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# Introduction

This contribution is a summary of the AI 8.7.2 - Potential extension(s) to Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX ActiveTime. The contribution is structured as follows,

Section 2 is a summary of each topics from the contributions companies submitted and relevant online/offline discussion during the meeting. And each sub-topic is arranged a sub-section. Section 3 is a summary of the potential proposals from section 2 as suggested by moderator. Section 4 is a table of summary of proposals from contributions submitted. Section 5 is a summary of previous agreements. Section 6 is the work plan. Section 7 is the decription of WI. Section 8 is reference. Section 9 is the history of this document.

Considering vast number of proposals, we need to identify high priority topics for discussion according to Chairman’s guidance. Therefore, the followings are proposed,

Section 2 basically contains two aspects, evaluation methodologies and high concepts according to the Chairman note’s guidance.

For 1st round discussion

* For section 2.1 (evaluation methodologies), since not so many issues we need to address and I simply add a table for each subsection to collect companies’ opinions in question from Q1 – Q6.
* For section 2.2(high-level concepts),
  + For power saving schemes and triggering schemes (Q7 and Q8),
    - As you may see, there is a vast number of proposals there (>8 power saving schemes, and couple of triggering schemes). It is grouped into several topics in section 2.2.1.9. Q7 and Q8 is asked to companies to provide comments to whether the schemes listed is clear or if there is something missing.
    - And since couple of triggering schemes (described in section 2.2.2)are mentioned in the contribution, please if possible indicate any feasible triggering schemes for each topic in Q8. This will help understanding the triggering design once for next step.
  + For prioritization, Q9 in section 2.2.3 is asked
    - Please provide (at least) an early input on topic 1 described in Section 2.2.1.9 with more than 5 contributions (if you are OK to regard them as high priority)
    - In addition, if possible indicate prioritization for the other topics 2 – 7 in Section 2.2.1.9 (discussed in less than 5 contributions) of your companies position if they are to be regarded as high / medium / low priority

For 4th round discussion,

The following section are marked yellow for discussion

* Section 2.1.1.4 performance metrics and assumptions
* Section 2.1.3.4 additional traffic model
* Section 2.2.1.9.4 adaptation schemes
* Section 2.2.2.4 triggering schemes

# Summary of the contributions/discussions

## Potential evaluation methodology updates

### Performance metrics & assumptions

Performance metrics

One company discussed performance metrics including UE power saving gain, Latency of packet/user perceived throughput for evaluation [HW], which is also part of TR38.840 section 8.2.

One company proposes that UE power savings vs. system performance/latency/overhead impact should be considered as part of evaluation of potential enhancements for power savings during active time [E///], which is also part of the Rel-16 TR38.840.

#### 1st round discussion:

**Question 1: Is it fine that the performance metris decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 is reused for power saving evaluation of Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation during ActiveTime?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes, but also baseline should be clarified. | Baseline for comparison of performance gains should be existing Rel-15/16 UE power saving techniques/CA activation/dormancy. |
| OPPO | Yes | It can be mostly reused for the principle of evaluation metrics in 38.840 |
| MediaTek | Yes | We also support Ericsson’s comment on clarifying/updating the baseline setting. This is also required in the WID scope as quoted below:   |  | | --- | | 2-a) Study and specify, if agreed, extension(s) to Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX Active Time for an active BWP, including PDCCH monitoring reduction when C-DRX is configured [RAN1]   * NOTE: Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power saving solutions should be supported by the UE and included in the evaluation. RAN1 will ask the confirmation from RAN2 that Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power saving solutions are properly utilized. |   For an efficient way to include the effect of all power saving schemes, Section 2.2 of R1-2007032 can be referred. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | The performance metrics in the current TR have been able to meet the evaluation requirement. Also, there is no any new performance metric being proposed from other companys. Therefore the performance metrics should be reused for power saving evaluation of Rel-17. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Vivo | Yes | The power saving techniques can be applicable to both normal UEs and Redcap UEs. For example, for RedCap UE, it may not be CA-capable. And SCell dormancy and CA activation may not be applicable. The baseline can be clarified from the proponents. |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | Performance metris decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 can be reused for this topic. |
| Nokia | Yes | The key is to establish a proper baseline using all Rel-15 and Rel-16 power saving features. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | yes |  |
| InterDigital | Yes. |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |
| SONY | Yes |  |
| DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | We agree that the performance metrics described in TS 38.840 section 8.2 can be reused for power saving evaluation.  In addition, we also agree that a proper set of the Rel-15/16 power saving solutions can be considered in the Rel-17 evaluation according to the WID. |
| LG | Yes | We think the performance metris decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 should be reused as much as possible |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We think the metrics in the TR are quite general. |
| CATT | Yes | TR38.840 has comprehensive matrices |

#### 2nd round discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1:**   * **The performance metrics decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 is reused** **for power saving evaluation of Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation during ActiveTime.** |
| **Comments:**  All companies agrees the performance metrics should be reused. There is no any new performance metric being proposed. Therefore the proposals listed above seems to be easy to OK for all. |
| **Suggestions for next step:**  Some companies [E///][MTK][Nokia][ZTE] suggest to set a baseline for comparison. Hence, it is suggested to further handle this during this meeting.  Serveral options can be considerd. For example, a) agree on a common set as baseline for all technique to compare if consensus can be achived, b) considering different features may rely on different UE capability, company to report the baseline for comparison. c) several baseline sets depending on different UE capability. d)… |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | We would like to re-iterate the need for having some common ground for evaluation. This means that we would preferably have a set of well-defined simulation/evaluation setups, which would result in realistic power saving. For this to reflect realistic power saving, we need to establish the baseline such that it will utilize the recently used features from Rel-16 power saving, as well as the already existing features from Rel-15 (with proper settings according to the deployment scenario). Hence, assuming limited set of supported features from Rel-15 and Rel-16, would seem rather determistic choise to boost/emphasize the attainable gains. Like discussed already during the Rel-16 work, we should now at least aim to introduce solutions that can provide attainable gains on top of existing functionalities. |
| MediaTek | Fine with Proposal 1.  We still think it is better to agree on a common baseline. Otherwise, wer are afraid that it is not easy to judge the benefits of different enhancement candidates among companies. |
| CATT | The performance matrices in TR38.840 is used with the baseline of Rel-16 power saving techniques, which includes DRX adaptation with DCP and SCell dormancy. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes.  We support the proposal 1. We also agree that a baseline assumption for comparison needs to be agreed for further evaluation before the next meeting. Regarding the options listed by the moderator, we prefer option b) and at least can agree the baseline for the evaluation of schemes with high priority, according to the outcome of **Question 9: priority for each topic described in section 2.2.1.9 and relevant reasons**. However, we are open to have further discuss on the baseline in the next week. |
| Samsung | DRX with DCI format 2\_6 for indication wether or not to skip DRX ON duration can be baseline for the comparison purpose. |
| Ericsson | The following text (from WID) should be added as a subullet to clearly reflect what is the performanc gain compared against.   * Note: Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power saving solutions should be supported by the UE and included in the evaluation. |
| Qualcomm | We agree that a set of common baseline would be beneficial. We could discuss simple baseline configurations of Rel-15/16 power saving schemes. |
| InterDigital | Yes. We agree that a common baseline can be used. |
| Intel | Fine with Proposal 1. Regarding the options, we agree a common set of baseline assumptions according to Option a) can be used. Companies can report if some parameters are considered different from baseline, depending on features/capability. Hence, a combination of Option a) and b) can be considered. |
| LG | Yes. We agree on the proposal and also on the suggestion that we set up the the common baseline for comparison before the next meeting. |

#### 3rd round discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1:**   * **The performance metrics decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 is reused** **for power saving evaluation of Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation during ActiveTime.** * **The following is recommended for evaluating the gain of potential Rel-17 enhancements for power savings during active time**   + **Long DRX cycle,**   + **DRX adaptation with DCP,**   + **Cross-slot scheduling mechanism,**   + **BWP adaptation,**   + **MIMO layer adaptation,**   + **Company to report other assumptions, e.g., short DRX cycle, SCell dormancy as a baseline for comparison** |
| **Comments:**  Some companies suggest to set a baseline for comparison. The update of proposal 1 is needed. Some assumptions are   * depending on UE capability / network avalibility or * different companies have different understanding to be included or * some proposed baseline assumptions are from spatial or frequency domain, which can be considered have less impact to time-domain solutions (most schemes for evaluation is time-domain adpataion),   therefore it is proposed to allow companies to report other assumptions for baseline. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We are ok for the proposal with additional bullet. Some of the assumption may not be needed, e.g. MIMO layer adapatation for comparision of PDCCH skipping scheme. But since those are not mandate. Companies will finally compare with the baseline. The FL comments also help for understanding. |
| Nokia | It is not clear why only subset of the Rel-15 and Rel-16 features are recommeded to be accounted? The work item objective seems to require that all of the features are included. Namely short DRX together with Rel-16 UE assistance information which can have direct effect to the amount of PDCCH monitoring should be considered at least. Thus propose to adjust/add following bullets:   * + **Long and short DRX cycle,**   **….**   * + **Rel-16 UE assistance information (short/long DRX cycle, IAT, short cycle timer,**   Also a question that as the number of MIMO layers (DL/UL) is part of BWP configuration, do we need to mention other BWP specific configurations or can we for example assume that BWP adaptation implicitely covers also adjustment of the BW, CORESET and SS set(s) as an example? If this is common understanding, maybe we could merge these two bullets for example:   * + **BWP adaptation including for example adaptation of PDCCH monitoring configuration and number of MIMO layers**   + **~~MIMO layer adaptation,~~** |
| CATT | All Rel-16 power saving features, such as DRX adaptation for long DRX, cross-slot scheduling, maximum MIMO layer adaptation, SCell dormancy, Secondary DRX group and UE assistance information should be the baseline for Rel-17 UE power saving enhancement in CONNECTED mode. |
| Qualcomm | It seems that it would be infeasible to reach a consensus on the details of reference configuration of baseline schemes. Thus, it would be the best we can do to list up candidate schemes and leave the detailed configuration and selection of schemes up to companies.   * **The following ~~is recommended~~baseline schemes can be considered for evaluating the gain of potential Rel-17 enhancements for power savings during active time**   + **Long DRX and short cycle,**   + **DRX adaptation with DCP,**   + **Cross-slot scheduling mechanism,**   + **BWP adaptation including for example adaptation of PDCCH monitoring configuration and number of MIMO layers,**   + **~~MIMO layer adaptation,~~**   + **SCell dormancy**   + **Company to report other assumptions~~, e.g., short DRX cycle, SCell dormancy as a~~ and/or detailed configuration of baseline for comparison** |
| CMCC | Scell dormancy and UE assistance information should be considered. |

#### 4th round discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 1:**   * **The performance metrics described in TR38.840 section 8.2 is reused for power saving evaluation of Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation during ActiveTime.** * **The following Rel-15 / 16 features is recommended of the power consumption as reference for baseline. Company can report the feature combinations being used in the analysis.**   + **DRX**     - **C-DRX cycle 40msec for VoIP**       * **10ms IAT, 8ms On-duration**       * **Assume max two packets bundled**     - **C-DRX cycle 160msec for FTP**       * **Alt 1: 100 msec IAT, 8ms On-duration**       * **Alt 2: 20 msec IAT, 8ms On-duration**       * **Alt 3: short DRX**         + **20 ms IAT, 8ms On-duration**         + **20 ms for short DRX cycle, 4 cycles**     - **[C-DRX cycle 40ms for ‘additional traffic model’ defined in Rel-17**       * **10ms IAT, 8ms On-duration]**   + **DCP for DRX adaptation,**     - **DCP offset to DRX on = 3 ms**   + **Cross-slot scheduling adaptation**     - **Minimum K0 can be adapted from 0 to 1 for FR1, 0 to [4] for FR2**   + **BWP switching, including**     - **MIMO layer adaptation,**       * **Max # of MIMO layer can be adapted from 4 layer to 2 layerfor FR21, 2 layer to 1 layer for FR2**     - **PDCCH monitoring period adaptation**       * **PDCCH monitoring period can be adapted from per slot monitoring to [X] slot monitoring**     - **Bandwidth adaptation**       * **Bandwidth can be adapted from 100MHz to 20MHz for FR1, [200]MHz to [100]MHz for FR2**     - **Note:**        * **BWP transition time type 2 is assumed, BWP transition duration is**         + **5 slot @ 30kHz SCS for FR1,**         + **18 slot@120kHz SCS for FR2**         + **the slot-average power level for BWP transition duration is according to TR38.840**       * **BWP switching indication is [Y] (ms) after last PDSCH of a packet/data burst.**       * **Whether BWP switching is modeled depends on the assumed UE capability and evaluated schemes.**   + **Scell dormancy assumption for CA capable UEs**     - **FR1 & FR2: SCell dormancy with 160 ms periodic CSI measurement and reporting** * **Other settings**   + **CA assumption if configured for CA capable UEs**     - **For FR1, FFS**     - **For FR2, 4\*100MHz can be considered.**   + **Assumptions for scheduler**     - **For FR1, no restriction on the beam assumptions being used in each slot**     - **For FR2, gNB equally schedule the slots for UEs targeting to different beams.** |
| **Comments:**  Some companies suggest to set a baseline assumption to include not only a subset. Therefore, more features are added with reasonable assumptions being presented from companies’ contributions and TR38.840.  For ‘additional traffic model’, it depends on the outcome of proposal 3, therefore the square brackets is added for it. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Spreadtrum | Generally, we are fine with this proposal.  Regarding the evaluation baseline, we share the similar view with HW. If we address the PDCCH monitoring adaptation, it is better not to involve the frequency or spatial domain power saving techniques, e.g. BWP switching and MIMO adaptation, at least for sake of simplicity of evaluation. |
| Nokia | We think that this proposal is a fair compromise for moving forward. It provides good reminder for the features to be considered, while leaving companies some freedom to select those features that they feel are most relevant when trying to determine what is the actual gain that can be obtained over Rel-15 and Rel-16 existing functionality with the proposed sceheme. Like noted earlier in our understanding from the WID, the RAN pleanary expects to do proper evaluation over baseline achievable over existing features, not a selected sub-set. Thus, like noted few times earlier, in this light it does not seem very acceptable to use very pessimistic assumptions for example for C-DRX configuration. In addition noting that the afore list should not of course understood as exhaustive list and mechanism such as MAC-CE to move the UE to DRX or using BWP adaption to adjust CORESET/SS parameters should not be forgotten or ignored. We hope that our trust will not be misplaced and that companies actually aim to show improvements over proper baseline of supported Rel-15 and Rel-16.  Then few observations for detailed values.  As noted above, we would recommed companies to consider especially for the FTP3 model (with 200ms inter-arrival time) somewhat better aligned DRX configuration accouting short DRX cycle together with shorter IAT.  We were bit wondering why Type1 was not assumed for the BWP switching delay? I think it would be preferable to consider the better (Type1) value for a fair comparison, as it is highly likely that the ‘adaptation delay’ considered in RAN1 evaluations for any new scheme tends to be on the ‘aggressive side’, to be adjusted later on in the specification phase, as we have seen in the past.  Also the minimum gap between DCP and onDuration is taking the worst case value, maybe ps-Offset=2ms could be considered  Also another question for the Y (in the BWP switching). As this seems to relate to scheduler decision to adapt the UE behavior, should we then Y as some form of decision delay, that is jointly considered for the adaptations schemes? Maybe this could be captured under the scheduler assumptions? |
|  |  |

### Power model

Power model

[Huawei] proposes additional power model for DCI format 2\_6. Two values of minimum time gap in terms of slots per SCS are specified and the UE reports one of the minimum time gap. Hence, the monitoring time gap and the power consumption value of monitoring the DCI format 2\_6 need to be modeled in the evaluation, e.g., 100 for minimum time gap = 1slot and 50 for minimum time gap = 6 slots.

[Nokia] also proposes to define assumptions on WUS monitoring power consumption and ps-Offset.

Moderator proposes to have more discusses and inputs on power model for DCI format 2\_6 and reusing TR38.840 Power model as starting point.

#### 1st round discussion:

**Question 2: Reusing TR38.840 Power model as starting point for evaluation of DCI-based power saving schemes. FFS additional power model.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
| OPPO | Yes | Considering the WUS consumption power is relatively small, we may not include it in the modeling. The WUS power saving gain can be model for comparison. |
| MediaTek | Yes | We are fine to reuse it. |
| Xiaomi | Yes | We can reuse TR38.840 power model as starting point. Moreover, some details of power model can be adjusted. |
| Samsung | Yes |  |
| Vivo | Yes |  |
| CMCC | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | We are fine to reuse it.  Regarding the power model for DCI format 2\_6, more discussion is required.  In our understanding, WUS monitoring is more like a “PDCCH-only with cross-slot scheduling(no need to buffer PDSCH)” power state, the relative power of this state should be 70 for FR1. Besides, time gap shoule be considered, UE can switch to micro sleep state in the time gap, the power should be 45. For 30KHz SCS, two minimum time gaps were specified, they are 1 slot and 6 slots.  Therefore, the power consumption value of monitoring the DCI format 2\_6 shoule be: (70+45)/258(we can set to 60 for simplify) for minimum time gap = 1slot and (70+45\*6)/748.6(we can set to 50 for simplify) for minimum time gap = 6 slots |
| Nokia | Yes | TR38.840 could be used as a staring point. As we are now focusing on active time operation, the UL activity and impact to power consumption should be also considered. Assumption Also common assumption for WUS power consumption would be needed. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | yes | It is agreeable to reuse the existing power models in TR38.840 and additionally define the power model on WUS.  Because WUS indication was introduced in Rel-16 and will be taken as the baseline when evaluating the potential power saving techniques, we need define the the power model for WUS. We propose two values corresponding to different minimum time gap, e.g., 100 for minimum time gap = 1slot, 50 for minimum time gap = 6 slots. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |  |
| Intel | Yes, partially | As power saving enhancements during active time also include RedCap devices, some modification to power model is necessary, when reduced BW, and reduced number of antennas are used. |
| SONY | Yes | TR38.840 should be the starting point. Updates to the power model relating to DCI2\_6 would be useful. |
| DOCOMO | Yes |  |
| ZTE | Yes | The power consumption of WUS detection needs to be discussed. For example, 50 power unit with minimum time gap = 1 slot for FR1 and 100 power unit with minimum time gap = 2 slots for FR2. |
| LG | Yes | We think the TR38.840 Power model should be a starting point |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We are fine with reusing the existing power model. We are also open to discuss the power model for DCI format 2\_6. |
| CATT | Yes | TR38.840 has comprehensive power model. |

#### 2nd round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 2:**   * **Reusing power model in TR38.840 for evaluation of DCI-based power saving schemes.**    + **FFS additional power model for the followings**     - **Any update of power models for wake-up signals**     - **Any missing models for UL activity by checking e.g. DL triggered (HARQ FB) and periodic (CSI reporting)** |
| **Comments:**  [HW/HiSi][Spreadtrum][Nokia][Sony][ZTE] proposes some update of the power model of WUS.  [Nokia] asks for considering UL activities for evaluation. So it is fair to check if there is any missing models UL activity by checking e.g. DL triggered (HARQ FB) and periodic (CSI reporting).  [Intel] thinks power saving enhancements during active time also include RedCap devices, some modification to power model is necessary, when reduced BW, and reduced number of antennas are used. |
| **Suggestions for next step:**  Handle the model for WUS and UL during this meeting.  Power model for reduced BW, # of Rx has already been handled in 8.7.1.1, and RedCap AI 8.6.2 in FL summary. (Unless somebody believe we should not treated there :-P) Nothing is handled here unless anything new. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | For the case of need-based monitoring of non-fallback UL DCI, power model in TR 38.840 for PDCCH-only and PDCCH+PDSCH can further be reduced. Thus,   * + **FFS additional power model for the followings**     - **Any update of power models for wake-up signals**     - **Any missing models for UL activity by checking e.g. DL triggered (HARQ FB) and periodic (CSI reporting)**     - **Reduced power consumption model for PDCCH-only and PDCCH+PDSCH, if non-fallback UL DCI is not monitored** |
| Nokia, NSB | For the proposal above, it seems that regular UL traffic is completely missing. Most DL traffic will cause some UL traffic (for instance TCP ACK). Further, services like gaming, video conferencing, etc would observe more symmetric traffic. Hence, from our point it would be crucial to also include PUSCH transmissions into the power modes and assumptions.   * **Reusing power model in TR38.840 for evaluation of DCI-based power saving schemes.**    + **FFS additional power model for the followings**     - **Any update of power models for wake-up signals**   **-Any missing models for UL activity by checking e.g. DL triggered (HARQ FB) and periodic (CSI reporting), SRS and PUSCH** |
| Mediatek | Agree with Proposal 2. |
| CATT | We agree with moderator’s proposal without FFS points. The power model of SRS and PUSCH for FR1/FR2 had been captured in TR38.840. |
| ZTE | The power consumption of WUS detection needs to be discussed. For example, 50 power unit with minimum time gap = 1 slot for FR1 and 100 power unit with minimum time gap = 2 slots for FR2.  We think the power state for UL captured in TR 38.840 is enough to simulate UE’s UL behavior. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. Support the proposal but it would be better to change ‘wake-up signals’ to ‘DCI format 2\_6’. 2. There is no need for the UL activity. DL triggered HARQ feedback has been considered in TR38.840. The power model of SRS and PUSCH for FR1/FR2 had been captured in TR38.840.   **Proposal 2:**   * **Reusing power model in TR38.840 for evaluation of DCI-based power saving schemes.**    + **FFS additional power model for the followings**     - **Any update of power models for ~~wake-up signals~~ detecting DCI format 2\_6**     - **~~Any missing models for UL activity by checking e.g. DL triggered (HARQ FB) and periodic (CSI reporting)~~** |
| Samsung | We agree with the main text. For additional power model, we suggest to remove the list of details as the TR38.840 is complete for at least baseline evealuation. We can keep a note: additional power model for missing state or update is not precluded. |
| Ericsson | OK |
| Qualcomm | We are generally fine with the proposal. Although we don’t see any need for additional UL power models other than those in TR38.830, we can keep it as FFS until further discussion is made. |
| InterDigital | Agree with the proposal. Any need for additional UL power model beyond what is already captured in 38.840 can be discussed. |
| Intel | Agree with main bullet. Regarding FFS, we observe that TR already captured UL power models for short and long PUCCH, PUSCH, SRS. PDCCH-only model can be used for WUS. Hence, need for FFS is not clear. |
| Panasonic | Agree on handling the model of WUS and UL part.  Particuplarly, in our understanding, the WUS power consumption model would be developed and assuming certain number of PDCCH symbols and BDs/CCEs. Thus we suggest to take this opportunity to extend the current PDCCH only model for same and cross-slot scheduling, which can be utilized for the study of DCI-based adaptation as per appropriate. |
| LG | We are okay with the main bullet and the second bullet starting with the FFS. But, we prefer removing the list of details until we see a consensus. |

#### 3rd round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 2:**   * **Reusing power model in TR38.840 for evaluation of DCI-based power saving adaptation schemes.**    + **Note: company reporting additional power model for missing state or update is not precluded.** |
| **Comments:**  Some companies proposes update of power models for wake-up signals, while some thinks TR38.840 is complete for at least baseline evealuation.  For UL activities, some companies don’t see any need for additional UL power models other than those in TR38.840.  For reduced power consumption model for PDCCH-only and PDCCH+PDSCH, if non-fallback UL DCI is not monitored, the current BD scaling method in TR38.840 can be used.  Some companies think any new model or update of the model can be discussed. Therefore, it can be up to companies to report any additional power model for missing state ot update. |
| **Suggestions for next step:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We noticed that in other topic like 8.7.1.1, additional extension to RedCap is also proposed for e.g. narrwor band scaling and RedCap Ues. We would like to consider further if this is accepted in 8.7.1.1.  Note the RedCap SI is also addressing it and even few companies propose similar DCI –based approach. To save duplicated works and avoid out-of-scope, we should move to this AI. |
| Nokia | The power consumption model can be maybe considered based on TS38.840, but it is not fully evident how it is assumed to be applied e.g. for UL control information. This would in our inderstanding require some assumption regarding UL/DL slot pattern. In minimum we would need time between DL and UL slot.  For DCP/WUS having some common assumption also for minimum time gap would be good. |
| CATT | UE Power model in TR38.840 should be used. If additional power model is needed, the proponent should provide the justification of additional UE power model. |
| Spreadtrum | In our previous analysis, DCI format 2\_6 monitoring is a power state of “PDCCH-only with cross-slot scheduling(no need to buffer PDSCH) and certain number of PDCCH symbols and BDs/CCEs”, the power unit of DCI format 2\_6 monitoring can be calculated based on the power model in TR38.840.  Regarding the time gap of WUS, micro sleep can be assumed in evaluation. |

### Additional traffic model

Additional Traffic model

For additional traffic model, [HW][MTK][OPPO][SS][vivo][sony][Nokia] proposed to introduces “intensive eMBB traffic”. Based on FTP Model 3., some parameters need to be updated based on TR38.840. The parameters includes mean inter-arrival time, packet size (as well as data rates), and corresponding DRX settings. [vivo][Nokia] also propose another model not based on FTP Model 3 for gaming and video conferencing. While [QC] has an observation that additionalsettings other than those recommended in TR 38.840 is not evident.

A table summarizes the input on additional traffic model is as follows,

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Additional model | HW | MTK | OPPO | Samsung | Vivo | Sony | Nokia | Qualcomm |
| Model | Intensive eMBB traffic based on FTP Model 3 | Real-Time Video based on FTP model 3 | Gaming and Short Video IM based on FTP model 3 | data-intensive traffic model based on FTP model 3 | Gaming model based on FTP Model 3 | high data intensity traffic model based on FTP Model 3 | video call/conference traffic model e.g. based on [R1-070674] | TR38.840 |
| Mean inter-arrival time | 15 ms | 30 ms | 15 ms | 50 ms | 50ms | 16.67ms |  | 200ms |
| Packet size | 0.05Mbytes | 0.08 Mbytes | 0.05Mbytes / 0.01Mbytes | 1 Mbytes | 200Bytes | 0.05Mbytes |  |  |

In order to merge the input of traffic model as much as possible which minimizes evaluation burden, by considering ifferent input on Mean inter-arrival time and Packet size, the following traffic models in additional to TR38.840 is proposed,

* For UE power saving scheme evaluation, besides traffic model defined in TR38.840, the following ‘additional traffic model’ can be used,
  + FTP Model 3 with 0.15MB packet size and 50ms mean inter-arrival time

Note 0.15MB packet size and 50ms mean inter-arrival time results in 24Mbps mean data rate which matches most companies’ proposals for intensive eMBB traffic

#### 1st round discussion

**Question 3:**

* **Is it OK to have an additional traffic model for UE power saving scheme evaluation besides traffic model defined in TR38.840?**
* **Is it OK to use FTP Model 3 for the additional traffic model?**
* **What is the modification of the additional traffic model compared to traffic model defined in TR38.840 if used? E.g, mean inter-arrival time and/or packet size and/or data rate?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | Yes. | Agree to add one additional traffic model. Suggest packet size of 0.05Mbytes with 15ms inter-arrival time. |
| Ericsson | No | The model in 38.840 should be used for the evaluations. Note new traffic models for real-time video/gaming may be considered for XR SI - so duplicate effort in this work item should be avoided. |
| OPPO | Yes | The 38.840 did not capture fully the use traffic. And this is the time for updating the traffic model in connected mode case. The parameter of Short Video would be one of the important one in the current smartphones. We consider 15 ms mean arrival time-interval and 0.05Mbytes~0.01Mbytes Packet size. To simplify the evaluation, a signle merged value from contributions can be considered.  Note, the short video like IM is quite different case with other SI. |
| MediaTek | Yes | * To conclude whether enhancement is needed for connected mode power saving, we should consider covering all type of data characteristics, particularly in packet size and inter-packet arrival time. For short inter-packet arrival time, RAN1 only consider VoIP with very small packet size. While fixing small BWP bandwidth or number of MIMO layers can optimize VoIP power consumption, the same scheme will degrade the data efficiency for the traffic with large packet size. In this regard, additional model with short inter-packet arrival time, e.g., 30 ms, and large packet size, e.g. 10k bytes to 100 kbytes, will be necessary for the evaluation of Rel-17 power saving enhancements. * “Video conference” becomes common due to COVID-19, but we are not able to tell what is the power saving performance with NR power saving schemes. It is suggeseted RAN1 can include “Video conference” traffic to cover such common real-world traffic.   + XR traffic is rare in real world and still under definition in SA4. It is more reasonable UE power saving group can cover this existing real-world traffic instead of waiting for XR SI that should target to enable a “future” traffic. * For modeling “Video conference”, **FTP model 3** can be utilized since it has been widely utilized in NR, including “R15 enabled use case” in TR 38.824 and “FTP” and “IM” in TR 38.840. The following settings can also be considered:   + Reuse VoIP DRX setting for similar latency requirement   + Mean inter-packet arrival time of 1/30 second   + Fixed packet size w.r.t. data rate for HD or full-HD streaming   + CA setting e.g., FR2 4 x 100 Mhz CCs |
| Xiaomi | - | We are open to discuss the additional traffic model and would rather to reuse the FTP Model 3. The detailed parameters can be discussed further. |
| Samsung | Yes | We suggest to consider additional traffic model for data-intensive traffic based on FTP model 3. |
| Vivo | Yes | We propose to have gaming model based on FTP Model 3 and 50ms mean inter-arrival. The packet size can be determined by data rate. And we are open to discuss. |
| CMCC | Yes | We are open to introduce additional traffic model. |
| Spreadtrum | * Yes * Yes * mean inter-arrival time and packet size |  |
| Nokia | * + Yes | We would prefer to consider video conferencing type of model as the more data intensive. We are OK to try to approximate that with the FTP3 model (i.e. exponential versus pareto distribution). For interarrival time this could be achieved by setting the mean to [6ms] and increasing the λ=[1.1] and truncating the range to [15ms].  On packet size, we should also discuss if we intend to model the transmission and of whether we use the Rel-16 assumption. This is especially relevant to account the UL. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | 1. We think additional traffic model is needed to model the intensive arrival traffic. The proposed intensive eMBB traffic is based on FTP model 3, which is not XR traffic. 2. It’s OK to use FTP model 3 for the additional traffic model. 3. We prefer the traffic of 0.05Mbytes with mean inter-arrival interval of 15ms. However, we are open to the video conference traffic. |
| InterDigital | Yes | * + We are open to new traffic model based on FTP 3. |
| Intel | Yes, partially | * + In addition to traffic models used in TR 38.840, traffic models/parameters adopted in RedCap study should also be included |
| SONY | Yes | **Additional traffic model**: Yes. The traffic model is for evaluation of power saving schemes and doesn’t have to be super-accurate (we do not need to wait for the XR SI). The traffic models we used in Rel-16 were meant to be *representative* of the traffic type and not super-accurate. We can adopt the same approach here.  **FTP3**: Yes. OK to use FTP3 for the additional traffic model.  **Modification**: inter-arrival time = 15ms, packet size = 0.05Mbytes. We do not support an inter-arrival time of 50ms for two reasons: (1) it equates to a video frame rate of 20fps, which doesn’t seem realistic these days, (2) we think that the conclusions drawn from considering an inter-arrival time of 50ms will be similar to those drawn in Rel-16 for a 200ms inter-arrival time   * + **Other**: We would like to see simulations with the UE operating simultaneously with two different traffic models (e.g. FTP and web). This is more realistic of a UE running more than one app and avoids techniques being optimized for one traffic model. |
| ZTE | Yes | We think additional traffic model is needed.  It’s okay to reuse FTP Model 3 for the additional traffic model. The mean inter arrival time can be 50ms and packet size can be 0.05Mbytes . In addition, an appropriate DRX setting for the additional traffic model should be further discussed. |
| LG | Yes | The model in 38.840 should be used for the evaluations. We don’t think additional models are needed, but it is okay if introduced based on a consensus. |
| Qualcomm | No | Additional traffic models that are not in TR 38.840 can be optionally considered by individual company. We don’t see a strong motivation to add other mandatory traffic models. |
| CATT | No | The baseline traffic model in TR38.840 should be used. Additional traffic models were supported in Rel-16 already from different companies. There is no need to have additional traffic model as the baseline. |

#### 2nd round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 3:**   * **Existing traffic model is used for UE power saving scheme evaluation,** * **FFS: consider the following ‘additional traffic model’ ,**   + **Based on FTP Model 3**   + **packet size: [0.15MB]**   + **mean inter-arrival time: [50ms]** |
| **Comments:**  Most companies are OK to study based on additional traffic model in addition to existing traffic model. And most companies are proposing additional traffic model . Some company thinks it should avoid duplication work to other SI.  Most of the proposed additional traffic models are based on FTP model 3. However, the suggested packet size and mean inter-arrival time from companies are quite divergent. |
| **Suggestions for next step:**  Should handle the details of ‘additional traffic model’ during this meeting. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia, NSB | We are not really sure regading the use of the existing traffic model only. Unless we have badly optimized C-DRX configuration, which we should not have due the availability of the Rel-16 UE assistance, this traffic model with mean interarrival time of 200ms does seem to result significant amount of active time. If we agree to use this earlier traffic model, we should also agree to use C-DRX configuration that is better aligned with traffic model based on UE assistance information.  For the new model, it should be applied to both UL and DL (simultaneously), and we would prefer to consider lower inter-arrival time e.g. 15ms. |
| MediaTek | We are generally fine with Proposal 3.  We support to consider video conferencing like service which was missing in R16 study. In addition, it would be better to consider its corresponding cDRX and #carrier settings jointly. The following settings can be applied:   * Reuse cDRX settings for VoIP, e.g., cDRX cycle=40ms, to achive similar latency requirement * Consider FR2 4 x 100MHz CCs to support effective transmission for high data rate service |
| CATT | The traffic models in TR38.840 should be used as the traffic model for baseline evaluation. We encouraged other traffic models in Rel-16 power saving study. The performace results of Rel-16 power saving techniques in TR38.840 includes power saving gain from different traffic models. |
| ZTE | We are generally fine with Proposal 3.We support to introduce additional traffic model with the FTP Model 3. Regarding the mean inter-arrival time and the packet size, it is okay to further discuss. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | 1. support the first bullet; 2. According to the first round discussion, the majority view is to introduce additional traffic model for Rel-17 discussion. The main concern from some companies is the duplicated work with other Sis/Wis such as XR. We can focus on traffic model other than XR, which is based on FTP model 3. |
| Samsung | Agree with Proposal 3. |
| Ericsson | We are generally OK, but need at least until next meeting to resolve the FFS point.  So, the timeline for next step may have to be updated a bit. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the first bullet. For the second bullet, we still think the existing traffic models in TR 38.840 is the baseline, and any new models should be optional. If a new model is to be introduced, we should also go through calibration (as we did in Rel-16) and determine DRX configuration that matches the new traffic, which would take a while. |
| InterDigital | Agree that the new model should be optional. |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal 3. Additional new models can be optionally considered. So suggest to revise the bullets as  **Proposal 3:**   * **Existing traffic model is used for UE power saving scheme evaluation,** * **FFS: consider the following ~~‘additional traffic model’~~ optional traffic model,**   + **Based on FTP Model 3**   + **packet size: [0.15MB]**   + **mean inter-arrival time: [50ms]** |
| LG | We are okay with the proposal. |

#### 3rd round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 3:**   * **Legacy traffic model in TR38.840 and the following ‘additional traffic model’ can be used for Rel-17 DCI-based power sving adaptation evaluation,** * **‘Additional traffic model’ is modelled as follows,**   + **Based on FTP Model 3**   + **packet size: [0.15MB]**   + **mean inter-arrival time: [50ms]**   + **The model is applicable for DL and UL** * **Company reporting which traffic model(s) is used for Rel-17 DCI-based power sving adaptation evaluation.** * **For FR2, 4 x 100MHz CCs to support effective transmission for high data rate service can be considered.** |
| **Comments:**  Most companies seem to be OK to have an additional traffic model. And some companies propose to take it as an optional model depending on companies’ report. The proposal is updated accordingly. |
| **Suggestions for next step:**  Solve values in [] |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | To solve the square bracket we suggest to go to the majority. Seems in the original proposal, 15/16ms inter arrival time is mostly propose. Thus, it would be good he agree on 15 ms. Then, the packet size can be accordingly reduced to 0.1 MB/s. We are also fine for further half the packet sizes. The data size is quite normal rates of video in now days. The application scenarios is far more less than AR/VR senarios, which will taken care by other SI.  Regading the proposed term, we may name it Short Video Traffic model. |
| Nokia | For the Rel-16 traffic model, is it assumed that this only contains DL traffic or will this be applied also to UL? Like noted earlier, for the additional traffic model we would propose to have slightly shorther inter-arrival time to correspond better to video conferencing.  Also in Rel-16 we had assumption that payload is carried in single PHY packet (one slot). Is this still applied? Following this assumption, it is not clear what is the purpose of 4x100MHz CCSs for high data rate services? I.e. how to account? |
| CATT | Traffic models in TR38,840 could be used for DL and UL. Additional traffic models were used for the evaluation of UE power saving gain in Rel-16. The new traffic model could be used as an additional traffic model for baseline comparion. |
| Qualcomm | The intention of “additional” doesn’t look clear. Does it means that the new model is optional? If so, we prefer to use “optional traffic model” instead of “additional traffic model”. |

#### 4th round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 3:**  -         **Legacy traffic models in TR38.840 are considered baseline and the following [‘additional traffic model’] can be optionally considered for Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation evaluation,**  -         **‘Additional traffic model’ is modelled as follows,**  o    **Based on FTP Model 3**  o    **packet size: [0.15MB]**  o    **mean inter-arrival time: [50ms]**  o    **The model is applicable for DL and UL**  -         **Company reporting which traffic model(s) is used for Rel-17  DCI-based power saving adaptation evaluation.**  -         **For FR2, 4 x 100MHz CCs to support effective transmission for high data rate service can be considered.** |
| **Comments:**  Some companies commented the term ‘additional traffic model’, some company thinks it shold be named as ‘Short Video Traffic model’, some company thinks it should be named as ‘optional traffic model’. therefore it is with square bracket. More opnions and feedbacks on the change of the name is expected.  Some companies would like to agree on 15ms/16ms mean inter-arriaval time. By considering different views on the mean inter-arriaval time, e.g., 15/16ms, 30ms, 50ms, 200ms, and also potential overlap with other SI as stated by companies, suggest to keep [50ms] as the most likely acceptable value for compromise. |
| **Suggestions for next step:**  Solve values in [] |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|  | 200ms inter-arrival time is already covered in the FTP3 model of TR38.840 thus we don’t think it needs to be considered when determining the additional traffic model. Therfore we would still suggest using lower value for the ‘additional traffic model’ such as [30ms] |
|  |  |

### DRX settings

DRX Settings

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| DRX settings | HW | MTK | Vivo | Sony | Nokia | Qualcomm |
| DRX setting  (Period, On duration timer , Inactivity timer) | (20, 5, 10)ms | (20, 5, 10 )ms | 40ms | (20, 5, 10)ms, short DRX can be considered | (20,4,5) short DRX cycle of 10 ms with 10 cycles  (40,4,5) short DRX cycle of 20 ms with 5 cycles  (80,8,5) short DRX cycle of 40 ms with 3 cycles | TR38.840,  No short DRX |

Most companies prefers 20ms or 40ms long DRX period. And the value of DRX cycle for evaluation is reasonable to consider traffic model aforementioned. Therefore it is considered the Reference DRX configurations decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 is reused for DRX settings for ‘additional traffic model’. Note that 40ms period DRX configuration has already been included in TR38.840. And whether (20, 5, 10)ms DRX setting can be FFS if necessary.

#### 1st round discussion

**Question 4: Is it OK to reuse reference DRX configurations decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 as DRX settings for evaluation?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | FFS | Related to the parameter setting in Question 3. |
| Ericsson | No | In addition to the C-DRX configurations in 38.840 section 8.2, short DRX configurations should be added, including following examples:   * (long DRX cycle, IAT, short DRX cycle, number of short DRX cycles, on duration)   + 160 ms, 20 ms, 20ms, 4 cycles, FR1 On duration= 8ms   + 160 ms, 20 ms, 20ms, 4 cycles, FR2 On duration = 4ms   It may be also good to clarify that the question is about C-DRX settings. |
| OPPO | Yes | A common assumption for DRX setting could be helpful. Both 40 ms and 20ms is ok. We should pick one. |
| MediaTek | Yes | * + We support reusing reference DRX configurations in TR38.840.   + Short cycle is an optional feature that can be used to reduce the power consumption due to long DRX inactivity timer. Alternatively, DCI based power saving scheme can achieve the same purpose if network indicates UE to enter power saving after completing the last data transmission. If both schemes can provide the same functionality, we suggest to focus one setting and avoid duplicated evaluation efforts.   + Since the scope is to investigate “extension(s) to Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX Active Time for an active BWP”, we suggest to consider the baseline configuration with DRX long cycle and **all** Rel-15 and Rel-16 DCI based power saving schemes.   Note that it is not precluded that companies can simulate both DRX short cycle and all Rel-15 and Rel-16 DCI-based power saving schemes. But, from our observation, the additional benefit with short cycle is restricted to 1.5% - 4% while much complicating UE behaviors for power consumption analysis. Please refer slide 31 of R1-2003667 for more detail information. |
| Xiaomi | - | We are open to discuss the additional traffic model with updated DRX configurations.On the other hand, noted that short DRX configuration is not provided in TR. We suggest that it should be added. |
| Samsung | Yes | The same DRX configurations can be reused for traffic models defineded in TR28.840.  For additional traffic models, it’s OK to consider different DRX configuration as needed. |
| Vivo | Yes | We support reusing reference DRX configurations in TR38.840. |
| CMCC | Yes | OK to reuse reference DRX configurations decribed in TR38.840 |
| Spreadtrum | Yes | We think the reference DRX configurations decribed in TR38.840 are enough, even for the ‘additional traffic model’ |
| Nokia | No | Work item states that:  NOTE: Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power saving solutions should be supported by the UE and included in the evaluation.  Therefore we should account all mechanisms in Rel-15 and Rel-16 to from proper baseline including short DRX and other functionalities (MAC Ces). Given the Rel-16 feature on UE assistance information the also DRX configurations can be assumed to be aligned with the applied traffic model. The above quoted DRX configuration could be considered for the FTP3 model (with parametrization from Rel-16), but for any other agreed traffic model we should identify the proper DRX configuration. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | FFS | The DRX configuration in TR 38.840 can be reused. However, regarding the issue of whether some additional DRX setting is introduced, it depends on the additional traffic model in the Question 3. We share similar view with Apple on this point.  For short DRX configuration, we share similar view with MTK that it is enough to consider R16 based power adaptation. Proper implification is a reasonable way in the evaluation. |
| InterDigital | Yes. |  |
| Intel | Yes | All three DRX configurations in TR 38.840 can be considered, not just 40ms cycles. Note sure why studying 20ms DRX cycle is important |
| SONY | No | We would prefer an additional 20ms or less DRX setting. We also support that short DRX is added as a configuration (as per Ericsson comment) |
| DOCOMO | Yes | The reference DRX configuration in TR38.840 can be basically reused. For the additional traffic model, it can be discussed. |
| ZTE | Yes | It is okay to reuse reference DRX setting for the traffic models captured in TR 38.840 section 8.2 for evaluation.  The DRX setting for VoIP can be used for the additional traffic model, if any. |
| LG | Yes | The reference DRX configurations decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 cab be reused as DRX settings. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We think the reference DRX configuration in TR 38.840 are sufficient to represent typical operating situation with different traffic models. The need for a DRX cycle shorter than 40ms is not evident. |
| CATT | Yes | TR38.840 should be the baseline. |

#### 2nd round discussion

**Question 4: Is it OK to reuse reference DRX configurations decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 as DRX settings for evaluation?**

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 4:**   * **The Reference C-DRX configurations decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 is reused for evaluation**   + **Note: 40ms period DRX configuration has already been included in TR38.840.**   + **FFS: other C-DRX setting** |
| **Comments:**  Some controversial points as follows,  [OPPO][Sony] propose also to include 20ms C-DRX setting. [Intel] thinks it is not sure why 20ms C-DRX cycle is important. Also, some companies seesm to it can be considered different DRX configuration as needed.  [E///][Nokia][Sony] proposes to also include short DRX, while [MTK][HW/HiSi][Intel] thinks the necessityis still not clear. Considering TR38.840 has already stated short DRX can be a choice for evaluation, without loss of generalization, it is recommended companies can report their short C-DRX settings if they used in the evaluation. |
| **Suggestions for next step:**  Need to handle whether other C-DRX setting is needed during this meeting. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We support the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Strongly disagree. This is not in line with the scope of the WID, where it is stated that further improvements should take into account the features of already existing Rel-16. If these improvements are ignored, the baseline will be artificially poor and allow too many optimizations to show their gain. Hence we should use C-DRX configuration that is better aligned with traffic model based on Rel-16 UE assistance information |
| MediaTek | * We are not sure what the motivation of “Note” is. * What is the purpose for considering new cDRX settings? Is it for the additional traffic model mentioned in Proposal 3?   We think more clarifications are needed. |
| CATT | * + Reference DRX configuration in TR38.840 is used with Rel-16 power saving techniques of DRX adaptation with DCP and SCell dormancy as the baseline. |
| ZTE | We support to reuse the Reference C-DRX configurations decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 for the traffic model in TR 38.840 for evaluation.  Besides, the DRX setting for VoIP can be reused for the additional traffic model with mean inter-arrival time=50ms, if any. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support to reuse the Reference C-DRX configurations decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 for the traffic model in TR 38.840 for evaluation. For the DRX setting for additional traffic model, it can be decided together with the additional traffic model. |
| Samsung | The following DRX onfiguration in TR38.840 can be used for the new additional traffic with lower mean inter-arrival tiem.  C-DRX cycle 40msec, inactivity timer {25, 10} msec  - FR1 On duration: 4 msec  - FR2 On duration: 2 msec |
| Ericsson | Not OK. The note in the WID is clear that Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power saving solutions should be supported by the UE and included in the evaluation. Also, if new bursty traffic model is considered, then it is natural that suitable DRX configurations should be added as well. In summary, the following bullet should be added   * Short DRX configurations   + FFS : details |
| Qualcomm | As we commented in Proposal 3, the DRX configuration in TR 38.840 can be a baseline, and any additional configuration can be used by companies if they can justify. |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. If a new traffic type is introduced, a new DRX configuration may be necessary. |
| Intel | Agree with the proposal |
| LG | We are okay with the proposal. |

#### 3rd round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 4:**   * **The Reference C-DRX configurations decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 is reused for evaluation**   + **Up to company to select C-DRX configuration that is better aligned with traffic model**   + **Other C-DRX setting used in the evaluation is not precluded and should be reported by companies.** |
| **Comments:**  Some companies thinks more C-DRX settings can be used for evaluation. Accordingly, the proposal is updated not to preclude other C-DRX Settings. Company also commented that the C-DRX setting should also align with the some other factors, e.g., UE assistance info, traffics. Therefore, it is proposed that up to company to select C-DRX configuration that is better aligned with traffic model. And companies should report the corresponding settings. |
| **Suggestions for next step:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | To be flexible, we can accept 40ms. |
| Nokia | This seems not to account Rel-16 nor Rel-15 baseline properly, which was intended by the objective:  NOTE: Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power saving solutions should be supported by the UE and included in the evaluation. RAN1 will ask the confirmation from RAN2 that Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power saving solutions are properly utilized.  So the proposal seems to be in direct conflict with the work item objective. And thus we cannot support above proposal. We should, like noted, use DRX configuration better matched with the applied traffic model enabled by additional Rel-16 features. |
| CATT | We are supportive the proposal. The proposal does not preclude any other DRX configuration, such as short DRX, along with long DRX in TR38.840. |

#### 4th round discussion

Discussion on DRX related settings are moved to section ‘2.1.1 Performance metrics & assumptions’

### SSB measurement for RLM/BFD

[Nokia][MTK][vivo] mentions that UE is also required to perform radio link monitoring ( also other purposes, e.g., BFD) but it is modelled in the evaluation. It is proposed to define SSB and /or CSI-RS configurations for evaluation of objective 2a. [MTK][vivo] propose to consider SSB measurement per DRX cycle for RLM/BFD.

* Include the assumption in Table XX for modelling SSB measurement power consumption per DRX cycle for RLM/BFD.
* Modelling of SSB measurement overlapped with other channels/signals should follow TR38.840

Table XX: Assumed number of measured/total beams for RLM/BFD per DRX cycle

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | FR1 | FR2 |
| # measured beams / # total beams | 2 (1 slot) / 8 (4 slots) | 8 (4 slot) / 64 (32 slots) |

#### 1st round discussion

**Question 5: Does SSB measurement for RLM/BFD need to be modelled in evalution and how to model?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comments** |
| Apple | No | RLM/BFD relaxation will be discussed in rel-17 RAN4. We recommend separate discussion from 8.7.2. |
| Ericsson | OK, but as optionally modeled in evaluation. | This may depend on the scenario. |
| OPPO | No | Considering the measurement power consumption may not contribute differently to different DCI-based power saving scheme. We nee further dicuss to understand the motivation of introducing it.  The measurement may be considered in the RLM relaxation, which is different agenda item. |
| MediaTek | Yes | For identifying the candidate relaxation schemes for RLM/BFD, power saving benefit should be justified. In this regard, RAN1 should provide a updated model that captures per-DRX SSB measurement power consumption required by RLM/BFD. |
| Xiaomi | OK | SSB measurement for RLM/BFD can be considered here. Beause UE still needs to perform SSB measurement while WUS indicates that DRX OnDurationTimer doesn’t need to strart. But whether SSB measurement makes a impact on power saving assessments needs further discussion. |
| Samsung | No | We think it’s OK to ignore the power consumption fro RLM/BFD in connected mode, especially when the SINR is not bad. |
| Vivo | Yes | In the power saving evaluation, RLM/BFD is part of the dominat part. We see more than 30% power consumption by RLM based on our contribution ([R1-2005392](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2005392.zip)). Model RLM/BFD it is nessasry.  In Rel-16 UE power saving, 1 SSB burst set with 2SSB is assumed for evaluation for loop convergence, with periodicity of max (160ms, DRX cycle). When the DRX cycle is short (e.g., 40ms), the RLM periodidity is 40ms which is much less than 160ms. Therfore we think the max (160ms, DRX cycle) periodic measurement assumption we used in Rel-16 is not enough.  Therefore we propose to consider SSB measurement every DRX Cycle into consideration for CONNECTED mode UE for RLM/BFD. |
| CMCC | Yes | Open to this issue. |
| Spreadtrum |  | No strong view. |
| Nokia | Yes | Both SSB and (periodic) CSI-RS need to be modelled. Furthermore, reporting of such measurements during the active time from UE to network must be included as uplink transmissions. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No | In the WID, RAN4 is assigned to discuss the relaxation of RLM/BFR and it is not in the RAN1 scope now. It should be RAN4 to start the discussion and trigger RAN1 for any further work if RAN4 thinks it is needed.  Now in RAN1 evaluation, we don’t need to model this and we think it can be already modeled as the background activity in Rel-16. |
| Intel | Yes, partially | We think baseline can be 20ms SSB measurement periodicity for evaluation, taking into account SSB based measurements. |
| SONY | FFS | We are OK with considering the power consumption associated with RLM/BFD, but think that the model proposed need clarifying / updating. E.g. does the UE perform RLM / BFD measurements each DRX cycle regardless of whether the DRX cycle is 320ms (Rel-16, TR38.840) or 20ms (section 2.1.4 of this document)? |
| ZTE | NO | According the objective 2b in WID, the RLM/BFB relaxation will be discussed in RAN4. Regarding the simulation of SSB processing, we have models of background activities and RRM measurement. More consideration is not needed for the simulation of power saving gain from PDCCH reduction. We need to focus on RAN1 items within the limited TU. |
| LG | No | Prefer to focus on RAN1-led issues. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We are fine with modeling RLM/BFD in the evalution. However, we may need further discussion for the details. For example, in FR2, the power consumption may also depend on whether the measures SSBs are contiguous in time or not. |
| CATT | No | This is RAN4 issue. RRM measurement model in TR38.840 could be used for RLM/BFD. |

#### 2nd round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 5:**   * **The followings assumptions is considered for evaluation,**    + **The SSB measurement for RLM/BFD is performed every C-DRX cycle.**   + **The assumed number of measured/total beams for RLM/BFD per C-DRX cycle is**     - **2 (1 slot) / 8 (4 slots) for FR1**     - **8 (4 slot) / 64 (32 slots) for FR2**   + **Modelling of SSB measurement overlapped with other channels/signals should follow TR38.840**   + **FFS: CSI-RS for RLM/BFD**   + **Modelling of measurement for RLM/BFD is optional for evaluation.** |
| **Comments:**  Some companies (8) are OK to include the SSB measurement for RLM/BFD in the evaluation, while some companies (5) think it is not necessary.  The reason companies supporting this is power saving gain may be impacted when considering RLM/BFD in the evaluation. The reasons companies object this are in some cases (e.g., SINR high) RLM/BFD in the evaluation can be ignore or it is RAN4 work to define such power model.  Considering different view on this, FL recommend to optional consider the measurement for RLM/BFD in the evaluation as compromise. Modelling of measurement for RLM/BFD or not is both allowed. |
| **Suggestions for next step:**  Nokia commented the reporting of such measurements during the active time from UE to network must be included as uplink transmissions. It can be handled during section 2.1.2 as next step if anything is missing according to the TR38.840. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | The RLM/BFD evaluation periods were specified in RAN4 spec (TS38.133), e.g. as shown below:  Table 8.1.2.2-1: Evaluation period TEvaluate\_out\_SSB and TEvaluate\_in\_SSB for FR1   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Configuration | TEvaluate\_out\_SSB (ms) | TEvaluate\_in\_SSB (ms) | | no DRX | Max(200, Ceil(10 × P) × TSSB) | Max(100, Ceil(5 × P) × TSSB) | | DRX cycle≤320ms | Max(200, Ceil(15 × P) × Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | Max(100, Ceil(7.5 × P) × Max(TDRX,TSSB)) | | DRX cycle>320ms | Ceil(10 × P) × TDRX | Ceil(5 × P) × TDRX | | NOTE: TSSB is the periodicity of the SSB configured for RLM. TDRX is the DRX cycle length. | | |   Thus, we think that assumptions related to RLM/BFD measurements should be discussed in RAN4 for potential UE measurement relaxation for RLM/BFD as stated in WID:   * 1. Study the feasibility and performance impact of relaxing UE measurements for RLM and/or BFD, particularly for low mobility UE with short DRX periodicity/cycle, and specify, if agreed, relaxation in the corresponding requirements [RAN4] |
| Nokia, NSB | We would like to add a NOTE, that “Above signals shall be considered in the power consumption model” |
| MediaTek | Agree with Proposal 5. |
| CATT | We agree with Lenovo/MM’s view that this should be discussed in RAN4. |
| Apple | Agree with proposal 5. |
| ZTE | We would like to first clarify that the “Some companies (8) are OK to include the SSB measurement for RLM/BFD in the evaluation, while some companies **(~~5~~ 7)** think it is not necessary.” With this slight majority, we are not convinced by the necessity of modelling RLM/BFM **for the evaluation of power saving gain from PDCCH reduction techniques**.  It should be noted that RLM/BFD relaxation is a RAN4 item. We need to focus on RAN1 item with the limited TU (1 TU per meeting). Besides, if it is recommended to “optional consider the measurement for RLM/BFD in the evaluation ”, I think we don’t need to try to reach agreements within the group about the RLM/BFD model, companies who are interested in it can always report their simulation assumptions in their contribution. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is always allowed for companies to optionally provide results based on a reported evaluation assumption, which is justified reasonable. |
| Samsung | We are OK to consider RLM/BFD evaluation as optional for compromise. But we don’t think it’s necessary that RLM/BFD is performed every C-DRX cycle, especially when DRX cycle is short, e.g. 40ms. We suggest to remove the first bullet, and companies can follow RAN4 requirement accordingly. |
| Qualcomm | We agree with moderator’s comment. |
| InterDigital | We are not convinced that this should be included as part of the model. |
| Intel | We agree with CATT and Lenovo that decision on SSB based measurements for RLM/BFD per DRX cycle should be discussed in RAN4. We are not sure modeling of this activity in RAN1 is critical to study DCI based power saving adaptations in active time. |
| Panasonic | Leaving it to RAN4 as planned in the WID is more reasonable practice. |
| LG | Basically, we don’t think agreeing on this proposal should not be a high priority. However, as long as the intention of the Proposal 5 is to align the evaluation assumptions among companies that are interested in “optional” modelling of SSB measurement, then we don’t have a strong concern. |

#### 3rd round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 5:**  **Measurement for RLM/BFD every *N* C-DRX cycle can be optionally modelled.**   * **N = 1 as baseline, other values not precluded.** * **The assumed number of measured/total beams for RLM/BFD per C-DRX cycle is**   + - **2 / 8 for FR1**     - **8 / 64 for FR2** |
| **Comments:**  In Rel-16, for evaluation purpose, it is assumed that a periodicity of max(DRX cycle, 160 msec) is the baseline for periodic activities, e.g. time/frequency, channel or beam tracking (if applicable). However, the power consumption for RLM/BFD is not included while it can be performed every DRX cycle.  For RAN 1 evaluation, optionally model the RLM/BFD power consumption in the evaluation as a way forward can be considered. Other detailes can be up to company report. |
| **Suggestions for next step:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | We would propose to change “can be optionally modelled” to “must be modelled”. This is further needed also for RAN4 work, thus accounting it in baseline would make sense. |
| CATT | We agree to have the model. |

### Others

Instead of existing BW and CC configuration in TR38.840, one company proposes to consider **4 CCs of total 400 MHz for FR2.**

One company proposes to model UL activity or UL traffic and to model UCI related activity as DL triggerd (HARQ FB) and periodic CSI reporting.

#### 1st round discussion

**Question 6: Is there any others related to evaluation methodologies for power saving evaluation and what is it? Provide motivation if any.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Ericsson | Whether interruption is needed or not during transitions should be explicitly clarified for each scheme during the evaluations. The impact of presence/absence of interruptions on power savings and system impact should be included in the evaluation.  This is high priority from our perspective given the significant NW impact. |
| MediaTek | For DCI-based power saving schemes, network DCI indication overhead and UE power saving gain are important trade-off. For any Rel-17 enhancement scheme, justification on DCI indication overhead is therefore necessary. |
| Nokia | UL activity needs to be included as part of the evaluations. Both in terms of UL control information and UL data (e.g. using FTP3 model for video conferencing). |
| SONY | Consider UL activity |
| ZTE | A proper set of Rel-15/Rel-16 power saving techniques needs to be in the evaluation of Rel-17 power saving enhancement, e.g., WUS, cross-slot scheduling, BWP switching, etc. |

#### 2nd round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 6:**   * + **Send LS including the evaluation methodologies proposed in section 2.1.1/2/3/4/5 for connected-mode UE to RAN2 / RAN4** |
| **Comments:**  Some company[E///][Nokia][MTK] mentions system impact/overhead should be provided in the evaluation, which is also part of TR38.840 section 8.2. It is handled in section 2.1.1.  Some company [Nokia][Sony] mentions the UL activity should be included in the evaluation. The power model for UL is handled in 2.1.2. Since not all the traffics are with equal DL/UL or UL heavy, whether inclusion of UL activity can be up to certain cases. FL recommends the companies to report it in the results.  [E///] proposes whether interruption is needed or not during transitions should be explicitly clarified for each scheme during the evaluations. FL recommends asks for further clarification during the meeting. |
| **Suggestions for next step:**  Please provide details for other proposals for evaluation methodologies if any. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Once we have full set of agreements we can consider sending the relevant information to RAN4 (for RLM/BFD work), but I fail so see what RAN2 is expected to do with the information (which objective?), |
| MediaTek | Agree with Proposal 6. |
| CATT | We could include all agreements in the LS to RAN2/RAN4 not limiting evaluation methodology. |
| Apple | Similar to Nokia. RLM/BFD measurement power model can be used in RAN4 evaluation. Not sure why LS to RAN2 is needed. |
| ZTE | We are okay to send LS to RAN2 according to WID. However, we don’t think the PDCCH reduction has impact on RAN4. Hence, LS to RAN4 is not needed.  **Proposal 6:**   * + **Send LS including the evaluation methodologies proposed in section 2.1.1/2/3/4~~/5~~  for connected-mode UE to RAN2 ~~/ RAN4~~**   Besides, a proper set of Rel-15/Rel-16 power saving techniques needs to be considered in the evaluation of Rel-17 power saving enhancement, such as wake-up indication, cross-slot scheduling, and BWP switching. |
| Huawei & HiSilicon | All the agreements in the first meeting can be sent to RAN2. Maybe no need to RAN4. |
| Samsung | Agree with Proposal 6. |
| Ericsson | OK to send LS to RAN2. We should also ask RAN2 for their confirmation about Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power savings included in the evaluations, as per the following in the WI objective.   * *NOTE: Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power saving solutions should be supported by the UE and included in the evaluation. RAN1 will ask the confirmation from RAN2 that Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power saving solutions are properly utilized.* |
| Qualcomm | In our view, RAN2 would be more interested in idle mode power/evaluation model, based on the WID. Also, RAN4 would be interested in relaxing the requirement without harming the performance – power consumption would not be of their concern. So only limited set of information (e.g., reference traffic model, DRX configuration, etc.) would be enough to inform. |

#### 3rd round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 6:**   * + **Send LS including the evaluation methodologies proposed in section 2.1.1/2/3/4/5 for connected-mode UE to RAN2 / RAN4** |
| **Comments:**  Many companies think that the LS is sent when all the agreements are ready. Regarding the RAN2 and RAN4.  RAN2 is needed? Yes: MTK, CATT, ZTE, HW/HiSi, Ericsson, Samsung No: Nokia, Qualcomm, Apple  RAN4 is needed? Yes: MTK, CATT, Apple, Nokia, Samsung, Qualcomm No: ZTE, HW/HiSi, Ericsson |
| **Suggestions for next step:**  Further discussion on the conetent depending on the full agreements and which gourp the LS to send. And companies’ comments are appreciated. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We see the companies view on need of LS is more about proposal 5, not all the proposals. |
| Nokia | To correct my earlier statement, once we have agreed the list of power saving schemes for objective 2, could be confirmed from RAN2 as indicated by WID. Earlier question was more related to the Connected mode UE power modelling, if it is needed by RAN2 for evaluation (of which objective)?  Like noted above and earlier how to account/modelling of UL control information modeling needs to be clarified. |
| CATT | For clarification, we see the need to send RAN2/RAN4 LS for all the conclusion/agreements of Rel-17 UE power saving enhancements. |

## High-level concepts

### DCI-based power saving schemes for active time

#### Adaptation of PDCCH monitoring behaviours

Most of the proposals mentions DCI indication to change PDCCH monitoring behaviour, which is beneficial from UE power saving perspective. Two main stream of machensim includes search space set group switching which is similar to Rel-16 NR-U SS set group switching which is triggered by DCI 2\_0 or timer or detection of any PDCCH.

Note in RedCap SI, one of the objective is to reduce PDCCH monitoring in order to save power as well as UE cost reduction, which is also relevant to this WI. For the design of DCI-based power saving schmes for active time in power saving WI, it is also better to also take RedCap UE into account.

##### SS set group switching

Enhancement of search space set group switching

Many companies [HW, E///, ZTE, OPPO, SS, Spreadtrum, apple, IDC, Docomo, vivo, Nokia, QC] mention Rel-16 search space set group switching which is defined in Rel-16 NR-U WI. By this scheme, the UE only monitors one of the search space set groups, and it is switched to another by timer or the indication in DCI format 2\_0 or by detection of some DCI formats. As the PDCCH monitoring periodicity is configured per search space set, the periodicity of PDCCH monitoring is changed along with the search space set group switching. Other parameters defined in a search space set can also be switched, e.g., aggregation level, number of blind decoding and etc. Similar scheme can be considered to be extended in Rel-17 power saving.

Instead of Search space switching, some companies also think CORESET-level adaption is useful [LG]. And if the SS is switched, the corresponding CORESET might also be changed.

Triggering of space set group switching is investigated from many companies’ proposals,

The following parameters related to SS set group switching can be considered

* + PDCCH monitoring periodicity and duration,
  + aggregation level,
  + number of blind decoding

##### PDCCH skipping

Enhancement of PDCCH skipping

Many companies [HW, ZTE, OPPO, intel, Lenovo, CMCC, Spreadtrum, apple, IDC, vivo, QC] mention DCI based signaling indicating UE to skip PDCCH monitoring for a certain duration in active time.

Some companies [Nokia][HW][…] also mentioned DCI based signaling to go to DRX, which is similar to use a DRX Command MAC CE[Nokia]. While another source [HW] thinks that compared with DRX command MAC-CE, the packets may be delayed for short duration but can be scheduled at once after the short duration if DCI-based PDCCH skipping is used . gNB can control the total sleep time of UE more flexibly to achieve a tradeoff between low traffic latency and UE power saving gain.

Triggering of PDCCH switching are investigated from many companies’ proposals,

* The following schemes for PDCCH skipping can be considered,
  + Indication to change PDCCH monitoring behaviour, e.g.,
    - o to monitor PDCCH or to skip monitoring PDCCH,
    - to skipped PDCCH monitoring for a certain duration,
    - to adapt to different PDCCH parameters

#### MIMO layer adapation

Some companies [Samsung][vivo][HW] propose to dynamic adaptation to the maximum number of MIMO layers within the active BWP. For example, if there is no data transmission, gNB can indicates the UE to use the default configuration with smaller maximum number of MIMO layers for UE power saving. When the traffic data arrives, gNB indicates the UE to switch to larger maximum number of MIMO layers. Or it would be beneficial to support antenna adaptation method which does not require BWP switching for further power saving.

#### Relaxing PDSCH processing time

One company [Samsung] proposes that in order to achieve power saving from relaxed processing, it’s essential to consider relaxation on both PDCCH processing timeline and PDSCH reception and ACK/NACK feedback timeline, so that UE can lower the clock rate for all DL processing modules.

#### Downlink and uplink DCI decoupling

In Rel-15 and Rel-16 specification, the non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling are always configured in same search space for non-fallback. This will lead to unnecessary blind decoding for some DCI format (e.g., UL or DL grant) especially if their DCI size is different.

The straightforward way is to decouple non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling, i.e., configure different SS [vivo].

#### frequency domain domain

One company [Nokia] proposes the concept of resource block sets can be adapted for licensed band operation to control PDCCH monitoring behaviour in the frequency domain.

#### Dynamic change DRX parameters

One company [Sony] proposes L1 dynamic signaling mechanism where the configuration of the inactivity timer and DRX cycles in connected mode can be easily and quickly adapted based on the traffic for the UE or network conditions.

#### multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCH scheduling

Two company [Panasonic][Lenovo] proposes multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCH scheduling. In this case, even if PDCCH monitoring occasions are reduced for a UE like once per 2 slots or once per 4 slots, the throughput is not impacted. Multiple TB scheduling was supported by eMTC and NR-U and was also discussed in URLLC. For Rel.17 power saving enhancement, it can also be discussed and studied due to the power saving technical merit.

#### Others

*void*

#### Summary

In a summary, the following schemes are proposed in contributions from a high-level concepts. And there is a vast number of proposals there.

##### 1st round discussion

**Question 7:**

* **Is there any other topic which has not been listed for DCI-based power saving schemes in active time?**
* **Or is there any topic which is not well captured?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|
| Company A | Comments |
| Ericsson | WUS for short DRX can also be considered. |
| MediaTek | To agree the list, justification on whether an item is in the WI scope is needed. We suggest to remove the item(s) that cannot regarded as an extension to existing Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX Active Time for an active BWP. For example, Topics 5, 6 and 7 may need further clarification.   |  | | --- | | Study and specify, if agreed, extension(s) to Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX Active Time for an active BWP, including PDCCH monitoring reduction when C-DRX is configured [RAN1] |   Another consideration is whether we can evaluate the power saving performance. For example, we seem not able to evaluate Topic 3 as no power scaling is defined w.r.t. a relaxed PDSCH processing time.  Overall, we suggest to keep only the items with good justification on scope compliance and evaluation feasible. |
| Xiaomi | As we can see from the simulation, WUS applying to DRX short cycle can provide significant power saving. So we think PHY layer enhancement to support WUS applying to DRX short cycle should be considered.  And onsidering the limited time, we do not need to include other more topics. |
| Samsung | For Topic 1-2, it’s not clear whether PDCCH skipping duration can be associated with minimum scheduling offset. In our view, we prefer the PDCCH skipping jointly adapted with cross-slot scheduling. |
| Vivo | For topic 1-3, we think it can be achieved by SS switching since SS is linked to CORESET. Hence it can be merged to 1-1. |
| Nokia | Search space set group switching (topic 1-1) could be complemented with cross-slot scheduling as noted in R1-2006898. Also, like pointed out by Ericsson, considering simple extension of WUS to apply short DRX cycle as well could be considered for reducing PDCCH monitoring. On Topic 1-1, for my clarification, the listed parameters can already be adjusted today (as a part of SS set). Are these just given as examples? |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | It is not clear why the sub-bullets are needed for Topic 1-1. In our view, it is gNB implementation what parameters will be changed along with SS set switching. Further clarification would be appreciated.  For Topic 1-2, what’s the difference between sub-bullet 1 and sub-bullet 2? Does the sub-bullet 1 is an extension of dormancy indication to Pcell? Furthermore, it would be too general regarding the sub-bullet of ‘adapt to different PDCCH parameters’. More concrete proposal is needed. |
| InterDigital | We are generally fine with the proposals. For Topic 1-1, we should not restrict the technique only to the sub-bullets. We can add “e.g.” to show that the sub-bullets are examples.  For Topic 1-2, we perefer some clarification. Does PDCCH skipping imply skipping all monitoring occasions of every SS, or can we selectively skip a subset of monitoring occasions. The second option provides more flexibility. |
| Intel | We should add “Other options are not precluded” and RedCap Ues are included in consideration. We are not sure what can be achieved by summarizing all the proposals from companies, since we do not have a TR. We could focus on agreeing on high level direction first.  WUS is applied outside active time, hence we do not see how it can be considered for enhancements during active time. Focus for this agenda is active time. |
| DOCOMO | For topic 1-1, the parameters in sub-bullets can be changed by existing schemes. In our understanding, the intention here is that the enhancements based on SS set group switching can be considered, e.g., adaptation within SS set group, enhancements on how to indicate.  For topic 1-2, we share similar view as Samsung. The PDCCH skipping jointly adapted with cross-slot scheduling should be considered. |
| ZTE | According to our understanding, the adaptation of PDCCH monitoring behaviour can also be achieved by switch PDCCH monitoring periodicity without search space set switch. Hence, we suggest to add the following:  Topic 1-4：switch PDCCH monitoring periodicity within one search space set  Regarding sub-bullets in Topic 1-1, we agree with Huawei that whether these parameters change or not depends on network implementation.  The third bullet of Topic 1-2, i.e., “ adapt to different PDCCH parameters”, is not clear to us. More information is appreciated. |
| LG | Assuming that the intention is to capture the potential techniques based on contributions, we would like to add the followings.  As we understand it, PDCCH monitoring skipping for a certain duration applies to all configured search space sets, which may be beneficial when there is no data to be transmitted. On the other hand, if a DCI scrambled by a certain RNTI is required to be transmitted to a UE, the search space sets that are not configured to monitor the RNTI don’t needed to be monitored. In this case, if a NW can indicate to activate/deactive search space set(s), the power saving gain could be achived from monitoring skip of deactivated search space set(s). For this, our suggestion is to add “search space set level activation/deactivation” on the sub-bullet of Topic 1-2. |
| Qualcomm | The main source of the power saving gain is putting the RF front end into a low power mode. However, in some cases, the RF front end is shared by multiple CCs (e.g., intra-band CA). Therefore, to maximize the power saving gain, simultaneous triggering of a power saving scheme across multiple CCs can be studided. For example, the cross-slot scheduling adaptation in Rel-16 may be extended to support multi-CC simultaneous adaptation. |
| CATT | The key aspect to UE power saving study is the PDCCH monitoring reduction through dynamic adaptation. Most of other power saving techniques had been well discussed during Rel-16 power saving study and work. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | Regarding Topic 4, we think non-fallback UL DCI can be monitored whenever necessary, e.g. after sending SR. Thus, suggest to modify the summary as follows:  **Topic 4:**Decoupling non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling, e.g. configure different SS for each, adaptively monitoring non-fallback UL DCI |

##### 2nd round discussion

**The topic lists after 1st round discussion is as follows with change marks. The priority for each topic according to the input from section 2.2.3 is appended to each topic with a company list for reference.**

* **Topic 1:** Adaptation of PDCCH monitoring behaviours [Apple][OPPO][Xiaomi][Samsung][CMCC][Spreadtrum][ZTE][LG][CATT][Lenovo/MotM]
  + **Topic 1-1:** Search space set group switching ~~with the change of~~ [MTK][vivo][Nokia][HW/HiSi][DOCOMO][Qualcomm] [InterDigital]
    - ~~PDCCH monitoring periodicity and duration,~~
    - ~~aggregation level,~~
    - ~~number of blind decoding~~
  + **Topic 1-2:** PDCCH skipping which indicate to change PDCCH monitoring behaviour, e.g., [MTK][vivo] [HW/HiSi][DOCOMO][CATT]
    - to monitor PDCCH or to skip monitoring PDCCH,
    - to skipp PDCCH monitoring for a certain duration,
    - to adapt to different PDCCH parameters
    - search space set level activation/deactivation
  + **~~Topic 1-3:~~** ~~CORESET switching~~
* **Topic 2:** Dynamic adaptation to the maximum number of MIMO layers within the active BWP[Xiaomi] [Samsung] [HW/HiSi][DOCOMO, 2nd priority]
* **Topic 3:**Relaxing PDSCH processing time[Xiaomi] [Samsung]
* **Topic 4:**Decoupling non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling, i.e., configure different SS for each, adaptively monitoring non-fallback UL DCI by SR [vivo]
* **Topic 5:**RB sets adapatation for PDCCH monitoring in frequency domain
* **Topic 6:**L1 dynamic signaling mechanism where the configuration of the inactivity timer and DRX cycles in connected mode can be changed
* **Topic 7:**Multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCHscheduling [CMCC]
* **[Topic 8:** WUS for short DRX] [Ericsson?][Nokia?][Xiaomi?]

**By removing topics which no company propose as a high priority topic, the followings are proposed,**

**Proposal 7: For Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation in active time, the followings can be considered,**

* Adaptation of PDCCH monitoring behaviours
  + Search space set group switching
  + PDCCH skipping which indicate to change PDCCH monitoring behaviour, e.g.,
    - to monitor PDCCH or to skip monitoring PDCCH,
    - to skipp PDCCH monitoring for a certain duration,
    - to adapt to different PDCCH parameters
    - search space set level activation/deactivation
* Dynamic adaptation to the maximum number of MIMO layers within the active BWP
* Relaxing PDSCH processing time
* Decoupling non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling, i.e., configure different SS for each, adaptively monitoring non-fallback UL DCI by SR
* Multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCHscheduling
* **[**WUS for short DRX]

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|
|  |  |
| Nokia, NSB | We would support considering at least SS set group switching. Also Topic 5 should be considred with high priority, as the feature is already specified for NR-U and enables PDCCH monitoring adaptation. Its applicability to licensed spectrum should be considered. In addition, topic 8 [WUS for short DRX] would appear to be relatively minor spesfication update thus would support considering in the work  For features like MIMO layer adaptation, the application delay should be clearly determined, and commited(!) as the delay assumption is crucial to the power saving benefit over existing functionality. |
| MediaTek | As mentioned in our comments of 1st round discussion, we suggest to keep only the candidates with good justification on scope compliance and evaluation feasibility. Therefore, we propose the following updates:  **Proposal 7: For Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation in active time, the followings can be considered,**   * Adaptation of PDCCH monitoring behaviours   + Search space set group switching   + PDCCH skipping which indicate to change PDCCH monitoring behaviour, e.g.,     - to monitor PDCCH or to skip monitoring PDCCH,     - to skipp PDCCH monitoring for a certain duration,     - to adapt to different PDCCH parameters     - search space set level activation/deactivation * Dynamic adaptation to the maximum number of MIMO layers within the active BWP * ~~Relaxing PDSCH processing time~~ * Decoupling non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling, i.e., configure different SS for each, adaptively monitoring non-fallback UL DCI by SR * ~~Multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCHscheduling~~ * **~~[~~**~~WUS for short DRX]~~ |
| CATT | We are fine with moderator’s proposal for study but comparing with the Rel-16 power saving techniques as the baseline. |
| Apple | Fine with proposal 7 |
| ZTE | We are generally okay with the proposal. Some  The third sub-bullets of PDCCH skipping can be removed before it is clear. And we are also supportive to study PDCCH skipping to reduce PDCCH monitoring.  The proposal is suggested to be modified as follows:   * Adaptation of PDCCH monitoring behaviours   + Search space set group switching   + PDCCH skipping which indicate to change PDCCH monitoring behaviour, e.g.,     - to monitor PDCCH or to skip monitoring PDCCH,     - to skip~~p~~ PDCCH monitoring for a certain duration,     - ~~to adapt to different PDCCH parameters~~     - search space set level activation/deactivation * Dynamic adaptation to the maximum number of MIMO layers within the active BWP * Relaxing PDSCH processing time * Decoupling non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling, i.e., configure different SS for each, adaptively monitoring non-fallback UL DCI by SR * Multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCHscheduling * **[**WUS for short DRX] |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | fine. |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | We are fine with Proposal. WUS design should not be considered since the focus is active time. Multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCHscheduling should be included, as it can be seen as extension of DCI based scheme for multi-TB scheduling supported for NR-U. Also, PDCCH monitoring reduction/simplifications schemes targeted for RedCap Ues can be considered in this agenda, if deprioritized in RedCap. Hence, suggest to add a bullet as follows:   * Other schemes such as those targeted for RedCap Ues are not precluded |
| Panasonic | We are supportive of proposal 7. |
| LG | We are okay with the proposal. |

##### 3rd round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 7:**  **For Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation in active time, the followings can be considered,**   * Adaptation of PDCCH monitoring behaviours   + Search space set group switching   + PDCCH skipping which indicate to change PDCCH monitoring behaviour, e.g.,     - to monitor PDCCH or to skip monitoring PDCCH,     - to skip PDCCH monitoring for a certain duration,     - [to adapt to different PDCCH parameters]     - search space set level activation/deactivation * Dynamic adaptation to the maximum number of MIMO layers within the active BWP * Decoupling non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling, i.e., configure different SS for each, adaptively monitoring non-fallback UL DCI by SR * Extend RB sets adapatation for PDCCH monitoring in frequency domain to licensed band * [Relaxing PDSCH processing time] * [Multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCHscheduling] * **[**WUS for short DRX] |
| **Comments:**  The list is updated and it includes the following schemes:   * At least one company propose to set as high priority. * The schemes which is stated by companies during the discussion not expected to be studied, e.g., not with good justification or not in the scope, are put in square bracket.   One company stated other schemes such as those targeted for RedCap Ues are not precluded. Hence it is proposed to clarify what schemes targeted to RedCap before it can be put on the list.  One company stated that to adapt to different PDCCH parameters is not clear. Hence it is proposed to have further clarification before removing []. |
| **Suggestions for next step:**  Handle the bullets in []. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | We are also ok with “to skip PDCCH monitoring for a certain duration”. For the [] part, we suggest remove “[]” for adapt to different PDCCH parameters. |
| Nokia | Like noted earlier we would support additionally considering WUS for short DRX. |
| CATT | We are OK to study these items since most of them had been studied in Rel-16 UE power saving with the results captured in TR38.840. I would like to clarify the meaning of “to adapt to different PDCCH parameters”. Is it adaption to the CORESET configuration, search space parameters, PDCCH monitoring periodicity? |
| CMCC | We support Multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCHscheduling.  In addition, I would like to clarify the relationship between “to monitor PDCCH or to skip monitoring PDCCH”, and “to skip PDCCH monitoring for a certain duration,”, it seems the difference is duration of PDCCH monitoring skipping? |

##### 4th round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 7:**  **For Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation in active time, the followings can be considered,**   * Adaptation of PDCCH monitoring behaviours   + Search space set group switching   + PDCCH skipping which indicate to change PDCCH monitoring behaviour, e.g.,     - to monitor PDCCH or to skip monitoring PDCCH,     - to skip PDCCH monitoring for a certain duration,     - to adapt to different PDCCH parameters     - search space set level activation/deactivation * Dynamic adaptation to the maximum number of MIMO layers within the active BWP * Decoupling non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling, i.e., configure different SS for each, adaptively monitoring non-fallback UL DCI by SR * Extend RB sets adapatation for PDCCH monitoring in frequency domain to licensed band * [Relaxing PDSCH processing time] * Multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCHscheduling * WUS for short DRX |
| **Comments:**  Removing [] for items (marked red) which companies commented to have large interests. |
| **Suggestions for next step:**  Handle the bullets in []. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Spreadtrum | Regarding “search space set level activation/deactivation”, it seems more like SS Set group switching, because when SS Set group is switched there could be a SS Set is activated/deactivated. We are not sure whether it should be categorized in “Search space set group switching”. |
| Nokia | We do not have power consumption model for the PDSCH processing timeline so we would suggest it to be dropped for time being. |

### Triggering of DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX ActiveTime

Scheduling DCI triggering

Triggering power saving adaptation by scheduling DCI are mentioned by many companies.

For SS set group switching, the Rel-16 NR-U adopts DCI format 2\_0 using field *SearchSpaceSwitchTrigger-r16 to* trigger the UE to switch between search space set group 0 and 1. For licensed band, it is naturally to optimize that to include search-space group switching bit(s) in a UE specific scheduling DCI or by detection of absence/presence of scheduling DCI instead of group-common PDCCH 2\_0. And it is proposed by many companies [vivo, ZTE, MTK,CATT, SS, CMCC, Spreadtrum,LG,Panasonic, apple, E///, Qualcomm, Nokia, InterDigital, 14 ~~13~~ companies].

For PDCCH skipping, many companies mention that using DCIfor skipping [HW, vivo, zte, intel,OPPO, CMCC, Spreadtrum, Apple, IDC, 9 companies].

One company [HW] mentions for the active BWP, the maximum number of MIMO layers can be dynamically switched by L1 signaling with short switch delay.

Also, for the topic multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCH scheduling,, companies mentiuons it can be triggered by scheduling DCI. [Lenovo][Panasonic]

Detecting scheduling grant

3 companies [OPPO][vivo][Spreadtrum] proposes to change PDCCH monitoring behaviours based on detection of scheduling grant.

Timer triggering

Timer based adaptation is also mentioned by some companies[vivo][Spreadtrum]. For example, a timer, which is similar to the timer *searchSpaceSwitchingTimer-r16*, can trigger the UE to switch between search space set group 0 and 1.

Interact with HARQ

Some companies propose to optimize the PDCCH monitoring when interacts with potential HARQ retransmission [MTK][QC].

[QC] proposes similar to the existing UE behavior for handling HARQ retransmission during the DRX operation, a set of timers (e.g., RTT timer and retransmission timer) may be configured per HARQ process to control the UE’s discontinuous PDCCH monitoring behavior.

[MTK] proposes pre-indication adaptation. For example, network sends the adaptation triggering in the scheduling DCI for the last TB of a packet. If PDSCH is received successfully, UE switches to power saving duration. Otherwise, UE stays in data-efficient duration. The results show the pre-indication adaptation can achieve 9% and 38% of power saving gains for VoIP in 1CC/FR1 and Real-Time video in 4CC/FR2 when compared to convention adaptation, respectively.

The following for DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX ActiveTime can be considered when interact with HARQ retransmission, e.g.,

* timers (e.g., RTT timer and retransmission timer) may be configured per HARQ process to control the UE’s discontinuous PDCCH monitoring behaviour.
* When a UE receives the pre-indication for power saving, the UE is permitted to apply the adaptation if the configured condition(s) fulfils and network configures the condition(s).

One example of, the condition can be that when PDSCH is received successfully, UE adapation based on pre-indication if the configured condition(s) fulfils can also be used to other cases.

Joint indication vs independent indication

Besides independent indication of the Rel-17 DCI based power saving schemes in active time, some companies propose to joint indication of the PDCCH monitoring adaptation with

* cross-slot scheduling defined in Rel-16 [DoCoMo][OPPO] [MTK]
* Scell dormancy [MTK][CATT][Panasonic]

DCI dormat 2\_6 triggering

4 companies [LG][vivo][Lenovo][Qualcomm] propose to use DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time.

Others

One company [vivo] propose to switch SS set groupby detecting some UL transmission, e.g., SR / CG.

One company [OPPO] propose to further consider the mechanism based on the group common DCI. UE have to receive that special DCI format to do the switching, which is in parallel with scheduling DCIs. Similar to that, one compay [IDC] propose that go-to-sleep indication may be transmitted in the scheduling DCI or in a group-common PDCC.

In Rel-16, DCI format 2\_6 is monitored out side active time, one company [LG] suggests to use DCI format 2\_6 in active time to adapt the PDCCH monitoring.

#### 1st round discussion

**Question 8:**

* **Considering specific triggering schemes maybe only applicable for specific power saving schemes (described in section 2.2.1.9), provide your view on it if any of these triggering schemes has such restriction of usage. And provide feasible triggering schemes (described in section 2.2.2) for each topics.**
* **Is there any other triggering schemes for Rel-17 DCI-based power saving schemes in active time?**
* **Is there any triggering schemes not well captured from above?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|
| Apple | Scheduling DCI, timer based, and group common DCI can be used for topic 1 of 2.2.1.9, “Adaptation of PDCCH monitoring behaviours” |
| Ericsson | This is good starting point for this discussion. |
| OPPO | Our contributions does not means the Rel-17 enhancement should be Group Common DCI. Instead, it means the orginal Rel-16 SS switching adopt group common, which should be not good for power saving enhancement. |
| MediaTek | We think the first level items can be consolidated a bit. One possibility is to merge pre-indication scheme under scheduling DCI since the proposal is actually to improve restransmission handling for a power saving indication based on scheduling DCI. Also the proposal with RTT timer concept can be categorized together. In this regard, the following update to the list is suggested:   * **Scheduling DCI**   + **The indication of PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be**     - **Explicit/implicit indicated by scheduling DCI**     - **Joint indication of the PDCCH monitoring adaptation with**       * **cross-slot scheduling defined in Rel-16**       * **Scell dormancy**   + **The scheduling DCI for indicating PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be DCI format x\_1/x\_2**     - **DCI format x\_1**     - **DCI format x\_2**   + **Enhancement for retransmission handling**     - **Apply adaptation only after HARQ ACK condition is fulfilled**     - **Apply adaptation right after DCI indication but start timer(s) to handle retransmission if required** * **Timer based adaptation,**    + **A timer e.g., similar toTimer *searchSpaceSwitchingTimer-r16,* can trigger the UE to switch between search space set group 0 and 1**   + **~~A set of timers (e.g., RTT timer and retransmission timer) configured per HARQ process to control the UE’s discontinuous PDCCH monitoring behavior.~~** * **~~UE is permitted to apply the adaptation after receiving pre-indication for power saving and if the configured condition(s) fulfils. Network configures the condition(s)~~**   Also we suggest to consider justification on scope compliance and evaluation feasible before deciding the final list. For example, DCI format 2\_6 that is monitored outside DRX Active Time, is not in the WI scope. |
| Xiaomi | It is too early to be deep into the triggering details. We would like to later consider it after we have the consensus on introducing the specific power saving schemes. |
| Samsung | Besides scheduling DCI, DCI format 2\_6 with modification can also be considered for triggering adapation of PDCCH monitoring behaviours within DRX cycle. |
| Vivo | The group common DCI should be removed. |
| Spreadtrum | * For topic 1 of power saving schemes(2.2.1.9), scheduling DCI, timer and group common DCI can be considered. * No * No |
| Nokia | We do not think that active time adaptations should be only considered based on scheduling DCI, thus we would propose to merge these a bit:   * **~~Scheduling~~ DCI**   + **The indication of PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be**     - **Explicit/implicit indicated by ~~scheduling~~ DCI**     - **Joint indication of the PDCCH monitoring adaptation with**       * **cross-slot scheduling defined in Rel-16**       * **Scell dormancy**       * **SS set group switching defined in Rel-16**   + **The scheduling DCI for indicating PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be DCI format x\_1/x\_2**     - **DCI format x\_1**     - **DCI format x\_2**   [omitted text]:   * **~~Group common DCI~~** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This part should be further discussed after we have progress in section 2.2.1.9. However, we are open to list all candidates here. Regarding the bullet of DCI format 2\_6, we suggest further update:   * **Extension of DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time** |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. We can further down select after specific power saving mechanisms are introduced. |
| Intel | We should add “other options are not precluded”.  We don’t think timer based adaptation falls under the scope of this agenda.  Please add   * DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during active time.   For example, if DCI with ps-RNTI is received during active time, UE could treat this as PDCCH monitoring adaptation signal, instead of WUS. |
| SONY | The summary list above is a good starting point.  At this stage, we can associate the triggering scheme with the power saving scheme. i.e. we don’t need to consider separate tracks of (1) power saving scheme and (2) triggering scheme. |
| DOCOMO | Basically fine with the candidate list. It can be considered based on the candidates how to indicate for the respective topic in section 2.2.1.9. |
| ZTE | We think the adaptation to PDCCH monitoring behaviors can be triggered by scheduling DCI and timer.  Additionally, we would like to clarify that the detection of a PDCCH can be taken as an implicit indication of triggering method. |
| LG | If multiple power saving schemes are defined for Rel-17 power saving, or if a large number of information bits are needed to indicate Rel-17 power saving scheme(s), the PDCCH (e.g. non-fallback DCI including power saving information) performance might be degraded due to the higher code rate. So, we propose the DCI format 2\_6 (which is not monitored inside active time in Rel-16) to be used to indicate dynamic power saving adaptation during Active time. |
| Qualcomm | Combination of scheduling DCI and timer may be applied for Topic 1-1 and Topic 1-2. Also, DCI format 2\_6 may be applied for Topic 1-1. |
| CATT | Dynamic PDCCH adaptation with reusing the existing bits in existing DCI to reduce overhead. We don’t see the need to introduce new bits in existing DCI or new DCI format. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We think the current summary is a good starting point. |

#### 2nd round discussion

**The topic lists after 1st round discussion is consolidated as follows,**

**In summary, the following can be considered to dynamic trigger DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX ActiveTime,**

* **Scheduling DCI**
  + **The indication of PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be**
    - **Explicit/implicit indicated by scheduling DCI**
    - **Joint indication of the PDCCH monitoring adaptation with**
      * **cross-slot scheduling defined in Rel-16**
      * **Scell dormancy**
  + **The scheduling DCI for indicating PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be DCI format x\_1/x\_2**
    - **DCI format x\_1**
    - **DCI format x\_2**
  + **Enhancement for retransmission handling**
    - **Apply adaptation only after HARQ ACK condition is fulfilled**
    - **Apply adaptation right after DCI indication but start timer(s) to handle retransmission if required**
* **Non-scheduling DCI**
  + **SS set group switching defined in Rel-16**
  + **DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during active time, and it should extend DCI with ps-RNTI is received during active time**
  + **Unicast non-scheduling DCI**
* **Timer based adaptation,** 
  + **A timer e.g., similar toTimer *searchSpaceSwitchingTimer-r16,* can trigger the UE to switch between search space set group 0 and 1**
  + **~~A set of timers (e.g., RTT timer and retransmission timer) configured per HARQ process to control the UE’s discontinuous PDCCH monitoring behavior.~~**
* **~~UE is permitted to apply the adaptation after receiving pre-indication for power saving and if the configured condition(s) fulfils. Network configures the condition(s)~~**
* **Extension of DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time**
* **UL transmission, e.g., SR / CG**
* **~~Group common DCI~~**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
|
| Nokia, NSB | * + We noticed that FL made new category **for non-scheduling DCI**, this is OK to us, however, connection to cross-slot scheduling has been lost and should be added * Non-scheduling DCI   + SS set group switching defined in Rel-16     - Joint indication of the PDCCH monitoring adaptation with       * cross-slot scheduling defined in Rel-16   Also **scheduling DCI** could be carrying SS-space group adaptation indication, which is vice versa.   * + **The indication of PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be**     - **Explicit/implicit indicated by scheduling DCI**     - **Joint indication of the PDCCH monitoring adaptation with**       * **cross-slot scheduling defined in Rel-16**       * **Scell dormancy**       * SS set group switching defined in Rel-16 |
| MediaTek | We are generally fine with the updates.  However, DCI format 2\_6 is monitored/applied outside DRX active time, we don’t think it is in the WI scope. So, we suggest to remove the candidates related to DCI format 2\_6. |
| ZTE | The comments are as follows.   1. “Extension of DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time” is added as a sub-bullet of non-scheduling DCI 2. “Enhancement for re-transmission handling” is confusing. It looks like we are going to enhance the re-transmission mechanism. Replaced with “others”. Other proper description are okay. 3. “SS set group switching defined in Rel-16” is too general, which includes DCI format 2\_0, timer, detection of a PDCCH (implicit indication). It seems only DCI format 2\_0 is missed. Hence, “group-common DCI” is added in non-scheduling DCI. 4. “e.g., similar toTimer *searchSpaceSwitchingTimer-r16,* can trigger the UE to switch between search space set group 0 and 1”. The example is not needed.   The following revision is proposed.   * **Scheduling DCI**   + **The indication of PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be**     - **Explicit/implicit indicated by scheduling DCI**     - **Joint indication of the PDCCH monitoring adaptation with**       * **cross-slot scheduling defined in Rel-16**       * **Scell dormancy**   + **The scheduling DCI for indicating PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be DCI format x\_1/x\_2**     - **DCI format x\_1**     - **DCI format x\_2**   + **~~Enhancement for retransmission handling (~~others**     - **Apply adaptation only after HARQ ACK condition is fulfilled**     - **Apply adaptation right after DCI indication but start timer(s) to handle retransmission if required** * **Non-scheduling DCI**   + **~~SS set group switching defined in Rel-16~~**   + **Group common DCI**   + **DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during active time, and it should extend DCI with ps-RNTI is received during active time**   + **Extension of DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time**   + **Unicast non-scheduling DCI** * **Timer based adaptation,**    + **A timer ~~e.g., similar toTimer~~ *~~searchSpaceSwitchingTimer-r16,~~* ~~can trigger the UE to switch between search space set group 0 and 1~~**   + **~~A set of timers (e.g., RTT timer and retransmission timer) configured per HARQ process to control the UE’s discontinuous PDCCH monitoring behavior.~~** * **~~UE is permitted to apply the adaptation after receiving pre-indication for power saving and if the configured condition(s) fulfils. Network configures the condition(s)~~** * **~~Extension of DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time~~** * **UL transmission, e.g., SR / CG** * **~~Group common DCI~~** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | **The following bullet can be moved under the bullet of ‘unscheduling DCI’**   * **Extension of DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time** |
| Qualcomm | We agree with the proposal. We are also fine with the update suggested by Huawei/HiSilicon. |
| InterDigital | Fine with the proposal. |
| Intel | Fine with ZTE’s update, except timer based adaptation. It is not clear how timer based adaptatation can be included within the scope which only targets DCI based adaptation. |
| Panasonic | We are okay with the proposal. |
| LG | We are okay with the proposal. |

#### 3rd round discussion

Update the list of triggering schems as proposal 8 (with change mark compared to 2nd round discussion) as follows,

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 8: the following triggering schemes for DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX ActiveTime can be considered,**   * **Scheduling DCI**   + **The indication of PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be**     - **Explicit/implicit indicated by scheduling DCI**     - **Joint indication of the PDCCH monitoring adaptation with**       * **cross-slot scheduling defined in Rel-16**       * **Scell dormancy**       * **[SS set group switching defined in Rel-16]**   + **The scheduling DCI for indicating PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be ~~DCI format x\_1/x\_2~~**     - **DCI format x\_1**     - **DCI format x\_2**   + **Enhancement for retransmission handling**     - **Apply adaptation only after HARQ ACK condition is fulfilled**     - **Apply adaptation right after DCI indication but start timer(s) to handle retransmission if required** * **Non-scheduling DCI**   + **Group common DCI , e.g., SS set group switching defined in Rel-16**     - **Explicit indicated by DCI**     - **Joint indication of the PDCCH monitoring adaptation with**       * **cross-slot scheduling defined in Rel-16**   + **DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during active time, and it should extend DCI with ps-RNTI is received during active time**   + **Extension of DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time**   + **Unicast non-scheduling DCI** * **[Timer based adaptation,**    + **A timer e.g., similar toTimer *searchSpaceSwitchingTimer-r16,* can trigger the UE to switch between search space set group 0 and 1]** * **~~Extension of DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time~~** * **UL transmission, e.g., SR / CG** |
| **Comments:**  (1) For scheduling DCI based trigger scheme with [SS set group switching defined in Rel-16], how does a scheduling DCI based triggering joint indicated by a group common DCI? Ask for clarification from proponents.  (2) For Timer based adaptation, originally intension is to extend the Rel-16 timer based SS switching which is used in NR-U. FL recommends to put squeare bracket and wait for better description from proponents, otherwise, consider removing timer based adaptation which means no enhancement of timer based adaptation. |
| **Suggestions for next step:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| OPPO | Most of schems are in.  Some clarification:  It is duplicated to switch PDCCH monitoring with [SS set group switching defined in Rel-16]. Suggest to remove.  The following 2 is very similar, what is different for comparison purpose?  o DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during active time, and it should extend DCI with ps-RNTI is received during active time  o Extension of DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time |
| Nokia | With respect to (1) above; (a) a adaptation trigger that is currently only supported in GC-PDCCH could be added also to scheduling DCI (b) min K1/K2 value (current in scheduling DCI) could be linked with certain SS group(s). |
| Apple | For timer based adapation, we would like to keep it at high level and remove the sub-bullet, similar as ZTE’s second round comment. Timer based adaptation can be used in active time to adapt PDCCH monitoring behavior, including skipping or monitoring set adaption. It is alternative to non-scheduling DCI.   * **Timer based adaptation.** |
| CATT | For non-scheduling DCI, DCI format 0\_1 and 1\_1 for case 2 dormancy indication should be included. |
| CMCC | Agree with CATT. |

#### 4th round discussion

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal 8: the following triggering schemes for DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX ActiveTime can be considered,**   * **Scheduling DCI**   + **The indication of PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be**     - **Explicit/implicit indicated by scheduling DCI**     - **Joint indication of the PDCCH monitoring adaptation with**       * **cross-slot scheduling defined in Rel-16**       * **Scell dormancy**       * **[SS set group switching defined in Rel-16]**   + **The scheduling DCI for indicating PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation can be ~~DCI format x\_1/x\_2~~**     - **DCI format x\_1**     - **DCI format x\_2**   + **Enhancement for retransmission handling**     - **Apply adaptation only after HARQ ACK condition is fulfilled**     - **Apply adaptation right after DCI indication but start timer(s) to handle retransmission if required** * **Non-scheduling DCI**   + **Group common DCI , e.g., SS set group switching defined in Rel-16**     - **Explicit indicated by DCI**     - **Joint indication of the PDCCH monitoring adaptation with**       * **cross-slot scheduling defined in Rel-16**   + **DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during active time, and it should extend DCI with ps-RNTI is received during active time**   + **Extension of DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time**   + **Unicast non-scheduling DCI, e.g., DCI format 0\_1 and 1\_1 for case 2 dormancy indication** * **~~[~~Timer based adaptation to adapt PDCCH monitoring behavior, including skipping or monitoring set adaption,**    + **~~A timer e.g., similar toTimer~~ *~~searchSpaceSwitchingTimer-r16,~~* ~~can trigger the UE to switch between search space set group 0 and 1]~~** * **UL transmission, e.g., SR / CG** |
| **Comments:**  (1) For [SS set group switching defined in Rel-16], SS group(s) described by Nokia is part of the schems in the first sub-bullet ‘**The indication of PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation**’. And this has been described in 1st bullet of the proposal in section 2.2.1.9.4  (2) for OPPO’s second comment, my interptation is as follows (proponent please correct me if I am wrong),  o DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during active time, and it should extend DCI with ps-RNTI is received during active time -> companies propose to allow DCI format 2\_6 being monitored in active time  o Extension of DCI format 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring during next DRX cycle in the active time -> companies propose to use DCI form 2\_6 to indicate adaptation of the PDCCH monitoring behaviours, but the DCI format 2\_6 is still monitored outside active time.  (3) CATT and CMCC’s commented are addressed. |
| **Suggestions for next step:** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Nokia | Applying DCI format 2\_6 seems not absolutely necessary. We would need to introduce addional fields in any case and then it would seem possible to consider those e.g. in DCI format 2\_0.  Regarding the “[SS set group switching defined in Rel-16]”, if it is commonly understood that “PDCCH monitoring behaviour adaptation” coveres it as well, we are fine to remove the bullet. |
|  |  |

### Summary

**1st round discussion**

In section 2.2.1, there are vast number of schemes proposed. This section ask for input from companies on the priority for each schems described in section 2.2.1. Note per chairman’s guidance, the priority actually means the priority for discussion purpose only.

**Question 9: priority for each topic described in section 2.2.1.9 and relevant reasons**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **High/low priority for each topic and relevant reasons** |
|
| Company A | Comments |
| Apple | Topic 1 of 2.2.1.9 is the high priority. Topic 1 can potentially provide the biggest power saving gain. |
| Ericsson | We prefer to prioritise schemes indicated in our contribution, but more generally, the following criteria should be used to prioritize.   * Clear gain and distinction in functionality from schemes already specified in Rel-15/16. * Avoid overlap with schemes being discussed in other WI. |
| OPPO | Topic 1 should be prioritized. Others need more input and discussion. |
| MediaTek | For the list in Section 2.2.1.9, we suggest to prioritize Topics 1-1 and 1-2.  For the list in Section 2.2.2, prioritization on Scheduling DCI topic, with retransmission handling enhancement included, is also suggested. |
| Xiaomi | Topic 1,2,3 captured in 2.2.1.9 should be the first priority. |
| Samsung | We prefer to discuss Topic 1, 2, 3 with high priority.  We’ve learnt PDCCH monitoring overhead is the main issue for power saving in connected mode from Rel-16. So we think Topic 1 regarding adaptation of PDCCH monitoring behaviors within active time should be set with high priority.  For Topic 2 and 3, they are simple and effective extension from Rel16 PS schemes. |
| Vivo | We prefer topic 1(especifally topic 1-1 and 1-2) and topic 4 as high priority.  For topic 1-1, triggering method including explicit/implicit indicated by scheduling DCI, timer based method and UL transmission, e.g., SR / CG is prioritized.  For topic 1-2, explicit DCI triggering method is prioritized. |
| CMCC | Topic 1 and Topic 7 can be with high priority. |
| Spreadtrum | The top priority is **topic 1** of 2.2.1.9. This topic was already discussed in Rel.16 and the scheme related to this topic shows significant power saving gain. The remaining topics need more evaluation based on the new evaluation methology(if any). |
| Nokia | We are OK to start with topic 1-1, with the note that we should prioritize feasible extension from existing functionalities (with justifiable gains) |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Topic 1-1, Topic 1-2 and Topic 2 of section 2.2.1.9 are discussed first. Other topics are deprioritized. The proposals which have not been studied in Rel-16 and not captured in TR 38.840 should not be considered here. |
| SONY | There is clearly a lot of interest in the topic(s) listed under section 2.2.1.1, given the number of contributions. Hence it seems like these topics will be further studied.  It is too early to down-prioritise other topics as this is the first meeting where we have seen these topics. Once we have some evaluation assumptions and have been able to do more evaluations, we can decide make further prioritization decisions. |
| DOCOMO | Topic 1-1 and Topic 1-2 are first priority, and topic 2 is second priority. |
| ZTE | According to our simulation results, the power consumption contributed by PDCCH-only state is still dominant. So we think the Topic 1 which is aimed to reduce PDCCH monitoring should be of high priority.  Meanwhile, SS set group switching can be achieved by legacy operation in NR, so PDCCH skipping is preferred to be used for the extension to Rel-16 power saving schemes. |
| LG | Topic 1 can be prioritized. Others need more discussion. |
| Qualcomm | We think Topic 1-1 should be prioritize. Considering the support from the majority of companies, and since we already have the baseline design in Rel-16, we think it is a low hanging fruit. |
| CATT | Topic 1 with dynamic adaptation of PDCCH monitoring. |
| Lenovo, Motorola Mobility | We think Topic 1 shoud be prioritized. Topic 2 and topic 6 should be low priority, since those had been heavily discssued/evaluated in Rel-16, and substantial benefit was not justified. |

# Summary of the potential proposals

**Proposal 2:**

-         **Reusing power model in TR38.840 for evaluation of DCI-based power saving adaptation schemes.**

o    **Note: company reporting additional power model for missing state or update is not precluded.**

**Proposal 1:**

-         **The performance metrics described in TR38.840 section 8.2 is reused** **for power saving evaluation of Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation during ActiveTime.**

-         **The following is recommended for evaluating the gain of potential Rel-17 enhancements for power savings during active time**

o    **Long DRX cycle,**

o    **DRX adaptation with DCP,**

o    **Cross-slot scheduling mechanism,**

o    **bandwidth adaptation,**

o    **MIMO layer adaptation,**

o    **Company to report other assumptions, e.g., short DRX cycle, SCell dormancy as a baseline for comparison**

**Note: company should report their assumption of the baseline.**

**Proposal 5:**

**Company reporting assumption for periodic activities for the Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation evaluation.**

* **The periodic activities defined in TR38.840 can be reused.**
* **Measurement for RLM/BFD every C-DRX cycle can be optionally modelled**

**Proposal 3:**

-         **Legacy traffic models in TR38.840 are considered baseline and the following ‘additional traffic model’ can be optionally considered for Rel-17 DCI-based power saving adaptation evaluation,**

-         **‘Additional traffic model’ is modelled as follows,**

o    **Based on FTP Model 3**

o    **packet size: [0.15MB]**

o    **mean inter-arrival time: [50ms]**

o    **The model is applicable for DL and UL**

-         **Company reporting which traffic model(s) is used for Rel-17  DCI-based power saving adaptation evaluation.**

-         **For FR2, 4 x 100MHz CCs to support effective transmission for high data rate service can be considered.**

**Proposal 4:**

-         **The Reference C-DRX configurations decribed in TR38.840 section 8.2 is reused for evaluation**

o    **Up to company to select C-DRX configuration that is better aligned with traffic model**

o    **Other C-DRX setting used in the evaluation is not precluded and should be reported by companies.**

# Proposals from companies’ submitted contributions

|  |
| --- |
| [R1-2005264](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2005264.zip) Extension(s) to Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation for an active BWP Huawei, HiSilicon |
| **Proposal 1: The traffic model for the UE power saving scheme evaluation at least include FTP traffic, instant messaging, VoIP and intensive eMBB traffic.**  **Proposal 2: To evaluate the extension(s) of time domain adaptation for power saving, PDCCH based power saving signalling (wake-up indication) and cross slot scheduling based power saving are taken as the baseline for evaluation.**  **Proposal 3: The following metrics are considered in the evaluation of power saving mechanisms in the study:**   * **UE power saving gain** * **Latency of packet/user perceived throughput**   **Proposal 4: Reuse the existing power consumption models in TR 38.840 and add the power consumption model in Table 2 in Rel-17.**  **Proposal 5: Reuse link level simulation assumptions and system level simulation assumptions in TR 38.840 listed in Table 3.**  **Observation 1: Existing DRX mechanism (including MAC-CE based termination of inactivity timer), WUS indication and dormancy adaptation cannot skip PDCCH monitoring in certain short durations.**  **Proposal 6: Study DCI based PDCCH skipping in short duration in Rel-17 to trade-off between latency impact and power saving gain, including DCI based PDCCH skipping in indicated duration and adaptation to PDCCH monitoring periodicity.**  **Proposal 7: Study the enhancement of dynamic adaptation to the maximum number of MIMO layers for shorter application delay.** |
| [R1-2005391](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2005391.zip) Discussion on DCI-based power saving adaptation vivo |
| **Observation 1:**  **In Rel-15/16, the non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling are always configured simultaneously, which means UE need to blind decode both DCI formats in the same monitoring occasions. However, it is inefficient for UE power consumption if the DL and UL traffic are not symmetric.**  **Observation 2:**  **It is necessary to support search space group switching without BWP framework for both RedCap UE and non-RedCap UEs, due to the following restrictions of BWP framework.**   * **In Rel-15 and Rel-16, the maximum number of configured BWPs for DL/UL per cell is 4 and the BWPs may already be used for adapting different bandwidth and different maximum DL MIMO layers, the remaining BWPs to indicate different SS configuration is limited.** * **For RedCap UEs, dynamic BWP switching is not likely to be supported for RedCap UE with 20MHz bandwidth.** * **Long BWP switching delay**   **Observation 3: In FR2, due to the restriction of analog beamforming, there is only one beam direction across the whole bandwidth at one time. There are some optimizations available to adapt the PDCCH monitoring behavior to match the time pattern for analog beam.**  Proposal 1: To consider decoupling non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling, i.e., configure different SS for DL and UL DCI.  **Proposal 2: The power model for reducing the PDCCH candidates in TR38.840 can be used to evaluate the power saving gain for decouple non-fallback DCI for DL and UL scheduling.**  Proposal 3: Following can be considered for PDCCH search space adaptation within a BWP.   * Explicit SS set switching by scheduling DCI * Implicit SS set switching by detecting scheduling grant, UL transmission (SR/CG), etc. * Potential extension to WUS, e.g. WUS indicates SS set switching * Timer based SS set switching   Proposal 4: To consider PDCCH skipping-like method, which is dynamic and small time-scale method to adapt the PDCCH monitoring.  For evaluation methodologies, the followings are proposed,  **Observation 4: The RLM/BFD measurement and its power contribution were not modelled in Rel-16 power saving study, which made the results deviated from the reality.**  **Proposal 5: UE power saving evaluation shall explicitly model SSB measurement for RLM/BFD purpose every DRX cycle for CONNECTED mode UE.**  **Proposal 6: A modified traffic model inter-arrival time can be considered in for power saving evaluation. The following alternatives can be considered,**   * **Alt 1: adopt traffic model in Appendix in R1-2005391 for online gaming.** * **Alt 2: reusing FTP Model 3 with reduced mean inter-arrival time and packet size (e.g., online gaming)**  |  |  | | --- | --- | |  | Modified FTP traffic 3 for gaming | | Model | FTP model 3 | | Packet size | 200 bytes | | Mean inter-arrival time | 50 ms | | DRX setting | Period = 40 ms | |
| [R1-2005523](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2005523.zip) Extension to Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX Active Time ZTE |
| **Observation 1: Even configured with power saving techniques specified in Release 15 and Release 16, most UE power is consumed in the PDCCH-only state in BWP2.**  **Observation 2: The power saving gain by using PDCCH switching for FTP 3 and VoIP traffic model is 13.2% and 13.5% for FR1, and 30% and 39.4% for FR2.**  **Observation 3: The power consumption in the PDCCH-only state in BWP2 is reduced significantly when PDCCH skipping is applied.**  **Proposal 1: Power consumption in the PDCCH-only state in BWP2 should be further reduced.**  **Proposal 2: Both PDCCH switching and PDCCH skipping techniques should be further studied to improve the energy efficiency in DRX Active Time.** |
| [R1-2005617](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2005617.zip) Evaluation methodology and enhancement for connected mode UE power saving MediaTek Inc. |
| **Proposal 1: For Rel-17 UE power saving enhancements for connected mode, include “Real-Time Video” traffic type exhibiting both high data rate (e.g. 20 Mbps for full-HD/1080p) and frequent data activity (e.g., 10 ms – 50 ms) for more complete traffic type coverage.**  **Proposal 2: The following parameters are suggested for the “Real-Time Video” traffic type:**   * **FTP model 3 with mean inter-packet arrival time of 30 ms and packet size of 0.08 Mbytes** * **DRX (long cycle, on-duration, inactivity timer) = (20 ms, 5 ms, 10 ms)** * **1 CC of total 100 MHz for FR1 and 4 CCs of total 400 MHz for FR2**   **Proposal 3: Rel-17 power consumption analysis is based on partitioning UE processing timeline into data-efficient durations and power-saving durations. The power consumption characteristics for different types of durations are based on the corresponding settings for reception BW, number of MIMO layers, same/cross-slot scheduling, PDCCH monitoring and SCell dormancy.**    **Proposal 4: For data-efficient duration, include a delay of X (ms) after the last TB of a packet, comprising of at least the delays of UE ACK/NACK for the last TB, gNodeB processing for HARQ, and gNodeB indication for UE power saving. X = 8 ms is suggested, and larger X values can be reported if utilized.**  **Proposal 5: For data-efficient and power-saving settings, please refer Table 1 for Rel-17 power consumption baseline.**  **Table 1: Data-efficient and power-saving settings for Rel-17 power consumption baseline**    **Proposal 6: Include the assumption in Table 2 for modelling SSB measurement power consumption per DRX cycle for RLM/BFD.**  **Table 2: Assumed number of measured/total beams for RLM/BFD per DRX cycle**    **Observation 1: For less-frequent data traffic, including FTP and IM, Rel-15 and Rel-16 DCI-based power saving schemes can achieve significant power saving, leaving less margin for Rel-17 enhancements.**  **Observation 2: For frequent data traffic, including Real-Time Video and VoIP, Rel-15 and Rel-16 DCI-based power saving schemes achieve less power saving, and the power consumption portion of PDCCH-only monitoring is still dominant.**  **Proposal 7: Rel-17 UE power saving enhancements for connected-mode can focus on frequent data traffic, including Real-Time Video and VoIP, in FR2.**  **Observation 3: Rel-16 supports cross-slot scheduling adaptation and search space set switching to reduce UE power by time-domain adaptation, but the adaptation triggering is through different DCI formats. To achieve more efficient adaptation and minimize signaling overhead, the joint adaptation of two features can be considered.**  **Proposal 8: Support joint adaptation of cross-slot scheduling and search space set switching by reusing the bit field of “minimum applicable scheduling offset indicator” in DCI format 0\_1/1\_1 to minimize the signaling overhead.**  **Observation 4: As shown in Figure 6(b), pre-indication adaptation allows UE to go to power saving earlier because network is able to send the adaptation triggering before receiving the HARQ-ACK information from UE. And UE applies the adaptation only if the network configured condition fulfils.**  **Observation 5: The pre-indication adaptation is compatible to all DCI-based adaptation, e.g., SCell dormancy indication and cross-slot scheduling adaptation in Rel-16.**  **Observation 6: The pre-indication adaptation with fulfilled condition(s) can reduce UE power consumption significantly. Compared to conventional adaptation, it can provide 9% and 38% of power savings for VoIP in 1CC/FR1 and Real-Time video in 4CC/FR2, respectively.**  **Proposal 9: Support pre-indication adaptation to achieve fast and efficient adaptation.**   * **Network configures the condition(s) for UE power saving. When a UE receives the pre-indication for power saving, the UE is permitted to apply the adaptation if the configured condition(s) fulfils.**   **FFS the condition.** |
| [R1-2005721](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2005721.zip) PDCCH monitoring adaptation CATT |
| **Proposal 1: The PDCCH monitoring adaptation can be applied to dynamically indicate UE to reduce the PDCCH monitoring, e.g. the PCell dormancy, the PDCCH BD reduction, the PDCCH monitoring occasion granularity change, etc., without any changes of search space configuration.**  **Proposal 2: The existing DCI format 0\_1 and 1\_1 in Rel-16 are reused without introducing additional information field, in which the SCell dormancy indication field could be repurposed as the joint indication** **including the PDCCH monitoring adaptation for PCell and/or SCell dormancy indication.** |
| [R1-2005886](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2005886.zip) On PDCCH monitoring reduction techniques during active time Intel Corporation |
| **Observation 1: GTS provides significant additional power saving gain with respect to cross-slot scheduling with BWP adaptation enabled**   * **For cell center UE, i.e., 50% UE, GTS with up to 10ms sleep duration provides up to 30% additional power saving gain on top of power saving provided by Rel-16 schemes with less than 13% UPT loss.**   **Observation 2: Go-to-sleep signal has better potential for power saving gain compared to Short DRX.**  **Observation 3: For cell center UE, Go-to-sleep signal with 10ms sleep duration provide 29% power saving gain with 12% UPT loss compared to short DRX with 10ms.**  **Proposal 1: NR supports DCI based go-to-sleep signals during active time for PDCCH monitoring reductions**   * **FFS: Extension of Rel-16 DCI based solutions for triggering go-to-sleep signal.** * **FFS: Monitoring of measurement signals during sleep duration** |
| [R1-2005936](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2005936.zip) Potential enhancement to DCI based power saving adaptation Lenovo, Motorola Mobility |
| * **Proposal 1: Study enhancement to power saving DCI to support adaptation of a search space configuration in every DRX cycle.** * **Proposal 2: Study necessary enhancement to support multi-PDSCH/multi-PUSCH scheduling.** * **Proposal 3: Study scheduling based dynamic PDCCH skipping during Active Time for power saving mode UE.** |
| [R1-2006043](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006043.zip) DCI-based adaptation for PDCCH OPPO |
| ***Proposal 1: Models of power consumption and power scaling for adaptation is reused in Rel-17 with some necessary modification.***  ***Proposal 2: The new FTP models 3 for Gaming and Short Video IM could use 0.05 Mbytes packet size and 15ms mean inter-arrival time. Smaller Packet size like 0.01Mbytes can be also considered.***  ***Proposal 3: Power saving enhancement consider the PDCCH monitoring adaptation schemes including:***  ***Indicating Search Space group adaptation.***  ***Indicating skipping of PDCCH monitoring occasions.***  ***Autonomous PDCCH monitoring adaptation.***  ***Proposal 4: In power saving mode with cross-slot minimum k0, The UE specific PDCCH search space monitoring periodicity can be matched to the current applicable minimum K0 values.***  ***Considering the (min(K0)+1) as the monitoring periodicity.*** |
| [R1-2006159](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006159.zip) On enhancements of power saving techniques during DRX active time Samsung |
| Proposal 1: Support power saving signal for dynamic PDCCH adaptation during DRX active time. Search space set switching specified in Rel-16 can be a starting point.  Proposal 2: Support joint adaptation on minimum scheduling offset and PDCCH skipping when the UE is operated with cross-slot scheduling based power saving.  Proposal 3: Support joint adaptation on minimum PDSCH processing time and minimum scheduling offset.  Proposal 4: Support maximum MIMO layer adaptation without BWP switching  Proposal 5: Consider data-intensive traffic model that is modelled by FTP Model 3 with 1MB packet size and 50ms inter-arrival time |
| [R1-2006223](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006223.zip) Discussion on PDCCH monitoring reduction during DRX active time CMCC |
| **Proposal 1. Three PDCCH monitoring reduction techniques can be studied in Rel-17, and Alt 1 can be the highest priority:**  **Alt 1. Go-to-sleep indication;**  **Alt 2. PDCCH monitoring periodicity adaptation;**  **Alt 3. Search space set grouping.**  **Proposal 2. The DCI indication scheme of PDCCH monitoring reduction techniques e.g., adding bits or re-purpose DCI fields can be further studied.** |
| [R1-2006271](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006271.zip) Discussion on power saving techniques for connected-mode UE Spreadtrum Communications |
| ***Proposal 1: Consider to specify PDCCH skipping.***  ***Proposal 2：Consider to specify PDCCH monitoring periodicity switching.*** |
| [R1-2006313](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006313.zip) Discussion on DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX ActiveTime LG Electronics |
| **Proposal 1: For power saving on PDCCH monitoring, followings could be considered in Rel-17;**   * **Configurable BD/CCE limit** * **Dynamic CORESET (and/or search space set) activation/deactivation**   **Proposal 2: The DCI format 2\_6 could be used to indicate which search space set(s) are monitored during next DRX cycle.**  **Proposal 3: The DCI format 2\_6 could be monitored during Active time for indicating CORESET/search space set activation/deactivation.** |
| [R1-2006387](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006387.zip) Potential extension(s) to Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX ActiveTime Panasonic |
| **Proposal 1: The support of PDCCH monitoring reduction for traffic adaptation** **time domain within active time should be studied.**  **Proposal 2: DCI based PDCCH monitoring adjustment on parameters in RRC parameters *SearchSpace* and *ControlResourceSet* should be studied for Rel.17 power saving enhancement.**  Proposal 3: Multiple TB scheduling should be studied for Rel.17 power saving enhancement.  **Proposal 4: UE behaviour on simultaneous configuration of secondary DRX group, WUS and dormancy indication should be clarified with minimum specification impact.** |
| [R1-2006529](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006529.zip) PDCCH based power saving enhancements for connected-mode Ues Apple |
| **Proposal**   * Consider the support of additional power adaptation method in active time   + Dynamic PDCCH monitoring skipping   + Dynamic change of PDCCH monitoring parameters |
| [R1-2006548](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006548.zip) PDCCH-based power saving signal design considerations InterDigital, Inc. |
| ***Proposal 1: Search space switching/activation is considered to reduce PDCCH monitoring in Active Time.*** |
| [R1-2006668](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006668.zip) Discussion on potential enhancements for power savings during active time Ericsson |
| **Proposal 1 As a baseline, Rel-15/16 power savings mechanisms including the following should be considered for evaluating the gain of potential Rel-17 enhancements for power savings during active time.**  **a. Long and short DRX and associated MAC command CEs**  **b. BWP switching**  **c. WUS**  **d. Cross-slot scheduling**  **e. SCell dormancy**  **f. Secondary DRX**  **g. Search space set group switching**  **Proposal 2 UE power savings vs. system performance/latency/overhead impact should be considered as part of evaluation of potential enhancements for power savings during active time.**  **Proposal 3 It should be clarified whether a scheme evaluated for potential enhancements for power savings during active time entails an interruption or not.**  **a. Corresponding impact on UE power savings and system performance should be included in the evaluations.**  **b. If needed, RAN4 feedback should be taken at early stage of the study.** |
| [R1-2006738](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006738.zip) Discussion on extension to DCI-based power saving adaptation NTT DOCOMO, INC. |
| Proposal 1: It should be discussed first on what Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation(s) the enhancements will be considered.  Proposal 2: Consider following Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation(s) as the candidates for enhancements to reduce PDCCH monitoring.   * Rel-16 cross-slot scheduling enhancements, i.e., minimum scheduling offset of K0/K2 * Search space set group switching   Observation 1: It would be beneficial to consider PDCCH skipping in some slot(s) when cross-slot scheduling is applied in order to achieve further power saving gain.  Observation 2: Based on the search space set group switching, it would be possible to change the PDCCH monitoring periodicity with entering/leaving CDRX state.  Observation 3: Some mechanism providing more flexibility on adaptation of the parameters related to PDCCH monitoring can be considered. |
| [R1-2006755](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006755.zip) Power saving adaptation during Active Time ASUSTEK COMPUTER (SHANGHAI) |
| **Proposal 1: For comparing different PDCCH monitoring adaptation candidate, a power model with finer granularity could be developed for Rel-17.**  **Proposal 2: RAN1 further consider/compare PDCCH monitoring adaptation schemes studied in Rel-16, at least from the following two domain:**   * **time domain** * **CCE domain** |
| [R1-2006817](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006817.zip) DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX ActiveTime Qualcomm Incorporated |
| [Observation 1: For Rel-17 connected-mode power saving evaluation, need for additional DRX cycles other than those recommended in TR 38.840 is not evident.](#_Toc47691394)  [Observation 2: For Rel-17 connected-mode power saving evaluation, evaluation for Short cycle DRX is not necessary.](#_Toc47691395)  [Observation 3: For Rel-17 connected-mode power saving evaluation, need for new traffic models other than those in TR 38.840 is not evident.](#_Toc47691396)  [Observation 4: Rel-16 search space set switching feature can be reused for Rel-17 connected-mode power saving.](#_Toc47691397)  [Proposal 1: For Rel-17 connected-mode power saving evaluation, the Rel-16 power models, traffic models, and evaluation methodology in TR 38.840 are reused.](#_Toc47691398)  [Proposal 2: A search space set switching mechanism by a scheduling DCI and/or DCI format 2\_6 is considered as a Rel-17 connected-mode power saving scheme.](#_Toc47691399)  [Proposal 3: Scheduling DCI-based PDCCH skip indication is considered as a Rel-17 connected-mode power saving scheme. During the indicated skip duration, the UE can still monitor PDCCH in a discontinuous manner to handle potential HARQ retransmissions.](#_Toc47691400) |
| [R1-2006898](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006898.zip) UE power saving enhancements for Active Time Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |
| In Section 2.1 we discussed the general assumptions and made following observations and proposals:  **Observation:** *Power saving concepts for objective 2a must be compared with baseline utilizing all relevant Rel-15 and Rel-16 power saving features.*  **Observation:** *The UE assistance information of Rel-16 result in the DRX configuration to be accurately tailored to any traffic model being studied.*  **Proposal: RAN1 to define assumptions on WUS monitoring power consumption and ps-Offset. The duration is 1 slot and WUS is always correctly detected.**  **Proposal: RAN1 to define DRX configurations, including short DRX, for selected traffic models before evaluating new power saving features for objective 2a.**  **Proposal: RAN1 to define DRX configurations, including short DRX, for selected traffic models before evaluating new power saving features for objective 2a.**  In Section 2.2 we discussed the traffic model related aspects:-  **Proposal: Account also UL activity in the power consumption evaluation for the Active Time.**  **Proposal: Model UCI related UL activity as DL triggered (HARQ FB) and periodic (CSI reporting).**  **Proposal: For bi-directional traffic, base the UL user data activity on the corresponding traffic model.**  **Proposal: Approximate the UL-DL slot configuration with 5ms pattern as {DDDDDDUUUU} (6 DL, 4 UL).**  **Proposal: RAN1 to select/define a video call/conference traffic model e.g. based on [6].**  **Proposal: RAN1 to define SSB and CSI-RS configurations for evaluation of objective 2a.**  Finally in Section 2.3 we discuss the different mechanisms for power saving enhancements during active time and make following proposals and observations:  **Proposal: It should be ensured that the introduced enhancements do not have unneccesary overlap, and that priority is given for enhancement of existing functionalities.**  **Proposal: RAN1 to clarifiy the applicability of search space set switching for UE power saving in licensed bands, and discuss potential optimizations to further reduce the PDCCH monitoring based on it.**  **Observation:** *To increase power saving gains from PDCCH monitoring adaptation, the search space set switching could be complemented with cross-slot scheduling.*  **Observation:** *The concept of resource block sets can be adapted for licensed band operation to control PDCCH monitoring behaviour in the frequency domain.*  **Observation:** *Methods to reduce PDCCH monitoring during Active Time could be evaluated for power saving benefit and specification impact.*  **Observation:** *Methods to reduce the UL power consumption during Active Time could be evaluated for power saving benefit.* |
| [R1-2006946](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2006946.zip) Power saving enhancements for connected mode UEs Sony |
| **Proposal 1. Update TR38.840 to include a high data intensity traffic model that supports a high data rate with frequent data activity**.  **Proposal 2. Evaluations should consider the UE simultaneously supporting different traffic models in order to more realistically model UE operation**.  **Proposal 3: Study dynamic DRX configuration, where the configuration of the inactivity timer and DRX cycles can be signaled via DCI.** |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

# Summary of the previous agreements

*<viod>*

# Work plan

A suggested work plan for connected-mode enhancement is proposed to be discussed in [[R1-2005614](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2005614.zip)] as follows,

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quarter** | **Meeting** | **Work plan** |
| Q3/2020 | RAN1#102-e | **Connected-mode enhancements:**   * Evaluation methodology updates (based on TR 38.840) * Identify candidate enhancements   **LS evaluation methodology updates to RAN2** |
| Q4/2020 | RAN1#103-e | **Connected-mode enhancements (2nd & 3rd weeks):**   * Conclude beneficial enhancement(s) for DCI-based scheme(s) |
| Q1/2021 | RAN1#104 | **Connected-mode enhancements:**   * Specify enhancement(s) for DCI-based power saving scheme(s) |
| Q2/2021 | RAN1#104bis | **Connected-mode enhancements:**   * Specify enhancement(s) for DCI-based power saving scheme(s)   **LS Initial RRC parameters to RAN2** |
| Q2/2021 | RAN1#105 | **Connected-mode enhancements:**   * Finalize enhancement(s) for DCI-based power saving scheme(s)   **LS final RRC parameters to RAN2** |

# Work Item Description

*NR\_UE\_pow\_sav-Core; WID in* [*RP-200938*](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_88e/Docs/RP-200938.zip)*. The objectives are as follows*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Specify enhancements for idle/inactive-mode UE power saving, considering system performance aspects [RAN2, RAN1]    1. Study and specify paging enhancement(s) to reduce unnecessary UE paging receptions, subject to no impact to legacy UEs [RAN2, RAN1]  * NOTE: RAN1 to check and update, if needed, evaluation methodology in RAN1 #102-e meeting   1. Specify means to provide potential TRS/CSI-RS occasion(s) available in connected mode to idle/inactive-mode UEs, minimizing system overhead impact [RAN1] * NOTE: Always-on TRS/CSI-RS transmission by gNodeB is not required  1. Study and specify, if agreed, enhancements on power saving techniques for connected-mode UE, subject to minimized system performance impact [RAN1, RAN4]    1. Study and specify, if agreed, extension(s) to Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation during DRX Active Time for an active BWP, including PDCCH monitoring reduction when C-DRX is configured [RAN1]  * NOTE: Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power saving solutions should be supported by the UE and included in the evaluation. RAN1 will ask the confirmation from RAN2 that Rel-15 and Rel-16 available power saving solutions are properly utilized.   1. Study the feasibility and performance impact of relaxing UE measurements for RLM and/or BFD, particularly for low mobility UE with short DRX periodicity/cycle, and specify, if agreed, relaxation in the corresponding requirements [RAN4] * NOTE: Supplementary RAN2 work, if needed, can be triggered by RAN4 LS |

# Reference

The following contributions are submitted in RAN1#102-E in AI 8.7.2,

1. [R1-2005264](file:///C:\Users\wanshic\OneDrive%20-%20Qualcomm\Documents\Standards\3GPP%20Standards\Meeting%20Documents\TSGR1_102\Docs\R1-2005264.zip) Extension(s) to Rel-16 DCI-based power saving adaptation for an active BWP Huawei, HiSilicon
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