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# Introduction

This summary synthesizes observations and proposals from contributions submitted to 3GPP TSG RAN WG1 #122, focusing on **idle mode** energy efficiency for 6G Radio (6GR) in AI 11.5 and as described in the SID. The contributions address network energy savings (NES), user equipment power saving (UEPS), and joint NW-UE energy efficiency, emphasizing a holistic, day-one integration to overcome 5G’s limitations, such as backward compatibility constraints and fragmented feature deployment.

## Division among FLs

The FLs for the energy efficiency topic has agreed to the below approximate partitioning of topics. It is acknowledged that this partitioning is no exact science and topics may concern multiple RRC states, in which case the RRC state that is the dominant RRC state with respect to energy efficiency has been selected.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IDLE mode** | **CONNECTED mode** |
| SSB | Spatial domain enhancements, including CSI enhancement, etc. |
| SIB1/system information | Frequency domain enhancements, including BWP, Multi-carrier/CA, etc. |
| WUS/WUR | Connected domain enhancements, including PDCCH monitoring reduction, cWUS operation, etc. |
| Cell DTX/DRX | Power domain enhancements (if not overlapping with waveform agenda) |
| Idle mode metrics and scenarios | Connected mode metrics and scenarios |
|  | Power model updates |

## Work plan

The energy efficiency work in the 6G Radio SI has been scheduled for three meetings and the objective is to come up with recommendations to consider for further studies in different agenda items. That means that after the present meeting, only two meetings remain. Rapporteur’s work plan for AI 11.5 Energy Efficiency is as follows [2]:

|  |
| --- |
| RAN1#122 (8 TU)* Energy efficiency
	+ Identify candidate technologies for NW power saving, UE power saving, and joint mechanisms taking both NW and UE into account for power saving.

RAN1#122bis (10 TU)* Energy efficiency
	+ Continue identifying candidate technologies for NW power saving, UE power saving, and joint mechanisms taking both NW and UE into account for power saving.

RAN1#123 (10 TU)* Energy efficiency
	+ Complete identifying candidate technologies for NW power saving, UE power saving, and joint mechanisms taking both NW and UE into account for power saving, to be distributed to respective related agenda.
 |

In FL’s understanding, the term *candidate technology* represents a deliverable for the initial energy efficiency phase of the 6G radio SI.

The FL’s detailed deconstruction of the work plan is to divide the work into the following parts:

**RAN1 #122:** Agree on *topics* *for discussion* (during 3 meeting EE phase) as candidate technologies for NW/UE/joint power savings (i.e., in other AIs). In parallel, start discussion on energy efficiency models, metrics and scenarios for future use.

**RAN1 #122bis:** Agree on candidate technologies for NW/UE/joint power savings, evolve/refine agreed topics for discussion, if needed, and agree on further topics for discussion. Evolve discussions on models, metrics and scenarios.

**RAN1 #123:** Additional agreements on candidate technologies for NW/UE/joint power savings. Finalize models metrics and scenarios for future evaluation of energy efficiency.

# Discussion

## Day 1 functionality

### Companies’ views

Below is a composition of proposals relating to Day 1 requirements:

|  |
| --- |
| **Nokia - R1-2505131*** **Proposal 2**: 6GR to consider NES-native design from the first release, with mandatory UE support of the corresponding energy-saving design and features.
* **Proposal 2**: 6G should support cell DTX/DRX type of operation from day one to allow for sufficient BS sleep opportunities and achieve meaningful NES.
* **Proposal 3**: The first 6G release should support a leaner carrier and signaling reduction (of SS/PBCH synchronization signals, system information, PRACH and paging occasions) including on-demand provisioning mechanisms for NES operations of cells operating under low/no load.
* **Proposal 4**: The first 6GR release should support spatial adaptation (of Tx antenna ports/chains) and power adaptation, with enhanced CSI / SRS frameworks for NES operations.
* **Proposal 5**: The first 6G release should support Cell DTX/DRX for all RRC states, including enhancements during Cell DTX/DRX inactive time and interactions with other features (such as spatial/power-domain adaptation).
* **Proposal 13**: 3GPP specifies mandatory support for UE energy saving features from the first release of 6G.

**FUTUREWEI - R1-2505145*** **Proposal 3**: Adopt from day one 5G UE power saving techniques as baseline mechanisms in 6G, such as:
	+ Duty-cycled based operations (iDRX, eDRX, cDRX),
	+ LP-WUS with at least PEI and DCP functionality replacement,
	+ Relaxed RRM measurements of neighboring cells, and
	+ Relaxed/Offloading to LP-WUR of serving cell measurements.
* **Proposal 4**: Adopt and further enhance from day one the gNB power saving solutions developed in 5G (e.g., 5G NES features SCell with on-demand SSB or no SSB, on-demand SIB1, Cell DTX/DRX, etc.).

**Huawei, HiSilicon - R1-2505187*** **Proposal 1**: 6GR ES design should take the following guidance principles:
	+ Key ES techniques for network and UE should be considered in all the aspects of the system design for 6GR Day1 as mandatory requirement
		- including signal/waveform generation, initial access procedure, reference signal measurement/report, UL/DL control/data communication procedure, and UE state design etc.
* **Proposal 2**: NES designs for single carrier deployment should be first studied in Day 1, in order to achieve comprehensive energy savings and provide future proof design for initial access, and NES for multi-carrier deployment can be studied later than single carrier since it will not impact initial access design.

**Ofinno - R1-2505677*** **Proposal 4**: 6GR should support cell DTX/DRX for PCell and SCell from day-1.

**TCL - R1-2505698*** **Proposal 4**: Discussion on how to include the impact of physical air interface design (e.g., waveform, coding, frame structure, sequence design, etc.) in 6G energy efficiency from day 1.
* **Proposal 7**: Discuss potential power domain transmission technologies to improve sustainability in 6G day 1, at least including lower PAPR considerations, power control considerations, AI-assisted control and expanded deep sleep for both BS and UE PAs, adaptive emission masks and context-based EVM in RAN 1.
* **Proposal 8**: Discuss whether/how to consider low-power signal design in 6G day 1 for 6G energy savings.

**Apple - R1-2505917*** **Proposal 4**: Reduction/adaptation of common signals/channels should be considered in 6G day-1 to avoid backward compatibility issue and fully achieve the NES benefit.
	+ For OD-SIB1, how much additional NES gain can be obtained through SIB1 reduction in single cell case, under the assumption of increased SSB periodicity.
* **Proposal 5**: Cell DTX/DRX should be considered in 6G day-1 to avoid backward compatibility issue and fully achieve the NES benefit.

**Lenovo - R1-2505995*** **Proposal 1**: 6GR should aim to reduce TCO by utilizing the non-backward compatible opportunity provided by once in a decade new generation refresh by designing native energy efficient solution using various techniques such as time, frequency, spatial, power domain.
* **Proposal 17**: Study a unified device power saving mechanism using following techniques to support diverse device types from day-1
	+ Time domain technique
	+ Frequency domain technique
	+ Spatial domain technique
	+ Measurement relaxations
	+ Processing domain technique

**CMCC - R1-2506101*** **Proposal 4**: Support Cell DTX/DRX applies for both IDLE/CONNECTED mode, and more channels/signals from Day-1 in 6G.

**Vodafone, Bouygues Telecom, Deutsche Telekom - R1-2506134*** **Proposal 3**: Study introduction of LP-WUS/WUR for all device types in 6GR air interface as a day-1 considering potential impacts and benefits.

**InterDigital - R1-2506146*** **Proposal 1**: Support energy saving schemes for 6GR with following consideration:
	+ Support of power saving features from 6G Day-1
	+ Always on signal with longer periodicity
	+ Joint NW and UE energy saving
	+ Study all energy saving domains
	+ Flexible bandwidth adaptation
* **Proposal 10**: Support LP-WUS targeting low power receiver capability from 6G Day-1.

**SK Telecom - R1-2506152*** **Proposal 1**: For 6G energy efficiency, at least the following aspects should be studied:
	+ SSB/SIB1 transmission (longer periodicity, on-demand)
	+ Enhanced BWP mechanism
	+ Time-domain enhancement (UE-basis C-DRX vs. cell-basis DRX/DTX, LP-WUS/WUR)
	+ Reduced RRM measurement
	+ PEI

**AT&T - R1-2506237*** **Proposal 1**: Energy efficiency is leveraged across the 6G RAN design and supported as a Day 1 mandatory feature of 6GR.
* **Proposal 11**: Energy Efficiency metric(s) are included as 6GR key performance metrics from day 1.

**IIT Kanpur - R1-2506392*** **Proposal 2**: 6GR Day 1 design, shall apply time/frequency adaptations of SS/PBCH transmission with more on-demand signal transmission and less always-on signals. Also on-demand SIB1 operation shall be supported from the Day 1 in 6G.
* **Proposal 4**: 6GR Day 1 design shall enhance the low-power wake-up signal/receiver (LP-WUS/WUR) designs for improving UE power efficiency.
 |

### Summary

The Day 1 functionality proposals collectively address the critical need to integrate energy efficiency as a foundational principle in the initial 6G Radio (6GR) specification, overcoming the limitations of 5G NR where energy-saving features were introduced incrementally in later releases (e.g., Rel-16 to Rel-19), leading to fragmented adoption, optional implementation, and suboptimal effectiveness due to backward compatibility constraints. These proposals emphasize embedding energy-efficient mechanisms from Day 1, including:

* **Network Energy Savings (NES)**: Proposals advocate for leaner carrier designs, reduced signaling (e.g., on-demand SS/PBCH, SIB1, PRACH, paging), and Cell DTX/DRX to maximize base station (gNB) sleep opportunities, addressing 5G’s inefficiencies where always-on signals (e.g., SS/PBCH every 20ms or SIB1 every 160ms) limited deep sleep modes, achieving 83.7% NES for Cat-1 and 52.5% for Cat-2 under low load (TR 38.864) (Nokia Prop. 3, FUTUREWEI Prop. 4, Apple Prop. 4, IIT Kanpur Prop. 2).
* **UE Power Saving (UEPS)**: Mandatory UE energy-saving features, such as low-power wake-up signals/receivers (LP-WUS/WUR), duty-cycled operations (iDRX, eDRX, cDRX), relaxed RRM measurements, and unified power-saving mechanisms across time, frequency, spatial, and processing domains, are proposed to support diverse device types (e.g., IoT, XR/AR) from Day 1 (Nokia Prop. 13, FUTUREWEI Prop. 3, Lenovo Prop. 17, Vodafone Prop. 3, InterDigital Prop. 10).
* **System Design**: Proposals emphasize integrating energy efficiency into all aspects of 6GR design, including waveform, coding, frame structure, initial access, and power domain techniques (e.g., low-PAPR, adaptive emission masks, AI-assisted control), to ensure a sustainable air interface that balances performance, latency, and coverage (Huawei Prop. 1, TCL Prop. 4, Prop. 7, Prop. 8).
* **Performance Metrics**: Energy efficiency is proposed as a mandatory key performance indicator (KPI) from Day 1 to ensure evaluations reflect total system power consumption, avoiding 5G’s fragmented approach (AT&T Prop. 11).
* **Avoiding Backward Compatibility Issues**: By prioritizing single-carrier deployments and non-backward compatible designs, the proposals aim to embed energy-saving features natively, avoiding 5G’s challenges where features like PDCCH skipping and on-demand signaling were not universally adopted due to varying UE capabilities and complex network configurations (Huawei Prop. 2, Apple Prop. 4, Prop. 5).

These proposals collectively aim to create a lean, sustainable 6GR design that maximizes energy savings for both network and UE, reduces total cost of ownership (TCO), supports diverse use cases (e.g., IoT, NTN) in new spectrum (~7 GHz), and ensures energy efficiency is a core metric from the outset, enabling a more effective and unified approach compared to 5G’s incremental and constrained deployments.

### 1st round of FL comments and proposals

Many companies discuss the importance for Day 1 functionality for energy savings. In FL’s view, the whole purpose with the EE phase of the 6G Radio SI is to identify what such Day 1 functionality should be. Hence, there is little need to explicitly discuss this area further. Nevertheless, FL has one proposal related to Day 1 functionality, to get companies aligned regarding the ambitions with the EE phase.

FL Proposal 2.1‑1:

**RAN1 to strive for energy efficiency features that are mandatory from Day 1 to maximize energy gains.**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | Yes, as companies views arranged by FL, we should avoid backward compatibility issues, which has been observed in 5G deployment. In such way, 6GR can benefit more from EE features.  |
| InterDigital | Support |
| TCL | We supports this proposal, as making key energy-saving features mandatory from 6G Day-1 ensures uniform adoption across operators and devices for maximum network-wide gains. This addresses a major 5G gap (many energy efficiency features were optional, limiting impact). A Day-1 mandate would encourage early integration and optimization, benefiting both network energy costs and UE battery life. However, we stress that any mandatory features must be carefully vetted for feasibility and minimal added complexity, so as not to unduly burden device design or deployment.  |
| Spreadtrum | We think the wording of “mandatory” is too strong. We would like to change the proposal as following:FL Proposal 2.1‑2:**RAN1 to strive for energy efficiency features that are critical for ~~mandatory from~~ Day 1 to maximize energy gains of UE and Network.** |
| Panasonic | We support to have some mandatory EE features from Day 1. Just to clarify that, the intention is to discuss proposals/directions first and then to select some of the features and only to support them as mandatory. Or is the intention to assume from the beginning that only mandatory features would be discussed? |
| Qualcomm | In general, we don’t think the proposal is necessary. It is premature to discuss whether features are mandatory or not. At this state, we should follow Rapporteur’s work plan for AI 11.5 Energy Efficiency. If majority would like to make some conclusion, we suggest the following updated proposal:FL Proposal 2.1‑3 (updated):**RAN1 to strive for energy efficiency features ~~that are mandatory~~ from Day 1 to maximize energy gains.** |
| Fujitsu | Agree in principle. Based on the online discussion, we believe there is a common understanding that maximizing energy saving gains should not be done recklessly, the trade-off between energy saving gains and negative impact on the NW and UE sides needs to be considered. Therefore, we would like to propose the following updates:**RAN1 to strive for energy efficiency features that are mandatory from Day 1 to maximize energy gains without significantly negative impact on both NW and UE sides.** |
| Fainity | Clarify the proposals are applied for all device types? Especially all RRC IDLE UE can enable the energy efficiency features without UE capability negotiation signaling? |
| Ofinno | Support  |
| CEWiT | Support, some mandatory enhancements without backward compatibility issues, which has been a restriction in 5G NES enhancements. However, there should be scope for other enhancement which are critical but not mandatory for DAY 1. |
| Nokia | Support. Important to ensure broad support to energy efficiency features in 6G from the first release.  |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| Sharp | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Support |
| DCM | Support.  |
| CMCC | Support |
| CATT | We know the intention of this proposal, but we think this proposal may not be needed.  |
| ETRI | Support. We prefer Qualcomm’s version. |
| NEC | Support |
| Xiaomi | We support to have some mandatory EE feautres from 6G Day1 in order to avoid non-compability issue and make EE techniques come to reality as soon as possible.However, as mentioned by lots of companies, balance betwteen performance and EE is very important. Keep this in mind, ‘to maximize energy gains’ is too strong and partial. The key is to achieve a common understanding that EE should happen from Day1. Hence, we propose the following modification of the proposal:FL Proposal 2.1‑1:**RAN1 to strive for energy efficiency features that are mandatory from Day 1 ~~to maximize energy gains~~.** |
| Ericsson | Support. It is important that the features we standardize gets implemented. |
| vivo | We support the direction generally. However, we need to select the energy efficiency feature set carefully consider the individual energy saving gain for each feature and the accumulative gain when multiple features are combined . |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support in principle but need to clarify the maximum energy gain is targeting UE side or NW side or both sides. For example, for OOK based WUS, it has largest UE PS gain, does it mean this is our target?So, suggest to update it as follows**RAN1 to strive for energy efficiency features that are mandatory from Day 1 ~~to maximize energy gains.~~** |
| Samsung | As a usual practice, we understand ‘mandatory’ is from UE perspective. However, what important is to make energy efficiency features both for UE and NW from 6G day 1 and to enable them as basic features as much as possible.  |
| IIT Kanpur | We support the proposal. We also prefer to study other NES features that are not part of Day 1 6GR.  |
| Apple | Understand the intention but we also do not see the need of the proposal as CATT. We do not think maximizing energy gains is the only goal we should strive for. Energy saving gains should be jointly considered with complexity, overhead, latency at both BS and UE. If a proposal is indeed needed, we propose to have a more general guideline as follows: FL Proposal 2.1‑1(updated):**RAN1 to strive for energy efficient~~cy~~ design ~~features that are mandatory~~ from Day 1 ~~to maximize energy gains~~.** |
| Lenovo | Support , since it is a conclusion, addition from Fujitsu looks fine too. |
| Fraunhofer | We support the proposal. Some of the edits suggested above can be incorporated, e.g. the suggestion from Fujitsu to add ‘**without significant negative impact on both NW and UE sides.**’  |
| Tejas | Ok with the updated proposal from fujitsu. |
| OPPO | **First, our proposals 1-4 on the general design for 6G in contribution R1-2505761 were not captured in FL summary. We appreciate if feature lead could add our views also in the summary.** We agree with QC’s comment. At this stage is to good to go with the proposal suggested by QC. We don’t need to decide the features are mandatory at the moment.  |
| Futurewei | OK in principle. The proposal in this formulation has little value. It would be a more valuable proposal if the word “strive” is replaced by “should define”.Suggested change: RAN1 ~~to strive for~~ should define energy efficiency features that are mandatory from Day 1 to maximize energy saving gains. |
| Sony | Support |
| Vodafone | Support |
| MediaTek | In principle we are supportive for this proposal. But we want to echo the point captured in the SID that “both NW and devices” shall be considered. Hence, we suggest the following changes. **Modified Proposal 2.1-1:** RAN1 to strive for energy efficiency features that are mandatory for both UE and BS from Day 1 to maximize energy gains for both NW and devices. |
| AT&T | Fine with the MediaTek updated version |

## SSB requirements

### Companies’ views

Below is a composition of proposals relating to SSB requirements:

|  |
| --- |
| Nokia - R1-2505131* **Proposal 3**: The first 6G release should support a leaner carrier and signaling reduction (of SS/PBCH synchronization signals, system information, PRACH and paging occasions) including on-demand provisioning mechanisms for NES operations of cells operating under low/no load.
* **Proposal 6**: 6G studies to consider trade-off between network energy saving and UE complexity for initial access, including relaxing the default SS/PBCH periodicity.
* **Proposal 7**: On-demand reference signal, e.g. SS/PBCH, operation shall be studied in 6G.
* **Proposal 8**: For 6G design with SS/PBCH-less SCell operation, it is proposed to consider more flexible and scalable solutions that can fit in with different deployment scenarios.

FUTUREWEI - R1-2505145* **Proposal 4**: Adopt and further enhance from day one the gNB power saving solutions developed in 5G (e.g., 5G NES features SCell with on-demand SSB or no SSB, on-demand SIB1, Cell DTX/DRX, etc.).

CATT - R1-2505297* **Proposal 3**: In order to reduce the initial access delay due to sparse SSB, the solution of increasing the detection probability of SSB in one period of SSB burst set for initial cell selection should be studied, i.e., the UE can detect the PSS/SSS and decode the PBCH successfully within only one period of SSB burst set.
* **Proposal 4**: To increase the detection probability of SSB in one period of SSB burst set for initial cell selection, SSB repetition with one SSB period, PBCH repetition within one SSB or PBCH with a lower coding rate should be studied.
* **Proposal 5**: In 6GR, both network-triggered on-demand SSB and UE-triggered on-demand SSB for UEs in idle mode and connected mode should be introduced.

Spreadtrum (UNISOC) - R1-2505176* **Proposal 5**: The following technologies can be studied for 6GR joint NW&UE power saving:
	1. Reduce always-on signal and improve one-shot detecting performance of common signal/channel.

Xiaomi - R1-2505467* **Proposal 7**: Default SSB periodicity extension and/or sparse synchronization raster should be considered for 6GR with taking UE requirement into account.
* **Proposal 8**: Enhancements on RO adaptation and joint adaptation between RO and SSB can be considered in 6G to further reduce energy consumption.
* **Proposal 9**: Joint condensed common signal/channel design and L1-based paging adaptation can be considered for 6GR NES.

Samsung - R1-2505589* **Proposal 1**: Extend ‘Default’ SSB transmission periodicity longer than that of NR where a UE assumes the default value for initial cell selection.
* **Proposal 2**: Set Day 1 SSB design principle accommodating coverage, diverse devise type, and energy efficiency.

ZTE - R1-2505607* **Proposal 23**: Two stage SSB can be considered for UE and NW energy saving.

Ericsson - R1-2505625* **Proposal 3**: 6GR should support default SSB periodicity of 160 ms to enable network deep sleep states while maintaining acceptable UE Idle mode performance.
* **Proposal 5**: Study periodic bursts of SSB and SIB1 repetitions, where in each period multiple SSB and SIB1 repetitions are provided during a short time interval followed by a longer inactive interval.
* **Proposal 6**: 6GR should support coordinating system information broadcast with other common signals/channels in order not to interrupt sleeping opportunities.
* **Proposal 7**: Study a design with two GSCN raster subsets: a primary raster where UE assumes extended SSB periodicity and a secondary raster where UE assumes 20 ms SSB periodicity.
* **Proposal 8**: Study enhancements of on-demand SSB to extend its applicability.
* **Proposal 10**: SSB-less SCells operation should be included as baseline functionality in 6GR.

Tejas Networks Ltd. - R1-2505631* **Proposal 19**: Enhancements to the SSB RO mapping and RAR can be studied to reduce the overhead of indicating SSBs to the base station and reduce the RAR overhead associated with each RO.

Ofinno - R1-2505677* **Proposal 6**: 6GR should support OD-SSB and RAN1 to study cases where OD-SSB can be supported (e.g., PCell, SCell, on/off synch raster).

Quectel - R1-2505769* **Proposal 1**: The OD-SSB/OD-SIB1 structure simplifying SSB/SIB1 needs discussion in 6G.

Panasonic - R1-2505789* **Proposal 1**: To study synchronization signal design with options to be on-demand and adaptive in proper use cases.

Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI - R1-2505834* **Proposal 5**: The 6GR study should investigate the possibility of increasing common signal periodicity and enable on demand common signals.
* **Proposal 8**: The 6GR study should investigate the possibility of limiting the search area for synchronization signals so the UE does not have to search for the entire frequency grid.

LG Electronics - R1-2505858* **Proposal 1**: Study the default periodicity of synchronization signal (SS) larger than 20 msec.
* **Proposal 2**: Study on-demand SS and/or PBCH procedure and how to utilize SS/PBCH with adaptation for measurement.

Apple - R1-2505917* **Proposal 4**: Reduction/adaptation of common signals/channels should be considered in 6G day-1 to avoid backward compatibility issue and fully achieve the NES benefit.
	+ For SSB, study to introduce two types of SSBs, one is an always-on signal and designed for RRC\_IDLE UEs and the other is on-demand SSB for RRC\_CONNECTED UEs.

Fujitsu - R1-2505972* **Proposal 3**: Study the methods to enable on-demand transmission of cell common signals, such as SS, PBCH and SIB1, without limitations on applicable scenarios.
	+ The above aspects can be included in the initial access related discussions.

CAICT - R1-2506005* **Proposal 1**: the coverage and the capacity carrier can be defined to enable dynamic on/off carrier, the SSB signal with long periodicity and on demand SSB can be transmitted in the capacity carrier ,and the always on RS can be transmitted in the coverage carrier.

Sharp - R1-2506014* **Proposal 2**: To reduce unnecessary power consumption and signalling overhead, on demand reference signal in Pcell should be supported.

CMCC - R1-2506101* **Proposal 2**: RAN1 to further consider and study the following case for single carrier scenario in 6GR:
	+ Case 1: no “6G SSB” transmitted on a carrier by default, and UE triggers “6G SSB” transmission (and other common channels/signals if needed) by demand:
		- UE can pre-receives or pre-configures the uplink wake-up signal (UL-WUS) configuration, and transmits UL-WUS on the carrier with the assist of pre-stored information or other information (e.g. GNSS).
		- 6G BS can turn off TX part while enabling RX part for UL-WUS reception (e.g. sliding window detection).
	+ Case 2: always-on “6G SSB” transmitted on a carrier with large periodicity by default (e.g. 160ms), and UE on-demand triggers short period SS transmission (and other common channels/signals if needed):
		- The always-on “6G SSB” is used for cell detection, basic sync and provide necessary info (e.g. UL-WUS configuration), while the on-demand short period SS can be used for finer sync or fast measurement.
* **Proposal 3**: RAN1 to further consider and study the following case for multi-carrier scenario in 6GR:
	+ The common signal transmission/reception procedure (e.g. SIB1 transmission, RACH reception) for multiple carriers can converge to one anchor carrier. Therefore, other carrier (i.e. NES carrier) can turning off or only transmit long period SS by default, so as to obtain more NES gain.
	+ NES carrier can be activated per NW guidance or UE demand and UE can initiate access on NES carrier, so as to achieve better UE experience or load balancing for network.

ETRI - R1-2506069* **Proposal 9**: Study the definition of a default SSB periodicity substantially longer than 20 ms (e.g., 160 ms).
* **Proposal 10**: Study increasing the SSB resource size to enable one-shot SSB detection.
* **Proposal 12**: Study the use of on-demand SSB for several use cases.

InterDigital - R1-2506146* **Proposal 5**: Minimize the need to configure always-on signals (e.g., only present with long periodicities of at least 160 ms). Support configurations that do not require provisioning of always-on signals on all carriers.
* **Proposal 6**: Support on-demand signals/channels (e.g., configurable, dynamic (de)activation, and/or UE-requested) where it is applicable.

SK Telecom - R1-2506152* **Proposal 1**: For 6G energy efficiency, at least the following aspects should be studied:
	+ SSB/SIB1 transmission (longer periodicity, on-demand)

Qualcomm - R1-2506222* **Proposal 16**: Sync signal design should consider both NW energy saving, UE complexity and user experience.

AT&T - R1-2506237* **Proposal 16**: Derive an updated 6GR initial access procedure with SSB periodicity extended beyond 20ms, followed by evaluation of the performance and the underlying energy savings.
* **Proposal 17**: Study the pros and cons of the UE monitoring relatively fewer frequency raster points during the prospective 6GR initial access procedure.

NTT DOCOMO - R1-2506310* **Proposal 4**: Study the following directions to achieve better energy efficiency than NR for initial access procedure:
	+ Study placing sync-raster on specific band
	+ Study longer periodicity from NR such as 40 ms, 80 ms
	+ To achieve the above, study reducing the number of defined sync raster, thereby mitigating delays and UE burden through initial cell search.
	+ Coarser sync raster locations
	+ Limiting bands with sync raster by the specification
* **Proposal 5**: Study a mechanism to provide OD-RS transmission dynamically with less signalling overhead on PCell.
	+ Consider at least NW triggering mechanism, and UE triggering including the necessity and its criteria.
	+ Study dense RS transmission within one periodicity and use of each RS as a measurement sample for RRM
	+ Assumption: Static AO-SSB is transmitted with a long periodicity (e.g., ~160ms).

WILUS Inc. - R1-2506324* **Proposal 2**: Study On-Demand SSB/SSB1 for 6GR
	+ Enable on-demand SSB/SIB1 transmission for UEs in Idle, Inactive, or RRC\_Connected modes to maximize energy savings and deep-sleep opportunities for gNBs.
* **Proposal 3**: Study Extended SSB Periodicity for 6GR
	+ Introduce longer SSB periodicities to enable deeper gNB sleep modes, leading to substantial energy savings.

Rakuten Mobile, Inc. - R1-2506346* **Proposal 1.1**: RAN1 to define a study topic under the 6GR SID to evaluate the Beacon/Anchor/Data carrier architecture, including much higher sync signal periodicity, carrier roles, and SSB/SIB transmission strategies.
* **Proposal 1.2**: RAN1 to study implications of, SIB1 and paging transmitted by Anchor Carriers on demand or at ultra-low periodicity and Data Carriers remain dormant until scheduled user activity is detected.

CEWiT - R1-2506363* **Proposal 1**: 6G should support energy efficiency enhancements for common signals including
	1. On-Demand Signals for initial access including OD-SSB & OD-SIB1 a. Simplified SSB
	2. SSB periodicity extension beyond 20ms.

IIT Kanpur - R1-2506392* **Proposal 2**: 6GR Day 1 design, shall apply time/frequency adaptations of SS/PBCH transmission with more on-demand signal transmission and less always-on signals. Also on-demand SIB1 operation shall be supported from the Day 1 in 6G.
 |

### Summary

The above proposals collectively address the challenge of reducing energy consumption in 6G Radio (6GR) networks by minimizing the overhead of always-on Synchronization Signal/Physical Broadcast Channel (SS/PBCH, or SSB) transmissions, which contribute to network energy inefficiency in 5G NR, particularly under low or no traffic conditions. In 5G, the default 20 ms SSB periodicity prevents base stations (gNBs) from entering deep sleep modes, leading to substantial energy usage (e.g., limiting energy savings to less than 84.8% as per TR 38.864) (Ericsson Obs. 1, Samsung Obs. 1, MediaTek Obs. 1). The proposals advocate for solutions such as extending SSB periodicity (e.g., to 40 ms, 80 ms, or 160 ms), cf. Figure 1. When needed, on-demand SSB (OD-SSB) may be provided, triggered by either the network or a UE. Additionally, SSB-less SCell operations may be used in certain deployments, allowing deeper network sleep states and reduce UE complexity.



Figure 1: Zero-traffic energy consumption with increased SSB periodicity [13].

Additional enhancements include sparser sync rasters, SSB repetition, two-stage SSB designs, and simplified SSB structures to reduce UE search latency and complexity while maintaining coverage, particularly for new spectrum (~7 GHz) and diverse device types (Spreadtrum Prop. 5, NTT DOCOMO Prop. 4, Samsung Prop. 2). These proposals aim to overcome 5G’s backward compatibility constraints, which restricted on-demand SSB to SCells or non-standalone scenarios, ensuring a leaner, energy-efficient 6GR design from Day 1 that balances network energy savings (NES) with UE accessibility and user experience (Ofinno Prop. 6, Sharp Prop. 2, Qualcomm Prop. 16).

### 1st round FL comments and proposals

It is the FL’s understanding that companies have very different views on how an increased SSB periodicity would work. No company propose to only increase SSB to 160 ms and do nothing else to compensate the resulting decreased UE performance. For that reason, FL proposes that RAN1 focuses on what mitigation techniques would be useful to achieve 160 ms SSB periodicity with minimal impact on the UE performance.

Some companies object to the long SSB periodicity and instead propose a LP radio. In FL’s view, there is not necessarily any contradiction between LP radio and 160 ms (AO-)SSBs if these are combined with 20 ms OD-SSBs. In that case, the LP Radio would still have the same power performance as 20 ms (AO-)SSBs.

FL Proposal 2.2‑4:

**Study NW energy saving from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering:**

* **SBB types (always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),**
* **SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,**
* **SSB detection performance,**
* **SCell operation,**
* **Etc.**

Companies are welcome to share their views on the above FL proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | On UE performance impact, we understand it at least includes latency of accessing a cell. In addition to UE performance impact, the NES on CD-SSB in 6GR should also consider UE complexity, e.g., detection number increasing with the larger default SSB period.  |
| InterDigital | Generally fine with the intention of the proposal. But, we have some comments on the original proposal. 1. Increasing the default periodicity is not the only issue which needs to be considered. In addition, we don’t need to restrict the consideration on cell defining SSB or SSBs on sync raster.2. For sync raster granularity, we do not want to highlight one specific solution (i.e., the prioritized raster points). We believe that it would be better to have a generalized study area on sync raster granularity/location rather than pointing out one specific solution. 3. In our view, sync signals, MIB and PBCH may have different performance requirements. Having said that, in the current stage, we believe that it would be better to generalize the discussion. 4. As this discussion is triggered for IDLE modes, we prefer to focus on PCell operation in this discussion. FL Proposal 2.2‑5:**Study NW energy saving aspects considering ~~from increasing~~ the default periodicity of ~~cell-defining~~ SSB ~~on synchronization raster~~. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering:*** **SBB types (e.g. always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),**
* **SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **Synchronization raster granularity/location~~, incl. prioritized raster points,~~**
* **~~SSB d~~Detection performance of sync signals, MIB and PBCH,**
* **~~SCell operation,~~**
* **Etc.**
 |
| TCL | Three comments, thanks1. We agree that studying a longer default SSB periodicity (beyond the current ~20 ms, e.g. up to 160 ms) could unlock significant base station sleep periods, boosting network energy savings. However, this must be balanced against UE impacts–infrequent SSBs may slow initial cell detection and neighbor measurements or require UEs to wait longer, affecting latency and coverage. Any periodicity extension should be tuned so idle UEs can still efficiently find cells without excessive scanning energy or degraded user experience.
2. New SSB structure for 6G would be considered for power saving and low complexity, which would be more simplified and more flexible than 5G SSB. Thus, we suggest this issue should consider the impact of 6G SSB structure.
3. Beam sweeping is an important functionality of SSB. 6G may support narrower beams and a greater number of beams. When we study SSB, high-efficiency beam detection/sweeping could be considered.
 |
| Spreadtrum | In our view, SSB transmission adaptation and SSB structure/pattern also should considered. In addition, Scell operation only exists in RRC connected CA scenario. We prefer change “Scell operation” to “Multi-carriers operation”We prefer to modify this proposal into the following version.FL Proposal 2.2‑6:**Study NW energy saving from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering:*** **SBB types (e.g., always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),**
* **SSB transmission adaptation**
* **SSB structure/pattern**
* **SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,**
* **SSB detection performance,**
* **Multi-carriers operation, ~~SCell operation,~~**
* **Etc.**
 |
| Panasonic | We are supportive in general.First bullet has a typo of “SBB”.However, as the detailed design of SS, PBCH and so on has not started yet for 6GR, the usage of the term SSB is not so clear.We propose adding one bullet to clarify that:* Detailed design of the synchronization signal and PBCH is FFS.

Also, as this is IDLE mode session, the bullet of SCell operation should be modified to:**~~SCell operation~~ multi-carrier operation.** |
| Qualcomm | It is unclear whether cell-defining or non-cell-defining SSB needs to be defined for 6G yet. Per our understanding, this proposal concerns the SSB periodicity assumed for initial cell selection. This SSB should be always-on SSB. In addition to UE performance, it is critical to understand the impact of new default periodicity of SSB to cell search latency, UE’s complexity and power consumption. Furthermore, the sub-bullets are not necessary. FL Proposal 2.2‑7 (updated):**Study NW energy saving ~~from increasing the default~~ for different periodicity values of ~~cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster~~ SSB for initial cell selection. Additionally, study impacts on cell search latency/performance and UE’s complexity/power consumption/ performance ~~impact~~ and mechanisms to mitigate the impacts ~~UE performance degradations~~ ~~in important use-cases, considering:~~*** **~~SBB types (always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),~~**
* **~~SSB periodicity(ies),~~**
* **~~Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,~~**
* **~~SSB detection performance,~~**
* **~~SCell operation,~~**

**~~Etc.~~** |
| Fujitsu | In our understanding, SCell operation should be categorized to the connected mode. Additionally, the SSB transmitted on the SCell is not limited to sync rater. Thus, we suggest to remove SCell operation:**Study NW energy saving from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering:*** **SBB types (always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),**
* **SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,**
* **SSB detection performance,**
* **~~SCell operation,~~**

**Etc.** |
| Fainity | The bandwidth of SSB is suggested to take into account as well. In addition, Scell operation should be removed since the scope here is for Idle mode. |
| Ofinno | Support in general. Pefer to keep high level and remove “incl. priorizted rater points” or call whole bullet “sync raster prioritization. Two comments: * + On SCell operation we are okay to include but for clarification are we studying SCell for Idle mode?
	+ We think that low power SS and/or 2 stage SSB could also be included in the list of techniques to consider on the UE impact.
 |
| CEWiT | SSB structure and transmissions pattern need to be redefined for 6G. For e.g., simplified SSB or enhancements in transmissions patterns along with SSB periodicity extension can be studied which may improve SSB detection performance at the UE. Further, the Scell operation is intended for connected mode UEs, hence the enhancements should be both for single cell and multi cell operations especially for PCell. Hence we suggest following update in the proposal.FL Proposal 2.2‑8:**Study NW energy saving from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering:*** **SBB types (e.g., always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),**
* **SSB structure/pattern**
* **SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **enhancements to synchronization incl. raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points, etc**
* **SSB detection performance,**
* **Single/Multi-carriers operation, ~~SCell operation,~~**

**Etc.** |
| Nokia | Support in principle. The (intention) under 11.1 is to study the aspect related to synch signal structure, thus we could generalize to study the types of synchronization signals needed (always-on, on-demand etc.), periodicity etc. Also whether to consider the synchronization detection performance in this AI, 11.1 or 11.7 could be considered. |
| LG Electronics | The main bullet of the proposal looks good to us. However, we have several comments for several sub-bullets.* “SCell operation” seems to be contradictory to the main bullet where SSB is cell-defining and located on sync raster. Unless clarified, we prefer removing “SCell operation”
* “SSB periodicity(ies)” can be modified to “Periodicity(ies) of SS and/or PBCH” considering the possibility of different periodicities of SS and PBCH.
* Typo in the first sub-bullet (i.e., SBB 🡪 SSB)

With that, our suggested modification is as follows.**Study NW energy saving from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering:*** **SS~~B~~B types (always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),**
* **~~SSB p~~Periodicity(ies) of SS and/or PBCH,**
* **Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,**
* **SSB detection performance,**
* **~~SCell operation,~~**
* **Etc.**
 |
| Sharp | Support in general.For the purpose of NW energy saving, how to minimize the number of SSBs (periodicity/On-demand/etc.) in the time domain while still satisfying UE performance requirements should be studied.From this perspective, the comparison between SSB detection performance and the defined requirements should serve as the key metric for evaluating any proposed approach.Furthermore, as 6GR initial access procedure is not yet determined, whether ‘SSB’ will still be used in 6GR is not clear. Thus, we suggest change ‘SSB’ to ‘SS/PBCH synchronization signals’, which is in Nokia’s proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The starting point of the SSB discussion should be to identify what aspects could be enhanced to achieve all potential of NW energy savings and study impact of the corresponding techniques. For that reason, we believe it should beFL Proposal 2.2‑1-Huawei update:**Study NW energy saving for SSB transmission from various domains for different procedures/functions, and UE performance impact, including at least*** **Time domain: increasing the default periodicity of SSB beyond 20ms**
* **Spatial domain: reducing the TRxUs**
* **Power domain: lower PAPR signal generation**
* **Frequency domain: reduced transmission BW**
* **Necessary signaling provision for e.g. on-demand SSB**
* **At least initial access (including e.g. synch. Raster design), RRM measurement procedure, LP-WUS procedure for IDLE UEs should be considered**
* **UE performance impact includes at least access latency, coverage, sync. accuracy, UE power consumption**

 **~~increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering:~~*** **~~SBB types (always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),~~**
* **~~SSB periodicity(ies),~~**
* **~~Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,~~**
* **~~SSB detection performance,~~**
* **~~SCell operation,~~**
* **~~Etc.~~**
 |
| DCM | Generally ok. Meanwhile, it isn’t clear what needs to be captured in the list of bullets. We first saw it as aspects for related features, while after seeing Google comments, seems like it is for capturing KPI to assess e.g., cons of any change for SSB. |
| CMCC | We generally fine with this proposal but since this agenda is for idle mode, it is more appropriate to replace SCell operations to multi-carrier/multi-TRP operation. Therefore, we suggest the following revisions:FL Proposal 2.2‑1-CMCC rev1:**Study NW energy saving from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering:*** **SS~~B~~B types (always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),**
* **SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,**
* **SSB detection performance,**
* **Multi-carrier/multi-TRP ~~SCell~~ operation,**

**Etc.** |
| CATT | Support in principle.First, in the main bullet, whether cell-defining or non-cell-defining SSB should not be restricted. Seonce in the sync raster sub-bullet, the ‘**incl. prioritized raster points** ’ should be delated to make it more general.  |
| ETRI | Support the proposal in general. SCell operation can be discussed separately from the idle mode/initial access procedure. |
| NEC | We support this proposal. There is a broad consensus that extending the default SSB periodicity beyond 20 ms (e.g., to 160 ms) is a critical enabler for network deep sleep and offers significant NES gains. However, it is equally important to study the potential negative impacts on UE performance, such as increased access latency and complexity. Therefore, we agree that this study must be coupled with an investigation of mitigation techniques, such as one-shot SSB detection, sparser synchronization rasters, and on-demand SSB, to ensure a balanced solution that benefits both the network and the UE. |
| Xiaomi | We are generally fine with the proposal. It is a good starting point for discussion but include too many details. From our understanding, the first step should try to agree on SSB periodicity extension with taking UE performance into account.For the detailed SSB design, it should be handled under SSB agenda. Regarding to Scell operation, it is a bit confusing and can be removed considering it is already covered by ‚etc‘.FL Proposal 2.2‑1:**Study NW energy saving from increasing the default periodicity of c~~ell-defining~~ SSB on synchronization raster. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations ~~in important use-cases~~, ~~considering~~ the following aspects can be starting point for SSB design:*** **SBB types (always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),**
* **SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **SSB adaptation**
* **Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,**
* **SSB detection performance,**
* **~~SCell operation,~~**
* **~~Etc.~~ Other mechanisms are not precluded depending on SSB discussion**
 |
| Ericsson | Support. SCell operation may fit better in the CONNECTED mode discussions. |
| vivo | Before study of the mechanism for increasing SSB period, we need to determine which Cat of NW power model is the baseline for 6G study since it will have large impact on the NES gain of increasing SSB periods. Based on a single baseline Cat, NES gain of increasing SSB period should be evaluated to see whether it is deserved for further study. So we suggest the updated proposal:Study and evaluate NW energy saving from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster with respect to NW energy saving gain and UE impact (e.g., frequency scan and cell search latency, access latency, processing complexity, power consumption and etc.). ~~Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering:~~* ~~SBB types (always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),~~
* ~~SSB periodicity(ies),~~
* ~~Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,~~
* ~~SSB detection performance,~~
* ~~SCell operation,~~

~~Etc.~~ |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We support the intention of the proposal and we agree to introduce the larger default SSB periodicity (e.g., 160ms). While, some updates with red are suggested with following reasons:1. Important use cases are not clear
2. SSB type definition currently is not clear, we can set always-on SSB, on-demand SSB as examples for information.
3. Regarding SCell operation, CMCC’s update is more clear to us.
4. SSB structure, e.g., PSS, SSS, and PBCH decoupling, new SSB structure with better performance, also could be used to mitigate the impacts on UE side.
5. SSB adaptation also could be considered to mitigate the UE impacts as needed.

FL Proposal 2.2‑1:**Study NW energy saving from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations ~~in important use-cases~~, considering:*** **SBB types (e.g., always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),**
* **SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,**
* **SSB detection performance,**
* **Multi-carrier/multi-TRP ~~SCell~~ operation,**
* **SSB structure,**
* **SSB adaptation,**
* **Etc.**
 |
| Samsung | We suggest the following changes to the proposal for clarity: **Study NW energy saving from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster for initial cell search. Additionally, study UE performance impact and potential mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering:*** **S~~B~~SB types (e.g., always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),**
* **SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **Synchronization raster interval ~~granularity~~, incl. prioritized raster points,**
* **SSB detection performance,**
* **~~SCell operation,~~**
* **SSB structure(s),**
* **SSB pattern,**
* **Etc.**
 |
| IIT Kanpur | Support the proposal. There is a broad consensus to support increased periodicity SSB for significant NES gains. We are propose to include **the design of light SSB** in this proposal. In addition the NES techniques should be jointly studied with UE energy saving techniques such as improved SSB detection, sparser/prioritized synch raster points.  |
| Apple  | We believe that any study evaluating network energy savings from increased SSB periodicity should holistically address the associated negative impact at UE—such as increased UE initial cell search complexity, larger memory demands, power consumption, and cell access latency—rather than examining these factors in isolation or focusing solely on UE performance impact. Moreover, any proposal to adopt higher SSB periodicity values should be accompanied by mitigation strategies to manage the resulting increase in UE complexity. More importantly, beyond its impact on initial access operations, increased SSB periodicity directly affects other functional blocks in RRC\_IDLE—such as SIB monitoring and paging reception. A higher SSB periodicity often necessitates more frequent SSB monitoring to compensate for TO/FO drift. These procedures, performed periodically for RRC\_IDLE UEs, are just as critical as the initial cell search process.We therefore suggest the following modification: **Study the NW energy saving and the associated impact on UE including increased cell search complexity, higher memory requirement, larger power consumption for SIB/Paging reception and potential performance degradation (e.g., cell search latency) from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster. Additionally, study ~~UE performance impact and~~ mechanisms to mitigate these impacts at UE side. ~~UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering:~~*** **~~SBB types (always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),~~**
* **~~SSB periodicity(ies),~~**
* **~~Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,~~**
* **~~SSB detection performance,~~**
* **~~SCell operation,~~**
* **~~Etc.~~**
 |
| Lenovo | Our preference is to keep the bullet at high level without going into details of the schemes which can be discussed later in the respective initial access agenda item Study NW energy savings from increasing the default periodicity for the initial cell search on the synchronization raster and study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations.  |
| Fraunhofer | We support this proposal. Mechanisms to mitigate the impact of NW energy saving (NES) techniques on UE and network performance are key to enhance the scope of maximizing NES gains. In this case, specifically, sparse SS/PBCH transmission for NES (achieved via increased periodicity and/or on-demand transmission) should ensure faster synchronization and cell search mechanisms in the design for given sparseness compared to 5G.We agree with the modifications suggested by LGE and Samsung. |
| Tejas | Our preference is to study different deployment scenarios particularly non standalone case deployment and we prefer to study simplified SSB, such as SSB with partial PBCH and partial MIB in non-standalone. Hence, we suggest the following modification. **Study NW energy saving by adapting the SSB on or off the synchronisation. ~~from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster~~. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases, considering one or more of the following:*** **SBB types (always-on SSB, on-demand SSB, CD-SSB, NCD-SSB),**
* **SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **NEW SSB structure/pattern.**
* **Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,**
* **SSB detection performance,**
* **Deployment scenarios (Standalone deployment, non-standalone deployment, single carrier, multicarrier).**
* **SSB with partial PBCH and/or partial MIB.**
* **~~SCell operation,~~**

**Etc.** |
| OPPO | **Our proposal 10 and proposal 12 in R1-2505761 provided our views 6GR design for SSB. But these were not captured in FL summary. We appreciate if feature lead could add our proposal to the summary.** Regarding the proposal, we have the following comments:1. we think listing the bullets is good for the study guideline. But we think that different aspects should be put at the same level for the study,
2. it is not clear for the term SCell operation or multi-carrier operation. To our understanding, if this implies to, e.g., study whether OD-SSB can be considered for SCell or PCell. Maybe we should make this clear instead of saying simply SCell operation, so we agree with Fujitsu’s comment. But if it reflects whether the OD-SSB should rely on another cell, e.g., Cell-A in 5G R19, then we would suggest to use single-carrier or multi-carrier instead of SCell operation.
3. SSB structure should be added in the bullet as it can directly impact the UE detection complexity.

Suggested updated proposal: **Study NW energy saving aspects on SSB ~~from increasing the default periodicity of cell-defining SSB on synchronization raster. Additionally, study UE performance impact and mechanisms to mitigate UE performance degradations in important use-cases~~, considering:*** **SBB types (always-on SSB, on-demand SSB),**
* **SSB structure,**
* **SSB default periodicity and SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **Synchronization raster granularity, incl. prioritized raster points,**
* **SSB detection performance (including UE complexity and latency),**
* **~~SCell operation,~~multi-carrier and single-carrier scenarios,**
* **Etc.**
 |
| Futurewei | This is a good starting point. We think that there are other possible design decisions in 6GR to factor in such as C-DTX/DRX mode extension to SSB transmission, and SSB periodicity adaptation (time/spatial).  |
| Sony | We suggest adding SSB adaptation. |
| Vodafone | We are ok as a starting point, although this discussion may also depend greatly on the waveform discussion for DL and also Cellular IoT. On the SSB types, it would be good to understand if this is only restrict to OD-SSB, always ON-SSB or also other designs e.g lean SSB with only PSS as studied in Rel-18 NES  |
| MediaTek | We think the objectives for the three meeting in the SI phase are: (1) identify issues (2) propose candidate techniques for the identified issues (3) **evaluate pros and cons** of the proposed candidate techniques based on some **common evaluation assumptions** (including power models, scenarios, etc.). In our opinion, some high-level aspects (e.g. cell loading levels, BS category models, reference configurations, cell deployment scenarios etc.) are missing in this proposal while some second-level details (for a particular solution, e.g on-demand SSB, sync raster enhancements) have been added to the proposal. We assume the issue we are trying to resolve the network energy consumption caused by “always-on” SSBs and PRACH (somehow this is being discussed) when a cell has low to zero loading. Then we suggest the following proposal as a starting point instead. **Modified Proposal 2.2-4: Study NW energy efficiency with different always-on SSB periodicities with zero and low (FFS: [5 or 10]% RU) and light (FFS: RU percentage) cell loading using at least both BS Cat 1 and BS Cat 2 from TR 38.864 with Reference Configuration Set 1, Set 2, and Set 3. Additionally, study UE impact including at least cell search latency, cell complexity, power consumption, coverage, etc.** * **SSB periodicity(ies),**
* **SSB structure: frequency and time**
* **SSB transmission adaptation: spatial domain and power domain**
* **SSB detection performance**
* **Cell deployment scenarios: single carrier, and multi-carrier/TRPs**
* **Other aspects are not precluded.**
 |

## SIB-1 availability

### Companies’ views

|  |
| --- |
| Nokia - R1-2505131* **Proposal 3**: The first 6G release should support a leaner carrier and signaling reduction (of SS/PBCH synchronization signals, system information, PRACH and paging occasions) including on-demand provisioning mechanisms for NES operations of cells operating under low/no load.
* **Proposal 9**: Consider extending the Rel-19 OD-SIB1 for different deployment scenarios, including the single cell scenario.
* **Proposal 12**: On-demand SIB1 operation shall be studied in 6G, including support for legacy operation in PCell and other applicable scenarios.

FUTUREWEI - R1-2505145* **Proposal 4**: Adopt and further enhance from day one the gNB power saving solutions developed in 5G (e.g., 5G NES features SCell with on-demand SSB or no SSB, on-demand SIB1, Cell DTX/DRX, etc.).
* **Proposal 5**: Develop consistent energy efficiency solutions among all UE states. For instance, consistent on-demand control SIB1 signaling for all IDLE, INACTIVE and ACTIVE UEs.

CATT - R1-2505297* **Proposal 6**: In 6GR, on-demand SIB1 should be supported for both homogeneous network and heterogeneous network.
* **Proposal 10**: To simplify the on-demand mechanism of multiple common signals, a unified common signal request mechanism can be considered.

Spreadtrum (UNISOC) - R1-2505176* No SIB1 or OD-SIB1-related proposals.

Xiaomi - R1-2505467* **Proposal 9**: Joint condensed common signal/channel design and L1-based paging adaptation can be considered for 6GR NES.

Samsung - R1-2505589* No SIB1 or OD-SIB1-related proposals.

ZTE - R1-2505607* No SIB1 or OD-SIB1-related proposals.

Ericsson - R1-2505625* **Proposal 5**: Study periodic bursts of SSB and SIB1 repetitions, where in each period multiple SSB and SIB1 repetitions are provided during a short time interval followed by a longer inactive interval.
* **Proposal 6**: 6GR should support coordinating system information broadcast with other common signals/channels in order not to interrupt sleeping opportunities.

Tejas Networks Ltd. - R1-2505631* **Proposal 1**: Transmission of SIB1/SI corresponding only to one SSB beam will improve NES and is targeted for the low load scenario, and transmission of SI corresponding to all the active SSB beams will reduce the number of requests from different UEs and is used during the high load scenario.
* **Proposal 22**: Standalone OD-SIB1 needs to be studied in 6G to determine potential benefits as compared to the non-standalone case defined in 5G NR.

Ofinno - R1-2505677* **Proposal 5**: 6GR should support OD-SIB1 and RAN1 to study supporting OD-SIB1 for a standalone cell.

Quectel - R1-2505769* **Proposal 1**: The OD-SSB/OD-SIB1 structure simplifying SSB/SIB1 needs discussion in 6G.

Panasonic - R1-2505789* **Proposal 3**: To study system information design and framework facilitating common channel/signal ON/OFF and adaptation.

Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI - R1-2505834* **Proposal 5**: The 6GR study should investigate the possibility of increasing common signal periodicity and enable on demand common signals.

LG Electronics - R1-2505858* **Proposal 3**: Study on-demand SIB1 procedure for single-cell scenario (where a cell provides UL WUS configuration for its own on-demand SIB1) as well as for multi-cell scenario (as introduced in Rel-19 NES).
* **Proposal 6**: Study a unified/integrated on-demand procedure for multiple common signals/channels.

Apple - R1-2505917* **Proposal 4**: Reduction/adaptation of common signals/channels should be considered in 6G day-1 to avoid backward compatibility issue and fully achieve the NES benefit.
	+ For OD-SIB1, how much additional NES gain can be obtained through SIB1 reduction in single cell case, under the assumption of increased SSB periodicity.

Fujitsu - R1-2505972* **Proposal 3**: Study the methods to enable on-demand transmission of cell common signals, such as SS, PBCH and SIB1, without limitations on applicable scenarios.
	+ The above aspects can be included in the initial access related discussions.

Lenovo - R1-2505995* **Proposal 2**: 6GR should enhance common signals/channels transmission and periodicity for network energy saving under various cell load.

HONOR - R1-2506003* No SIB1 or OD-SIB1-related proposals.

CAICT - R1-2506005* **Proposal 1**: the coverage and the capacity carrier can be defined to enable dynamic on/off carrier, the SSB signal with long periodicity and on demand SSB can be transmitted in the capacity carrier ,and the always on RS can be transmitted in the coverage carrier.

Sharp - R1-2506014* **Proposal 2**: To reduce unnecessary power consumption and signalling overhead, on demand reference signal in Pcell should be supported.
* **Proposal 7**: On demand signalling for dual-side joint mechanisms for network and UE should be supported in energy efficiency.

ETRI - R1-2506069* **Proposal 13**: Study on-demand system information transmission as a complementary mechanism to periodic transmission.

Vodafone, Bouygues Telecom, Deutsche Telekom - R1-2506134* No SIB1 or OD-SIB1-related proposals.

InterDigital - R1-2506146* **Proposal 6**: Support on-demand signals/channels (e.g., configurable, dynamic (de)activation, and/or UE-requested) where it is applicable.

SK Telecom - R1-2506152* **Proposal 1**: For 6G energy efficiency, at least the following aspects should be studied:
	+ SSB/SIB1 transmission (longer periodicity, on-demand)

Qualcomm - R1-2506222* No SIB1 or OD-SIB1-related proposals.

AT&T - R1-2506237* No SIB1 or OD-SIB1-related proposals.

NTT DOCOMO - R1-2506310* **Proposal 6**: Study both of the following directions for OD-SIB1 operation
	+ Direction1: Standalone OD-SIB1 operation with introducing pre-defined/pre-configured UL WUS.
	+ Direction2: Representative cell/carrier to deliver NES cells’ system information.

WILUS Inc. - R1-2506324* **Proposal 2**: Study On-Demand SSB/SSB1 for 6GR
	+ Enable on-demand SSB/SIB1 transmission for UEs in Idle, Inactive, or RRC\_Connected modes to maximize energy savings and deep-sleep opportunities for gNBs.

Rakuten Mobile, Inc. - R1-2506346* **Proposal 1.2**: RAN1 to study implications of, SIB1 and paging transmitted by Anchor Carriers on demand or at ultra-low periodicity and Data Carriers remain dormant until scheduled user activity is detected.

CEWiT - R1-2506363* **Proposal 1**: 6G should support energy efficiency enhancements for common signals including
	1. On-Demand Signals for initial access including OD-SSB & OD-SIB1 a. Simplified SSB

IIT Kanpur - R1-2506392* **Proposal 2**: 6GR Day 1 design, shall apply time/frequency adaptations of SS/PBCH transmission with more on-demand signal transmission and less always-on signals. Also on-demand SIB1 operation shall be supported from the Day 1 in 6G.
 |

### Summary

The above proposals address the energy inefficiency caused by the frequent periodic transmission of SIB1 in 5G NR, typically every 20 ms or up to 160 ms, which consumes network resources and prevents gNBs from entering deep sleep modes, particularly in low or no-traffic (Sharp, Nokia Obs. 1, Ericsson Obs. 1, MediaTek Obs. 1). This always-on broadcasting limits network energy savings (NES), which could be reduced by up to 83.7% for Cat-1 and 52.5% for Cat-2 base stations under low load, as per TR 38.864. The proposals aim to mitigate this by enabling OD-SIB1, possibly triggered by UE requests via uplink wake-up signals (UL-WUS) or network conditions, allowing gNBs to remain in low-power states during idle periods (Sharp Prop. 7, NTT DOCOMO Prop. 6, FUTUREWEI Prop. 5). They address 5G’s backward compatibility constraints, which restricted OD-SIB1 to capacity cells in non-standalone scenarios, by advocating for support in standalone operation of on-demand SIB1, and both homogeneous and heterogeneous networks (Ofinno Prop. 5, Tejas Prop. 22, CATT Prop. 6). Additional enhancements include simplifying OD-SIB1 procedures, using default configurations or extended Master Information Blocks (MIB) to reduce signaling overhead, coordinating SIB1 with other common signals to avoid interrupting sleep opportunities, optimizing SIB1 transmission to specific SSB beams based on traffic load, and integrating with unified common signal request mechanisms to streamline operations (Ericsson Prop. 6, OPPO Prop. 13, CATT Prop. 10, Tejas Prop. 1). These changes ensure minimal impact on UE performance, such as access latency, while supporting diverse device types and new spectrum (~7 GHz) for a leaner, energy-efficient 6GR design from Day 1 (Apple Prop. 4, IIT Kanpur Prop. 2, Lenovo Prop. 2).

### 1st round FL comments and proposals

Companies agree that SIB1, as the only periodically transmitted SIB, is an obstacle to NW energy efficiency. The views on what to do about it differ, though. A UE-centric approach is a UE-initiated OD-SIB1 (and OD-SSB), as presented in Figure 2, whereas a NW-centric approach combines a more efficient SIB1 transmission with NW-initiated OD-SIB1 transmissions.



Figure 2: Illustration of UE-centric OD-SIB functionality [9].

In FL’s understanding, OD-SIB provisioning is not necessarily limited to SIB1 for which reason the FL proposes to generalize the discussion to overall system information.

FL proposes that companies study more detailed alternatives for OD-SIB and their respective potential gains.

FL Proposal 2.3‑9:

**Study and evaluate on-demand system information operation with respect to, e.g.,**

* **NW and UE energy savings potential,**
* **Acquisition delay**
* **Applicable deployment scenarios**
* **NW and UE complexity**

Companies are welcome to share their views on the above FL proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | On the FL Proposal 2.3-1, we would like to have a revision as below, to emphasize the concept in Figure 2 above, which is really helpful on reducing the cell accessing latency. In addition, we can also consider integration of UL-WUS with MSG1 in the subsequent RA procedure, since the UL-WUS can be PRACH as well in 6GR. FL Proposal 2.3‑10:**Study and evaluate on-demand system information operation with respect to, e.g.,*** **NW and UE energy savings potential,**
* **Acquisition delay, e.g., integration of one request for different OD common signal.**
* **Applicable deployment scenarios**
* **NW and UE complexity**
 |
| InterDigital | Support |
| TCL | We see clear benefit in on-demand system information to eliminate constant SIB1 broadcasts and reduce idle energy waste. Triggering SIB only when needed can significantly save network energy (5G evaluations showed skipping SIB1 yields substantial savings in low-load cells). It could also let UEs skip unnecessary system-info decoding. Nevertheless, we still concern about added access latency and signaling complexity–UEs requesting SI might face delays or contention. Thus, like proposal mentioned, acquisition delay needs carefully considered. |
| Spreadtrum | We think “request signaling” should be added.FL Proposal 2.3‑11:**Study and evaluate on-demand system information operation with respect to, e.g.,*** **NW and UE energy savings potential,**
* **Request signaling,**
* **Acquisition delay**
* **Applicable deployment scenarios**
* **NW and UE complexity**
 |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with this proposal |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Fainity | OK |
| Ofinno | Generally supportive. As many of the proposals from companies focus on SIB1 specifically we wonder if it would be helpful to have a note which says that the study includes SIB1 and OSI |
| CEWiT | The on demand SI operation should be studied including request signalling details between UE and Gnb. It can also be considered in conjuction with other operations especially common signals. We support the proposal with following modificationFL Proposal 2.3‑12:**Study and evaluate on-demand system information operation with respect to, e.g.,*** **NW and UE energy savings potential,**
* **Request signaling,**
* **Acquisition delay**
* **Applicable deployment scenarios**
* **Interaction with other common signal/channel operations**
* **NW and UE complexity**
 |
| Nokia | While on-demand system information in general is relevant for NES in 6GR, we need to be careful with the potential overlap between scope of the work in RAN1 and RAN2. For that reason, we propose to focus the RAN1 studies on SIB1, as its content has direct impact on physical layer procedures. In addition, we would like to clarify if “applicable deployment scenarios” includes other cases such as SIB1 offloading to an anchor cell, coexistence between OD-SIB1 and regular (but infrequent) SIB1. |
| LG Electronics | In general, the proposal is okay. Evaluation methodology that was defined in Rel-19 on-demand SIB1 can be considered as starting point. |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | The proposal should, probably with higher priority, look into single carrier scenario since it relates to the SSB discussion and initial access procedure, although the proposal does not limit to multi-carrier scenario. For that reason, we do not prefer to start with on-demand SIB; furthermore, NR has already established good design for on-demand SIB1, we would like to see all potential for SIB1 delivery for 6GR from Day1.NW complexity for SIB1/SIBx transmission does not seem to be concerned. We provide the following modificationsFL Proposal 2.3‑1-Huawei update:**Study and evaluate ~~on-demand~~ system information delivery ~~operation~~ with respect to, e.g.,*** **NW and UE energy savings potential,**
* **Acquisition delay, common PDCCH/SIB coverage, UE complexity**
* **Applicable deployment scenarios**
	+ **For multi-carrier scenario, On-demand SIB1 framework can be starting point**
* **~~NW and UE complexity~~**
 |
| DCM  | Generally fine. In Rel-19, some of the scenarios (e.g., standalone OD-SIB1 operation) were not supported due to backward compatibility and lack of time for the study. So,  in 6G, we would like to focus on the scenario which is not supported in NR. **Study and evaluate on-demand system information operation with respect to, e.g.,** * **NW and UE energy savings potential,**
* **Acquisition delay**
* **Applicable deployment scenarios, e.g., standalone OD-SIB1 cell**
* **NW and UE complexity**

 |
| CMCC | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | OK with the proposal.  |
| ETRI | Support |
| NEC | We support studying on-demand system information. A key limitation of the on-demand SIB1 feature in 5G NR was its reliance on an assisting anchor cell, which restricted its applicability. We agree with the general consensus that 6GR should study extending on-demand SIB1 to standalone/single-cell scenarios. Evaluating the potential energy savings, acquisition delay, and complexity, as proposed by the FL, is the correct approach to developing a more universally applicable and effective mechanism for 6GR. |
| Xiaomi | We support the intention of support OD-SIB1 to save energy. However, we feel a little bit lost on the proposal. Actually OD-SIB1 was comprehensively discussed during Rel-19, we should not repeat previous discussion as much as possible. For us, the main bullet with some modification is sufficient:FL Proposal 2.3‑1:**Study ~~and evaluate~~ on-demand system information operation ~~with respect to, e.g.,~~ and evaluate if necessary.*** **~~NW and UE energy savings potential,~~**
* **~~Acquisition delay~~**
* **~~Applicable deployment scenarios~~**
* **~~NW and UE complexity~~**
 |
| Ericsson | SupportFrom network EE perspective, on-demand system information is only meaningful if SSB periodicity is large. Regarding acquisition delay, on-demand operation can in some cases reduce the acquisition delay compared to periodic transmission with long periodicity. Regarding deployment scenarios – standalone operation (i.e. not relying on assisting cell) will benefit a wider range of practical network deployments. For SIB1 however, the question is how to provide the configuration. |
| Vivo | In our view, there are two different directions based on Rel-19 OD-SIB1 procedure: one is to extend OD-SIB1 to all cell types by providing WUS configuration within or together with NES cell’s SSB; the other is to reduce SSB transmission in capacity cells in addition to the SIB1 to achieve larger NES gain. Besides, on-demand system information is based on UL WUS. So we suggest the following updates **Study and evaluate on-demand system information (potentially together with SSB) operation with respect to, e.g.,*** **NW and UE energy savings potential,**
* **Acquisition delay**
* **Applicable deployment scenarios**
* **NW and UE complexity**
 |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We think not only OD-SIB1, also OD-SSB should be studied considering some aspects, e.g., NES gain or acquisition delay. Therefore, this proposal should be more general, as following**FL Proposal 2.3‑1:****Study and evaluate on-demand signal/channel ~~system information~~ operation with respect to, e.g.,*** **NW and UE energy savings potential,**
* **Acquisition delay**
* **Applicable deployment scenarios**
* **NW and UE complexity**
 |
| Samsung | We want to clarify that the proposal is for OD-SIB1 only or generally for all SIB (e.g., SIB1 and SIBx, x>1). If it is only for OD-SIB1, the main bullet may need to clarify this point.  |
| IIT Kanpur | We support the proposal. |
| Apple | In general, we would try to avoid leaving an impression in the summary part that the benefits/gains of the proposals have been commonly recognized. We propose to capture our proposal to further justify the necessity of OD-SIB1 by evaluating how much additional NES gain can be obtained through SIB1 reduction, under the assumption of increased SSB periodicity.(Prop.4 in R1-2505917). Proposed update to the Summary part: The above proposals address the energy inefficiency caused by the frequent periodic transmission of SIB1 in 5G NR, typically every 20 ms or up to 160 ms, which consumes network resources and prevents gNBs from entering deep sleep modes, particularly in low or no-traffic (Sharp, Nokia Obs. 1, Ericsson Obs. 1, MediaTek Obs. 1). This always-on broadcasting together with SSB transmission limits network energy savings (NES), which could be reduced by up to 83.7% for Cat-1 and 52.5% for Cat-2 base stations under low load, as per TR 38.864. The proposals aim to mitigate this by enabling OD-SIB1, possibly triggered by UE requests via uplink wake-up signals (UL-WUS) or network conditions, allowing gNBs to remain in low-power states during idle periods (Sharp Prop. 7, NTT DOCOMO Prop. 6, FUTUREWEI Prop. 5). They intend to address 5G’s backward compatibility constraints, which restricted OD-SIB1 to capacity cells in non-standalone scenarios, by advocating for support in standalone operation of on-demand SIB1, and both homogeneous and heterogeneous networks (Ofinno Prop. 5, Tejas Prop. 22, CATT Prop. 6). However, there were also proposals to further justify the need to reduce SIB1 broadcast, considering if the SSB periodicity is increased and SIB1 is broadcast with the same periodicity as SSB, additional NES gain for OD-SIB1 could be marginal (Apple Figure 4, Prop.4). Additional enhancements include simplifying OD-SIB1 procedures, using default configurations or extended Master Information Blocks (MIB) to reduce signaling overhead, coordinating SIB1 with other common signals to avoid interrupting sleep opportunities, optimizing SIB1 transmission to specific SSB beams based on traffic load, and integrating with unified common signal request mechanisms to streamline operations (Ericsson Prop. 6, OPPO Prop. 13, CATT Prop. 10, Tejas Prop. 1). These changes ensure minimal impact on UE performance, such as access latency, while supporting diverse device types and new spectrum (~7 GHz) for a leaner, energy-efficient 6GR design from Day 1 (~~Apple Prop. 4,~~ IIT Kanpur Prop. 2, Lenovo Prop. 2).For the proposal, Huawei’s version provides a more general starting point FL Proposal 2.3‑1(Updated):**Study and evaluate ~~on-demand~~ system information delivery, including broadcast and on-demand provisioning ~~operation~~ with respect to, e.g.,*** **NW and UE energy savings potential,**
* **SIB Acquisition delay~~,~~ and complexity**
* **Applicable deployment scenarios**
 |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal I think the **on-demand system information operation should be changed to on-demand minimum system information**  |
| Fraunhofer | We support this direction and agree with DCM, NEC and Ericsson to specifically address the standalone scenario without relying assistance from anchor cell has wider scope and greater potential for NES. |
| Tejas | Our preference is to include joint request of SI and other common signal such as SSB. **Study and evaluate the on-demand system information (OD-SI) or joint on demand system information and other common signal/channel operation with respect to, e.g.,*** **NW and UE energy savings potential,**
* **Acquisition delay**
* **Applicable deployment scenarios**
* **NW and UE complexity**
 |
| OPPO | **Our proposal 13 in R1-2505761 and the corresponding text provide some of our views on 6G SIB transmission. This is inline with the discussion item in FL summary section 2.3. Unfortunately, our views were not captured in FL summary. We appreciate if feature lead could add our proposal to the summary.** Regarding FL proposal, we are fine. |
| Futurewei | OK in principle. The FL refers to Fig 1, should it be Fig 2? Without additional specifics the formulation is quite like 5G NR study. For instance, we could differentiate with the following change: * **Applicable deployment scenarios in addition to those supported in 5G NR.**
 |
| Sony | We support this proposal. |
| Vodafone | RAN1 should strive to avoid defining scenarios that rely on underlaid coverage of other cells (Cell A and NES Cell), as the main reason it was not adopted in 5G was due to legacy UE impact. For 6GR if OD-SIB1 is to be defined it should only focus on standalone scenario. |

## DL WUS/WUR requirements

### Companies’ views

|  |
| --- |
| FUTUREWEI - R1-2505145* **Proposal 3**: Adopt from day one 5G UE power saving techniques as baseline mechanisms in 6G, such as:
	+ Duty-cycled based operations (iDRX, eDRX, cDRX),
	+ LP-WUS with at least PEI and DCP functionality replacement,
	+ Relaxed RRM measurements of neighboring cells, and
	+ Relaxed/Offloading to LP-WUR of serving cell measurements.

Spreadtrum (UNISOC) - R1-2505176* **Proposal 3**: The following technologies can be studied for 6GR UE power saving:
	1. Bandwidth adaptation, SCell dormancy, TX/RX antenna adaptation, paging enhancement, WUS/WUR, etc.

vivo - R1-2505420* **Proposal 3**: Study the introduction of wake-up signal and wake-up receiver for paging, PDCCH monitoring, and serving cell measurement for 6GR.

ZTE - R1-2505607* **Proposal 25**: Low power WUS should be supported in 6GR.

Ericsson - R1-2505625* **Proposal 17**: 6GR should adopt a simplified OFDM-based LP-WUS/WUR design for idle/connected mode UE power saving, with improved coverage and spectral efficiency compared to NR.

NEC - R1-2505641* **Proposal 13**: Study the enhancement of low-power wake-up signal/receiver (LP-WUS/WUR) for paging and PDCCH monitoring for 6GR.
* **Proposal 14**: Study the design of low-power synchronization signal (LP-SS) for serving cell measurement with low-power wake-up receiver for 6GR.
* **Proposal 19**: Study the enhancements of PDCCH skipping and SSSG switching with wake-up signal for 6GR.

Ofinno - R1-2505677* **Proposal 8**: 6GR should support a framework for LP-WUS as a baseline for power saving for RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE UEs.
* **Proposal 9**: RAN1 to study improving coverage for LP-WUS, e.g., by introducing repetition and/or low modulation order and coding rate, without increasing UE complexity.

OPPO - R1-2505761* **Proposal 4**: 6GR can consider to unify DCP/PEI/LP-WUS to avoid multiple variants of wake-up signal design in order to achieve better UE power saving performance.

Panasonic - R1-2505789* **Proposal 8**: To study possible LP-WUS/LP-SS integration with 6GR and the support by MRSS.

LG Electronics - R1-2505858* **Proposal 13**: Study DL WUS to control UE wake-up during active time, e.g., PDCCH monitoring, as well as wake-up for paging/measurement for idle/inactive mode.

Apple - R1-2505917* **Proposal 1**: Time domain adaptation techniques like C-DRX, PDCCH skipping, SSSG switching, and LP-WUS should be considered for a simplified/harmonized design to reduce UE power consumption for PDCCH monitoring.
* **Proposal 2**: LP-WUS/WUR design targeting all device types should be based on OFDM waveform to achieve better coverage and spectral efficiency, and should be applicable to both idle/inactive and connected mode UEs.

Fujitsu - R1-2505972* **Proposal 6**: For UE power saving, the following should be considered: C-DRX, PDCCH monitoring reduction, WUS for idle mode, etc.

KT Corp. - R1-2505991* **Proposal 3**: A low-power receiver is mandatory for both 6GR BS and UE.

HONOR - R1-2506003* **Proposal 6**: The design of low-power WUS should be considered on both the UE side and the network side to save energy.

Sharp - R1-2506014* **Proposal 6**: To complement the paging mechanism for UE energy efficiency, low-power WUS should be introduced in the 6GR design.

MediaTek - R1-2506024* **Proposal 5**: Study WUR for UE synchronization and measurements in addition to wake-up functionality.
* **Proposal 19**: For 6G, WUS/WUR should consider OFDM-based design to achieve better coverage and spectral efficiency.

CMCC - R1-2506101* **Proposal 5**: Support the following UE power saving techniques to be further adopted in 6GR:
	+ Time domain:
		- PDCCH Skipping/SSSG switching/cross-slot scheduling
		- I-DRX, Extended-DRX including PTW
		- RRM/RLM/BFD relaxation
		- LP-WUS/WUR for paging, PDCCH monitoring and serving cell measurement
	+ Frequency domain: SCell activation/deactivation/dormancy for CA scenario, BWP switching
* **Proposal 6**: RAN1 to further consider and study the enhancement of LP-WUS/WUR in 6GR:
	+ Signal design aspect, aim for better performance on coverage/robustness/efficiency:
		- Better receiver detection method for 6G LP-WUR more than envelope detection, can be considered.
		- The receiver accuracy, e.g., option 3 or 4 in 3GPP TR 38.845 (~0.1-1mW) can be considered as start point with justified power saving gain.
		- Overlaid-wise signals are not necessary to avoid unnecessary design trade-offs.
		- Both RRC IDLE / CONNECTED mode are supported.
	+ Procedure design aspect, aim for extend the usage:
		- For 6G LP-WUS,
			* It can be considered to carry small payload size data or extra indications, which can further reduce the turning-on time of MR and the complexity of PDCCH monitoring.
			* In addition, it can be considered together with the usage of PDCCH skipping to control PDCCH monitoring in a more power efficient way.
		- For 6G LP-SS,
			* It can be considered for neighbor cell/TRP measurement at least for cell selection/reselection procedure in addition to serving cell measurement.
			* It should consider a harmonized design of UE measurement can be targeted between 6G LP-SS for LP-WUR and “6G SSB” for Main Radio, in order to avoid too much always-on signals being transmitted by BS.

Vodafone, Bouygues Telecom, Deutsche Telekom - R1-2506134* **Proposal 3**: Study introduction of LP-WUS/WUR for all device types in 6GR air interface as a day-1 considering potential impacts and benefits.

InterDigital - R1-2506146* **Proposal 10**: Support LP-WUS targeting low power receiver capability from 6G Day-1.
* **Proposal 11**: Support multiple types of modulations with different receiver architectures considering different power consumption levels and achievable coverages.
* **Proposal 12**: Support low power receiver operations for mobility and cell (re)selection.

SK Telecom - R1-2506152* **Proposal 1**: For 6G energy efficiency, at least the following aspects should be studied:
	+ SSB/SIB1 transmission (longer periodicity, on-demand)
	+ Enhanced BWP mechanism
	+ Time-domain enhancement (UE-basis C-DRX vs. cell-basis DRX/DTX, LP-WUS/WUR)
	+ Reduced RRM measurement
	+ PEI

NTT DOCOMO - R1-2506310* **Proposal 13**: Study LP-WUS/WUR to control UE wake-up for PDCCH monitoring.
* **Proposal 14**: Study LP-WUS/WUR for RRM measurement.
* **Proposal 15**: Study extension of LP-WUS/WUR for neighbor cell measurement in idle/inactive mode, as well as serving cell measurement.

IIT Kanpur - R1-2506392* **Proposal 4**: 6GR Day 1 design shall enhance the low-power wake-up signal/receiver (LP-WUS/WUR) designs for improving UE power efficiency.
 |

### Summary

The DL WUS and WUR proposals address the significant UE energy consumption in 5G NR, particularly during PDCCH monitoring, paging, and RRM measurements, which account for approximately 30% of UE power usage due to frequent wake-ups that prevent the main radio (MR) from entering deep sleep states (Apple Obs. 1, MediaTek Obs. 2). These proposals aim to enhance UE power saving by introducing low-power wake-up signal (LP-WUS) and wake-up receiver (WUR) mechanisms as mandatory Day 1 features in 6GR, using OFDM-based designs or advanced detection methods (e.g., beyond envelope detection) to improve coverage, robustness, spectral efficiency, and reduced overhead/NW energy consumption compared to 5G NR (Ericsson Prop. 17, MediaTek Prop. 19, CMCC Prop. 6). They target minimizing unnecessary UE wake-ups for PDCCH monitoring, paging, and serving/neighbor cell measurements in both RRC\_CONNECTED and RRC\_IDLE/INACTIVE modes, enabling UEs to remain in low-power states longer (LG Prop. 13, Ofinno Prop. 8, NTT DOCOMO Prop. 15). Proposals advocate harmonizing LP-WUS/WUR with other power-saving techniques like C-DRX, PDCCH skipping, and SSSG switching, unifying designs with Paging Early Indication (PEI) and DCI-based Power Saving (DCP) to reduce complexity (Apple Prop. 2, OPPO Prop. 4, NEC Prop. 14). They address 5G’s limitations, such as underutilized WUS due to late standardization and multiple waveform variants (e.g., OOK vs. OFDM), by proposing simplified, robust designs with techniques like repetition or low modulation order, supporting diverse device types (e.g., IoT, XR/AR) in new spectrum (~7 GHz), and enabling mobility and cell (re)selection, achieving significant power savings (e.g., 10–20 times lower than MR per 3GPP Rel-18 studies, up to 80–90% compared to 5G paging) while maintaining low latency and compatibility with diverse 6GR use cases (Ofinno Prop. 9, InterDigital Prop. 10, vivo Prop. 3).

### 1st round FL comments and proposals

Most companies support an OFDM-based WUS/WUR due to its superior coverage, reduced overhead, and greater additional energy efficiency potential from, e.g., synchronization and RRM. For that reason, agreeing to an OFDM-based WUS is the first firm agreement put forward.

A natural consequence of such an agreement is for RAN1 to further study additional use for an OFDM-based WUS. This is presented in a follow-up proposal in FL Proposal 2.4-14.

FL Proposal 2.4‑13:

**Propose OFDM-based DL WUS as a candidate technology for further studies in the 6G Radio SI.**

Companies are welcome to share their views on the above FL proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | We are fine with studying OFDM-based DL WUS for enhancing WUS performance, especially for coverage consideration. But meanwhile, we should also consider whether OFDM-based DL WUS is applicable for diverse device types anticipated in 6GR.  |
| TCL | A unified OFDM WUS can replace multiple legacy indicators (PEI, DCP, etc.), simplifying protocols and benefiting both network and device vendors. It leverages standard OFDM receivers, avoiding the need for a separate waveform. However, some concerns are concluded as below* If any enhanced WUR should be considered in 6G day 1 or following LP-WUR discussed in Rel-18 SI (like OFDM-based overlaid sequence detection or OFDM-based sequence detection)
* What CP-OFDM or DFT-s-OFDM or both is used to generate OFDM-based DL WUS needs to be discussed if considering enhanced WUR.
 |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Panasonic | We are open to study the potential of OFDM-based DL WUS in the IDLE mode. However, the use/scenario and function should be looked into before such a conclusive proposal. For example, what is the target function, what is the UE procedure of receiving and use it and what is the relation with SS are all not discussed yet.But the wording of the proposal reads like it is already concluded. Thus, we propose to only discuss the next proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the proposal, but would like to avoid the “/WUR” in the discussion. It is up to the UE how to implement the receiver for the OFDM-based DL WUS. |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Fainity | OK with the proposal |
| Ofinno | Support |
| Nokia | The proposal should be reformulated in terms of study on DL-WUS. In the current format it is suggesting we first agree on DL WUS support, regardless of evaluations. Revised proposal: “Consider DL WUS in the studies performed in this AI.“ |
| LG Electronics | We support a principle pursuing a unified solution for PEI, DCP, or PDCCH monitoring adaptation. However, it would be premature to take OFDM-based DL WUS as a single candidate solution. Before narrowing down to a solution, we would suggest to study and compare pros and cons for several candidate schemes, i.e., DCI-based approach, OFDM-based DL WUS, and OOK-based DL WUS. |
| Sharp | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We agree enhancements on NR LP-WUS is beneficial. We suggest to modify the proposal as below,FL Proposal 2.4‑1-Huawei updated:**Study ~~Propose~~ OFDM/DFT-based DL WUS as a candidate technology ~~for further studies~~ in the 6G Radio SI, aspects to be considered include at least*** **Coverage, synchronization accuracy, capability**
* **Small control and/or data information**
* **Associated functions, e.g. serving cell/neighboring cell measurement.**
 |
| DCM  | We are supportive with studying OFDM-based DL WUS While the OOK-based LP-WUS signal in release 19 had the advantage of being usable with low performance OOK-based receivers, it caused large overhead regardless of the receiver type. Furthermore, low synchronization accuracy and BLER target limited coverage. This is a significant issue regarding commercial deployment. For this reason, in release 20, we need to study OFDM-based LP-WUS signals to achieve minimized NW resource overhead and maximized use cases with good UE PS gain.  |
| CMCC | Support |
| ETRI | To avoid multiple waveform variants and devices, we prefer to focus the study on OFDM-based DL WUS. |
| NEC | We are generally fine with the proposal, OFDM-based WUS is a good solution to extend the coverage of LP signal. However, we think OOK-based WUS can also be studied for the scenario that extremely low power consumption is demanded, if such a scenario is identified. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| vivo | We are generally ok to this proposal and suggest slight change to the wording. In addition, it is important to target unified design of DL WUS across IDLE and CONNETED modeFL Proposal 2.4‑1:~~Propose~~ Study OFDM-based DL WUS ~~as a candidate technology for further studies~~ in the 6G Radio SI. Target unified design of DL WUS across IDLE and CONNECTED mode usage.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support |
| Samsung | Suggest to reword:**~~Propose~~ Study OFDM-based DL WUS as a candidate technology for ~~further studies in~~ the 6G Radio SI.** |
| IIT Kanpur | We support the proposal for downlink WUS design in 6GR. |
| Apple  | We are fine with the proposal, but we would like to leave it open to still consider other DL WUS waveform(s) at this early stage.  |
| Lenovo  | support |
| Fraunhofer | support |
| Tejas | Support |
| OPPO | First, the proposal 4 under the company name OPPO captured in FL summary is not exactly our text. We have” ***Proposal 4:******For UE energy efficiency, the 6GR should consider energy efficient design for DL control channel and related procedure. UE energy efficiency should avoid duplication of design similar function, i.e., strive for a single power saving signal.***” Regarding OFDM-based DL WUS, we are open to study. That would reduce the duplicated functionality like DCP based PEI and LP-WUS based DCP. And the coverage would be much better for OFDM-based. |
| Futurewei | OK to study. We do not see any reason to restrict the study at this stage. We would like the following reformulation:**Propose ~~OFDM-based~~ DL LP-WUS as a candidate technology for further studies in the 6G Radio SI.** |
| Qualcomm | We prefer discussion toward general downlink low-power signal in which use cases of this signal can be further studied to benefit both NW and UE from energy efficiency perspectives. Hence, we suggest combining discussion of this proposal and Proposal 2.4-14 together as follows: **Propose: Study OFDM-based DL low-power RS at least including*** **Use cases e.g., wake-up indication, synchronization etc.**
* **Energy efficiency analysis**
* **Applicable RRC states**
 |
| Vodafone | Support the proposal, and it may be worth to investigate coexistence with 5G LP-WUS to allow single WUR for 5G LP-WUS and 6GR LP-WUS. Multicarrier operation in idle mode is also important to support, to allow offloading UEs from low bands where LP-WUS is expected to operated to perform RACH on other bands according to operator priority |
| AT&T | Agree with using OFDM-based LP-WUS as a starting point since this facilitates the support of the feature with the same waveform (assuming CP-OFDM is the rule of land for DL waveforms) |

FL Proposal 2.4‑14:

Study further use cases and potential energy efficiency gains for an OFDM-based DL WUS/WUR, apart from wake-up indication, e.g.,

* Synchronization,
* RRM measurements (e.g., neighbor cells),
* Small control information and/or data,
* Etc.

Companies are welcome to share their views on the above FL proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | We are supportive of use case of synchronization. Given that likely increased SSB periodicity, an additional signal in between two SSBs would be helpful for UE’s sync performance.  |
| TCL | We partially agree with this proposal. In our understanding, expanding WUS roles may introduce complexity and new failure modes. The DL WUS design must remain lightweight–any extra payload or usage should bring clear net energy gains and minimal added UE processing burden. We thus supports study but urges cautious evaluation of the cost-benefit trade-offs. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. A small modification is as followsFL Proposal 2.4‑15:Study further use cases and potential energy efficiency gains for an OFDM-based DL WUS/WUR, apart from wake-up indication, e.g.,* Synchronization,
* RRM measurements (e.g., serving cell and/or neighbor cells),
* Small control information and/or data,
* Etc.
 |
| Panasonic | We believe this is regarding basic IDLE mode UE procedures and operations. So **cell identification** should also be added.Also, the meaning of the wake-up indication should also be open at this moment. Thus, to put wake-up indication to the bullet is suggested:* Wake-up indication and function
 |
| Qualcomm | Ok with the proposal with the same note on removing “/WUR” |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Fainity | We suggest the redirect behavior upon cell selection and on-demand SSB behavior should be included in this study. |
| Ofinno | Support the main bullet. Could we clarify what we mean by small control information and/or data? If we understand right it may be simpler to say “enhance information LP-WUS can indicate/carry” |
| CEWiT | We are open to discuss the enhancements needed for the proposal |
| Nokia | Inline what was commented above, the intention seems to be to study the EE benefits (of extending) the WUR capabilities for further power saving. In addition, one needs to consider, e.g. energy penalty at network side from DL WUS transmission, potential spectral efficiency loss (due to higher system overhead), potential coverage difference between DL WUS and other DL signals/channels, transmitter impairments (especially if there is power difference between other channels and DL-WUS). |
| LG Electronics | As we stated in Proposal 2.4-1, we would like to study/compare candidate techniques on the table. In that sense, our proposal can be as follow,Study further use cases and potential energy efficiency gains for ~~an OFDM-based DL WUS/WUR~~ candidate DL WUS/WUR techniques (i.e., DCI-based approach, OFDM-based DL WUS, and OOK-based DL WUS), apart from wake-up indication, e.g.,* Synchronization,
* RRM measurements (e.g., neighbor cells),
* Small control information and/or data,
* Etc.
 |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC | Support |
| ETRI | We support studying synchronization and RRM measurements including neighbor cells. Regarding the third one, we think it is not necessary to include the study on small control information and data as it will complicate LP-WUS design and will not align with 6GR design principles. |
| NEC | We support this proposed study. Utilizing a more capable OFDM-based WUR for functions beyond simple wake-up indication is a promising direction for maximizing UE power saving. There is wide support for investigating the use of the WUR for offloading main radio operations, such as performing RRM measurements on serving and neighbor cells, maintaining synchronization, and even receiving small data packets. This would allow the UE's main receiver to remain in a deep sleep state for longer periods, leading to significant energy savings. |
| Xiaomi | We are generally fine with the direction. DL WUS is confused, no sure the extent, e.g., LP-WUS, DCP, PEI. If the intention is to cover all kinds of WUS, it’s better to clarify as we don’t have a terminology of DL WUS before. |
| Ericsson | Support. RRM measurements would be beneficial. |
| vivo | We agree to study further use cases besides wake-up indication and corresponding energy efficiency gains for DL WUS/WUR.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support |
| Samsung | There should be a preliminary proposal on whether to study DL WUR, and then discuss the details about further procedures.  |
| IIT Kanpur | We are open to discuss these aspects. |
| Apple  | We support the proposal  |
| Lenovo | We can keep it at high level by removing the sub-bullets. Add impact to the NW energy savings, if any. Study further use cases and potential energy efficiency gains for an OFDM-based DL WUS/WUR, apart from wake-up indication, and impact to the NW energy savings  |
| Tejas | We support |
| OPPO | Suggest not to have a standalone proposal 2.4-1. Please see our comment above. |
| Futurewei | OK to study, however the specific scenarios for the usage must be defined first |
| Qualcomm | Please see our response under Proposal 2.4-13. |
|  |  |

## Cell DTX/DRX and sleep mechanisms

### Companies’ views

|  |
| --- |
| Nokia - R1-2505131* **Proposal 2**: 6G should support cell DTX/DRX type of operation from day one to allow for sufficient BS sleep opportunities and achieve meaningful NES.
* **Proposal 3**: The first 6G release should support a leaner carrier and signaling reduction (of SS/PBCH synchronization signals, system information, PRACH and paging occasions) including on-demand provisioning mechanisms for NES operations of cells operating under low/no load.
* **Proposal 4**: 6G should support lean carrier operation in capacity cells where always-on signals can be turned off in the absence of traffic.
* **Proposal 9**: Consider extending the Rel-19 OD-SIB1 for different deployment scenarios, including the single cell scenario.

FUTUREWEI - R1-2505145* **Proposal 4**: Adopt and further enhance from day one the gNB power saving solutions developed in 5G (e.g., 5G NES features SCell with on-demand SSB or no SSB, on-demand SIB1, Cell DTX/DRX, etc.).
* **Proposal 5**: Develop consistent energy efficiency solutions among all UE states. For instance, consistent on-demand control SIB1 signaling for all IDLE, INACTIVE and ACTIVE UEs.

CATT - R1-2505297* **Proposal 2**: In 6GR, cell DTX/DRX should be supported for both homogeneous network and heterogeneous network.
* **Proposal 6**: In 6GR, on-demand SIB1 should be supported for both homogeneous network and heterogeneous network.
* **Proposal 10**: To simplify the on-demand mechanism of multiple common signals, a unified common signal request mechanism can be considered.

Xiaomi - R1-2505467* **Proposal 9**: Joint condensed common signal/channel design and L1-based paging adaptation can be considered for 6GR NES.

ZTE - R1-2505607* **Proposal 4**: Cell DTX/DRX should be supported in 6GR to allow sufficient BS sleep opportunities.

Ericsson - R1-2505625* **Proposal 4**: Study cell DTX/DRX to allow sufficient BS sleep opportunities, including support for legacy operation.

Tejas Networks Ltd. - R1-2505631* **Proposal 6**: Cell DTX/DRX should be supported in 6GR to enhance energy efficiency for BS under various traffic load.
* **Proposal 22**: Standalone OD-SIB1 needs to be studied in 6G to determine potential benefits as compared to the non-standalone case defined in 5G NR.

Ofinno - R1-2505677* **Proposal 4**: 6GR should support cell DTX/DRX for PCell and SCell from day-1.

OPPO - R1-2505761* **Proposal 2**: Cell DTX/DRX can be studied for 6GR to allow sufficient BS sleep opportunities and achieve meaningful BS energy saving.
* **Proposal 13**: For the 6GR, OD-SIB1 without relying on cell A can be studied with the following considerations:
	+ further simplify the OD-SIB1 procedure compared to the 5G OD-SIB1 counterpart,
	+ consider adopting default configurations, allowing the necessary OD-SIB1 parameters to be inferred with minimal signaling, or consider introducing an extended MIB to provide necessary configuration.

Quectel - R1-2505769* **Proposal 1**: The OD-SSB/OD-SIB1 structure simplifying SSB/SIB1 needs discussion in 6G.

Panasonic - R1-2505789* **Proposal 3**: To study system information design and framework facilitating common channel/signal ON/OFF and adaptation.

Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI - R1-2505834* **Proposal 3**: The 6GR study should investigate the possibility to deactivate the capacity cell in case of no or low traffic load.

LG Electronics - R1-2505858* **Proposal 3**: Study on-demand SIB1 procedure for single-cell scenario (where a cell provides UL WUS configuration for its own on-demand SIB1) as well as for multi-cell scenario (as introduced in Rel-19 NES).
* **Proposal 6**: Study a unified/integrated on-demand procedure for multiple common signals/channels.

Apple - R1-2505917* **Proposal 5**: Cell DTX/DRX should be considered in 6G day-1 to avoid backward compatibility issue and fully achieve the NES benefit.

Fujitsu - R1-2505972* **Proposal 2**: Study the methods to turn off always-on signals in capacity cells without traffic for energy saving, and enable fast activation of the cell when traffic arrives.
* **Proposal 3**: Study the methods to enable on-demand transmission of cell common signals, such as SS, PBCH and SIB1, without limitations on applicable scenarios.
	+ The above aspects can be included in the initial access related discussions.

Lenovo - R1-2505995* **Proposal 2**: 6GR should enhance common signals/channels transmission and periodicity for network energy saving under various cell load.

CAICT - R1-2506005* **Proposal 1**: the coverage and the capacity carrier can be defined to enable dynamic on/off carrier, the SSB signal with long periodicity and on demand SSB can be transmitted in the capacity carrier ,and the always on RS can be transmitted in the coverage carrier.

Sharp - R1-2506014* **Proposal 5**: Cell DTX/DRX should be supported in 6GR to allow sufficient BS sleep opportunities and achieve meaningful BS energy saving.

CMCC - R1-2506101* **Proposal 3**: RAN1 to further consider and study the following case for multi-carrier scenario in 6GR:
	+ The common signal transmission/reception procedure (e.g. SIB1 transmission, RACH reception) for multiple carriers can converge to one anchor carrier. Therefore, other carrier (i.e. NES carrier) can turning off or only transmit long period SS by default, so as to obtain more NES gain.
	+ NES carrier can be activated per NW guidance or UE demand and UE can initiate access on NES carrier, so as to achieve better UE experience or load balancing for network.

InterDigital - R1-2506146* **Proposal 3**: Support cell DTX/DRX to allow sufficient BS sleep opportunities where it is applicable.
* **Proposal 6**: Support on-demand signals/channels (e.g., configurable, dynamic (de)activation, and/or UE-requested) where it is applicable.

SK Telecom - R1-2506152* **Proposal 1**: For 6G energy efficiency, at least the following aspects should be studied:
	+ SSB/SIB1 transmission (longer periodicity, on-demand)
	+ Enhanced BWP mechanism
	+ Time-domain enhancement (UE-basis C-DRX vs. cell-basis DRX/DTX, LP-WUS/WUR)
	+ Reduced RRM measurement
	+ PEI

NTT DOCOMO - R1-2506310* **Proposal 2**: Study cell DTX/DRX operation for 6GR, including support for legacy operation in PCell.

WILUS Inc. - R1-2506324* **Proposal 2**: Study On-Demand SSB/SSB1 for 6GR
	+ Enable on-demand SSB/SIB1 transmission for UEs in Idle, Inactive, or RRC\_Connected modes to maximize energy savings and deep-sleep opportunities for gNBs.

Rakuten Mobile, Inc. - R1-2506346* **Proposal 1.2**: RAN1 to study implications of, SIB1 and paging transmitted by Anchor Carriers on demand or at ultra-low periodicity and Data Carriers remain dormant until scheduled user activity is detected.

CEWiT - R1-2506363* **Proposal 1**: 6G should support energy efficiency enhancements for common signals including
	1. On-Demand Signals for initial access including OD-SSB & OD-SIB1 a. Simplified SSB
	2. SSB periodicity extension beyond 20ms.

ETRI – R1-2506069* **Proposal 1:** For DTX/DRX in 6GR, aim to design a single framework, or a minimal set of frameworks, that can address diverse scenarios.
* **Proposal 2:** Address both TN and NTN scenarios for DTX/DRX in 6GR, taking into account the following key operational differences:
	1. TN scenario: Certain essential transmissions may be allowed outside active duration.
	2. NTN scenario: In beam-hopping use cases, transmissions are inherently not possible outside active duration.
* **Proposal 3:** Allow configurability in 6G DTX/DRX so that parameters can be flexibly adjusted for different use cases, traffic characteristics, and performance–energy saving priorities.
* **Proposal 4:** For the purpose of pursuing a single, unified DTX/DRX framework, study the following objectives:
	1. Classify signals and channels into multiple categories
		+ For example, (1) not impacted by DTX/DRX operation, (2) impacted by DTX/DRX operation, and (3) configurable (connected mode only)
	2. Configurable timer operation (e.g., extension of active duration based on inactivity timer)
	3. For connected mode, UE-specific configuration of DTX/DRX parameters
* **Proposal 5:** Study beam-level DTX/DRX operation and analyze its necessity for specific use cases (e.g., NTN, mTRP in TN).
* **Proposal 6:** Study use cases and analyze applicability of multiple DTX/DRX patterns for one carrier.
* **Proposal 7:** Study both idle mode and connected mode operations for DTX/DRX in 6GR.
* **Proposal 8:** Study potential enhancements to the random access procedure and paging operation for idle mode DTX/DRX operation.
 |

### Summary

The proposals for cell DTX/DRX, cell activation/inactivation, and System Information (SI) signaling for capacity cells address the energy inefficiency in gNB, driven by the continuous transmission of always-on signals like Synchronization Signal Blocks (SSBs) and System Information (SI, e.g., SIB1), which prevent gNBs from entering deep sleep modes, particularly in low or no-traffic scenarios, prohibiting network energy savings (NES) of 83.7% for Cat-1 and 52.5% for Cat-2 base stations under low load, as per TR 38.864 (Nokia Obs. 1, Ericsson Obs. 1). These proposals aim to enhance 6GR energy efficiency by implementing cell DTX/DRX to enable gNB sleep states during idle periods, supporting both primary (PCells) and secondary cells (SCells) in homogeneous and heterogeneous networks (Nokia Prop. 2, CATT Prop. 2, Ofinno Prop. 4). They advocate dynamic activation/inactivation of capacity cells, turning off always-on signals when traffic is absent and enabling rapid reactivation to maintain responsiveness (Fujitsu Prop. 2, Fraunhofer Prop. 3). Additionally, they propose converging SI signaling to anchor or coverage carriers in multi-carrier scenarios, allowing capacity (NES) carriers to deactivate or use minimal, long-periodicity signals, enhancing NES and load balancing (CAICT Prop. 1, CMCC Prop. 3, Rakuten Prop. 1.2). Further enhancements include on-demand SIB1 transmission across all UE states (IDLE, INACTIVE, CONNECTED), simplified procedures with default configurations or extended Master Information Blocks (MIB), and unified common signal request mechanisms to reduce signaling overhead (FUTUREWEI Prop. 5, OPPO Prop. 13, CATT Prop. 10). These changes address 5G’s backward compatibility constraints, which restricted such mechanisms to specific scenarios like non-standalone deployments and promote Day 1 integration in 6GR to support diverse deployments and new spectrum (~7 GHz) while ensuring UE accessibility and system performance (Apple Prop. 5, NTT DOCOMO Prop. 2).

### 1st round FL comments and proposal

There is large support for cell DTX/DRX among companies although the understandings of what cell DTX/DRX implies and includes differ as well as what gains may result from it. It is also pointed out by companies that a joint framework for both UE and gNB DTX/DRX should be included in this study. For that reason, FL proposes to further study such a joint framework.

FL Proposal 2.5‑16:

**Study joint Cell DTX/DRX and UE DTX/DRX regarding,**

* **Common (idle mode) signal adaptation and clustering,**
* **UE effects (latency and synchronization),**
* **Etc.**

Companies are welcome to share their views on the above FL proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | We support this proposal, which is a good starting point of joint NW/UE DTX/DRX.  |
| InterDigital | Support |
| TCL | We support a unified approach to idle-mode DTX/DRX that jointly optimizes base station and UE sleep cycles.  |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine to study Cell DTX/DRX in RRC idle/inactive mode. In RRC idle/inactive mode, the UE receives the paging message based on the paging cycle. At present, there is no UE DTX/DRX mechanism in RRC idle/inactive mode. In addition, common (idle mode) signal adaptation and clustering is not clear to us. We prefer to modify this proposal into the following version.FL Proposal 2.5‑17:**Study ~~joint~~ Cell DTX/DRX ~~and UE DTX/DRX regarding~~in idle mode, at least considering:*** **Impacts on common ~~(idle mode)~~ signals/channels ~~adaptation and clustering~~ transmission(e.g., SSB, SIB1, Paging, etc.),**
* **Impacts on ~~UE effects (~~access latency and synchronization~~),~~**
* **Etc.**
 |
| Panasonic | We support the main proposal but think the bullets are a bit challenging to agree at this moment.In addition, we propose to strive for such joint Cell/UE DTX/DRX design framework applicable for both IDLE and CONNECTED mode. |
| Qualcomm | We suggest the following update. * We suggest to UE DTX to be aligned with legacy term “UE DRX”.
* The 1st bullet can be generalized to “Mechanisms to achieve joint Cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX”

FL Proposal 2.5-1 (updated):**Study joint Cell DTX/DRX and UE ~~DTX/~~DRX at least including ~~regarding,~~*** **~~Common (idle mode) signal adaptation and clustering,~~**
* **UE impact ~~effects (latency and synchronization),~~**
* **Energy efficiency analysis**
* **Applicable UE RRC states**
* **Mechanisms to achieve joint Cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX**

**~~Etc.~~** |
| Fujitsu | We have one question for clarification. In our view, joint cell DTX/DRX and UE DTX/DRX is also a promising energy saving solution for connected mode. Does this discussion solely focus on idle mode?  |
| Fainity | OK with the proposal |
| Ofinno | We are supportive in general. Agree with Qualcomm’s comment on removing UE DTX. While we agree that it is worthwhile to study joint techniques we wonder if we should also include study of cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX individually as well at this early stage. Suggest this update:**Study Cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX including,*** **Joint cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX**
* **Common (idle mode) signal adaptation and clustering,**
* **UE effects (latency and synchronization),**
* **Etc.**
 |
| CEWiT | We are fine with the proposal.  |
| Nokia | Support, joint operation of Cell DTX/DRX and UE DTX/DRX is important aspect to be addressed for 6G.Besides, during the non-active period of cell DTX/DRX, further “relaxation” of transmission/reception (e.g. longer periodicity of NW transmission of signal/channel and UE monitoring/measuring) could be specifically considered for 6G compared with active period of cell DTX/DRX. Moreover, the interaction of feature designs, i.e. between cell DTX/DRX and on-demand SSB or on-demand SIB1, could also be jointly investigated. |
| LG Electronics | Agree with FL that cell DTX/DRX operation needs to be considered with UE DTX/DRX operation from the beginning of 6GR. In addition, alignment of cell DTX/DRX active time and UE DTX/DRX active time can be considered as well. “Clustering” in the first sub-bullet is quite hard to understand. With this regard, our suggestion is as follows.**Study joint Cell DTX/DRX and UE DTX/DRX regarding,*** **Common (idle mode) signal adaptation ~~and clustering~~,**
* **UE effects (latency and synchronization),**
* **Alignment between cell DTX/DRX active time and UE DTX/DRX active time**
* **Etc.**
 |
| Sharp | Supoort the proposal. The cordination would contributes improvemen both UE power saving and NW energy saving. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | To be discussed later.Cell DTRX is just a container that include behavior of cell or UEs.Critical things at the moment is to identify what signal/channels and what functions/procedures are to be enhanced. With the above, we see the need of another proposal: FL Proposal 2.5‑1- Huawei update:**Study necessary enhancements to signals for at least IDLE UEs in addition to SSB/SIBx, including** * **Preamble**
* **RAR**
* **PUSCH**
* **Paging**
* **Common PDCCH**
* **New signal/channels, e.g. for LP WUS**
* **configuration provision methods (e.g. for UE identification), signaling (e.g. for adaptation)**
* **UE impact on e.g. detection complexity, sync. accuracy**
* **etc.**

**~~joint Cell DTX/DRX and UE DTX/DRX regarding,~~*** **~~Common (idle mode) signal adaptation and clustering,~~**
* **~~UE effects (latency and synchronization),~~**
* **~~Etc.~~**
 |
| DCM  | We think we should study first what kind of signals are targeted for Cell DTX/DRX and UE DTX/DRX.  Also, we would like to study Cell DTX/DRX and UE DTX/DRX operation depending on the deployment scenario (for coverage cell or capacity cell) because turning off SSB within non-active period on capacity cell would be feasible, while coverage cell which offers initial access (initial attach) cannot turn off SSB within the period.  |
| CMCC | We generally fine with the bullets listed below, but whether such effect should be bundled with joint Cell DTX/DRX and UE DTX/DRX may need further discuss. There can be multiple ways to achieve such dense pattern. |
| CATT | The Cell DTX/DRX should be discussed for IDLE mode, then whether/how to joint Cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX can be further studied.  |
| ETRI | We support the proposal in general, and prefer Spreadtrum’s version. We want to add one more aspect from TN and NTN harmonization perspective as follows:FL Proposal 2.5‑17:**Study ~~joint~~ Cell DTX/DRX ~~and UE DTX/DRX regarding~~in idle mode, at least considering:*** **Impacts on common ~~(idle mode)~~ signals/channels ~~adaptation and clustering~~ transmission(e.g., SSB, SIB1, Paging, etc.),**
* **Impacts on ~~UE effects (~~access latency and synchronization~~),~~**
* **Applicability for TN and NTN**

**Etc.** |
| NEC | We support this proposal. Our view is that a holistic and joint optimization of network energy saving and UE power saving is a critical principle for 6G. A proper evaluation methodology must be able to assess the direct impact of network-side procedures on UE power consumption. This includes quantifying the interplay between enhanced Cell DTX/DRX on the network side and the UE's own DRX cycles. Therefore, studying a joint framework as proposed is essential. |
| Ericsson | We think that also scheduling of system information (both SIB1 and OSI) should be covered here, irrespective of capacity or coverage cell scenario. In NR, the scheduling of OSI in sequential, non-overlapping SI windows leads to spread transmissions. SIB1 repetitions are also spread in time in NR. For 6GR, we should study improvements in this area. |
| vivo | As far as we understand, cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX are connected mode procedure in 5G NR. The need of extension to idle mode should be first studied. So we suggest the following updates:**Study and evaluate Cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX in IDLE mode operation, regarding,*** **Common (idle mode) signal adaptation and clustering,**
* **UE effects (latency and synchronization),**
* **Etc.**

Further, the concept of UE DTX operation in IDLE mode is not clear to us.  |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Besides SSB such signal can be adapted, the PRACH channel also could be adapted. Besides latency and sync issue, UE effect also includes the impacts on measurement.Therefore, following updates is suggestedFL Proposal 2.5‑1:**Study joint Cell DTX/DRX and UE DTX/DRX regarding,*** **Common (idle mode) signal/channel adaptation and clustering,**
* **UE effects (e.g., measurement, latency and synchronization),**
* **Etc.**
 |
| Samsung | This pertains to UE idle and inactive modes, UE DTX/DRX refers to when UE receives SI and paging message and can transmit RACH. We don’t have cell DTX/DRX in UE idle for NR, so the first step can be to study cell DTX/DRX for UEs in idle and inactive modes. We suggest the following wording:**Study ~~joint~~ Cell DTX/DRX ~~and UE DTX/DRX~~ in idle mode regarding,*** **Common ~~(idle mode)~~ signal ~~adaptation and clustering~~ (e.g., SSB, SIB, paging, RACH) transmission/reception,**
* **~~UE effects (latency and synchronization),~~**
* **Joint operation with UE DRX**
* **Etc.**
 |
| IIT Kanpur | We are open to discuss these aspects. |
| Apple | We think cell DTX/DRX should be first discussed in CONNECTED mode. Whether/how cell DTX/DRX has to be supported for IDLE/INACTIVE mode needs further investigation. One possible way is that there is no cell DTX/DRX configuration in IDLE mode, but the common signal/channels, e.g. SSB, SIB1, PRACH and Paging are designed naturally to form a clustered pattern so that energy efficiency can be achieved. We propose to update the proposal: FL Proposal 2.5‑xx:**Study ~~joint Cell~~ schemes to achieve NW side DTX/DRX ~~and UE DTX/DRX regarding~~ for common signals/channels used for IDLE UEs, including,*** **Common ~~(idle mode)~~ signal/channel adaptation and/or clustering, etc**
* **Impacts on UE ~~effects (~~access latency and synchronization~~),~~ should be considered**
* **~~Etc.~~**
 |
| Lenovo | **We can keep the main bullet at high level, sub-bullets can be discussed separately as they can be configured separately too. We are fine Qualcomm wording.**  |
| Fraunhofer | Support. We think mechanisms to achieve joint Cell DTX/DRX and UE DRX is important in idle mode (concerning common signals/channels) and in connected mode. Both needs to be studied.  |
| Tejas | Same view as Huawei. |
| OPPO | First, the proposal 2 under the company name OPPO captured in FL summary section 2.5.1 is not from our contribution. So this proposal may need to be re-allocated to a right place. Second, our proposal 13 captured in FL summary section 2.5.1 is related to SIB1 design thus should be moved to FL summary in section 2.3.1. Moreover, our proposal 17 in R1-2505761 is about our views on 6GR Cell DTX/DRX and is missing from the FL summary. We would appreciate if this proposal can be captured to reflect our views. Regarding the proposal, we think that ‘UE DTX/DRX’ and ‘joint’ are bit confusing. We don’t understand what it means. If the joint means joint energy saving, we should just say it. **Study ~~joint~~ Cell DTX/DRX for joint network and UE energy saving ~~and UE DTX/DRX~~ regarding,*** **Common (idle mode) signal adaptation and clustering,**
* **UE effects (latency and synchronization),**
* **Etc.**
 |
| Futurewei | OK in principle, not clear what does mean “latency” for the idle mode. Is it the initial access latency? If so, it should be clarified in the proposal.Suggested Change:**Study joint Cell DTX/DRX and UE DTX/DRX regarding,*** **Common (idle mode) signal adaptation and clustering,**
* **UE effects (paging/initial access latency and synchronization),**
* **Etc.**
 |
| Vodafone | Support |
| AT&T | * For a UE in idle mode, the UE follows paging cycle and not DRX cycle. Further clarification is needed on the proposal
* Agree with Qualcomm on adding EE analysis as part of the study
 |

Moreover, an LP radio has been proposed by companies, e.g., for transmitting SSB or SIB1 or receiving UL WUS or requests for OD-SSB or OD-SIB1. It is the FL’s view that the RAN1 spec does not concern implementation matters like particular radio implementations. For that reason, FL proposes as a first step to study the spec impact, if any, with such a radio.

FL Proposal 2.5‑18:

**Study the spec impact, if any, of a gNB implementation with an LP stage for idle mode signal support.**

Companies are welcome to share their views on the above FL proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| InterDigital | In our view, we prefer to have the proposal in the same level with proposal 2.5-1. Given the situation, we suggest the following proposal. Study utilization of low power transmitter/receiver at gNB in IDLE mode.  |
| TCL | While implementing a low-power radio stage for idle-mode signals is a promising hardware approach, we agree with the FL that RAN1 should remain agnostic to specific gNB implementations. We are cautious about dedicating standardization effort here – ideally, if a separate “LP” receiver/transmitter chain is used for SSB, SIB1 or WUS, it should function under existing spec assumptions. We support clarifying whether any spec changes are needed to enable such designs. If so, they must be minimal and justified, since introducing hardware-specific hooks could increase complexity without clear broad benefit. |
| Panasonic | We are open to discuss. |
| Qualcomm | As we discuss for the UE side, we’d rather avoid implying any implementation architecture choice here. We also do not think that the focus should be on spec impact yet, but the utility of a proposal.FL Proposal 2.5‑19:**~~Study the spec impact, if any, of a gNB implementation with an LP stage for idle mode signal support.~~****Study a base station low-power state for idle mode signal support** |
| Fujitsu | If LP radio requires special design such as the waveform and target performance, then there will be spec impact. Otherwise, we think it can be left to gNB implementation. |
| Ofinno | Okay to study. |
| CEWiT | We are open to discuss. |
| Nokia | Do not support. This proposal is unclear, we should not be discussing gNB implementation aspects, but potential spec impacts to support particular features. Moreover, the definition of “LP stage” is unclear. |
| CMCC | Can be further discussed. |
| CATT | Agree with Qualcomm’s proposal. The low-power state for base station can be first studied before go to the spec impac.  |
| NEC | Support |
| Ericsson | Not support.The concept is too vague. There is no common understanding of the function of this LP entity. Besides, we see several potential issues, like increased latency when it has to wake-up the MR (especially if it is a CAT2 BS). And the market-penetration of this type of radio will be small, if any. It will rather drive investment costs for operators investments, while the objective with network EE is to reduce costs. We should prioritize the models for widely deployed radios. |
| vivo | We are open to study this. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are jumping to the spec discussion which is confusing to us. At the SI beginning, we firstly need to consider whether it is feasible and necessary. For example, whether the gNB could have a low power mode but also operate with monitoring PRACH with same sensitivity. |
| IIT Kanpur | We are open to discuss these aspects. |
| Apple | We prefer to study what signals/channels may need to be transmitted/received with a LP mode first to understand how this mode works and then study whether there is a spec impact. FL Proposal 2.5‑18(update):**Study the feasibility ~~spec impact, if any,~~ of using a LP-Tx/RX for BS ~~gNB implementation with an~~ ~~LP stage~~ mode transmission/reception for idle mode signal/channel ~~support~~.** |
| Lenovo  | We are fine with the Qualcomm wordings |
| Tejas | Ok to study |
| OPPO | Ok for the update  |
| Futurewei | The proposal is confusing, are we going to study the spec impact or the performance impact, or both? Our understanding is that if the design of SSB, PDCCH/PDSCH indicating/carrying SIB1, or UL WUS is not impacted by such a radio then it won’t lead to a spec impact, so maybe the proposal can be formulated to study a new design for common signals (e.g., SSB, UL WUS) compatible with a low power radio. |
| LG Electronics | It is too early to study spec impact before knowing the implication of NW low power mode. During online session discussion, it was found that companies have different assumptions on NW energy efficient operation mode. Therefore, it would be better to first make a common understanding of what NW low power mode means. |
| AT&T | Prefer deprioritizing the proposal and focus on performance/ performance requirement at the time being |

FL Proposal 2.5‑20:

**Study and evaluate anchor cell SI signaling for capacity cells.**

Companies are welcome to share their views on the above FL proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | Although understanding the intention, perhaps we should have definition of anchor cell and capacity cell first, to avoid possible different understanding across companies.  |
| InterDigital | Fine |
| TCL | Cross-cell SI coordination may burden networks and confuse UE implementations (e.g. requiring UEs to monitor a different cell for essential info). We support studying feasibility and performance – any anchor-based approach must demonstrably simplify overall signaling and avoid introducing undue overhead or coverage gaps. |
| Panasonic | Okay. |
| Qualcomm | We believe this proposal is already included in Proposal 2.3-1 |
| Fujitsu | We are open to studying offloading SIs of capacity cell(s) to an anchor cell.  |
| Ofinno | Is the intention to say the anchor cell SI includes all the SI of the capacity cells or more generally anchor cell SI includes information on the capacity cells? We support the latter at this stage.  |
| CEWiT | We are Okay |
| Nokia | Support |
| Sharp | We are open to discuss. |
| CMCC | Generally support, and from our understanding such mechanism may but only restrict to the concept of cell, but also can be further studied from carrier/TRP-level aspect. Therefore, we suggest the following revisions:FL Proposal 2.5‑3-CMCC rev1:**Study and evaluate anchor cell/carrier/TRP SI signaling for capacity cells/carriers/TRPs.** |
| ETRI | Support in general. This issue seems more relevant to system information delivery in section 2.3. |
| NEC | Support |
| Xiaomi | We support the direction of jointly considering cell-DTX/DRXa and C-DRX. It is a systematic design and will impact very aspects on communication. Hence, we think the main bullet itself is sufficient at this stage. |
| Ericsson | We agree to study transmission of SI signaling from coverage/anchor cells on behalf of capacity cells. Furthermore, we think that evaluations should be done for PAGING and PRACH where for example the coverage/anchor cell pages the UE and directed to respond in either anchor or capacity cell. |
| Vivo | We need to clarify the concept of anchor cell SI signaling before agreeing this proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Open to consider but anchor cell is not clear to us. |
| Samsung | Anchor cell signaling can include signaling other than SI for cell. For example, anchor cell signaling include activation/deactivation of capacity cellsSuggest the following wording:**Study and evaluate power savings benefit of anchor cell ~~SI~~ signaling for communication on capacity cells.** |
| IIT Kanpur | We are open to discuss. |
| Apple  | We think this proposal can be discussed together with Proposal 2.3-1.  |
| Lenovo  | Are we suggesting to study usage of anchor cell in the idle mode ?**Study and evaluate anchor cell SI signaling in the idle mode** |
| Tejas | Can be discussed in proposal 2.3-9. |
| OPPO | We think 6G Day-1 should focus on coverage cell energy saving. Because the coverage layer is always on and cannot be switched off. While operators have already many solutions by implementation to save power for capacity cell. So we suggest that the capacity cell energy saving should be put lower priority. |
| Futurewei |  It is not clear the context of the proposal. Is the proposal referring to SI signaling in SCells? What are the scenarios that this proposal considers? The FL text above refers “to anchor or coverage carriers in multi-carrier scenarios”, is it the same as the anchor cell? Should we also address whether the anchor cell and the capacity cells can be the same cell to simplify the system configuration? |
| LG Electronics | Same view as Qualcomm |
| AT&T |  |

## Models, metrics and baseline scheme(s)

### Companies’ views

|  |
| --- |
| **Nokia - R1-2505131*** **Proposal 1**: 6G should target meaningful energy efficiency improvements over Rel-18 for all load conditions and consider the following for NES evaluation:
	+ Energy consumption for BS and UE.
	+ Both data transmission/reception and other operations (e.g., monitoring, measurements, and signaling).
	+ A metric combining performance and energy efficiency, e.g., capacity or throughput per energy unit, for different load conditions and deployment scenarios.
* **Proposal 17**: 6G SI to use the 5G BS power model Cat.2 in TR 38.864 as a starting point for network energy saving evaluations.
* **Proposal 18**: 6G SI to use the 5G UE power consumption model (e.g. in TR 38.840 and in TS38.869) as a starting point for UE energy saving evaluations.

**FUTUREWEI - R1-2505145*** **Proposal 1**: Adopt a comprehensive energy efficiency evaluation methodology for 6GR, which considers:
	+ Energy consumption for all operations (e.g., data transmission/reception, monitoring, measurements, and signaling) for both BS and UE.
	+ Energy efficiency metric combining spectral efficiency and energy consumption, e.g., bits/Joule, for different load conditions and deployment scenarios.
* **Proposal 2**: Develop new energy efficiency metrics for 6GR, which consider new use cases, new frequency bands, and deployment scenarios, including:
	+ Energy efficiency for sporadic traffic.
	+ Energy efficiency for multi-band operation.
	+ Energy efficiency for diverse device types and capabilities.
* **Proposal 8**: Consider studying energy consumption evaluation methodologies for AI/ML-based approaches in 6G.
* **Proposal 9**: Include energy efficiency as part of the evaluation KPIs for all 6G AI/ML-based use cases based on studied and agreed methodologies.

**Huawei, HiSilicon - R1-2505187*** **Proposal 4**: Study proper KPI for Energy-efficiency (EE) oriented 6GR system design which allows network and UE can have more opportunities for energy saving
	+ Study energy saving evaluation based on user experience, compared with UPT.

**Xiaomi - R1-2505467*** **Proposal 11**: Discuss metrics on joint energy saving between network and UE.

**Ericsson - R1-2505625*** **Proposal 1**: 6GR should target meaningful EE improvements for all load conditions, considering the following aspects for evaluation:
	+ Energy consumption for BS and UE, covering data transmission/reception and other operations (e.g., monitoring, measurements, and signaling).
	+ A metric combining performance and EE, e.g., capacity or throughput per energy unit, for different load conditions and deployment scenarios.
* **Proposal 2**: Study EE evaluation methodology for 6GR considering new use cases, new spectrum, and diverse device types:
	+ EE for sporadic/low load traffic.
	+ EE for multi-band operation.
	+ EE for diverse device types (e.g., XR/AR, IoT).

**Tejas Networks Ltd. - R1-2505631*** **Proposal 2**: In 6GR, EE evaluation methodology should consider new use cases, new spectrum and diverse device types for BS and UE energy efficiency improvements.
* **Proposal 3**: In 6GR, EE metric should combine spectral efficiency and energy consumption (e.g., bit/Joule) for different load conditions and deployment scenarios.

**NEC - R1-2505641*** **Proposal 11**: The evaluation methodology for 6G must account for the net energy impact, considering the power consumption of real-time model inference and monitoring operations within the RAN.

**TCL - R1-2505698*** **Proposal 3**: Consider whether/how to define energy efficiency parameters in 6G systems, including UE side energy efficiency or NW side energy efficiency or end-to-end (including NW+UE) energy efficiency.

**OPPO - R1-2505761*** **Proposal 1**: 6GR should adopt a comprehensive EE evaluation methodology, considering:
	+ Energy consumption for BS and UE for all operations (e.g., data transmission/reception, monitoring, measurements, signaling, etc.).
	+ EE metric combining spectral efficiency and energy consumption (e.g., bit/Joule) for different load conditions and deployment scenarios.

**Fraunhofer IIS, Fraunhofer HHI - R1-2505834*** **Proposal 1**: Energy saving gains at network and UE sides must be considered critical metrics, alongside traditional performance indicators such as data rate and latency. These metrics should be explicitly included in performance evaluations across several key agenda items in the 6G study.
* **Proposal 3**: RAN1 should focus on revising the evaluation methodology for 6GR energy savings to accommodate relevant scenarios, novel technologies like AI and ISAC, and the increased flexibility provided by the foundational design aspects like initial access.
* **Proposal 4**: Once a revised version of the 6GR power saving evaluation methodology, including the power consumption models and KPIs are finalized, all relevant agenda items should employ them for evaluation.

**Apple - R1-2505917*** **Proposal 3**: 6G should target meaningful EE improvements over Rel-18, considering:
	+ Energy consumption for BS and UE for all operations.
	+ EE metric combining spectral efficiency and energy consumption for various load conditions and deployment scenarios.

**KT Corp. - R1-2505991*** **Proposal 1**: Procedures for managing the energy-saving balance between NW and UE are adopted in 6GR.

**CAICT - R1-2506005*** **Proposal 2**: EE evaluation methodology for 6GR should consider energy consumption of BS and UE, and EE metric should combine spectral efficiency and energy consumption for various load conditions.

**ETRI - R1-2506069*** **Proposal 1**: For 6GR, a comprehensive EE evaluation methodology should be developed considering:
	+ Energy consumption for BS and UE for data transmission/reception and other operations (e.g., monitoring, measurements, signaling).
	+ EE metric combining performance and energy consumption (e.g., bit/Joule) for various load conditions and deployment scenarios.

**CMCC - R1-2506101*** **Proposal 1**: 6GR should target meaningful EE improvement, considering:
	+ Energy consumption for BS and UE for all operations, including data transmission/reception, monitoring, measurements, and signaling.
	+ EE metric combining spectral efficiency and energy consumption (e.g., bit/Joule) for various load conditions and deployment scenarios.

**InterDigital - R1-2506146*** **Proposal 1**: Adopt comprehensive EE evaluation methodology for 6GR, considering energy consumption for BS and UE, and EE metrics combining spectral efficiency and energy consumption for various load conditions.
* **Proposal 2**: Study EE evaluation for new 6GR use cases, including sporadic traffic, multi-band operation, and diverse device types.

**AT&T - R1-2506237*** **Proposal 11**: Energy Efficiency metric(s) are included as 6GR key performance metrics from day 1.
* **Proposal 12**: An energy efficiency metric based on aggregate throughput normalized by the total system power at the transmitter and/or receiver side, including power needed to operate different transmitter/receiver modules, is considered as a starting point for evaluation of energy efficiency in 6GR air interface.
 |

### Summary

The proposals for energy efficiency (EE) modeling and metrics address the limitations of 5G NR energy efficiency evaluation frameworks, which were introduced late (e.g., Rel-16 and Rel-18) and primarily focused on data transmission/reception, often neglecting energy consumption from other operations like monitoring, measurements, and signaling, particularly under diverse load conditions and emerging use cases such as AI/ML, Integrated Sensing and Communication (ISAC), and XR/AR (Nokia Obs. 1, Ericsson Obs. 1, Fraunhofer Prop. 3).

Proposals aim to establish EE as a key performance indicator (KPI) from Day 1 in 6GR, leveraging 5G models like the gNB power models Cat.1 or Cat.2 (TR 38.864) and UE power model (TR 38.840, TS 38.869) as baselines, while introducing new metrics (e.g., aggregate throughput normalized by total system power) and methodologies that account for all gNB and UE operations, including real-time AI/ML inference, and support new spectrum (~7 GHz) and diverse deployment scenarios (Nokia Prop. 17, AT&T Prop. 12, FUTUREWEI Prop. 8). They emphasize joint NW-UE energy saving metrics, user experience-based evaluations, and end-to-end EE parameters to ensure a holistic, standardized approach, overcoming 5G’s fragmented implementation and enabling balanced trade-offs between performance and energy consumption across all 6GR use cases (Huawei Prop. 4, KT Corp. Prop. 1, TCL Prop. 3).

### 1st round FL comments and proposals

In order to diligently assess energy efficiency techniques, models, metrics and scenarios are needed. Regarding the models, it is FL’s view, based on companies’ inputs, that RAN1 needs to discuss whether the existing models in TR 38.840 (5G NR), TR 38.875 (RedCap), TR 38.869 (UE WUR) and TR 38.864 (gNB) need to be updated, and if so, how.

Evaluation assumptions for 6G Radio are discussed in AI 11.2. The 11.2 FL has come with the following suggestion for the continued discussion:

|  |
| --- |
| **Observations and suggestions from moderator [of AI 11.2]**:* The traffic model could be discussed as a common assumption in section Error: Reference source not found.
* The power consumption or energy efficiency for AI related use cases will be discussed in the agenda of AI/ML study.
* Other assumptions, e.g., power model, metrics for energy efficiency evaluation, and baseline schemes could be discussed in the agenda of energy efficiency study.
 |

From the above it is clear that the focus of AI 11.5 should focus on power model, evaluation metrics and baseline schemes for said evaluation metrics. Furthermore, EE FLs have agreed that the majority of power models will be discussed in the connected mode discussions. Based on this, and companies’ input, the following is proposed regarding power models:

FL Proposal 2.6‑21:

**Study if and how the existing UE and network power consumption models need to be enhanced for (UE) idle mode 6G radio.**

Companies are welcome to share their views on the above FL proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| InterDigital | Fine |
| TCL | Support. Many new idle-mode features (e.g. low-power wake-up receivers, cell DTX, multi-band sleep strategies) won’t be captured by legacy 5G models. By enhancing these models, we ensure proposed techniques are assessed with realistic assumptions about idle power draw and sleep/wake overhead. Also, we think that incorporating new components (like ultra-low-power radio stages and higher-frequency bands) into the models as needed. |
| Spreadtrum | In our view, “the existing UE and network power consumption models” is not clear in the proposal. We prefer to modify this proposal into the following version.FL Proposal 2.6‑22:**Study if and how the existing UE and network power consumption models in TR 38.840, TR 38.864 and TR38.869 need to be enhanced for (UE) idle mode 6G radio.** |
| Panasonic | Agree |
| Qualcomm | We are ok with the proposal |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ofinno | Support |
| CEWiT | Support |
| Nokia | Support if proposal is modified to remove brackets around “UE”. The existing models can be used for UEs in idle mode, but there is no need to define a “network idle mode radio”.  |
| LG Electronics | In our view, it would be better to strive for a common power consumption model for idle and connected mode, and to discuss evaluation assumptions altogether in one FL summary. |
| Sharp | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Considering new spectrum, BS/UE hardware evolution and some joint consideration of BS/UE EE, it is evident that the current modeling of both sides need update, even for IDLE mode UEs. On the other hand, it is a bit unclear how to evaluate gNB power savings with only IDLE UEs assumed. Is it to assume empty load/common signal only?For the moment, we provide a general update applicable to all scenarios.FL Proposal 2.6‑1-Huawei update:**Study ~~if and~~ how the existing UE and network power consumption models need to be enhanced for ~~(UE) idle mode~~ 6G radio.** |
| CMCC | Support the proposal.Moreover, from our point of view, the following aspects can be further considered and studied:* Specific values of relative power, transition time and additional transition energy should be revisited considering the evolution of product at the year of 2030 (i.e. the year that 6GR is potentially ready for commercial use).
* More accurate scaling method for UE power model to jointly consider RU in frequency/spatial/power domain, and further consider aspects like PDCCH blind decoding.
* Consider both Tx and Rx at the same time for evaluation.
* More accurate model for PA efficiency.
 |
| CATT | OK with the proposal.  |
| ETRI | Support |
| Xiaomi | OK |
| Ericsson | Support |
| vivo | We think there is no dedicated power model for IDLE mode operation, thus suggest the following revision. **Study if and how the existing UE and network power consumption models that are applicable to IDLE mode operations need to be enhanced for (UE) idle mode 6G radio.** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | The power model in 38.840 and 38.864 are applied for both idle/inactive mode and connected mode. We do not think we need to restrict it to idle mode. FL Proposal 2.6‑21:**Study if and how the existing UE and network power consumption models need to be enhanced for (UE) ~~idle mode~~ 6G radio.** |
| Samsung | OK |
| IIT Kanpur | We support the proposal. |
| Apple  | We agree with the principle of this proposal. However, we think we need to consider in general what needs to be enhanced for UE and NW power models, not only limited to IDLE mode. Huawei’s updated version is preferred.  |
| Lenovo  | ok |
| Fraunhofer | Support |
| Tejas | Same view as Huawei |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal |
| Futurewei | Not sure how to understand the proposal. Will there be another similar study for the connected mode? How will they be combined given that a cell will support UEs in both idle and connected modes |
| Vodafone | Similar view as Huawei |

Regarding the evaluation metrics, and taking the discussion in AI 11.2 into consideration, it is FL’s understanding from 11.2 that the intention is to evaluate relative metrics compared to a baseline scheme. Additionally, in idle mode, it is not really relevant to discuss detailed transmission-centric metrics like bits/joule but more fundamental properties like total power consumption, duty cycle, deep sleep duration, UE access latency (in relation to energy consumption) etc. For that reason, the following is proposed for evaluation metrics:

FL Proposal 2.6‑23:

**Study idle mode energy efficiency metrics for UE EE, network EE, and joint UE and NW EE.**

Companies are welcome to share their views on the above FL proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| InterDigital | In our reading, energy efficiency related metrics are proposed to reflect both system performance (e.g., throughput) and energy consumption/saving. However, as this discussion is for IDLE mode, we are not sure that we can consider system performance in this discussion. It may be better to discuss in CONNECTED mode discussion.  |
| TCL | We support developing metrics for UE-side, network-side, and joint UE–NW energy efficiency. These could include average idle power consumption, duty cycle (sleep ratio), wake-up latency penalties, or an end-to-end energy score. |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Agree. |
| Qualcomm | We support the direction, but we would like to have more discussion on what a metric for joint energy looks like before agreeing to the proposal.  |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal |
| Ofinno | Support |
| CEWiT | We are fine to study defining metrics for UE EE, network EE, and joint UE and NW EE. For e.g., relative network energy saving gain w.r.t. baseling can be a metric for network EE. |
| Nokia | Support, it is important to have clear evaluation metrics so that energy efficiency impact of different proposals for 6GR can be evaluated later on. |
| LG Electronics | As commented in Proposal 2.6-1, it would be better to strive for a common power consumption model for idle and connected mode, and to discuss evaluation assumptions altogether in one FL summary. |
| Sharp | Support |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | We are generally not in favor of the proposal since idle mode for UE does not necessarily mean e.g. empty load of BS. Perhaps a general proposal is sufficient and more proper.For more details, the metrics for both energy and performance should be studied. For energy evaluation, energy consumption/energy efficiency can be considered. For performance, instead of using latency/UPT, we propose a new one, i.e., the QoS based metric. As explained in our contribution, the user QoS satisfaction is a common and generic performance metric to justify how the system works for user experience.FL Proposal 2.6‑2 – Huawei update:**Study ~~idle mode~~ energy efficiency metrics for UE EE, network EE, and joint UE and NW EE, including energy consumption/energy efficiency, QoS based metric, and etc.** |
| DCM  | support  |
| CMCC | Support.For joint NW and UE energy saving, we suggest to further study the framework for supporting features that are bilateral beneficial for both network and UE. For example, some features can be supported as a package and enabled together, e.g. UE wake up BS signal and some UE power saving features. |
| ETRI | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Xiaomi | FineFor Idle mode, as there is no UE data transmission, power consumption and power saving gain could be the candidate metrics.  |
| vivo | We agree to study energy efficiency metrics for UE and network. However, for current wording on joint UE and NW EE, it sounds like there will be dedicated metrics to joint UE and NW EE. Before study, we are not sure such joint metrics are realistic. UE EE metrics and network EE metrics can also work together to reflect the joint UE and NW EE, and thus, we suggest a more general way as below:FL Proposal 2.6‑2:Study idle mode energy efficiency metrics for UE ~~EE,~~ and network EE., ~~and joint UE and NW EE.~~ |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Energy efficiency is not clear to us, if we do not have the definition, how we could study? |
| Samsung | OK |
| IIT Kanpur | Support |
| Apple | We think both IDLE and CONNECTED mode needs to be considered. Currently, we do not see the need to differentiate EE metrics for different UE modes.  |
| Lenovo | ok |
| Fraunhofer | We are open to discuss. It is important, however, to clarify the scope and usefulness of the joint UE and NW metric. In addition to EE, we should consider energy consumption, energy saving gains and QoS-based metric as suggested by Huawei.  |
| Tejas | Support |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal |
| Futurewei | Open to discuss. |
| Vodafone | Prefer to have separate metrics for NW and UE, it is more transparent for the evaluation and comparison |
| AT&T | Support |

Finally, RAN1 needs to agree on baseline scheme(s) for the evaluation. In FL’s understanding, this may include default NW and UE configurations, network load, deployment type, frequency ranges etc.

FL Proposal 2.6‑24:

**Study relevant baseline schemes for network and UE energy efficiency assessment, including**

* **Network and UE configurations,**
* **UE traffic types,**
* **Network load (in the range from empty to high),**
* **Network deployment, e.g. single carrier, multi-carrier**
* **Frequency ranges FR1, FR2, FR3**
* **etc.**

Companies are welcome to share their views on the above FL proposal.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | We think UE types should also be considered, given that diverse UE types would be introduced in 6GR Day-1. In addition, we can also consider UE status. For example, if UE is under overheating situation, the power usage status would be impacted.  |
| InterDigital | Fine |
| TCL | Actually, EE features should not undermine meeting QoS targets, security, or other key performance objectives. We are confusing what is UE traffic types, is there any relationship with time delay or data rate or reliability? |
| Spreadtrum | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Is this for both RRC modes or only for IDLE mode? UE traffic types only apply to connected mode. |
| Qualcomm | We propose to also capture total energy over a day to better reflect the total gains from energy savings designs.**Study relevant baseline schemes for network and UE energy efficiency assessment, including*** **Network and UE configurations,**
* **UE traffic types,**
* **Network load (in the range from empty to high),**
* **A combination of network load values.**
* **Network deployment, e.g. single carrier, multi-carrier**
* **Frequency ranges FR1, FR2, FR3**
 |
| Fujitsu | We are fine with the proposal |
| CEWiT | We are fine with proposal in general. However, we are not clear whether the UE traffic type is meant for inactive UEs. |
| Nokia | Support, though one should not refer to FR3 here as there is no such FR defined in 3GPP. |
| LG Electronics | OK with the proposal |
| Sharp | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | This proposal in general does not fit IDLE UEs or empty load gNB. And we do not see how the sub-bullets are relevant to “schemes” – is the intention to discussion baseline evaluation assumptions? Nevertheless, several other comments:* For IDLE UEs, instead of UE configurations, the basic UE capabilities/UE types are more relevant.
* FR3 is not yet defined.

FL Proposal 2.6‑3 – Huawei update: **Study relevant assumptions ~~schemes~~ for network and UE energy efficiency assessment, including*** **Network and UE configurations/capabilities,**
* **UE traffic types,**
* **Network load (in the range from empty to high),**
* **Network deployment, e.g. single carrier, multi-carrier**
* **Frequency ranges FR1, FR2, and other spetrum~~FR3~~**
* **etc.**
 |
| CMCC | Support, and we think multi-TRP can also be included in Network deployment.FL Proposal 2.6‑3-CMCC rev1: **Study relevant baseline schemes for network and UE energy efficiency assessment, including*** **Network and UE configurations,**
* **UE traffic types,**
* **Network load (in the range from empty to high),**
* **Network deployment, e.g. single carrier, multi-carrier, multi-TRP**
* **Frequency ranges FR1, FR2, FR3**
* **etc.**
 |
| ETRI | Fine with the proposal. |
| Ericsson | We can also consider diverse device types. |
| Xiaomi | Similar question as Panasonic. |
| vivo | Since there will be different baseline schemes for network and UE involve different aspects to be studied, we suggest separate this proposal for UE and gNB respectively. In addition, it should be clarified if the study of this proposal includes IDLE mode operation only or both IDLE and CONNECTED? |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Baseline assumption or scheme is confusing. For example, if both single carrier and multi-carrier deployment are considered, which one is the baseline? So, if the intention of the proposal is to discuss the baseline assumption, then we can just choose one assumption as baseline. If the intention of the proposal is to capture the evaluation assumptions, then we can list all the relevant items. Based on the later way, we have the following updatesFL Proposal 2.6‑3: **Study relevant ~~baseline~~ assumptions~~schemes~~ for network and UE energy efficiency assessment, including*** **Network and UE configurations,**
* **UE traffic types,**
* **Network load (in the range from empty to high),**
* **Network deployment, e.g. single carrier, multi-carrier, multi-TRP, RIS**
* **Frequency ranges FR1, FR2, FR3**
* **etc.**
 |
| Samsung | 1. Suggest to replace “schemes” by “scenarios”2. To be generic, just having ‘traffic types’ should be enough.-------------**Study relevant baseline ~~schemes~~ scenarios for network and UE energy efficiency assessment, including*** **Network and UE configurations,**
* **~~UE~~ traffic types,**
* **Network load (in the range from empty to high),**
* **Network deployment, e.g. single carrier, multi-carrier**
* **Frequency ranges FR1, FR2, FR3**
* **etc.**
 |
| IIT Kanpur | We support the proposal in general. However, in IDLE/Inactive mode, it is not clear what UE traffic type mean. |
| Apple | Generally fine with the proposal. The last bullet ‘’ Frequency ranges FR1, FR2, FR3’’ is already included in the first bullet. |
| Lenovo  | Generally fine with the proposal, mention ‘combination of UE traffic types’  |
| Fraunhofer | Support and agree with Ericsson to add diverse device types. |
| Tejas | Same view as Panasonic |
| OPPO | We are fine with the proposal |
| Futurewei | Open to discuss. In our opinion, for the assessment/evaluation this group should coordinate (be consistent) with evaluation methodology AI assumptions. |
| AT&T | Agree with QC on considering different network loads |

## Omitted topics

It is the FL’s understanding that the following topics that have been discussed among contributions will be discussed elsewhere and for that reason will not be discussed in AI 11.5:

* Waveforms, that will be specifically discussed in AI 11.3.1, and
* AI/ML, that will be discussed in AI 11.6.

# Contacts

Below is a contact list for companies’ delegates following the energy efficiency topic in the 6G Radio SI:

|  |  |  |
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