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# Introduction

Study Item (SI) for network energy savings for NR is approved in [1]. For the study of performance evaluation for this SI, the relevant objectives include below

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Definition of a base station energy consumption model [RAN1]
* Adapt the framework of the power consumption modelling and evaluation methodology of TR38.840 to the base station side, including relative energy consumption for DL and UL (considering factors like PA efficiency, number of TxRU, base station load, etc), sleep states and the associated transition times, and one or more reference parameters/configurations.
1. Definition of an evaluation methodology and KPIs [RAN1]
* The evaluation methodology should target for evaluating system-level network energy consumption and energy savings gains, as well as assessing/balancing impact to network and user performance (e.g. spectral efficiency, capacity, UPT, latency, handover performance, call drop rate, initial access performance, SLA assurance related KPIs), energy efficiency, and UE power consumption, complexity. The evaluation methodology should not focus on a single KPI, and should reuse existing KPIs whenever applicable; where existing KPIs are found to be insufficient new KPIs may be developed as needed.

Note: WGs will decide KPIs to evaluate and how.The study should prioritize idle/empty and low/medium load scenarios (the exact definition of such loads is left to the study), and different loads among carriers and neighbor cells are allowed. The following example scenarios (mapping between scenarios and network loads is left to the study) including single-carrier and multi-carrier deployments are used as the starting point for discussion on prioritized scenarios for the study. The following example scenarios are listed in no particular order.* Urban micro in FR1, including TDD massive MIMO (note: this scenario can also model small cells)
* FR2 beam-based scenarios (note: this scenario can also model small cells)
* Urban/Rural macro in FR1 with/without DSS (no impact to LTE expected in case of DSS)
* EN-DC/NR-DC macro with FDD PCell and TDD/Massive MIMO on higher FR1/FR2 frequency

Note 1: legacy UEs should be able to continue accessing a network implementing Rel-18 network energy savings techniques, with the possible exception of techniques developed specifically for greenfield deployments.Note 2: the study of energy savings specifically for IAB is not part of the scope.The study should coordinate with RAN4 as needed. |

For that purpose, the following email discussion is assigned:

|  |
| --- |
| [109-e-R18-NW\_ES-02] Email discussion on performance evaluation by May 20 – Yi (Huawei)* Check points: May 12, May 18, May 20
 |

This document provides FL initial observations on relevant discussion points and questions/proposals, by summarizing the contributions submitted to agenda item 9.7.1 [2]-[22]. Relevant contributions [23]-[29] submitted to agenda item 9.7.3 are also taken into account.

Draft(s) can be found in [Inbox](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Inbox/drafts/9.7.1) and will be updated per companies further input. The FL proposals starting with ‘study’ or ‘FFS’ consider the initial round of view summary based on contributions, thus can be possibly revised by extended proposals to be agreed/proceeded within this meeting once they are more converged. There is no intention to postpone those bullets in future meetings. When making comments and uploading the input, please see the guidance in [R1-2203012](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2203012.zip) with recommended naming convention and [R1-2203013](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG1_RL1/TSGR1_109-e/Docs/R1-2203013.zip) concerning the deadline(s) for each check point respectively.

Companies are invited to make your input for FL questions tagged with FL2 prior to 3rd NES GTW 3:00am UTC on May 13 (rough 18 h), as well as to enter contact information below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Contact** | **Email address** |
| Apple | Sigen Ye | sigen\_ye@apple.com |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Recommendations for possible GTW treatment:

tbd

# Energy consumption model for BS

## Framework for modeling BS energy consumption

Almost all contributions that have relevant discussion on this aspect confirm that on high level, some reference configurations (which could be differently represented in contributions e.g. as nominal configurations), and multiple BS power states including sleep/non-sleep states with relative power values are needed. In addition to what has been considered in SID, majority among these companies also confirm that the use of scaling for non-sleep state is needed. It appears to be commonly acknowledged that this framework similar to UE power saving model can be agreeable as the BS power consumption model framework. Therefore, the following proposal can be considered and it is noted that this proposal does not intend to preclude any finer modifications/differentiation among e.g. FR1 and FR2, UL and DL, other potential improvement etc. Other details for each ‘component’ can be further discussed in following sub-sections.

**FL1 Proposal 2.1-1**

* **For evaluation purpose, the energy consumption modeling for a BS include at least the following:**
	+ **Reference configuration**
	+ **Multiple power state(s) including sleep/non-sleep mode(s) with relative power values/units, and associated transition times**
	+ **Scaling method to be applied for non-sleep mode.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | There are different types of BS, e.g. macro cell, micro cell, small cell. How to model the different types of BS? Using different sets for modeling or absorbed into scaling methods (e.g. power level and antenna ports number)? |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Vodafone | Y | Although we see the importance on showcasing absolute gains rather than just relative |
| Intel | Y, partially | We are generally fine, except the scaling part. We think it is commonly understood that scaling applies to active states only. However, we think BS energy consumption modeling and considerations can be different considering various architectures. We are ok with applicability with scaling method. However, scaling method only applied to non-sleep modes might not fully represent how power may need to scale when different components of BS, e.g. TRPs, are in sleep mode.Let’s consider reference configuration assumes 1 TRP. Now, if we would like to extend the model to a network with 5 TRPs, how the scaling applies, if some of the TRPs are in sleep, for example if 2 out of 5 TRPs are not actively transmitting/receiving and in micro-sleep. Then to calculate energy consumption of that network based on reference configuration, how to correctly capture the status of the TRPs and whether that can be a component in micro-sleep value that can be scaled by the number of TRPs that are not active. We don’t have a good formulation to capture this, so for our suggestion is to remove the “scaling method to be applied to non-sleep mode”. Once sleep/non-sleep modes can be further developed, we should be able to come back to the scaling methods.Although not critical, we prefer to use term “energy states” instead of “power states”. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y, partially | We are generally fine with the main contents proposed.Besides, we want to address the below issues:* There can be multiple Reference configurations, i.e. depends on BS types if Micro BS is further considered.
* For a sleep mode, the transition time and transition energy that is associated with should be defined as well.

For each scaling of the non-sleep modes, the (de-)activation time to apply a scaling should be defined. |
| LG Electronics | Y,partially | In general, we are fine with Proposal 2.1-1.Considering the additional power consumed during state transition, we can add transition energy in the second sub-bullet, as follows.* **For evaluation purpose, the energy consumption modeling for a BS include at least the following:**
	+ **Reference configuration**
	+ **Multiple power state(s) including sleep/non-sleep mode(s) with relative power values/units, and associated transition times/energy**
	+ **Scaling method to be applied for non-sleep mode.**
 |
| China Telecom | Y | We are generally fine with the proposal 2.1-1.  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | Support. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Samsung | Yes | We are fine with FL’s proposal in general. From our perspective, it is straightforward to use the BS energy consumption model similar as UE power saving model. We are okay to further discuss the details of energy consumption models for scenarios, e.g. FR1 and FR2, sTRP and mTRP, and channels, e.g. UL and DL. Also, we would like to simplify the cases for baseline evaluation. |
| Apple | Y | Transition energy should be added in addition to transition time. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | For sleep mode transition, not only the transition times but also the additional transition energy shall be discussed. So, the following modifications are recommended.Suggested update:* For evaluation purpose, the energy consumption modeling for a BS include at least the following:
	+ Reference configuration
	+ Multiple power state(s) including sleep/non-sleep mode(s) with relative power values/units, and associated transition times and additional transition energy
	+ Scaling method to be applied for non-sleep mode.
 |
| Fraunhofer IIS | Y | We share similar view as Spreaturm on the different type of BS. |
| vivo | Y | We are fine with the proposal and LGE’s modification since transition energy should also be defined. |
| HW/HiSi | Y | We Support the **Proposal.**Regarding some comments raised above for different types of base station, we think this is related with the Proposal 2.1-4. We think the proposal here is regarding the framework with respective to a given base station decided in proposal 2.1-4. Considering Base-station has various types, such as Macro/ micro/ small cell, it is worthy considered to construct separately models for typical type of base-station. However, considering the TU in RAN1, some type of BS should be prioritized and other types of BS could be discussed later or reported by companies.The multi Base-station case could be studied after we finished the single station model. |
| Fujitsu | Y | We are generally fine with the proposal 2.1-1. |
| Qualcomm | Y w/ update | * For evaluation purpose, the energy consumption modeling for a BS includes at least the following:
	+ Reference configuration
	+ Multiple power state(s) including sleep/non-sleep mode(s) with relative power ~~values/units~~, and associated transition times
	+ Power scaling method ~~to be applied for non-sleep mode~~.
	+ Note: separate considerations for FR1 and FR2 in modelling energy consumption.

Comment: the power scaling may be also needed of sleep mode. |
| CATT | Y | We are OK with the proposal. * The reference configuration could be considered to have one as the baseline for the comparison in the evaluation.
* The definition of the gNB sleeping states needs to be specified in order to have common assumption in the evaluation since different definitions were made from companies’ contributions
 |
| MediaTek | Y | We generally support moderator proposal with the following comments that may also resolve questions from previous responses:* It is suggested to specify a single reference model with multiple scaling factors for different BS types or ISD ranges can balance model simplicity (looks focus of multiple companies) and model diversity (e.g. Intel’s intention to include TRP and Nokia’s suggestion in multiple BS reference models)
* We support separation of FR1 and FR2 due to very different implementations and power consumption characteristics

We prefer using analogous terminologies, i.e., “power state” as TR 38.840, with the intention to avoid the confusion when capturing both network power consumption and UE power consumption as evaluation metrics.  |
| Ericsson1 | Needs update  | We are OK with the proposal in general, but with following updates. Support LG suggestion to add transition energy. For scaling, we tend to agree with Intel/Qualcomm comment. We think scaling should also be applied/considered for microsleep e.g. for antenna scaling. Suggest updating last bullet as follows and leave the details for further discussion. * + Scaling method to be applied for at least for non-sleep mode
		- FFS : Scaling applied or not for sleep mode
 |
| FL | FL consideration:* Different BS can be considered in other proposals, leading to detailed difference for modeling without affecting the framework. Some companies have a comment with a concrete solution, i.e. using multiple scaling factors to address that and there is similar consideration that one baseline is useful.
* Transition energy is adding while there is different preference on ‘energy’ vs ‘power’ for state. Since the duration generally last for a while (more than one symbol), perhaps ok to use ‘energy’ and we can be consistent as long as we keep use ‘energy’ without confusion.
* Scaling applicability to sleep modes can be studied. Perhaps it also relates to the definition of sleep mode that is to be further defined. As we start from UE power saving model, ‘at least’ is added similar to one suggestion given.

**FL2 Proposal 2.1-1a*** **For evaluation purpose, the energy consumption modeling for a BS includes at least the following:**
	+ **Reference configuration**
		- **FFS a baseline for comparison in evaluation with multiple scaling in consideration of other aspects, e.g. TRP/BS types etc, if any dependency**
		- **Note FR1 and FR2 to be separately considered for detailed parameters**
	+ **Multiple ~~power~~ energy state(s) including sleep/non-sleep mode(s) with relative power ~~values/units~~, and associated transition times/energy**
	+ **Scaling method to be applied at least for non-sleep mode.**
		- **FFS : Scaling applied or not for sleep mode**
		- **FFS (de-)activation time for applying the scaling**
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes with update | 1. It would be fine to use energy consumption other than power consumption. However, regarding the change from “power state” to “energy state”, we have concerns on that. In our view, “power state” means the average energy consumption in a relatively short time unite, e.g. slot or symbol. “energy state” seems refer to some long term state. In TR 38.840, UE power saving SID defines “power state” which is the power consumption per each slot. Considering this, we don’t prefer to change it to “energy state” in NES study. We didn’t see any reason for this change.
2. Regarding the FFS bullet of (de-)activation time for applying the scaling, we would like to have better understanding on it. How does it impact the energy evaluation? Or if the intention to investigate the impact on the scheduling due to the adjustment on some components on BS? If the answer is yes, maybe we could add “whether/how to model” before the bullet considering not all the scaling needs activation/de-activation time.
 |
| Spreadtrum | Yes partially | We share the similar view as HW on “(de-)activation time for applying the scaling”. It seems complicating the model, if we consider the “transition” time for scaling… |
| ZTE,Sanechios | Y with update | For the FFS under reference configuration, considering there is no much point in comparing the simulation results of different BS types, “baseline for comparison” is unclear and misleading. Minor update is suggested.**Suggested update on Proposal 2.1-1a*** + - **FFS a baseline ~~for comparison~~ in evaluation with multiple scaling in consideration of other aspects, e.g. TRP/BS types etc, if any dependency**
 |
| Futurewei | Y with updates | The texts in red should be removed since the understanding is that further details and discussions on all aspects of the listed sub-bullets.  |
| Apple |  | We are generally fine with the modified proposal. But we would also like some clarification on “FFS (de-)activation time for applying the scaling” before agreeing on the FFS. Alternatively we can remove the FFS for now and continue the discussion.A question after seeing the discussion regarding “energy” vs “power” and “energy state” vs “power state”: of course we all know the difference between energy and power literally speaking. Companies seem to think energy consumption should be used for BS, but we have been using power consumption for UE. I am puzzled why this difference between BS and UE. Not the most critical issue here, but would be good to understand. |
| intel | Y with update | The FFS sub-bullet under Reference configuration is not clear. Suggest to remove it. Regarding scalability to sleep/non-sleep mode, we think it would be better to agree on a definition of sleep and non-sleep mode first and understand better the scope of each mode. Please note that as mentioned in our email, we are not against the scaling method. We think it should be considered, but more finer description for sleep vs non-sleep especially for multi-TRP cases is needed first.**FL2 Proposal 2.1-1a*** **For evaluation purpose, the energy consumption modeling for a BS includes at least the following:**
	+ **Reference configuration**
		- **~~FFS a baseline for comparison in evaluation with multiple scaling in consideration of other aspects, e.g. TRP/BS types etc, if any dependency~~**
		- **Note FR1 and FR2 to be separately considered for detailed parameters**
	+ **Multiple ~~power~~ energy state(s) including sleep/non-sleep mode(s) with relative power ~~values/units~~, and associated transition times/energy**
	+ **~~Scaling method to be applied at least for non-sleep mode.~~**
		- **~~FFS : Scaling applied or not for sleep mode~~**
		- **~~FFS (de-)activation time for applying the scaling~~**
 |

Another general aspect is that there is converged preference that the time domain granularity of BS energy consumption model should be in a dynamic level, e.g. per slot basis [2][3][4][7][9][10][11] etc.. The following can be considered.

**FL1 Proposal 2.1-2**

* **The BS energy consumption model can be used to evaluate the power consumption of BS per slot.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | The symbol level model should be studied. It can be absorbed into scaling methods in some companies’ contribution. Therefore, suggest adding a NOTE, e.g. the power consumption of BS for symbol(s) can be modeled in the scaling method. |
| OPPO | N | We think symbol-level evaluation is more reasonable. |
| IDCC | N | We think symbol-level evaluation is needed. However, this may be be achieved by scaling slot level power, for example using time and frequency occupancy. |
| Intel | Y | While we see that symbol level modeling can be made more accurate by considering different combination of signal/channels, we think for evaluation purposes, approximate model based on per slot assumption is sufficient and may not result in significantly different observation than symbol level model. It may be too cumbersome to assess transmission status on symbol by symbol level and evaluate in the SLS. Having said that we agree that based on per slot value, several important cases (e.g., 1 SSB transmission) can be identified for scaling. Alternatively, some quantization can be considered, such as if a transmission occupies half slot or less, a common scaling is applied and transmission occupying more than half slot are treated same way as per slot. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y | Generally we are fine with the Proposal 2.1-2. But suggest to have below rewording:FL1 Proposal 2.1-2* The BS energy consumption model can be used to evaluate the powerenergy consumption of BS per slot.

NOTE: When we talk about something that is given for a certain time period it has to be energy not power |
| LG Electronics | Y | The power consumption of BS per slot can be considered as a baseline. |
| China Telecom | Y | We share the similar as Spreadtrum. We agree to evaluate the energy consumption in slot. However, since the techniques such as symbol-level ON/OFF can be adopted and the duration of the transmission may less than a slot. We suggest to take this into consideration by the scaling method.And we agree with Nokia/NSB that the **power consumption** should be replaced by the **energy consumption**, not only for this proposal, but for all the proposals. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Scaling for symbol-level can be considered if necessary. |
| CMCC | Y with more clarification | We agree to evaluate the power consumption of BS per slot. However, further clarification is helpful to let us on the same page regarding the definition of per slot power consumption of different sleep states and non-sleep state. For sleep states, such as the power consumption of deep sleep defines the power consumption when BS is in deep sleep within the slot.For non-sleep state, the power consumption can be defined by PRB utilization in a slot. For example, the energy consumption of 100% PRB utilization is defined for reference configuration, the PRB utilization of other values, such as 50%, can be scaled with respect to the energy consumption of 100% PRB utilization. However, the definition of 50% PRB utilization should be carefully studied, one state is that 50% symbols in a slot are occupied for transmission, another state is that all the symbols are used for transmission with 50% PRB occupation, or even a combination of the above two states. The power consumptions of different working states are not same although the PRB utilization is 50%. So, at least a clarification on the definition of power consumption of non-sleep state per slot is needed. |
| Panasonic | Y | We support the comment from Spreadtrum, DOCOMO and other companies regarding symbol level scaling. |
| Samsung | Yes | Fine with FL’s proposal. |
| Apple | Y | A clarification question: if we have the energy consumption model on per-slot level, do we assume e.g. data is always scheduled with a full slot? Or some additional scaling w.r.t. the transmission duration will be considered? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | In TR38.840, slot-based power consumption model is used for UE. Similar solution can be considered for BS model.And evaluating the power consumption of BS per slot is reasonable and simple considering the SLS simulations. In addition, the number of symbols occupied in a slot should be considered as a scaling factor for power consumption in the unit of slot. |
| Fraunhofer IIS | Y | Symbol-level granularity evaluation is preferred. |
| Vivo | Y | In our view, basic BS energy consumption model is defined in terms of slot granularity. For the active transmission or reception occupying part of slot (e.g. symbol-level occupation), it could be done by time-domain scaling.  |
| HW/HiSi | Y | From the perspective of SLS, it is reasonable to use TTI/slot as time unit, and the power can be calculated per TTI/slot. If the time unit for SLS is set to symbol, the complexity of the evaluation would increase a lot.We acknowledge that the calculation based on symbol level could be more accurate. Actually, since we have the scaling method, it seems not such important to focus on the time unit. For example, if only 2 symbols in a slot(14os) is occupied, the actual power for these 2 symbols is 1/7 of the power of 14os. Thus, we recommend to introduce the symbol level power calculation in scaling method. |
| Fujitsu | Y | Symbol-level adaptation can be evaluated by the application of scaling. |
| Qualcomm | N | Purpose of the proposal is unclear. More clarification is necessary. Does the proposal discuss whether the power is averaged over a slot like UE power model or something else? |
| CATT | Y | The gNB energy consumption might be different per symbol. However, the energy consumption should be measured in average per slot, which is the similar measured as the power model in Rel-16 UE power saving study.  |
| MediaTek | Y | Given sub-slot power consumption graduality can be achieved by e.g., symbol-level power scaling, defining per-slot power values for the power states looks reasonable. For companies to better understand the proposal, it will be useful to include an (example) table for further discussion.  |
| Ericsson1 | N | The modelling should be based on power consumption per symbol. Unlike a UE, the gNB may transmit/receive multiple channels/signals to/from multiple UEs and it is rather inflexible to handle all these variations starting from a slot-based model and scaling back to various Tx/Rx/sleep operations in one slot. For example, we would like to check with slot-level proponents how following cases will be handled :* Different symbols have different Tx/Rx BW
* Some symbols with DL and some symbols with UL
* Some symbols are empty while other symbols have Tx/Rx
 |
| FL | FL considerations:* The main motivation for the proposal is to achieve a dynamic model for BS energy consumption, e.g. slot or symbol level.
* At least slot level is achievable for all for comparison. If a symbol level calculation is provided, the total energy can still be compared per slot. It is perhaps not so meaningful to compare the energy of each symbol even though the model can enable that purpose. That said, to clarify some questions, transmission on only few symbols of a slot is possible or no transmission is also possible, leading to a smaller energy value for that slot. It may be averaged or by other way. To be discussed with FFS.

**FL2 Proposal 2.1-2a:*** **For evaluation purpose, the BS energy consumption model can be used to evaluate the energy ~~power~~ consumption of BS per slot.**
	+ **Note at least symbol-level energy consumption of BS can be calculated by scaling.**
	+ **FFS the scaling method details or other means that enable the following for evaluation,**
		- **Different symbols have different Tx/Rx BW**
		- **Some symbols with DL and some symbols with UL**
		- **Some symbols are empty while other symbols have Tx/Rx**
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | We are in general fine with the FL2 proposal. Regarding the FFS cases in the last bullet, one way could be scaling the energy of slot-level energy consumption under different Tx/Rx BW etc. and linearly combine them. We agree that this can be further discussed in the scaling part. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes partially | Suggesting removing the FFS part. The scaling method should be included in the proposal of scaling. This proposal only solved the time unit of energy model. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y with updates | We are generally OK with the proposal. We agree with Spreadtrum that in this stage, it is not necessary to determine the scaling details. We should consider first the scaling of the slot-level energy consumption. For scaling method of the symbol-level energy consumption, it’s better to be discussed in the scaling section.Therefore, the modification is suggested.**Suggested update FL2 Proposal 2.1-2a:*** **For evaluation purpose, the BS energy consumption model can be used to evaluate the energy ~~power~~ consumption of BS per slot.**
	+ **Note at least symbol-level energy consumption of BS can be calculated by scaling.**
	+ **FFS: the scaling method details for symbol-level energy consumption ~~or other means that enable the following for evaluation,~~**
		- **~~Different symbols have different Tx/Rx BW~~**
		- **~~Some symbols with DL and some symbols with UL~~**
		- **~~Some symbols are empty while other symbols have Tx/Rx~~**
 |
| Futurewei | Y with updates | The intention of the proposal is to have the BS consumption model “able to support” evaluation of the energy consumption of the BS at slot/symbol level. Saying it ‘can be used..’ sounds confusing since we don’t have a consumption model yet. |
| Apple |  | We support ZTE’s update. We can discuss the details separately. |
| Intel | Y with updates | It is not clear whether the following bullet intends to calculate energy consumption at the symbol level for any possible combination of signal/channels or not. If yes, we think that is unnecessarily complicating the evaluation, since there can be many possible scenarios. Some approximation can still be obtained for scaling such as based on whether occupancy in number of symbols is above or below a threshold.* + **Note at least symbol-level energy consumption of BS can be calculated by scaling.**

 To this end, we suggest following update**FL2 Proposal 2.1-2a:*** **For evaluation purpose, the BS energy consumption model can be used to evaluate the energy ~~power~~ consumption of BS per slot.**
	+ **~~Note at least~~ FFS: How ~~symbol-level~~ energy consumption of ~~BS~~ signal(s)/channel(s) occupying less than a slot can be calculated by scaling.**
	+ **FFS the scaling method details or other means that enable the following for evaluation,**
		- **Different symbols have different Tx/Rx BW**
		- **Some symbols with DL and some symbols with UL**
		- **Some symbols are empty while other symbols have Tx/Rx**
 |

To further adapt the framework of UE power consumption modeling to BS side, views seem to be a bit split in terms of the considerations of UL and DL and of corresponding channels, unlike what has been done at UE side. For example, [2] focus on the DL part while also mention that power consumption of UL part can be considered relative to that of DL. A few others generally consider that UL and DL are separately modeled while [6][17][26] consider the DL and UL should be modeled together (possibly depending on duplex, e.g. TDD). It seems that in the case of separate modeling, what mostly differentiates in the model presented in companies input is to have separate relative power values in DL transmission and UL reception at BS, for non-sleep model. And modeling/evaluation for DL only or UL only should be possible in order to verify the scheme/gains for one direction only. A gNB is generally considered as sleep when data is communicating in neither DL nor UL. Thus, the following can be considered.

**FL1 Proposal 2.1-3**

* **For evaluation, the BS energy consumption for DL and UL can be separately modelled, allowing DL-only transmission or UL-only reception at least for non-sleep mode.**
* **Study whether/how to adopt channel/signal-specific modelling for some cases**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Y(for the first bullet) | In fact we are not quite sure what is the meaning of second bullet. What is “channel/signal-specific” modeling? And what is the relation between “channel/signal-specific” modeling and separate DL/UL modeling？ |
| Spreadtrum | Y | As mentioned in some companies’ contribution, modeling of UL-only reception can be simplified due to tight time frame. |
| OPPO | Y | We suggest to study a simple modelling which is independent of specific channels/signals, e.g., a unified model for all the DL channels/signals. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Vodafone | Y |  |
| Intel | Y, partially | We agree that energy consumption states in DL and UL can be simplified and we may not need specific handling of different possible combinations of channels. Nonetheless, we think some categorization can still be useful, such as PDCCH + PDSCH channel are expected to be processed in a common block, whereas other channel/signal transmission comprising background activity, such as SSB, RS could be processed with less power. However, if majority agrees to go move forward with single DL active state, we can accept that for sake of progress. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y | Generally we are fine. But we could like the clarification from @FL on: How to understand the 2nd-bullet bullet with “channel or signal specific modelling for some cases”, is it something targeting for slot type, such as SSB-only, PDCCH-only? Could you please elaborate a bit. Thanks! |
| LG Electronics | Y | For the simplicity, we can consider DL-only or UL-only per slot. In addition, for the sleep mode, we prefer to model BS energy consumption only for DL-only transmission, which means that the BS does not need a transition time/energy to wake up for UL reception. |
| DOCOMO | Y | We also would like a clarification on the second bullet. |
| CMCC | Y | Support. |
| Samsung |  | Regarding the 1st bullet, we are okay to study the BS energy consumption models for both DL and UL in general. However, we prefer to define the unified models for DL and UL to simplify the simulation assumption. Our suggestion is as following:* **For evaluation, define the BS energy consumption model including both DL and UL at least for non-sleep mode.**

For the 2nd bullet, it is fine with us. |
| Apple |  | We would like to clarify what it means exactly to separately model energy consumption for DL and UL. Does it mean that e.g. if we can simulate DL and UL separately and evaluate the energy consumption for DL and UL separately? Or it only means in the power model itself, we define power state for DL and UL separately? (e.g. either we only have DL-only/UL-only slots, or we add the two power values up if the slot has both DL and UL.) |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We are generally OK with the first bullet. However, for the second bullet, we think it is unclear and needs to be further clarified, i.e., what the channel/signal-specific modeling means and what “some cases” refers to. |
| Fraunhofer IIS | Y |  |
| vivo | Y | We prefer a unified state for DL and UL separately for basic energy consumption model. Does the first bullet mean this?Another question is: besides active state, what’s the energy value for a slot that has no DL or UL active and also doesn’t enter into a sleep state? Whether to define an idle state to address this should also be discussed. |
| HW/HiSi | Y | From our view, for active mode, only one active mode for DL tx only and one active mode for UL only is sufficient. The factor that influence power is the time-domain / frequency domain utilized ratio/spatial domain RF chain ratio/power spectrum density, no matter what types of signal transmitted. So it is not necessary to have many channel specific DL modes.  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y w/ update | Study whether~~/how to adopt~~ channel/signal-specific power modeling is necessary ~~for some cases~~ |
| CATT | Y | Although the Tx/Rx at gNB are aggregated signaling processing for all UEs, the individual channel model should be model to reflect some system loads with some channel transmissions only.  |
| MediaTek | Y (only for 1st bullet with condition) | If separated power states for non-sleep DL and UL operations are to be defined, it will be necessary to keep minimum power states, e.g. only data/traffic and RS-only/background operations for either DL or UL, for efficient system-level simulations. Also it will be necessary to define some “combining rule” for the slot with simultaneous DL and UL processing. For the sake of progress, we can accept defining DL power states first and FFS for UL power states and the “combining rule”.For 2nd bullet, the amount of resources in time/frequency/space/power is more relevant to BS power consumption while we think it is not necessary to define specific power states for different PHY channels. In our view, defining only data/traffic and RS-only/background operations for either DL or UL is sufficient. In this regard, we are not supportive of 2nd bullet. |
| Ericsson1 | Needs update | In our view, a DL-only evaluation without considering UL transmission or vice-versa does not provide accurate picture as both Tx and Rx can prevent the gNB from going to a sleep state. So, at least when modeling sleep states and transitions to/from sleep states, both DL and UL should be jointly considered. Then at least for TDD, energy consumption in non-sleep state would be DL only or UL only. We propose the following update. * For evaluation, at least for non-sleep mode (slots/symbols) and TDD, the BS energy consumption for DL and UL can be separately modelled, allowing DL-only transmission or UL-only reception ~~at least for non-sleep mode~~.
* FFS: Impact of UL reception/DL transmission on sleep states and on transitions to/from sleep state.
* FFS: FDD case
* Study whether/how to adopt channel/signal-specific modeling ~~for some cases~~
 |
| FL | Considerations/clarifications as below:* Channel/signal-specific intends to represent slot type, e.g. active DL is represented for a slot only has SSB as one explicit state. This is one DL-only transmission without modelling UL. This is assumed true at least for active/non-sleep mode.
* For simultaneous DL and UL (e.g. in FDD), it is not included in previous proposal but can be added as FFS.
* There is split view. Some prefer DL-only at this moment and some consider UL needs to be considered. A slight majority prefer a simplified UL power modeling, if it is to be considered.

**FL2 Proposal 2.1-3a*** **For evaluation, at least for non-sleep mode (slots/symbols) and TDD, the BS energy consumption for DL and UL can be separately modelled, allowing DL-only transmission or UL-only reception ~~at least for non-sleep mode~~.**
	+ **FFS: whether UL model can be simplified based on DL model**
	+ **FFS: the impact of UL-only or DL-only on sleep modes and associated transition**
* **Study whether~~/how to adopt~~ channel/signal-specific energy modelling is necessary ~~for some cases~~**
* **FFS: FDD**
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes | For FDD case, we think it could be combined based on UL-only model and DL-only model. Maybe we can revise the last bullet:* **FFS: FDD, e.g. including combination the UL only model and DL only model in TDD to figure out the simultaneously UL reception and DL transmission**
 |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For the following sub-bullet, some suggestion is as below.* + **FFS: whether UL model can be simplified ~~based on DL model~~**

For the following sub-bullet, clarification provided by proponent is appreciated.* + **FFS: the impact of UL-only or DL-only on sleep modes and associated transition**

For the FDD model, we think it also includes some time slot that is DL-only(no reception in UL) or UL-only(no transmission in DL). Therefore, we prefer to update it to be more generic* **FFS: FDD, e.g. based on TDD power consumption model**
 |
| Futurewei | Y with updates | Putting ‘FFS:FDD’ gives the wrong impression that we may not have a model for FDD.  |
| Apple |  | The meaning of the two FFS sub-bullets under the first bullet are unclear to us. We could simply remove FFS for now, and agree on the main bullets first. The other details can be further discussed. |
| Intel | Y with minor updates | We don’t think we need to use (slots/symbols) next non-sleep mode. It should be valid in general.**FL2 Proposal 2.1-3a*** **For evaluation, at least for non-sleep mode ~~(slots/symbols)~~ and TDD, the BS energy consumption for DL and UL can be separately modelled, allowing DL-only transmission or UL-only reception ~~at least for non-sleep mode~~.**
	+ **FFS: whether UL model can be simplified based on DL model**
	+ **FFS: the impact of UL-only or DL-only on sleep modes and associated transition**
* **Study whether~~/how to adopt~~ channel/signal-specific energy modelling is necessary ~~for some cases~~**
* **FFS: FDD**
 |

There are also contributions proposing to consider different BS types or BS categorizations in the modeling [3][4][5][18][20][22], e.g. macro BS, small cell or AAS gNB, possibly accounting for different scenarios and relative power value variations. This is one aspect that is different from the UE power saving model. Similarly, [3][18] also consider split of a BS, e.g. radio unit (RU) vs. baseband unit (BBU), or functional blocks. Since macro BS is widely adopted in previous study in IMT-2020 and also included as in above, the following can be considered.

**FL1 Proposal 2.1-4**

* **At least macro BS can be assumed for energy consumption model.**
* **Study whether/how to further adapt the energy consumption model considering different BS types/categorizations/components.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | As commented for FL1 Proposal 2.1-1, we are open for modeling the different BS types. If the scaling method (e.g. power level and antenna ports number) cannot describe the difference among different BS types, we need to define several sets of modeling (e.g. macro BS, AAS gNB and small cell BS). |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Vodafone | Y |  |
| Intel | N | We think at least two BS types should be considered, such as one macro and one small cell. Based on listed scenarios in SID, modeling of small cell BSs are important, such as for SLS evaluation of 2-layer HetNet like deployment where several small cell BSs may exist under a macro BS and it is expected that energy states of a small cell BS can be simpler. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y | Agree to start with focusing on Macro BS.For FR2, it makes more sense to have Micro BS being considered and modeled (if needed). |
| LG Electronics | Y | The macro BS can be a baseline and the energy consumption for different BS types/categorizations/components can be scaled or derived from the energy consumption model for the macro BS. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | Since macro BS is widely used in the deployment, we support macro BS can be assumed for energy consumption model.We do not see the need to adapt the energy consumption model considering different BS components. From our understanding, the energy consumption of BBU is mainly related to the number of baseband units, more baseband units, higher energy consumption, the network energy saving scheme or the downlink PRB utilization rate has little impact on the energy consumption of BBU. The energy consumption of AAU is mainly related to the sleep states of BS, different sleep states can save 10%-80% energy consumption of AAU. Therefore, energy consumption of BBU can be seen as static energy. Finally, the static energy consumption of BBU superimposed the dynamic energy consumption of AAU is the energy consumption of BS. There is no need to further adapt the energy consumption model considering different BS components. |
| Panasonic | Y with revision | We propose to also consider other different base station types, as also mentioned by the example scenarios in the SID. So we think the second bullet should be “Study how to further adapt the energy consumption model considering different BS types/categorizations/components.” |
| Samsung |  | We are okay with the first bullet. For the second bullet, we have concerns on how to define the each energy consumption models for each BSs and components. Moreover, the effectiveness of potential techniques would be different according to BS types with different capabilities. So, we prefer to determine the common energy saving model. |
| Apple | Y | We are fine to start with macro BS, but we also feel that we may need a model for micro BS, which can be potentially achieved by scaling. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | We generally agree the proposal 2.1-4.For the first bullet, we agree that the macro BS should be considered for energy consumption model.For the second bullet, it is recommended that only one base station type can be taken as the reference configuration. If other types of BS need to be discussed, the power consumption of the BS can be obtained through the scaling rules of the time domain, frequency domain, spatial domain and the power domain. Therefore, the proposal can be modified as follows.The absolute power consumption for different BS types can be different, but BS power consumption model is a relative power consumption model, instead of an absolute power consumption model. And we don’t think we intend to compare the PS gain among different BS type. Hence, there is no need to directly define power consumption models for different BS type. |
| Fraunhofer IIS | Y | In our view, at least the differentiation of macro BS and small cell BS makes a lot of sense. The macro is one of the models but we most likely need at least 2 variations of the model (for different types). |
| Vivo | N | Agree with Intel that different BS types should be taken into account. As stated in SID, different scenarios with different BS type (macro, micro and small cell) may be involved in evaluation. Instead of prioritizing one specific scenario, a framework should be determined first. In our view, the following two methods are possible:Option 1: Define energy state per BS typeOption 2: Define energy state for one specific BS type (e.g., Macro BS) and perform scaling (power, antenna and etc.) for other BS types.In our view, different BS type may involve different hardware structure, simple scaling may not be reasonable. Besides, for sleep state, there is no scaling according to the following proposal. Then it means that for a specific sleep mode, the energy consumption for different BS types is the same. We are not sure this is a reasonable assumption. |
| HW/HiSi | Y | Support to focus on Macro BS to the whole structure of power modelling. Additional type of BS could be considered later or reported by individual companies. |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y w/ update | * At least macro cell BS for FR1 and micro cell BS for FR2 can be assumed for energy consumption model.
* Study whether/how to further adapt the energy consumption model considering different BS types (e.g., micro and small cell BS in FR1)~~/categorizations/components~~.
 |
| CATT | Y | We are OK to have a baseline deployment scenario with macro BS only. We could have different deployment scenario with different types of BS.  |
| MediaTek | Y (small update on QC revision) | We support QC revision with “adapt” in 2nd bullet further revised to “adapt/scale” since power model of different BS types can be approximated by a set of power scaling factors. |
| Ericsson1 | Clarification needed | From description above, it is not clear if the term “macro-BS” includes BS with AAS support which is common in current deployments. Massive MIMO AAS BS should be considered as the starting point as discussed in our contribution. So, the terminology used in the proposal needs to be clarified. Another option is to directly discuss reference configurations and avoid discussion on terminology.  |

[3][20] mention that the BS energy consumption model may need to reflect the technology trend for potential improvements or being future proof.

**FL1 Proposal 2.1-5**

* **Study whether/how to further adapt the energy consumption model in consideration of technology trend in e.g. a few years.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Y |  |
| Spreadtrum | Y | As mentioned in SID, the green fields and non-backward compatibility can be considered. |
| OPPO |  | This can be discussed in a case-by-case manner. A general consideration of technology trend might be too vague and it might cause some aggressive/impractical assumptions. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Vodafone |  | Agree with OPPO’s view. We sort of see the opposite of the proposal, not to adapt on new trends but rather for current configurations that will stay for a while such as DSS. |
| Intel | Y | We think it is very important that develop model remains flexible enough so that different functional splits of future BS architectures can be accommodated into the developed model. One good example is defining multiple sleep modes, such as up to 4. This may allow modeling of architectures such as different groups of HW components can be operated in a distributed manner. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y | To our view, it is an important issue need to be clarified for this study, on whether the BS power consumption should reflect today’s base stations or future BS technologies. And it is understood from the FL’s proposal that, the modelling consideration is on future BS technologies. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y | Support. |
| Panasonic | Y | In our opinion, this should be reflected by the scaling method in the power model. |
| Samsung | N | Without knowing the future technology trend for now, it is difficult for us to be on the same page of what we agreed on. Anyhow, even without this proposal, it can be discussed based on company’s contribution. |
| Apple |  | This proposal is too generic and we are not sure what it implies exactly. Does it mean we need to be very aggressive on the power model? By how much? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | N | It is helpful to establish a energy consumption model that conforms to the future technology trend. However, at present, it is unclear know what the future techniques are, and the impacts on the energy consumption model and specifications are unknown. We cannot clearly tell which parts of the energy consumption model should be adjusted to align with the potential trends. Therefore, we don’t think it is critical to discuss the details of the energy consumption model with future technological trends now. |
| Fraunhofer IIS |  | We share similar view as OPPO. |
| vivo |  | We are unclear how such proposal can guide the future work. What can be achieved by the current implantation is also important. This can be discussed case by case. |
| HW/HiSi |  | We agree with OPPO and VDF that the technology trend might be vague for the study. At least the current technology (R17) or implementation should be well modeled. Enhanced technology could be reported by companies and with corresponding energy saving result. |
| Fujitsu |  | We feel sympathy with Oppo’s view. It is necessary to discuss how to avoid impractical assumptions when considering future trend. |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | N | We consider our implementation with most advanced technologies. The technology trend does not provide a realistic implementation possibility. In particular, this is a proprietary implementation issue unless companies might be willing to reveal their implementation of gNB in detail.  |
| MediaTek | N | Experience from UE power saving works shows a relative power consumption model is good enough even with multiple generations of chip evolution. In this regard, it may not be really worthy of accommodating future trends, particularly considering the limited study time. |
| Ericsson1 |  | We agree with the intention. RAN1 has to agree on a model according to the SID schedule and as discussed in our contribution, the modeling effort in the SI should already avoid both overly conservative estimates, assuming older technology, and highly optimistic estimates presuming technology disruptions. However, we do not see a strong need to make separate RAN1 agreement regarding this.  |

[3] proposes to clarify that the study does not consider multi-RAT mode. There was a relevant discussion in RAN plenary on consideration for LTE, and the outcome is that ‘no impact to LTE expected in case of DSS’. This proposal can be further considered if clarification is deemed necessary.

## Reference configuration

Generally both FR1 and FR2 are considered. And there is good convergence on the inclusion of frequency, BW size, antenna configuration, SCS, number of component carriers (CC), and power level. There are also channel/signal specific configurations proposed. In view of proposed parameters, the following can be considered. Note currently it is proposed with square bracket even if it is proposed by an operator. Some parameters may be missing due to lack of proposals but can be further discussed/determined within this meeting. TDD structure is listed in [5][18]. This can be further discussed/determined along with other (missing) parameters.

**FL1 Proposal 2.2-1**

* **At least TDD should be included for evaluation of FR1 and FR2. FFS FR1 FDD.**
* **For FR1, at least the following should be considered for reference configuration**
	+ **DL**
		- **frequency range [2.6 GHz]**
		- **system BW [100 MHz]**
		- **SCS [30 kHz]**
		- **number of CC [1]**
		- **TX [64]**
		- **Power level [FFS]**
		- **[common signal/RS, SSB periodicity 20 ms x 2 per slot]**
		- **FFS other channel/signal, e.g. PDCCH/PDSCH**
	+ **UL**
		- **system BW [100 MHz]**
		- **SCS [30 kHz]**
		- **number of CC [1]**
		- **RX [1]**
* **For FR2, at least the following should be considered for reference configuration**
	+ **DL**
		- **frequency range [28 GHz]**
		- **system BW [400 MHz]**
		- **SCS [120 kHz]**
		- **number of CC [16]**
		- **TX chain [2]**
		- **Power level [FFS]**
		- **[common signal/RS, SSB periodicity 20 ms x 2 per slot]**
		- **FFS other channel/signal, e.g. PDSCH**
	+ **UL**
		- **system BW [400 MHz]**
		- **SCS [120 kHz]**
		- **number of CC [16]**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Y(generally) | Detailed values can be changed based on further discussion |
| Spreadtrum | Partial Y | The reference configuration is used as the reference of BS energy consumption. The reference should be single CC. For CA case, the energy consumption of multi CC can be multiples of that of single CC. |
| OPPO |  | Detailed parameters/values can be further discussed. |
| IDCC | Y | Final values can be decided based on further discussion. |
| Intel | Y, partially | We have following suggestion for revision* Carrier frequency : ~~2.6 GHz~~ 4GHz
* Add for both FR1 and FR2, Number of TRP: 1
* BS Power level in FR1 and 2 can follow the assumption in TR 38.802

FR2: Number of CC: ~~16~~ 1 |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y, partially | For FR2, we have the following proposal regarding system BW and number of CC* For FR2, at least the following should be considered for reference configuration
	+ DL
		- frequency range [28 GHz]
		- system BW [~~400~~100 MHz]
		- SCS [120 kHz]
		- number of CC [~~16~~1]
		- TX chain [2]
		- Power level [FFS]
		- [common signal/RS, SSB periodicity 20 ms x 2 per slot]
		- FFS other channel/signal, e.g. PDSCH
	+ UL
		- system BW [~~400~~100MHz]
		- SCS [120 kHz]
		- number of CC [~~16~~1]
 |
| LG Electronics | Y,partially | We are fine except for the number of CCs for FR2. We prefer 1 CC evaluation as the baseline for both FR1 and FR2, and companies can extend evaluation assumption to CA case if needed. |
| China Telecom | Y, partially | We are generally fine with the proposal.However, for the frequency range for FR1, we think the 4GHz may be more representative and common. We suggest to modify the reference configuration as follow:• Carrier frequency : 4GHz [2.6GHz]The details for other parameters can be further discussed. |
| DOCOMO | Y, partially | We have the following suggestions for revision:* FR1
	+ frequency range [~~2.6 GHz~~ 4 GHz]
* FR2
	+ system BW [~~400 MHz~~ 100 MHz]
	+ number of CC [~~16~~ 1]
 |
| CMCC | Y, partially | For FR1 UL, why the RX number is [1]? From our deployment, the RX number is 64. So, we propose to modify the RX number to [64].Yes for the FR1 frequency range, we think 2.6GHz needs to considered due to large scale deployment. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | Suggest to reformulate as following:* **For FR1, at least the following should be considered for reference configuration**
	+ **Common**
		- **Duplex: TDD**
		- **frequency range [2.6 GHz]**
		- **system BW [100 MHz]**
		- **SCS [30 kHz]**
		- **FFS other channel/signal, e.g. PDCCH/PDSCH**
	+ **DL**
		- **number of CC [1]**
		- **TX [64]**
		- **Power level [FFS]**
		- **[common signal/RS, SSB periodicity 20 ms x 2 per slot]**
	+ **UL**
		- **number of CC [1]**
		- **RX [1]**
* **For FR2, at least the following should be considered for reference configuration**
	+ **Common**
		- **Duplex: TDD**
		- **frequency range [28 GHz]**
		- **system BW [400 MHz]**
		- **SCS [120 kHz]**
		- **FFS other channel/signal, e.g. PDSCH**
	+ **DL**
		- **number of CC [16]**
		- **TX [2]**
		- **Power level [FFS]**
		- **[common signal/RS, SSB periodicity 20 ms x 2 per slot]**
	+ **UL**
		- **number of CC [16]**
		- **RX [1]**
 |
| Apple |  | We also think 1 CC should be the baseline for both FR1 and FR2. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y with some update | **For FR1 & FR2:**1. The impact of carrier frequency are not easy to be reflected in the power consumption model. In a CA scenario, multiple carrier frequency may be involved, and different combinations of carrier frequency can be considered. It is complicated to model these carrier frequency one by one, the discussion will be lengthy and controversial. Therefore, clarifications about the necessity of carrier frequency are appreciated.

In our understanding, there is no need to consider carrier frequency in the reference configuration. Two categories, i.e., FR1 and FR2, are sufficient.It is also noticed that in TR38.840, the carrier frequency is not mentioned in reference configuration.1. In TR38.840, the configuration of some channel, e.g., PDCCH BD times, will impact UE power consumption. However, for BS model, these similar impact is not foreseen.

Therefore, the configuration of the common signal/RS and other channel/signal should be considered in the simulation assumption, which needn’t to be considered in the reference configuration.**For FR1:**1. For FR1, 1 RX is not reasonable for BS, 64R is recommended.

**For FR2:**1. For 400 MHz system bandwidth, the SLS workload will overburden. The 100 MHz system bandwidth is recommended.
2. For FR2, one CC should be used as the reference configuration.
3. Same as FR1, the configuration of the common signal/RS and other other channel/signal should be considered in the simulation assumption, which needn’t to be considered in the reference configuration.
4. For UL, the configuration of the receiving antenna is missing.

To sum up, we suggest**Proposal 2.2-1*** **At least TDD should be included for evaluation of FR1 and FR2. FFS FR1 FDD.**
* **For FR1, at least the following should be considered for reference configuration**
	+ **DL**
		- **~~frequency range [2.6 GHz]~~**
		- **system BW [100 MHz]**
		- **SCS [30 kHz]**
		- **number of CC [1]**
		- **TX [64]**
		- **~~Power level [FFS]~~**
		- **~~[common signal/RS, SSB periodicity 20 ms x 2 per slot]~~**
		- **~~FFS other channel/signal, e.g. PDCCH/PDSCH~~**
	+ **UL**
		- **system BW [100 MHz]**
		- **SCS [30 kHz]**
		- **number of CC [1]**
		- **RX [64~~1~~]**
* **For FR2, at least the following should be considered for reference configuration**
	+ **DL**
		- **~~frequency range [28 GHz]~~**
		- **system BW [100 ~~400~~ MHz]**
		- **SCS [120 kHz]**
		- **number of CC [1 ~~16~~]**
		- **TX chain [2]**
		- **Power level [FFS]**
		- **~~[common signal/RS, SSB periodicity 20 ms x 2 per slot]~~**
		- **~~FFS other channel/signal, e.g. PDSCH~~**
	+ **UL**
		- **system BW [100 ~~400~~ MHz]**
		- **SCS [120 kHz]**
		- **number of CC [1 ~~16~~]**
		- **RX chain [2]**
 |
| Fraunhofer IIS | Y |  |
| vivo | Y, partially | For FR1 UL, 1 Rx is not typical; For FR2 UL, Rx number is missing.For FR2, number of CC should be 1 for reference configuration. |
| HW/HiSi | Y | For the proposed configuration, we are OK to put the values in square brackets for further discussion. And we think 4GHz seems be more assumed in 3GPP study for FR1 TDD. Therefore, maybe 4GHz could be utilized.Besides the proposal on TDD FR1, we think FR1 FDD should be also considered, which has also good commercial deployment today. And the reference configuration template is listed as following:* BS DL: FR1 FDD
	+ SCS: 15 kHz
	+ Number of carrier: 1 Component carrier (CC)
	+ System bandwidth: 20 MHz
	+ Transmit antenna configuration: [8, 16 or 32] Tx
	+ Power levels: [FFS] dBm
 |
| Fujitsu | Y, partially | Simulation assumption in TR38.802 including frequency range, system BW and number of CC can be the baseline for reference configuration. |
| Qualcomm | Y w/ update | * At least TDD with massive MIMO should be included for evaluation of FR1 and FR2. FFS FR1 FDD.
* For FR1, at least the following should be considered for reference configuration
	+ DL
		- Carrier frequency ~~range~~ [2.6 GHz]
		- system BW [100 MHz]
		- SCS [30 kHz]
		- number of CC [1]
		- ~~TX~~ The number of TxRUs [64]
		- Tx Power level and corresponding PA efficiency [FFS]
		- [common signal/RS, SSB periodicity 20 ms x 2 per slot]
		- FFS other channel/signal, e.g. PDCCH/PDSCH
* For FR2, at least the following should be considered for reference configuration
	+ DL
		- frequency range [28 GHz]
		- system BW [400 MHz] system BW [100 MHz]
		- SCS [120 kHz]
		- number of CC [16] number of CC [1]
		- TX chain [2]
		- Tx Power level and corresponding PA efficiency [FFS]
		- [common signal/RS, SSB periodicity 20 ms x 2 per slot]
		- FFS other channel/signal, e.g. PDSCH
	+ UL
		- system BW [400 MHz] system BW [100 MHz]
		- SCS [120 kHz]
		- number of CC [16] number of CC [1]

Comment: That needs to be more specific for SSB, SIB1 and Ros |
| CATT | Y/partially | For FR1, the UL Rx = 1 is not an usual case in the gNB deployment. For FR2, * The BW should be 100 MHz.
* Number of CC should be [1]
 |
| MediaTek | Y with updates | * For FR1, it looks both 2.6 GHz and 4 GHz are both of interest. Given macro cell in FR1 will be the reference configuration, 2.6 GHz looks more reasonable, yet we can include 4 GHz when 2 CC case is considered (e.g. for inter-band SSB-less study). Accordingly, the following revision for FR1 is suggested:
	+ - **Frequency range [2.6 GHz; +4 GHz for 2 CC case]**
		- **system BW [100 MHz]**
		- **SCS [30 kHz]**
		- **number of CC [1 or 2]**
* For FR2, it is common understanding that wider spectrum is available, and thus a smaller total BW than FR1 looks not common. In this regard, the following revision is suggested:
	+ - **system BW [~~400 MHz~~ 100 MHz]**
		- **SCS [120 kHz]**
		- **number of CC [~~16~~ 4]**

 Structure suggested by Samsung looks good to us. |
| Ericsson1 | Needs update | We support the revisions from DOCOMO. Additionally, suggest making below updates. Regarding common signal/RS, it may need some clarification and hence for now suggest starting with SSB periodicity 20 ms. * + FR1, UL
		- RX [~~1~~ 64]
	+ FR2
		- RX [~~1~~ 64]
		- TX[~~2~~ 64]
	+ [~~common signal/RS,~~ SSB periodicity 20 ms ~~x 2 per slot~~]
 |
| FL | Consideration/clarification: * For carrier frequency, add ‘if needed’ and would like to hear more companies view.
* For FR2, note it is RF chain number. But proposal from companies is added for potential consideration or clarification.
* Adding FDD FR1.
* Assuming other parts are stable, square bracket is removed.

**FL2 Proposal 2.2-1a*** **~~At least TDD should be included for evaluation of FR1 and FR2. FFS FR1 FDD.~~**
* **For FR1, for single CC case (FFS multiple CC), at least the following should be considered for reference configuration**

**Set 1*** + **Common**
		- **Duplex: TDD**
		- **frequency range, if needed: 4 GHz, optional 2.6 GHz**
		- **system BW: 100 MHz**
		- **SCS: 30 kHz**
		- **FFS: other channel/signal, e.g. PDCCH/PDSCH**
	+ **DL**
		- **number of CC: 1**
		- **number of TRP: [1]**
		- **number of TxRU ~~TX~~: 64**
		- **Power level [~~FFS~~ TR38.802 as starting point, FFS PA efficiency]**
		- **[common signal/RS if needed: SSB periodicity 20 ms ~~x 2 per slot~~]**
	+ **UL**
		- **number of CC: 1**
		- **RX: [64 ~~1~~]**

**Set 2, Optional*** + **Common**
		- **Duplex: FDD**
		- **system BW: 20 MHz**
		- **SCS: 15 kHz**
	+ **DL**
		- **number of CC: 1**
		- **number of TxRU: 8/16/32**
		- **Power level [FFS]**
* **For FR2, for single CC case (FFS multiple CC), at least the following should be considered for reference configuration**
	+ **Common**
		- **Duplex: TDD**
		- **frequency range, if needed: 28 GHz**
		- **system BW: ~~400~~ 100MHz**
		- **SCS: 120 kHz**
		- **FFS other channel/signal, e.g. PDCCH/PDSCH**
	+ **DL**
		- **number of CC: ~~16~~ 1**
		- **number of TRP: [1]**
		- **TX chain: [2/64]**
		- **Power level [~~FFS~~ TR38.802 as starting point, FFS PA efficiency]**
		- **[common signal/RS if needed: SSB periodicity 20 ms ~~x 2 per slot~~]**
	+ **UL**
		- **number of CC: ~~16~~ 1**
		- **RX chain: [1/2/64]**
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes with some update | For the PA efficiency part, we think it does not belong to the reference configuration. It could be discussed in BS power model, if the group thinks necessary. We think the “FFS PA efficiency” should be removed here.For FDD part, we can add the UL part and we prefer to remove optional for FDD considering FDD also has good commercial deployement.**Set 2~~, Optional~~*** + **Common**
		- **Duplex: FDD**
		- **system BW: 20 MHz**
		- **SCS: 15 kHz**
	+ **DL**
		- **number of CC: 1**
		- **number of TxRU: 8/16/32**
		- **Power level [FFS]**
	+ **UL**
		- **number of CC: 1**
		- **RX chain: 8/16/32**
 |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips |  | For the carrier frequency, as we commented in the first round of discussion, we think we don’t need it in the reference configuration. The reasons are as below1. In TR38.840, there is no carrier frequency involved in reference configuration of UE power consumption model, either.

|  |
| --- |
| 8.1.1 UE power consumption model for FR1**Reference Configuration for FR1**- Downlink: TDD - Subcarrier spacing (SCS): 30 kHz - Number of carrier: 1CC, - System Bandwidth: 100 MHz  |

1. Since there are more than 1 carrier frequency listed, it already implies that the power consumption model can be applied to different carrier frequency.
2. It is a relative power consumption model, instead of absolute power consumption model

Hence, we suggest to remove the carrier frequency in the reference configuration.For PA efficiency, we also think it can be included in scaling factor discussion. |
| Apple |  | For FR2, it has “TX chain: [2/64]” for DL, and “RX chain: [1/2/64]” for UL. We wonder why we need to consider a case where the # of RX chain is smaller than # of TX chain. |
| intel | Y with update | We agree that Set 2 should be optional and Set 1 is baselineFor FR2, we suggest using 400MHz for system BW as baseline, other values optional. |

## Power states and transition time

Relative power value should be clearly defined. A few companies mentioned that similar to UE power saving model, the deepest sleep mode consumes the least power and is considered as the basic power unit.

**FL1 Proposal 2.3-1**

* **In the evaluation, the power consumption value is normalized relatively to the deepest sleep mode to be defined for BS energy consumption model.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi |  | Does that mean the power for deepest sleep mode is ‘1’, and other state is ‘n’(n>=1)? Is that really suitable for the real case? In fact we are not sure, and hope to get clarified. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | For simplicity |
| OPPO |  | It is reasonable to normalize the power consumption value to a mode, we can further discuss whether it is the deepest sleep mode.The goal is to control the dynamic range among different power consumption modes. |
| IDCC | Y | It is reasonable to use normalization. But the reference state can be decided after agreeing on the states. For example, deep sleep may be used as reference with power level [1] but hibernating state may have power smaller than [1]. |
| Vodafone | Y | We agree to have the evaluation done relatively but it is also important to convey the absolute gains obtained from the different techniques |
| Intel | Y | We could just agree that deepest sleep mode is assigned relative value 1, and power values for other states are obtained relative to that.  |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y | @FL: try to further check our understanding, so the “deepest sleep mode” here you refer to is the BS Standby state as in our Tdoc, or so-called Hibernate state in Ericsson’s presentation/Tdoc, is it correct understanding? |
| LG Electronics | Y | Agree with Proposal 2.3-1 but it is first necessary to discuss how many BS power saving modes will be defined considering the SSB periodicity and the transition time. Since gNB should transit to active mode periodically in order to transmit the periodic signal such as SSB, some sleep modes may not be able to be reached depending on the periodicity of SSB if transition time corresponding to the sleep mode is longer than SSB periodicity. Therefore, among multiple sleep modes, it is needed to determine whether to allow a sleep mode for which transition time can be longer than periodicity of SSB/SIB1.  |
| China Telecom | Y | We are fine with the proposal 2.3-1. But we think the details should be clarified after further defining the sleeping states. |
| DOCOMO | Y | Share the similar view to Intel. The deepest sleep mode is assigned relative value 1 and other states have relative values. |
| CMCC | Y | Support. |
| Panasonic |  | We suggest to firstly discuss what sleep modes to be supported. It may not be necessary to the deepest sleep mode. |
| Samsung | Yes | Support |
| Apple | Y |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y | This is an effective and simple method. |
| Fraunhofer IIS | Y | We are fine with the proposal. However, we think the deepest state needs more clarification. Also, we think we should have an FFS on how to provide aggregate network energy usage in mixed scenarios. Certainly [1] unit for a macro BS will not correspond to [1] unit for a small cell. |
| Vivo | Y |  |
| HW/HiSi | Y | Support the proposal. Similar as UE power saving, the most energy saving mode can be normalized to 1. Actually, we think the point made here should be a normalized power model is utilized, and maybe it is not very important to use which state as the reference state with normalized power of 1. |
| Fujitsu | Y | In addition, the simulation result of BS energy consumption in a particular case can be further normalized with that in full load case. |
| Qualcomm | N | Let us discuss sleep states first, and then discuss how to normalize the power. In particular, it is important to first discuss how many sleep states are sufficient and theirs corresponding characteristics. |
| CATT | N | We need to define the sleep state first. The power model for gNB is much different to that for UE in Rel-16 UE power saving study. The UE could go into the deep sleep state based on gNB configuration of DRX without any interruption of network access. The deep sleep state is considered as part of normal UE operation. Thus, the deep sleep state is used as the reference for the normalization of other UE power consumption in UE power model. For gNB, the deep sleep state is not a normal operation and is an inactive to provide network access to UE. Thus, we should use one state of gNB normal operation, such as micro sleep, which all components of gNB in ready state for transmission/reception but no signal processing in Tx/Rx chains.  |
| MediaTek | N | In UE power modelling, it is actually based on setting PDCCH-only power to be 100, and other power values are normalized w.r.t. PDCCH-only power. The reason is PDCCH-only is most common operation for UE vendors to conduct measurement, and more confident measurement values can be obtained. The deep sleep value is actually not the base value, and it can be seen in the power value table of TR 38.840, the value can be optionally set to 0.5.Following the same consideration, we suggest to define “SSB-only” power value as 100 and define the values for other power states.  |
| Ericsson1 | N | In our view, it makes sense to exclude e.g. hibernate sleep (discussed in our contribution) from the deepest sleep state used as reference for scaling, i.e. value 1.  |
| Futurewei | Y |  |

Views on different power states are quite diverse. For consideration of sleep mode, there are more sleep modes preferred in general. Particularly, 4 modes are considered in [3][6][16][18][20]. 3 modes are considered in [4][5][7][10][11][14][15][17][21] while two modes are considered in [2][8][18]. Depending on BS split/types, there may also be multiple preference from companies. More discussion is needed.

**FL1 Proposal 2.3-2**

* **Study how to define sleep modes and determine the characteristics for each mode from one or multiple of the below**
	1. **Relative power level range or power saving range**
	2. **Transition time range**
	3. **BS breakdown/components that can be turned off**
	4. **Other approaches are not precluded**
* **Study the assumption of order for BS entering/resume from a sleep mode to another mode (sleep or non-sleep), i.e. state machine which may have impact on the additional transition energy.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N,****Preferred option** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Y(generally) | for the second bullet, “**order for BS entering/resume from a sleep mode to another mode**”, our view is that ,to simplify power modeling, sleep mode can only turn into non-sleep mode. Currently we see no needs to discuss the power consumption/transition from one sleep mode to another sleep mode. |
| Spreadtrum | Y, prefer a) and b) | c) can be discussed, but we are not sure companies can have the consensus. In UE power model, the sleep modes defined in an abstract way, e.g. time of sleep, relationship b/w sleep energy and transition energy.For state machine, we are not sure how complicated it should be. In UE power model, we only assume the transition b/w sleep mode and non-sleep mode. The prerequisite is UE will perform a definite sleep mode after a non-sleep behavior. UE simply follows the semi-static tasks and the limited NW- triggered states. BS may face more dynamic situation? |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Vodafone | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | We think 4 sleep modes are needed to flexibly consider different functional splits at BS and how different groups of HW components can be turned on/off, some of which may need longer activation/deactivation time. We think modeling considers all of a), b), and c) and these considerations are inter-related. For example, 1 first group of components may consume more power and/or longer activation time than a second group or vice versa.Additionally, we should further discuss the 2nd bullet if possible.We think there is value in discussing how the BS enter/exit sleep modes (SM). For example, whether deeper SM can be entered directly (e.g entered from active mode only) or need to be entered from a previous SM state.This is related to the question discussed during GTW for Ericsson sleep mode state transition diagram.Lastly, we should add a 3rd bullet.Study energy consumption during transition time to and from a sleep mode |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y, prefer a+b | The sleep modes can be defined based on a and b (from the list above) plus the transition energy, similarly to their definition for the UE power model.  |
| LG Electronics | Y, At least a) b) | For the state transition model, it is necessary to discuss whether to transition step by step or direct when switching between active mode and each sleep mode. For example, assuming that there are four sleep modes, BS may transition from sleep mode 1 to the deepest sleep mode 4 via sleep modes 2 and 3. Alternatively, in another state transition model, the BS may directly transit any of the sleep modes from active mode. |
| China Telecom | Y at least a) + b) | For the sleep modes, at least a) and b) should be defined. As for c), we think it can be discussed and related to the specific value of a) and b), but the details may not be needed for the study at this stage, a general definition of c) is enough.For the state transition model, whether the transition of state can happen between the two SM directly should be studied. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Option a) and b) | Fundamentally, the energy consumption of BS is related to the BS components that can be turned off, different working states of these components define different level of power consumption. So, option c) is the nature of different sleep modes’ definition. This can be used for discussion, but not easy for specification. However, BS works in different states cost different power, and BS turns off different components or ramps up different components require different transition time. So, the relative power level and transition time can be used to define sleep modes in energy consumption model. |
| Panasonic | Y in general | Besides the a/b/c of the first bullet, we also propose to clarify and consider the possible gNB activities in different sleep modes, e.g. what processing requires which BS components to be on. Because even when gNB is neither transmitting nor receiving, some processing is still needed, e.g. common signal/message preparation, scheduling preparation and high layer signaling processing. |
| Samsung |  | For the 1st bullet, we think at least three network states need to be investigated, and there could be further refinement during discussion. So suggest to revise the wording to “Study how to define sleep modes, how many states to evaluate, and how to determine the characteristics for each mode from one or multiple of the below”For the 2nd bullet, in terms of transition between sleep modes, we think it is beneficial to investigate it for NWES. So suggest to revise the wording to “Study the assumption of order for BS entering/resume from a sleep mode to another mode (sleep or non-sleep) and the associated additional transition energy, i.e. state machine which may have impact on the additional transition energy.” |
| Apple |  | At least a and b are needed for a sleep mode. In addition, transition energy is also needed. C can be discussed as it may help clarify the motivation for different sleep modes, but we do not see a need to formally agree on it.Some assumptions need to be made regarding the state transitions. We wonder if it is really necessary to define the transition from one sleep mode to another sleep mode, but we are open to discuss. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y, b | Similar to UE power saving, option b is preferred. The BS can enter the low power consumption state (sleep mode) by shutting down some components. The power consumption of BS with different components shutting down is different. However, whether a base station can shut down some components depends on the transition time. The base station can shut down components only when the time conditions(the time of no traffic transmission is longer than or equal to the time of component ramp up/ramp down) are met. In addition, the power levels affect the transmission services of the BS. When there is no service transmission and BS enters into sleep mode, the influence of the BS power level is small. Therefore, option b is the most direct and simple way to define sleep mode. |
| Fraunhofer IIS | Y |  |
| vivo | Y (generally) | We are generally fine with the proposal. It may be better to study whether the sleep mode definition is shared between DL and UL, or separate. We may add one bullet:d) Joint or separate sleep for DL and UL |
| HW/HiSi | Y, prefer a, b | Since the BS implementation could be various, and the definition of turning off level is various, we think define only 2 sleep modes is easier for the study. The first is dynamic sleep, which could recover to active mode quickly. And the second is deep sleep, which represent the most energy saving mode.For bullet c), we share the view from Spreadtrum that it may not be easy to align among different vendors regarding which component should be switched off under a power state, considering there is no definition on which component switching off in UE power model. This can be discussed as reference during the meeting but may not be used as the definition of the sleep modes. |
| Fujitsu | Y, prefer b | Follow the definition for the UE power consumption model in TR38.840. The sleep duration has direct impacts on UE behavior. |
| Qualcomm |  | * **Study how to define sleep modes and determine the characteristics for each mode from one or multiple of the below**
	1. **Relative power ~~level range or power saving range~~**
	2. **Transition time ~~range~~**
	3. **BS breakdown/components that can be turned off**
	4. **Other approaches are not precluded**

**Note: Values for both baseline cases, i.e., 1) for macro BS in FR1 and 2) for micro BS in FR 2.** |
| CATT | Y | (b) and (c). The sleep state in gNB is to provide the gNB energy consumption reduction with limited impact to the services. The change of relative power level would not provide meaningful power consumption reduction for gNB.  |
| MediaTek | Y (remove c)) | We are generally supportive of the proposal as well as the revision by QC. Since for sleep states, it looks not necessary to breakdown detailed components, and c) is suggested to be removed.For the state machine, we would like to suggest the simple model in open published paper, e.g. [THIS IEEE paper](https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8088616) and illustration as below, which can save companies’ valuable time and provide a common reference.Diagram  Description automatically generated |
| Ericsson1 | Needs update | Suggest below update. For c), we think it is covered by the relative power and the transition time, which is also how the UE sleep states were defined. * Study how to define sleep modes and determine the characteristics for each mode from one or multiple of the below
	1. Relative power ~~level range or power saving range~~
	2. Transition time ~~range~~
	3. ~~BS breakdown/components that can be turned off~~
	4. Other approaches are not precluded
* Study the assumption of order for BS entering/resume from a sleep mode to another mode (sleep or non-sleep), i.e. state machine which may have impact on the additional transition energy.
 |
| FL | Based on the discussion over email, the following can be considered. Note whether it is from active state or not may be a further step of discussion.**FL2 Proposal 2.3-2a*** **Study how to define sleep modes and determine the characteristics for each mode from one or multiple of the below**
	1. **Relative power ~~level range or power saving range~~**
	2. **Transition time ~~range~~**
	3. **~~BS breakdown/components that can be turned off~~**
	4. **Transition energy**
	5. **Other approaches are not precluded**
	6. **Note: BS breakdown/components that can be turned off can be considered when defining the specific values of the characteristics for sleep modes.**
* **Study the assumption of order for BS entering/resume from a sleep mode to another mode (sleep or non-sleep), i.e. state machine which may have impact on the additional transition energy.**
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes |  |
| Spreadtrum | Yes |  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes |  |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Intel | Yes |  |

For non-sleep mode, which could possibly be split into DL and UL (if agreed), for each direction, there could be different approaches for determining the power value/unit. It is FL understanding that [21] may be proposing a different approach from those in [3]. Further, [3] proposes not to consider specially the case of simultaneous UL and DL.

**FL1 Proposal 2.3-3**

* **For evaluation purpose, the power consumption for DL/UL (if agreed) in active mode is determined based on one of the following**
1. **Explicit power consumption values per slot-type (FFS definitions)**
2. **A single power consumption value linearly scaled by the number of occupied symbols over 14**
3. **Interpolation between a base power state and a peak power state (FFS definitions)**
* **FFS dependency on other conditions e.g. scenario, RB utilization**
* **FFS whether there is need to adapt the model for simultaneous UL and DL in active mode for this SI.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N,****Preferred option** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Y(generally) | For the last bullet, our thinking is we can first identify which components are shared by DL and UL, and which component are operating separately for DL /UL. And by such classification, we can model for simultaneous UL and DL in active mode. And this FFS is also related to **FL1 Proposal 2.1-3** |
| Spreadtrum | Y, prefer c), also fine for a) | For b), we are not sure the energy consumption is only scaled with symbols number. Maybe, it is also scaled with bandwidth (or loading). Moreover, b) can be included in c) as a factor of interpolation.For a), we think per-slot-type PHY channel(s) may not be practical, since gNB should perform multi-tasks, e.g. broadcast, unicast for multiple UEs. |
| OPPO | Y | A base power value can be defined and it reflects power consumption for full bandwidth occupancy in a symbol. Scaling approach can be applied on top of it. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Intel | Y (a, b) | We think (b) should be further generalized.For example, a set of quantized (scaled) values based on number of occupied symbols, e.g. 1 ~ 7 occupied symbols apply a specific scaling, 8 ~ 14 occupied symbols doesn’t apply any scaling, etc.Linear scaling should still be covered by this generalization. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y, prefer b) |  |
| LG Electronics | Y, prefer a) | At least the power consumption value for each DL signals/channels in active mode should be defined per slot-type.Alternatively, we can accept (b) if RB utilization is considered as well as symbol-level utilization. |
| China Telecom | Y, prefer b) |   |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | N | More clarification of the three options is helpful. For option a), what is the meaning of “explicit power consumption value”, is this means that a static power is assumed without consider the symbol or RB occupation? For option b), this approach does not consider the RB utilization in frequency domain, which also has impact on BS power consumption. For option c), how to obtain the interpolation?From our understanding, the power consumption for active mode can be defined by PRB utilization in a slot. For example, the energy consumption of 100% PRB utilization is defined for reference configuration, the PRB utilization of other values, such as 50%, can be scaled with respect to the energy consumption of 100% PRB utilization. However, the definition of 50% PRB utilization should be carefully studied, one state is that 50% symbols in a slot are occupied for transmission, another state is that all the symbols are used for transmission with 50% PRB occupation, or even a combination of the above two states. The power consumptions of different working states are not same although the PRB utilization is 50%.  |
| Panasonic |  | The third bullet should be supported. It can be defined by the number of DL and UL symbols in a slot. |
| Samsung |  | Okay to study the power consumption for DL/UL in active mode. |
| Apple | Y | We are fine to discuss further to down-select.On b), by “linearly scaled”, does it cover the case where there is a baseline power even if there is no tx/rx on a symbol? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y, b | Network has to simultaneously transmit multiple DL traffic to one or more UEs in the cells based on a proper scheduling strategy. When other factors such as bandwidth remain the same, there is little difference among different transmission type, and what matters for DL power consumption is the symbol occupation. Therefore, a single power consumption value linearly scaled by the number of occupied symbols is suggested. |
| Fraunhofer IIS | Y |  |
| vivo | Y, prefer b) |  |
| HW/HiSi | Y | The first bullet seems to resolve how to capture the symbol level scaling of energy consumption. If symbol level power is adopted, we think the linear scaling from 14 symbol could be considered. For this bullet, we prefer b.For active mode, we think the power is including PA part, RF chain part and the static power part. The PA part determined by the PA efficiency ($η$), the number of activated RF chains ($β\_{1}$), scheduled RB occupancy ratio ($β\_{2}$), other factors ($β\_{3}$) like the power spectrum density (PSD). The RF chain part contains dynamic power part for the activated RF chain except the PA part. The static power part is the same as the power consumption for the dynamic sleep modeThe simultaneous DL and UL transmission case in active mode could be deprioritized after the separate DL or UL active mode are finished. |
| Fujitsu | Y for UL | For DL, we prefer to considering RB utilization here because it directly impacts the energy consumption of PA. |
| Qualcomm | C | What does “values per slot-type” mean in a)? Slot-type in terms of size, i.e., 7 mini slots of 2 symbols, or 2 mini-slots of 7 symbols? Or, in terms of content, e.g. with SSB, or without SSB. |
| CATT | N | The definition is not clear in defining the actual gNB behavior in power consumption. (a) needs to be clarified. The power consumption of the channel combination would be used for defining the average power consumption per slot as those defined in UE power model in TR38.840. The linear scaling of symbols in (b) is not correct since there is a static component of gNB power consumption. (c) is too far away from the reality in the measure of gNB power consumption. |
| MediaTek | N | We somehow think this proposal is not necessary since the purpose looks already address in the proposal of reference power states and the proposal of power scaling factors/formulas. |
| Ericsson1 | N | This discussion seems to be linked to FL1 Proposal 2.1-2.In our view, it is preferable to have symbol level modeling instead of discussing separate scaling factor for ‘slot to symbol’ level modeling.Also, regarding c), if a micro-sleep state is introduced, it is unclear how the conditions for micro-sleep and base power state would be different. It would be good to get a clarification on this from the proponents.  |

## Scaling

The scaling approach is proposed to be reused by majority companies with same or different scaling factors. Among various aspects, the BWP size, number of CC in CA, antenna configurations and power spectrum density (PSD) gain most support. Again, if DL- and UL-only is agreed, scaling can be separately applied to e.g. DL BWP and UL BWP. The exact values need further discussion. In general, the following seems agreeable.

**FL1 Proposal 2.4-1**

* **For evaluation, the scaling in a BS energy consumption model can be applied based on the following,**
	+ **antenna port**
	+ **BWP in one CC and number of CC in CA**
	+ **PA related aspects.**
	+ **FFS other domain scaling**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| **Xiaomi** |  | Other factors should be considered,such as, TRX chain , RB utilization |
| Spreadtrum | Y | For BWP in one CC, we are not sure. It is common understanding that PA is dominant for energy consumption of transmission. If PSD is not largely variant, the bandwidth in one CC may cause different total power output. If PSD can be largely variant, maybe gNB can keep the constant total power output. |
| OPPO |  | For simplicity, we can assume the PSD is constant, then bandwidth scaling can be applied. Here we suggest to replace “BWP” with “used PRB”. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Intel | Y, partially | Further discuss how to take PA scaling into account, whether to absorb into BW scaling or consider separately |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y, partially | Regarding “PA related aspects”, we prefer to rewording with “PSD” or transmit power scaling |
| LG Electronics | Y but need clarification for antenna port | Similar to UE power consumption scaling for adaptation, the linear scaling formula can be applied to BS power consumption for CC/BW, the transmission power, or occupied symbols.However, regarding antenna port, it is necessary to clarify if gNB typically implements PA per each of antenna ports. If this is the case, we can adopt linear scaling model also for antenna port, similar to UE power consumption model. Otherwise, we may consider the formula other than linear scaling formula especially for antenna port. |
| China Telecom | Y | What “the PA related aspects” includes need further discussed. Besides, the scaling in time domain should also be considered if the power defined for power state is based on the slot level. |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | N | We propose to separately consider BWP in one CC and number of CC in CA.* + BWP in one CC
	+ number of CC in CA
 |
| Panasonic |  | Scaling based on symbol number per slot should be supported. |
| Samsung |  | Fine |
| Apple |  | Y |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Y with update | We generally agree the proposal. Some further descriptions are shown as follows.1. The number of symbols occupied in a slot should be considered as a scaling factor for power consumption when per slot power consumption are adopted.
2. The impact of PA related aspect can be incorporated into max transmission power adaptation, i.e, power level.
3. “BWP” is a UE specific terminology. From NW perspective, it is more appropriate to use bandwidth.
4. It should be clarified that whether “antenna port” refers to the “physical antenna port”, or “antenna port of some specific channel/signal”. Moreover, for FR2, TX chain is used. The corresponding adaptation impact on scaling factors needs consideration.

To sum up, the modified proposal is shown as follows.**Proposal 2.4-1*** **For evaluation, the scaling in a BS energy consumption model can be applied based on the following,**
	+ **the number of symbols occupied in a slot**
	+ **antenna ~~port~~ adaptation**
	+ **~~BWP~~ bandwidth in one CC and number of CC in CA**
	+ **Transmission power level ~~PA related aspects.~~**
	+ **FFS other domain scaling**
 |
| Fraunhofer IIS | Y | We support the proposal. |
| vivo | Y, partially | First, the scaling rule for DL and UL should be discussed separately.Second, for frequency domain scaling in DL, what’s the assumption behind:Assumption 1: PSD is constantAssumption 2: total transmission power is constant.If assumption 1 is valid, transmit power scaling is enough to address this.If assumption 2 is valid, additional BW scaling needs to be justified. In TR38.840, the UE Tx power consumption model is dependent on the output power, but not transmission BW.Third, what does “PA related aspects” mean? Suggest to change to total output power.Last, time domain scaling should be added, e.g. the number of symbols occupied in a slot as ZTE suggests. |
| HW/HiSi | Y | Maybe, the first bullet can be revised to the number of antenna ports? In our understanding, this impacts the number of activated number of TRX chains.For the second bullet, maybe BWP can be revised to bandwidth of the transmission/reception? In addition, for CA case, it also depends on the implementation, e.g., separate or common RF chain. We can have further discussion on the other domain scaling. |
| Fujitsu |  | The energy consumption of PA depends on the number of occupied RBs more than the size of BWP. Rather than including BWP in one CC here, RB utilization can be included here or in FL1 proposal 2.3-3. |
| Qualcomm |  | * For evaluation, the scaling in a BS energy consumption model can be applied based on the following,
	+ The number of antenna ports
	+ BWP in one CC ~~and number of CC in CA~~
	+ The number of CCs
	+ Transmit power
	+ PA efficiency (per transmit power & supply voltage) ~~related aspects.~~
	+ FFS other domain scaling

**Comment**: It is not clear why we need scaling for “BWP in one CC” – can you clarify it? |
| CATT |  | PA related aspects are not related to actual gNB power consumption. This was also discussed and agreed in Rel-16 UE power consumption.  |
| MediaTek | Y (update on ZTE revision) | We are supportive of ZTE revision with the following revision:* **~~BWP~~ Ratio of total occupied RBs in a slot in one CC and number of CC in CA**
 |
| Ericsson1 | Needs update | Agree with Nokia comment to replace PA aspect with PSD or transmit power.Also suggest replacing BWP with BW to reflect the frequency-domain scaling.Also, at this point, prefer to keep the main bullet broader by capturing that the scaling can be based on one or more of the following.  |
| FL | The following can be considered.**FL2 Proposal 2.4-1a*** **For evaluation, the scaling in a BS energy consumption model can be applied based on one or more of the following,**
	+ **Number of used antenna ports**
	+ **Occupied BW~~P~~/RBs in a slot in one CC ~~and~~**
	+ **number of CCs in CA**
		- **FFS dependency of RF sharing**
	+ **PSD, transmit power or PA efficiency (per transmit power & supply voltage) ~~PA related aspects~~**
		- **FFS dependency on BW scaling**
	+ **number of symbols occupied within a slot**
	+ **FFS other domain scaling**
	+ **FFS scaling is linearly or else, for each domain**
 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Yes with update | Regarding the part of PA efficiency, we are not sure whether the modeling needs RAN4 involvement. Maybe RAN1 should first focus on PSD and transmit power part. And leave PA efficiency for RAN4 check. |
| Spreadtrum | Yes partially | Suggest moving the FFS points of Proposal 2.1-2a to this proposal under “number of symbols”* + **FFS the scaling method details or other means that enable the following for evaluation,**
		- **Different symbols have different Tx/Rx BW**
		- **Some symbols with DL and some symbols with UL**
		- **Some symbols are empty while other symbols have Tx/Rx**
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Yes | We are okay with these scaling factors in general. |
| Apple | Yes |  |
| Intel | Y with updates | We suggest to include # TRPs below**FL2 Proposal 2.4-1a*** **For evaluation, the scaling in a BS energy consumption model can be applied based on one or more of the following,**
	+ **Number of used antenna ports**
	+ **Occupied BW~~P~~/RBs in a slot in one CC ~~and~~**
	+ **number of CCs in CA**
		- **FFS dependency of RF sharing**
	+ **PSD, transmit power or PA efficiency (per transmit power & supply voltage) ~~PA related aspects~~**
		- **FFS dependency on BW scaling**
	+ **number of symbols occupied within a slot**
	+ **number of TRPs**
	+ **FFS other domain scaling**
	+ **FFS scaling is linearly or else, for each domain**
 |

# Methodology

## KPI

For evaluation methodology and KPI, the baseline may need to be clarified [5][13][17]. Due to lack of input and common view, companies are invited to share your answer for the question.

**FL1 Proposal 3.1-1**

* **Companies view are invited to clarify the baseline for evaluation for this SI**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Spreadtrum | For simplicity, the energy consumption without energy savings can be considered as baseline |
| OPPO | The energy consumption without energy savings can be considered as baseline. |
| IDCC | Energy consumption without energy savings can be considered as baseline. |
| Intel | Baseline may assume without modeling of any sleep modes |
| NOKIA/NSB | The baseline(s) for evaluation can be defined based on the reference configuration, the number of UEs per cell/network, and traffic model. For the calibration, we can assume 1 single stationary UE per cell, and a single load level. The load can be bursty (FTP3) or constant (% of PRB utilization). |
| LG Electronics | Energy efficiency should be included as one of KPIs in evaluation methodology for network energy savings, considering LSs from SA working group.  |
| China Telecom | The baseline for evaluation should be defined as the state without any sleep modes or energy saving techniques. |
| DOCOMO | The reference configuration can be defined as baseline.  |
| CMCC | Simulation assumption in TR 38.840 with reference configurations agreed in energy consumption model section can be considered, considering the evaluation scenarios. For the baseline performance, implement based schemes need to be considered, for example, gNB can delay some burst packets to later adjacent slots so as to reserve more consecutive slots for sleep, with the increase of latency.  |
| Panasonic | As proposed in our contribution, to facilitate the study, the energy saving gain compared with the baseline reference configuration should be the main KPI |
| Samsung | At least the following KPIs should be considered:* Energy saving gain (ESG)
* UPT
* Latency
* Coverage
 |
| Apple | Two baselines can be considered: (1) energy consumption without any sleep modes; (2) energy consumption with sleep modes that can be achieved by implementation without spec impact. It is especially important to have (2) because this is what can be done without any newly defined features. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The power consumption without any ES techniques can be considered as the baseline. |
| Vivo | We think the following could be considered as baseline:1. Operation without any energy saving
2. Operation with implementation-based energy saving

For the baseline 2, it would verify the need of any spec-oriented energy saving scheme. One example of baseline 2 would implementation-based sleep mode transition. However, the detailed method for determination of sleep mode should be defined or reported for baseline 2. |
| HW/HiSi | Firstly, it is obvious that the enhanced technology, such as gNB DTX is not baseline.Secondly, some implementation enhancement, not defined from standard perspective, is not regarded as baseline. Because such kind of techniques may be not available to align among all companies.So, we think the baseline should be normal transmission, with R15/16/17 specifications adopted. The parameter is defined in reference configuration. Other parameters and technologies not defined in reference configuration should be reported by companies, if utilized. |
| Fujitsu | Full load case can be the baseline for the evaluation. Furthermore, normalized energy consumption, for which the simulation result of energy consumption is further normalized with that of full load case, can be used for easy understanding.  |
| Qualcomm | R17 should be the baseline |
| CATT | The baseline system operation needs to be specified in order to capture the energy saving gain of gNB energy saving techniques. An example of the baseline transmission is as follows,* Periodic SSB transmission at each cell, e.g., [20 ms]
	+ Including periodic RACH resource for initial access and random access procedures
* Periodic system broadcast information at a cell, e.g., [160 ms]
	+ Including paging transmission
* Resource allocation and transmission of DL/UL control channels
	+ CORESET is located at each slot for UE PDCCH monitoring
	+ UL control channel resource is allocated for each slot
		- Periodic SR resource allocation
* Baseline for scenario specific system configurations
	+ MIMO
		- Periodic CSI-RS transmission, e.g., [10 ms]
		- Periodic CSI feedback, e.g., [20 ms]
	+ CA/DC
		- PDCCH and CSI-RS configuration in SCell
 |
| MediaTek | * BS/gNB: Given simple sleep mechanism has been published since at least 2017 (e.g. [THIS IEEE paper](https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/8088616)), it is more reasonable to set BS/gNB power consumption with a simple sleep mechanism as baseline.
* UE: UEs with traffic and C-DRX parameters as specified in TR 38.840.
 |
| Ericsson1 | Baseline should be Rel-17.  |
| Futurewei | Proposal seems not necessary as it is already being currently discussed. |

The SID has already listed multiple potential KPIs for consideration. In addition to the most natural KPI of energy/power saving gain, energy efficiency (EE) in unit of bit per Joule is drawing more interest. As this is a new KPI for PHY study, some discussion is needed. Companies are invited to share your consideration for the definition of EE.

**FL1 Proposal 3.1-2**

* **Companies view are invited to clarify the definition of energy efficiency for evaluation.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | For empty to low traffic, energy efficiency can be expressed by consumed energy per time unit. For medium to high traffic, energy efficiency can be expressed by consumed energy per time unit or consumed energy per bit. |
| Spreadtrum | EE is usually defined as capacity over energy consumption or coverage area over energy consumption, as mentioned in TR 21.866. For simplicity, it can be regarded an energy consumption for a given scenario (with fixed capacity and/or coverage area). Or, the capacity (equal to UPT in some cases) and coverage area should be stated in the evaluation results. |
| OPPO | We agree with the FL summary, i.e., energy efficiency (EE) is defined in unit of bit per Joule. |
| Intel | We think similar to UE power saving study, we could use mean energy consumption per slot as KPI to compute energy consumption and compare different techniques and baseline |
| NOKIA/NSB | Please find our propose in the following:We propose multi-dimensional NW EE KPIs that jointly consider the energy consumption of the network and system/UE performance. In our Tdoc, we list UPT-aware, cell throughput-aware,data volume aware, EE KPIs. On the contrary, if the evaluation was based on comparing a set of independent KPIs, (say X % network energy saving gain, Y % UPT gain, and Z % latency gain), it would be challenging to derive any conclusion.In accordance with the proposed BS power consumption model, the network power consumption is expressed as a relative power consumption to the most power-efficient sleep state and is unitless. Therefore, the energy consumption in the NW EE metrics should be unitless (i.e. not be expressed as Joule) |
| LG Electronics | The definition of EE from TR 38.913 Clause 7.19 is as follows:$$EE\_{global}=\sum\_{scenario K}^{}b\_{K}EE\_{scenario K}$$* where$b\_{K}$ refers to the weights of every deployment scenario where the network energy efficiency is evaluated and,
* $EE\_{Scenario}=\sum\_{load level 1}^{}a\_{1}\frac{V1}{EC\_{1}}$
	+ where **V1**= Refers to the traffic per second served by a base station (in bits/s),
	+ $EC\_{1}$ = Refers to the power consumed by a base station to serve V1 (in Watt = Joule/s), and
	+ $a\_{1}$ = Refers to the weight for each traffic load level.

According to the above equation captured from TR 38.913, the absolute power value is required to calculate EE. However, according to the objective of SID or the UE power saving model in TR 38.840, the relative power can be used to define gNB power consumption model. Therefore, the definition of EE may need to be modified so that it can also be calculated based on a relative power value. A simple solution could be to replace the absolute power in EE formula with the relative power (i.e., new EE = ratio of throughput to reference power consumed by gNB). Given the relationship between absolute power and relative power, the original EE value calculated by the absolute power can be derived from the new EE value calculated by the relative power. Therefore, the EE value calculated by relative power can also be considered as a valuable KPI for evaluation methodology. |
| China Telecom | We share the similar view as Nokia/NSB. The traditional definition of EE is in unit of bit/Joule. While the KPIs in multiple dimensions can be considered for the NES, we proposed a more general expression of EE = the concerned KPI/energy consumption, the concerned KPI can be UPT/throughput/latency/coverage. With this method, the performance can be better valued and associated with the specific scenarios and techniques. Besides, as Nokia pointed, if we want to jointly considered several KPIs at the same time, then using the gain in percentage instead of the absolute value would be better, and the EE can be unitless. |
| DOCOMO | By referring 38.840, energy consumption is defined as the power value averaged over the operation within a slot. Then the energy efficiency is defined as bit per Joule over the operation within a slot.  |
| CMCC | Given that power saving gain will be evaluated based on BS power model with relative power value, how to get conclusion with evaluation results of both EE and power saving gain needs to be studied. |
| Panasonic | Energy efficient in bit per Joule requires much more details to define than the power model using normalized values, i.e. we need to define more realistic power values of different power states in units of Watts and even for breakdown of components. We have no issue with this but have concern on how this will be converged. |
| Samsung | We think the listed KPIs including coverage is sufficient for PHY study. However, we are okay to discuss for new KPI such as EE.  |
| Apple | For simplicity, the energy efficiency can be defined as the energy consumption (relative, no unit) divided by the number of bits for a given duration. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Energy saving gain is more meaningful in a long term duration. However, energy efficiency is more of a short term definition in the previous discussion. Moreover, the energy efficiency also depends on other factors such as modulation order, transmission layer, etc. For the evaluation of the impacts of NW ES techniques, using other KPIs such as UPT, latency, etc, is more straightforward compared with energy efficiency. |
| Fraunhofer IIS | We think we should stick to the conventional definition of EE as stated by OPPO. |
| HW/HiSi | Based on the discussion in power model of BS, it seems majority companies want to use a relative unit power model for the study. Therefore, Energy Efficiency in unit of bit per Joule is impossible under this power model.Secondly, based on the comments above, we feel the intention of this EE metric seems how to tradeoff among multiple fundamental KPIs, e.g. power saving gain, UPT loss, system throughput. We think we should focus on which set of fundamental KPIs should be studied first. After that, we can discuss whether this new EE metric is needed or not. In our understanding, in 3GPP, the study is always based on multiple KPIs and considering the tradeoff among them, the conclusion can be made in previous discussions, even without a new metric based on the multiple fundamental KPIs.To evaluate the power saving benefit on BS, we think at least the energy saving gain vs baseline can be used. Also, the energy value per slot mentioned by intel can be also utilized.  |
| Fujitsu | For evaluation in this SI, energy efficiency can be defined as a ratio between the aggregated UPT in the simulated area and the energy consumption by all the network nodes in the area.  |
| CATT | The absolute energy efficiency requires the measure of energy consumption of gNB, which is implementation dependent. The power model is proposed to use relative power in relation to the reference state. If relative power model is used, the energy efficiency should be unitless.  |
| MediaTek | While a single EE metric may be easy to compare different energy saving schemes, there can be critical information loss. For example, Scheme A and Scheme B can achieve the following EE values:EE(Scheme A) $∝$ 90% UPT / 80% energy consumption = 1.25 EE(Scheme B) $∝$ 60% UPT / 40% energy consumption = 1.5We may recommend Scheme B because of better EE, but Scheme A may actually be a better solution with much confined UPT loss.In this regard, we would like to suggest to capture EE value (preferably based on simple formula) together with at least UPT, network power consumption and UE power consumption results. |
| Ericsson1 |  “Energy efficiency” can have different definitions from consumed energy per maximum capacity to consumed energy per delivered bits and so on. If such KPI is to be introduced in RAN1 (there are already definitions in other WGs/specs), how it reflects the intention of the SI should be studied. Temporary high energy efficiency is not a good measure for evaluating network energy consumption, and this is generally evaluated over a longer time, e.g., 24 hours, which is normally out of scope for RAN1 evaluations. It should be discussed how KPIs that can be directly measured from RAN1 evaluations such as such as BS energy consumption, and BS energy saving gains (derived from the power model under discussion) relate to an additional energy efficiency KPI.  |

For study of the impact on system performance, UPT can be considered as adopted in UE power saving study and proposed by majority contributions. It may also be combined for joint consideration with EE. Other KPIs for system impact evaluation may vary depending on techniques and scenarios, and companies view are split.

For UE side impact evaluation, it seems the below can be considered.

**FL1 Proposal 3.1-3**

* **For network performance impact evaluation, at least UPT should be considered,**
	+ **FFS in combination with other KPIs e.g. UTP-aware EE, UPT/latency, UPT-UE power etc.**
* **For UE performance impact balance, UE power consumption/access delay/latency can be considered,**
	+ **FFS in combination with energy consumption of BS.**
* **Note, this does not preclude to consider other KPIs when found appropriate for certain techniques/scenarios**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Xiaomi | Y(generally fine) | For the first bullet, when the traffic load is from empty to low, for network performance impact evaluation, our thinking is packet latency seems a more suitable KPI than UPT. |
| Spreadtrum | Y | UPT should be considered in a certain form, e.g. combined form or individual form. The additional UE power consumption should be stated in the evaluation results. |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | Agree |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y,partially | Network performance can be evaluated with cell throughput aware and data volume aware EE. FFS in combination with other KPIs.UE performance can be evaluated with UPT-aware EE. FFS in combination with other KPIs (e.g. UE power consumption). |
| LG Electronics | Y | In our understanding, if above performance metrics are to be reported, performance loss or gain needs to be compared with the reference configuration. Would it be the correct understanding? |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | We agree with the FL summary. |
| CMCC | Y,partially | For UE power consumption, if it means to evaluate power consumption increment for each enhancement schemes as what has been done in UE power saving item, maybe the evaluation work load will be high. |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | Generally, we are okay with FL’s proposal. In addition, we are considering that coverage is also one of important key factors for NW and UE performance. |
| Apple | Y | For the 2nd bullet, we prefer to change “can be considered” to “should be considered”, similar as the 1st bullet. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | **Y** | For network performance impact, we think UPT and latency are sufficient as the KPIs for NW ES evaluation. |
| Fraunhofer IIS | **Y** | The UPT/reliability needs to be further studied. |
| Vivo | Y (generally) | We are generally fine with the proposal. For the second bullet, we suggest to revise it according to SID:**For UE performance impact balance, UE power consumption/access delay/latency ~~can~~ should be considered** |
| HW/HiSi | Y | The BS power saving gain should be obtained with acceptable/minimized loss of the BS/UE performance metrics. So, the UE UPT loss should be also focused/reported when adopting BS power saving technologies. |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y w/ update | FL1 Proposal 3.1-3* For network performance impact evaluation, at least UPT and coverage and total energy consumption including UE energy consumption should be considered,
	+ FFS in combination with other KPIs e.g. UTP-aware EE, UPT/latency, UPT-UE power etc.
* For UE performance impact balance, UE power consumption/access delay/latency can be considered,
	+ FFS in combination with energy consumption of BS.
* Note, this does not preclude to consider other KPIs when found appropriate for certain techniques/scenarios
 |
| CATT | Y | We would like to clarify that the main KPI is the energy saving gain of the proposed gNB energy saving techniques comparing to the baseline gNB operation not the Energy efficiency. Average UPT/latency among UEs in the system if system level simulation is used for evaluation. The other matrices, such as UE power consumption, should be captured.  |
| MediaTek | Y with update | Typical performance index should include UE dropping/satisfaction rate, and thus revision to UE performance impact is suggested as follows:* For UE performance impact balance, UE power consumption/access delay/latency and UE dropping/satisfaction rate can be considered,
 |
| Ericsson1 | Needs update | We are OK consider UPT impact and UE power consumption/latency. Prefer rewording as below (UPT impact falls under both NW and UE performance impact).* ~~For network performance impact evaluation,~~ at least UPT should be considered,
	+ FFS in combination with other KPIs e.g. UTP-aware EE, UPT/latency, UPT-UE power etc.
* ~~For UE performance impact balance,~~ UE power consumption/access delay/latency can be considered,
	+ FFS in combination with energy consumption of BS.
* Note, this does not preclude to consider other KPIs when found appropriate for certain techniques/scenarios
 |

## Evaluation scenario

Among the listed example scenarios in SID, i.e.

* Urban micro in FR1, including TDD massive MIMO (note: this scenario can also model small cells)
* FR2 beam-based scenarios (note: this scenario can also model small cells)
* Urban/Rural macro in FR1 with/without DSS (no impact to LTE expected in case of DSS)
* EN-DC/NR-DC macro with FDD PCell and TDD/Massive MIMO on higher FR1/FR2 frequency

The first and third scenario gain most of support in the initial round of contrition view summary. If we go with this approach for down-selection, FR2 will be completely deprioritized which may be less preferable since it is expected to establish more insight of the saving potential especially for scenario with large energy consumption. Therefore, companies are invited to further consider your priority for evaluation scenarios. Note it is not necessary to be limited by the exact bullet from the above scenarios – as they are examples in no order, other combinations from/than those can also be considered.

**FL1 Proposal 3.2-1**

* **Companies are invited to further consider priority for evaluation scenarios for BS energy saving study.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| Spreadtrum | Urban scenarios should be prioritized. |
| OPPO | Urban scenarios should be prioritized. |
| IDCC | Urban scenarios should be prioritized. |
| Vodafone | Urban scenarios should be prioritized, making sure that DSS scenarios are covered within the evaluation. |
| Intel | Urban scenario with Massive MIMO, 2-layer Hetnet |
| NOKIA/NSB | We have the following proposal in our Tdoc for prioritization of the evaluation scenarios:RAN1 to prioritize evaluations in the following scenarios: * Urban macro in FR1 without DSS and with CA, with/without massive MIMO,
* Rural macro in FR1 without DSS and with CA, and
* Urban micro in FR1 and FR2

RAN1 to focus on NR-only scenarios and consider with lower priority evaluations in the following scenarios: * EN-DC/NR-DC macro with FDD Pcell and TDD/Massive MIMO on higher FR1/FR2 frequency, and
* Scenarios “With DSS”
 |
| LG Electronics | We prefer to prioritize NR-only scenarios with massive MIMO in FR1 and FR2, while EN-DC and DSS scenarios can be considered as low priorities. |
| China Telecom | The Urban scenarios should be prioritized. And the SSB-less with inter-band CA should also be considered. |
| DOCOMO | Urban macro/micro scenario for both FR1 and FR2 should be prioritized.  |
| CMCC | We think the third scenarios that is Urban/Rural macro in FR1 can be first priority, and it also including TDD massive MIMO. And then the first and second scenarios can be second priority.  |
| Panasonic | In the study item phase, we think the intention of this SID is to avoid such discussion on priority. If it is needed, this should be done in RAN plenary and then update the SID. |
| Samsung | We share the view from FL. We prefer to prioritize the following cases as starting points:* FR2 beam-based scenarios (note: this scenario can also model small cells)

Urban/Rural macro in FR1 with/without DSS (no impact to LTE expected in case of DSS) |
| Apple | Urban scenarios |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think scenarios in FR1 including Uma and Umi, should be considered as high priority for BS energy saving evaluation. Other scenarios are optional. FR2 scenarios are suggested to be considered as low priority considering the deployment status and SLS workload. |
| Vivo | Urban scenarios should be prioritized. |
| HW/Hisi | We prefer to focus on studying Urban Macro case. Others can be reported and studied by companies. |
| Fujitsu | Prioritizing urban macro scenario is fine to us. |
| Qualcomm | Urban Micro TDD with massive MIMO for both FR1 and FR2. It is optional for Urban Macro & Rural for FR1. |
| CATT  | Urban Macro & Rural for FR1 should be prioritized.  |
| MediaTek | To be more specific, Dense Urban for FR1 in TR 38.840 can be prioritized |
| Ericsson1 | This can be based on Table A.2.1-1. Urban Macro should be prioritized.  |

## Traffic model

One of the objective of SID is highlighted as below:

*The study should prioritize idle/empty and low/medium load scenarios (the exact definition of such loads is left to the study), and different loads among carriers and neighbor cells are allowed.*

Several contributions contribute to this. In general, there is an aligned understanding that the load at least refers to the PRB utilization while there is proposal that it also concerns other factors e.g. number of UEs per cell. [3] propose to agree on a definition used in other standard, i.e. the load levels defined by ETSI in ES 202 706-1, which may be reasonably reused. To allow unbalanced load, [6][18] propose to adopt non-uniform UE distributions.

**FL1 Proposal 3.3-1**

* **The load for evaluation for BS energy saving study refers to the network load levels defined by ETSI in ES 202 706-1, where ‘idle/empty’ refers to ‘unloaded’ cell, ‘low load’ refers to ‘low load’ utilizing 30% PRB and ‘medium load’ refers to ‘medium load’ utilizing 50% PRB.**
* **Non-uniform UE distribution can be considered. Other approaches that are used for achieving different loads among carrier/cells should be clearly stated.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Spreadtrum | Y | Idle/empty load can be referred to 5~10% load to address the common signal/channel, e.g. SSB/SIB/… |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Intel |  | Resource utilization (RU) corresponding to a specific load should consider a range of RU values. During evaluations, it is quite difficult to simulated a fixed RU in all cells, let alone in a single cell due to dynamics of the scheduling and traffic burstiness.Suggest changing low load to be 5% ~ 25% RU, medium load to be 25% ~ 50%.Also, we would like to clarify that “unloaded” cell still may need to send SSB, and SIBx and can results in some RU measured in the evaluations, and it does not necessarily correspond to 0% RU. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y |  |
| LG Electronics |  | We prefer to define the level of traffic load based on resource utilization, e.g., 20% and 40% RU correspond to low and medium load, respectively.Regarding non-uniform UE distribution, does it mean non-uniform load across gNBs for a given frequency, or across carriers? |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC |  | We are ok to use PRB utilization to define the load. And different load status such as ‘idle/empty’, 10%, 30%, 50% can be considered. |
| Panasonic |  | We need more discussion before agreeing on this, as 30% resource utilization ratio is a bit too high for low load. We also support non-uniform load/UE distribution. The method can be FFS, e.g. different UE numbers per cell or using multiple data flows per cell. |
| Samsung | Yes | For the 1st bullet, we are okay to define the load level according to resource utilizing. We would like to define at least three load levels. |
| Apple |  | We are generally fine with the proposal, but feel the proposed values may be a bit too large. Using a range (as proposed by Intel) also seems to make sense. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | **Y** | Even we think up to 30% PRB utilization is sufficient for NW ES evaluation, we are okay to optionally consider higher PRB utilization cases, such as 50%.Considering the workload of SLS, we think we need to clarify the mandatory simulation cases, otherwise, the simulation results will be diverse. And it is not beneficial to draw observation/conclusion. In our views, idle/empty load and low load needs be considered. Other resource utilization (RU) cases, for example, 5%, 15%, 30% also need to be evaluated.In CA case, the UE distribution is per cell. And different UE distribution among different cells is allowed. We agree that the UE distribution should be clarified.Moreover, we think it should be clarified that whether common signal/channel is accounted in the PRB utilization calculation. |
| Fraunhofer IIS | **Y** | From our point of view “idle/empty” is a very important scenario. We can start from ETSI levels, but eventually we need to be a bit more flexible depending on what needs to be studied. For example “idle” could be from 0-1% , so that we can study the maximum power saving as well as how well the traffic is handled when it does arrive. |
| Vivo | Y | One clarification for the resource utilization ratio: it means occupied RB for data only or for data+signaling?Response to LG’s question: it is non-uniform UE distributionin simulated geographic area, e.g. non-uniform across cells. |
| HW/HiSi | Y | 30%/50% could be treated as typical value of load level for network energy saving study. The load level for SSB/RS only could be reported / calculated for certain configuration. |
| Fujitsu | Y | We also think using a range is more suitable for the evaluation. |
| Qualcomm | Y with clarification | Per ETSI in ES 202 706-1, load level is defined by the PRBs occupancy level by **User Plane (UP) data activity** during a defined observation period. Does this mean load level or PRB utilization for loaded scenarios does not contain REs for non-data channels (e.g., CSI-RS, PTRS and PDCCH in downlink)?Add also ‘High load’ utilizing 70% of the PRBs, for evaluating PA related techniques |
| CATT | Y | We are OK with the proposal.  |
| MediaTek | Y with revision | * For traffic load, we suggest to use range for load. For example low-load as 10% < RU <= 30% and medium load as 30% < RU <= 50% to accommodate evaluation variations
* For achieving the target RU, we suggest to increase UE number instead of changing packet size or mean packet inter-arrival time. Without aligned methodology, companies may see diverse results and fail to achieve useful consensus for the study.
 |
| Ericsson1 | Needs further discussion | We suggest discussing further the applicability of ETSI model to the dynamic system simulations typically performed by RAN1, e.g. whether/how the RU definition, traffic model and other assumptions in RAN1 could be aligned with the definitions in ETSI model.  |

The proposed traffic models based on contributions for the study include:

1. FTP3: 0.5MB, 200ms
2. FTP3 IM: 0.1MB, 2s
3. VOIP
4. XR: 30/45Mbps
5. C-DRX : 40/160/320ms cycle, on-duration 4/8/10

Similar to UE power saving study, multiple models can be considered.

**FL1 Proposal 3.3-2**

* **FTP3, FTP3 IM and VOIP can be considered in the evaluation.**
* **FFS other traffic models that can be optionally considered.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| OPPO | Y |  |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | We suggest including XR traffic model, at least as an option. Periodic XR traffic may offer energy saving opportunity at the BS. |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y, partially | We prefer to prioritize the FTP3 with 0.5MS, 200ms for the evaluation of this study |
| LG Electronics | Y | Similar to UE power saving, FTP model 3 and VoIP can be considered for the performance evaluation. |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y |  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Samsung  | Yes | Okay |
| Apple | Y,partially | We prefer to prioritize one FTP model among the two: FTP3: 0.5MB, 200ms to reduce the workload. The load will be controlled anyway. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | **Y** |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| HW/HiSi | Y | The packet size should be agreed for SLS, and the traffic model agree in UE power saving could be utilized. The arriving rate and UE number per cell could be adjusted to fit the load level. |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y | Regarding the inclusion of XR, we think it may easily violate the low/medium load condition in the SID. If frequent data traffic characteristics is the main consideration for including XR, it can be sufficient to include VoIP. |
| Ericsson1 | Y |  |

## Simulation assumption

SLS is explicitly mentioned in the SID thus should be considered. Additionally, [7][14] propose numerical methods for e.g. handover drop rate analysis and [10] propose LLS for e.g. power saving signal detection. The following can be considered.

**FL1 Proposal 3.4-1**

* **At least SLS should be considered in the evaluation. Other method, including numerical analysis and LLS for KPI(s) other than UPT can also be considered.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Y/N** | **Comments** |
| Spreadtrum | Y |  |
| OPPO |  | The high priority can be given for baseline simulations, which is based on system level simulations. |
| IDCC | Y |  |
| Intel | Y | Agree with proposal |
| NOKIA/NSB | Y | We think SLS is sufficient for this study |
| LG Electronics | Y | We agree that SLS should be the baseline for performance evaluation. |
| China Telecom | Y |  |
| DOCOMO | Y | SLS is mandatory. LLS is optional if needed.  |
| CMCC | Y |  |
| Panasonic | Y |  |
| Samsung |  | The contexts are fine. Since the objective#2 in the SID already captured “evaluating system-level network energy consumption”, we don’t see the value of this proposal.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | **Y** |  |
| vivo | Y |  |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Y |  |
| Fujitsu | Y |  |
| Qualcomm | Y |  |
| CATT | Y |  |
| MediaTek | Y |  |
| Ericsson1 | Y |  |
| Futurewei | Y |  |

For other assumption parameters, the following are proposed in contributions: IMT-2020, 38.802, 38.840 and 38.830. It may be good to look into the overall SLS parameters first to check if some of them can be referred to.

The simulation assumptions proposed by companies for this meeting may be provided later.

# Other issues/discussion points/missing proposals

If there is any other important issue/discussion point/missing proposal that you consider should be discussed, please share your proposal below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Domain (optional, for potential categorization)** | **Issue content/comments/questions** |
| OPPO |  | In this meeting, we should at least nail down the details of section 2.2 to section 2.4. |
| Qualcomm |  | Does the energy consumption power consider power systems loss (e.g., DC-DC converter loss, main power supply loss, active cooling)? If not, why? It should be noted that we should know how significant a PHY/MAC enhancement can contribute to the overall BS energy savings. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Simulation results

It seems there is no strong need to treat the initial simulation results submitted for the first meeting for this SI. Therefore, there is no particular proposal set along that.
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