3GPP TSG-RAN WG2 #124 R2-23xxxxx

Chicago, USA, 13 – 17 Nov, 2023

Agenda Item: 7.16.2.2

Source: Intel Corporation

Title: [Post123bis][016][AIML] Model Transfer (Intel)

Document for: Discussion, Decision

# Introduction

This document is to address the following email discussion:

* [POST123bis][016][AI/ML] Model transfer (Intel)

Scope: Discuss table that captures pros, cons and specification efforts for the 4 solutions.

Intended outcome: Agreeable proposal/table

Deadline: Nov. 1st

To facilitate the discussion, below agreements from previous meetings related to model transfer are captured:

* RAN2 #120

|  |
| --- |
| * For model transfer/delivery for AI/ML models (for the target use cases of this SI), RAN2 to study CP-based, UP-based solutions |

* RAN2 #121

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| * We Use the wording “model transfer/delivery” * model delivery that serves the use cases in the SI is within RAN2 scope, regardless other aspects. * Agreed:   Aim to at least analyze the feasibility and benefits of model/transfer solutions based on the following:  Solution 1a: gNB can transfer/deliver AI/ML model(s) to UE via RRC signalling.  Solution 2a: CN (except LMF) can transfer/deliver AI/ML model(s) to UE via NAS signalling.  Solution 3a: LMF can transfer/deliver AI/ML model(s) to UE via LPP signalling.  Solution 1b: gNB can transfer/deliver AI/ML model(s) to UE via UP data.  Solution 2b: CN (except LMF) can transfer/deliver AI/ML model(s) to UE via UP data.  Solution 3b: LMF can transfer/deliver AI/ML model(s) to UE via UP data.  Solution 4: Server (e.g. OAM, OTT) can transfer/delivery AI/ML model(s) to UE (e.g. transparent to 3GPP).  **Table: relations between solutions and use cases**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Solutions** | **Applicable use cases** | | Solution 1a, 1b | CSI feedback enhancement  Beam management  Note: No specific considerations for Positioning accuracy enhancement for Solution 1a and 1b. | | Solution 2a, 2b | CSI feedback enhancement  Beam management  Note: No specific considerations for Positioning accuracy enhancement for Solution 2a and 2b. | | Solution 3a, 3b | Positioning accuracy enhancement | | Solution 4 | CSI feedback enhancement  Beam management  Positioning accuracy enhancement |   Note: the solutions use case relation is preliminary (work in progress), and the purpose is to have better understanding on what to further analyse   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Pros** | **Cons** | | **Solution 1a** | 6. The existing RRC signaling solutions can be reused as baseline, at least including delta signaling and segementation  9. Additional security and verification may not be necessary as the UE already established security before the transfer is initiated  11. gNB can take the control of the AIML model transfer itself, which can not be achieved by traditional UP based solution | 1. Face challenges to convey large size or “no upper limit size” AI model by RRC message (e.g. >45kBytes)  2. Maybe high control plane overhead, as a large model size may need segmentation/transmission/acknowledgment. This consumes critical configuration time for model transfer/delivery  3. An incomplete control plane model transfer has to be restarted upon mobility, as there are no current procedures to resume transmission across gNBs. Some companies wonder whether it is critical or not as it depends on how frequent the gNB to send new/updated AI/ML to the UE | | **Solution 2a and 3a** | 5. Service continuity on model transfer/delivery is easy to achieve compared with Solution 1a  6. Impacts on RAN2 may be limited (some companies think that LPP signalling is in RAN2 scope) | 1. Face challenges to convey large size or “no upper limit size” AI model by RRC message (e.g. >45kBytes)  3. If NAS does the segmentation, it may introduce some overhead  4. (only valid for Solution 2a) CN is not a good option for later on model monitoring/activation/deactivation/fallback/update that requires less latency. The model transfer/delivery is transparent to gNB, it could be tricky to get gNB involved in the AI model LCM. It could be problematic when the network needs to be in control of what happening at the UE side and especially in two-sided models where one side of the model is intended to be located at the network side | | **Solution 1b** | 1. The network can provide different 5QIs for model transfer/delivery with different QoS requirements (e.g. can support large model size)  2. Compared with CP-based solutions, this Solution 1b can reduces control plane overhead, reduces overhead at gNB for model delivery/transfer  5. Compared with CP-based solutions, it may not need to consider CP message segmentation, CP message blocking issue | 5. Not compatible with current mobility procedure. Supporting model transfer during mobility is not so straightforward | | **Solution 2b and 3b** | 1. The network can provide different 5QIs for model transfer/delivery with different QoS requirements (e.g. can support large model size)  5. Compared with CP-based solutions, it may not need to consider CP message segmentation, CP message blocking issue | 2. CP signalling is needed to configure and initiate the model transfer from the CN  4. May be unable to support delta-model transfer/delivery based on current user plane framework | | **Solution 4** | 2. If 3GPP network can be aware of AI/ML model in this Solution 4, the network can provide different 5QIs for model transfer/delivery with different QoS requirements (e.g. can support large model size). How to synchronize 3GPP and server so that the network can take appropriate actions is not clear, and it may not be fully under 3GPP control | 2. There may be inter-operability issues, such as:  a) Different implementations may lead to different model performances and a huge burden of model management (e.g., frequent model activation/deactivation)  b) Massive offline coordination is needed or requires lots of coordinations among vendors, especially for the CSI compression use case  4. When network cannot control the model transfer/delivery, the transfer of large model may impact important and delay sensitive user data traffic |  * The table can serve as starting point for continued discussion (but contains some parts that seems non consensus, e.g. delta configuration). |

* RAN2 #123

|  |
| --- |
| * Model transfer/delivery can be initiated in following two ways:   Reactive model transfer/delivery: an AI/ML model is downloaded when it is needed due to changes in scenarios, configurations, or sites.  FFS: Proactive model transfer/delivery: AI/ML models are pre-download to UE, and a model switch is performed when changes in scenarios, configurations, or sites occur. |

* RAN2 #123bis

|  |
| --- |
| **=> Agree to split**  ***- Solution 4a: OTT server can transfer/delivery AI/ML model(s) to UE (transparent to 3GPP).***  ***- Solution 4b: OAM can transfer/delivery AI/ML model(s) to UE.*** |

As observed from previous discussion, model transfer is also related to the mapping of functions to entities that were discussed in R2-2308286 [2] and agreed in RAN2 #123:

|  |
| --- |
| [R2-2308286](http://www.3gpp.org/ftp//tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_123/Docs//R2-2308286.zip) Report of [Post122][060][AIML] Mapping of functions to physical entities (CMCC) CMCC report Rel-18 FS\_NR\_AIML\_air  - Quite long discussion  - CMCC report that FFS items has support from 3 companies.  - Chair Comment: These options represent several possibilities. RAN2 would typically have selected a specific architecture option, and for a WI, specific option(s) need to be selected. Hope it is possible to further narrow down during the SI.   * P1-P6 are agreed, it is expected that FFS items for which support is not increased will be removed. |

# Discussion

As mentioned above, this discussion is mainly focuses on pros/cons/spec impact of the four model transfer solutions. Rapporteur understands that there’s a relationship between model transfer and functionality mapping to entities. However, **there’s no intention from this email discussion to down-select among the four model transfer solutions**. Therefore, in below discussion, it is assumed that FFS (e.g. CN, OAM) in mapping of functions to physical entities are considered.

## 2.1 Model Transfer/Delivery Discussion Area

It is observed from the table summarized in R2-2302268 [1] that there are several common areas discussed when comparing different model transfer/delivery solutions, e.g. model size, etc.

Rapporteur believes that summarizing discussion areas for model transfer/delivery could help companies to share the same understanding when discussing feasibility and gap of certain model transfer/delivery solution. Following discussion areas are currently mentioned in the existing table summarized in R2-2302268 [1]:

**A1.** **Large, no upper limit model size** (mentioned in Solution 1a, Solution 2a and 3a, Solution 1b, Solution 4)

It is observed that all solutions can support model transfer/delivery with model size smaller than 45kBytes by default, e.g. CP solutions can support model size smaller than 45kBytes based on existing number of RRC segments. Therefore, for this discussion area, we only focus on model transfer/delivery for model size larger than 45kBytes.

**A2. Security and integrity** (mentioned in Solution 1a)

**A3. Latency requirement, e.g. critical, relax, no latency requirement** (mentioned in Solution 2a)

It is observed that air interface latency can be the same for all solutions by proper setting (e.g. priority setting for SRB/DRB, etc). Therefore, we only focus on the delta latency component for each solution.

**A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs)** (mentioned in Solution 1a, Solution 2a, Solution 1b)

**A5. NW controllability (e.g. model management decision at gNB)** (mentioned in Solution 1a, Solution 2a)

**A6. Partial model update (e.g. delta configuration)** (mentioned in Solution 1a, Solution 2b and 3b)

**A7. Flexible model transfer/delivery QoS** (mentioned in Solution 1b, Solution 2b and 3b, Solution 4)

Different models allow to use different QoS

**A8. Interoperability (e.g. No/minor need for offline coordination among vendors)** (mentioned in Solution 4)

**A9: Deployment/enhancements to network and RAN protocols**

**A10: Network complexity (e.g., storage and processing)**

**Q1: Do you agree the above discussion areas should be considered during discussion of model transfer/delivery solutions?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No (please list the item(s) correspondingly)** | **Comment** |
| OPPO | No at least for A2/A8 | A2  No matter CP or UP based solution is considered, Security and integrity is already supported in legacy, so no need to consider this as the pros or cons for any specific solution.  A8  If open model format is used for model transfer/delivery solution1a, there is no inter-operability issue as all devices can recognize the details of the open format model. If proprietary model format is used for model transfer/delivery solution1a, inter-operability issue may happen as usually one vendor cannot recognize the details of the proprietary format model from another vendor. But it should be noted that this restriction is not only applied to model transfer/delivery solution1a, but also applied to all the other model transfer/delivery solutions. In this sense, we can know that solution1a has no advantage over the other solutions on inter-operability aspect.  **Observation:Model transfer/delivery solution1a has no advantage over the other model transfer/delivery solutions on inter-operability aspect.**  It does not make sense to consider inter-operability aspect as one of the pros or cons for a specific model transfer/delivery solution when evaluating each candidate solution, so we propose the following:  **Proposal: Do not consider inter-operability aspect when evaluating pros and cons for each candidate solution.** |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No: A3, A7, A6  Yes: Others | **A3, A7**  We think A3 and A7 can be merged as both are about QoS impacts.  **A6**  For the terminology partial model update, the meaning is unclear and what RAN2 should study is also unclear.  RAN1 has the definition of model update:  **Retraining or fine tuning of an AI/ML model, via online/offline training, to improve the model inference performance.**  However, there were not much progress on details.  In previous RAN2 discussions, some companies thought that if some of model information is visible to some layer, delta configuration may be used. However, this was not discussed and confirmed.  In general, we do not think the necessity of A6 is clear.  **Others**  We observe that RAN1 is also discussing case y/z1-z5 for model transfer/delivery. For pros/cons analysis in RAN1, they are discussing the evaluation metrics, and maybe some of metrics are similar to what we are discussing here.  For now, we think RAN2 and RAN1 can have parallel discussions/analysis. |
| Qualcomm | No for A2, A3, A5, A6, and A8  Please add A9 and A10 | A2  Whether model delivery is over control or user plane, legacy procedures already support security aspects.  A3  It is not realistic to ask every gNB to store all models. A central storage for gNB-based solutions will make delays for all solutions similar (storage -> gNB -> UE).  [Rapp] As it is the same for all solutions, during comparison between solutions, similar as “model size smaller than 45kBytes” and “security and integrity”, rapp suggests no need to consider this latency during this discussion.  A5  For all of the model delivery, the LCM decisions can still remain at the gNB. For example, in model ID-based LCM, even in 1b/2a/2b/4, which model should be used can be determined by the gNB. Therefore, in all model delivery methods considered, the network controls the LCM.  [Rapp] the question is about whether additional signaling is required between gNB and other network entity if model is not at gNB, but model management decision is at gNB.  A6  The user plane can support delta model delivery. It is up to the implementation, how that model and parameter sets are stored. Model training entities can develop multiple parameter sets for a model structure. These parameter sets can be transferred using UP when required. Therefore, delta model delivery can be supported in all model delivery methods.  A8  For all of the model delivery methods, inter-operability issues exist. For example, if the model is developed by a UE vendor, then gNB still needs to know how to manage the model at the UE (for model ID-based LCM). Therefore, all solution has the same inter-operability.  Furthermore, the inter-operability issues remain valid even for open-format models, as the entities that are developing the open-format models or parameter sets still have to indicate to the NW how these open-format models are to be used. If developed by the network, then, cross-compiling UE models is an issue that is not solved.  **We also propose to add the following issues:**  A9: Deployment Impact  Some solutions have greater deployment impact than others. The differences in deployment impact should be studied.  A10: gNB impact (e.g., standard interface, storage and processing)  Some solutions have greater gNB impact than others for standardization and implementation. The differences in gNB impact should be studied.  [rapp] Based on rapporteur’s understanding, all above discussion areas may lead to some deployment/enhancement to interfaces and RAN protocols or certain level of complexity, which is the RAN specification impact we need to identify. Having a new discussion area seems a little duplicate. Therefore, rapporteur suggests companies to add the corresponding specification impact to below sections. |
| Apple | OK to discuss all (A1-A10) in this email discussion to identify potential spec impacts.  But disagree to capture any of them in TR 38.843 as "requirement" or "readiness" of model transfer. | Thanks for Rapporteur's hard work. We are fine to **consider A1-A10** **only in this email discussion to identify potential spec impacts if converged** (e.g. only capture "increase segmentation number" for solution 1a if we can converge this point, but no need to capture its readiness column).  However, we **do not agree to capture any of them in TR 38.843 as "requirement" or "readiness" of model transfer.** Our considerations are:   1. RAN2 is only responsible for a small piece of model transfer (i.e. signaling). It is still RAN1 to determine requirement, feasibility and conclusion of model transfer.   [Rapp] Agree it depends on RAN1 input if there’s any. However, since there’s no input for now, Rapp suggests to continue work on RAN2 analysis with the assumption model size may be larger than 45kBytes for completeness.   1. Among A1-A10, some of them are just enhancement direction while some of them are not clear whether they are requirement:    * For example, A1 may not be a requirement if RAN1 conclude that model for Rel-18 use cases is expected to be smaller than 45kbyte.    * For example, A3/A7 are QoS rather than requirements (i.e. workable or not).   [Rapp] For this discussion, we are discussing “discussion areas”, which can be generic when we compare different solutions.   * + For example , A4/A6 are actually enhancement because whether to support service continuity and delta signaling doesn't impact whether model transfer can work but just performance enhancement.   [Rapp] Agree, performance enhancement to meet other areas may also lead to RAN specification impact. That’s why it’s considered.   1. We have agreed the table with Pros and Cons in RAN2#121. The agreed Pros and Cons + potential RAN impacts in this email discussion are sufficient to conclude model transfer in SI from RAN2 perspective. From this point of view, extra capturing "Readiness" or "Requirement" is not necessary.   Thus, if any of them are captured in TR, it means RAN2 have to satisfy it. We don't think RAN2 is ready to make such conclusion. So, we don't agree to capture anything in "**readiness**" column of followed 8 tables (i.e. we agree to capture " **RAN specification impact** " column if converged). |
| ZTE | Yes: A1, A4, A6  No: A2, A3, A5, A8, A9, A10  Neutral: A7 | **A1.** **Large, no upper limit model size** (mentioned in Solution 1a, Solution 2a and 3a, Solution 1b, Solution 4)  **ZTE: The data transmission have a upper boundary via CP tunnel while there is no upper boundary via UP tunnel, it can be one of the benchmarks to evaluate the PRO and CONs for each solution**  **A2. Security and integrity** (mentioned in Solution 1a)  **ZTE: In our understanding, not only CP based solution, both UP transmission also can be ciphered/IP which depends on the RRC configuration. This evaluation can not be a benchmark for evaluating the solutions**  **A3. Latency requirement, e.g. critical, relax, no latency requirement** (mentioned in Solution 2a)  **ZTE: It is really confusing, The latency requirement seems a kind of requirement evaluation for different use cases of model transfer rather than an evaluation for the model transfer solutions. In addition, since we does not do enough research for the solutions on the table, the delay evaluation for each solution may not be scientific/realistic.**  [Rapp] RAN2 already mapped different solutions to different use cases. Hence, evaluation for model transfer solutions can also be mapped to evaluation for different use case of model transfer.  **A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs)** (mentioned in Solution 1a, Solution 2a, Solution 1b)  **ZTE: Yes, CP based solution will encounter such issue.**  **A5. NW controllability (e.g. model management decision at gNB)** (mentioned in Solution 1a, Solution 2a)  **ZTE: In our understanding, the NW controllability cannot be a benchmark for the evaluation of solution. It is hard to say the controllable model transfer is a good thing (PROs), otherwise is not (CONs)...**  [Rapp] As explained in below section, we are not saying “pros”/”cons”. Instead, we only focus on state of fact and gaps to identify specification impact. This is related to whether additional signaling is needed between gNB and other network entities.  **A6. Partial model update (e.g. delta configuration)** (mentioned in Solution 1a, Solution 2b and 3b)  **ZTE: Yes, if the open format can be supported, the partial model update can be realized in the CP based solution which can save the overhead of model transfer.**  **A7. Flexible model transfer/delivery QoS** (mentioned in Solution 1b, Solution 2b and 3b, Solution 4)  **ZTE: Not sure whether there is any need to classify the different model transfer with different QoS. We can follow the majorities.**  **A8. Interoperability (e.g. No/minor need for offline coordination among vendors)** (mentioned in Solution 4)  **ZTE: In our understanding, all model transfer between UE and NW may have interoperability issue regardless of the which solution is used.**  **A9: Deployment/enhancements to network interfaces**  **ZTE: the Network interface is out of RAN2 spec which has RAN3/SA impact.suggest not using this as benchmark to evaluate the solution.**  **A10: gNB complexity (e.g., storage and processing)**  **ZTE: It is not in the 3GPP scope which cannot be listed in the 3GPP TR.** |
| Mediatek | No: A2  Yes: A1, A3(with revision), A4, A7, A5 (with revision),  Need clarification on **A6, A8,** A9, A10 | **A2**  Same view as OPPO and Qualcomm.  **A3**  Based on the description, it would be more accurate to refer to it as '**the overall latency of model transfer/delivery**' rather than 'latency requirement',  as the latency requirement (critical, relax, or no latency requirement) comes from RAN1 on how quickly model transfer/delivery needs to be completed, e.g., for reactive model transfer/delivery.  **A5-> suggested to revised as** NW controllability on model transfer/delivery  The intention is NW controllability on model transfer/delivery instead of other LCM aspects, e.g. model management. For all solutions, NW controllability on model management (model monitoring, model activation/deactivation/switch/fallback) is the same.  **A6**  The specifics of how a partial model update operates and how a delta configuration could be possible are not clear. This point may be more closely related to the model format, i.e., whether it's an open format or a proprietary format. A partial model update typically involves updating parameters, rather than the entire model. The feasibility of a delta configuration, on the other hand, could depend on various factors, e.g. how to representing the model structure and parameters with ASN.1. RAN2 needs to clarify how it works first.  **A7**  Need to clarify the motivation to differentiate the model transfers with different QoS/SRB priorities, and whether flexible QoS is needed for model delivery/transfer.  **A8**  The exact meaning of interoperability and the types of offline coordination considered are unclear. This point may also be related to the format of the model, i.e., whether it's an open format or a proprietary format. RAN2 needs to clarify what interoperatibility issues are concerned.  One valid point may be whether model/functionality identification is performed in offline manner or through signlaing over air interface. If it is the only point, we may need to make it this point clear.  **A9: Deployment/enhancements to network interfaces**  I'm uncertain whether we need to consider the realistic deployment status for this discussion, as there may be more constraints in a real network. The complexity and variability of real-world network deployments could introduce additional factors that we need to consider. Therefore, we need to understand the implications of these factors on our discussion.  **A10: gNB complexity (e.g., storage and processing)**  Why only gNB complexity is concerned instead of the NW complexity? It might be due to the specific role and function of gNBs in the network. However, the complexity can vary depending on where the model is stored. This is particularly relevant when considering different location assumptions. |
| Interdigital | See comments | We agree with the sentiment expressed by Apple that the discussion points are just to facilitate this email discussion and not to be captured as is in the TR.  We also think it will facilitate the discussion if we remove some items.  *To remove*  *A2*: As expressed by other companies as well, we can remove this one as both CP/UP support both encryption and integrity protection.  *A6:* It is not clear if model update is something that happens that often to make the delta update an important aspect to consider. As also pointed out by other companies, even for the UP solution, delta update can be made (e.g., if open format is used)  *A8:* As others have pointed out, there could be interoperability issues in most of the cases  *A9/A10*: We agree with the views expressed by ZTE regarding these points.  Thus, in all the questions below, we are providing comments only on A1, A3, A4, A5 and A7 |
| Xiaomi | No: A2, A6  Yes: A1, A3, A4, A5, A7  New area (model delivery in uplink) should be also considered. | **A2:** Agree with others that in all solutions, ciphering and integrity protection are applicable, therefore no need to list it as aspect for comparison.  **A6**: Agree with others that it is not clear that delta update is an important area to consider, and UP solutions can also support such delta update when open format is used.  New aspect: we think **model delivery in uplink** should be supported since RAN2 agreed to support model delivery from UE to gNB for type 1 of CSI compression with two-sided model [2]. Therefore it should be listed as a new area. |
| TCL | No: A2,  Yes with comments: A6, A3, A7,  Yes: Others. | A2:  We show similar views with some of above companies, in the legacy methods including CP and UP solutions, the security and integrity are already guaranteed.  A6:  It is not clear to us what is partial model update (e.g. delta configuration)? Suggest to first clarify the definition of the partial model update.  In our understanding, partial model update means that some parameters have been redeveloped for a certain model structure, such as learnable parameters, hyper-parameters. Firstly, from our perspective, the parameters of partial model update may be regraded as data packet, which can be transferred/delivered through CP and UP solutions, but for proprietary format model, the UE vendor can not recognize the parameters from NW vendor, it means that the partial model update transfer/delivery is meaningless. On the other hand, with open format model, the above parameters of a model are visible for two different vendors, only the changed parameters can be transferred/delivered, which is able to decrease the signaling overhead of using CP solutions compared to UP solutions.  A3 and A7:  The model transfer/delivery may have various latency requirements, which may affect the priority of SRB/DRB and QoS. Given there is the mapping between SRB/DRB and QoS, we think it is better to merge the discussion about A3 and A7. |
| LGE | No: A2, A6, A8  Yes: Others | If certain items cannot provide a clear basis for comparing CP/UP solutions, we think they can be excluded from consideration. For instance:   * A2 (security/integrity) : No issues for either CP or UP solutions. * A6 (Partial model update) and A8 (Interoperability) : They are more influenced by the model format than by the choice between CP and UP solutions. |
| vivo | Yes: A1, A4, A8  Yes with comments: A3, A5, A6, A7  No: A2, A9, A10 | For A2, all the solutions can provide security and integrity.  For A3, the latency performance may also rely on whether the entity responsible for model transfer/delivery can be aware of the status (e.g., serving cell) of the UE.  [Rapp] based on rapp’s understanding, this may not be relevant to this discussion.  For A5, related to model identification, e.g., if the model transfer/delivery is unavailable at gNB, extra UE-initiated model identification procedure may be needed.  For A6, all the solutions can support partial model update. The difference is that the CP-based solution can support the partial model update from signalling perspective, while the UP-based solution is up to implementation.  For A7, FFS whether multiple levels of QoS for model transfer/delivery are needed.  For A9, the enhancement to network interface is the spec impact rather than potential issues.  For A10, gNB complexity is implementation. |
| Ericsson | No. A6, A7, A8  See comments for the rest too. | We share views with Apple in the sense that we should rather focus on listing specification impact. This is the only possible way to objectively assess what kind of effect or work is needed in a normative phase.  Some comments concerning some of the specific areas pointed out by the email disc. Rapporteur below:  A3: Difficult to grasp what is meant by “proper setting”. Going along the lines of what Huawei proposes, it is perhaps a better alternative to consider A3-related-aspects in A7’s discussion.  We are also unsure on what “we only focus on the delta latency component for each solution”. If a solution guarantees fulfilment of the latency requirements, it is not relevant to discuss whether such solution is a delta worse than another solution.  [Rapp] “delta latency component” refers to the latency that is not common among solutions. For example, solution 2/3 has longer latency than solution 1, as delta latency is cost by model transfer/delivery from CN/LMF to gNB.  A4: The validity of this requirement depends on the size of the model to be transferred for which we have not done an analysis yet. First, we should assess whether this is a problem or not.   A6: As we see it, whether the whole model or a part of it is being transferred should be independent of the solution. Afterall, this seems to be more related to e.g., a header in the message being transferred instead of details concerning the model transfer alternative itself.  A7: Similar view as Huawei. Not clear at the moment if there is any motivation for different QoS for different models. Anyhow, this discussion should be part of A3.  A8: agree with previous comments that inter-operability problems are common to all solutions by definition. There is no solution for which it can be claimed that inter-operability problems can be avoided.  A9: Suggest following rewording referring instead to protocols: “**Deployment/enhancements to network and RAN protocols**”  A10: Propose to say “Network” complexity (storage, processing, etc) since some of the solutions also study impact in the CN. |
| Lenovo | Yes: A1, A3&7, A4, A5&9&10  No: A2  Unclear: A6, A8 | A3&A7 are both about QoS handling, could be combined.  A5&A9&A10 are about involvement of NW, could be combined. When NW is involved there will be of course additional complexity.  A2: not sure if there is really any different w.r.t security and integrity among 7 solutions.  A6, A8: we tend to believe A6 and A8 are not really related to the model transfer/deliver solutions. Both are dependent on if involved nodes/entities can interpret the same model format.  We also agree with Apple that categorization of issues as such is good for discussion, while we need to carefully check if any needs to be captured in the TR eventually. |
| NEC | Yes: A1/A2/A3/4 | A5 etc can be network impact.  A6 may be combined with A4 for model transfer continuity |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Yes: A2, A3, A4  Neutral: A1, A5, A7  No: A6, A8, A9, A10 | A1. We need to discuss max limit of the data size allowed if only CP based solution to be discussed  A3. Latency requirement can be studied for each use case separately.  [Rapp] RAN2 already mapped different solutions to different use cases. Hence, evaluation for model transfer solutions can also be mapped to evaluation for different use case of model transfer.  A5. If NW is aware of the any update information, then it would be necessary to have some level of controls. This should be aligned with function entity mapping tables in [R2-2308286](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/WG2_RL2/TSGR2_123/Docs/R2-2308286.zip). For solution 4a, with UE side model, this is not needed to be discussed.  A6. This is not yet been defined. We do not know what delta configuration means in practice.  A7. We did not understand how different models need to use different QoS.  A8. For only CP based solution and open format model, this may be relevant. However, open format model is not in Rel 18 scope.  A9: We did not understand what kind of deployment impact is to be foreseen. Models are proprietary, so deployment impact is transparent anyway to 3GPP. Moreover, the scope of this criterion is not clear to us as UE models will be transfer/download/delivery to from the NW entity to the UE and why additional interfaces like Xn and/or NG-AP are needed.  A10. The implication to gNB is not clear to us.  We comply with Apple and we don’t support to include all these in the TR. |
| Sharp | All the options in A1-A10 can be discussed (with comments) to identify pros and cons of each option and hence the potential spec impact. But since RAN1 is still discussing aspects related to model transfer/delivery which may impact the requirements, we agree with some companies above to not capture anything in requirement or readiness in TR 38.843. | A6, needs further clarification on what is included or meant by ‘partial’ model update?  Further A7, A3 seems similar as both options aims to address QoS aspects so the difference between the two needs to be clarified or perhaps they can be merged.  A2, in existing UP and CP procedures, security aspects are already included, therefore it is not clear if this is really required, or existing security aspects are sufficient. |
| CATT | No: A2, A3, A8, A10  A7 with comments  Yes for others | A2:  We also think the Security and integrity can be achieved by both CP and UP solutions with appropriate configuration. This perspective should not be used for evaluation among the solutions.  A3/A7:  We think the A3 (Latency requirement) can be included in A7 (Flexible model transfer/delivery QoS) since latency can be a significant factor of QoS.  And for A7, for DRB, the QoS requirement is associated with 5QI for Resource type, Priority Level, PDB, PER or others, and for SRB only the priority is used. So what kind of QoS requirement is needed for the model transfer should be clarified first, e.g., latency of transmission, reliability, or others.  A8:  Interoperability has relationship with whether to choose the open or proprietary model format, but we think it is a common issue for all the model transfer solutions. So this perspective should not be used for evaluation among the solutions.  A10:  We think it should not be in the discussion area for the consideration of model transfer/delivery solutions. Since each solution may introduce complexity, e.g. for gNB, for CN or for LMF. |
| Samsung | See comments | We have similar view to Apple that the discussion points above are only part of the email discussion to clarify pros, cons and specification efforts for the 4 solutions, but there is no need to include them in the TR.  Regarding the discussion points, we also agree with the reasoning from other companies that on:  No: A2, A4, A6, A9, A10 A8  Yes: A1, A3, A5, A7.  For A8. We do not understand why interoperability is an issue for Solution 4. Open format model transfer from a different vendor may have interoperability issue as the model may not be suitable to UE’s implementation. For prioritary format transfer from properitary server may not have such issue. |
| CMCC | Yes: A1(with revision), A3, A4, A5, A6, A8  No: A2, A9, A10  Comments on A7 | A1: As per RAN1 agreements on model transfer/delivery as below, we think “model size” in A1 can be revised to **“model/model parameters size”** to cover the possible case.  *Delivery of an AI/ML model over the air interface, either parameters of a model structure known at the receiving end or a new model with parameters. Delivery may contain a full model or a partial model.*  A2: We agree with other companies that the security is supported in legacy procedures for both CP-based and UP-based solution.  For A6/A8: In our understanding, this is related to the model format (open format or properitary format).  For A7: We think the motivation of using different QoS for different models is unclear. In addition, whether A3 and A7 maybe merged can be considered since the latency is an important factor of QoS.  A9/A10: We share the similar view with ZTE that A9 is out of RAN2 scope and A10 is out of 3GPP scope. |
| Futurewei | No: A1-A10 | It is our understanding that in R19 3GPP will focus on offline model training. As a result, trained models will most likely be deployed offline without involving 3GPP signaling. Based on this, we believe the discussion on model transfer/delivery can be left beyond R19.  [rapp] it’s solution 4 captured above. also explained by rapp, there’s no intention to downselect any soltuion from this email discussion. |

###### Summary

In general, on the point about RAN1 parallel discussion on model transfer/delivery, after checking RAN1 meeting notes and conclusions, it seems RAN1 discussed model transfer/delivery from a different dimension, e.g. model format, collaboration level, which is different from RAN2 discussion angle (e.g. mechanism using CP/UP).

Considering there’s not much overlap between evaluation metrics discussed in RAN1 and above discussion areas discussed in RAN2 and both RAN1/2 are expected to complete SI in next meeting, rapporteur suggests to discuss model transfer/delivery in RAN2 separate from RAN1 discussion, as we are discussing from different angles. Whether to capture the discussion area in the TP is out scope of this email discussion, and can be further decided during online meeting. At least for the discussion below, the agreeable discussion areas will be used to evaluate RAN specification impact.

Furthermore, as clarified in phase 1 discussion, there’s no intention to down-select any solution from this email discussion, and the main motivation of the summarized tables are used for capturing current status, gaps and RAN specification impact for certain solution. Rapporteur believes down selection for model transfer/delivery solutions may also rely on other factors, e.g. functionality mapping, etc. Hence, following observation is captured:

Observation 1: The below tables only serves for the purposes of capturing current status, gaps and RAN specification impact for certain solution.

On discussion area A1: Large, no upper limit model size

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| (19/19)  Oppo, HW, QC, Apple, ZTE, MTK, IDCC, Xiaomi, LGE, vivo, E///, Lenovo, NEC, Nokia (neutral), Sharp, CATT, SS, CMCC | (0/19) |

All companies are ok to consider A1 at least in this email discussion, some updates based on RAN1 agreement about model/model parameter:

“*Delivery of an AI/ML model over the air interface, either parameters of a model structure known at the receiving end or a new model with parameters. Delivery may contain a full model or a partial model.*”

Rapporteur proposes to update A1 as follows:

**A1.** **Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size**

It is observed that all solutions can support model transfer/delivery with model size smaller than 45kBytes by default, e.g. CP solutions can support model size smaller than 45kBytes based on existing number of RRC segments. Therefore, for this discussion area, we only focus on model transfer/delivery for model size larger than 45kBytes.

On discussion area A2: Security and integrity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| (6/19)  HW, Apple, E///, NEC, Nokia, Sharp | (13/19)  Oppo, QC, ZTE, MTK, IDCC, Xiaomi, TCL, LGE, Vivo, Lenovo, CATT, SS, CMCC |

As commented by companies, security and integrity are already supported in legacy procedure for both CP-based and UP-based solutions, hence, this discussion area will not be considered during solution evaluation.

Rapporteur proposes not to consider A2 during this email discussion.

Observation 2: Security and integrity is supported by all model transfer/delivery solutions via existing mechanisms.

On discussion area A3: Latency requirement

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| (14/19)  Oppo, Apple, MTK, IDCC, Xiaomi, TCL, LGE, vivo, Lenovo, NEC, Nokia, Sharp, SS, CMCC | (4/19)  HW (consdier as yes when merging with A7), QC, ZTE, CATT (consdier as yes when merging with A7) |

5 company commented to consider A3 with A7 (flexible QoS). 1 company asked to consider latency from storage location to gNB. It was further mentioned by this company that the delay for all solutions are similar. Therefore, during comparison between solutions, similar as “model size smaller than 45kBytes” and “security and integrity”, we don’t need to consider the common area during this discussion.

With this, Rapporteur proposes to merge A3 with A7, which is shown below in A7.

On discussion area A4: Model transfer/delivery continuity

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| (17/19)  Oppo, HW, QC, Apple, ZTE, MTK, IDCC, Xiaomi, TCL, LGE, vivo, Lenovo, NEC, Nokia, Sharp, CATT, CMCC, Ericsson (depends on the model size) | (1/19)  SS (no comment) |

All companies are ok to consider A4 at least in this email discussion, except one company (but no comment on why it’s not acceptable).

Therefore, Rapporteur proposes to consider A4 during follow-up discussion:

**A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs)**

On discussion area A5: NW controllability

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| (15/19)  Oppo, HW, Apple, MTK, IDCC, Xiaomi, LGE, vivo, E///, Lenovo, Nokia (neutral), Sharp, CATT, SS, CMCC, TCL | (3/19)  QC, ZTE, NEC (consider as network impact) |

Most companies are ok to consider A4 at least in this email discussion, two companies’ comment to A5 seems ok to consider it or the motivation from rapp is misunderstood, where rapp further provided explanation in above table.

With that, Rapporteur proposed to consider A5 during follow-up discussion with small update:

**A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB)**

On discussion area A6: Partial model update

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| (9/19)  Oppo, Apple, ZTE, TCL, vivo, NEC, Sharp, CATT, CMCC | (8/19)  HW, QC, IDCC, Xiaomi, LGE, E///, Nokia, SS |

6 companies are not clear about the definition about partial model update, and some companies think it is relevant to model format.

Based on above observation, rapporteur suggests not to consider this area at least in phase 2 of this email discussion, and leave it to be further discussed during online meeting.

Proposal 1: RAN2 to continue discussion on the definition of partial model update and whether this needs to be supported during model transfer/delivery if needed.

On discussion area A7: Flexible model transfer/delivery QoS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| (15/19)  Oppo, QC, Apple, ZTE(neutral), MTK, IDCC, Xiaomi, TCL, LGE, vivo, Nokia (neutral), Sharp, CATT, SS, CMCC | (3/19)  HW, E///, NEC |

Five company commented to consider A3 with A7 (flexible QoS). Some companies commented that it’s not clear whether flexible QoS is needed. Furthermore, rapporteur would like to clarify that there’s no intention from the above summary to introduce QoS to SRB, where we use SRB priority instead.

To address companies’ concern, Rapporteur proposes to update A7 (+A3) as follows:

**A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB)** (including latency, etc) **and priority (for SRB)**.

Proposal 2: RAN2 to discuss whether different QoS is needed for different model transfer/delivery.

On discussion area A8: Interoperability

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Yes | No |
| (6/19)  HW, Apple, vivo, Sharp, CMCC, TCL | (10/19)  Oppo, QC, ZTE, IDCC, LGE, E///, NEC, Nokia, CATT, SS |

It is observed from companies’ input that interoperability has a dependency on what model format is used. Rapporteur suggests to postpone discussion on interoperability until further progress in RAN1/2 on model format.

Rapporteur proposes this discussion area will not be considered in at least phase 2 of this email discussion.

On discussion area A9 & A10

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| A9 | Yes | No |
| (7/19)  QC, Apple, E///, Lenovo, Sharp, CATT, TCL | (7/19)  ZTE, IDCC, Vivo, NEC, Nokia, SS, CMCC |
| A10 | Yes | No |
| (6/19)  QC, Apple, E///, Lenovo, Sharp, TCL | (8/19)  ZTE, IDCC, Vivo, NEC, Nokia, CATT, SS, CMCC |

Based on rapporteur’s understanding, all above discussion areas may lead to some deployment/enhancement to interfaces and RAN protocols or certain level of complexity, which is the RAN specification impact we need to identify. Having a new discussion area seems a little duplicate.

Therefore, rapporteur suggests companies to add the corresponding specification impact to below sections.

Based on above summary, here’s the updated discussion areas for phase 2 reference:

Proposal 3: RAN2 to consider below discussion areas when evaluating model transfer/delivery solutions:

- A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size

- A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs)

- A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB)

- A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB).

## 2.2 Model Transfer/Delivery Table

According to Rapporteur’s observation, during past discussion, companies may have different understanding on whether one bullet is a pro or con for certain solution, considering pros/cons are quite strong wording. Therefore, it is proposed to update the table by stating the objective facts, rather than stating pros/cons in a subjective position.

With the listed discussion areas above, “pros” used in existing table can be considered as “**readiness** of solution x”, indicating **which discussion area(s) are considered (or not) by certain solution**. On the other hand, “cons” used in existing table can be considered as “**current status and gaps**”, by **stating current supporting level and gaps for “not support” discussion area**. In the end, “RAN specification impact” includes potential RAN specification impact. It should be clear that “**RAN specification impact**” column tends to **identify area of specification impact**, rather than being a complete collection of detailed solution.

Furthermore, regarding to CN impact, Rapporteur understands that some solutions may have CN impact. However, it is not RAN2 scope to discuss the details of what CN impact is. Therefore, Rapporteur proposes that, for those solutions that may have potential CN impact, instead of going into details during this email discussion, we add a Note in “RAN specification impact” column by stating there may be a CN impact and leaving the details to SA during normative phase.

With above considerations, please find below mapping between original context to discussion area as below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Pros** | **Cons** |
| **Solution 1a** | 6. The existing RRC signaling solutions can be reused as baseline, at least including delta signaling and segementation  => A6: support partial model update based on RRC delta signaling  9. Additional security and verification may not be necessary as the UE already established security before the transfer is initiated  => A2: security and verification is supported, as security is established by UE based on existing procedure  11. gNB can take the control of the AIML model transfer itself, which can not be achieved by traditional UP based solution  => A5: gNB can control management directly, no additional interaction between management and model transfer is needed over NW interfaces | 1. Face challenges to convey large size or “no upper limit size” AI model by RRC message (e.g. >45kBytes)  2. Maybe high control plane overhead, as a large model size may need segmentation/transmission/acknowledgment. This consumes critical configuration time for model transfer/delivery  => A1: model size >45kBytes is not supported based on existing number of RRC segments  3. An incomplete control plane model transfer has to be restarted upon mobility, as there are no current procedures to resume transmission across gNBs.  => A4: transmission is restarted upon mobility  Some companies wonder whether it is critical or not as it depends on how frequent the gNB to send new/updated AI/ML to the UE  => A3: procedure latency depends on model size and SRB priority  =>A9: Requires Xn and/or NG-AP Interfaces.  =>A10: Requires gNB to store models. If not stored locally, then, latency is increased as well. |
| **Solution 2a and 3a** | 5. Service continuity on model transfer/delivery is easy to achieve compared with Solution 1a  => A4: For Solution 2a, support within AMF coverage area based on PDCP status report; For Solution 3a, support within LMF coverage area based on LPP signaling segmentation  6. Impacts on RAN2 may be limited (some companies think that LPP signalling is in RAN2 scope)  => Note: The details of model transfer/delivery procedure from CN to UE is out of RAN scope.  =>A10: No gNB Impact. | 1. Face challenges to convey large size or “no upper limit size” AI model by RRC message (e.g. >45kBytes)  3. If NAS does the segmentation, it may introduce some overhead  => A1: model size >45kBytes is not supported based on existing number of RRC segments  4. (only valid for Solution 2a) CN is not a good option for later on model monitoring/activation/deactivation/fallback/update that requires less latency. The model transfer/delivery is transparent to gNB, it could be tricky to get gNB involved in the AI model LCM. It could be problematic when the network needs to be in control of what happening at the UE side and especially in two-sided models where one side of the model is intended to be located at the network side  => A5: For Solution 2a, gNB cannot perform management directly, considering model transfer is transparent to gNB.  =>A9: Additional deployment impact out of RAN2 scope. |
| **Solution 1b** | 1. The network can provide different 5QIs for model transfer/delivery with different QoS requirements (e.g. can support large model size)  => A7: support by existing QoS-DRB mapping  2. Compared with CP-based solutions, this Solution 1b can reduces control plane overhead, reduces overhead at gNB for model delivery/transfer  => A1: support different model sizes  5. Compared with CP-based solutions, it may not need to consider CP message segmentation, CP message blocking issue  => A1: support different model sizes | 5. Not compatible with current mobility procedure. Supporting model transfer during mobility is not so straightforward  => A4: No solution support model transfer/delivery service continuity if DRB terminated at gNB  =>A10: Requires gNB to store models. If not stored locally, then, latency is increased as well. |
| **Solution 2b and 3b** | 1. The network can provide different 5QIs for model transfer/delivery with different QoS requirements (e.g. can support large model size)  => A7: support by existing QoS-DRB mapping  5. Compared with CP-based solutions, it may not need to consider CP message segmentation, CP message blocking issue  => A1: support different model sizes  =>A10: No additional gNB impact. | 2. CP signalling is needed to configure and initiate the model transfer from the CN  => A5: gNB cannot perform model management directly, NAS signalling is used to configure and initiate model transfer from CN.  4. May be unable to support delta-model transfer/delivery based on current user plane framework  => A6: CN cannot support delta-model transfer/delivery in user plane  =>A9: Additional deployment impact out of RAN2 scope. |
| **Solution 4** | 2. If 3GPP network can be aware of AI/ML model in this Solution 4, the network can provide different 5QIs for model transfer/delivery with different QoS requirements (e.g. can support large model size).  => A7: support different 5QIs  => A1: support different model sizes  How to synchronize 3GPP and server so that the network can take appropriate actions is not clear, and it may not be fully under 3GPP control  =>A9: No additional deployment impact.  =>A10: No additional gNB impact. | 2. There may be inter-operability issues, such as:  a) Different implementations may lead to different model performances and a huge burden of model management (e.g., frequent model activation/deactivation)  b) Massive offline coordination is needed or requires lots of coordinations among vendors, especially for the CSI compression use case  => A8 is not supported  4. When network cannot control the model transfer/delivery, the transfer of large model may impact important and delay sensitive user data traffic  => A5 is not supported |

Besides, Rapporteur also provides additional information based on understanding from previous discussion on readiness and current status/gaps, which are marked in grey.

With that, the updated tables can be found as below. To facilitate this email discussion, rapporteur splits the table under different subsections for each solution.

##### Solution 1a: gNB can transfer/deliver AI/ML model(s) to UE via RRC signalling

Table . Solution 1a Readiness and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Readiness** | **RAN specification impact** |
| **Current status and Gaps** |
| A1 | not supported | extension of the number of RRC segments is required to support models larger than 45kBytes |
| maximum 45kBytes based on existing number of RRC segments |
| A2 | supported |  |
| A3 | procedure latency depends on model size and SRB priority |  |
| A4 | not supported | Introduce service continuity support for SRBs |
| transmission is restarted upon mobility |
| A5 | supported |  |
| A6 | supported |  |
| A7 | not supported | introduce multiple SRBs or SRB with variable/multiple priorities |
| SRB priority is used |
| A8 | supported |  |
| A9 | Requires Xn and/or NG-AP Interfaces |  |
| A10 | gNB complexity (storage and processing) |  |

**Q2-1a: For Solution 1a, do you agree the content in above table to capture analysis of model transfer/delivery solutions? (please include comments only on the current context in this question. For new add-ons, please see Q3-1a)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| #example | Yes: Ax No: Ay | Ax:  Ay: |
| OPPO | No  A2/A6/A8 | A2: See comments in Q1;  A6:  Working Assumption in RAN1#111 meeting  *Consider “proprietary model” and “open-format model” as two separate model format categories for RAN1 discussion,*   |  |  | | --- | --- | | *Proprietary-format models* | *ML models of vendor-/device-specific proprietary format, from 3GPP perspective*  *NOTE: An example is a device-specific binary executable format* | | *Open-format models* | *ML models of specified format that are mutually recognizable across vendors and allow interoperability, from 3GPP perspective* |   *From RAN1 discussion viewpoint, RAN1 may assume that:*   * *Proprietary-format models are not mutually recognizable across vendors, hide model design information from other vendors when shared.* * *Open-format models are mutually recognizable between vendors, do not hide model design information from other vendors when shared*   **Based on above RAN1 agreement and working assumption, we can know both open format and proprietary-format are considered for model transfer:**  **In legacy, delta signaling is only applied to control plane in DL.**  When it comes to model transfer/delivery, we think the meaning is totally different. It’s not about control plane parameter update, but about delta model update. Usually AI/ML model algorithm data can be divided into two parts, i.e. model algorithm structure parameters and model algorithm weight parameters. If only model algorithm weight parameters are changed and the model algorithm structure parameters are known by the model receiver, delta model update can be considered to only update model algorithm weight parameters without changing model algorithm structure parameters. This is the typical scenario for delta model update, which can save the signaling overhead for model update procedure especially when the whole model size is very big. But it seems that this scenario is only applied to open format model case as the gNB can recognize the details of the AI/ML model algorithm, so it’s possible to define two separate parameters for an open format model, one is for model algorithm structure parameters while another is for model algorithm weight parameters. In this way, delta model update can be achieved like the legacy way used for delta signaling. But this delta model update definition is only applied to open format model case, if proprietary format model is used for model transfer/delivery, delta model update definition copied from legacy delta signaling definition is impossible as the gNB usually cannot recognize the details of the AI/ML model algorithm for a proprietary format model.  More addition, even if we consider open format model for solution1a, the model privacy and future proof are still under estimation. Every time a new open format model is introduced into 3GPP system, all legacy gNBs should be upgraded to understand the new model, which is somehow impossible/undesirable from operator perspective, so how open format model can work for future proof is still questionable for solution1a.  **Observation: Delta model update definition ported from legacy delta signaling definition is only applied to open format case for solution1a, but not applied to proprietary-format case.**  Based on above, we propose:  **Current status and Gaps:**  May be supported if open format is used for model transfer  **RAN specification impact**  How partial model update is applied to proprietary format may need extra spec effort.  A8: See comments in Q1  [Rapp] thanks, all are removed in phase 2 based on discussion in section 1. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No: A3, A7, A6  Yes: Others | **A3, A7**  As we commented above, both A3 and A7 are about QoS impacts, so there could be the uniform analysis.  For readiness of A3 and A7, the text is suggested: **Not supported. It depends on model size and SRB priority.**  For RAN spec impact, the text is suggested: **Impacts on SRBs in DL, e.g. introduce multiple SRBs or SRB with variable/multiple priorities.**  **A6**  As we commented above, the meaning of A6 is unclear and it should be clarified first. e.g. what kind of information may need delta configuration.  [Rapp] thanks, updated. |
| Qualcomm | Yes, for all, with comments.  A2, A3, A5, A6, A8 are similar for all solutions, therefore A2, A3, A5, A6, and A8 should be removed from the table. Instead, A9, and A10 should be added. | A2: See comments to Q1. Remove 9 (in pros) from solution 1a in the pros and cons table.  A3: Either every gNB will have to store all models (see A10), or a centrally located storage will have similar delays as any other solution.  A5: As discussed in response to Q1, in all of the solutions, NW (gNB) can manage the model. Note that the model can be developed by UE vendors or 3rd party. For solution 1a, we still need a solution for model transfer/delivery from the training entity to gNB. Remove 6 and 11 (in pros) from solution 1a in the pros and cons table.  A6: discussion on A6 for solution 1a is irrelevant. Also, see the comment to Q1. All the model transfer/delivery methods can support parameter set update/delta model update. This is up to model development.  A8: See comment to Q1.  A9: Currently, Xn is not widely deployed in the network. For this delivery method to work, we need high Xn deployment.  A10: Needs more storage and processing at gNB. If not stored locally, then, latency is increased as well.  [Rapp] For A5/A8/A9, please see rapp’s reply above in 1st section. A2/A3/A6/A8 are removed in phase 2. |
| Apple | Yes: A1, A4 with comments, A7  No: all others | On A4, please note that current SRB4 (QoE) has already support service continuity during HO. It is just segmentation transmission continuity can't be ensured because UE will discard the previous transmitted RRC segments during HO, according to section 5.3.5.3 of TS 38.331:  *3> if configured with application layer measurements and if application layer measurement report container has been received from upper layers for which the successful transmission of the message or at least one segment of the message has not been confirmed by lower layers:*  *4>* ***re-submit the MeasurementReportAppLayer message or all segments of the*** *MeasurementReportAppLayer message to lower layers for transmission via SRB4;*  Thus, we suggest to revise A4 as:  Introduce service continuity support for SRBs with segmentations.  [Rapp] thanks, updated |
| ZTE | Yes : A1, A4, A6  No with comments: A7  No: All others | We tend to agree with the A1, A4, A6 which is summarized by rapporteur.  Regarding A7, it is not crystal clear about the motivation to differentiate the model transfers with different QoS/SRB priorities. We need to confirm the motivation first, and then to discuss whether the multiple SRBs for model transfer is needed or not.  [rapp] it’s clarified with condition.  For other items except for A1, A4, A6, please see our reply in question 1 where all other items seems not be precisely/correctly to reflect the PROs and CONs for each solution. |
| Mediatek | Yes: A1, A3 with change, A4, A5 with change  FFS: A6, A7, A8, A9, A10 | A3 yes, if the overall latency is concerned (instead of latency requirement)  A5 yes, if the NW controllability focuses on the controllability on model transfer/delivery.  A6, A7, A8 needs further clarification  A9 see comment in Q1  A10  True for solution 1a, but not clear about the specification impact  [rapp] all are considered with clarification. |
| Interdigital | No (see comment to Q1): A2, A6, A8, A9, A10  No: A3 (see comments)  Yes: A1, A4, A5, A7 | A3: large model size support is already discussed under A1, so assuming this is addressed, it seems that solution 1a will not have latency issues?  [rapp] A3 is merged with A7 |
| Xiaomi | Comments for A3  No need to discuss A2 and A6 (see comments to Q1)  Yes for others | A3: Solution 1a has impact on latency of other RRC messages since current requirement in TS 38.300 is that *“all segments of an RRC message are transmitted before sending another RRC message*”. This means that when transmitting a large AI model, other RRC messages, which could be delay sensitive, might be delayed.  [rapp] A3 is merged with A7. Furthermore, based on rapporteur’s understanding, this can be solved by setting proper priority among SRBs. A4 is also updated to consider segmentation, hence, rapp believes this aspect is already included in the updated impact. |
| TCL | No: A2,  Yes with comments: A6, A3, A7,  Yes: Others | A2: See comments in Q1.  A6: See comments in Q1.  A3 and A7:  There is a little bit of repeat and conflict on the discussion of RAN specification impact for A3 and A7. As described in the Q1’s comments, it is possible that model transfer/delivery may have different latency requirements, which may bring some spec impact on radio bearer priority setting, we suggest to marge A3 and A7 and align the discussion.  [rapp] A3 is merged with A7 |
| LGE | No: A2, A6, A8  Yes with comment: A3  Yes: Others | For A2, agree with current status, but there is no need to consider them as Q1 answer.  For A3, current status can be changed to “supported”. We can focus on the latency component originated from the signaling between gNB and other network entity(-ies).  [rapp] A3 is merged with A7  For A6 and A8, need to remove them. They are influenced by the model format |
| vivo | Yes: A1 with comments, A3 with comments, A4 with comments, A5, A7, A8 with comments  No: A2, A6 | A1: Depends on the model size. Model transfer of model size larger than 45 KB is not supported.  [rapp] yes, as explained, we are focusing on model size larger than 45kB.  A2: can be removed  A3: Solution 1a can provide low latency as the gNB can transfer the appropriate model to UE once HO happens. The current description may be duplicated with A7.  A4: Related to model generalization performance, i.e., if the model is valid per cell, the issue does not exist.  A6: Specification impact is the signaling design of partial model update, e.g., add/mod/release.  A8: Specification impact includes the indication of model format.  [rapp] A3 is merged with A7. The rest is removed. |
| Ericsson | Yes: A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A9, A10.  No: the rest | The focus for this solution should be on how large models are. Having this in mind. Note that we should focus on highlighting that large AIML model could require RRC segmentation, which is an already existing procedure but that would need to be considered to cover AIML-model-transfer-related matters. We can consider Apple’s comment to enable RRC segmentation for service continuity.  A6/A7/A8: They should not be considered as per our Q1.  [rapp] A3 is merged with A7 and updated A7 specification impact with condition for RRC segmentation. |
| Lenovo | Yes: A1, A2, A3, A5, A7  Unclear: A4, A6, A8 | A4 is under the assupmtion that if a model from source gNB can be continueously used under target gNB. RAN1/RAN2 may need to confirm this first.  A6 and A8 depends on the model format discussion.  [rapp] thanks, updated. rapp suggests to work under the assumption of supporting continuity for completeness. |
| NEC | Yes: A1, A2, A3, A4 | A6 may be considered together with A4. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No: A3, A6, A8, A9, A10 | A3: Not supported (see Q1)  A6: Not supported by delta configuration. Please clarify the details if supported.  A8: It is not clear how interoperability would be supported if the model is a proprietary.  A9: We did not understand what kind of deployment impact is to be foreseen. Models are proprietary, so deployment impact is transparent anyway to 3GPP. Moreover, the scope of this criterion is not clear to us as UE models will be transfer/download/delivery to from the NW entity to the UE and why additional interfaces like Xn and/or NG-AP are needed.  A10. The implication to gNB is not clear to us.  [rapp] all are removed. |
| Sharp | Maybe considered: A6  Yes: all others | A6: Agree with some companies above that it should be decided based on the outcome of the model format discussion.  [rapp] it is removed |
| CATT | No : A2, A3, A8, A10  Yes: A1, A4 with change, A5, A6, A9  FFS: A7 (see comments to Q1) | A2/A3/A8/A10: See comments in Q1;  A4: Agree with Apple that the RAN spec impact is to introduce service continuity support for SRB segmentations.  [rapp] updated. |
| Samsung | See answer to Q1  (No: A2, A4, A6, A9, A10)  (Yes: A1, A3, A5, A7). | Similar view to Xiaomi on A3: Solution 1a has impact on latency of RRC messages. That is, even with SRB priority considered for RRC messages (i.e. different/lower priority for RRC messages carrying AI model), the requirements in TS 38.300, means that transmission of any RRC message is postponed/delayed pending transmission of all segments of RRC message carrying the AI model.  [rapp] A4 is updated to consider segmentation, hence, rapp believes this aspect is already included in the updated impact. |
| CMCC | No: A2, A9, A10 | See our comments on Q1. |

**Q3-1a: For Solution 1a, is there any other readiness/current status and gaps/RAN specification impact need to be added in the above table? Please state from the objective fact point of view.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Readiness** | **Current status and gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| #example | Ax: | Ax: | Ax: |
| Qualcomm | Can potentially support transfer or delivery of models < 45KBs   * Even in that case the model delivery can be interrupted (fail) due to handover | Significant gap   * Delivery of large model * Lossless model delivery * Dependence on availability of Xn interface   If Xn is not deployed between two gNB, then any proposed enhancements cannot work. | Requires RAN2 enhancements such as   * Larger RRC segmentation * SRB Reestablishment, such that model delivery can continue.   [rapp] above two points are already considered.  Requires Xn/NG-AP enhancements such as   * Forwards of untransmitted model or sequence number   This method highly depends on Xn and/or NG-AP enhancements/deployments. Otherwise, none of the RAN2 proposed solutions work.  [rapp] rapp thinks Xn/NG-AP impact are included in service continuity. if it concerns, rapp add it in spec impact corresponding to A4. and check companies’ view. |
| Xiaomi |  | Model delivery in uplink | New RRC message and procedure are required to support AI model delivery in uplink for solution 1a since existing messages like UAI is not suitable to deliver AI model.  [rapp] rapp suggest to focus on DL first in this email discussion, since we never identify any solution for UL so far. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  | Update information size is unknown, and there is no direction on model transfer for any use case specific in RAN1 agreements. | Therefore, we cannot verify the RAN spec impact based on hypothesis.  [rapp] rapp thinks it’s a good approach that RAN2 to progress something in 1 meeting before SI completion. Furthermore, it’s still not clear when and whether RAN1 input on this will be received. Rapp suggests to be constructive and we focus on whatever RAN2 can achieve. |

###### Summary

As summarized above, A3 is removed and merged with A7, A2/A6/A8 will not be considered during phase 2, A9/A10 are identified as RAN specification impact. Hence, the related rows are removed from the summarized table. To be more efficient, rapp further remove rows for “not supported”.

With that, considering companies’ input during phase 1, please see updated table as below:

Proposal 4: For solution 1a, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 1a current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | maximum 45kBytes based on existing number of RRC segments | extension of the number of RRC segments is required to support models larger than 45kBytes |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | transmission is restarted upon mobility | Introduce service continuity support for SRBs with segmentations.  Xn/NGAP enhancement(s) for model transfer/delivery continuity |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | supported |  |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | procedure latency depends on model size and SRB priority | impact on SRBs in DL, e.g. introduce multiple SRBs, etc, depends on whether flexible QoS is needed |

##### Solution 2a/3a: CN (except LMF)/LMF can transfer/deliver AI/ML model(s) to UE via NAS signalling/LPP signalling

Table . Solution 2a/3a Readiness and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Readiness** | **RAN specification impact** |
| **Current status and Gaps** |
| A1 | not supported | extension of the number of RRC segments is required to support models larger than 45kBytes |
| model size >45kBytes is not supported based on existing number of RRC segments |
| A2 | supported |  |
| A3 | 1) procedure latency depends on model size and SRB priority; 2) other latency includes forwarding NAS message latency from CN to gNB |  |
| A4 | supported with limitation |  |
| For Solution 2a, support within AMF coverage area based on PDCP status report;  For Solution 3a, support within LMF coverage area based on LPP signaling segmentation |
| A5 | not supported | support management and model transfer interaction between CN and gNB |
| For Solution 2a, gNB cannot perform management directly, considering model transfer is transparent to gNB |
| A6 | Solution 2a: not supported  Solution 2b: supported | For solution 2a, support delta signaling for NAS message |
| Solution 2a: NAS delta signaling is not supported |
| A7 | not supported | introduce multiple SRBs or SRB with variable/multiple priorities |
| SRB priority is used |
| A8 | supported |  |
| A9 | Not supported | Impact on the NG interface for the RAN controllability (see A5) |
| A10 | No additional gNB impact |  |

**Q2-2a3a: For Solution 2a/3a, do you agree the content in above table to capture analysis of model transfer/delivery solutions? (please include comments only on the current context in this question. For new add-ons, please see Q3-2a3a)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| #example | Yes: Ax No: Ay | Ax:  Ay: |
| OPPO | No for A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/A6/A7/A8 | A1: Upper layer segmentation is invisible for RRC layer, we propose the following rewording:  **Current status and Gaps:**  Although upper layer segmentation is invisible for RRC layer, SRB1 or SRB2 will be used to carry the continuous upper layer segmentation container, this may have influence on transmission of other information, e.g. normal NAS/RRC info, carried via SRB1/SRB2.**RAN specification impact**  ]  The coexistence between upper layer segmentation container including model data, and normal NAS/RRC info.A2: See comments in Q1  [rapp] updated by considering upper layer segmentation.  A3: RAN specification impact is missing, we propose:  **RAN specification impact**  If SRB other than SRB1/SRB2 is introduced or reused, RAN may need to consider the SRB priority.  A4: Upper layer segmentation is invisible for RRC layer, we propose the following rewording:  **Current status and Gaps:**  For Solution 2a, support based on NAS signaling segmentation;  For Solution 3a, support based on LPP signaling segmentation.  **RAN specification impact**  The coexistence between upper layer segmentation container including model data, and normal LMF triggered/NAS/RRC info.  [rapp] updated.  A5:  **Current status and Gaps:**  For Solution 2a/3a, gNB cannot perform management directly, considering model transfer is transparent to gNB  **RAN specification impact**  For solution 2a, support management and model transfer interaction between CN except LMF and gNB via NAS signaling;  For solution 3a, support management and model transfer interaction between LMF and gNB via NRPPa signaling;  A6  We don’t think RAN can evaluate the delta configuration for upper layer, so a general description is sufficient and safe:  **Current status and Gaps:**  Upper layer delta configuration is invisible from RAN point of view.  **RAN specification impact**  Note: delta configuration may have some spec impact for CN.  A7: Currently, QoS requirements are not applicable to SRB as SRB priority is used instead.  **Current status and Gaps:**  N/A  **RAN specification impact**  N/A  [rapp] SRB priority is within RAN2 scope, rapp doesn’t mean to introduce QoS for SRB.  A8: See comments in Q1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No: A1, A3, A7, A6  Yes: Others | **A1**  For segmentation of CP signaling, it depends on the CP level. RAN2 did not discuss in which layer the segementation should be performed, and we think at least RRC or NAS/LPP may be candidate entities for doing the segmentation. If RRC does the segmentation, there could be the similar analysis to Solution 1a; if NAS/LPP does the segmentation, it may only impact NAS layer or LPP layer, and thus the impacts on RRC may be minimal.  So we suggest:  For readiness, ok with the current wording.  For RAN spec impact, change the text into:  **If NAS/LPP do not support segmentation, it may need RRC segmentation, and extension of the number of RRC segments is required to support models larger than 45kBytes.**  [rapp] agree in principle, rapp further updates based on the uncertainty which layer is responsible for segmentation. see update in the table.  **A3, A7**  As we commented above, both A3 and A7 are about QoS impacts, so there could be the uniform analysis.  For readiness of A3 and A7, the text is suggested: **Not supported. It depends on model size and SRB priority. Other latency includes forwarding NAS message latency from CN to gNB.**  For RAN spec impact, the text is suggested: **Impacts on SRBs in DL, e.g. introduce multiple SRBs or SRB with variable/multiple priorities.**  **A6**  As we commented above, the meaning of A6 is unclear and it should be clarified first. e.g. what kind of information may need delta configuration. |
| Qualcomm | No for A1, A4, A5, A6  A2, A3, A5, A6, A8 are similar for all solutions, therefore A2, A3, A5, A6, and A8 should be removed. Instead, A9 and A10 should be added. | A1: NAS can segment in such a way that RRC segmentation may not be required.  A2: See comments to Q1.  A5: Same as comments to Q1, Q2-1a. Remove 4 (in cons) from solution 2a/3a in the pros and cons table.  [rapp] rapporteur suggests to focus on the new table, as the legacy pros/cons table are converted to the new ones.  A6: Same as comments to Q1, Q2-1a. |
| Apple | Yes: A1 with change  No: all others | We only agree A1 with Huawei's change, i.e. **If NAS/LPP do not support segmentation, it may need RRC segmentation, and extension of the number of RRC segments is required to support models larger than 45kBytes.**  For A5/A6, we think their spec impact are out of RAN2 scope. So, RAN2 is not in position to make conclusion (i.e. not capture them in TR).  [rapp] just to clarify, if any interaction between CN and gNB, e.g. NGAP, it is in RAN scope (RAN3).  On A7, it essentially requires a new QoS profile for model transfer in UP. It is SA2 scope. So, RAN2 is not in position to make conclusion (i.e. not capture them in TR).  [rapp] SRB priority is within RAN2 scope, rapp doesn’t mean to introduce QoS for SRB. |
| ZTE | Yes for readiness: A1, A4, A6,  Yes for specification impact: A6  Yes for specification impact with modification: A1.  No for A7.  No for All others. | Regarding the specification impact for A1, we share the same view with HW/apple regarding solution 2a. For the solution 3A already support segmentation (i.e. LPP), **we do not think there is any enhancement to RRC segmentation needed for solution 3A.** Regarding solution 2A, potential specification impact in both SA and RAN can be clarified, In this sense, we suggest to modify the specification impact for A1 like below:  NAS signaling segmentation or extansion of RRC segmentation maybe required for solution 2A.Regarding A7, please see our comments in Question 1 and 2.  For other items except for A1, A4, A6, please see our reply in question 1 where all other items seems not be precisely/correctly to reflect the PRO and CONs for each solution. |
| Mediatek | Yes: A1 with change, A3, A4 with change, A5,  FFS: A6, A7, A8, A9, A10 | A1:  We agree with HW’s revision.  A4:  For Solution 2a, support within AMF coverage area based on NAS signaling segmentation.  For Solution 3a, support within LMF coverage area based on LPP signaling segmentation  A6, A7, A8: see comment in Q1  A9 see comment in Q1. If it is out of RAN2 scope, why we need to list it in the table?  A10 there should be some impacts on gNB e.g., due to the enhancement on NRPPa signaling. |
| Interdigital | No (see comment to Q1): A2, A6, A8, A9, A10  No: A1 (see comments), Yes: A3, A4, A5, A7 | A1: Agree with the comments from Huawei/Apple |
| Xiaomi | No need to discuss A2 and A6 (see comments to Q1)  Yes for others |  |
| TCL | No: A1, A2, A6;  Yes with comments: A6, A3, A7;  Yes: Others. | A1: Agree with Huawei's views, both RRC or NAS/LPP are able to perform the segmentation.  A2: See comments in Q1.  A6: See comments in Q1.  A3 and A7: See comments to Q1, Q2-1a. |
| LGE | No: A1, A2, A6, A8  Yes with comment: A3  Yes : Others | For A1, similar view with Qualcomm  For A2, agree with current status, but there is no need to consider them as Q1 answer.  For A3, need to remove the first consideration. We can focus on the latency component originated from the signaling between gNB and other network entity(-ies). (i.e., between gNB<->CN)  For A6 and A8, need to remove them. They are influenced by the model format |
| vivo | Yes: A3 with comments, A4, A5 with comments, A6, A7 with comments, A8 with comments  No: A1, A2, | A1: the upper layer may perform the segmentation. For LPP transmission between LMF and UE, the segmentation is performed at the LPP layer.  A2: remove  A3: The CN may not be able to get the real-time serving cell of UE, thus cannot transfer the applicable model to UE in real-time.  A5: the model/functionality may provide RAN awareness, that is, the specification impact can be interaction between UE and gNB.  A7: New messages are needed to carry NAS messages with different priorities.  [rapp] rapp thinks it’s covered by “introduce multiple SRBs or SRB with variable/multiple priorities”. new messages is not precluded.  A8: Specification impact includes the indication of model format. |
| Ericsson | Yes: A1, A2 and A5, A9 (with comments), A10   No: the rest | A1: OK to reword RAN spec. impact as proposed by Huawei.  A5: *(addressing Apple’s comment)* to focus on interaction between entities within RAN2 domain, we can instead consider the case where the communication to allow for control/management/awareness is between UE and gNB.  A9: This is related to A5, since to introduce support for management/interaction between CN and gNB, there would be a need to consider that the NG interface could be impacted. Concerning WGs would then need to address such case. (See modifications for table above).  A6/A7/A8: They should not be considered as per our Q1. |
| Lenovo | Yes: A2, A3, A4, A5, A7  No: A1  Unclear: A6, A8 | A1: Agree with Huawei’s comment  A6 and A8 depends on the model format discussion. |
| NEC | Yes: A1, A2, A5 |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No: A1, A5, A6, A8, A9, A10 | A1: for option 3a, LPP supports its own message segmentation, which can exceed the number of RRC segments available.  A5: for option 3a, if LPP transfers the message, there should be sufficient NW awareness for controllability.  [rapp] so far, those are not supported based on rapp’s understanding.  A6: none of the solutions 2a, 3a support delta signaling. Please clarify how?  A8: It is not clear how proprietary model will support interoperability  A9: We did not understand what kind of deployment impact is to be foreseen. Models are proprietary, so deployment impact is transparent anyway to 3GPP. Moreover, the scope of this criterion is not clear to us as UE models will be transfer/download/delivery to from the NW entity to the UE and why additional interfaces like Xn and/or NG-AP are needed.  A10: The implication to gNB is not clear to us. |
| CATT | No : A2, A3, A8, A10  Yes: A1 with comments, A4, A5 with comments, A6, A9  FFS: A7 (see comments to Q1) | A2/A3/A8/A10: See comments in Q1;  A1: It may not need extension of the number of RRC segments if the NAS/LPP segments could fulfil the requirement. And this should also depend on e.g. SA2.  A5: For both Solution 2a and **3a**, gNB cannot perform management directly, and for RAN specification impact, it should support management and model transfer interaction between CN/ **NRPPa** and gNB. |
| Samsung | See comments to Q1  (No: A2, A4, A6, A9, A10)  (Yes: A1, A3, A5, A7). |  |
| CMCC | No: A2, A9, A10 | See our comments on Q1. |

**Q3-2a3a: For Solution 2a/3a, is there any other readiness/current status and gaps/RAN specification impact need to be added in the above table? Please state from the objective fact point of view.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Readiness** | **Current status and gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| #example | Ax: | Ax: | Ax: |
| Qualcomm | DL NAS transfer message can be reused. | Significant gap   * Delivery of large model * NAS or RRC segmentation can needs enhancements. * Lossless model delivery   Indication of model download completion.  [rapp] above points are captured in current status and gaps in A1 and A4. | Some signalling enhancements may be required to indicate  Model transfer is completed.  [rapp] rapp thinks spec impact to A5 includes this point. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell |  | Update information size is unknown, and there is no direction on model transfer for any use case specific in RAN1 agreements. | Therefore, we cannot verify the RAN spec impact based on hypothesis. |
|  |  |  |  |

###### Summary

As summarized above, A3 is removed and merged with A7, A2/A6/A8 will not be considered during phase 2, A9/A10 are identified as RAN specification impact. Hence, the related rows are removed from the summarized table. To be more efficient, rapp further remove rows for “not supported”.

With that, considering companies’ input during phase 1, please see updated table as below:

Proposal 5: For solution 2a/3a, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 2a/3a current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | model size >45kBytes is not supported based on existing number of RRC segments;  CN supports NAS signalling segmentation;  LMF supports LPP signalling segmentation | If NAS/LMF does not do segmentation for model transfer/delivery, it may need RRC segmentation, and extension of the number of RRC segments is required to support models larger than 45kBytes. |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | supported with limitation:  For Solution 2a, support within AMF coverage area based on NAS signalling segmentation;  For Solution 3a, support within LMF coverage area based on LPP signaling segmentation | Note: supporting service continuity across AMF/LMF is out of RAN scope and needs coordination with CN groups |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | For Solution 2a, gNB cannot perform management directly, considering model transfer is transparent to gNB  management and interaction between UE and gNB is not supported | support management and model transfer interaction between CN/LMF and gNB, e.g. via NAS signaling or NRPPa signalling when model management at gNB  support management and interaction between UE and gNB (e.g. model identification, model transfer completion indication, etc) when model management at gNB |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | procedure latency depends on model size and SRB priority; other latency includes forwarding NAS message latency from CN to gNB | impact on SRBs in DL, e.g. introduce multiple SRBs , etc, depends on whether flexible QoS is needed |

##### Solution 1b: gNB can transfer/deliver AI/ML model(s) to UE via UP data

Table . Solution 1b Readiness and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Readiness** | **RAN specification impact** |
| **Current status and Gaps** |
| A1 | supported | support DRB termination at gNB |
| A2 | supported? |  |
| A3 | procedure latency depends on model size and DRB priority |  |
| A4 | not supported | identify a solution to support service continuity support between gNBs when DRB is terminated at gNB |
| Solution not identified to support model transfer continuity if DRB terminated at gNB |
| A5 | supported |  |
| A6 | not supported | solution for gNB to support delta-model transfer/delivery in user plane |
| solution not identified to support model update if DRB terminated at gNB |
| A7 | supported |  |
| A8 | supported |  |
| A9 | Requires Xn and/or NG-AP Interfaces |  |
| A10 | gNB complexity (storage and processing) |  |

**Q2-1b: For Solution 1b, do you agree the content in above table to capture analysis of model transfer/delivery solutions? (please include comments only on the current context in this question. For new add-ons, please see Q3-1b)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| #example | Yes: Ax No: Ay | Ax:  Ay: |
| OPPO | No for A1/A2/A3/A7/A8 | A1: Only ‘support’ is not accurate to reflect the status, so we propose:  **Current status and Gaps:**  No model size limitation if UP method is used for model transfer  A2: See comments in Q1  A3: QoS requirements should be considered also for DRB, so we propose:  **Current status and Gaps:**  procedure latency depends on model size, QoS requirements and DRB priority  **RAN specification impact**  QoS management for model transfer  Note: Whether QoS management for solution1b has CN involvement needs SA clarification.  A7: In legacy, gNB is not the entity to control QoS, so we propose:  **RAN specification impact**  QoS management for model transfer  Note: Whether QoS management for solution1b has CN involvement needs SA clarification.  A8: See comments in Q1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No: A2, A3, A7, A6  Yes: Others | **A2**  Readiness should be “**not supported**” as solutions are unclear for now.  RAN spec impact: **support DRB termination at gNB**  **A3, A7**  As we commented for above questions, there should be uniform analysis for A3 and A7 as they are about QoS impacts.  **A6**  As we commented for above questions, the meaning of A6 is unclear, and what kind of information may need A6 is also unclear. |
| Qualcomm | No for A2, A4, A6  A2, A3, A5, A6, A8 are similar for all solutions, therefore A2, A3, A5, A6, and A8 should be removed. Instead, A9 and A10 should be added. | A2: See comments to Q1.  A4: RAN2 has no expertise on this. I-UPF at two gNB can be connected and transfer the status of model transfer/delivery between themselves. Remove 5 (in cons) from solution 1b in the pros and cons table.  A6: See comments to Q1 and Q2-1a. The assumption that delta or parameter set update cannot be supported over the UP-based method is wrong. |
| Apple | Yes: A1 with change, A4  No: all others | We agree with Huawei that for A1:   * Readiness should be “**not supported**” as solutions are unclear for now. * RAN spec impact: **support DRB termination at gNB**   For A6, we may understand Rapporteur intention, but we prefer to avoid confusing term like "delta signaling in UP" which should not be captured in TR. |
| ZTE | Yes for readiness: A1, A4, A6  No for specification impact: A4  Yes for specification impact: A1, A6  No for all others | Regarding the specification impact for A4, in our understanding, the data continuity is mainly for HO case, and data forwarding is already supported for inter-CU handover, so we do not think there is any specification impact even if the DRB is assumed to be terminated at gNB.  Regarding A7, please see above comments from us  For other items except for A1, A4, A6, please see our reply in question 1 where all other items seems not be precisely/correctly to reflect the PRO and CONs for each solution. |
| Mediatek | No: A2  Yes: A1 with change  FFS A6, A8, A9, A10  The assumption on A3, A4. A5, A7 need to be clarified. | A1: Agree with OPPO  A3, A4, A5 and A7 in the table 3 take the assumption that the DRB carrying model is terminated at the gNB, which has direct control on QoS.  [rapp] add “when DRB is terminated at gNB” as a condition for A1 and A7, similar to what did for A4.  But the alternative way is that the DRB carrying the model is terminated at UPF as existing DRBs, which requires the gNB delivers the model to the UPF. Then we may have different conclusion.  A6, A7, A8 see comment in Q1 |
| Interdigital | No (see comment to Q1): A2, A6, A8, A9, A10  No: A3, A4 (comments)  Yes: A1, A5, A7 | A3: assuming that DRB termination at the gNB is handled/specified, it is not clear why there will be more requirements here than the latency requirement for other UP data over the Uu.  [rapp] update and merge with A7, now it’s to identify a solution to manage QoS in gNB  A4: not clear how service continuity is an issue here considering model is terminated at the gNB and data forwarding between gNBs is a fundamental feature of HO. |
| Xiaomi | No need to discuss A2 and A6 (see comments to Q1)  Yes for others | A2: Our understanding is that existing UP security model is applicable for solution 1b therefore security and integrity is supported for solution 1b. |
| TCL | No: A2,  Yes with comments: A6, A3, A7,  Yes: Others | A2: See comments to Q1, Readiness should be“supported”. Given all the solutions support security and integrity, it is useless to compare pros and cons, and suggest removing it.  A6: See comments in Q1.  A3 and A7: See comments in Q1 and Q2-1a; |
| LGE | No: A1, A2, A4, A6, A8  Yes with comment: A3  Yes : Others | For A1, we also think current status can be “not supported” as it is unclear how to achieve it.  For A2, agree with current status, but there is no need to consider them as Q1 answer.  For A3, current status can be changed to “supported”. We can focus on the latency component originated from the signaling between gNB and other network entity(-ies). (i.e., between gNB and CN)  For A4, we also think current status can be “supported” as the data can be forwarded to target cell during HO.  [rapp] that is for the fact when DRB terminating at CN, if DRB terminates at gNB, we never discuss whether current mechanism can work or not.  For A6 and A8, need to remove them. They are influenced by the model format |
| vivo | No: All | There is no DRB termination at gNB, i.e., no readiness for Solution 1b. And solution 1b can be de-prioritized. |
| Ericsson | Yes: A1, A2, A9, A10 but see comment.  No: the rest | As is, this is not a viable solution, since the gNB does not terminate UP data. Hence, A1 is not supported for this case and we would then need to consider the RAN specification impact highlighted by the email discussion Rapporteur.  A6/A7/A8: They should not be considered as per our Q1. |
| Lenovo | Yes: A1, A2, A3, A5, A7  Unclear: A4, A6, A8 | A4 is under the assupmtion that if a model from source gNB can be continueously used under target gNB. RAN1/RAN2 may need to confirm this first.  A6 and A8 depends on the model format discussion. |
| NEC | Yes: A1, A4, A5 |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No: A1  Not applicable: A3, A6, A7, A8, A9, A10 | A1: We agree with HW. The gNB does not support the termination of a UP data transmission session.  A3: It is not possible to comment without any proper evaluation. Moreover, the terminology ‘delta latency component’ is not defined.  A5: The LMF could perform model management for 3b. For the use cases relevant to solutions 3, the gNB doesn’t need to be in control.  A6: The terminology ‘delta singaling or ‘delta model’ is not defined. Any comment is irrelevant.  A7: No strong opinion without any RAN1 information on model size.  A8: It is not clear how proprietary model will support interoperability  A9: We did not understand what kind of deployment impact is to be foreseen. Models are proprietary, so deployment impact is transparent anyway to 3GPP. Moreover, the scope of this criterion is not clear to us as UE models will be transfer/download/delivery from a NW entity to the UE and why additional interfaces like Xn and/or NG-AP are needed.  A10: The implication to gNB is not clear to us. |
| Sharp | Yes, to A1, A3, A4, A5, A7 with comments and A4,  No: all others | For A1, agree with Huawei, Solutions are not clear hence readiness should not be supported.  Support DRB termination at gNB  For A3, A4, A5, A7 assumption on where the DRB is terminated needs to be clarified.  A6 and A8 is to be decided based on the outcome of the model format discussion. |
| CATT | No : A2, A3, A8, A10  Yes: A1 with comments, A4, A5 with comments, A6, A9  FFS: A7 (see comments to Q1) | A2/A3/A8/A10: See comments in Q1;  A1: We agree with Huawei and Apple that for A1 the solution is unclear now and the readiness should be “not supported”, and this problem also existing for A5. |
| Samsung | See comments to Q1  (No: A2, A4, A6, A9, A10)  (Yes: A1, A3, A5, A7). |  |
| CMCC | No: A2, A9, A10 | See our comments on Q1. |

**Q3-1b: For Solution 1b, is there any other readiness/current status and gaps/RAN specification impact need to be added in the above table? Please state from the objective fact point of view.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Readiness** | **Current status and gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| #example | Ax: | Ax: | Ax: |
| Qualcomm | Supports   * Delivery of large models * Delivery of parameter sets or delta models * Lossless model delivery (some clarification may be needed from SA2)   Security and integrity of model | Distributed model storage  May require large storage and processing at gNBs |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

###### Summary

As summarized above, A3 is merged with A7, A2/A6/A8 will not be considered during phase 2, A9/A10 are identified as RAN specification impact. Hence, the related rows are removed from the summarized table. To be more efficient, rapp further remove rows for “not supported”.

Proposal 6: For solution 1b, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 1b current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | No model size limitation;  DRB termination at gNB (if needed) is not supported | support DRB termination at gNB if needed |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | model transfer continuity if DRB terminated at gNB is not supported | identify a solution to support service continuity support between gNBs when DRB is terminated at gNB  Xn/NGAP enhancement(s) for model transfer/delivery continuity |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | supported |  |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | procedure latency depends on model size, QoS requirement and DRB priority;  QoS management at gNB is not supported for DRB is terminated at gNB (if needed) | identify a solution to support QoS management at gNB for model transfer when DRB is terminated at gNB |

##### Solution 2b/3b: CN (except LMF)/LMF can transfer/deliver AI/ML model(s) to UE via UP data

Table 4. Solution 2b/3b Readiness and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Readiness** | **RAN specification impact** |
| **Current status and Gaps** |
| A1 | supported | No RAN impact  Note: The detail procedure of model transfer from CN/LMF to UE is out of RAN scope |
| A2 | supported |  |
| A3 | 1) procedure latency depends on model size and DRB priority; 2) other latency includes forwarding data from CN to gNB |  |
| A4 | support with limitation |  |
| For Solution 2b, support within AMF coverage area based on PDCP status report; For Solution 3b, support within LMF coverage area based on LPP signaling segmentation |
| A5 | gNB cannot perform model management directly, NAS signalling is used to configure and initiate model transfer from CN. | support management and model transfer interaction between CN and gNB |
| A6 | not supported | solution for CN to support delta-model transfer/delivery in user plane |
| CN cannot support delta-model transfer/delivery in user plane |
| A7 | supported |  |
| A8 | supported |  |
| A9 | *(Impact out of RAN2 scope)* |  |
| A10 | No additional gNB impact |  |

**Q2-2b3b: For Solution 2b/3b, do you agree the content in above table to capture analysis of model transfer/delivery solutions? (please include comments only on the current context in this question. For new add-ons, please see Q3-2b3b)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| #example | Yes: Ax No: Ay | Ax:  Ay: |
| OPPO | No for A1/A2/A3/A4/A5/A7/A8 | A1: Although the content of GTP/UP tunnel may be transparent to gNB, the gNB may still need to get the model meta info from CN/LMF, this may fall into the A5 scope, so we propose:  **Current status and Gaps:**  No model size limitation if UP method is used for model transfer  **RAN specification impact**  See the impact analysis for A5A2: See comments in Q1  A3: QoS requirements should be considered also for DRB, so we propose:  **Current status and Gaps:**  1) procedure latency depends on model size , QoS requirements and DRB priority; 2) other latency includes forwarding data from CN to gNB  **RAN specification impact**  QoS management for model transfer  Note: Whether QoS management for solution1b has CN involvement needs SA clarification.  A4: For solution 2b, we don’t know why we only focus on AMF coverage case, we think NG HO case can also result in AMF change and Model transfer/delivery continuity is also guaranteed via UP L2 handling. More addition, PDCP status report is a specific solution, we should make the wording generic during SID phase.  For solution3b, we understand the proposed wording is a typo, because it’s obvious that solution3b does not rely on LPP signaling segmentation. Maybe we can merge solution2b/3b, so we propose:  **Current status and Gaps:**  For Solution 2b/3b/ Model transfer/delivery continuity is achieved via UP L2 handling, e.g. PDCP status report.  A5: Better to differentiate solution2b/3b  **Current status and Gaps:**  For solution2b/3b, gNB may need extra method to acquire model meta info for model management purpose;  **RAN specification impact**  For solution2b, gNB cannot perform model management directly, NAS signalling is used to configure and initiate model transfer from CN;  For solution3b, gNB cannot perform model management directly, NRPPa signalling is used to configure and initiate model transfer from LMF.  Note: whether RAN3/SA2 is involved may need RAN3/SA2 clarification.  A7: new QoS policy may be considered by CN, but the details should be clarified by SA2.  **RAN specification impact**  Note: whether SA2 is involved may need SA2 clarification  A8: See comments in Q1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No: A3, A7, A5, A6  Yes: Others | **A3, A7**  As we commented for above questions, there should be uniform analysis for them as they are about QoS impacts.  **A5**  For solution 2b/3b, it is FFS whether all of model information are transferred via UP. In the past, some companies commented that some of model information (e.g. model ID, meta data) may be transferred via CP, e.g. from CN to UE, from CN to gNB. In this case, we have the following suggestions:  Readiness: **gNB cannot perform model management directly.**  RAN spec impact: **This column should be only about the impats in Uu interface, so the current wording can be removed as it is not relevant to RAN impacts.**  [rapp] To clarify, NGAP is within RAN scope. Uu impact is added.  **A6**  As we commented for above questions, the meaning of A6 is unclear, and what kind of information may need A6 is also unclear. |
| Qualcomm | No for A3, A4, A5, A6  A2, A3, A5, A6, A8 are similar for all solutions, therefore A2, A3, A5, A6, and A8 should be removed. Instead, A9 and A10 should be added. | A3: Do not agree with 2). Not significant as compared to scheduling and Uu delay. Therefore, other latency including forwarding data from CN to gNB should be removed.  A4: Supports retransmission (without any limitations). AF/AS can be connected to multiple AMFs (depending on CN architecture). Need further study from SA2. This is outside RAN2's scope.  A5: gNB can perform model management based on metadata and UE capability signaling. Therefore, even if the model delivery is over UP, the gNB can have full control over model management. Additional signalling may be required over the Uu to indicate the completion of delivery/transfer of the configured model. Remove 2 (in cons) from solution 2b/3b in the pros and cons table. Note that configuration is done based on the UE capability signaling. Model transfer can happen between UE and CN transparent to the gNB; gNB is indicated once model transfer/delivery is complete.  A6: Same comments as in Q1, Q2-1a, Q2-1b. Remove 4 (in cons) from solution 2b/3b in the pros and cons table. |
| Apple | Yes: A1  No: all others | A1 is correct that " No RAN impact".  On A5/A6, we think they are out of RAN2 scope, and thereby RAN2 is not in position in making conclusion (i.e. not capture them in TR).  [rapp] see comment above |
| ZTE | Yes for A1, A4, A6 with editorial comments.  No for others | Regarding A4:  For Solution 2b, support within AMF coverage area based on PDCP status report; For Solution 3b, support within LMF coverage area based on LPP signaling segmentation  Regarding A7, please see our comments in above  For other items except for A1, A4, A6, please see our reply in question 1 where all other items seems not be precisely/correctly to reflect the PRO and CONs for each solution. |
| Mediatek | Yes: A1, A3,  No: A2, A4, A5  FFS: A6, A7 A8, A9, A10 | A2  Common for all solutions, which is out of RAN2 scope and can be removed.  A4  Considering the model is delivered through DRB, model transfer/delivery continuity is by default supported, e.g., via AM transmission. But the interaction between gNB and CN/LMF needs to be considered.  A5 Agree with OPPO that we should differentiate 2b and 3b.  A6, A7, A8 see comment in Q1  A9 see comment in Q1  A10 For solution 2a if model management is performed by gNB, there should be some gNB impacts. |
| Interdigital | No (see comment to Q1): A2, A6, A8, A9, A10  No: A4 (see comments),  Yes: A1, A3, A5, A7 | A4: for solution 2b, it is not clear why even more stringent requirement is being put here that we don’t have for normal UP data transmission?  [rapp] as QC pointed out, whether continuity supports across AMF is out of RAN scope, which requires further SA/SA2 study. |
| Xiaomi | General comment for solution 3b: analysis of solution 3a is applicable to solution 3b.  For solution 2b: No need to discuss A2 and A6 (see comments to Q1), Yes for others | In solution 3b, AI/ML model is transferred between LMF and UE via LPP signalling carried as UP data, as specified in TS 23.273. Therefore in both solution 3a and 3b, AI/ML model are carried in LPP signalling. From RAN2 perspective, there might be no difference between Option 3a and 3b since both options require LPP enhancements to support AI model transfer/delivery.  In summary, our understanding is that analysis of solution 3a is applicable to solution 3b. |
| TCL | No: A2,  Yes with comments: A5, A6, A3, A7,  Yes: Others | A2: See comments in Q1.  A5: It is without RAN2 domain, we agree with Apple‘s comments, and remove the assumption in the “RAN specification impact”.  A6: See comments in Q1.  A3 and A7:See comments to Q1, Q2-1a. |
| LGE | No: A2, A3, A6, A8  Yes with comment: A3  Yes: Others | For A2, agree with current status, but there is no need to consider them as Q1 answer.  For A3, need to remove the first consideration. We can focus on the latency component originated from the signaling between gNB and other network entity(-ies). (i.e., between gNB and CN)  For A6 and A8, need to remove them. They are influenced by the model format |
| vivo | Yes: A1, A3 with comments, A4, A5 with comments, A6 with comments, A7  No: A2, A3, A8 | A2: remove  A3: The CN may not be able to get the real-time serving cell of UE, thus cannot transfer the applicable model to UE in real-time.  A5: the model/functionality may provide RAN awareness, that is, the specification impact can be interaction between UE and gNB.  A6: whether the partial model update is supported is up to implementation, i.e., no explicit signalling.  A8: not supported for proprietary format, i.e., offline interaction is needed between UE and NW. |
| Ericsson | Yes: A1, A9, A10 see comment  No: the rest | A5: *(addressing Apple’s comment)* to focus on interaction between entities within RAN2 domain, we can instead consider the case where the communication to allow for control/management/awareness is between UE and gNB.  A6/A7/A8: They should not be considered as per our Q1. |
| Lenovo | Yes: A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A7  Unclear: A6, A8 | A6 and A8 depends on the model format discussion. |
| NEC | Yes: A1, A9, A10. |  |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Not applicable: A3, A6, A7, A8, A9, A10  No: A5 | A3: It is not possible to comment without any proper evaluation. Moreover, the terminology ‘delta latency component’ is not defined.  A5: The LMF could perform model management for 3b. For the use cases relevant to solutions 3, the gNB doesn’t need to be in control.  A6: The terminology ‘delta singaling or ‘delta model’ is not defined. Any comment is irrelevant.  A7: No strong opinion without any RAN1 information on model size.  A8: It is not clear how proprietary model will support interoperability  A9: We did not understand what kind of deployment impact is to be foreseen. Models are proprietary, so deployment impact is transparent anyway to 3GPP. Moreover, the scope of this criterion is not clear to us as UE models will be transfer/download/delivery to from the NW entity to the UE and why additional interface like Xn and/or NG-AP are needed.  A10: The implication to gNB is not clear to us. |
| Sharp | Yes: to A1, A2, A7  Unclear: A6, A8 |  |
| CATT | No : A2, A3, A8, A10  Yes: A1 with change, A4, A5, A6, A9  FFS: A7 (see comments to Q1) | A2/A3/A8/A10: See comments in Q1;  A1: Since for A1, there is no RAN impact, the wording can also be changed to “No RAN impact”. |
| Samsung | See comments to Q1  (No: A2, A4, A6, A9, A10)  (Yes: A1, A3, A5, A7). |  |
| CMCC | No: A2, A9, A10 | See our comments on Q1. |

**Q3-2b3b: For Solution 2b/3b, is there any other readiness/current status and gaps/RAN specification impact need to be added in the above table? Please state from the objective fact point of view.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Readiness** | **Current status and gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| #example | Ax: | Ax: | Ax: |
| Qualcomm | Supports   * Delivery of large models * Delivery of parameter set or delta model * Lossless model delivery * Security and integrity of model |  | Some enhancements are required for management.  Indicate gNB when a configure model is downloaded by the UE. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

###### Summary

As summarized above, A3 is merged with A7, A2/A6/A8 will not be considered during phase 2, A9/A10 are identified as RAN specification impact. Hence, the related rows are removed from the summarized table. To be more efficient, rapp further remove rows for “not supported”.

Proposal 7: For solution 2b/3b, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 2b/3b current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | No model size limitation | No RAN impact  Note: The detail procedure of model transfer from CN/LMF to UE is out of RAN scope |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | supported with limitation:  For Solution 2b, support within AMF coverage area based on NAS signalling segmentation;  For Solution 3b, support within LMF coverage area based on LPP signaling segmentation | Note: supporting service continuity across AMF/LMF is out of RAN scope |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | gNB cannot perform model management directly;  management and interaction between UE and gNB is not supported | support management and model transfer interaction between CN/LMF and gNB when model management at gNB  support management and interaction between UE and gNB (e.g. model identification, model transfer completion, etc) when model management at gNB |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | procedure latency depends on model size, QoS requirement and DRB priority;  other latency includes forwarding data from CN to gNB | Note: The detail QoS requirement on CN for model transfer/delivery is out of RAN scope |

##### Solution 4a: OTT server can transfer/delivery AI/ML model(s) to UE (transparent to 3GPP)

Table . Solution 4a Readiness and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Readiness** | **RAN specification impact** |
| **Current status and Gaps** |
| A1 | supported | No RAN impact |
| A2 | Not within RAN scope |
| A3 | 1) procedure latency depends on model size and DRB priority; 2) other latency includes forwarding data from OTT server to gNB |
| A4 | not supported |
| transparent to RAN |
| A5 | not supported |
| transparent to RAN |
| A6 | not supported |
| transparent to RAN |
| A7 | supported |
| A8 | not supported |
| A9 | No impact by definition |
| A10 | No additional gNB impact |

**Q2-4a: For Solution 4a, do you agree the content in above table to capture analysis of model transfer/delivery solutions? (please include comments only on the current context in this question. For new add-ons, please see Q3-4a)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| #example | Yes: Ax No: Ay | Ax:  Ay: |
| OPPO | No for A2/A3/A4/A6/A8 | A2: See comments in Q1  A3: QoS requirements should be considered also for DRB, we also don’t know how OTT server can transfer the model to gNB directly, so we propose:  Current status and Gaps:  1) procedure latency depends on model size , QoS requirements and DRB priority; 2) other latency includes forwarding data from OTT server to CN  RAN specification impact  QoS management for model transfer  Note: Whether QoS management for solution4a has CN involvement needs SA clarification.  A4: solution4a is also a special kind of UP solution, Model transfer/delivery continuity can also be achieved via UP L2 handling, so we propose:  **Current status and Gaps**  May besupported via UP L2 handling.  A6: transparent to RAN is sufficient, we cannot say there is no Partial model update via Non-3GPP method, so we propose:  **Current status and Gaps**  transparent to RAN  A8: See comments in Q1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No: A3, A7, A6  Yes: Others | **A3, A7**  As we commented for above questions, there should be uniform analysis for them as they are about QoS impacts.  **A6**  As we commented for above questions, the meaning of A6 is unclear, and what kind of information may need A6 is also unclear. |
| Qualcomm | No for A2/A3/A4/A5/A6/A8  A2, A3, A5, A6, A8 are similar for all solutions, therefore A2, A3, A5, A6, and A8 should be removed. Instead, A9, A10 and A11 should be added. | A2: See comments to Q1.  A3: Similar comment as Q2-2b3b. The server can be placed close to gNB to reduce latency.  A4: Same understanding as OPPO.  A5: gNB can perform model management based on metadata and UE capability signaling. Therefore, even if the model delivery is over UP, the gNB can have full control over model management. Additional signalling may be required over the Uu to indicate the completion of delivery/transfer of the configured model. Remove 4 (from cons) from the pros and cons table, as model delivery can happen through DRBs not affecting priority traffic. Note that over-the-top traffic is not provided with high-priority DRBs anyway in the 3GPP network.  A6: See comments to Q1, Q2-1a, Q2-1b.  A8: See comments to Q1. The interoperability issue is similar to any other solution. Remove 2 (from cons) from the pros and cons table, as all models need to satisfy the RAN4 requirements (nothing special to do in this case). |
| Apple | Yes: OK to just capture "No RAN impact" | As we responded in Q1, we do not agree to capture anything on "readiness" in TR, but we are OK to capture " no RAN impact" for solution 4a which is aligned its description " transparent to 3GPP". |
| ZTE | Yes for A1,A4, A6  No for all others | For all other items except for A1,A4,A6, please see our reply in question 1 where all other items seems not be precisely/correctly to reflect the PRO and CONs for each solution. |
| Mediatek | Yes: A1, A3,  No: A2, A4, A5  FFS: A6, A7,A8, A9, A10  We should soften the statement ‘No RAN impact’. It may have RAN impact depends on to what extend RAN awareness is required for model delivery, especially when the AI/ML model doesn’t have good generalization performance, e.g., cell-specific model. | A2  Common for all solutions, which is out of RAN2 scope and can be removed.  A4  Considering the model is delivered through DRB, model transfer/delivery continuity is by default supported, e.g., via AM transmission.  A5  If network controllability is for model management, it is the same for all solutions, e.g., NW needs to perform model monitoring and model control.  If network controllability is for model delivery, it’s for sure that NW doesn’t have direct control on model delivery. But considering the case that the AI/ML model may not have good generalization performance, which is associated to certain RAN configuration, condition, scenarios, site, etc, certain RAN involvement may be needed.  A6, A7, A8 see comment in Q1  A9, A10  If the model doesn’t have good generalization performance, e.g., area-specific model, RAN involvement will be helpful instead of downloading the model blindly. |
| Interdigital | No (see comment to Q1): A2, A6, A8, A9, A10  No: A4 (see comments)  Yes: A1, A3, A5, A7 | A4: not clear why UP service continuity cannot support this. |
| Xiaomi | No need to discuss A2 and A6 (see comments to Q1)  No for A4  Yes for others | **A4**: in our understanding, the model transfer continuity across gNBs is just like handling of normal data during handover, and it is supported by default. |
| TCL | No: A2,  Yes with comments: A6, A3, A7  Yes: Others | A2: See comments to Q1;  A6: See comments to Q1;  A3 and A7, It is unclear to us about the model transfer/delivery between the OTT server and UE, anyway, the upper-layer data may also influence the DRB and QoS priority setting, same comments with Q1. |
| LGE | No: A2, A4, A5, A6, A8  Yes with comment: A3  Yes: Others | For A2/A6/A8, need to remove them (Similar comments as previous)  For A3, need to remove the first consideration. We can focus on the latency component originated from the signaling between gNB and other network entity(-ies). (i.e., between gNB and OTT)  For A4, we also think current status can be “supported” as the data can be forwarded to target cell during HO. (UP handling)  For A5, it depends on the model monitoring location. If the gNB monitors the model, it can recognize the model transfer/delivery. We can add RAN impacts: *support management and model transfer interaction between OTT and gNB* |
| vivo | Yes: A1, A3 with comments, A7, A8  No: A2, A4, A5, A6 | A2: remove  A3: OTT server may not be able to get the real-time serving cell of UE, thus cannot transfer the applicable model to UE in real-time.  A4: supported, similar to solution 2b/3b  A5: the model/functionality may provide RAN awareness, that is, the specification impact can be interaction between UE and gNB.  A6: whether the partial model update is supported is up to implementation, i.e., no explicit signalling. |
| Ericsson | Yes: A1, A2(but), A7, A9, A10  No: the others | A2: Security is guaranteed even if the model is transferred from the OTT server. So, it is supported, even if RAN protocols are not used for the transfer.  A3: Agree with QC. The fact that the transfer is done from the OTT server, it does not mean that latency requirements for the model transfer are not met.  A4: Agree with others view. In this solution, the continuity across gNB is guaranteed by definition, given that the model is not transferred from the gNB.  A5: agree with QC. The fact that model is delivered from the OTT server does not mean that the gNB cannot control or be involved. This can be handled as any other service for which a QoS flow/bearer and associated resources need to be established in the network.  A6: See comments to Q1. This is not a relevant area.  A8: Agree with QC. |
| Lenovo | Only A3 and A7 may have RAN imipact | A3 and A7 may have RAN impact, but require some enhanced awareness design from OTT to CN to RAN. |
| NEC | Yes: A1, A2, A7 | We think OTT server based approach means 3GPP transparent, which RAN2 should keep in mind |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Not applicable: A3, A6, A7, A8, A9, A10 | A3: It is not possible to comment without any proper evaluation. Moreover, the terminology ‘delta latency component’ is not defined.  A6: The terminology ‘delta singaling or ‘delta model’ is not defined. Any comment is irrelevant.  A7: No strong opinion without any RAN1 information on model size.  A8: It is not clear how proprietary model will support interoperability  A9: We did not understand what kind of deployment impact is to be foreseen. Models are proprietary, so deployment impact is transparent anyway to 3GPP. Moreover, the scope of this criterion is not clear to us as UE models will be transfer/download/delivery to from the NW entity to the UE and why additional interfaces like Xn and/or NG-AP are needed.  A10: The implication to gNB is not clear to us. |
| Sharp | Agree with companies above, No RAN impact. | On A5 agree with Qualcomm, gNB can perform model management based on metadata and UE capability signalling.  On A3, A7, (may have some RAN impact) QoS requirements should be considered for model transfer (including DRB). The network may ensure seamless and uninterrupted model delivery from OTT server to the UE within a defined time frame. To achieve this, it is not clear how the awareness will be introduced and maintained between OTT, CN and gNB.  A6: Clarify that transparent to RAN implies that there’s no RAN impact |
| CATT | No : A1, A2, A3, A7, A8, A10  Yes for others | A2/A3/A8/A10: See comments in Q1;  A1/A7: Since the solution is transparent to 3GPP, we think there should not have “supported“. For A1/A7, the wording is better to change into “Not within RAN scope“ similar as A2. |
| Samsung | See comments | No need to discuss: A1, A2, A4, A6, A8  Yes: A3, A5, A7, A9 A10.  For A8, same view as QC and see reply to Q1 |
| CMCC | No: A2, A9, A10 | See our comments on Q1. |

**Q3-4a: For Solution 4a, is there any other readiness/current status and gaps/RAN specification impact need to be added in the above table? Please state from the objective fact point of view.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Readiness** | **Current status and gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| #example | Ax: | Ax: | Ax: |
| Qualcomm | Supports   * Delivery of large models * Delivery of parameter set or delta model * Lossless model delivery * Security and integrity of model |  | Some enhancements are required for management.  Indicate gNB when a configure model is downloaded by the UE. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

###### Summary

As summarized above, A3 is merged with A7, A2/A6/A8 will not be considered during phase 2, A9/A10 are identified as RAN specification impact. Hence, the related rows are removed from the summarized table. To be more efficient, rapp further remove rows for “not supported”.

Proposal 8: For solution 4a, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 4a current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | No model size limitation | No RAN impact |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | supported with limitation:  If model transfer/delivery from OTT server via CN , support within AMF coverage area based on NAS signalling segmentation;  If model transfer/delivery from OTT server via LMF , support within LMF coverage area based on LPP signaling segmentation | Note: supporting service continuity across AMF/LMF is out of RAN scope |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | transparent to RAN | support management and model transfer interaction between OTT server and gNB when model management at gNB  NOTE: FFS whether this is within RAN scope or not  support management and interaction between UE and gNB (e.g. model identification, model transfer completion, etc) when model management at gNB |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | procedure latency depends on model size, QoS requirement and DRB priority;  other latency includes forwarding data from OTT server to gNB | Note: The detail QoS requirement for model transfer/delivery of solution 4a is out of RAN scope |

##### Solution 4b: OAM can transfer/delivery AI/ML model(s) to UE

Table . Solution 4b Readiness and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Readiness** | **RAN specification impact** |
| **Current status and Gaps** |
| A1 | over CP: not supported  over UP: supported | over CP: if model size larger than 45kBytes, extend RRC segment number |
| over CP: maximum 45kBytes based on existing number of RRC segments |
| A2 | Not within RAN scope | Note: The details security and integrity of solution 4b is out of RAN scope |
| A3 | 1) procedure latency depends on model size and SRB/DRB priority; 2) other latency includes forwarding data from OAM to gNB | latency reduction if model transfer/delivery has critical/relax latency requirement |
| A4 | support within OAM coverage |  |
| A5 | not supported | support management and model transfer interaction between OAM and gNB |
| gNB cannot perform model management directly, signalling between gNB and OAM is used to configure and initiate model transfer from OAM. |
| A6 | over CP: not supported  over UP: not supported | support delta signaling/delta-model transfer/delivery over CP/UP |
| over CP: OAM delta signaling to gNB is not supported  over UP: user plane cannot support delta-model transfer/delivery |
| A7 | supported |  |
| A8 | not supported |  |
| A9 | *(Impact out of RAN2 scope)* |  |
| A10 | No additional gNB impact |  |

**Q2-4b: For Solution 4b, do you agree the content in above table to capture analysis of model transfer/delivery solutions? (please include comments only on the current context in this question. For new add-ons, please see Q3-4b)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| #example | Yes: Ax No: Ay | Ax:  Ay: |
| OPPO | Not sure for A1  No for A2/A3/A8 | A1: for solution4b, we are wondering why the segmentation is visible from RRC point of view if OAM control the segmentation, in basic logic, RRC layer should treat any OAM segmentation as a container like any other upper layer info.  [rapp] updated with condition if OAM does not do segmentation  A2: See comments in Q1  A3: QoS requirements should be considered also for DRB  **Current status and Gaps**  1) procedure latency depends on model size , QoS requirements(DRB only) and SRB/DRB priority; 2) other latency includes forwarding data from OAM to gNB  A8: See comments in Q1 |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | No: A1, A3, A7, A6  Yes: Others | **A1**  For solution 4b, the tranmission path is unclear to us. It may include:  UP: OAM (as a server) to UE  CP: OAM to entity X, and then to UE. Entity X may be: CN, gNB, others?  **To us, RAN2 just agreed to split Solution 4, and there are lots of aspects to be clarified first for Solution 4b.**  For now, the readiness text seem to be based on some assumptions on the tranmission path, and we suggest to make it clear. For example:  Readiness: **over CP, if the transmission path is “OAM -> RAN -> UE” and CP is used for RAN -> UE, not supported. Over UP: supported.**  RAN spec impact: **over CP, if the transmission path is “OAM -> RAN -> UE” and CP is used for RAN -> UE, if model size larger than 45kBytes, extend RRC segment number**  **A3, A7**  As we commented for above questions, there should be uniform analysis for them as they are about QoS impacts.  **A6**  As we commented for above questions, the meaning of A6 is unclear, and what kind of information may need A6 is also unclear. |
| Qualcomm | No for A1, A2, A3, A5, A6, A8  A2, A3, A5, A6, A8 are similar for all solutions, therefore A2, A3, A5, A6, and A8 should be removed. Instead, A9, A10 and A11 should be added. | A1: Same view as OPPO  A2, A3, A5, A6, A8: Similar comments as previous. |
| Apple | Yes: A2 (i.e. Note: The details security and integrity of solution 4b is out of RAN scope)  No: all others | As we responded in Q1, we do not agree to capture anything on "readiness" in TR, but we are OK to capture " (i.e. Note: The details security and integrity of solution 4b is out of RAN scope)" for solution 4b.  On A1: same view as OPPO. We don't prefer to capture it in TR.  On A5/A6, we think they are out of RAN2 scope, and thereby RAN2 is not in position in making conclusion (i.e. not capture them in TR). |
| ZTE | Comments for A1  Yes for A4, A6  No for all others | Regarding A1, we think the data transmission between UE and OAM has not been supported yet, regardless of UP and CP.  For A1:  Readiness: CP based solution: not support, UP based solution: not support  Specification impact: For UP based solution, NW shall at least provide IP address of OAM to UE. For CP based solution，extension of RRC segmentation may be needed.  [rapp] For QoE, transfer from OAM to UE via gNB over CP is supported.  Regarding A7 see our comments in above  For other items except for A1, A4, A6, please see our reply in question 1 where all other items seems not be precisely/correctly to reflect the PRO and CONs for each solution. |
| Mediatek | Many aspects are out of RAN scope: A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, A7, A9, A10, | A1  It is made based on the assumption that there is a transmission path between UE and OAM via gNB and both CP/UP based transmission are supported. But we are not sure whether the assumption is correct or not.  If I understand correctly, the solution 4 is a UP based solution and the transmission tunnel may be transparent to 3GPP. **Solution 4: Server (e.g. OAM, OTT) can transfer/delivery AI/ML model(s) to UE (e.g. transparent to 3GPP).**  Not sure whether CP based transmission should be considered. From network implementation point of view, if the model is transmitted from OAM to UE via CP, there is not much difference from solution 1a?  A2  Common for all solutions and need to be removed  A3  Agree with OPPO  A4, A5, A7, A9, A10 out of RAN2 scope.  FFS on A6, A8 |
| Interdigital | No (see comment to Q1): A2, A6, A8, A9, A10  No: A1 (see comments)  Yes: A3, A4, A5, A7 | A1: not clear why the CP based solution doesn’t support bigger sizes (if segmentation is done at the OAM) |
| Xiaomi | No need to discuss A2 and A6 (see comments to Q1)  Yes for others |  |
| TCL | No: A1, A2,  Yes with comments: A6, A3, A7,  Yes: Others. | A1: We agree the OPPO ‘s comments.  A6, A3, A7: Similar comments as previous. |
| LGE | No: A1, A2, A6, A8  Yes with comment: A3  Yes: Others | For A1, Similar with Oppo  For A2/A6/A8, need to remove them (Similar comments as previous)  For A3, need to remove the first consideration. We can focus on the latency component originated from the signaling between gNB and other network entity(-ies). (i.e., between gNB and OAM) |
| vivo | No for all | No direct connection between OAM and UE.  If the intention is that the OAM transfers the model to gNB first and then retransmission to UE via CP, the conclusion of solution 1a can be reused.  If the intention is that the OAM transfer the model to UE via UP, the conclusion of solution 2b/3b can be reused. |
| Ericsson | Yes: A2(but), A4, A9, A10 | There is no direct interface between the OAM and the UE. So, taking on Huawei’s comment on “paths”, it seems that the option would be for the OAM to firstly provide the model to the gNB, and then the gNB to provide the model to the UE. On this matter, it is quite clear that the main specification impact is in SA5, and SA5 should provide guidance on how to realize this type of model transfer.   RAN2 can after this discuss the specification impact on RAN2 protocols. The above could be highligted in the TR (and that’s all).  More comments below:  A1: Similar as above comments. Not clear what is the issue, given that it is the OAM that control the process.  A2: True that is not in RAN scope, but security is guaranteed irrespectively.  A3: Similar as comment to prior question, the fact that the OAM delivers the model does not mean that latency requirements cannot be met.  A5: NW controllability is always possible between the gNB and OAM (that can be analysed in SA5 if needed)  A6/A7/A8: similar comment as above. |
| Lenovo | Yes: A2, A3, A4, A5, A7  No: A1  Unclear: A6, A8 | Agree with some companies that if segmentation is at OAM, CP could also carry large size model. |
| NEC | Yes: A2 A4 and A7 | There is no direct interface between the OAM and the UE. So then actually OAM based approach is identical to solution 1a/1b besides the interaction between OAM and gNB, which is proprietary (not seen to 3GPP spec).  Logically, as said by Ericsson, OAM need to firstly provide the model to the gNB, and then the gNB to provide the model to the UE. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | No: A1, A4  Not support: A3, A6, A7, A8, A9  Not applicable: A5, A10  Yes: A2 | A1: ‘Over UP: supported’ is not clear to us. There is currently no direct interface from OAM->UE. And the indirect path is not straightforward as HW mentioned.  A3: It is not possible to comment without any proper evaluation. Moreover, the terminology ‘delta latency component’ is not defined.  A4: Out of RAN2 scope  A5: Out of RAN2 scope  A6: The terminology ‘delta singaling or ‘delta model’ is not defined. Any comment is irrelevant.  A7: No strong opinion without any RAN1 information on model size.  A8: It is not clear how proprietary model will support interoperability  A9: We did not understand what kind of deployment impact is to be foreseen. Models are proprietary, so deployment impact is transparent anyway to 3GPP. Moreover, the scope of this criterion is not clear to us as UE models will be transfer/download/delivery to from the NW entity to the UE and why additional interfaces like Xn and/or NG-AP are needed.  A10: The implication to gNB is not clear to us.  Agree with Apple that we should not capture these in the TR. |
| CATT | No : A1, A2, A3, A4, A7, A8, A10  Yes for others | A2/A3/A8/A10: See comments in Q1;  A1: Agree with HW that the transmission path is unclear. For CP, MDT like configuration can be utilized and the OAM -> (X) -> gNB -> UE path is possible, and for UP maybe OAM direct path to UE is OK. So it should be discussed based on the clarified transmission path.  A4/A7: Since for A4/A7 there is no RAN impact, both wording may change to “Not within RAN scope“ similar as A2. |
| Samsung | See comments | No need to discuss: A1, A2, A4, A6.  Yes: A3, A5, A7, A9 A10. |
| CMCC | Comments on A1  No: A2, A9, A10 | A1: In our understanding, UP-based solution is not supported since there is no direct interface from OAM->UE for now. However, we think CP-based solution is supported via indirect path, such as OAM can send QoE configuration via OAM->RAN->UE, or SON/MDT configuration via OAM->AMF->RAN->UE. Therefore, A1 should be revised to **“over UP: not supported, over CP: supported”**. |

**Q3-4b: For Solution 4b, is there any other readiness/current status and gaps/RAN specification impact need to be added in the above table? Please state from the objective fact point of view.**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Readiness** | **Current status and gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| #example | Ax: | Ax: | Ax: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

###### Summary

As summarized above, A3 is merged with A7, A2/A6/A8 will not be considered during phase 2, A9/A10 are identified as RAN specification impact. Hence, the related rows are removed from the summarized table. To be more efficient, rapp further remove rows for “not supported”.

Furthermore, as commented by some companies, it’s our first time to further discuss solution 4b. Rapporteur summarized based on companies’ comments and further clarify the transmission path for solution 4b:

4b-1: OAM can transfer/delivery AI/ML models to UE via “OAM -> RAN -> UE”, where CP is used for “RAN -> UE”

4b-2: OAM can transfer/delivery AI/ML models to UE via “OAM -> UE”, e.g. via IP tunnel.

Proposal 8: For solution 4b, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 4b current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact**  **(NOTE: whether and how to support model transfer/delivery from OAM to gNB and OAM to UE directly is out of RAN scope)** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | over CP: maximum 45kBytes based on existing number of RRC segments if OAM does not do segmentation for model transfer/delivery  over e.g. IP: no model size limitation, but direct connection between OAM and UE is not supported | over CP: If OAM does not do segmentation for model transfer/delivery, it may need RRC segmentation, and extend RRC segment number if model size larger than 45kBytes  Over e.g. IP: NOTE: whether and how to support direct connection between OAM and UE is out of RAN scope |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | support within OAM coverage |  |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | gNB cannot perform model management directly | NOTE: support management and model transfer interaction between OAM and gNB is out of RAN scope |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | over CP: 1) procedure latency depends on model size and SRB priority; 2) other latency includes forwarding data from OAM to gNB  over e.g. IP: direct connection between OAM and UE is not supported | over CP: Note: The detail QoS requirement for model transfer/delivery of solution 4b is out of RAN scope  over e.g. IP: NOTE: whether and how to support latency, QoS requirement between OAM and UE is out of RAN scope |

# Conclusion

To be updated after phase 2

Observation 1: The below tables only serves for the purposes of capturing current status, gaps and RAN specification impact for certain solution.

Observation 2: Security and integrity is supported by all model transfer/delivery solutions via existing mechanisms.

Proposal 1: RAN2 to continue discussion on the definition of partial model update and whether this needs to be supported during model transfer/delivery if needed.

Proposal 2: RAN2 to discuss whether different QoS is needed for different model transfer/delivery.

Proposal 3: RAN2 to consider below discussion areas when evaluating model transfer/delivery solutions:

- A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size

- A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs)

- A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB)

- A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB).

Proposal 4: For solution 1a, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 1a current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | maximum 45kBytes based on existing number of RRC segments | extension of the number of RRC segments is required to support models larger than 45kBytes |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | transmission is restarted upon mobility | Introduce service continuity support for SRBs with segmentations.  Xn/NGAP enhancement(s) for model transfer/delivery continuity |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | supported |  |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | procedure latency depends on model size and SRB priority | impact on SRBs in DL, e.g. introduce multiple SRBs, etc, depends on whether flexible QoS is needed |

Proposal 5: For solution 2a/3a, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 2a/3a current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | model size >45kBytes is not supported based on existing number of RRC segments;  CN supports NAS signalling segmentation;  LMF supports LPP signalling segmentation | If NAS/LMF does not do segmentation for model transfer/delivery, it may need RRC segmentation, and extension of the number of RRC segments is required to support models larger than 45kBytes. |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | supported with limitation:  For Solution 2a, support within AMF coverage area based on NAS signalling segmentation;  For Solution 3a, support within LMF coverage area based on LPP signaling segmentation | Note: supporting service continuity across AMF/LMF is out of RAN scope and needs coordination with CN groups |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | For Solution 2a, gNB cannot transfer models directly, considering model transfer is transparent to gNB  management and interaction between UE and gNB is not supported | support management and model transfer interaction between CN/LMF and gNB, e.g. via NAS signaling or NRPPa signalling when model management at gNB  support management and interaction between UE and gNB (e.g. model identification, model transfer completion indication, etc) when model management at gNB |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | procedure latency depends on model size and SRB priority; other latency includes forwarding NAS message latency from CN to gNB | impact on SRBs in DL, e.g. introduce multiple SRBs , etc, depends on whether flexible QoS is needed |

Proposal 6: For solution 1b, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 1b current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | No model size limitation;  DRB termination at gNB (if needed) is not supported | support DRB termination at gNB if needed |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | model transfer continuity if DRB terminated at gNB is not supported | identify a solution to support service continuity support between gNBs when DRB is terminated at gNB  Xn/NGAP enhancement(s) for model transfer/delivery continuity |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | supported |  |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | procedure latency depends on model size, QoS requirement and DRB priority;  QoS management at gNB is not supported for DRB is terminated at gNB (if needed) | identify a solution to support QoS management at gNB for model transfer when DRB is terminated at gNB |

Proposal 7: For solution 2b/3b, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 2b/3b current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | No model size limitation | No RAN impact  Note: The detail procedure of model transfer from CN/LMF to UE is out of RAN scope |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | supported ~~with limitation:~~  ~~For Solution 2b, support within AMF coverage area based on NAS signalling segmentation;~~  ~~For Solution 3b, support within LMF coverage area based on LPP signaling segmentation~~ | ~~Note: supporting service continuity across AMF/LMF is out of RAN scope~~ |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | gNB cannot transfer model directly;  management and interaction between UE and gNB is supported | ~~support management and model transfer interaction between CN/LMF and gNB when model management at gNB~~  support management and interaction between UE and gNB (e.g. model identification, model transfer completion, etc) when model management at gNB |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | procedure latency depends on model size, QoS requirement and DRB priority;  other latency includes forwarding data from CN to gNB | Note: The detail QoS requirement on CN for model transfer/delivery is out of RAN scope |

Proposal 8: For solution 4a, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 4a current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | No model size limitation | No RAN impact |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | supported ~~with limitation:~~  ~~If model transfer/delivery from OTT server via CN , support within AMF coverage area based on NAS signalling segmentation;~~  ~~If model transfer/delivery from OTT server via LMF , support within LMF coverage area based on LPP signaling segmentation~~ | ~~Note: supporting service continuity across AMF/LMF is out of RAN scope~~ |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | ~~transparent to RAN~~  Model transfer/delivery is transparent to RAN | ~~support management and model transfer interaction between OTT server and gNB when model management at gNB~~  ~~NOTE: FFS whether this is within RAN scope or not~~  support management and interaction between UE and gNB (e.g. model identification, model transfer completion, etc) when model management at gNB |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | procedure latency depends on model size, QoS requirement and DRB priority;  other latency includes forwarding data from OTT server to gNB | Note: The detail QoS requirement for model transfer/delivery of solution 4a is out of RAN scope |

Proposal 8: For solution 4b, RAN2 considers below table as baseline and to be endorsed in the TP:

Table. Solution 4b current status/gaps and RAN specification impact

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Discussion Area** | **Current status and Gaps** | **RAN specification impact**  **(NOTE: whether and how to support model transfer/delivery from OAM to gNB and OAM to UE directly is out of RAN scope)** |
| A1. Large, no upper limit model/model parameter size | over CP: maximum 45kBytes based on existing number of RRC segments if OAM does not do segmentation for model transfer/delivery  over e.g. IP: no model size limitation, but direct connection between OAM and UE is not supported | over CP: If OAM does not do segmentation for model transfer/delivery, it may need RRC segmentation, and extend RRC segment number if model size larger than 45kBytes  Over e.g. IP: NOTE: whether and how to support direct connection between OAM and UE is out of RAN scope |
| A4. Model transfer/delivery continuity (i.e. resume transmission of model (segments) across gNBs) | Over CP: support within OAM coverage |  |
| A5. NW controllability on model transfer/delivery (e.g. model management decision at gNB) | Over CP: gNB performs model transfer directly | NOTE: support management and model transfer interaction between OAM and gNB is out of RAN scope |
| A7. Model transfer/delivery QoS (for DRB) (including latency, etc) and priority (for SRB) . | over CP: 1) procedure latency depends on model size and SRB priority; 2) other latency includes forwarding data from OAM to gNB  over e.g. IP: direct connection between OAM and UE is not supported | over CP: Note: The detail QoS requirement for model transfer/delivery of solution 4b is out of RAN scope  over e.g. IP: NOTE: whether and how to support latency, QoS requirement between OAM and UE is out of RAN scope |
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