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# Introduction

In 3GPP RAN2 #112-e meeting, the following LS on paging enhancement was sent from RAN2 [1].

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Overall Description:**In RAN2#112-e, RAN2 discussed UE grouping for paging enhancement in Rel-17 UE power saving WI. RAN2 confirmed that UE grouping is considered as a candidate of paging enhancements for UE power saving. Regarding paging for UE subgroups, RAN2 has discussed and considered the following methods: * Paging indication for UE subgroups using paging DCI, with either same-slot or cross-slot scheduling;
* Paging early indication (PEI) / wake-up signal (WUS) for UE subgroups;
* UE subgroup indication by using multiple P-RNTIs;
* Paging for UE subgroups using different time/frequency resources.

From RAN2 perspective, the last two methods are de-prioritized. Notice that these methods are not mutually exclusive.**2. Actions:****To RAN1:**RAN2 respectfully asks RAN1 to take the above information into consideration and provide information on the feasibility and limitations of carrying subgroup information with their recommended solution. |

Based on the above LS and companies’ contributions [4]-[7], this summary is devoted to collect companies’ views on the potential LS reply.

# 1st Round of Discussion and Proposals

According to the LS from RAN2, the following methods have been discussed and considered:

* Paging indication for UE subgroups using paging DCI, with either same-slot or cross-slot scheduling;
* Paging early indication (PEI) / wake-up signal (WUS) for UE subgroups;
* UE subgroup indication by using multiple P-RNTIs;
* Paging for UE subgroups using different time/frequency resources.

And the last two methods are deprioritized. For the 1st round of discussion, UE subgrouping information in paging DCI and the two deprioritized methods can be discussed.

## UE Subgroups Information in Legacy Paging DCI

From the observations in RAN1 #103-e meeting, only marginal power saving gain can be achieved by using paging DCI with either same-slot or cross-slot scheduling, as quoted in the table below. Consequently, the following proposal is suggested:

Proposal 1: Paging indication for UE subgroups using legacy paging DCI, with either same-slot or cross-slot scheduling, is not supported from RAN1 perspective.

|  |
| --- |
| Agreements:Observation: For NR idle/inactive-mode UEs, UE sub-grouping indication within a PO can provide the following power saving gains w.r.t. Rel-16:* If the original group paging rate is 10%:
	+ [0.3%] - [1.1%] where the baseline assumes 1 SS burst for synchronization before PO reception
	+ [0.4%] - [0.8%] where the baseline assumes 2 SS bursts for synchronization before PO reception
	+ [0.3%] - [1.0%] where the baseline assumes 3 SS bursts for synchronization before PO reception
* Some sources also evaluated performance if the original group paging rate is in the range between 20% and 80% and showed following results:
	+ [0.7%] - [7.6%] where the baseline assumes 1 SS burst for synchronization before PO reception
	+ [0.8%] - [3.0%] where the baseline assumes 2 SS bursts for synchronization before PO reception
	+ [0.5%] - [4.7%] where the baseline assumes 3 SS bursts for synchronization before PO reception

The number of UE sub-groups evaluated ranges from 2 to 16.Some companies show concern on assuming group paging rate larger than 60%.Note: It is FFS in RAN1 another group paging rate > 10% for the evaluation of Rel-17 paging enhancement.Agreements:Observation:For NR idle/inactive-mode UEs with 10% group paging rate, cross-slot scheduling with K0 = 1, which can be supported by Rel-15/Rel-16 for Type 2 CSS, can provide the following power saving gains w.r.t. same-slot scheduling (K0 = 0):* [<1%] –[2.5%] where the baseline assumes 1 SS burst for synchronization before PO reception
* [<1%] -[1.6%] where the baseline assumes 2 SS bursts for synchronization before PO reception
* [<1%] -[1.44%] where the baseline assumes 3 SS bursts for synchronization before PO reception

One source shows that cross-slot scheduling with K0 = 32, which cannot be supported by Rel-15/Rel-16 for Type 2 CSS, can provide the following power saving gains w.r.t. same-slot scheduling (K0 = 0):* [0%] where the baseline assumes 1 SS burst for synchronization before PO reception
* [6.3%] where the baseline assumes 3 SS bursts for synchronization before PO reception

The power saving gain will become lower with higher group paging rate. |

Companies please provide comments/suggested revisions to Proposal 1 and in Table 1:

Table 1: Companies’ comments/suggested revisions to Proposal 1

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment(s)/Suggested Revision(s)** |
| Qualcomm | It is too early to make the conclusion of the proposal.This should depend on the conclusion on paging early indication design. If PEI design is based on paging DCI, sub-grouping indication can be carried by the paging DCI.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with the proposal.Based on the observations in the last meeting, the power saving gain from the sub-grouping carried by paging DCI is marginal. |
| CATT | We are OK with the proposal since the power saving gain is very small.  |
| Panasonic | We think before concluding the PEI detailed physical layer design, better not to conclude this. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## RAN1’s view on the deprioritized methods

For the following two methods deprioritized by RAN2, it can expect that their power saving gains are limited because only paging PDSCH reception is possible to be reduced. And the UE processing timeline is similar to that of legacy behaviour.

* UE subgroup indication by using multiple P-RNTIs;
* Paging for UE subgroups using different time/frequency resources.

Consequently, the following proposal is suggested:

Proposal 2: For the down prioritized items, RAN1 agrees that they can be down prioritized and RAN1 will not work further on them.

Table 2: Companies’ comments/suggested revisions to Proposal 2

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment(s)/Suggested Revision(s)** |
| Qualcomm | Agreed with the proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Agree with the proposal. |
| CATT | Agree with the proposal |
| Panasonic | We are okay with this proposal. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# 2nd Round of Discussion and Proposals

(To be updated)

# Summary

(To be updated)
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