# Conclusions

The study focused on the following objectives: (1) confirm XR and Cloud Gaming (CG) applications of interest, (2) identify the traffic model for the applications of interest taking outcome of SA WG4 work as input, (3) identify evaluation methodology and KPI to assess XR and CG performance for relevant deployment scenarios, (4) evaluate XR and CG performance towards characterization of identified KPIs.

Diverse AR, VR, and CG applications were identified and confirmed in the study. These applications include, but not limited to, VR1 (Viewport dependent streaming), VR2 (Split Rendering: Viewport rendering with Time Warp in device), AR1 (XR Distributed Computing), AR2 (XR Conversational), CG.

Traffic models and characteristics of AR, VR, and CG applications were developed taking into account NR RAN performance evaluations. The traffic models include single stream downlink (DL) traffic model for VR/AR/CG, multi-stream DL traffic model for VR/AR/CG, single stream uplink (UL) traffic models for VR/AR/CG, and multi-stream UL traffic model for AR, as described in Clause 6.

The AR, VR, and CG performance for NR was evaluated using the traffic models for FR1 and FR2 in various deployment scenarios, indoor hotspot, dense urban, and urban macro, in terms of capacity, UE power consumption, coverage and mobility.

XR capacity

The capacity for AR, VR, and CG applications was evaluated and the results are summarized as follows:

* The baseline capacity for AR, VR, and CG in FR1 DL/UL and FR2 DL/UL were evaluated based on the agreed traffic model, evaluation methodology, and KPIs, with the results and observations given in Clause 8.3.1. The evaluation results show that 5G NR can well support AR, VR, and CG for the evaluated cases and scenarios.
* The capacity impact of different data-rates, different PDB/PER (packet delay budget/packet error rate) values, jitter, dual-eye buffer staggering, different TDD frame formats, different bandwidths, or FDM/SDM and mini-slot operations have been evaluated. The results and observations are given in Clause 8.3.2. Based on the evaluation results, the following is observed:
  + The AR, VR, and CG capacity is smaller for applications requiring higher data rate.
  + The AR, VR, and CG capacity is higher with larger PDB value and/or less stringent (i.e., higher) PER requirement.
  + The AR, VR, and CG capacity is higher with larger system bandwidth.
* Various potential XR capacity enhancement schemes were proposed and evaluated by different companies. Their results and observations are given in Clause 8.3.3.

XR UE power consumption

The UE power consumption for AR, VR, and CG applications was evaluated and the results are summarized as follows:

* The power saving gain from Release 15, 16, and 17 power saving schemes including CDRX, PDCCH monitoring adaptation, cross slot scheduling, MIMO layer adaptation was evaluated with respect to the case when UE is always on, i.e., UE is available for gNB scheduling for all slots. Corresponding results and observations are given in Clause 9.3.1.
* The UE power consumption was evaluated for different parameters. The results and observations are given in Clause 9.3.2. The following is observed from the results:
  + There is a trade-off between UE power saving gain and capacity.
  + Higher application frame rate leads to higher UE power consumption.
  + Higher application data rate leads to higher UE power consumption.
  + Lower uplink pose/control periodicity leads to lower UE power consumption.
* The potential enhancement schemes for UE power saving were proposed end evaluated by different companies. Their results and observations are given in Clause 9.3.3.

XR coverage

The AR, VR, and CG coverage was evaluated based on the agreed traffic model and methodology for coverage evaluation. The results and observations are given in Clause 10.3.

According to the evaluation results, it is observed that for deployment scenarios of dense urban and urban macro, UL coverage is smaller than DL coverage. The coverage is impacted by data rate and PDB.

XR mobility

The performance of mobility for AR, VR, and CG applications was studied. The study considers two mobility KPIs given in Clause 11.2: number of consecutive XR packets lost and minimum target time between handover events The evaluation methodology of mobility performance evaluation is given in Clause A.4, and the evaluation results are given in Clause 11.3. The following is observed from the results:

* + Higher PDB leads to lower (better) mobility KPIs.
  + Higher frame rate leads to higher (worse) number of consecutive XR packets lost.
  + Both selected KPIs are the lowest (best) when the handover interruption time is lower than PDB.
  + Higher handover interruption time leads to higher (worse) mobility KPIs.