3GPP TSG-RAN WG1 Meeting #104-e R1-21xxxxx

e-Meeting, January 25th – February 5th, 2021

Source: Moderator (vivo)

Title: Email discussion for evaluation methodology and assumptions – round 2

Agenda Item: 8.14.2

Document for: Discussion and Decision

# Introduction

This contribution is a summary on the email discussion on other evaluation methodology and assumptions for XR and Cloud Gaming in the contributions [1-18] submitted under AI 8.14.2.

[104-e-NR-XR-02] Email discussion/approval for other evaluation methodology and assumptions – Xiaohang (vivo)

* 1st check point: 1/28
* 2nd check point: 2/2
* 3rd check point: 2/4

**For the 2nd round discussion, please kindly provide your views and comments by UTC 15:00 pm 2/3.**

# Agreements in RAN1 #104e

**Outcome of 2nd GTW**

Agreement: adopt following update for TDD configuration for XR/CG evaluation

* FR1:
	+ Option 1: DDDSU
	+ Option 2: DDDUU
* FR2:
	+ Option 1: DDDSU
	+ Option 2: DDDUU

Detailed S slot format is 10D:2F:2U. Other S slot format(s) can also be optionally evaluated.

Further clarify that for option 2 for FR1/FR2, there is [2]-symbol gap at the end of third “D” slot of  DDDUU.

FFS whether or not to differentiate the two options (e.g., mandatory vs. optional)

**Outcome of 3rd GTW**

Agreements**:** For XR evaluation, ideal channel estimation can be optionally evaluated.

Agreements**:**System bandwidth for XR/CG evaluations are as follows.

* For FR1,
	+ Baseline: 100 MHz
	+ Optional: 20/40 MHz, 2\*100 MHz with CA
* FR2
	+ Option 1: 100 MHz
	+ Option 2: 400 MHz

Companies should report the CA setting if CA is adopted.

Other system bandwidth can also be optionally evaluated.

Agreements**:**For outdoor scenarios, the BS antenna parameters are as

* Option 1: 64 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (8,8,2,1,1;4,8)
* Option 2: 32 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (8,2,2,1,1,8,2)

Company to report the BS antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluation.

Other BS antenna parameters can also be optionally evaluated.

Agreements**:**For FR2, UE antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluations are as follows.

* Option 1 (Follow Rel-17 evaluation methodology for FeMIMO in R1-2007151)
	+ (M, N, P)=(1, 4, 2), 3 panels (left, right, top)
* Option 2 (from TR 38.802 – developed in Rel-14)
	+ 4Tx/4Rx: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (2,4,2,1,2;1,2), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.5)λ, the polarization angles are 0° and 90°

Company to report the UE antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluation.

Other UE antenna parameters can also be optionally evaluated.

Agreements**:** For XR/CG evaluation, adopt following assumptions for BS height for Urban Macro

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * **Parameter**
 | * **Proposed value**
 |
| * **Urban Macro (FR1)**
 |
| * BS height
 | * 25m
 |

Agreements**:**For Dense urban and Urban Macro, the UE height for indoor UEs is updated as following based on Table 6-1 in TR 36.873.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Urban Micro/Macro cell with high UE density(3D-UMi) /(3D-UMa) |
| UE height (*hUT*) in meters | general equation | *hUT*=3(*nfl* – 1) + 1.5 |
| *nfl* for outdoor UEs | 1 |
| *nfl* for indoor UEs | *nfl* ~ uniform(1,*Nfl*) where*Nfl* ~ uniform(4,8) |

Agreements**:**At least for XR/CG capacity evaluation, for DL and UL

* Baseline: DL and UL performances are evaluated independently
* Optional: DL and UL performance are evaluated together
* FFS details both the baseline and the optional evaluations

# Discussion of 2nd round

**Evaluation methodology**

**Proposal 1:** For Dense urban for XR/CG evaluation, down-select the following options for BS height.

* Option 1: BS at 25 m and UMa channel model, as per TR 38.802
* Option 2: BS at 10 m and UMi channel model
* Option 3: BS at 25 m and UMi channel model, as per agreement in RAN1 #103e

Note option 1 or option 2 needs to update the previous agreement in RAN1 #103e

During the GTW meeting in 2/1, the above proposal was discussed. Per the guidance from Mr. Chairman, we need to reach consensus by all companies if we change the previous agreement. Based on the email discussion, it can be seen that there are companies who have concerns to revert the previous agreement on BS height for Dense urban. Given the situation, the only solution seems to keep the previous agreement in RAN1 #103e, i.e. option 3 in the above proposal.

1. **Can we agree on this? Please share your comments if you have any concern.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | Considering the UE height can be up to 8 floors, we prefer Option 1. However, we can also go with Option 2 if that is majority to facilitate progress. |
| Ericsson | We prefer option 1, and have concerns on option 2 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support Option 1.Whilst agreements are to be respected, we think that putting UMi in the RAN1#103e agreement was an accidental mistake - after all, it would be strange for one particular SI to deliberately choose a channel model that does not exist elsewhere among 3GPP SI/WIs. It is soon enough that fixing the mistake has little or no impact on companies’ simulation efforts, and for this reason we are OK to alter an agreement this time.According to RAN1#103-e agreement below, for Dense Urban scenario, the BS height is agreed to be 25m and single layer with marco layer is assumed. So it is straightforward to adopt BS height 25m and UMa channel model. In addition, according to the latest agreement in RAN1#104-e, UE height can be up to 22.5 m in 8th floor. So the performance under BS height 10 m could be very bad if no change to BS height is made. BS height 25 m is more reasonable.If some companies still have strong concerns to fix this mistake, another way forward is keeping RAN1#103-e agreement as it is (refers to Option 3), and we can have new agreements to extend to include Dense Urban (e.g., Option 1). Companies can choose one of the options for Dense Urban and report in their simulation results.Agreement: (RAN1#103-e)Adopt the following deployment for XR/CG evaluations* …
* Dense urban: FR1 and FR2
	+ Detailed deployment refers to TR 38.913, where single layer with Marco layer is assumed.
	+ Channel model: UMi. Detailed definition of UMi refers to TR 38.901.
* …

 |
| FUTUREWEI | Support Option 1  |
| QC | We hope the simulation assumptions to be consistent throughput agreements. In this sense, either option 1 or 2 is preferred. Option 1: This choice is more in line with scenario described in 38.802. In Option 1, we recommend removing “as per TR 38.802” from Proposal since it can introduce unnecessary potential confusions. There are some parameters we already agreed in 103e but **not** in line with 38.802, e.g., bandwidth, BS Tx power, etc. Option 2: The agreements made during 103e and 104e and 38.901 for channel model already include most of required simulation assumption. |
| OPPO | It is better to align the scenario, channel model and other parameter. Otherwise, the simulation assumptions seem strange. We slightly prefer Option 1, but are also ok with other options. |
| vivo | Fine with either Option1 or Option2. Following figures illustrates the comparison of DL coupling loss and geometry for these three options, where UMa 25m/Umi 10m/Umi 25m are corresponding to Option 1/2/3, respectively. From the coupling loss CDF, it can be observed about 2dB difference among Option1/2/3. From the geometry CDF, it can be observed that the performance of edge UE is almost the same among three options. Although it can be seen that there is slight difference for middle and centre UEs, the system performance may not be affected significantly from the perspective of SLS.If there is no consensus between Option1 and Option2, Option 3 is the nature way.C:\Users\ADMINI~1\AppData\Local\Temp\WeChat Files\e60dde50b9f6aacf538695a41427408.png |
| LG | We can agree. Among the Options, we would be okay with either Option 1 or Option 2. As it was already confirmed that the previous agreement caused different understandings among companies, we don’t think we have to stick to the previous agreement at this time.  |
| DOCOMO | We support to revert the previous agreement and prefer Option 1. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Both option 1 and option 2 needs to update previous agreements. Our first preference is to stick to option 3. Yet in case of majority view, we could accept HW’s proposed approach by introducing option 2 as a new agreement, but not option 1. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine to revise the agreement in RAN1#103e, and OK with either option 1 or option 2.  |
| Nokia, NSB | We prefer Option 1 as this is an already known and well-adopted scenario in 3GPP.Option 2 shows the non-existing scenario, as there is simply no Dense Urban with macro layer and 200 m ISD that has 10 m BS height. It also potentially has issues with coverage for the UEs at high floors (UE height much higher than BS). Finally, as it appears after the discussion, it is likely to require revisiting the “almost-ready” agreement in Proposal 2 for the antenna downtilt, thus costing us more time to carefully recheck if 12 degree DWT is the best value for 10 m BS height (some companies were pointing out that it may be not).Option 3 is ok in terms of the BS height, as it carefully follows the Dense Urban definition (as agreed earlier). At the same time, it uses the non-applicable parameter for the UMi channel model, which is, strictly speaking, not perfectly correct. This, again, may cause us issues in future. Not sure, what are the technical arguments of choosing Option 3 over Option 1.Option 1 is the most reasonable technical choice here since it has both: (i) the correct Dense Urban deployment adopted in this SI (as agreed earlier) and in many prior 3GPP activities; combined with (ii) an appropriate channel model validated to be applicable to our scenario with 25m antenna height. |

Regarding the downtilt for Dense urban, we have discussed the following proposal in the 1st round discussion and a clear majority view can be observed based on 1st round of email discussion. Although the downtilt is related to the BS height, it should be noted that if RAN1 cannot reach consensus to revert the BS antenna height agreement, the following proposal seems to be agreeable.

**Proposal 2**: **For XR/CG evaluation, adopt 12 degree for downtilt for Dense Urban in FR1.**

* **Other downtilt value can also be optionally evaluated**

**Note: if RAN1 cannot reach consensus to revert the BS antenna height agreement, proposal 2 is agreed**

1. **Please share your comments if you have any concern on the proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | Fine with FL proposal. |
| Ericsson | Agree |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We support BS height 25 m and 12 degree for downtilt. |
| FUTUREWEI | Support proposal |
| QC | We support the proposal. |
| OPPO | Support |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | It seems this question is related to the previous one. Can we wait for the down-selection on Proposal 1? For example, if Option 1 is adopted in Proposal 1, then we may lose the motivation for evaluating multiple degrees in Proposal 2, which is good. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | No need for the note. Our thinking is 12 degree could be used for both RAN1#103-e agreement as well as a new agreement reflecting option2. |
| Xiaomi | Support FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support the FL proposal in case the BS height is 25 m |

**Power evaluation**

For evaluation of UE power consumption for XR, the following proposal is updated based on the 1st round discussion.

**Proposal 3. To facilitate further discussion on evaluation of power saving effect of different power saving schemes, the following references are defined.**

* **Case 1: UE power consumption assuming UE is always ON, i.e., UE is always available for gNB scheduling.**
* **Case 2: UE power consumption assuming Rel-15/16 CDRX configuration**
* **Company can optionally evaluate for other cases, e.g.**
	+ **Genie: UE power consumption assuming that UE is in a sleep state (e.g., micro/light/deep sleep as defined in TR38.840) whenever there is neither DL data reception nor UL transmission. From the gNB scheduling perspective, UE is always available for scheduling, i.e., there is no difference from Baseline in gNB scheduling and corresponding UE Tx/Rx. It is noted that Genie is not a power saving scheme but the result may serve as an upper bound of power saving gain of power saving techniques, which may potentially motivate development of new power saving techniques that can approach the Genie performance.**
	+ **R15/16/17 power saving techniques for connected mode, e.g., BWP, PDCCH skipping, search space switching, etc.**
	+ **Other schemes are not precluded (e.g., new power saving techniques)**
1. **Please share your comments on the proposal 3.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | We are fine with the main bullet and Case 1. For Case 2, since there are many possible CDRX configurations in Rel-15/16, we are not sure it should be made mandatory. Our suggestion is to put Case 2 under the optionally evaluated cases. Besides, for the optionally evaluated power saving techniques, we suggest to first focus on Rel-15/16/17 available power saving techniques for connected mode, while new power saving schemes can be evaluated if it provides additional gain on top of Rel-15/16/17 available power saving techniques. |
| Ericsson | Agree with MTK – evaluating all the CDRX options would be too time-consuming. Agreeing on a reasonable DRX configuration could be one way forward, but that would probably be too time-consuming |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We suggest to set Case 1 as the baseline since it involves no power saving technique and costs most power consumption. In Case 2, there could be many different CDRX configurations. So Case 2 cannot be the baseline since we haven’t discussed and agreed a “baseline” CDRX configuration. In fact, CDRX is a kind of power saving technique, companies can choose proper configurations and report the corresponding power saving gain compared to Case 1.For Genie, it’s enough to describe what is Genie, no need to further describe the motivation or potential usage. Different companies may have different understanding on the benefits/usage of Genie. For example, to us, Genie is unachievable in practice, so we do not see benefits of evaluating Genie. So the following parts need to be removed.* **It is noted that Genie is not a power saving scheme but the result may serve as an upper bound of power saving gain of power saving techniques, which may potentially motivate development of new power saving techniques that can approach the Genie performance.**

We suggest to first focus on C-DRX and other existing power saving techniques since they are commonly known and companies can compare results with each other. If new power saving technique is evaluated, it’s possible that this only comes from one or very few companies, and the results may not be so convincing and it’s hard for RAN1 to have consensus on such results. So we suggest to remove the last sub-bullet.In summary, the following red changes are suggested:**Proposal 3. To facilitate further discussion on evaluation of power saving effect of different power saving schemes, the following references are defined.** * **Case 1 (Baseline): UE power consumption assuming UE is always ON, i.e., UE is always available for gNB scheduling.**
* **Case 2: UE power consumption assuming Rel-15/16 CDRX configuration**
* **Company can optionally evaluate for other cases, e.g.**
	+ **Genie: UE power consumption assuming that UE is in a sleep state (e.g., micro/light/deep sleep as defined in TR38.840) whenever there is neither DL data reception nor UL transmission. From the gNB scheduling perspective, UE is always available for scheduling, i.e., there is no difference from Baseline in gNB scheduling and corresponding UE Tx/Rx. ~~It is noted that Genie is not a power saving scheme but the result may serve as an upper bound of power saving gain of power saving techniques, which may potentially motivate development of new power saving techniques that can approach the Genie performance.~~**
	+ **R15/16/17 power saving techniques for connected mode, e.g., BWP, PDCCH skipping, search space switching, etc.**
	+ **~~Other schemes are not precluded (e.g., new power saving techniques)~~**
 |
| FUTUREWEI | Do not agree with proposal for the following reasons * + 1. Case 2 may not be considered as baseline, the baseline is Case 1 while Case 2 might be optional
		2. Schemes may require joint UL and DL simulations. We consider this as controversial topic as it is was left to being optional in the agreement below.

Agreements**:** At least for XR/CG capacity evaluation, for DL and UL * Baseline: DL and UL performances are evaluated independently
* Optional: DL and UL performance are evaluated together

FFS details both the baseline and the optional evaluationsFurther details of the agreement made towards UL and DL simulations need to be considered first before discussing power saving techniques i.e. until the FFS parts have been resolved first of the above agreements. * + 1. Further details are needed regarding for example, single or multiple streams and its effects on power consumption.

In general given the agreement in regards to DL and UL joint and separate simulations, where the separate is baseline while joint is optional, the consequent power consumption evaluations may be different. It is not clear at this point, how each of the options will impact power consumption evaluations.  |
| QC | We support Case 1 and 2.For Case2, although in principle it is better to limit evaluation cases, at least for now, we think it is a bit difficult to limit the evaluated CDRX parameters since we don’t know how much capacity impact each CDRX configuration would have. When choosing the configuration, we think, we also need to take into account on the impact on capacity as well. If parameter set limitation is necessary, we think, it could be done in later meetings.For optional evaluation, we support FL suggestion. |
| OPPO | Share the same view as MTK/Ericsson/Huawei on Case 1. Thus, we prefer to keep Case 2 as optional. |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal. |
| LG | Okay with Case 1 as a reference. For others, we prefer them to be optional unless we can come up with a small number of CDRX configurations for Option 2. |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal and agree with other companies that Case 1 should be baseline. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Same view as MTK. |
| Xiaomi | Share other companies’ view that case 1 should be the baseline. All other cases can be optional. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are, in general, ok with the proposal. However, we share the other companies’ preference to have a Case 1 as a baseline and Case 2 (as well as all other potential cases) as optional.There were also concerns by other companies that the current definition for Case 2 may lead to confusion, as there can be multiple configurations within Case 2 ultimately showing different results.Maybe, a way forward is to make Case 2 optional and add an FFS for Case 2 to define CDRX configurations better during future meetings (to facilitate comparison between the results reported by companies for Case 2).We also suggest removing last bullet **~~Other schemes are not precluded (e.g., new power saving techniques).~~** The motivation of the new power scheme should be given first, as development of new power saving scheme is not the scope of this SI. Maybe, it is better to first evaluate how well the existing power-saving schemes are applicable/not-applicable to XR and only then discuss if we need to expand the SI focus. In this SI, we already have a number of existing schemes that companies can have a look first and compare the results with each other (not to mention coverage and mobility evaluations that we have not even started discussing to date). |

For the table to collect the evaluation result of UE power consumption for XR, the following proposal is updated based on the 1st round discussion. Note that additional metrics can also be reported once they are agreed. This table can be as the starting point.

**Proposal 4. UE power consumption (i.e., power saving gain of the evaluated scheme) for XR is evaluated in conjunction with impact on latency, user experience, and capacity. In this regard, the following table is used to collect results from companies as a starting point.**

Table 1 Evaluation of UE power saving schemes for e.g., {dense urban, AR, FR1}

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Power Saving Scheme | Power Saving Gain (PSG) compared to Case 1 | #satisfied UEs per cell2 / #UEs per cell3 |
| PS gain of 5%-tile UE in PSG CDF1 | PS gain of 50%-tile UE in PSG CDF1 | PS gain of 95%-tile UE in PSG CDF1 | Mean PS gain |
| Case 1 | - | - | - | - | K1 / N |
| Case 2 | X1 % | Y1 % | Z1 % | U1% | K2/ N |
| Case X | X2 % | Y2 % | Z2 % | U2% | K3 / N |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note 1: CDF of power saving gains of each UE

Note 2: # of satisfied UEs per cell among # of UEs per cell (=N).

Note 3: # of dropped UEs per cell (=N) that needs to be the same for all power saving schemes to be evaluated.

Note 4: company to provide the detailed simulation assumptions including parameter values for each case, e.g. CDRX parameters

1. **Please share your comments on the proposal 4.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | We think keeping Mean PS gain is sufficient for power saving evaluation since this is also the methodology used in R16 power saving work item. We are not sure how can we compare two schemes if one provides better PS gain for Mean PS gain while another provides better PS gain for 50%-tile UE in PSG CDF. |
| Ericsson | Power savings part is too complicated. Avg. power savings gain reporting should be enough in alignment with current UEPS evaluations.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We share similar view with MediaTek that “mean PS gain” is enough. Other metrics can be up to companies report. |
| FUTUREWEI | The different schemes that are mentioned may have different parameters that should be carefully chosen as it would affect the end results and skew the conclusions. We should take efforts to agree on a reasonable set of schemes (including relevant evaluation methodology) also taking into account of workload. Work can stagger after capacity evaluations are performed first.In general given the agreement in regards to DL and UL joint and separate simulations, where the separate is baseline while joint is optional, the consequent power consumption evaluations may be different. It is not clear at this point, how each of the options will impact power consumption evaluations. Clearly defining the schemes in relation to the assumed DL and UL interaction is needed.  |
| QC | Capturing mean value only can provide limited information. Additional information in tail side (both left and right) could provide lower or upper side of power saving gains seen by users and how much they deviate from the mean. We believe that having such information would highly benefit this study item, where we want to understand current XR performance in various aspects, identify any potential issues/problems, and better understand the nature of those issues and even potential solutions.Note that 5%, 50%, 95% numbers should be already available when we get its mean value. So, in terms of additional workload, it should be minimal. |
| OPPO | Share the same view as MTK/Ericsson/Huawei that mean PS gain is sufficient |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal. Since the performance of power saving gain per UE is already available when we calculate mean power saving gain, there is no need to spend extra effort. In addition, the CDF of power saving gain per UE can provide more information to analyse potential power issues.  |
| LG | We are okay with the Proposal 4. We see power saving for XR devices is important. Getting more information would be helpful to check the relevant schemes and potential enhancements for power saving. |
| DOCOMO | Share the same view as QC/vivo/LG. |
| ZTE,Sanechips | Fine with the table. We have an editorial suggestion as to reformulate the ‘case X(1,2)’ in the first column as ‘scheme X(1,2)’ to avoid conjunction with the previous FL proposal, |
| Xiaomi | Share the view that mean power saving gain would be enough to compare among solutions. It is up to each company whether to report other metrics.  |
| Nokia, NSB | Ok, in general. See the concerns by MTK/Ericsson/Huawei/OPPO view. Maybe, having mean PS gain as mandatory and quantiles as optional may be a way forward. |

To estimate UE power consumption for tx power other than 0dBm and 23dBm, following proposal is updated based on 1st round discussion.

**Proposal 5: For UL UE power consumption evaluation for UE with transmit power X [0,23] dBm, adopt the following**

* **Baseline: Consider only two Tx power values as defined in TR 38.840**
	+ **Companies to provide detailed assumptions on UE power consumption for Tx power values other than 0 and 23 dBm**
* **Optional: Linear interpolation method in linear scale for Tx power values other than 0 and 23 dBm**
1. **Please share your comments on the proposal 5.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| MTK | We think sub-bullet under “Baseline” should be put under the “Optional” main bullet if Tx power values other than 0 and 23 dBm are to be used. This would match the baseline description better. |
| Ericsson | Support. For a system simulation, there will be a need to do interpolation (the UE Tx power will rarely be 0 or 23dBm), and we think the interpolation method should be described.  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Fine with the proposal. |
| FUTUREWEI | In our views, the power consumption models developed in TR 38.840 should be used as starting point for power consumption evaluation for XR. Suggest that a baseline would be more unified instead of having companies provide detailed assumptions which otherwise would diversify results making difficult to draw conclusions and baseline results may not be easily comparable. One suggestion is to clearly define an assumption such as that provided in the Optional. |
| QC | Support this proposal.For **Baseline**, companies should provide detailed assumption on UL transmit power of UEs simulated, transmit power control, corresponding UE power consumption, etc.For **Optional**, we could use following formula for transmit power X dBm for a given uplink state.$$y=\frac{(B-A)}{200-1}(x-1)+A$$where* A is a relative power number of the uplink state for tx power of 0dBm (1mW).
* B is a relative power number of the uplink state for tx power of 23dBm (200mW).
* x (mW) is the tx power of a UE in linear scale
* y is the linear interpolated value of UE power consumption for a UE with tx power x (mW).

Following figure shows the relation between A, B, x, and y in linear interpolation method.Following figure shows the example of linearly interpolated values for various x values for A=250, and B=700. In this plot, y axis is relative power (**in linear scale**) and x axis is converted to **dBm scale**.Machine generated alternative text:   |
| OPPO  | Support |
| vivo | Fine with the proposal. The sub-bullet under baseline is needed, since only 0dBm or 23dBm can be selected according to TR38.840, the details of how to choose one of them should be reported by companies when Tx power is other than 0dBm and 23dBm. |
| LG | Okay with the Proposal 5. Also okay to go one step further with QC’s formulation for interpolation even if we don’t see any ambiguity without it. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We prefer to add an exemplary approach as elaborated in our paper R1-2100529 as copied below. This is a representative approach that could considered to model the UE Tx power consumption with the current two states.

|  |
| --- |
| In RAN1 #103-e meeting, UE max transmission power for XR evaluation is set to 23dBm. Two simple methods can be considered to model the relative power for transmission power between 0dBm and 23dBm.*Alt 1: Reusing the power values at 0dBm and 23dBm. UL(long PUCCH or PUSCH) power value is 250 within [0dBm, M], and UL power value is 700 within (M, 23dBm].**Alt 2: Linear interpolation technique. The following formula can be used to obtain the UL power between 0dBm and 23dBm.**Y = 250 + 2.25\*X.* *X is transmission power in mw, Y is UL power at X mw.*1. RAN 1 down-selects between the two methods for relative value modeling between UL transmission power with (0dBm 23dBm) for FR1,

Alt 1: UL(long PUCCH or PUSCH) power value is 250 within [0dBm, M], and UL power value is 700 within (M, 23dBm].Alt 2: Y = 250 + 2.25\*X, X is transmission power in mw, Y is UL power at X mw. |

The modification looks like**Proposal 5: For UL UE power consumption evaluation for UE with transmit power X [0,23] dBm, adopt the following** * **Baseline: Consider only two Tx power values as defined in TR 38.840**
	+ **Companies to provide detailed assumptions(e.g. falling back to the relative power state associated with the nearest transmit power in linear scale) on UE power consumption for Tx power values other than 0 and 23 dBm**
* **Optional: Linear interpolation method in linear scale for Tx power values other than 0 and 23 dBm**
 |
| Xiaomi | Fine with FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Fine with this proposal. |

# Discussion of 1st round

## Applications and deployment scenarios

Following companies discussed the applications and deployment scenarios for XR/CG evaluations.

[Ericsson] proposed a priority for evaluation: CG > AR > VR. For CG and AR, Dense urban is prioritized. For VR, indoor hotspot is prioritized.

[Huawei] proposed to prioritize Dense urban and Urban Macro for FR1.

[Qualcomm] proposed the suggested evaluation scenarios for VR/AR/CG.

[ZTE] proposed to prioritize indoor for AR2 and CG, CG and UMi for VR2.

[vivo] proposed to prioritize indoor hotspot for VR2, CG, Dense urban for CG and AR2, and Urban Macro for AR2.

[Xiaomi] proposed to prioritize indoor for VR, both indoor and outdoor for AR/CG.

**Q1: The deployment scenarios for evaluation may be applied to each of XR/CG applications of interest. However, if all the XR/CG applications are considered, there will be too many combinations of deployment scenarios and XR/CG applications, which could lead to numerous simulation work. Therefore, it may be desirable to consider prioritization of combinations of deployment scenarios and XR/CG applications, e.g.,**

* **For VR**
	+ **Indoor hotspot**
* **For AR**
	+ **Dense urban**
	+ **Indoor hotspot**
* **For CG**
	+ **Dense urban**
	+ **Indoor hotspot**

**Please note that with such prioritization, companies can still submit evaluation results for de-prioritized scenarios.**

1. **Please share your views on the above question.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | We support prioritizing the following cases.* For VR
	+ Indoor hotspot
* For AR
	+ Dense urban (1st preference)
	+ Indoor hotspot (2nd preference)
* For CG
	+ Dense urban (2nd preference)

Indoor hotspot (1st preference) |
| CATT | We are OK to have all of them.  |
| ZTE , Sanechips | Firstly, FR1 should be prioritized for evaluation. In RAN1 #103-e meeting, evaluation methodology and assumption for FR1 were mostly accomplished. RAN1 still need more work on evaluation methodology including the bandwidth and UE antenna for FR2. It is much easier to have a set of agreeable simulation assumption for FR1. Secondly, we prioritize indoor for AR2 and CG, Umi for CG and VR2. For VR2, it is a rendered version of a delivered visual and audio scene requiring a user to wear a head mounted display, to completely replace the user's field of view with a simulated visual component, and to wear headphones, to provide the user with the accompanying audio. For AR2, XR conversational, one of applications of AR2, is an application when a user is provided with additional information or artificially generated items or content overlaid upon their current environment featuring more UL traffic. People usually have a meeting at office or at home. For CG, it can be played using a device, and used in both indoor and outdoor scenarios. |
| OPPO | We can postpone this discussion until the traffic models are agreed. If the traffic models are the same or similar for different types of applications, then we don’t need to differentiate the applications for RAN1 evaluation. From RAN1 perspective, we only need to discuss the combination of agreed traffic models and deployment scenarios.  |
| AT&T | We are fine with the proposed prioritization. |
| Intel | Ok to have all the scenarios. Can prioritize Dense Urban Micro for AR/CG. |
| DOCOMO | We are fine with the proposed prioritization. |
| vivo | We support FL’s proposal. |
| Facebook | Fine with proposal |
| Sony | We are OK with the proposed prioritization. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | For VR, Dense Urban scenario should also be considered since it is the typical commercial deployment of NR networks. Meanwhile, according to RAN1#103-e agreements below (red part), such prioritization will be discussed after the traffic models are stable. Since the detailed traffic model is still under discussing and not stable, this issue can be postponed.Agreement:**XR applications**RAN1 confirms that diverse applications of VR1/2, AR1/2, CG are of interest for study. Potential prioritization/down selection of these applications for evaluation is to be discussed after detailed traffic models and relevant evaluation assumptions are stable.Agreement:It is to be further discussed how to prioritize the combinations of deployment scenarios and applications after traffic models for each application are stable. |
| LG | Okay. Even if for AR and CG urban macro is more relevant than indoor hotspot, as many companies want to have the Uma as optional, we are okay with the prioritization suggested by the FL.  |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree with OPPO and Huawei on deferring this discussion until the corresponding traffic models are agreed (as per 103-e agreements). This seems like a logical order to first agree on (i) what do we plan to model and how and only then decide (ii) which of these are to be prioritized. |
| MTK | We are fine with FL proposal. We suggest to further prioritize FR1 and CG/AR, but this can be discussed later. |
| Vodafone | For AR and Gaming for FR1 we think we should also evaluate Urban Macro, as these services need to work well also in wide area coverage, not just where there are small cells deployed. Indoor hotspot seems lower priority than that for us. |
| InterDigital | We believe that all scenarios can be considered in evaluations, however, in the interest of reducing the number of evaluations, VR/AR Indoor hotspot and Dense urban need to be prioritized.  |
| Futurewei | Suggest prioritizing Dense Urban for FR1 and since it makes more sense to have DU with AR then possibly prioritize AR Dense Urban. Agree with FL need to avoid too many combinations. Once considerable progress has been made for capacity evaluations may possibly add more scenarios for evaluations |
| Ericsson | Support prioritization, but we need stronger prioritization. Propose to remove indoor hotspot for AR and CG  |

## Capacity evaluation methodology

### Methodology

**DL and UL evaluation dependency**

[Xiaomi, Nokia, OPPO, vivo, Qualcomm] discussed the dependency of DL and UL evaluation

[Xiaomi, Nokia, OPPO, vivo] proposes that DL and UL capacity are evaluated separately.

[Qualcomm] proposes to simulate DL and UL together to capture interaction between DL and UL in power evaluation.

For simulation purpose, DL and UL capacity can be evaluated independently to simplify the simulation. On the other hand, since there are interactions between DL and UL for XR/CG applications, it would be good to evaluate XR/CG considering the dependency of DL and UL. Besides, considering both DL and UL transmission in the simulation, it is more accurate to evaluate the performance of capacity or power for XR/CG. However, the evaluation considering DL and UL together would bring additional complexity for simulation. So it can be optional for companies to do such evaluation.

**Proposal 1: For XR/CG evaluation, for DL and UL**

* **Option 1: DL and UL performances are evaluated independently (baseline)**
* **Option 2: DL and UL performance are evaluated together (optional)**
1. **Please share your views on the above** **proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| Nokia, NSB | We would like to adjust the listed proposal a bit, as there might be some confusion here related to “DL and UL separately” vs. “DL and UL together”.There are several possibilities:Option 1: DL and UL traffic are modelled separately. In this case, one simulation is run with only DL traffic, while the other one with only UL.Option 2. DL and UL traffic are modelled together, but the DL-related and UL-related metrics are captured separately. These metrics can be further combined into unified metrics, but they are originally captured separately.Option 3. DL and UL traffic are modelled together, there is no separation between DL-related and UL-related metrics.Out of these options, we prefer Option 2 (modelling both DL and UL traffic together but distinguishing the DL and UL metrics).Option 1 is the easiest to simulate, but the obtained results for capacity and UE power consumption may be too optimistic. E.g., if the cell supports 10 XR devices in DL (DL-only traffic) and 10 XR devices in UL (UL-only traffic), this doesn’t mean that the cell supports 10 XR devices if both DL and UL traffic are present together. In fact, this doesn’t tell us much on how may XR devices the cell supports with both DL and UL traffic (the value may range anywhere from 0 to 10).Option 3 is similar to Option 2 in modelling assumptions, but it does not allow to carefully analyse the possible bottlenecks in supporting XR services. Particularly, it is important to see, which direction of traffic is a limiting factor: e.g., a higher-rate but less critical video in DL or a lower-rate but delay-sensitive pose update in UL. If the companies just report “12 XR devices are satisfied”, we lose a lot of important and useful information. |
| QC | We support Proposal 1. Ideally it would be the best to simulate jointly DL and UL to accurately evaluate the performance affected by interaction between DL and UL. However, considering simulation complexity, separate simulations can be considered as baseline, which would be able to capture most of key performance aspects especially for capacity evaluation. When it comes to power evaluation, result from separate evaluations would not capture accurately UE sleeping behaviour (in reality, UE cannot sleep when there is activity in either DL or UL), and therefore joint DL & UL simulation would be beneficial. But, again taking into account simulation complexity, we are okay to make joint DL & UL simulations optional even in power evaluation.  |
| CATT | Option 1: DL/UL are simulated independently. |
| ZTE , Sanechips | We support Option 1. Firstly, XR applications are characterized by more intensive DL traffic, hence, we ought to prioritize evaluation for DL.Secondly, DL-related simulation and UL-related simulation separately can facilitate the result reporting/collection from companies.Thirdly, DL-related simulation and UL-related simulation separately has simpler workload than simulation simultaneously.  |
| OPPO | Support proposal 1. Which option is used in evaluation is up to companies |
| AT&T | We prefer Option 2, especially as clarified by Nokia. Option 1 is not realistic and may miss key aspects of practical system operation which impact XR performance. |
| Intel  | Ok with current proposal with Option 1 as baseline. For Option 2, we prefer Option 2 from Nokia above with the clarification that DL and UL traffic is modelled based on independent parameters but in the same simulation.  |
| DOCOMO | We prefer Option 2 clarified by Nokia. |
| vivo | We support the proposal and the clarification of option 2 by Nokia. |
| Facebook | Fine with option 1 |
| Apple | Fine with FL proposal |
| Sony | We support Option 1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Ok with Option 1.Application layer will use UL pose/control to render frame, but this is transparent to RAN transmission. So from RAN’s perspective, both DL and UL are periodic traffic, and there is no relationship between them. There is no need to model the interaction between UL and DL in RAN1.Btw: Question 2 here seems to be the same as Question 10 in XR01 email thread (copied below)? Do we plan to have one or separate discussions for them?*(in XR01)* **Question 10**. Please share your view on (i) whether/how to evaluate two eye buffers, (ii) how to model traffic arrival time offset across UEs, (iii) whether/how to evaluate dependency of DL and UL traffic. |
| LG | Okay with the FL suggestion with the understanding that the simplified one is baseline to gather more feedbacks from companies and the more complex one as optional to check with more accurate results. Regarding further breakdown of Option 2 in Question 2 into Option 2 and 3, whether to have metrics for DL and UL separately or a unified metric seems to be a next level of details that can be further discussed when we discuss metrics to report. |
| Xiaomi | We support option 1. But we are fine with FL proposal. |
| MTK | We prefer Option 2 clarified by Nokia. |
| InterDigital | We support proposal 1. Having independent performance evaluation can also provide good insight into performance bottlenecks.  |
| Futurewei | Due to increased complexity and for sake of making progress in SI we therefore prefer to prioritize Option 1. While Option 2 may be evaluated by companies as optional when the details related to joint downlink and uplink EVM is completed. |
| Ericsson | Independent evaluation should be baseline. Companies are free to contribute for other scenarios |

### Evaluation assumptions

**Channel estimation**

In RAN1 #103e, it was agreed that realistic channel estimation is adopted for XR/CG evaluations. Regarding whether or not the include ideal channel estimation for the XR/CG evaluations, companies’ views are summarized as below based on the input.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Channel estimation | RealisticFFS:Ideal(optional) |

* Ideal is also considered
	+ *Nokia, CATT, LG, Samsung, Huawei, vivo*

Realistic channel estimation is necessary to evaluate the performance in practical deployment. Meanwhile, Ideal channel estimation can be useful for evaluation. Hence,

**Proposal 2: in addition to realistic channel estimation, ideal channel estimation can be optionally evaluated.**

1. **Please share your views on the above** **proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | To reduce workload, we propose realistic only. |
| CATT | No need for IDEL channel estimation |
| ZTE , Sanechips | Object. Companies’ simulation results are largely based on the realistic assumption including realistic channel estimation. We don’t see the benefit of providing additional results for ICE. |
| OPPO | If the realistic channel estimation is used as the baseline, we are not sure what the benefit of the additional evaluation with ideal channel estimation is. If companies are free to select one of them, we are ok to keep the two options (realistic and ideal)  |
| AT&T | Realistic channel estimation is sufficient  |
| Intel  | IMT-2020 assumed realistic channel estimation and this should be sufficient for XR. Interested companies can always submit additional results.  |
| DOCOMO | Realistic channel estimation is sufficient but we are OK to keep ideal channel estimation as optional. |
| Vivo | We support the proposal. |
| Facebook | Realistic channel estimation should be sufficient. |
| Sony | Realistic channel estimation as the baseline. This is a study item, we are OK if some companies want to provide simulation results with ideal channel estimation (as optional). |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal. The results under ideal channel estimation are informative since they eliminate the impacts of different channel estimation algorithms. |
| LG | Okay with the proposal. Ideal channel estimation may be useful to derive an insight on the impact of different channel estimation performances from different company’s evaluation results. |
| Xiaomi | Similar as OPPO, we support to add ideal channel estimation, but not as an optional option. Companies can freely choose between ideal and realistic channel estimation. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with Proposal 2. |
| MTK | We support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | Ideal channel estimation can be excluded from evaluation assumptions in the interest of reducing number of evaluations. Realistic channel estimation assumption will provide sufficient value to the performance evaluations.  |
| Futurwei | Prefer to keep the ideal case as optional |

**TDD configuration for XR/CG evaluation**

Regarding TDD configuration for XR/CG evaluation, companies input in RAN1 #104e is summarized as below.

* FR1:
	+ Option 1: DDDSU
		- *MTK*
	+ Option 2: DDDUU
		- *Apple (for AR2), Samsung*
* FR2:
	+ Option 1: DDDSU
	+ Option 2: DDDUU is also introduced
		- *Qualcomm*

S slot format is constructed as

* S = 10:2:2
	+ *Qualcomm, MTK, Nokia, ZTE, DCM, vivo*
* S = 11:1:2
	+ *CATT*
* S = D or U
	+ *Huawei*

**Proposal 3: adopt following update for TDD configuration for XR/CG evaluation**

* **FR1:**
	+ **Option 1: DDDSU**
	+ **Option 2: DDDUU**
* **FR2:**
	+ **Option 1: DDDSU**
	+ **Option 2: DDDUU**

**Detailed S slot format is 10D:2F:2U**

**Further clarify that for option 2 for FR1/FR2, there is [2]-symbol gap at the end of third “D” slot of DDDUU.**

1. **Please share your views on the above** **proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | We support Proposal 3. |
| CATT | We are OK with Proposal 3 |
| ZTE , Sanechips | Firstly, we regard 10D:2F:2U as an example of the detailed S slot format. Other formats are also considered. Companies can report the S slot format and evaluate with other S slot formats. This can be one of further studying points. Secondly, according to agreement in RAN1-103-e meeting, it has been noted that other TDD configuration or FDD can be optionally evaluated. Hence, it is not necessary to add another option in FR2.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreement:Adopt the following TDD configuration for XR/CG evaluation* FR1:
	+ Option 1: DDDSU
	+ Option 2: DDDUU
* FR2:
	+ Option 1: DDDSU

FFS detailed S slot formatNote: Other TDD configuration or FDD can be optionally evaluated. |

 Moreover, due to various possibilities of S slot format, the frame structure of Option 1 in FR2 can achieve that of Option 2 by using S slot format: 2F:12U.  |
| AT&T | We are OK with Proposal 3. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | We support the proposal. |
| Facebook | OK with the proposal |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Detailed format of S slot will bring additional complexity for simulation. For simplicity, S slot being treated as all D slot should also be considered. So we suggest to add Option 3: DDDDU. |
| LG | Okay with the introduction of Option 2 for FR2, and the detailed S slot format. For the gap symbol at the end of the last D slot, if this is to further align evaluation results, then shouldn’t we do the same thing for the 2F symbols in the S slot? They could be used for downlink if there is no uplink transmission from the start of the following U slot. Or, just let companies report on their assumption on those symbols. |
| Xiaomi | We are OK with FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree for the S slot. In principle, agree with the additional line “Further clarify that for option 2 for FR1/FR2, there is [2]-symbol gap at the end of third “D” slot of DDDUU.”, assuming that it means that the third D is, in fact, a slot with 12D:2F format (slot #4 according to the SFI index table). |
| MTK | We want to clarify that companies are free to select one of them from the two options. If so, we support the proposal. Otherwise, we suggest to further down-select one TDD pattern for each application (Ex. CG, AR, VR) |
| InterDigital | We support the TDD configuration in proposal 3  |
| Futurewei | As discussed online during GTW, both options are used and companies can choose which one to use. If one of them needs to be baseline, we suggest option 2 as it is simpler and easily aligned between the companies. |
| Ericsson | Do not support. DDDSU is enough. |

**Downtilt for XR/CG evaluation**

·         For XR/CG evaluation, adopt the following assumptions for downtilt

* Dense Urban
	+ 12 degree
		- *FutureWei, Samsung (Dense urban), Qualcomm (Dense Urban, FR1, no need for FR2), Huawei, ZTE (Dense urban), OPPO (Dense Urban), vivo (Dense urban)*
	+ 6 MDT and 6 EDT
		- *Nokia*

**Proposal 4: For XR/CG evaluation, adopt 12 degree for downtilt for Dense Urban in FR1.**

1. **Please share your views on the above** **proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | Prefer 12 degree. |
| CATT | We are OK with proposal 4 but considering the assumption not realistic |
| ZTE , Sanechips | Support.  |
| OPPO | Support proposal 4 |
| Intel  | The down tilt should be a function of ISD and BS antenna height. Typically, 12 degree for Dense Urban Macro with 25m BS height provides good coverage. For Dense Urban Micro with 10m BS height, 10 degrees yields better spectral efficiency.  |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LG | Okay. |
| Xiaomi | We agree with FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB  | We are ok with Proposal 4, but we share the Intel’s concern. In addition, moving the BS to 10m with 12-degree downtilt, while simultaneously elevating the indoor UEs to high floors (up to 22.5m) may lead to some of these UEs located “above” the main beam (and thus having coverage issues). This may potentially challenge stringent reliability constraints for indoor XR users and cause us some troubles during the evaluation campaign. |
| MTK | We support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support proposal 4. For Dense Urban, 12 degree downlit would provide better coverage in micro cell.  |
| Futurewei | Agree with proposal |
| Ericsson | Support |

**System bandwidth for XR/CG evaluations**

* FR1
	+ 100MHz baseline
		- *CATT*
	+ No need to support 200 MHz
		- *Samsung, OPPO*
	+ CA with 20/40 MHz per CC can be used optionally
		- *Samsung*
	+ CA with 2\*100 MHz can be used optionally
		- *MTK, ZTE, vivo*
* FR2
	+ 400 MHz
		- *Samsung, Qualcomm, DCM, OPPO, vivo*
	+ 800 MHz as optional
		- *Qualcomm*
	+ 100 MHz as baseline
		- *Nokia, CATT, DCM, OPPO*
	+ 2\*100 MHz and 4\*100 MHz can be optional
		- *Nokia*

It is also proposed by [ZTE] that companies can report CA setting and evaluate with other system bandwidth using CA

It is needed for companies to clarify the motivation and potential benefit for CA modeling in XR/CG evaluation.

**Proposal 5: System bandwidth for XR/CG evaluations are as follows.**

* **For FR1,**
	+ **Baseline: 100 MHz**
	+ **Optional: 20/40 MHz, 2\*100 MHz with CA**
* **FR2**
	+ **Option 1: 100 MHz**
	+ **Option 2: 400 MHz**

**Companies should report the CA setting if CA is adopted**

1. **Please share your views on the above** **proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | Support Proposal 5. |
| CATT | We are OK with Proposal 5 |
| ZTE , Sanechips | Support. |
| OPPO | Support in principle.  |
| AT&T | We are OK with Proposal 5 |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal |
| vivo | We support the proposal. |
| Sony | Support Proposal 5. Preferably FR2 – 400 MHz as the baseline. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LG | For FR2, we can have the same approach as in FR1. Our preference is 200 MHz as baseline and 400 MHz as optional if needed. We think assuming larger bandwidth for FR2 is typical.  |
| Xiaomi | We are OK with FL proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support Proposal 5. |
| MTK | We prefer to set FR2 Option 2 as 200MHz, due to the following text in 38.306***channelBWs-DL***For FR2, the bits in *channelBWs-DL* (without suffix) starting from the leading / leftmost bit indicate 50, 100 and 200MHz. The third / rightmost bit (for 200MHz) shall be set to 1.We ca live with Proposal 5 if that’s the way forward. |
| InterDigital | We support proposal 5. |
| Futurewei | Agree with the proposal. The wider 400 MHz for FR2 may be kept as optional or alternatively having the 100 MHz as baseline. |
| Ericsson | In general, there is no need to specify optional scenarios, companies are anyway OK to submit anything. 100MHz BW is enough for FR1 |

**BS antenna parameters**

For outdoor scenarios, the  BS antenna parameters are as follows.

* FR1,
	+ Option 1: 64 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (8,8,2,1,1;4,8)
		- *Qualcomm, Huawei, MTK, ZTE, vivo*
	+ Option 2: 32 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (8,2,2,1,1,8,2)
		- *Samsung, CATT, LG, OPPO*
	+ Option 3: 32TxRUs (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (4,4,2,1,1,4,4)
		- *Nokia (baseline)*

(dH, dV) = (0.5λ, 0. 5λ)

**Proposal 6: For outdoor scenarios, the  BS antenna parameters are as**

* **(M, N, P, Mg, Ng) = (8,8,2,1,1), (Mp, Np ) is reported by companies**

**(dH, dV) = (0.5λ, 0. 5λ)**

1. **Please share your views on the above** **proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | We support Proposal 6 as a compromised solution.  |
| CATT | We are OK with Proposal 6 |
| ZTE , Sanechips | **Proposal 6: For outdoor scenarios, the  BS antenna parameters are as*** **~~(M, N, P, Mg, Ng) = (8,8,2,1,1), (Mp, Np ) is reported by companies~~**
* **64 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (8,8,2,1,1;4,8)**

**(dH, dV) = (0.5λ, 0. 5λ)**Is this a typo? For the BS antenna parameters, we support Option 1.Large number of antennas can increase the system capacity. In TR 38.830, BS antenna configuration of (M,N,P,Mg,Ng) = (8,8,2,1,1) can be used for Urban deployment. |
| OPPO | Ok with Proposal 6 since it seems the only way for progress/compromise |
| AT&T | Ok with the FL proposal |
| Intel | It would be more ideal to agree on TXRUs, otherwise simulation results comparison and averaging across companies can be difficult (as seen in IMT-2020). Option 1 can be used. |
| DOCOMO | Support the proposal |
| vivo | We support the proposal. |
| Apple | We support Option 2, we don’t need to repeat the discussion in RAN1 103-e. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal. We are also ok with Option 1. |
| LG | Okay with the proposal.For better understanding, consider adding a note saying “companies to clearly state the exact feedback/MUX mechanism used for the simulation”. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Regarding the BS antenna configuration, we share the Apple’s concerns on 32TxRU vs. 64TxRU. We are afraid that mandating a single 64TxRU option is very risky. As discussed during the previous meeting, this may lead to overheads, issues with antenna virtualization, as well as unnecessary long modeling time. This may be a challenge for a given number of configurations and anticipated complex traffic patterns with stringent requirements. Therefore, 64TxRU should not be set as the only option. |
| MTK | We support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We support proposal 6. |
| Futurewei | Support proposal |
| Ericsson | What is the motivation of going with the larger antenna? Clearly, the absolute capacity numbers will be lower, but the results are as interesting with a smaller antenna – since they are more common. A larger antenna will also lead to longer simulation times. We prefer option 2 or 3 |

**UE antenna parameters**

UE antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluations are as follows

* FR1:
	+ Baseline: 2T/4R, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (1,2,2,1,1;1,2), (dH, dV) = (0.5, N/A)λ
	+ Optional: 4T/4R, 1T/2R, 2T2R
		- 1T/2R
			* *Apple, Samsung*
* FR2:
	+ Option 1 (Follow Rel-17 evaluation methodology for FeMIMO in R1-2007151)
		- (M, N, P)=(1, 4, 2), 3 panels (left, right, top)
		- (Mp, Np) is up to company. Need to be reported with simulation result.
		- *Samsung, Qualcomm, Nokia, LG(optional), OPPO (panel setting is up to company), vivo*
	+ Option 2 (from TR 38.802 – developed in Rel-14)
		- 4Tx/4Rx: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (2,4,2,1,2;1,2), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.5)λ, the polarization angles are 0° and 90°
		- *MTK, ZTE, CATT, LG (baseline)*

**Proposal 7: For FR2, adopt Option 1 (Follow Rel-17 evaluation methodology for FeMIMO in R1-2007151) for UE antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluations.**

* **(M, N, P)=(1, 4, 2), 3 panels (left, right, top)**
1. **Please share your views on the above** **proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | Support Proposal 7. Option 1 is already widely being used in other WI and also capture typical FR2 antenna panel design. |
| CATT | Option 2. We would like to align with TR38.802 |
| ZTE , Sanechips | Object. We prefer Option 2. In our opinion, Option 1 would require companies to report (Mp, Np) parameters, risking having different results due to the different settings. To better compare the companies' results, unified parameters are better choice. |
| OPPO | ok |
| AT&T | Ok with proposal 7 |
| Intel | Note that in R1-2007151, the UE panels are (left, right **and back**) and not top.  |
| DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal |
| vivo | We support the proposal. |
| LG | Option 2 is preferred. Similar view with CATT and ZTE. |
| Nokia, NSB | Support Proposal 7. |
| MTK | We prefer Option 2 because Option 1 has more uncertainty (Ex. Mp, Np, panel setting) |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal 7 |
| Futurewei | OK with proposal |
| Ericsson | Support |

**UE antenna height for Dense urban**

[Intel] discussed the UE antenna height for indoor UEs in Dense urban. It is proposed that indoor UEs are considered to be evenly distributed in different floors of a building (buildings ranging in height from 4 floors to 8 floors)

FL comment: the suggestion by Intel is valid. For indoor UEs in Dense urban, UEs are distributed in different floors. The modelling of building height for UEs in UMi is considered in 38.901, which refers to 3D-UMi in TR36.873. For Dense urban for XR/CG evaluations, the same modeling can be adopted.

**Proposal 8: the UE antenna height for indoor UEs is updated as following based on Table 6-1 in TR 36.873.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Urban Micro cell with high UE density (3D-UMi) |
| **UE height (*hUT*) in meters** | general equation | *hUT*=3(*nfl* – 1) + 1.5 |
| *nfl* for outdoor UEs | 1 |
| *nfl* for indoor UEs | *nfl* ~ uniform(1,*Nfl*) where*Nfl* ~ uniform(4,8) |

1. **Please share your views on the above** **proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | Support the update. |
| CATT | We are OK for the update |
| ZTE , Sanechips | We prefer to implement this as a RAN1 conclusion or add a note for clarification. Frankly speaking, our understanding of the previous agreement is what this proposal means. |
| DOCOMO | OK with the update. |
| vivo | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are fine with the proposal. |
| LG | Okay with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are ok with this proposal. |
| MTK | We support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the update |
| Futurewei | It is not clear which scenario the proposal is for. We assume it is only for dense urban, right? I think this can be optional at most. |
| Ericsson | Support |

**BS antenna height for Dense urban**

[Qualcomm] mentioned that BS height of 25ms for Dense urban scenario does not match with UMi BS height of 10m assumed in 38.901 and proposed to update the BS height for dense urban to 10m according to UMi model (38.901).

FL comment: the suggestion by Qualcomm is valid. For Dense urban, it was agreed that the UMi Channel model refers to TR 38.901 is adopted. According to Table 7.2-1 in TR 38.901, the BS antenna height for UMi is 10 m. So the BS antenna height for Dense Urban scenario for XR/CG evaluations is proposed to update to 10 m.

Table 7.2-1: Evaluation parameters for UMi-street canyon and UMa scenarios

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameters | UMi - street canyon | UMa |
| Cell layout | Hexagonal grid, 19 micro sites, 3 sectors per site (ISD = 200m) | Hexagonal grid, 19 macro sites, 3 sectors per site (ISD = 500m) |
| BS antenna height  | 10m | 25m |
| UT location | Outdoor/indoor | Outdoor and indoor | Outdoor and indoor |
| LOS/NLOS | LOS and NLOS | LOS and NLOS |
| Height  | Same as 3D-UMi in TR36.873 | Same as 3D-UMa in TR36.873 |
| Indoor UT ratio | 80% | 80% |
| UT mobility (horizontal plane only) | 3km/h | 3km/h |
| Min. BS - UT distance (2D) | 10m | 35m |
| UT distribution (horizontal) | Uniform | Uniform |

**Proposal 9: the BS antenna height for Dense Urban scenario for XR/CG evaluations is proposed to update to 10 m, according to the Table 7.2-1 in TR 38.901.**

1. **Please share your views on the above** **proposal.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | Support the update to 10m. |
| CATT | We are OK with the update |
| ZTE , Sanechips | We insist 25m BS antenna height with no modification. |
| AT&T | OK with the update |
| Intel  | OK with update since UMi Channel model is designed to model a below roof-top street canyon. |
| DOCOMO | OK with the update |
| vivo | We support the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | In RAN1#103-e, BS height of 25m for Dense urban scenario of single layer with Macro layer is agreed. We do not see strong reasons to revert this agreement. |
| LG | Okay with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Ok with correcting the height from 25m to 10 m. |
| MTK | We support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We are ok with the proposal 9 to update to 10m |
| Futurewei | Agree with proposal |
| Ericsson | Do not support. The parameters for Dense Urban are provided in 38.802 – it is clearly stated that the BS height is 25m. It is also stated that the channel model to use is 3D Uma or 5GCM UMa.  |

## Evaluation of UE Power Consumption for XR

### XR applications and deployment scenarios for Power Evaluation

Taking into account simulation workload, we may want to further prioritize or down-select deployment scenarios and XR applications for evaluation of UE power consumption, e.g.,

1. For FR1
	1. Prioritize AR in dense urban scenario
2. For FR2
	1. Prioritize AR in indoor hotspot scenario

while companies can still submit power evaluation results for other applications and deployment scenarios. (Note: AR may be a representative application for power evaluation as its form factor, e.g., AR glasses may be more sensitive to power consumption)

1. **Please share your view on prioritization of XR applications and deployment scenarios for evaluation of UE power consumption.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | We think AR is one of applications with higher preference among companies. Furthermore, AR has heavier UL of which power contribution is higher than other applications. Therefore, the need for power study and identification of potential power problem is higher than other cases. We support this prioritization, however at the same time, we also want to optionally support other applications. |
| CATT | No need to prioritize the scenario for power consumption.  |
| ZTE , Sanechips | Support. |
| OPPO | Similar comments as for Question 1 |
| DOCOMO | Would prefer not to make down-selection among the applications but if it is really needed, the proposed prioritization seems fine. |
| vivo | We agree that AR services may be more sensitive to power consumption, thus AR can be prioritized for power evaluation. |
| Facebook | Share the same view as QCOM and vivo |
| Apple | We support AR applications be prioritized. |
| Sony | We support to prioritize AR applications |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | Similar to our comments for Question 1, suggest to postpone such prioritization until the traffic models are stable. |
| LG | Okay to prioritized AR for both FR1 and FR2. For deployment scenarios, we think dense urban is more representative for both FR1 and FR2. Therefore, dense urban for both FR1 and FR2 is preferred. |
| Xiaomi | Do not see the need to further prioritize. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with OPPO. Similar comments as for Question 1. |
| MTK | Support |
| InterDigital | We support the proposal to prioritize AR, especially for FR1 dense urban scenario |
| Futurewei | We suggest focussing the study and evaluation first on capacity rather than power consumption. Power consumption evaluation methodology for XR needs further discussion and require more agreements be made before initiating the work and may require lots of effort and time to agree on detailed power evaluation methodology in RAN1. When it is right time to perform Power consumption evaluations, we prefer to prioritize AR. |
| Ericssson | Support  |

### Power Saving Schemes to be evaluated

The following Table 1 summarizes proposals from companies [1-18] on power saving schemes to be evaluated for XR applications.

Table 1 Views on power saving schemes for XR evaluation

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | View |
| Huawei | *For power consumption evaluation of XR, “always on” (i.e., without C-DRX) is adopted as the baseline.**When evaluating power saving techniques, C-DRX mechanism can be considered.*  |
| CATT | *Proposal 12: For XR service evaluation, the power consumption evaluation methodology and metric in TR38.840 could be reused and Rel-16 power saving scheme could be evaluated as baseline. And if needed, power saving enhancement for XR service should be considered for XR/CG service.* |
| Ericsson  | Baseline XR performance should be evaluated assuming that the UE is always available for scheduling (i.e., without including DRX or other power saving techniques) and any studies on power savings techniques should consider latency/throughput impact compared to the baseline. |
| vivo | *Introducing enhanced power saving techniques, including starting time adaptation for ON Duration of C-DRX, and Rel-16/Rel-17 power saving schemes such as PDCCH skipping.**For XR/Cloud Gaming power consumption evaluation,** *Power consumption performance is evaluated by using power consumption model in TR 38.840.*
* *Power consumption performance and capacity performance are evaluated together by considering different C-DRX configurations.*
	+ *Details of C-DRX configurations are reported by companies.*
 |
| MTK | Proposal 14: R15/R16/R17 available DL power saving techniques, including BWP switch, cross-slot scheduling, SCell dormancy, and MIMO layer adaptation, should be evaluated first for DL power consumption baseline determination in XR/CG scenario. |
| InterDigital | For analyzing performance of power saving techniques (e.g., DRX configuration, BWP switching, scheduling techniques, etc.) system level simulation can be used. |
| Intel | *Use new XR traffic models and define related baseline C-DRX parameters for UE power saving evaluations.* |
| Samsung | The need and identification of XR-specific UE power savings mechanisms is part of the XR SI.  |
| QC | For XR power evaluation, RAN1 consider various power saving schemes including R15/R16/R17 power saving techniques and various assumptions having high impact on UE power consumption.  |

In RAN1 103-e, the following was agreed.

* TR38.840 is the baseline methodology potentially with some modifications if necessary.  RAN1 aim to minimize modeling effort.

Given that the power evaluation methodology in TR38.840 only provides relative power numbers, power evaluations following the evaluation methodology are valid only for comparison of different scenarios and/or different power saving schemes.

**Proposal 10. To facilitate further discussion on evaluation of power saving effect of different power saving schemes, the following references are defined.**

* **Baseline**: UE power consumption assuming UE is always ON, i.e., UE is always available for gNB scheduling.
* **Genie**: UE power consumption assuming that UE is in a sleep state (e.g., micro/light/deep sleep as defined in TR38.840) whenever there is neither DL data reception nor UL transmission. From the gNB scheduling perspective, UE is always available for scheduling, i.e., there is no difference from Baseline in gNB scheduling and corresponding UE Tx/Rx. It is noted that Genie is not a power saving scheme but the result may serve as an upper bound of power saving gain of power saving techniques, which may potentially motivate development of new power saving techniques that can approach the Genie performance.

**Proposal 11. Companies may submit evaluation result of UE power consumption for XR (i.e., gain/loss against the baseline) among the following candidate schemes.**

* R15/16/17 power saving techniques for connected mode, e.g., CDRX, BWP, PDCCH skipping, search space switching, etc.
* Other schemes are not precluded (e.g., new power saving techniques),

Note 1: CDRX is highly recommended to evaluate, and selection of other schemes are up to companies.

Note 2: Results of UE power consumption (i.e., gain/loss against the baseline) need to be presented with detailed description of the evaluated power saving schemes. For instance, CDRX result need to be presented with parameter values of inactivity timer, on duration, DRX cycle.

1. **Please share your view on Proposal 10 and 11.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | We support the definition of Baseline and Genie. As noted, results of both Baseline and Genie result can be collected from a single simulation, so additional workload would not be substantial . Genie can provide good amount of insight on power performance and possibility of potential enhancement.For Proposal 11, CDRX is the most fundamental scheme, thus we support evaluation of CDRX first. The specific parameter values such as drx cycle, inactivity timer, on duration can be chosen by each company in their simulations taking into account impact to the performance of UE and network, i.e., maintaining a similar performance with baseline in terms of #satisfied UEs per cell. Companies need to report the selected parameters when reporting the results of power and #satisfied UEs per cell.  |
| CATT | We don’t agree with Proposal 10. Proposal 10 should include Rel-15 DRX configuration with DRX cycle matched with the XR traffic mean iter-arrival time.For Proposal 11, Rel-16 DRX adaptation with UE wakeup and Rel-17 PDCCH skipping power saving techniques should be considered for XR power saving.  |
| ZTE , Sanechips | For Proposal 10, we think that Genie is not needed, for it is an ideal power saving scheme, which is difficult to implement. And introducing Genie power saving scheme leads to additional workload. By the way, it is enough for various power saving schemes to display their power saving gain compared with the Baseline.For Proposal 11, we think the main bullet barely conveys any information. Maybe it can be simply revised to ‘Companies are encouraged to submit evaluation result of CDRX and BWP scheme for XR’.  |
| OPPO | We are ok with proposal 10 to define some references.As for proposal 11, it is up to companies to report what scheme(s) is used in the evaluation. |
| Intel | Ok with Proposal 10. Proposal 11 may not be required; it is up to companies to submit results for chosen schemes. Rather may be beneficial to have a calibration effort based on agreed scheme to further align results across companies. |
| vivo | Fine with Proposal 10 and 11. |
| Facebook | We support proposal 10 for the provision of some reference performance.For proposal 11, we agree with defining a few basic schemes, such as CDRX while up to the companies to provide additional schemes.  |
| Apple | Fine with both proposals |
| Sony | On proposal 10, we share similar view a CATT that we should consider Rel-15 DRX configuration as the baseline. On proposal 11, Rel-17 power saving is not finished yet. Hence, we should not consider it. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | For proposal 10, we agree that the baseline should be “always ON”.For proposal 11, C-DRX should be prioritized.  |
| LG | Okay with Proposals 10 and 11. For the Genie in Proposal 10, further defining the sleep state a UE may assume among micro/light/deep sleep seems to be needed. If that is true, then we can leave an explicit FFS on that point. |
| Xiaomi |  We are OK with proposal 10 but think genie can be optional. We also think it is up to companies to report the power saving scheme used in the evaluation. |
| Nokia, NSB | Ok with Proposal 10. For Proposal 11, we would like to note that developing new power saving techniques (the second bullet) is not in the scope of this SI. |
| MTK | The term “baseline” in Proposal 10 may be misleading since a “baseline” should be evaluated with Rel-15/16/17 available schemes, which is the intention for Proposal 11. |
| InterDigital | We agree with Proposal 10 to have UE “Always ON” model as the Baseline for evaluation of power saving techniques. However, we do not believe “Genie” as stated in proposal 10 is necessary to evaluate any power saving technique because evaluation of power saving technique on its own is not much use. The objective of power saving evaluation is to evaluate the gain of a given power saving technique over the “Baseline” along with comparison of the associated system capacity. There would not be a meaningful system capacity (latency or any QoE ) associated with the “Genie” power saving technique (a UE in sleep mode). We agree with Proposal 11.  |
| Futurwei | Do not agree with proposal specifically since the schemes as described in the proposal would require lots of effort and time to agree upon such detailed power evaluation methodology in RAN1. * + 1. Schemes may require joint UL and DL simulations. We consider this as controversial topic as it is yet not agreed that such an assumption is made - some companies prefer to do the separate UL and DL simulations.
		2. Methodology on power consumption evaluation with separate UL and DL simulation needs to be developed accordingly.
		3. Further details are needed regarding single or multiple streams and its effects on power consumption.

 In addition to that, prefer that as initial phase of this study item focus on capacity evaluations before moving to power consumptions at later stage. We do not see the need of a genie scheme. |
| Ericsson | In principle we are supportive, but shouldn’t these definitions be made in the UE power savings AI? – and not here. |

### Tradeoff between Performance Aspects

Table 2 captures the view from sources on tradeoff between different performance aspects and required methodology for XR evaluation.

Table 2 Views on tradeoff between different performance aspects

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Source | View |
| Huawei | *Proposal 9: For the evaluations of UE power consumption for XR, the impact on user experience is considered in addition to power saving gains.* |
| Vivo | *Proposal 1:* *When evaluating the power consumption performance, the capacity performance should be jointly considered to show the potential trade-off between them.* |
| ZTE | Observation 3: Power saving technique will have impact on system capacity. Power saving and capacity should be jointly considered.Proposal 7: Companies can provide simulation results of capacity impact together with power saving gain instead of power saving gains subject to predefined threshold on the capacity loss.  |
| InterDigital | Proposal 4: Study aspects related to tradeoff between UE power savings and capacity in SL and LL evaluations  |
| Ericsson | 1. Baseline XR performance should be evaluated assuming that the UE is always available for scheduling (i.e., without including DRX or other power saving techniques) and any studies on power savings techniques should consider latency/throughput impact compared to the baseline.
 |
| QC | Proposal 20:In case power saving gain of power saving techniques is quantified, the gain is evaluated, compared, and captured subject to a given capacity constraint. |

As captured in Table 2, multiple companies have observed and pointed out that there exist tradeoff relations among different performance aspects: capacity, power, coverage. One good example is tradeoff between power saving gain and capacity. In network/UE operation, applying a power saving scheme may result in delayed packet scheduling (as the UE is supposed to be in a sleep state for a certain duration depending the applied power saving scheme), which can increase the chance of violating packet delay budget and consequently lead to lower capacity. Therefore, UE power consumption needs to be carefully evaluated in conjunction with impact on latency, user experience, and capacity.

**Proposal 12. UE power consumption (i.e., power saving gain of the evaluated scheme) for XR is evaluated in conjunction with impact on latency, user experience, and capacity. In this regard, the following table is used to collect results from companies, to be captured in the TR.**

Table 3 Evaluation of UE power saving schemes for e.g., {dense urban, AR (30Mbps, 10ms FDB, …)}

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Power Saving Scheme | Power Saving Gain (PSG) compared to the baseline | #satisfied UEs per cell2 / #UEs per cell3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| PS gain of 5%-tile UE in PSG CDF1 | PS gain of 50%-tile UE in PSG CDF1 | PS gain of 95%-tile UE in PSG CDF1 | Average UE Latency | Packet loss rate | RU | Metric 1 | Metric 2 |
| Baseline | - | - | - | K14 / N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Genie | X1 % | Y1 % | Z1 % | K24/ N |  |  |  |  |  |
| CDRX | X2 % | Y2 % | Z2 % | K34 / N |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scheme A | X3 % | Y3 % | Z3 % | K44/ N |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note 1: CDF of power saving gains of each UE

Note 2: # of satisfied UEs per cell among # of UEs per cell (=N).

Note 3: # of dropped UEs per cell (=N) that needs to be the same for all power saving schemes to be evaluated.

Note 4:

* K1 = K2 by the Genie definition (please note that Baseline and Genie results can be collected from the same simulation).
* Parameters of a power saving scheme should be carefully chosen to ensure that the degradation in #satified UEs per cell by the applied power saving technique, compared to the baseline is within a range (e.g., 5%).
1. **Please share your views on the above** **proposal 12.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| QC | We support the above Table format that facilitates our discussion on power evaluation by presenting the details of what data are to be collected and how. N determines system load and we can further discuss what value of N would be chosen in simulations.  |
| CATT | We don’t agree with genie proposal. The baseline should be Rel-15 CDRX.  |
| ZTE , Sanechips | Partly support.Firstly, Genie is not needed. Hence, the ‘Genie’ row should be deleted.Secondly, ‘PS gain of average PSG’ is enough. The power consumption for different UE is different, the average power consumption among multiple UEs can provide an overview of power consumption of XR. Last but not least, we disagree the Note 4 and prefer it deleted. For the first bullet, we disagree the evaluation/simulation of Genie. For the second bullet, massive evaluations are needed to obtain a well-balanced power saving technique harnessing the capacity-power tradeoff. Hence, the simulation workload is high if many power saving techniques are evaluated. Companies can provide simulation results of capacity impact and power saving gain. And the simulation results provided from each company can be jointly used to find a ‘satisfied’ setting or a best power saving techniques. This may decrease the simulation workload and find a ‘satisfied’ setting given the TU allocated for this study. |
| OPPO | We share the same view with ZTE that the average power saving gain is preferred. We also support to delete the send bullet of Note 4 based on the same reason explained by ZTE |
| Intel | Utility of genie aided scheme in the table is unclear. Comparison to baseline should be OK. Additionally, the last column can be reported as a metric but to optimize this within a given range especially with different traffic models may entail high simulation complexity.  |
| vivo | Fine with proposal 12.  |
| Facebook |  OK with the proposal |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | For simplicity, average power consumption across UEs can be the baseline. Other metrics can be up to company report.We also suggest to remove Note 4, this can be left for company report. |
| LG | Okay with the proposal. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree with the general form of the table. We also think that additional metrics (not only the #satisfied UEs but also e.g., latency, etc.) can be reported as columns to the right.We also do not support the second bullet point in Note 4.* Parameters of a power saving scheme should be carefully chosen to ensure that the degradation in #satisfied UEs per cell by the applied power saving technique, compared to the baseline is within a range (e.g., 5%).

There is no need for such a requirement here and, especially, for setting any numerical cutoff (e.g., 5%). We believe that at this stage companies may report whatever results they see appropriate. Then (when the results are collected) it is a separate discussion on which of them to be included in the TR. In that sense, the degradation in the number of supported UEs is definitely not the only criteria to consider.To facilitate the compromise, Genie row can be also made optional in the table, if needed. |
| MTK | We share the same view with ZTE that the average power saving gain is sufficient.  |
| InterDigital | We support the table in proposal 12 but, again, we think Genie power saving scheme can be removed or made optional |
| Futurewei | The different schemes that are mentioned may have different parameters that should be carefully chosen as it would affect the end results and skew the conclusions. We should take efforts to agree on a reasonable set of schemes (including relevant evaluation methodology) also taking into account of workload. Work can stagger after capacity evaluations are performed first.In case the Genie scheme is not agreed then the table may need modifications. In any case, we think its still early to agree on this proposal |
| Ericsson | Power savings part is too complicated. Avg. power savings gain reporting should be enough in alignment with current UEPS evaluations.  |

### Other Evaluation Methodology for Power Evaluation

#### Linear Interpolation based Power Estimation for UL Slot with Tx Power other than 0dBm and 23dBm

UE power consumption is composed of power contributed from DL rx and UL tx. However, due to the nature of DL heavy traffic, when it comes to power evaluation, in many cases, the focus has been on DL than UL. Accordingly, 38.840 has power model with focus on DL.

In XR application, UE makes lots of UL transmissions e.g., pose/control/scene upload. Their data rates range from 1Mbps ~ 10Mbps with very short interval (2ms ~ 100ms) between two consecutive transmissions. This makes UL power contribution increases significantly. Thus, UL power contribution should not be ignored in XR power study. Another reason to consider is UE tx power. In R16 power model, although 0dBm and 23dBm cases were defined, 23dBm cases were hardly considered. However, in real network, UEs’ tx power depends on pathloss, target SNR, etc could be quite high, i.e. higher than 0dBm. Thus, in such case, power consumption due to high tx power (PA) makes significant contribution to total power consumption.

The current power model in 38.840 does not support power level other than 0dBm and 23dBm. To estimate power consumption of Ue of which transmit power is X dBm with X ≠ 0dBm and 23dBm, we could use interpolation method.

Table 4 Views on linear interpolation of power consumption numbers for tx power other than 0 and 23dBm.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | View |
| QC | Linear interpolation in linear domain is reasonable method allowing approximation of power states with different UE tx power (other than 0dBm and 23dBm). The linear interpolation method already has been used / captured in 38.840 to estimate the power consumption for different number of BD. We observe good match between this interpolation method and data points. |
| vivo | *Proposal 2: For XR/Cloud Gaming power consumption evaluation, introduce interpolation algorithm for UL power between 0dBm and 23dBm.* |
| ZTE | Proposal 15: RAN 1 down-selects between the two methods for relative value modeling between UL transmission power with (0dBm 23dBm) for FR1, Alt 1: UL(long PUCCH or PUSCH) power value is 250 within [0dBm, M], and UL power value is 700 within (M, 23dBm].Alt 2: Y = 250 + 2.25\*X, X is transmission power in mw, Y is UL power at X mw.Proposal 16: RAN 1 down-selects between the two methods for UL power between 0dBm and 23dBm for FR2, Alt 1: UL(long PUCCH or PUSCH) power value is 350 within [0dBm, M], and UL power value is 800 within (M, 23dBm].Alt 2: Y = 350 + 2.25\*X, X is transmission power in mw, Y is UL power at X mw. |

**Summary**

* **Use linear interpolation method to estimate power consumption for tx power other than 0dBm and 23dBm.**

**Proposal 13:** Power model supports linear interpolation technique for power consumption estimation.For example, the power consumption of a UL power state (Long PUCCH, PUSCH as defined in 38.840) for UE with transmit power X dBm can be determined by linear interpolation of existing power numbers for 0dBm and 23dBm tx power in linear domain.Note that this technique could be applied to short PUCCH/SRS power state in similar fashion or to the estimation of power with different number of UL tx symbols.

1. **Please share your comments on Proposal 13.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | View |
| QC | We support Proposal 13. This is necessary to evaluate UE power consumption for XR with minimal effort on power evaluation methodology. Linear interpolation is already being used in 38.840 power model to estimate different number of BDs. Thus, this proposal is to extend it to cases that are needed for our XR power evaluations.  |
| CATT | The power consumption is NOT linear with respected to the Tx power. The UL power model was defined to have 0 dBm as the generic case and 23 dBm is an extreme case. The power consumption of power amplifier is not linear between 0 dBm and 23 dBm. We could use the 0 dBm power model for most of PUSCH model.  |
| ZTE , Sanechips | In our opinion, linear interpolation (Alt 2 in [R1-2100529]) is reasonable. But quantization method (Alt 1 in [R1-2100529]) might be better, since it has a simple workload and avoids any excessive discussion. Alt 1 determines a M value as a threshold firstly, then the UL power value is 250 within [0,M] dBm, and 700 within [M, 23] dBm.  Moreover, we think that the linear interpolation method is also reasonable for short PUCCH/SRS power state in similar fashion or to estimation of power with different number of UL tx symbols. Note that interpolation method and quantization method could be applied to antenna scaling for tx Power other than 0 and 23dBm. And we also think that Alt1 is preferable since it is simple and avoids any excessive discussion.  |
| OPPO | Not support Proposal 13. From our understanding, the evaluation of power consumption is a relatively rough estimation of the real power consumption of active UE. The current model of TR 38.840 has considered all the key aspects which have obvious impact on UE power consumption. Thus, more elaborations on other aspects that are not modelled in TR 38.840 will not offer much additional benefit. |
| vivo | Support Proposal 13 at least for FR1. For FR2 for UL, only one value 350 is provided in TR 38.840, but the Tx power level is undefined. Power model cannot be achieved by linear interpolation. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | 0dBm and 23dBm respectively represent good and bad coverage for UEs, we think this is enough in current stage. |
| LG | Okay in principle with the proposal. Need the following clarification to avoid confusion.Use linear interpolation method in linear scale to estimate power consumption for tx power other than 0dBm and 23dBm. |
| Nokia, NSB | Ok with Proposal 13. |
| MTK | We prefer to stick with 38.840 as baseline, and treat linear interpolation as optional. |
| InterDigital | We support proposal 13 |
| Futurewei | In our views, the power consumption models developed in TR 38.840 should be used as starting point for power consumption evaluation for XR and at least Rel-16 mechanisms for power savings. Further necessary augment of modelling for uplink need to be justified and specified. |
| Ericsson | Support |

#### Other Enhancements

The following tables summarize views on other enhancements for power evaluation.

**Special Slot Modelling**

Views on S slot modelling

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | View |
| Huawei | * Power model for “S” slot: As discussed in Section 3.3, we propose to consider the S slot as all D slot or all U slot, and this can be determined after the traffic models of different applications are stable. So there is no need to develop additional power consumption model for S slot.
 |
| ZTE | Proposal 18: Power of “PDSCH+PUCCH” is 450 at 23dBm, and power of “PDCCH+PDSCH+PUCCH” is 470 at 23 dBm.Proposal 19: Power of “PDSCH+PUCCH” and “PDCCH+PDSCH+PUCCH” at other transmission power can be obtained according to the following 2 alternatives.  Alt 1: Power of “PDSCH+PUCCH” is 280 at [0dBm, M], and power of “PDSCH+PUCCH” is 450 within (M, 23dBm]. Power of “PDCCH+PDSCH+PUCCH” is 300 within [0dBm, M], and power of “PDCCH+PDSCH+PUCCH” is 470 at (M, 23dBm]. Alt 2: Power of “PDSCH+PUCCH” and “PDCCH+PDSCH+PUCCH” at other transmission power can be obtained using linear interpolation. |
| MTK | Proposal 16: Model the power consumption of S slot as DL slot. |
| QC | Observation 3: Power consumption for S slot needs to be discussed.  |

**Summary**

* Model S slot as D or U slot instead of introducing new power state with DL and UL.
* Introduce a new S slot with tx power at 0/23dBm and define a rule for estimating power consumption for different tx power.

**New UL Power State**

Table 5 Views on New UL power slots

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | View |
| Huawei | * Power model for UL slots: The power model for long PUCCH, short PUCCH, PUSCH and SRS has been provided in TR 38.840. For the UL slots that are not defined in TR 38.840, it is preferred not to model them separately if the power consumption difference is small.
 |
| vivo | *Proposal 3: For power consumption evaluation, the following aspects should be considered:** *Improving power consumption models for (1) special slots, (2) multiple UL channels in a slot, such as PUSCH, PUCCH and SRS concurrent in a slot, etc.*
 |
| ZTE | 1. For XR evaluation, the following two alternatives for UL power states can be considered.

Alt 1: Use the original power states and do not add more power states.Alt 2: Power of PUCCH or PUSCH with different number of symbols can be obtained by power of long PUCCH multiplied by a coefficient. The coefficient can be calculated by A = 0.3 + (N-1)/13\*0.7, N is the number of symbols the PUCCH or PUSCH or UL power state occupied. |
| MTK | Proposal 15: Do not introduce additional UL power model required on top of 38.840 due to the small delta values.  |

**Summary**

* Do not introduce new UL power states if power difference is small.
* Use liner interpolation method for estimating UL slots with different number of UL symbols.

**Antenna Scaling for tx Power other than 0 and 23dBm**

Table 6 Antenna scaling for tx power other than 0 and 23dBm

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | View |
| ZTE | Proposal 13: RAN 1 down-selects from the following alternatives to model the antenna scaling for power consumption within [0dBm, 23dBm]:  Alt 1: 2Tx power is 1.4x 1Tx power within [0dBm,M] and 1.2x.within (M,23dBm]Note: M is the median value of transmission power in mw domain instead of dB domain and is same for other related proposals. Alt 2: The power state within (0dbm,23dbm) is obtained via linear interpolationProposal 14: 4Tx power is 1.4x 2Tx power within [0dBm,M] and 1.2x.within (M,23dBm] for FR1. If option 2 for UE antenna is used, the antenna scaling for FR1 will be reused for FR2. |

**Summary**

* Improve antenna scaling factor for tx power other than 0dBm and 23dBm.
1. **Please share your comments on the above aspects. One possibility is to leave the detailed assumptions up to companies.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company  | View |
| QC | Following the agreement made in RAN1 103e, “TR38.840 is the baseline methodology potentially with some modifications if necessary.  RAN1 aim to minimize modeling effort”, we can leave detailed assumptions on the above aspects up to companies as it would require lots of effort and time to agree upon such detailed power evaluation methodology in RAN1. Another power modelling aspect we point out is FR2 power. There is some basic modelling which is not captured in 38.840, for example, power numbers for FR2 are incomplete, i.e., no tx power is specified. Further clarification is needed on this. At least FR1 equivalent details (e.g., 0dBm, 23dBm) needs to be added to FR2 part. |
| CATT | The power model does not associate with antenna scaling. No need to consider this factor |
| ZTE , Sanechips | Support. In our perspective, UE transmit power will be changed according to power control technique. Therefore the antenna scaling in TR 38.840 is not enough because the antenna scaling for the transmission power other than 0dBm and 23dBm isn't provided.  Two alternatives could be considered to this end in [R1-2100529],*Alt 1: To simplify the scaling model and resultant simulation efforts, current two coefficients of antenna scaling can be reused for other transmission power.**Alt 2: The power state within (0dbm,23dbm) is obtained via linear interpolation* And the antenna scaling for FR1 can be reused for FR2.  |
| OPPO | Leave them to companies |
| vivo | Support model S slot as DL (if DL heavy) or UL (if UL heavy) slot.Power model for different number of symbols can be deduced by linear interpolation between short PUCCH/PUSCH and long PUCCH/PUSCH by assuming 1 symbols for short and 14 symbols for 1ong.For antenna scaling for 2Tx power modelling, reuse 1.4 scaling factor for 0dBm and 1.2 scaling factor for 23dBm from 1Tx. Other power level and 4Tx antenna scaling model can be further studied. |
| Huawei, Hisilicon | For S slot, modelling S slot as DL or UL slot can be considered for simplicity.For UL power states, support not introducing new UL power states if power difference is small. |
| LG | Prefer to leave the detailed assumptions summarized above up to companies as suggested by the FL. |
| Nokia, NSB | We agree with QC and OPPO that most of these aspects can be left to companies (“companies should report”), otherwise it may take large unnecessary effort to agree on all the minor details. |
| MTK | We prefer to first leave these issues to companies. Deciding these detailed scaling number can be time-consuming for an e-meeting. |
| InterDigital | Leave them up to the companies |
| Futurewei | It is preferred to have common understanding on modelling instead of leave to companies. Otherwise the evaluation outcomes will not be aligned or useful. |
| Ericsson | Do not support.  |

# Summary

## Proposals for 3nd GTW (Monday in 2nd week)

**Proposal 1**: For XR evaluation, ideal channel estimation can be optionally evaluated.

**Proposal 2:** System bandwidth for XR/CG evaluations are as follows.

* For FR1,
	+ Baseline: 100 MHz
	+ Optional: 20/40 MHz, 2\*100 MHz with CA
* FR2
	+ Option 1: 100 MHz
	+ Option 2: 400 MHz

Companies should report the CA setting if CA is adopted.

Other system bandwidth can also be optionally evaluated.

**Proposal 3:** For outdoor scenarios, the BS antenna parameters are as

* Option 1: 64 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (8,8,2,1,1;4,8)
* Option 2: 32 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (8,2,2,1,1,8,2)

Company to report the BS antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluation.

Other BS antenna parameters can also be optionally evaluated.

**Proposal 4**: For FR2, UE antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluations are as follows.

* Option 1 (Follow Rel-17 evaluation methodology for FeMIMO in R1-2007151)
	+ (M, N, P)=(1, 4, 2), 3 panels (left, right, top)
* Option 2 (from TR 38.802 – developed in Rel-14)
	+ 4Tx/4Rx: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (2,4,2,1,2;1,2), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.5)λ, the polarization angles are 0° and 90°

Company to report the UE antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluation.

Other UE antenna parameters can also be optionally evaluated.

**Proposal 5:** For XR/CG evaluation, adopt following assumptions for BS height for Urban Macro

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Parameter** | **Proposed value** |
| **Urban Macro (FR1)** |
| BS height | 25m |

**Proposal 6**: For Dense urban and Urban Macro, the UE ~~antenna~~ height for indoor UEs is updated as following based on Table 6-1 in TR 36.873.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Urban Micro/Macro cell with high UE density(3D-UMi) /(3D-UMa) |
| UE height (*hUT*) in meters | general equation | *hUT*=3(*nfl* – 1) + 1.5 |
| *nfl* for outdoor UEs | 1 |
| *nfl* for indoor UEs | *nfl* ~ uniform(1,*Nfl*) where*Nfl* ~ uniform(4,8) |

**Proposal 7**: For XR/CG evaluation, adopt 12 degree for downtilt for Dense Urban in FR1.

* Other downtilt value can also be optionally evaluated

**Proposal 8**: For XR/CG evaluation, for DL and UL

* Baseline: DL and UL performances are evaluated independently, i.e. DL and UL traffic are modelled separately
* Optional: DL and UL performance are modeled together
	+ FFS details, e.g. whether and how to measure DL-related, UL-related and DL-UL-combined performance metrics
* ~~Optional: DL and UL performance are evaluated together, i.e. DL and UL traffic are modelled together but the DL-related and UL-related metrics are captured separately~~

**Proposal 9:** For Dense urban for XR/CG evaluation, down-select the following options for BS height.

* Option 1: BS at 25 m and UMa channel model, as per TR 38.802
* Option 2: BS at 10 m and UMi channel model
* Option 3: BS at 25 m and UMi channel model, as per agreement in RAN1 #103e

Note option 1 or option 2 needs to update the previous agreement in RAN1 #103e

## Updated proposals based on 1st round discussion (2/1)

Based on the 1st round discussion, it can be seen that most of the evaluation methodology and assumptions aspects could be converged. Below are updated proposals for the evaluation methodology, according to the views from companies input.

Hope we can reach some conclusion by email and save the online time. Please share if you have additional comments.

For the other aspects, we will continue the discussions in the 2nd week.

**Proposal 1**: For XR evaluation, ideal channel estimation can be optionally evaluated.

**Proposal 2**: For XR/CG evaluation, adopt 12 degree for downtilt for Dense Urban in FR1.

* Other downtilt value can also be optionally evaluated

**Proposal 3:** System bandwidth for XR/CG evaluations are as follows.

* For FR1,
	+ Baseline: 100 MHz
	+ Optional: 20/40 MHz, 2\*100 MHz with CA
* FR2
	+ Option 1: 100 MHz
	+ Option 2: 400 MHz

Companies should report the CA setting if CA is adopted.

Other system bandwidth can also be optionally evaluated.

**Proposal 4**: For Dense urban, the UE antenna height for indoor UEs is updated as following based on Table 6-1 in TR 36.873.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Urban Micro cell with high UE density (3D-UMi) |
| UE height (*hUT*) in meters | general equation | *hUT*=3(*nfl* – 1) + 1.5 |
| *nfl* for outdoor UEs | 1 |
| *nfl* for indoor UEs | *nfl* ~ uniform(1,*Nfl*) where*Nfl* ~ uniform(4,8) |

**~~Proposal 5~~**~~: the BS antenna height for Dense Urban scenario for XR/CG evaluations is proposed to update to 10 m, according to the Table 7.2-1 in TR 38.901.~~

**Proposal 6**: For XR/CG evaluation, for DL and UL

* Baseline: DL and UL performances are evaluated independently, i.e. DL and UL traffic are modelled separately
* Optional: DL and UL performance are evaluated together, i.e. DL and UL traffic are modelled together but the DL-related and UL-related metrics are captured separately

**Proposal 7:** For outdoor scenarios, the BS antenna parameters are as

* Option 1: 64 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (8,8,2,1,1;4,8)
* Option 2: 32 TxRU, (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (8,2,2,1,1,8,2)

Company to report the BS antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluation.

Other BS antenna parameters can also be optionally evaluated.

**Proposal 8**: For FR2, UE antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluations are as follows.

* Option 1 (Follow Rel-17 evaluation methodology for FeMIMO in R1-2007151)
	+ (M, N, P)=(1, 4, 2), 3 panels (left, right, top)
* Option 2 (from TR 38.802 – developed in Rel-14)
	+ 4Tx/4Rx: (M, N, P, Mg, Ng; Mp, Np) = (2,4,2,1,2;1,2), (dH,dV) = (0.5, 0.5)λ, the polarization angles are 0° and 90°

Company to report the UE antenna parameters for XR/CG evaluation.

Other UE antenna parameters can also be optionally evaluated.

**Please share your comments if any on the above updated proposals.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
| *Moderator* | Thanks for comments. The proposals are updated with changing marks.Please find my replies on the following comments.@Claes, Avik, allThanks for Avik providing the downtilt information. For Dense urban, we have made the following agreement in RAN1#103e.Agreement:Adopt the following deployment for XR/CG evaluations* Indoor hotspot: FR1 and FR2
	+ Detailed definition of Indoor hotspot refers to TR 38.913.
	+ Channel model: InH. Detailed definition of InH refers to TR 38.901.
* Dense urban: FR1 and FR2
	+ Detailed deployment refers to TR 38.913, where single layer with Marco layer is assumed.
	+ Channel model: UMi. Detailed definition of UMi refers to TR 38.901.

During the discussion in last meeting, it is the common understanding that most of the simulation assumptions are based on TR 38.802. For Dense urban with single layer with Marco layer, the detailed assumptions can be referred to TR 38.802, expect that UMi channel model as defined in 38.901 is used. Therefore, the BS height is not needed to updated to 10 m, i.e. 25 m is assumed for Dense urban for BS height.On the other hand, 12 degree downtilt is typical for Dense urban and is supported by majority companies.I suggest to keep the agreed assumptions as in RAN1 #103e and refer to TR 38.802 for the other detailed assumptions.@JayRegarding the system bandwidth for FR2, I tend to agree that setting a baseline assumption could be useful. On the other hand, it is also commented by some companies that there is no need for baseline and companies can provide any results. It can be seen that both 100 MHz and 400 MHz system bandwidth for FR2 are interested by some companies. So it is more appropriate to let companies to select the assumption for evaluation without the need of defining the baseline/optional assumptions.@Diana, Zhihua,Regarding proposal 6, for the case where DL and UL performance are evaluated together, DL and UL traffic are modelled together. The performance metrics for DL and UL are collected separately such that the satisfied UE is measured separately in DL and UL, i.e. the interpretation of option 1 by OPPO’s. The clarification from Nokia would be a good reference.Since DL/UL evaluation together may introduce additional complexity for simulation, so it can be optional for company to evaluate. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Proposals for 2nd GTW (Thursday in 1st week)

* For Capacity evaluation methodology

**Proposal 1: For XR evaluation, in addition to realistic channel estimation, ideal channel estimation can be optionally evaluated.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Channel estimation | RealisticIdeal(optional) |

**Proposal 2: adopt following update for TDD configuration for XR/CG evaluation**

* **FR1:**
	+ **Option 1: DDDSU**
	+ **Option 2: DDDUU**
* **FR2:**
	+ **Option 1: DDDSU**
	+ **Option 2: DDDUU**

**Detailed S slot format is 10D:2F:2U. Other S slot format can also be evaluated.**

**Further clarify that for option 2 for FR1/FR2, there is [2]-symbol gap at the end of third “D” slot of DDDUU.**

**Proposal 3: For XR/CG evaluation, adopt 12 degree for downtilt for Dense Urban in FR1.**

* **Other downtilt value can also be evaluated**

**Proposal 4: System bandwidth for XR/CG evaluations are as follows.**

* **For FR1,**
	+ **Baseline: 100 MHz**
	+ **Optional: 20/40 MHz, 2\*100 MHz with CA**
* **FR2**
	+ **Option 1: 100 MHz**
	+ **Option 2: 400 MHz**

**Companies should report the CA setting if CA is adopted.**

**Other system bandwidth can also be evaluated.**

**Proposal 5: For Dense urban, the UE antenna height for indoor UEs is updated as following based on Table 6-1 in TR 36.873.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Urban Micro cell with high UE density (3D-UMi) |
| **UE height (*hUT*) in meters** | general equation | *hUT*=3(*nfl* – 1) + 1.5 |
| *nfl* for outdoor UEs | 1 |
| *nfl* for indoor UEs | *nfl* ~ uniform(1,*Nfl*) where*Nfl* ~ uniform(4,8) |

**Proposal 6: the BS antenna height for Dense Urban scenario for XR/CG evaluations is proposed to update to 10 m, according to the Table 7.2-1 in TR 38.901.**

**Proposal 7: For XR/CG evaluation, for DL and UL**

* **Baseline: DL and UL performances are evaluated independently, i.e. DL and UL traffic are modelled separately**
* **Optional: DL and UL performance are evaluated together, i.e. DL and UL traffic are modelled together but the DL-related and UL-related metrics are captured separately**
* For Evaluation of UE Power Consumption

**Proposal 8. To facilitate further discussion on evaluation of power saving effect of different power saving schemes, the following references are defined.**

* **Baseline: UE power consumption assuming UE is always ON, i.e., UE is always available for gNB scheduling.**
* **FFS other cases, e.g.**
	+ **Genie: UE power consumption assuming that UE is in a sleep state (e.g., micro/light/deep sleep as defined in TR38.840) whenever there is neither DL data reception nor UL transmission. From the gNB scheduling perspective, UE is always available for scheduling, i.e., there is no difference from Baseline in gNB scheduling and corresponding UE Tx/Rx. It is noted that Genie is not a power saving scheme but the result may serve as an upper bound of power saving gain of power saving techniques, which may potentially motivate development of new power saving techniques that can approach the Genie performance.**
	+ **DRX: UE power consumption assuming Rel-15 DRX configuration**
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