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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments** |
| CEWiT | Time domain techniques:  Based on the study,we think that the techniques A-1-2 and A-1-6 have the potential to provide significant energy saving. Further the techniques can be combined with other techniques such as A-1-1 and A-1-3 for enhancing the energy saving gains and reducing the overhead. For technique A-1-6, the results provided in the study phase shows improvement in energy saving from 4.8% to 14.8% when number of SSBs increases from 1 to 8. Hence the technique A-1-6 will be more useful when the number of beams is more. For e.g. in FR2, with 64 SSBs, the energy saving gain achieved by A-1-6 for cat 1 gNB increases to 21.6% and it will further increase to 59.05% when combined with technique A-1-3.  Frequency domain techniques:  The base for achieving energy saving gain for the techniques B2 and B3 is because of disabling of frequency band at the gNB. However, the techniques B2 and B3 deals with the procedure to minimize the impact of disabling of frequency band at the gNB on the UE. Both techniques can be advantageous depending on the scenario. For e.g., when the overlap between frequency band disabled at gNB and active BWP of UE is high, then technique B2 is advantageous, whereas B3 has upper hand when overlap between frequency band disabled at gNB and active BWP of UE is low. Thus, the techniques B2 and B3 can be incorporated together and can be applied depending on the scenario, where the exact details for specifying B2 & B3 can be discussed in WI phase. Based on the above, we suggest to update the conclusion as follows:  Based on the study, from time and frequency domain,   * at least technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DT/DRX is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended,   at least techniques A-1-1, A-1-2, A-1-3, A-1-4 (for paging enhancement), A-1-6, A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1, A-5-2 and techniques B-2 and B-3 together have the potential to provide large gain for network energy savings particularly at empty or low load, and could be potentially combined with each other based on some sources’ results, although it is understood that the gain is not linearly accumulated from each individual technique, e.g.,   * + gNB may target network energy savings by A-5-1/B-1-1 without SSB/SIB1, or by A-1-1 with simplified SSB, or by A-1-3 with longer SSB periodicity, * technique A-3 of UE WUS can be enabled for demanding SSB/SIB1 as in techniques A-5-2, when needed, as a trigger on a gNB targeting energy saving, * to support techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1 and/or A-5-2, potential feasibility/requirement confirmation from RAN4 is expected for proper synchronization/mobility/SCell (de-)activation, * whether/which technique(s) to recommend is to be discussed in RAN plenary.   Also, the examples in above part of the conclusion are not clear to us, such as whether the first sub bullet of the example “gNB may target network energy savings by A-5-1/B-1-1 without SSB/SIB1, or by A-1-1 with simplified SSB, or by A-1-3 with longer SSB periodicity,” is representing the use of multiple techniques in combination or it is just saying that energy saving can be achieved by using either one of the mentioned techniques. If it means that the energy saving can be achieved by using techniques individually or in combination then we like to update the first sub bullet in the examples as follows:   * + gNB may target network energy savings by A-5-1/B-1-1 without SSB/SIB1, or by A-1-1 with simplified SSB, or by A-1-2 with skipping of SSB/SIB1 transmission occasion, or by A-1-3 with longer SSB periodicity, or by A-1-6 with scheduling of SIB1 without PDCCH.   Also, kindly update the reference of CEWiT’s inputs in the Table 6.1.1.2-1 as [24] [27] |
| vivo | Please find below our suggested changes in conclusion part of the TR in revision mark:  Network energy savings for NR have been studied for both FDD and TDD, both FR1 and FR2. Power model comprised of different BS power states/modes for BS power consumption is generated in section 5 by using relative power, which accommodates DL transmission and UL reception, and two types of BS categories. A scaling approach considering BS power split by a static part of power and a dynamic part of power is established for evaluation purpose, reflecting the relationship of BS power consumption with respect to transmission resources/configurations in time, frequency, spatial and power domain.  The potential techniques for enabling/improving network energy savings from various domains are evaluated and analysed, as documented in section 6.1- 6.4. Techniques description, performed evaluations and performance impact on selected KPIs including UPT, access delay, latency, UE power consumption, or on averaged energy efficiency etc., as well as legacy UE impact and specification impact are summarized therein. The relevant higher layer procedures and analysis for some techniques are also included in section 6.1. Other common aspects from higher layer are studied and the outcome is documented in section 6.5.  The study of time domain techniques can be summarized as follows.  Depending on factors such as selected baselines, BS categories, SLS configurations (including reference configurations, traffic models, number/periodicity of reference signals), scaling parameters, and UE profiles (including UE RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE/CONNECTED mode, DRX configurations), as well as conditions (such as gNB detection, gNB coordination, UE ability of synchronization) etc. and at zero/low load that is targeting NES scenario for time domain techniques,   * 3 sources show technique A-1-1 of simplified SSB without PBCH or with partial PBCH could achieve BS energy savings by 0.7%~30.49% [30] and 7.41% in average, * 2 sources show technique A-1-2 of skipping one or more of SSB/SIB1 transmission could achieve BS energy savings by 0.3%~25.4% and 8.05% in average, * 9 sources show technique A-1-3 of adapting the periodicity of SSB longer than 20ms up to 1280ms could achieve BS energy savings by 0.9%~84.8% and 30.9% in average, * 2 sources show technique A-1-4 of adapting Paging (by 1 source) or SSB transmission patterns (by 1 source), could achieve BS energy savings by 0.2%~42.3% and 15% in average for Paging enhancement or 10.3% for SSB enhancement, * 1 source shows technique A-1-5 of adapting RACH periodicity/occasions could achieve BS energy savings by 14.4%~24.9% and 20.6% in average, * 1 source shows technique A-1-6 of scheduling SIB1 by SSB could achieve BS energy savings by 4.8%~14.8% and 10.3% in average, * 5 sources show technique A-3-1 of UE WUS triggering gNB for SSB/SIB/RACH could achieve BS energy savings by 6.2%~80.7% and 35.57% in average while 1 source show technique A-3-2 of UE WUS triggering gNB for UL reception could achieve BS energy savings by 25.7%~93% and 67.86% in average, * 6 sources show technique A-4 of UE C-DRX alignment could achieve BS energy savings by 0.2%~71.4% and 27.7% in average, * 3 sources show technique A-5-2 of on-demand SSB/SIB1 could achieve BS energy savings by 2.6%~43.4% and 20.35% in average, * Except for technique A-3-2 of UE WUS triggering gNB for UL reception, the evaluation of other techniques is based on the baseline BS power model in Section 5, * Evaluation scheme of technique A-1-6 of scheduling SIB1 by SSB and technique A-3 of UE WUS matches the proposed technique while evaluation scheme of other techniques is not matching the proposed technique for all or part of sources, * Technique A-1-1 of simplified SSB, A-1-2 of skipping one or more of SSB/SIB1 transmission, A-1-6 of scheduling SIB1 by SSB, technique A-3-1 of UE WUS triggering gNB for SSB/SIB/RACH and technique A-5-2 of on-demand SSB/SIB1 can’t be supported in current spec/implementation while the result from other techniques may be achieved by legacy mechanism supported by current spec or implementation. * Technique A-1-4 of adapting Paging and technique A-1-5 of adapting RACH periodicity/occasions may be used in a cell where legacy UE can still use legacy Paging/RACH resources, while other techniques may be enabled for a carrier only when legacy UEs are not using the carrier, * Technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DTX/DRX is also studied in higher layer. From RAN2 perspective, technique A-4 is considered feasible and beneficial to align UE DRX with Cell DTX and DRX alignment among multiple UEs. * Technique A-3 of UE WUS is also discussed in higher layer and from RAN2 perspective, it is feasible if RAN1 agrees to support WUS, and details can be discussed in normative phase.   For techniques in frequency domain, the study can be summarized as follows.  Under various conditions,   * 8 sources show technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation could achieve BS energy savings by 0.3%~98.4% and 29.19% in average on the energy saving cell/carrier with 5.5%~18.9% BS energy increase on the associated cell/carrier, * 1 source shows technique B-1-2 of UE-group PCell switching could achieve BS energy savings by 37.5%, * 1 source shows technique B-2 of BWP adaptation of multiple UEs within a carrier could achieve BS energy savings by 17.4%~52.2% and 28.5% in average, * 3 source show technique B-3 of BW adaptation of multiple UEs within a BWP could achieve BS energy savings by up to 1.75%, * Evaluation of all techniques is based on the baseline BS power model in Section 5, * Evaluation scheme of technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation and technique B-3 of BW adaptation of multiple UEs within a BWP matches the proposed technique while evaluation scheme of other techniques is not matching the proposed technique for all or part of sources, * Technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation could achieve expected gain particularly at empty or low/light load, with no or minor UPT gain, while cannot be operated as PCell/PSCell for legacy UEs; technique B-1-2 and B-2 could provide expected gain at the expense of small to medium UPT loss, * Technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation and technique B-3 of BW adaptation of multiple UEs within a BWP can’t be supported in current spec/implementation while the result from other techniques may be achieved by legacy mechanism supported by current spec or implementation. * From RAN2 perspective, technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SCell without SSB in inter-band CA and NES cell without SSB/SIB may need more detailed study in normative phase with feasibility up to RAN1. From RAN2 perspective, techniques B-2 is not considered.   Based on the study and the above observations, from time and frequency domain,   * at least technique A-3-1 of UE WUS triggering gNB for SSB/SIB/RACH and A-4 of UE C-DRX alignment is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended, * at least techniques, A-1-3, A-5-1/B-1-1, A-5-2 and have the potential to provide large gain for network energy savings particularly at empty or low load, and could be potentially combined with each other based on some sources’ results, although it is understood that the gain is not linearly accumulated from each individual technique, e.g., * gNB may target network energy savings by A-5-1/B-1-1 without SSB/SIB1, or by A-1-3 with longer SSB periodicity with potential combination of A-3-1 of UE WUS triggering gNB * whether/which technique(s) to recommend is to be discussed in RAN plenary.   For techniques in spatial domain, over baseline of 32/64 TxRU for a gNB/TRP, the study can be summarized as follows,   * 12 sources show technique C-1 of adaptation of spatial elements could achieve BS energy savings by 0~48.2% and 19.02% in average with legacy UE co-existence, at the expense of small to medium negative impact on UPT/latency depending on further enhancement. 4 sources provide evaluation results for dynamic adaptation that matches the proposed technique while 9 sources provide evaluation result for static adaptation. * 3 sources show technique C-2 of TRP muting in multi-TRP operation could achieve BS energy savings by 19.7%~41.6% and 33.79% in average, at the expense of small to medium negative impact on UPT/latency etc. 1 source provide evaluation results for dynamic adaptation that matches the proposed technique while 2 sources provide evaluation result for static adaptation. * The result from both techniques may be achieved by legacy mechanism supported by current spec or implementation.   For techniques in power domain, the study can be summarized as follows,   * 10 source show technique D-1 of transmission power adaptation could achieve BS energy savings by 2.3%~51.5% with legacy UE co-existence, with small UPT loss/negative impact on latency/UE power consumption. 2 sources provide evaluation results for dynamic adaptation that matches the proposed technique while 8 sources provide evaluation result for static adaptation. * 1 source shows technique D-2 of over the air digital pre-distortion, technique D-3 of channel aware tone reservation, and technique D-5 of UE post-distortion, could achieve BS energy savings by 8.9%, by 2.1%~9.5%, and by 16.1% respectively, with no/negligible negative impact on UPT/UE power consumption. * The result from all techniques may be achieved by legacy mechanism supported by current spec or implementation.   Based on the study and the above observations, from spatial and power domain,   * at least a technique based on C-1 is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended. Technique C-2 has the potential to provide large network energy saving gain and could be potentially combined with technique C-1.   For other higher layer aspects for network energy savings, from their perspective, the study can be summarized as follows.   * It is feasible to handle legacy UEs and NES-capable UEs via cell (re-)selection techniques. It is also feasible and possible to enhance the CHO framework to handover UEs faster. * Group HO is not considered. * Inter-node beam activation and paging enhancement need more study in normative phase.   Based on the study, a means that can prevent legacy UEs from camping on NES cells (of which definition can be left to WI phase) by configurations, and/or allow NES-capable UEs to (down-)prioritize specific NES cell(s) on specific frequency, is needed. CHO enhancement for faster handover can be considered in WI phase.  The main updates are in the following aspects:   1. For time-domain techniques, energy saving gain is updated to zero or empty load since this is really targeting scenario for time-domain techniques; 2. Average energy saving gain is added for all evaluated technique or sub-techniques; 3. Adding observation on evaluation feasibility, whether the evaluation scheme and proposed technique matches, whether to have possible support by legacy mechanisms and etc. 4. Update the recommended technique based on the following rules:  * Number of sources providing evaluation is larger than 2 * Average ES gain is larger than 15% * Evaluation is based on baseline power model in Section 5 * Evaluation scheme and proposed technique matches for at least more than 2 sources   Besides, the recommended technique is better not to be supported by legacy mechanism and the feasibility is estimated by RAN2 if involved.  Based on the above guideline, technique A-3-1 of UE triggering SSB/SIB/RACH, technique A-4 of UE C-DRX alignment and technique C-1 of dynamic port selection are recommended.  Note the above updates are based on the following technique summary table:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Technique | No. Sources | ES gain (%) | | | Evaluation Feasibility | Evaluation scheme matching | UE impact | Possible support by legacy mechanism | RAN2 feasibility | | min | max | avg | | A-1-1 | 3 | 0.7 | 30.49 | 7.41 | Yes | Yes for 2 sources and No for 1 source  Proposed scheme is simplified version of SSB. However,  1 source reporting combined large gain from both only PSS and SSS transmitted from SSB, and half-reduced SIB1 transmission. | No evaluation | No | - | | A-1-2 | 2 | 0.3 | 25.4 | 8.05 | Yes | No for all sources  Proposed scheme is dynamic adaptation of SSB occasion. However,  performance of dynamic adaptation of SSB numbers is not provided | No evaluation | No | - | | A-1-3 | 9 | 0.9 | 84.8 | 30.9 | Yes | No for all sources  Proposed scheme is dynamic adaptation of SSB/SIB1 period. However,  performance of dynamic SSB/SIB1 periodicity adaptation is not provided. | No evaluation | Yes  The period of SSB/SIB1 can be adapted by SIB1 in current spec. | - | | A-1-4 | 2 | 0.5 | 42.3 | 14.48 | Yes | Unclear whether the proposed scheme is dynamic adaptation of paging resource  If so, the performance of dynamically adapting paging configurations is not provided. | No evaluation | Yes  Proper configuration may achieve to concentrate paging resource in one PF. | - | | A-1-5 | 1 | 14.4 | 24.9 | 20.6 | Yes | No for all sources  Performance of dynamic RACH configuration is not provided. | On UPT/access delay/latency, this scheme increases access delay/latency from 10ms to 70ms | Yes  The period of RACH can be adapted by SIB1 in current spec. | - | | A-1-6 | 1 | 4.8 | 14.8 | 10.3 | Yes | Yes | No evaluation | No | - | | A-2 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | A-3-1 WUS trigger SSB/SIB1/RACH | 5 | 6.2 | 80.7 | 35.57 | Yes | Yes | When WUS period is 20ms, marginal UPT loss, access delay/latency increment and UE power consumption increment are observed. | No | Yes | | A-3-2 WUS trigger UL reception | 1 | 25.7 | 93 | 67.86 | No gNB is assumed to be in a state such that the main UL receiver is still in deep sleep when detecting wake-up signal and gNB is able to wake up **from deep sleep to active in one slot** after WUS detection.  No RAN1 agreement of feasible power model for low power WUS detection | Yes | There is latency reduction observed | Yes  SR may be used as a kind of WUS with low power detection | Yes | | A-4 | 6 | 0.2 | 71.4 | 27.7 | Yes | Yes for UE C-DRX alignment scheme  No evaluation results for informing cell DTX/DRX to UE | one result shows there is marginal negative impact while one result shows it can be up to 15.5% | Yes  Proper RRC configuration/ reconfiguration can achieve cell DTX/DRX | Yes | | A-5-2  On-demand SSB/SIB1 | 3 | 2.6 | 43.4 | 20.35 | Yes | No for 2 sources  Proposed scheme is on demand SSB/SIB1. However, 2 sources evaluate zero load without any triggering of SIB1 transmission | Performance impact of on demand SSB/SIB was not provided. | No | - | | A-5-1/B-1-1  SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation | 8 | 0.3 | 98.4 | 29.19 | Yes | Yes | In most results for SSB and/or SIB saved from one carrier of two carriers, the UPT is not negatively impacted while one result shows slightly increased UPT. | No | RAN2 discussed but conclude that the feasibility is  left to RAN1 | | B-1-2  Dynamic Pcell switching | 1 | 37.5 | 37.5 | 37.5 | Yes | No  Baseline: Keep 2 CCs activated Enhancement: deactivate 1 CC and keep 1CC activated | UPT degrades by 14% if one Scell goes to dormant state. | Yes  Handover command can be used for Pcell switching in current spec | - | | B-2 | 1 | 17.4 | 52.2 | 28.5 | Yes | No  BWP switching delay is not modelled. | UPT loss by 28.4%~14.47%, and packet latency increases by 6.44%~39.4% | Yes  BWP switching can be done by DCI in current spec | - | | B-3 | 3 | -75.4 | 1.75 | -26.71 | Yes | Yes | significantly reduced UPT, and additionally reduced average EE | Yes  BWP bandwidth can be changed by RRC reconfiguration or BWP switching | - | | C-1 | 12 | 0.00 | 48.2 | 19.02 | Yes | Yes for 4 sources with dynamic adaptation  No for 8 sources with static adaptation only | UPT loss of 0.3%~18.5% observed | Yes  With CSI reports respect to different number of spatial elements available, gNB is able to dynamically adjust the number of spatial elements for PDSCH transmission in current specification. | - | | C-2 | 3 | 19.7 | 39 | 33.79 | Yes | Yes for 1 source with dynamic adaptation  No for 2 sources with static adaptation | UPT loss of 7.27%~28.7% | Yes  RRC reconfiguration can enable or disable one or more TRPs. | - | | D-1 | 10 | 2.3 | 40.5 | 16.08 | Yes | Yes for 2 sources  No for 8 sources  Proposed scheme is dynamic adaption of PDSCH power. However, 8 sources reports  semi-static power adaptation only. | UPT loss is observed from 2.03%~19.49% | Yes  Dynamic PDSCH power adaptation can be achieved in the following two legacy way:  1. UE reports CSI based on one PDSCH power offset and gNB implementation to estimate CSI for other PDSCH power;  2. gNB configures multiple CSI-RS with different power offset | - | | D-2 | 1 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 8.9 | No  Note PA scaling values used for this NW ES scheme are not covered by RAN1 power consumption scaling model. | No  Modeling of OTA information is not provided | On UPT/latency, no negative impact is observed. | Yes  gNB can implement DPD without OTA informaiton | - | | D-3 | 1 | 2.1 | 9.5 | 4.53 | No  Note PA scaling values used for this NW ES scheme are not covered by RAN1 power consumption scaling model. | No  Modeling of tone reservation is not modeled | On UPT/latency, no negative impact is observed. | Yes  Current legacy rate matching pattern may be used for tone reservation | - | | D-4 | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | D-5 | 1 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 16.1 | No  Note PA scaling values used for this NW ES scheme are not covered by RAN1 power consumption scaling model. | No  Modeling of UE complexity is not provided | On UPT or latency, there is no negative impact observed. | Yes  gNB can implement DPD without UE involvement to achieve PAPR reduction | - | |
| NOKIA/NSB | Regarding Chapter 7: Conclusion, we have the following revision proposal.  Network energy savings for NR have been studied for both FDD and TDD, both FR1 and FR2. Power model comprised of different BS power states/modes for BS power consumption is **~~generated~~ defined** in section 5 **for evaluation purposes** by using relative power, which **~~accommodates~~ includes different sleep and active states (including** DL transmission and UL reception**)**, and two types of BS categories. A scaling approach considering BS power split by a static part of power and a dynamic part of power is established for evaluation purpose, reflecting the relationship of BS power consumption with respect to transmission resources/configurations in time, frequency, spatial and power domain.  The potential techniques for enabling/improving network energy savings **~~from~~ in** various domains are evaluated and analysed, as documented in section 6.1- 6.4. Techniques description, performed evaluations and performance impact on selected KPIs including UPT, access delay, latency, UE power consumption, or on averaged energy efficiency etc., as well as legacy UE impact and specification impact are summarized therein. The relevant higher layer procedures and analysis for some techniques are also included in section 6.1. Other common aspects from higher layer are studied and the outcome is documented in section 6.5.  The study of time domain techniques can be summarized as follows**. [NOKIA:] The lists below cover only the ES gains of all investigated techniques, the UPT impact should be added for each technique to show a full picture.**  Depending on factors such as selected baselines, BS categories, SLS configurations (including reference configurations, traffic models, number/periodicity of reference signals), scaling parameters, and UE profiles (including UE RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE/CONNECTED mode, DRX configurations), as well as conditions (such as gNB detection, gNB coordination, UE ability of synchronization) etc.,   * 3 sources show technique A-1-1 of simplified SSB without PBCH or with partial PBCH could achieve BS energy savings by 0.7%~30.49% [30], * 2 sources show technique A-1-2 of skipping one or more of SSB/SIB1 transmission could achieve BS energy savings by 0.3%~25.4%, * 2 sources out of 9 sources show technique A-1-3 of adapting the periodicity of SSB longer than 160ms up to 1280ms could achieve BS energy savings by 3.4%~83.6%, * 2 sources show technique A-1-4 of adapting Paging (by 1 source) or SSB transmission patterns (by 1 source), could achieve BS energy savings by 0.2%~42.3% for Paging enhancement or 10.3% for SSB enhancement, * 1 source shows technique A-1-5 of adapting RACH periodicity/occasions could achieve BS energy savings by 14.4%~24.9%, * 1 source shows technique A-1-6 of scheduling SIB1 by SSB could achieve BS energy savings by 4.8%~14.8%, * 6 sources show technique A-3 of UE **sending uplink wake-up signal (**WUS) **to request a transmission / reception of a channel/signal from the ~~triggering~~** gNB could achieve BS energy savings by -2.4%~93%, **where using legacy signals/channel could already provide large part of the ES gain.** * 6 sources show technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DT/DRX could achieve BS energy savings by 0.2%~71.4%, * 3 sources show technique A-5-2 of on-demand SSB/SIB1 could achieve BS energy savings by 2.6%~43.4%, * Except for technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX, the gains from the above techniques are expected at the expense of increased negative impact on UPT/latency (including for legacy UEs), from small to relatively large as traffic increases, unless at empty load, * Technique A-1-4 of adapting Paging and technique A-1-5 of adapting RACH periodicity/occasions may be used in a cell where legacy UE can still use legacy Paging/RACH resources, while other techniques may be enabled for a carrier only when legacy UEs are not using the carrier, * Technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DT/DRX is also studied in higher layer. From RAN2 perspective, technique A-4 is considered feasible and beneficial to align UE DRX with Cell DTX and DRX alignment among multiple UEs.   For techniques in frequency domain, the study can be summarized as follows.  Under various conditions,   * 8 sources show technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation could achieve BS energy savings by 0.3%~98.4% on the energy saving cell/carrier with 5.5%~18.9% BS energy increase on the associated cell/carrier, * 1 source shows technique B-1-2 of UE-group PCell switching could achieve BS energy savings by 5.8%~37.5%, * 1 source shows technique B-2 of BWP adaptation of multiple UEs within a carrier could achieve BS energy savings by 17.4%~52.2%, * 3 source show technique B-3 of BW adaptation of multiple UEs within a BWP could achieve BS energy savings by up to 1.75%, * Technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation could achieve expected gain particularly at empty or low/light load, with no or minor UPT gain, while cannot be operated as PCell/PSCell for legacy UEs; technique B-1-2 and B-2 could provide expected gain at the expense of small to medium UPT loss, * From RAN2 perspective, technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SCell without SSB in inter-band CA and NES cell without SSB/SIB may need more detailed study in normative phase with feasibility up to RAN1. From RAN2 perspective, techniques B-2 is not considered.   Based on the study, from time and frequency domain,   * at least technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DT/DRX is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended, * at least techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-1-4 (for paging enhancement), A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1, A-5-2 and technique B-2 have the potential to provide large gain for network energy savings particularly at empty or low load, and could be potentially combined with each other based on some sources’ results, although it is understood that the gain is not linearly accumulated from each individual technique, e.g., * **For gNB targeting energy saving, A-1-1 and A-5-2 may be combined with technique A-3 (UE WUS) for network synchronization and demanding SSB/SIB1 transmission** * **gNB may target network energy savings by A-5-1/B-1-1 without SSB/SIB1~~, or by A-1-1 with simplified SSB, or~~** * **gNB may alternatively target network energy saving by A-1-3 with longer SSB periodicity,** * **~~technique A-3 of UE WUS can be enabled for demanding SSB/SIB1 as in techniques A-5-2, when needed, as a trigger on a gNB targeting energy saving,~~** * to support techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1 and/or A-5-2, potential feasibility/requirement confirmation from RAN4 is expected for proper synchronization/mobility/SCell (de-)activation, * whether/which technique(s) to recommend is to be discussed in RAN plenary.   For techniques in spatial domain, over baseline of 32/64 TxRU for a gNB/TRP, the study can be summarized as follows,   * 12 sources show technique C-1 of adaptation of spatial elements could achieve BS energy savings by 0~48.2% with legacy UE co-existence, at the expense of small to medium negative impact on UPT/latency depending on further enhancement. * 3 sources show technique C-2 of TRP muting in multi-TRP operation could achieve BS energy savings by 19.7%~41.6%, at the expense of small to medium negative impact on UPT/latency etc.   Based on the study, at least a technique based on C-1 is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended. Technique C-2 has the potential to provide large network energy saving gain and could be potentially combined with technique C-1.  For techniques in power domain, the study can be summarized as follows,   * **With transmission power reduction on PDSCH,** 10 source show technique D-1 of transmission power adaptation could achieve BS energy savings by 2.3%~51.5% with legacy UE co-existence, with small UPT loss/negative impact on latency/UE power consumption, * 1 source shows technique D-2 of over the air digital pre-distortion, technique D-3 of channel aware tone reservation, and technique D-5 of UE post-distortion, could achieve BS energy savings by 8.9%, by 2.1%~9.5%, and by 16.1% respectively, with no/negligible negative impact on UPT/UE power consumption.   Based on the study, at least a technique based on D-1 is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended.  For other higher layer aspects for network energy savings, from their perspective, the study can be summarized as follows.   * It is feasible to handle legacy UEs and NES-capable UEs via cell (re-)selection techniques. It is also feasible and possible to enhance the CHO framework to handover UEs faster. * Group HO is not considered. * Inter-node beam activation and paging enhancement need more study in normative phase.   Based on the study, a means that **one** can prevent legacy UEs from camping on NES cells (of which definition can be left to WI phase) **~~by configurations~~**, and/or allow NES-capable UEs to (down-)prioritize specific NES cell(s) on specific frequency, **is ~~are~~** needed **if any methods are specified that degrade legacy UE performance to operate in RRC\_IDLE/RRC\_INACTIVE states on corresponding cell**. CHO enhancement for faster handover can be considered in WI phase. |
| MTK1 | Thanks Rapporteur/Yi for integrating the quality TR. Below please find our suggested revisions:   * **On Session 7 Conclusions**:   + Last subbullet of 3rd paragraph: “align UE DRX with Cell DTX and DRX alignment …” looks a bit odd. Revision to the following can be clearer: “align UE DRX durations with Cell DTX and DRX ~~alignment~~ durations …”   + Recommendation for time and frequency domain: Since adaptation of UE DTX/DRX is to maximize BS DRX/DRX durations for NW ES benefit, the following revision is suggested: “A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX ~~toward~~ to maximize Cell DTX/DRX durations is beneficial …”   + Recommendation for time and frequency domain: As discussed during the meeting, for SSB-less SCell, RAN4 also needs to check synchronization including AGC. In this regard the following revision is suggested: “potential feasibility/requirement confirmation from RAN4 is expected for proper synchronization (including AGC)/mobility/SCell (de-)activation,” * **On Tables of evaluation results**:   + Since companies provide both absolute values or ‘loss in %’ for UPT/Latency/UE power consumption, it is useful to specify (%: loss w.r.t. baseline) so as to avoid confusion. Specifically, the following are suggested:   + Table 6.1.1.2-1: BS energy savings by simplified SSB: Revision of one column title as “UPT/access delay/latency/UE power consumption (%: loss w.r.t. baseline)”   + Table 6.1.1.2-3: BS energy savings by adapting SSB/SIB1 periodicities: Revision of one column title as “UPT/access delay/latency/UE power consumption (%: loss w.r.t. baseline)”   + Table 6.1.1.2-4: BS energy savings by adapting Paging/SSB transmission patterns: Revision of one column title as “UPT/access delay/latency/UE power consumption (%: loss w.r.t. baseline)”   + Table 6.1.1.2-5: BS energy savings by adapting RACH periodicity/occasions: Revision of one column title as “UPT/access delay/latency/UE power consumption (%: loss w.r.t. baseline)”   + Table 6.1.3.2-1: BS energy savings by UE wake up signal (WUS): Revisions on multiple column titles as: “UPT (%: loss)”, “Access delay/latency (%: increase)”, and “UE power consumption (%: increase)”   + Table 6.1.4.2-1: BS energy savings by adaptation of UE DTX/DRX: Revisions on multiple column titles as: “UPT (%: loss)” and “Access delay/latency/UE power consumption/Other KPI(s), if any; (%: increase)”     - After checking OPPO t-doc, R1-2211458, 1st and 3rd UPT results show ‘loss’ of 15.5% and thus -15.5% should be corrected to 15.5% to be consistent with OPPO’s 2nd and 4th UPT results (8.7% represents 8.7% loss in their t-doc).   + Table 6.2.1.2-1: (a) BS energy savings by multi-carrier enhancements for results submitted to frequency domain [8]: Revisions for the following     - vivo results: “UE power consumption increase: 0%”     - MTK results: “UPT loss: 0.00%; Access delay/latency increase: 0%; UE power consumption increase: 0%”     - Qualcomm results: UPT loss: 14%   + Table 6.2.2.2-1: BS energy savings by BWP adaptation within carrier: Revision of one column title as “KPI (%: loss w.r.t. baseline)”   + Table 6.3.1.2-1: BS energy savings by adaptation of spatial elements: Suggested revisions on OPPO results for consistency with other rows:     - UPT: 550Mbps (47.2% loss);     - UPT: 782.56Mbps (21.2% loss);   + Table 6.3.2.2-1: BS energy savings by TRP muting in multi-TRP operation: We cannot find current UPT loss numbers from [12], can Rapporteur help check?   + Table 6.4.1.2-1: BS energy savings by (dynamic) transmission power adaptation: Revision of one column title as “Other KPI (%: loss w.r.t. baseline)”     - Minor correction on typo for capturing Qualcomm results: “UPT loss at 50%-tile: 10%”   + Table 6.4.2.2-1: BS energy savings by over the air DPD: Suggested revision as “UPT loss: 0.00%, latency increase: 0%”   + Table 6.4.3.2-1: BS energy savings by Channel Aware Tone reservation: Suggested revision as “UPT loss: 0.00%, latency increase: 0%, UE power consumption increase: 0%”   + Table 6.4.5.2-1: BS energy savings by UE post-distortion: Suggested revision as “UPT loss: 0.00%, latency increase: 0%” |
| Intel | For B-3, results of the 1 of the sources were miss-characterized in the conclusion.  >>Yi:done.  On the issue for combining different techniques. We suggest leave out whether techniques are recommended to be combined or not from the conclusion. Such aspects can be discussed in RAN Plenary, and conclusion should simply provide a list of potential recommendations. Combining different techniques as part of the recommendation was not part of any discussions during the meeting, and we suggest to keep the conclusion simple.  Lastly, we suggest leaving out any text that state, “can be considered in WI phase”. While we are actually supportive of CHO enhancements for NWES. This is something that should be discussed in RAN Plenary as part of the WID scoping, and really has nothing to do with the recommendation.  We suggest the following edits/changes:  ========== start of changes ============  **7 Conclusions**  *<omitted unchanged text>*   * 6 sources show technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards achieving Cell DTX/DRX could achieve BS energy savings by 0.2%~71.4%,   *<omitted unchanged text>*   * 2~~3~~ source show technique B-3 of BW adaptation of multiple UEs within a BWP could achieve BS energy savings by up to 1.75%, and 1 source shows BW reduction technique results in negative energy saving gains (i.e. energy consumption increase) up to 75.4%.   *<omitted unchanged text>*   * at least technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards achieving Cell DTX/DRX is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended,   >>Yi:revised as multiple companies having comments.  *<omitted unchanged text>*   * at least techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-1-4 (for paging enhancement), A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1, A-5-2 and technique B-2 have the potential to provide large gain for network energy savings particularly at empty or low load.~~, and could be potentially combined with each other based on some sources’ results, although it is understood that the gain is not linearly accumulated from each individual technique, e.g.,~~   + ~~gNB may target network energy savings by A-5-1/B-1-1 without SSB/SIB1, or by A-1-1 with simplified SSB, or by A-1-3 with longer SSB periodicity,~~   + ~~technique A-3 of UE WUS can be enabled for demanding SSB/SIB1 as in techniques A-5-2, when needed, as a trigger on a gNB targeting energy saving,~~   + ~~to support techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1 and/or A-5-2, potential feasibility/requirement confirmation from RAN4 is expected for proper synchronization/mobility/SCell (de-)activation,~~   + ~~whether/which technique(s) to recommend is to be discussed in RAN plenary.~~   >>Yi: simplified as email discussed, but promote a high level recommendation with keeping a discussion point for RAN plenary.  *<omitted unchanged text>*  Based on the study, at least a technique based on C-1 is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended. Technique C-2 has the potential to provide large network energy saving gain ~~and could be potentially combined with technique C-1~~.  >>Yi:done  *<omitted unchanged text>*  Based on the study, a means that can prevent legacy UEs from camping on ~~NES~~ cells ~~(of which definition can be left to WI phase)~~ that perform network energy saving (NES) by configurations, and/or allow NES-capable UEs to (down-)prioritize specific ~~NES~~ cell(s) on specific frequency, is needed. CHO enhancement for faster handover is feasible in the context of switching network energy saving features in a cell ~~can be considered in WI phase~~.  ========== End of changes ============  >>Yi: as email commented, RAN2 said “NES cell definition will be discussed in WI”. |
| Samsung | #1) In section 5.1, to be clear and align the definitions of **Sa** for both DL and UL, we would like to revise as below:  [Section 5.1]   * is a dynamic part of power for BS in active, which is scaled based on reference configuration.   + - Baseline: , where ,, is the fraction of active TRxRUs, the ratio between the RF bandwidth and the maximum system BW, and the ratio of PSD per TxRU between the DL transmission and reference configuration, respectively.   …   * + is a dynamic part of power for BS in active, which is scaled based on reference configuration, and is the fraction ~~percentage~~ of active TRxRUs.   #2) In section 7, the ESG value of technique D-1 was not updated while already reflected in section 6.4.1. Suggest corresponding update in section 7as follows:  [Section 7]  For techniques in power domain, the study can be summarized as follows,   * 10 source show technique D-1 of transmission power adaptation could achieve BS energy savings by 2.3%~51.6~~5~~% with legacy UE co-existence, with small UPT loss/negative impact on latency/UE power consumption,   #3) Regarding the newly added results for tech A-1-1 in section 7, we think it should have consistency between section 6.1.1.2 and section 7. If the group is OK to add the results, we suggest to update both section 6.1.1.2 and section 7. In addition, remove the reference in section 7 as below:  [Section 7]   * ~~3~~4 sources show technique A-1-1 of simplified SSB without PBCH or with partial PBCH could achieve BS energy savings by 0.7%~30.49% ~~[30],~~   #4) In section 7, scheme 2 of A-3 is not captured (while it is already captured in section 6.1.3.1). We suggest the following update:  [Section 7]  Based on the study, from time and frequency domain,   * at least technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DT/DRX is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended, * at least techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-1-4 (for paging enhancement), A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1, A-5-2 and technique B-2 have the potential to provide large gain for network energy savings particularly at empty or low load, and could be potentially combined with each other based on some sources’ results, although it is understood that the gain is not linearly accumulated from each individual technique, e.g., * gNB may target network energy savings by A-5-1/B-1-1 without SSB/SIB1, or by A-1-1 with simplified SSB, or by A-1-3 with longer SSB periodicity, * technique A-3 of UE WUS can be enabled for demanding SSB/SIB1 as in techniques A-5-2, when needed, as a trigger on a gNB targeting energy saving, technique A-3 can also be used to trigger gNB to wake up with technique A-4, * to support techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1 and/or A-5-2, potential feasibility/requirement confirmation from RAN4 is expected for proper synchronization/mobility/SCell (de-)activation, * whether/which technique(s) to recommend is to be discussed in RAN plenary. |
| Fraunhofer | In the conclusions section, the description of "A-5-1/B-1-1" is a bit unclear, as the energy saving gains are hardly comparable with other techniques (the results are broken down between ES carrier and anchor carrier and there is no equivalent in other techniques). We suggest the following change: "  For techniques in frequency domain, the study can be summarized as follows.  Under various conditions,   * The overall gain of A-5-1/B-1-1 depends on the number of carriers on deployment and signals transmitted or received at ES carriers as well as the remaining carriers. 8 sources show technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation could achieve BS energy savings by 0.3%~98.4% on the energy saving cell/carrier, which translates to an overall gain of 0.15% ~ 49.2% gain in a 2 carrier deployment. In a deployment with more carriers a larger energy saving gain is possible. If more information needs to be transmitted at the anchor carrier the same 8 sources show a 5.5%~18.9% BS energy increase on the associated cell/carrier"   >>Yi: see revisions and zte comment.  Regarding common signals adaptation, we believe it is well understood that such methods provide high energy saving gains and, therefore, are important to achieve the objectives set for this study item. The gains are highlighted but we think the recommendation is not clear enough. We suggest to make it more clear:   * “at least techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-1-4 (for paging enhancement), A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1, A-5-2 and technique B-2 have the potential to provide large gain for network energy savings particularly at empty or low load, and could be potentially combined with each other based on some sources’ results, although it is understood that the gain is not linearly accumulated from each individual technique, e.g., * gNB may target network energy savings by A-5-1/B-1-1 without SSB/SIB1, or by A-1-1 with simplified SSB, or by A-1-3 with longer SSB periodicity, * technique A-3 of UE WUS can be enabled for demanding SSB/SIB1 as in techniques A-5-2, when needed, as a trigger on a gNB targeting energy saving, * to support techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1 and/or A-5-2, potential feasibility/requirement confirmation from RAN4 is expected for proper synchronization/mobility/SCell (de-)activation, * In light of the potential large energy savings, adaptations of common signals are recommended. Which technique(s) to recommend is to be discussed in RAN plenary.   “  >>Yi: done.  At last, but not least, there is no clear recommendation regarding the mitigation of impacts of Network energy saving techniques. We believe such recommendation to be of great importance to the RAN plenary to define a valuable work Item scope which will lead to practical and effective NES techniques. We suggest to add the recommendation when the impacts are mentioned:   * “Except for technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX, the gains from the above techniques are expected at the expense of increased negative impact on UPT/latency (including for legacy UEs), from small to relatively large as traffic increases, unless at empty load, * Technique A-1-4 of adapting Paging and technique A-1-5 of adapting RACH periodicity/occasions may be used in a cell where legacy UE can still use legacy Paging/RACH resources, while other techniques may be enabled for a carrier only when legacy UEs are not using the carrier, * As most of the studied techniques have some performance impact, it is recommended that the normative phase includes not only energy saving techniques but also the mitigation of their impacts. The normative phase should address, for example, improved initial access (initial cell selection and access procedure), evaluation of measurement performance and increased UE power consumption when the network apply Network Energy Savings.   “  >>Yi: perhaps can be simplified and more generic to all techniques, so added in the end of conclusion part. |
| Futurewei | Thanks for the proposed text on the Conclusion. On your criteria when drafting the Conclusion, we have slightly different views on Criteria #2 and #3 in your email. A single company proposal and results can also mean that the results could not be verified and the support for such the scheme is not there in the first place. However, we are fine to capturing the results from these techniques. On #3, we feel the combination usability of different techniques should be left to network implementation and should be a selection criterion.  We have some suggestions on the existing proposed texts:   * On the Time domain techniques, the last two items do not belong in the same category of description. We see all the bullets are capturing the summary of evaluation results but the last two is more of ‘observations.’. The other techniques also contain its own valuable observations, not just the last two bullets. Suggestion is to remove these two bullets: * ~~Except for technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX, the gains from the above techniques are expected at the expense of increased negative impact on UPT/latency (including for legacy UEs), from small to relatively large as traffic increases, unless at empty load,~~ * ~~Technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DT/DRX is also studied in higher layer. From RAN2 perspective, technique A-4 is considered feasible and beneficial to align UE DRX with Cell DTX and DRX alignment among multiple UEs.~~ * On this sentence, “whether/which technique(s) to recommend is to be discussed in RAN plenary,” our view is that such sentence is not needed to be included in the TR as it is expected that RAN would take the TR in the consideration when approving the WI. So, we suggest to remove the sentence. Instead, the texts can be structured in the following manner, and we believe it is still providing sufficient information for decision to be made in the Plenary:   …  Based on the study, from time and frequency domain,   * ~~at least~~ technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DT/DRX is beneficial for network energy savings~~, and can be recommended~~, * ~~at least~~ techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-1-4 (for paging enhancement), A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1, A-5-2 and technique B-2 have the potential to provide large gain for network energy savings particularly at empty or low load, and could be potentially combined with each other based on some sources’ results, although it is understood that the gain is not linearly accumulated from each individual technique, e.g., * gNB may target network energy savings by A-5-1/B-1-1 without SSB/SIB1, or by A-1-1 with simplified SSB, or by A-1-3 with longer SSB periodicity, * technique A-3 of UE WUS can be enabled for demanding SSB/SIB1 as in techniques A-5-2, when needed, as a trigger on a gNB targeting energy saving, * to support techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1 and/or A-5-2, potential feasibility/requirement confirmation from RAN4 is expected for proper synchronization/mobility/SCell (de-)activation, * ~~whether/which technique(s) to recommend is to be discussed in RAN plenary.~~   …  Similar structure can be adopted to the other techniques as well.  >>Yi: as more concern raised for DTX, recommendation is removed but keep ‘beneficial’. Same as D-1. Recommendation for C-1 is kept.  As for the ‘plenary discussion’ part, it might be good to keep it as a discussion point to avoid the impression that nothing can be recommended. |
| LG Electronics | Several initial comments:   1. **For the title of Section 6.1.5, we suggest to remove “including on-demand SSB/SIB1” since Technique A-5 includes 2 sub-techniques.**   Technique A-5 adaptation of SSB/SIB1   1. **In our view, it should be clarified that Techniques B-1-1 and Technique A-5-1 are differentiated in terms of whether a UE is configured with CA (i.e., Technique B-1-1) or non-CA (i.e., Technique A-5-1). With this regard, SCell without SSB in inter-band CA (RAN2) in Section 6.1.6 falls into Technique B-1-1 and NES Cell without SIB/SSB (RAN2) in Section falls into Technique A-1-5.** 2. **For the title of Table 6.2.1.2-1 (a) and (b), we suggest the following modification.**   Table 6.2.1.2-1: (a) BS energy savings by multi-carrier enhancements for results submitted to Technique B-1-1  (b) BS energy savings by multi-carrier enhancements for results submitted to Technique A-5-1   1. **For Section 6.3.1.2, we have one editorial comment.**   On UE power consumption, 2 sources show that there is increase by up to 79.99% (when number of TX RU is reduced from 64 to 8).   1. **“CHO” can be added in Section 3.3 Abbreviations.** 2. **For conclusion, our comments are shown below.**   The study of time domain techniques can be summarized as follows.  Depending on factors such as selected baselines, BS categories, SLS configurations (including reference configurations, traffic models, number/periodicity of reference signals), scaling parameters, and UE profiles (including UE RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE/CONNECTED mode, DRX configurations), as well as conditions (such as gNB detection, gNB coordination, UE ability of synchronization) etc.,   * 3 sources show technique A-1-1 of simplified SSB without PBCH or with partial PBCH could achieve BS energy savings by 0.7%~30.49% [30], * 2 sources show technique A-1-2 of skipping one or more of SSB/SIB1 transmission could achieve BS energy savings by 0.3%~25.4%, * 2 sources out of 9 sources show technique A-1-3 of adapting the periodicity of SSB longer than 160ms up to 1280ms could achieve BS energy savings by 3.4%~83.6%, * 2 sources show technique A-1-4 of adapting Paging (by 1 source) or SSB transmission patterns (by 1 source), could achieve BS energy savings by 0.2%~42.3% for Paging enhancement or 10.3% for SSB enhancement, * 1 source shows technique A-1-5 of adapting RACH periodicity/occasions could achieve BS energy savings by 14.4%~24.9%, * 1 source shows technique A-1-6 of scheduling SIB1 by SSB could achieve BS energy savings by 4.8%~14.8%, * 6 sources show technique A-3 of UE WUS triggering gNB could achieve BS energy savings by -2.4%~93%, * 6 sources show technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DT/DRX could achieve BS energy savings by 0.2%~71.4%, * 3 sources show technique A-5-2 of on-demand SSB/SIB1 could achieve BS energy savings by 2.6%~43.4%, * Except for technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX, the gains from the above techniques are expected at the expense of increased negative impact on UPT/latency (including for legacy UEs), from small to relatively large as traffic increases, unless at empty load, * Technique A-1-4 of adapting Paging and technique A-1-5 of adapting RACH periodicity/occasions may be used in a cell where legacy UE can still use legacy Paging/RACH resources, while other techniques may be enabled for a carrier only when legacy UEs are not using the carrier, * Technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DT/DRX is also studied in higher layer. From RAN2 perspective, technique A-4 is considered feasible and beneficial to align UE DRX with Cell DTX and DRX alignment among multiple UEs.   For techniques in frequency domain, the study can be summarized as follows.  Under various conditions,   * 8 sources show technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation could achieve BS energy savings by 0.3%~98.4% on the energy saving cell/carrier with 5.5%~18.9% BS energy increase on the associated cell/carrier, * 1 source shows technique B-1-2 of UE-group PCell switching could achieve BS energy savings by 5.8%~37.5%, * 1 source shows technique B-2 of BWP adaptation of multiple UEs within a carrier could achieve BS energy savings by 17.4%~52.2%, * 3 source show technique B-3 of BW adaptation of multiple UEs within a BWP could achieve BS energy savings by up to 1.75%, * Technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation could achieve expected gain particularly at empty or low/light load, with no or minor UPT gain, while cannot be operated as PCell/PSCell for legacy UEs; technique B-1-2 and B-2 could provide expected gain at the expense of small to medium UPT loss, * From RAN2 perspective, technique A-5-1/B-1-1 of SCell without SSB in inter-band CA and NES cell without SSB/SIB may need more detailed study in normative phase with feasibility up to RAN1. From RAN2 perspective, techniques B-2 is not considered.   Based on the study, from time and frequency domain,   * at least technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DT/DRX is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended, * at least techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-1-4 (for paging enhancement), A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1, A-5-2 and technique B-2 have the potential to provide large gain for network energy savings particularly at empty or low load, and could be potentially combined with each other based on some sources’ results, although it is understood that the gain is not linearly accumulated from each individual technique, e.g., * gNB may target network energy savings by A-5-1/B-1-1 without SSB/SIB1, or by A-1-1 with simplified SSB, or by A-1-3 with longer SSB periodicity, * technique A-3 of UE WUS can be enabled for demanding SSB/SIB1 as in techniques A-5-2, when needed, as a trigger on a gNB targeting energy saving, * to support techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1 and/or A-5-2, potential feasibility/requirement confirmation from RAN4 is expected for proper synchronization/mobility/SCell (de-)activation, * whether/which technique(s) to recommend is to be discussed in RAN plenary.   For techniques in spatial domain, over baseline of 32/64 TxRU for a gNB/TRP, the study can be summarized as follows,   * 12 sources show technique C-1 of adaptation of spatial elements could achieve BS energy savings by 0~48.2% with legacy UE co-existence, at the expense of small to medium negative impact on UPT/latency depending on further enhancement. * 3 sources show technique C-2 of TRP muting in multi-TRP operation could achieve BS energy savings by 19.7%~41.6%, at the expense of small to medium negative impact on UPT/latency etc.   Based on the study, at least a technique based on C-1 is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended. Technique C-2 has the potential to provide large network energy saving gain and could be potentially combined with technique C-1.  For techniques in power domain, the study can be summarized as follows,   * 10 source show technique D-1 of transmission power adaptation could achieve BS energy savings by 2.3%~51.5% with legacy UE co-existence, with small UPT loss/negative impact on latency/UE power consumption, * 1 source shows technique D-2 of over the air digital pre-distortion, technique D-3 of channel aware tone reservation, and technique D-5 of UE post-distortion, could achieve BS energy savings by 8.9%, by 2.1%~9.5%, and by 16.1% respectively, with no/negligible negative impact on UPT/UE power consumption.   Based on the study, at least a technique based on D-1 is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended. |
| DOCOMO | Thanks for the @VIVO to provide the summary table for each technique in the last of the input. But for the input on “Possible support by legacy mechanism” in the table, we think that it is not the truth at least for C-1 and D-1.  For C-1, current specification supports “With CSI reports respect to different number of spatial elements available”, but it cannot support the dynamic spatial adaptation. Following shows one example.  For example, gNB is capable with max. 8 ports and configurate UE for 2/4/8 port CSI-RS with different CSI-RS report configuration for measurement and reporting. If gNB turns off some spatial elements and goes into NWES mode with 2 ports, UE cannot measure 4/8 port CSI-RS at that time. In this case, enhancement for C-1 is needed obviously.  For D-1, for the first mechanism of “1. UE reports CSI based on one PDSCH power offset and gNB implementation to estimate CSI for other PDSCH power”, we argue that based on one PDSCH power offset, gNB could not precisely estimate the RI (even PMI/CQI) for other PDSCH power offsets. We can understand that UE may report high rank (e.g. rank=4) in case of high gNB PDSCH power level or low rank (e.g. rank=1) in case of low gNB PDSCH power level. If UE only report CSI assuming high gNB PDSCH power level, it is hard for gNB to estimate the precise RI, corresponding PMI, as well as the CQI for much lower power levels. Significant performance degradation will be observed.  For the second mechanism of “2. gNB configures multiple CSI-RS with different power offset”, as there may be multiple power offsets to achieve dynamic power adaptation, it will obviously increase the effort of UE CSI measurement and payload size of CSI reporting.  Based on above argument, legacy mechanism could not support dynamic power adaptation well, thus enhancement for D-1 is needed. |
| Apple | Some high level comments:   * We prefer not to have the average energy saving included, as the average numbers can be misleading sometimes depending on the number of sources and the cases being evaluated. * We also think the other impact (other than network energy saving gain) should be included as part of the conclusion, as otherwise RAN plenary may simply take the conclusion and decide the WID scope solely based on the network energy saving gain. This of course should be avoided. * For the combination of the techniques, we think it is important to point out that A-3 is not a standalone technique, and it needs to be used to assist other techniques. * For Technique A-4, it should be described as adaptation of cell DTX/DRX in general, which may include UE DTX/DRX adaptation. This is aligned with the description of A-4, and it is also what has been studied in RAN2. The network energy saving is achieved through cell DTX/DRX. Alignment of UE DTX/DRX with cell DTX/DRX may mitigate the impact on UE performance, but it can be achieved in legacy system already (maybe with larger signaling overhead). Therefore, we suggest the following changes: * “6 sources show technique A-4 of adaptation of cell DTX/DRX with alignment of UE DTX/DRX could achieve BS energy savings by 0.2%~71.4%, * … * Except for technique A-4 of adaptation of cell DTX/DRX, the gains from the above techniques are expected at the expense of increased negative impact on UPT/latency (including for legacy UEs), from small to relatively large as traffic increases, unless at empty load, * Technique A-1-4 of adapting Paging and technique A-1-5 of adapting RACH periodicity/occasions may be used in a cell where legacy UE can still use legacy Paging/RACH resources, while other techniques may be enabled for a carrier only when legacy UEs are not using the carrier, * Technique A-4 of adaptation of Cell DTX/DRX is also studied in higher layer. From RAN2 perspective, technique A-4 is considered feasible and it is also beneficial to align UE DRX with Cell DTX and DRX alignment among multiple UEs.”   >>Yi: done in an alternative way for RAN1 part. Keep ‘cell’ as it is used in RAN2.  The following sentence should be removed, as the necessity may depend on what techniques are to be specified. If the specified techniques allow the support of legacy UEs, it may not be needed.  “”  On CHO enhancements, we suggest the following:  “CHO enhancement for faster handover can be considered in WI phase, if time allows.”  It is also fine to remove the sentence.  >>Yi: removed.  On the RAN1 recommendations, we are generally fine with A-4 (assuming it is modified to adaptation of cell DTX/DRX) and C-1. We have some reservations on the remaining techniques. Note that we should also be cautious on the workload in WI phase. Since it can be very difficult to converge with email discussions, we would prefer to leave it for further discussion in RAN plenary.  >>Yi: removed recommendation but keep ‘benefical’. |
| CMCC | As to the average gain, we share similar view as FL that the baseline and ES schemes are different among evaluation results of companies, so taking average seems not fair although it provides a simple way to compare schemes.  For the number of sources, they can be a reference for determining recommended techniques.  >>Yi: number of ref kept.  For the recommendation part of time and frequency domain as following, we understand the motivation of FL is to give some feasible classification of technologies, and this is useful since we are now making conclusion and should provide useful information for RAN plenary.  The first subbullet is for gNB multi-carrier operation, and we share similar view as LGE in the email that A-5-1 is for non-CA UE operation during the study phase. However, we are fine to classify them into multi-carrier schemes, where power saving is mainly from non-anchor carrier(energy saving carrier) without SSB/SIB1 or only with PSS/SSS for synchronization, and these non-anchor carrier can be used as serving cell of non-CA UEs or as SCell of CA UEs. Both non-CA and CA case depends on assistance information from anchor carrier. Time domain schemes that provides significant gain of course can be applied to non-anchor carrier, such as A-1-1 and A-1-3. We are generally fine with this bullet.  For A-1-1 and A-1-3 with only simplified SSB or larger periodicity than traditional values, if they are applied to gNB single carrier operation, they may not applied standalone, combined with A-3/A-5-2 is necessary to provide full function of one gNB. We have some small modification for this.  ----------------------------   * at least techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-1-4 (for paging enhancement), A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1, A-5-2 and technique B-2 have the potential to provide large gain for network energy savings particularly at empty or low load, and could be potentially combined with each other based on some sources’ results, although it is understood that the gain is not linearly accumulated from each individual technique, e.g.,   + gNB may target network energy savings by A-5-1/B-1-1 without SSB/SIB1, or by A-1-1 with simplified SSB, or by A-1-3 with longer SSB periodicity,   + technique A-3 of UE WUS can be enabled for demanding SSB/SIB1 as in techniques A-5-2, when needed, as a trigger on a gNB targeting energy saving, such as with A-1-1, A-1-3, or A-3,   + to support techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1 and/or A-5-2, potential feasibility/requirement confirmation from RAN4 is expected for proper synchronization/mobility/SCell (de-)activation,   + whether/which technique(s) to recommend is to be discussed in RAN plenary.   >>Yi: combination is simplified, see email. |
| ZTE, Sanechips, | 1. We agree with vivo’s intention that average value may provide more information about the PS gain. However, since the evaluation assumptions including BS category, traffic load, etc., are not the same among companies, it is not clear whether this kind of average operation makes sense. Therefore, we think the average values in the conclusion part is not needed. 2. As to the following description of WUS, we think it is better to align the term with observation part, since technique A-3-1 also triggers RO, which is UL reception, too.  * while 1 source shows technique A-3-2 of UE WUS triggering gNB ~~for UL reception (~~to wake up in case of uplink traffic arrival could achieve BS energy savings by 25.7%~93% in range and 67.86% in average, * Except for technique A-3-2 of UE WUS triggering gNB ~~for UL reception (~~to wake up in case of uplink traffic arrival , the evaluation of other techniques is based on the baseline BS power model in Section 5,   >>Yi: done.   1. As to the following bullet, and other descriptions relevant to higher layer, we think it should be left to RAN2/3.  * Technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX towards Cell DTX/DRX is also studied in higher layer. From RAN2 perspective, technique A-4 is considered feasible and beneficial to align UE DRX durations with Cell DTX and DRX durations among multiple UEs.   >>Yi: it is copied from RAN2/RAN3. The conclusion part should include all WGs.   1. As to the highlights in the following paragraph, it is noticed that 2. Some companies, like Intel, already provides ES gain for two carriers in their evaluations. Further average for two carriers may not correct at least for the results provided by these companies. 3. The ES gain from other solutions is per carrier. Same rule should be applied to technique A-5-1/B-1-1 families. Therefore, the highlights are not needed.   Moreover, we think the information refers to system information.  8 sources show technique A-5-1 for non-CA/B-1-1 for CA of SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation could achieve BS energy savings by 0.3%~98.4% in range and 29.19% in average on the energy saving cell/carrier, ~~which translates to an overall gain of 0.15% ~ 49.2% gain in a 2-carrier deployment~~ and if more information, such as system information, needs to be transmitted at the anchor carrier then 2.3%~18.9% BS energy increases on the associated cell/carrier,  >>Yi: done.   1. As to the following bullet, since RAN1 only evaluates semi-static C-DRX alignment, which is actually can be done via gNB implementation, it doesn’t need efforts in WI phase.  * at least technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX is beneficial for network energy savings~~, and can be recommended,~~   >>Yi: done.   1. As to the following bullet, the scope of adaptation of common channels/signals is not clear. For example, SSB-less/SIB-less doesn’t necessarily to be “adaptation”. The following is suggested.   In light of the potential large energy savings, adaptations/reduction/elimination of common channels/signals are recommended. Which technique(s) to recommend is to be discussed in RAN plenary. At least techniques A-1-1, A-1-3, A-1-4 (for paging enhancement), A-3, A-5-1/B-1-1, A-5-2 and technique B-1 ~~B-2~~ have the potential to provide large gain for network energy savings particularly at empty or low load, and could be potentially combined with each other based on some sources’ results, although it is understood that the gain is not linearly accumulated from each individual technique  >>Yi: done. B-2 is not typo.   1. The combination of technique C-2 with C-1 has not be sufficiently discussed yet. The following highlights are suggested to remove before it is commonly understood.   Technique C-2 has the potential to provide large network energy saving gain ~~and could be potentially combined with technique C-1~~.  >>Yi: done.   1. For the power domain, we think there are lots of similarities with spatial domain, the combination with spatial domain can be considered.   Based on the study, at least a technique based on D-1 is beneficial for network energy savings, and can be recommended.  >>Yi: there are concerns from two companies, so recommendation is removed.   1. For the power domain, we think there are lots of similarities with spatial domain, the combination with spatial domain can be considered. 2. For the following bullets, it seems also RAN2 expertise. The following is suggested.   Based on the study, a means that one can prevent legacy UEs from camping on NES cells (of which definition can be left to WI phase), and/or allow NES-capable UEs to (down-)prioritize specific NES cell(s) on specific frequency, is needed, which is left to the WI phase depending on whether the existing mechanism for cell (re)selection is sufficient according to the NES techniques specified.  >>Yi: done.   1. Thanks Yi for the careful check and correction of our results. The following is suggested since the UL traffic is only evaluated for cat2 BS, otherwise, the last sentence is problematic if we put it together with the first part. And the additional PS gain value should be updated as 24.2%, instead of 33.3%.  * for CA, one source shows, BS energy saving gain can be 80.4%~97.4% at empty load, 6.1%~72.7% at low load for DL traffic, or 18.7%~39.4% at low load for UL traffic compared with baseline of SSB periodicity of {20ms, 80ms, 160ms}. The BS energy saving gain from SSB-less cell with UL traffic is 12.6%~24.2% ~~33.3%~~ larger than SSB-less cell with DL traffic for BS category 2.   >>Yi: done.  One more typo in the following value, it should be 2.3%, not 2%. Thanks.  With SIB-less only from one of two carriers and SSB is still transmitted,   * one source shows BS energy saving gain can be 3.3%~40.7% compared with baseline of SSB+SIB periodicity of {20ms+20ms, 80ms+80ms, 160ms+160ms} for anchor cell and non-anchor cell; meanwhile, the SIB1 carried on another carrier increase the energy of that carrier by 2.3% ~~2.0%~~~17.8%, resulting a total saving across two carries by 1% ~~1.3%~~~22.9%;   >>Yi: done. |
| FL | See reply above with >>Yi: |
| ZTE, Sanechips | A minor comment. The lower bound of power domain adaptation is 2.3%, instead of 3.9%.  With semi-static power reduction of 3~18dB in 6 sources and two other sources, compared to a baseline without power reduction, network energy saving can be achieved by 2.3% 3.9%~51.6%, |
| CEWiT | We share similar view as FL, CMCC and Apple for the average gain, that the baseline and ES schemes are different among evaluation results of companies, so taking average seems not fair to compare schemes.  For the number of sources, they should not be a reference for determining recommended techniques since it may cause loosing of some techniques with great potential of energy saving gain. |
| QCOM | Below are our additional comments:   * 8 sources show technique A-5-1 for non-CA/B-1-1 for CA of SSB- and/or SIB1-less operation could achieve BS energy savings by 0.3%~98.4% in range on the energy saving cell/carrier and if more information, such as system information, needs to be transmitted at the anchor carrier then 2.3%~18.9% BS energy increases on the associated cell/carrier, meanwhile the UPT/UE power consumption is not negatively impacted while 1 source shows slightly increased UPT and 1 source shows reduced SCell activation delay, assuming UE sync is based on SSB from anchor carrier and UE measurement is not considered,   + A gNB implementing this cannot be operated as PCell/PSCell for legacy UEs.   + For SSB-less and/or SIB1-less operation in non-CA, comparison to CA is not provided   >>Yi: done but revised. The proposed suggestion is a bit different so the agreed observation is used.  < omitted >   * >>Yi: removed “recommend” and plenary discussion point but consider it is beneficial. |
| CATT | 1. Technique A- 1-3: The range of power saving gain for the SSB periodicity below 160 ms should be captured explicitly.   The following show the BS energy savings by technique A-1-3, i.e. configuration/adaptation of longer periodicity of common signals and/or uplink random access opportunities.  Based on the results with static configurations from 9 sources, it can be observed that longer SSB/SIB1 periodicity can bring BS with significant energy savings with gains up to 84.8% in most cases, compared to a selected baseline, for both BS Categories, under all reference configurations. When other configurations/settings are the same, the saving gain generally increase as the periodicity becomes larger, and decrease as the traffic load increases or the number of SSBs increases.  >>Yi: done.   1. Section 6.1.4.2 Technique A-4 Adaptation of DTX/DRX   The following captures the results for adaptation of UE/gNB DTX/DRX.  Table 6.1.4.2-1: BS energy savings by adaptation of UE/gNB DTX/DRX  >>Yi: let's settle this only in conclusion part.   1. Section 6.2.1.2, it seems that CATT’s results of dynamic activation of SCell SSB/SIB1 was not captured in the observation.   >>Yi: I assume the “Multi-carrier energy savings enhancements” is in the range of the current gain.   1. Section 6.3.1, CATT’s results are based on multiple CSI reports. Thus, the suggestion of revision of observation is as follows,   With dynamic/semi-static adaptation of spatial elements,  - ~~One~~ two sources show~~s~~ that BS energy saving for UE specific PDSCH for FR1 can be achieved by 3.4%~19.~~2~~6% with dynamic adaptation and multi-CSI, compared to dynamic adaptation of spatial elements with single CSI report. The UPT loss was observed by less than 10%;  >>Yi: It seems CATT results are compared with no adaptation case so it belongs the second, is it? Then it is already in the currently range.   * *One source shows that BS energy saving for UE specific PDSCH for FR1 can be achieved by 3.4%~19.6% with dynamic adaptation and multi-CSI, compared to dynamic adaptation of spatial elements with single CSI report. The UPT loss was observed by less than 10%;* * *3~~2~~ sources show that the gain for UE specific PDSCH for FR1 can be 6.8~~7.6~~%~31.3% with dynamic adaptation and multi-CSI, compared with no adaptation, with UPT loss of 0.02%~7%;*  1. Section 6.4.1, the observation of dynamic power reduction is misleading. Most companies showed the gain with 2.3% - 34.3% with negligible UPT loss were not captured.   >>Yi: understand the point. “most” may be a bit vague. We could come up with a better wording for plenary discussion. |
| LG Electronics | * 1. As we commented earlier, the title of Section 6.1.5 needs to be modified.   6.1.5 Technique A-5 adaptation of SSB/SIB1 including  >>Yi: in the email this was replied that there seems no strong need to remove this. It just says including this. Could you explain why this is very critical? The reason I specifically keep this is because part of the results are moving to frequency domain so I would like to emphasize the remaining results acutally for on-demand SSB/SIB.   * 1. Several comments for conclusion:   The study of time domain techniques can be summarized as follows.  Depending on factors such as selected baselines, BS categories, SLS configurations (including reference configurations, traffic models, number/periodicity of reference signals), scaling parameters, and UE profiles (including UE RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE/CONNECTED mode, DRX configurations), as well as conditions (such as gNB detection, gNB coordination, UE ability of synchronization) etc.,   * 4 sources show technique A-1-1 of simplified SSB without PBCH or with partial PBCH could achieve BS energy savings by 0.7%~30.49% in range, with empty load.   [LGE] Since no UPT impact with empty load is obvious, we suggest to remove “with no observed impact on UPT”.  <omitted>  >>Yi: done.   * 5 sources show technique A-3-1 of UE WUS triggering gNB for SSB/SIB/RACH could achieve BS energy savings by 6.2%~80.7% in range with UPT loss by 0%~24.2%, while 1 source shows technique A-3-2 of UE WUS triggering gNB to wake up in case of uplink traffic arrival could achieve BS energy savings by 25.7%~93% in range, with latency gain of 0%~45.5% depending on the SR periodicity assumed in the baseline,   [LGE] According to Samsung’s results, only latency impact was submitted.  <omitted>  >>Yi: revised to latency reduction without gain.  [LGE] Suggest to remove the bullet above since the definition of “matching” is unclear.  >>Yi: done   * Technique A-1-4 of adapting Paging and technique A-1-5 of adapting RACH periodicity/occasions may be used in a cell where legacy UE can still use legacy Paging/RACH resources with negative impact on latency for legacy UEs, while other techniques may be enabled for a carrier only when legacy UEs are not using the carrier.   [LGE] Suggest to remove “except technique A-3” since the following sentence is already captured in Section 6.1.3.3.   |  | | --- | | 6.1.3.3 Legacy UE and RAN1 specification impacts  Legacy UEs and UEs that do not support this technique cannot wake up a cell that is inactive. Legacy UEs and UEs that do not support this technique are not provided with expected transmission from the cell, therefore they cannot operate in the cell. |   <omitted>  >>Yi: done  Based on the study and summary, from time and frequency domain,   * technique A-4 of adaptation of UE DTX/DRX for Cell DTX/DRX alignment is beneficial for network energy savings. * A technique based on A-3 of UE WUS triggering gNB to wake up is beneficial for network energy savings. * In light of the potential large energy savings, adaptation/reduction/elimination of common channels/signals in single or multi-carrier operation are beneficial for network energy savings.   [LGE] We also support Samsung’s suggestion.  [LGE] Suggest to remove.  >>Yi: done  For techniques in spatial domain, over baseline of 32/64 TxRU for a gNB/TRP, the study can be summarized as follows,   * 12 sources show technique C-1 of adaptation of spatial elements could achieve BS energy savings by 0~48.2% in range, with legacy UE co-existence, at the expense of small (less than 10% for dynamic adaptation with multi-CSI) to large (up to 87.08% for static adaptation) negative impact on UPT. 4 sources provide evaluation results for dynamic adaptation while 9 sources provide evaluation result for static adaptation. * 3 sources show technique C-2 of TRP muting in multi-TRP operation could achieve BS energy savings by 19.7%~41.6% in range, at the expense of UPT loss of 7.27%~22% for static TRP muting. 1 source provide evaluation results for dynamic adaptation while 2 sources provide evaluation result for static adaptation.   [LGE] Suggest to remove “that matches the proposed technique” since the definition of “matching” is unclear. In addition, as highlighted above, the number of sources seems incorrect.  >>Yi: done. The number is correct since there is same source providing results for both cases. |
| vivo | Thanks Yi for the great effort. Please find our additional comment on v5.  In general, given the current discussion, we DO NOT agree to recommend C-1 alone from RAN1 perspective, as C-1 can already be achieved by current specification (see point 3 below), and what is to be enhanced based on the current specification is not clear (no discussion during the SI). We believe there are other techniques more beneficial, we would like to the leave the whole discussion to RAN plenary.  And please find some detailed comments as below.   * + 1. On Technique A-4, we have the following suggested text:   6 sources show technique A-4 of semi-static UE C-DRX alignment ~~cell DTX/DRX with semi-statically alignment of UE DTX/DRX~~ could achieve BS energy savings by 0.2%~71.4% in range, meanwhile, 3 sources show that there is negative impact on UPT with loss from 0.91% to 15.5%, and 1 source shows that when the UE DRX cycle is 160ms and gNB active time is 80ms the UPT is increased while in other configurations there can be large UPT loss (up to 62.4%), 1 source shows marginal increment on latency while 1 source show up to 50% latency increase.  [vivo] This is the wording from our agreed observation in Section 6.1.4.2  technique A-4 of adaptation of UE ~~DTX/~~DRX for Cell DTX/DRX alignment is beneficial for network energy savings  [vivo] No UE DTX and so DTX should be removed   * + 1. We suggest the following change:   In light of the potential large energy savings, adaptation/reduction/elimination of SSB/SIB1~~other common channels/signals~~ in single or multi-carrier operation are recommended.  [vivo] other common channel/signals is too broad and not clear. Suggest to make it clear to say SSB/SIB1.   * 1. On recommendation of technique C-1, we think it may be already supported by existing spec and suggest to remove “can be recommened”:   Based on the study, at least a technique based on C-1 is beneficial for network energy savings~~, and can be recommended~~. Technique C-2 also has the potential to provide large network energy saving gain.  @Docomo: In your example, for the slot configured with 8 port CSI-RS, gNB will turn on all ports for UE to perform measurement. Actually this 8 port CSI-RS is better to be configured with SSB that may also need 8 port transmission. But for PDSCH transmission, gNB can perform dynamic adaptation of spatial element based on all CSI reports of 2/4/8 port.   * 1. On Technique D-1, we are fine with current text by removing “can be recommended”   @Docomo:  For 1st mechanism, in our understanding, gNB implementation can predict RI, PMI and CSI for other power offset based on a reporting CSI although it is not 100% accurate. Actually, CSI reported by UE is also not 100% accurate. Besides, more advanced technique such as AI can be used by gNB to do so to improve the accuracy.  For 2nd mechanism, it seems that you agree that it can serve the same purpose to have dynamic PDSCH power adaptation although “it will obviously increase the effort of UE CSI measurement and payload size of CSI reporting.” Actually, multiple CSI-RS resource can be configured to UE in the same time-frequency resource position with different power offsets. UE only perform measurement once so there is no increase of UE CSI measurement. For CSI reporting, gNB could multiplex the CSI reporting in the same PUCCH if the configured reporting PUCCH are overlapping.   * 1. On CHO part in higher part, we suggest the following update to align with the text in Section 6.5.2:   It is feasible to handle legacy UEs and NES-capable UEs via cell (re-)selection techniques. It is also feasible and possible to enhance the CHO framework ~~to handover UEs faster~~.  [vivo] In Section 6.5.2, it says “From RAN2 perspective, CHO enhancements are feasible.” It is preferred to align the wording here. |
| Samsung | Thanks Yi for your continuous efforts.  One additional comment on the latest draft: the assumption of A-3-2 is that gNB can detect WUS during sleep state on top of the BS power mode in section 5.  [Section 7]   * + Note technique A-3-2 of UE WUS triggering gNB to wake up in case of uplink traffic arrival assumes that gNB can detect WUS during sleep state. |
| Fujitsu | The followings are our comments for conclusion:   1. We suggest to include the simulation assumption about the WUS in the following sub-bullet:  * With the assumption of ideal detection of UE WUS, 5 sources show technique A-3-1 of UE WUS triggering gNB for SSB/SIB/RACH could achieve BS energy savings by 6.2%~80.7% in range with UPT loss by 0%~24.2%, while with the assumption that WUS can be detected by gNB in sleep state, 1 source shows technique A-3-2 of UE WUS triggering gNB to wake up in case of uplink traffic arrival could achieve BS energy savings by 25.7%~93% in range, with UPT gain of 0%~45.5% depending on the SR periodicity assumed in the baseline,  1. Regarding technique A-3 (UE WUS), we share similar view as Intel and CATT that the evaluation only considered ideal conditions, further study is required. Recommendation in current state seems too rush. |