF and power consumption. |
| MTK | Prefer less than 1 to support RRC CONNECTED use cases. In this case, LPWUR needs to monitor at least 1 occasion per OFDM slot. Low monitoring power consumption is needed. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

### 2C: target coverage for LP-WUS

**E****ricsson** propose that, for coverage evaluations, LP-WUS/WUR designs that strive to match the coverage for NR PDCCH should be considered.

**Samsung:** The coverage for LP-WUS/WUR should be comparable to at least that of the NR downlink channel.

**Huawei** propose to use PUSCH or Msg3, as the reference for coverage evaluation of LP-WUS.

**Qualcomm**

Proposal: RAN1 strives to design LP-WUS to have a similar coverage as NR channel X.
 FFS: The NR channel X is either PDCCH or PUSCH.
 FFS: Channel configuration of X

**ZTE** propose that the target coverage of LP WUS should be better than PUSCH.

**Proposal 12: RAN1 strives to design LP-WUS to have a similar coverage as NR** [**PDCCH] channel.**

Moderator encourage companies to express more views on this topic and how to proceed.

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Futurewei | We suggest to consider a coverage target that is at least equivalent to PUSCH and strives to approach that of PDCCH, but not necessarily set PDCCH coverage as target to have more flexibility to trade-off power saving gain, resource overhead, and latency. |
| Spreadtrum | Strive to paging PDCCH, otherwise LP-WUS cannot be used at cell edge and transition of main radio may happen often, and thus the power saving gain in real deployment will be gone. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The bottleneck channel, i.e. PUSCH, is preferred to be as the coverage target. For LP-WUS used in IDLE/inactive mode, we can be flexible to further compromise to set the target as the coverage of PUSCH for Msg3 considering the Msg3 is the bottleneck of coverage during the IDLE/inactive states. We don’t see a need to over-optimize the LP-WUS to have the same coverage of PDCCH.  |
| QC | @FL, please capture QC view (above) as well.We encourage companies to do detailed study on coverage, data rate and overhead.We propose to make an agreement on following proposal as a first step.**Proposal: RAN1 strives to design LP-WUS to have a similar coverage as NR channel X. FFS: The NR channel X is either PDCCH or PUSCH. FFS: Channel configuration of X**  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Better than PUSCH would be enough, which can cover most of the UEs in a cell. Moreover, this is a good starting point, since we still can pursue the coverage similar with PDCCH. |
| Xiaomi | The bottleneck channel needs to take PUSCH into account and the LP WUS coverage should be superior to the bottleneck channel. |
| Nokia1 | Thus the question is whether we will aim for full coverage or partial coverage. There is evidently cost associated to requiring LR (and LP-WUS) to support higher/full coverage. If we on the other hand in practice require MR to be used at the cell edge for mobility evaluations e.g. for neighboring cells, implying more power consuming design for LR might not be justified. From this perspective, it might be more practical to consider partial coverage. However, it would increase the feasible deployments for LP-WUS if better coverage can be attained.  |
| Intel | From our evaluation, the MIL for LP-WUS can be better than PUSCH but is much worse than common PDCCH. Since PUSCH or msg3 is involved in cell section/tracking area update, it would be fine to take PUSCH or msg3 as baseline. The assumed data rate for PUSCH should be further clarified.  |
| Samsung | Our preference is to set the target as PDCCH. On the other hand, if it is difficult to achieve consensus, something like “strive to approach PDCCH” would be fine. |
| Apple | We are fine with the spirit of the proposal, but we prefer QC’s version. We may need to be a bit cautious about the various tradeoff. |
| LGE | We believe that the target coverage of LP-WUS is not necessarily PDCCH. We may lose power saving gain to target PDCCH coverage to strive to design LP-WUS to have a similar coverage of NR. So, we can further study and discuss the case of the coverage of LP-WUS being smaller than the target coverage of NR and how to handle the unbalanced coverages between LP-WUS and NR. |
| FL1 | Supported companies are as follows,PDCCH: Spreadtrum, Nokia(?), SamsungPUSCH: Futurewei, Huawei/ HiSilicon (msg3), ZTE/ Sanechips, Xiaomi, Intel(msg3), LGE(?)Considering this, FL suggest the WF1 for PDCCH, WF2 for PUSCH,and WF3 to proceed as compromise.Please see proposal 2C-v1 |

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

RAN1 strives to design LP-WUS to have a similar coverage as NR channel X. The NR channel X is

* Option 1: PDCCH
* Option 2: PUSCH,
	+ FFS PUSCH with data rate defined in the coverage SI or PUSCH for message3
* FFS other options

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| SONY | OK with the proposal, however what do “WF1”, “WF2”, “WF3” refer to in the FL1 comment?Our basic view is that for coverage evaluations, LP-WUS/WUR designs should have a comparable coverage to PUSCH and strive to match the coverage for NR PDCCH. |
| Futurewei | We are OK with the proposal |
| Ericsson1 | LP-WUS controls paging PDCCH reception RAN1 should strive to design LP-WUS to not impact paging. We do not follow why RAN1 should strive to have a target that is significantly worse.  |
| Spreadtrum2 | OK. It can be scalable, e.g. PUSCH for IoT, PDCCH for wearables/eMBBs. We still think there could be at least two categories for design.IoT:* Continuous monitoring
* Low power value for LR
* No RRM: stationary or low mobility
* Initiate RACH after wakeup to reduce latency
* Small MR transition energy/time for special device, e.g. LPHAP
* DRX for MR, entering deep-sleep usually

Wearables/eMBBs* Duty cycle
* High power value for LR
* RRM: up to medium mobility
* Monitor PO after wakeup to reduce overhead of LP-WUS
* Large MR transition energy/time
* eDRX for MR, entering ultra-deep-sleep usually
 |
| Samsung | We are OK to proposal in principle, and these options can be down-selected further. We think that the assumed aggregation level (AL) of PDCCH for Option 1 can be specified as FFS, because AL can affect the coverage performance. |
| xiaomi | Generally fine. And AL 8 and AL 16 should be prioritized for PDCCH. |
| CATT | OK with the intention of this proposal. |
| MTK | Okay  |
| vivo | @Ericsson, system should be affected by bottleneck channel. For IDLE state, msg3 coverage is even worse than paging PDCCH, so it ‘s not useful to target LP-WUS even better than msg3.So we support the proposal [M] Proposals 2C-v1 as a compromise to proceed.  |
| Nokia2 | At least we have seem to have common understanding that the LP-WUS coverage does not need to exceed the PDCCH coverage. 😊Evidently whatever we choose, should not affect the system paging performance. So, if the LP-WUS coverage is less than paging coverage, we would need to have mechanism in place for the UE to gracefully fallback to normal paging monitoring. This maybe required also if paging PDCCH and LP-WUS coverage are roughly equal, as due to larger diversity order (freq/spatial) the PDCCH coverage may be occasionally better.Hence a question from myside would be that do we take similar assumption as in Rel-17 that it is up to the UE whether it monitors PEI or directly to PO, but paging performance must not be impacted. I.e. is the UE mandated to monitor LP-WUS (if configured/supported)? |
| Intel | Ok with the update.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine in general. Actually, it is possible to set both channels as targets, i.e. target#1 and target#2. As a work in study phase, the techniques to achieve each target can be identified. Maybe this can be as some compromise.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We want to provide a medium option:Option 3: at least comparable or better than PUSCH |
| FL2 | It seems in principle fine.@Nokia, from FL perspective, I have no idea to your question. Let’s see more comments. @SONY, sorry for typo, WF1/2/3 should be option 1/2/3@Samsung, suggest to solve the details later. |
| OPPO | Share similar views as SONY.LP-WUS/WUR designs should have a comparable coverage to PUSCH at least, and strive to match the coverage for NR PDCCH. If the coverage of LP-WUS/WUR can’t match the PDCCH’s, it is better to reduce the coverage gap as much as possible. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Evaluation results

***Moderator: To be handled in another documents after consolidating the results.***

# Online/offline

##### [H] Proposals 1A-1-v3:

For evaluation purpose, FAR target is determined across a reference time duration T of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials,

* UE have N attempts within T, where N is the number of LP-WUS transmission occasions with in T.
	+ ~~N is the number of attempts within T.~~
	+ where T is {1.28s, 2.56, …}. Other values are not precluded for evaluation.
	+ Company to report (FAR, T, N)
		- ~~Note: FAR = {0.1%, 1%} as agreed in RAN1#112~~
* ~~Note 1:~~ For example, if UE performs multiple correlations for a sequence ~~part for potential LP-WUS transmission in that~~ in the monitor occasion, these correlations are considered as UE implementation in ONE trial/attempt.
* ~~Note 2:~~ If UE performs ~~multiple non-overlapping~~ N attempts for the N occasions within the reference time duration, the false alarm event for the attempts are assumed as independent.
* ~~Note 3: Number of attempts per second (~~$λ$~~) can be calculated from T and N, i.e.,~~ $λ={N}/{T}$~~.~~

Power saving evaluations that companies provide the assumed side conditions to attain the used FAR over T or per one attempt e.g. CRC/sequence length in LP-WUS design

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

RAN1 strives to design LP-WUS to have a similar coverage as NR channel X. The NR channel X is

* Option 1: PDCCH
* Option 2: PUSCH,
	+ FFS PUSCH with data rate defined in the coverage SI or PUSCH for message3
* FFS other options

##### [H] Proposal 1C-4-v3:

The period of ~~low power~~ synchronization signal for power evaluation can be

* {20ms, 40ms, 80ms, 160ms, 320ms} for evaluations assuming SSB
* For evaluations assuming LP-SS
	+ { 320ms, 640ms, 1280ms, 2560ms, 5120ms, 10240ms ~~400ms, 1.28s, 10s(at least for frequency tracking)~~}
* Other values are not precluded

Note: companies to report the purpose of the ~~low power~~ synchronization signal along with evaluations , e.g. can be for LR synchronization (i.e., time and/or frequency tracking) and/or measurement.

##### [M] Proposal 2A-v3:

The latency for the target use cases are considered as follows:

* + Latency for RRC CONNECTED mode is in the order of milliseconds
	+ Latency for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE mode is in the order of seconds

##### [H] Proposals 1A-2-v3:

Working assumption

For Model 1 of frequency error, Frequency displacement (Fd), defined as the difference between ideal frequency and frequency due to 1) clock drifting (ΔF); and 2) residual frequency error from previous synchronization/calibration (Fr), is given as Fd (ppm)=ΔF (ppm) +Fr(ppm), ~~where Fr is:~~

* Companies to report Fr and important assumptions for achieving Fr, e.g., if MR can assist to calibrate LP-WUR to correct the frequency error or if LP-WUR can only correct the frequency error based on LP-WUS synchronization signal

##### [H] Proposal 1C-1-v2:

**Confirm Alt 2 in the following agreement and update as follows**

**Agreement**

For evaluation, at least for FR1 MR ultra-deep sleep state, (Ramp-up and down transition energy, ramp-up time) is as follows,

* Alt 1: (15000, 400ms) as baseline
* Alt 2: (~~[~~40000~~]~~, ~~[~~800ms~~]~~)

Company to report which alternative they use for which use cases.

##### [H] Proposal 1C-2-v3:

----------------------------TP start-------------------------------------------

**6.3.2 Power model for LP-WUR (LR)**

The following power model for LP-WUR is used for evaluation for FR1,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Power State** | **Relative Power (unit)** | **Transition energy:****(unit multiplied by ms)** | **Ramp-up timeTLR, ramp-up (ms)** |
| **Off[1]** | 0.001/ [Y, e.g., Y>=0.1 or 0.01] | [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2] | TLR, ramp-up = FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up |
| **On[2]** | 0.01/0.05/0.1/0.5/1/2/4/10/20/30* ~~FFS: If other values are needed~~
 |

* FFS: whether further categorization/sub-categorization is needed and how.
* FFS: Mapping from values to a LP-WUR architecture or LP-WUR mode of operation
	+ 10/20/30 for LP-WUR ON power state are used for OFDM receiver
* FFS: LP-WUR power consumption values for FR2.
* Note1: A unit of power is defined to be the same for main receiver and LP-WUS receiver.
* Note2: the values provided is for the purpose of studying power saving gain, and the values can be further revisit and categorization depending on the receiver architecture discussion.
* Note3: For LP-WUR ‘on’ state, more than one values within the above range may be used for evaluation (e.g. for a single LP-WUR architecture)
* Note4:
	+ ~~For cat1a, clock error option 3 or 4 is assumed,~~
	+ ~~FFS for cat1b, clock error option 1 or 2 is assumed~~
	+ For WUR Off value 0.001, oscillator option 1, 2, 3, 4 are not assumed and only RTC is maintained; For WUR Off value Y, option 1,2,3,4 can be assumed.
* Note5: Up to companies to report whether same or different values are assumed for WUS monitoring and time/frequency synchronization.

----------------------------TP End-------------------------------------------

# void

# Summary of the previous agreements

## RAN1#110bis-e

**For future meetings on LP WUS:**

Use the following terminology for future discussion,

* Main radio (MR): the Tx/Rx module operating for NR signals/channels apart from signals/channel related to low-power wake-up
* LP-WUR (LR): The Rx module operating for receiving/processing signals/channel related to low-power wake-up.

**Agreement**

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

**Agreement**

Both RRC IDLE/INACTIVE and CONNECTED modes are to be studied as part of the LP-WUS/WUR SI.

* FFS: Further prioritization if needed during the study item.

**Agreement**

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

* For IoT and wearable cases, reuse TR38.875 power model as baseline.
* For eMBB and other cases, reuse TR38.840 power model as baseline.
* Introduce ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state for main radio of UEs with LP-WUS receiver
	+ FFS: The details of ‘*Ultra-deep sleep*’ power state

**R1-2210512** FL summary#2 of evaluation on low power WUS Moderator (vivo)

**Agreement**

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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Relative Power (unit) | Ramp-up and down transition energy (Note1):(unit multiplied by ms) | Ramp-up time | Time for sync/re-sync |
| **Ultra-deep sleep** | **[0.015]** | [2000 ~ 40000]* Study to converge on candidate numbers to use for evaluation
* FFS: other values and reported by companies.
* FFS: down-selection of the values,
* companies are encouraged to provide details for down-selection
 | [400ms], FFS: 100ms | **X** |

 Note1:

* + Ramp-up time may consist of the procedure for [main radio hardware tune on e.g., boot, memory load and etc.],
	+ Time for sync/re-sync consists of the procedure for [main radio to re-synchronization with the serving gNB etc.],
		- FFS: X and whether/how to have different values depending on other factors, e.g., signal-to-noise ratio
		- Companies can report the assumption of X in the initial evaluation.
	+ Ramp up and down energy includes power for ramp-up and ramp-down. Energy consumption for sync/re-sync is separately calculated.
* The total time for main radio transition from ultra-deep sleep to active/micro sleep state is the sum of ramp-up time and time for sync/re-sync.
	+ FFS whether/how to define ramp-down time, whether to separately describe the ramp-down energy consumption

Note 2: the power state transitions in this table refer to transitions between ultra deep sleep state and active / micro sleep state.

Note 3: The values inside of ‘[ ]’ are to be used as starting point of future study on LP-WUS

**Agreement**

The following power model for LP-WUR/WUS evaluation is considered,

* + Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘off’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR does not perform monitoring:
		- [0.001]
	+ Relative power unit for LP-WUR ‘on’ state, i.e., the LP-WUR performs monitoring:
		- [0.005/0.01/0.02/0.03/0.05/0.1/0.2/0.5/1/2/4]
		- Other values are not precluded to be evaluated.
		- FFS: Mapping from values to a LP-WUR architecture or LP-WUR mode of operation
	+ No additional transition energy and transition time between ‘on’ and ‘off’ state as start point, FFS any transition energy and transition time if needed.

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

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

Note3: For LP-WUR ‘on’ state, more than one values within the above range may be used for evaluation (e.g. for a single LP-WUR architecture)

FFS: LP-WUR power consumption values for FR2.

**Agreement**

For R18 LP-WUS/WUR power evaluation in RRC connected mode, the following can be considered,

* XR traffic model with evaluation methodologies and assumptions captured in TR 38.838.
* eMBB traffic model with evaluation methodologies and assumptions captured in TR 38.840
* Heartbeat traffic models in 3GPP TR 38.875.
* Other models are not precluded.

Company to further provide the followings,

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

**Agreement**

* For LP-WUS coverage evaluation, the noise figure of LP-WUR is
	+ Options : [9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 24], Other values can be reported by companies
* FFS: how to determine the NF option.
* The values provided is for the purpose of studying coverage of LP-WUS, and it can be further revisited depending on the receiver architecture discussion.

**Agreement**

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

* The miss-detection rate (MDR) of LP-WUS [1%],
* The false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS
	+ [0.1%, 1%, 10%]
	+ Other values are not precluded for studying reported by companies
* Note: if LP-WUS for wake-up indication consists of two parts or even multiple parts, the proposed MDR/FAR should take into account the reception performance of the two or more parts jointly
* The above values applied in both RRC CONNECTED and IDLE/INACTIVE mode.
* FFS FAR requirement based on the study outcome of the impact of FAR on power consumption / power saving gain / system overhead
* FFS: Note: FAR should be evaluated both in the absence of gNB transmissions and in the presence of transmissions from gNB. Proponent to provide the details.

**Agreement**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Performance Metric** | **Note** |
| System overhead | expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS (including guard band or time or others resource used for LP-WUR if any) among all resourcesOther assumptions related to the system overhead analysis can be reported, e.g., the LP-WUR raw data rate evaluated in the coverage evaluations. |
| FFS: Capacity impact | [Evaluate the system capacity impact due to introducing of LP-WUS] |
| FFS: NW power consumption / Energy Efficiency | [Impact of LP-WUS/WUR operation on gNB energy consumption as performance metric in system impact analysis.] |

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Performance Metric** | **Note** |
| Power consumption | Relative power consumption in units. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. For comparison, the relative power consumption and evaluation period for baseline schemes should also be provided, as well as the power saving gain (i.e., percentage of power consumption reduction of the proposed power saving scheme from the baseline scheme). |
| Latency | For IDLE/INACTIVE state, the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PO UE can [monitor/detect] the paging message* FFS: if UE is not required to monitor a PO after wake-up, e.g., latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time UE transmits the PRACH after LP-WUS detection.
* sync/re-sync for main radio is included

For CONNECTED state, TBD |
| FFS: UPT | FFSNote: it is for connected mode purpose. |

Companies to report baseline scheme, e.g., PO monitoring with i-DRX, e-DRX, with or without PEI

Companies to report the power consumption / power saving gain considering the FAR impact , latency considering MDR impact

Other performance metrics (e.g., mobility) can be reported by companies (if any)

**Agreement**

The following is assumed for RRC IDLE/INACTIVE evaluation,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameters** | **Value** |
| i-DRX cycle length | 1.28s and other values not precluded and reported by companies, consider both with PEI/ without PEI |
| e-DRX cycle length | 20.48s, 61.44s and other values not precluded, company to report which value(s) are used.  *Note: ‘ultra-deep sleep’ state can be assumed for eDRX whenever necessary for baseline UE* |
| Number of POs in Paging Frame | 1 |
| Number of DRXs per PTW | 4 |
| Number of SSB before PO / PEI | 1, 2 or 3, (used for e.g., AGC adjustment, T/F tracking, serving cell and intra-F measurement)company to report which value(s) are usedNote: the assumptions is for MR wakes from ‘Deep sleep’ |
| Sync/re-sync after ultra-deep sleep | companies to report the timeline of sync/re-sync and X value, X is the time for sync/re-sync |
| RRM Measurement | Company to report whether and how the RRM measurement is assumed, e.g., whether RRM performed by main radio or LP-WUR, whether RRM is relaxed or not. |
| LP-WUS monitoring | Option 1: continuously monitoringOption 2: discontinuously monitoring, with [T] ms as the period for complete an on-and-off cycle, and [D] ms as the active time for monitoring LP-WUS every cycle. |
| Traffic | Option 1 (baseline):Per UE paging rate (*R\_E*)= ([1%]) or ([0.1%]) or ([0.01%]) or ([0.001%]) within duration Y, [FFS Y is an i-DRX cycle length or an absolute time duration length]* *R\_G* denotes as the group paging rate and *R\_E* denotes as UE paging rate, and 1-*R\_G*=(*1-R\_E)^N*, where *N* is the number of UEs in the group, and N is [TBD]
* FFS: how (*R\_G*, *R\_E*) for e-DRX derived from

 FFS: Option 2 (optional):Reusing TR 38.875 heart beat traffic model

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Model | FTP3 |
| Packet size | 100 Bytes |
| Mean inter-arrival time | 60s (per UE paging rate≈2%) |

 Model RRC connection phase power consumption as follows,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| RRC connection duration | [30ms] |
| Relative energy consumption of RRC connection block (Relative power x ms) | [=3000] |

 Other options are not precluded can be reported by companies. |
| Others | Reported by companies |

**Agreement**

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

* MIL is used as the metric for LP-WUS coverage evaluation
* urban (2.6GHz/4GHz), rural(700MHz) scenario for FR1 are considered to be evaluated, others (e.g., FR2) are not precluded.

Note: For IoT/wearables devices, refer to R17 Redcap SI TR38.875 if the assumptions differ from TR38.830.

Companies report any other assumptions which differ from the TR38.875/ TR38.830, e.g., Tx and Rx loss

Companies are encouraged to compare LP-WUS with at least PDCCH for paging, PUSCH, others are not precluded. FFS: Target coverage of LP-WUS

## RAN1#111

**Agreement**

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Performance Metric** | **Note** |
| System overhead | expressed as percentage of used part of all REs for LP-WUS (including guard band or time or others resource used for LP-WUR if any) among all resourcesOther assumptions related to the system overhead analysis can be reported, e.g., the LP-WUR raw data rate evaluated in the coverage evaluations. |
| Capacity impact | Evaluate the system capacity impact due to introducing of LP-WUSNote: it is for UEs which are in connected mode. Definition is the same as in XR TR. |
| FFS: NW power consumption / Energy Efficiency | [Impact of LP-WUS/WUR operation on gNB energy consumption as performance metric in system impact analysis.] |

For power and latency evaluation of the LP-WUS, the following performance metrics definitions provided for future study

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  **Performance Metric** | **Note** |
| Power consumption | Relative power consumption in units. The power consumption includes main radio and LP-WUR. For comparison, the relative power consumption and evaluation period for baseline schemes should also be provided, as well as the power saving gain (i.e., percentage of power consumption reduction of the proposed power saving scheme from the baseline scheme). |
| Latency | For IDLE/INACTIVE state, * the latency is the time interval between the data arrival time at the gNB and the time of the first PO UE can monitor the paging message
* alternatively, if UE is not required to monitor a PO after wake-up, company to report detailed procedure and definition of the latency

. In RAN1#111, there are no definitions being precluded* sync/re-sync for main radio is included
 |
| UPT | The definition is the same as in [TR38.840]Note: it is for connected mode purpose. |

Companies to report baseline scheme, e.g., PO monitoring with i-DRX, e-DRX, with or without PEI

Companies to report the power consumption / power saving gain considering the FAR impact, latency considering MDR impact

Other performance metrics (e.g., mobility) can be reported by companies (if any)

**Agreement**

Update the IDLE/INACTIVE state traffic model option 1 as follows and remove traffic model option 2,

* The traffic arrival is modeled as a Poisson Arrival Process where inter-arrival times are exponentially distributed, the mean arrival time is P = YREF / RE, REF, where
	+ RE, REF= 1%, 0.1%, 0.01% or 0.001% and YREF = 1.28s
	+ Per group paging probability RG = 1 – (1 – RE)N, where N is the number of UEs in the group
		- FFS: Value of N
* For LP-WUS
	+ Both per group and UE paging can be assumed.

Note：

* For i-DRX with ~~i-DRX~~ cycle duration Y second,
	+ Per UE paging probability RE = 1 – (1 – RE, REF )Y/YREF
	+ ~~Per group paging probability R~~~~G~~ ~~= 1 – (1 – R~~~~E~~~~)~~~~N~~~~, where N is the number of UEs in the group~~
* For e-DRX with K i-DRX cycles duration, ~~L~~ PTW duration of L i-DRX cycles, and an i-DRX cycle duration Y second
	+ Per UE paging probability is
		- RE = 1 – (1 – RE, REF )(K-L)Y/YREF for the first i-DRX cycle within the PTW
		- RE = 1 – (1 – RE, REF )~~L~~Y/YREF for each of the remaining L-1 i-DRX cycles within the PTW
	+ ~~Per group paging probability R~~~~G~~ ~~= 1 – (1 – R~~~~E~~~~)~~~~N~~~~, where N is the number of UEs in the group~~
	+ L=4 (as agreed in RAN1#110bis)

**Agreement**

For MR, at least for FR1 evaluation,

* Number of SSBs for sync/re-sync for MR is up to 10
	+ Companies to report timeline and energy consumption
* Companies to provide feasibility analysis for transition time and transition energy with aim to converge to one or two set of values in RAN1#112

**Agreement**

The following power model for LP-WUR is used for evaluation for FR1,

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power State | Relative Power (unit) | Transition energy:(unit multiplied by ms) | Ramp-up timeTLR, ramp-up (ms) |
| **Off** | 0.001 | [TLR, ramp-up \*(PON+POFF)/2] | TLR, ramp-up = FFS, and company to report TLR, ramp-up FFS: Relation between Receiver architecture and its relative power and value of TLR, ramp-up |
| **On** | ~~0.005/~~0.01/~~0.02/0.03/~~0.05/0.1/~~0.2/~~0.5/1/2/4FFS: If other values are needed |

FFS: whether further categorization/sub-categorization is needed and how.

## RAN1#112

**Conclusion:**

The FAR definition does NOT include the impact of the falsely alarmed for wake-up due to the detection of a LP-WUS which is intended to wake-up/alarm the LP-WUR of another UE within the same UE group

**Agreement**

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

* IoT cases including e.g., industrial wireless sensors, controllers, actuators and etc, including the following characteristics,
	+ FFS: latency
	+ primary for small form devices
	+ power-sensitive
	+ static, nomadic or limited mobility
* Wearable cases including e.g., smart watches, rings, eHealth related devices, and medical monitoring devices etc.,
	+ FFS: latency
	+ primary for small form devices,
	+ power-sensitive
	+ low/medium speed, FFS: high speed
* eMBB cases including e.g., XR/smart glasses, smart phones and etc.,
	+ FFS: latency
	+ devices form is various and not restricted
	+ power-sensitive
	+ low/medium speed, FFS: high speed

Note: other use cases/characteristics are not precluded if any.

**Agreement**

For evaluation, at least for FR1 MR ultra-deep sleep state, (Ramp-up and down transition energy, ramp-up time) is as follows,

* Alt 1: (15000, 400ms)
* Alt 2: ([40000], [800ms])

Company to report which alternative they use for which use cases.

**Agreement**

For coverage evaluation, the following is used,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Number of RX chains at the UE’s MR ~~antenna elements for UE~~ | Case 1: 1 Rx for RedcapCase 2: 2 RxCase 3: 4 RxCompany to report which case is being used. Further decision on antenna assumption for coverage is FFS. |
| Number of RX chains ~~antenna elements~~ for LP-WUR | 1 RxNote: agreed in RAN1#110bis |
| Scenario and frequency | Urban: 4GHz (TDD), 2.6GHz (TDD) Rural: ~~4GHz (TDD), 2.6GHz (TDD), 2GHz (FDD),~~ 700MHz (FDD)~~Rural with long distance: 700MHz (FDD), 4GHz (TDD)~~ |
| Reference data rates for MR ~~eMBB~~ | Urban: PDSCH 10Mbps, PUSCH 1MbpsRural: PDSCH 1Mbps, PUSCH 100kbps~~Rural with long distance: DL 1Mbps, UL 100kbps, 30kbps (optional)~~ |
| Reference PDCCH configuration |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| SCS | 30kHz for TDD, 15kHz for FDD. |
| Aggregation level | 8, 16Company to report which case is being used. Further decision on aggregation level for coverage is FFS. |
| Payload | 40 bits |
| CORESET size | 2 symbols, 48 PRBs |
| Tx Diversity | Reported by companies |
| BLER | 1% BLER, |

 |
| Pathloss model (select from LoS or NLoS) | Urban: NloSRural: NloS ~~and LoS~~ |
| Bandwidth | 100MHz for 4GHz and 2.6GHz.~~20MHz for 2GHz (FDD)~~20MHz (optional for 10MHz) for 700MHz. (FDD) |
| Channel model for link-level simulation | TDL-C for NLOS~~, TDL-D for LOS.~~ |
| Delay spread | Urban: 300ns, optional: 1000ns and companies to provide descriptions for such scenariosRural: 300ns~~Rural with long distance: 30ns~~ |
| UE velocity | Urban: 3km/h Rural: 3km/h, FFS: 120km/h (optional 30km/h) for outdoor |
| Number of antenna elements for BS | - Urban: 192 antenna elements for 4GHz and 2.6GHz, (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (12,8,2,1,1)(optional) 128 antenna elements for 4GHz, (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,8,2,1,1)~~- Rural: 64 antenna elements for 4GHz and 2.6GHz~~~~(M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,4,2,1,1)~~~~32 antenna elements for 2GHz~~~~(M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,2,2,1,1)~~- Rural: 16 antenna elements for 700MHz(M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (4,2,2,1,1) |
| Number of TxRUs for BS | gNB architectures to study:- 2 or 4 TXRUs for ~~2GHz,~~ 700 MHz - 64TxRUs for 2.6 and 4 GHz. ~~- Optional: 32 TXRUs at 2 GHz~~~~gNB modeling in LLS for TDL:~~~~- Option 1: 2 or 4 gNB RF chains in LLS.~~ ~~- Option 2 (Optional): Number of gNB RF chains = number of TXRUs in LLS.~~ ~~- Companies can report if and how correlation is modelled.~~ |

Note: The descriptions above does not change the agreements for coverage in the RAN1#110-bis.

**Agreement**

For link-level simulation of LP-WUS, the following table is used as starting point,

* FFS for other assumptions if any
* Note: The assumptions are not intended to limit the scope of the study or the design.

**Table XX. Simulation assumptions for LP-WUS**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Attributes** | **Assumptions** |
| Carrier Frequency | 2.6GHz/4GHz/700MHz |
| Waveform | OOK , FSK , OFDMCompany to report which option for OOK /FSK /OFDM is used |
| Channel structure | * Option 1: Sync signal /sequence+ payload + CRC,
* Option 2: Sequence only,
* Option 3: Payload+CRC,
* Other options are not precluded
* Company to report the sequence length, payload size, CRC length (may or may not be presence).
 |
| SCS of OFDM generator for NR signal | 30kHz/15KHz |
| Configuration for LP-WUS signal | For OOK/FSK waveform,* Option 1a: M=1 and SCSs = 15kHz (same as NR signal)
* Option 1b: M=1 and SCSs = 30kHz (same as NR signal)
* Option 2a: M =2/4/8 for SCS = 15KHz (same as NR signal)
* Option 2b: M =2/4/8 for SCS = 30 kHz (same as NR signal)
* Option 3: M=1 and SCSs = 60kHz/120kHz/240kHz
* Note: M is referred to the definition of “M” in the agreements for OOK-1/2/3/4 and FSK-1/2

For OFDM: FFS, e.g., ZC sequenceOther options are up to companies to report |
| WUS duration | Number of OFDM symbols: e.g., 1,2,4, 8, 16,24 symbols  |
| MDR/FAR assumption | * The miss-detection rate (MDR) of LP-WUS 1%,
* The false-alarm rate (FAR) of LP-WUS
	+ [0.1%, 1%]
	+ Other values are not precluded for studying, reported by companies
	+ Further discuss on the following alternatives for FAR target
		- Alt 1: FAR target is determined per single WUS attempt/trial,
		- Alt 2: FAR target is determined across a reference time duration of one or multiple WUS attempts/trials
			* FFS: possible values for reference time durations
		- Companies to report details, e.g., receiver behaviour, how to compute MDR, detection threshold
	+ Companies to report the selected reference time duration values and the associated number of WUS attempts/trials
 |
| Code scheme | Companies to report, if any, the coding scheme (e.g., Manchester code or any other schemes) and the code rate (e.g., 1/2, 1/4, ….) |
| gNB Channel BW  | 20MHz, FFS other values |
| LP-WUS BW | Option 1:* 5MHz including subcarriers for guard band
* 4.32MHz (i.e.,12 RBs) for LP-WUS transmission for 30kHz SCS

Option 2:* {2.16, 4.32} MHz including subcarriers for guard band
* 1.44MHz, 2.88MHz (i.e.{4, 8} RBs) for LP-WUS transmission for 30kHz SCS

FFS: other options are up to companies to reportGB is symmetrically placed on each side of LP-WUS |
| Filter  | X-th Order filter (e.g. Butterworth, Chebyshev, …) with Y MHz bandwidth,* X = {3, 5}
* Companies to report Y

Companies to report any other assumptions if needed |
| Adjacent subcarrier interference | * PDSCH mapped on resources other than that for WUS and guard band;

EPRE of LP-WUS / EPRE of PDSCH =ρ, where ρ=0 dB as baseline, ρ= {3, 6} dB as optional |
| Sampling Rate | * Companies to report.
 |
| ADC bit width | 1-bit, 4-bit, 8-bit, ideal and other options are not precluded |
| Channel Model | See link coverage assumption table (will copy and paste here) |
| Impairment modelling | * FFS: Frequency and time error model
* Phase noise up to company report, e.g. the modelling used for 802.11ba
* Other cell interference is up to company to report
 |

**Working Assumption**

* For evaluation of LP-WUR frequency and time errors, the following is used,

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Value** |
| **Oscillator max frequency error [ppm], Oscillator frequency drift [ppm/s]** | option 1: (200, 0.1)option 2: (50, 0.1)option 3: (10, 0.05)option 4: (5, 0.05)Other values are not precluded for studying, reported by companies |
| **RTC max frequency error [ppm]** | 20 |

* Company to report how to use the clocks for LR on/off state**s**
	+ The above clock assumptions for LR assumes the MR is in ‘ultra-deep sleep’ power state.
	+ For Option 3/4,
		- FFS applicability when MR is in ultra-deep sleep power consumption state and associated power consumption for LR on state and LR off state,
			* e.g., option 3/4 is not applicable
				+ when MR is in ‘ultra-deep sleep state’ with [0.015] power units and LR is in off state or,
				+ when LR monitoring power less than [TBD] power unit,
		- Note: Assumptions important for achieving performance by option 1/2/3/4 clock for LR should be declared, including active on/off power, transition energy/ ramp-up time TLR, ramp-up for LR and etc.
	+ If MR is in other state than ‘ultra-deep sleep state’, the clock running for MR can be used for LR.
		- assumptions important for achieving performance by using MR clock for LR should be declared
	+ Other clock accuracy options are not precluded. Companies to report options based on a feasibility analysis of clock power consumption and UE power consumption to use the clock accuracy option
* Company to report the frequency error assumption for the detection of LP-WUS/synchronization signal,
	+ The following are examples for consideration, other approaches are not precluded,
		- Model 1:
		- The relationship between a drifted frequency error(ΔF), frequency drift ( F’) over a time (T1) is ΔF = ±F’ \* T1
		- When frequency displacement [Fd] reaches max frequency error, it is assumed to be equaled to max frequency error
		- T1 is the time from the previous frequency synchronization. T1 may take different values depending on the chosen frequency synchronization approach.
		- FFS: Frequency displacement (Fd), defined as the difference between ideal frequency and frequency due to 1) clock drifting (ΔF); and 2) residual frequency error from previous synchronization/calibration (Fr), is given as Fd (ppm)=ΔF (ppm) +Fr(ppm).
		- Model 2: random frequency drifting, FFS details
* Company to report the timing drifting error assumption for the detection of LP-WUS/synchronization signal,
	+ The following are examples for consideration, other approaches are not precluded,
		- Model 1 [R1-2301438] [R1-2301558][R1-1714993]:
		- The relationship between the maximum frequency error(Fe) and corresponding timing drift( ΔT) over a time(T) is ΔT = ±Fe \* T (linear region)
		- The relationship between a frequency drift( F’), and corresponding timing drift(ΔT) over a time(T) is ΔT = Fr\*T ±0.5 \* F’ \*T2 (transient region)
		- The transition between transient and linear region (from synchronization or calibration point/time) occurs at time [Ts= (Fe-Fr)/( F’)]
		- T is the time from the previous time synchronization. T may take different values depending on the chosen synchronization approach
		- FFS: Time error (Te) before detection of a current sync signal is defined as the difference between ideal time of the current sync signal and the time error due to 1) clock time drift (ΔT); and 2) residual time error from previous synchronization/calibration (Tr); Te= ΔT+ Tr
		- Model 2: random time drifting, FFS details
* FFS: Phase noise model

# Proposals from companies’ submitted contributions

## XXX

# SID

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

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

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