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# Introduction

**CB: # AIRAN2\_Stage3**

**- Analyze and coverage on supporting input, output and feedback through existing procedures or new defined procedures**

**- Standard impact analysis on network energy saving, mobility optimization and load balancing**

**- Discuss the remaining issues, e.g., validity time**

**- Potential impacts over interfaces**

**- Capture agreements and open issues**

(ZTE - moderator)

Summary of offline disc [R3-225014](file:///D:\3GPP\RAN3%23114bis\TSGR3_114bis-e\Inbox\Drafts\CB%20%23%20AIRAN3_ES\Inbox\R3-225014.zip)

Two phases of this email discussion:

* Phase 1 Deadline: 23:59UTC, Thursday, 19th Aug (before online session starts).
* Phase 2 Deadline: 23:59UTC, Monday, 23th Aug. (before online session starts), we will try to come up with agreements in the 2nd phase discussion before online session.

# For the Chairman’s Notes

Propose the following:

Propose to capture the following:

**Agreement text…**

**Agreement text…**

**WA: carefully crafted text…**

Issue 1: no consensus

**Issue 2: issue is acknowledged; need to further check the impact on xxx. May be possible to address with a pure st2 change. To be continued…**

# Discussion

## Standard impacts on procedures for AI/ML function

Based on the TR37.817, majority companies in their contributions mention that for some information for three agreed AI/ML based use cases, (Network Energy Saving, Load Balancing, and Mobility Optimization) needs to be enhanced over Xn/F1/E1 interface.The information for AI/ML function is divided to input information, output information, and feedback information.

Since there is some overlapped information across these use cases (e.g., predicted resource status, current resource status, and UE performance, etc), there are two options as follows:

* Option 1: Enhance/reuse the existing procedure if the revelant procedure can be found. [16][21][23][24][38][39][40][44][45][46][50] [25][26][27]
* Option 2: Define the new procedure for the information used for AI/ML.[8][32][35][36][37][38]

**Q1: Companies are invited to provide their views on which option above is preferred to support AI/ML function for the overlapped information (e.g. predicted resource status, predicted resource status, current resource status, predicted UE trajectory and UE performance, etc )?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which option?** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo |  | We are fine to go for either way, both have pros and cons as we discussed in our paper R3-224421. |
| Huawei | Option 1 preferred | Option 1 is simpler, technically we see pros and cons for both options, we are also open to further discuss new procedures, but in our understanding, we don’t see the need to introduce new procedure in E1/F1, maybe we could start from this point. |
| Qualcomm | Option 1 | Option 1 is preferred as mentioned in our paper. Resource Status Reporting procedure and Handover related procedures can be reused to transfer the AI/ML related data. If there a need to introduce new message, we are open to discuss them further. |
| Samsung | Option1 | According to the R17 discussion, most input/output/feedback information identified for AI/ML training or inference has a relevant existing procedure to collect. Hence, if applicable, taking existing procedure as baseline and enhancing it to support AI/ML functionality are convenient. |
| vivo | Option 1, FFS for Option 2 | It is straightforward to reuse the existing relevant procedures, e.g., reusing Resource Status request/response for the predicted resource status transfer.  If there is no relevant procedure, e.g., UE associated feedback, new procedures shall be introduced. |

Following are the new procedures proposed by companies:

* Option 1: Define the new unified procedures for AI/ML function for input information, output information, and feedback information nformatio [39][40]:
  + AI/ML Data Collection Procedure (to collect historical nformation)
  + AI/ML Predicted Information Procedure (to transfer predicted information)
  + AI/ML Feedback Information Procedure (to retrieve feedback information)
* Option 2: Define two non-UE associated procedure for predicted information and UE performance [44][45][46]:
  + AI/ML Assistance Data Reporting Initiation (for handling the subscription mechanism)
  + AI/ML Assistance Data Reporting (for handling the collection of subscribed information)
* Option 3: Define two non-UE associated procedure, and two UE-associated procedure [16]:
  + Node Data Collection Initiation procedure and Node Data Collection Reporting procedure
  + UE Data Collection Initiation procedure and the UE Data Collection Reporting procedure
* Option 4: Define the new procedure only for predicted information [23][24]:
  + Predicted Information Request/Response/Update

**Q2: If you agree to define new procedures, companies are invited to provide their views on which stage3 signalling design option over interfaces above is preferred?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which option?** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo | Option 4 | If we go for new procedures, it seems a cleaner option to define new procedure only for predicted information to distinguish from legacy procedures for the same .  A general question needs to be clarified if we call the new procedure “AI/ML xxx procedure” as in Option 1 and 2 is that, would that imply the carried information cannot be used for non-AI/ML purpose? E.g., the UE performance feedback after the HO. Similarly, would that imply other legacy procedures will not be used for AI/ML purpose, which doesn’t seem to be the intention. |
| Huawei | See comment | In our understanding, if we would like to introduce new procedure, this procedure should be common for all use cases (including possible new use cases in the future), and should be common for request/response for the data of different purpose, e.g. history info/predicted info etc. |
| Qualcomm |  | See our comment for Q1. Prefer Reuse.  But if there is a strong preference to use new message, we prefer a single Request/Response procedure for all the AI/ML use cases. |
| Samsung |  | If no relevant existing procedure, the detailed new procedure can be discussed case by case. |
| vivo |  | Revisit this issue when the Xn impact is concluded, e.g., feedback. |

## Network Energy Saving

Since, in RAN1 there is one study item “Study on network energy savings for NR”, [12][25][40] propose to focus on the cell-level energy saving strategy (e.g., cell activation/deactivation), and avoid the overlapped discussion compared to RAN1 led SI.

**Prosposal: Regarding AI/ML based Energy Saving, cell-level energy saving strategy (cell activation/deactivation) as a start point in RAN3, avoiding overlapped discussion for network energy saving in RAN1 SI.**

**Q3: Companies are invited to provide their views on the proposal above?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo | Yes | It would be safer to keep the discussion on cell level to avoid overlapped discussion. |
| Huawei | Yes | We could start from cell level activation/deactivation; and of course, overlap with SI on ES should be avoided. |
| Qualcomm | Yes | We could start with cell level and avoid overlap with RAN1 |
| Samsung | Yes | The cell-level energy saving has been supported by the spec, and AI/ML can help to do the optimization. There is another SI network energy saving, and other granularities maybe will be studied in this SI. In current stage, it is better to take cell switch on/off as the starting point. Other granularities depends on the progress of network energy saving SI, whose corresponding AI for RAN impact can be delayed. |
| vivo | Yes | Follow RAN1’s conclusion. |

Following information for AI/ML based network energy saving use case which has standard impacts are summarized based on contributions:

|  |
| --- |
| **Input Information** |
| 1. Predicted resource status information from neighbour NG-RAN nodes over Xn [1][10][25][37][40][44][48] |
| 1. Historical resource status [40] |
| 1. Current/Predicted Energy Efficiency from neighbour NG-RAN nodes [1][8][25] |
| 1. Current/Predicted energy state from neighbour NG-RAN nodes [1][8] |
| 1. Current/Predicted Energy efficiency score [44] |
| 1. Predicted overload status information over Xn/E1/F1 [25] |
| 1. Energy efficiency [23]: NG-RAN data energy efficiency, Network slice energy efficiency, including energy efficiency of eMBB, uRLLC and mIoT, PNF power consumption, including average power, minimum power, and maximum power, PNF energy consumption ,Energy state (high/low/active/inactive) |
| 1. Measurement frequency for reporting EE [37][51] |
| **Output Information** |
| 1. Predicted energy saving strategy (e.g., predicted cell switch-on/off decision) [25] |
| 1. Time for switch-off indication to show when the cell switch-off [25] |
| 1. Predicted time length indication that the cell will stay in the current activation/deactivation. [12] |
| 1. The predicted load transferring plan [25] |
| **Feedback** |
| 1. UE QoS parameters (Handover interruption time, UL Data Rate, UL Data Rate) [1][8] |
| 1. Per-cell total DL/UL UE throughput (i.e. “DRB.UEThpDl” and “DRB.UEThpUl” in TS 28.552)[16] |
| 1. Per-cell “Average delay DL air-interface” and the “Average delay UL on over-the-air interface” [16] |
| 1. RVQoE measurements [44] |
| 1. UE energy consumption [44] |
| 1. UE level performance (e.g., UL/DL throughput, packet delay, packet loss) [44] |

**Q4: Companies are invited to provide their views on which information listed above has the standard impact with priority order. And Elaborate more on the detailed standard impact.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which?** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo | Input: 1, 3  Output: 9 or 11,  Feedback: 13 or 18, | 1: the predicted resource status can be carried in enhanced RESOURCE STATUS REPORT or new procedure depending on Q1.  3: new procedure is needed to exchange energy efficiency.  9 or 11: depending on if new procedure is used for transmitting the predicted e.g. cell activation/deactivation. At least it can be done in a way that when indicating the cell activation/deactivation as legacy, the gNB also indicate for how long the cell will stay in the activation/deactivation state.  13 or 18: After handover a UE due to energy saving, the UE performance after HO can be feedback to the source gNB. 13 and 18 look similar. |
| Huawei | See comment | Input: predicted resource status info 5, current/predicted EE 1  Output: predicted resource status info 5  Feedback: EE (energy efficiency), resource status info |
| Qualcomm |  | Input – 1, 6  Output – predicted resource status info, predicted cells to be deactivated/switched off and the duration  Feedback – 14  Energy Efficiency, Energy State and Energy Score are useful only when there is a standardized procedure on how to calculate them. Else the values provided cannot be interpreted correctly by the consumer.  UE Energy consumption is not needed to calculate a network energy efficiency. |
| Samsung | Yes for 1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12.  Yes but more description is needed: 13, 16, 18 | For 1, yes. It needs to collect predicted resource status information from neighbor node to generate ES decision to avoid local overload, switch on/off ping-pong.  For 2, it can be collected by existing resource status reporting procedure.  For 3, yes. Energy efficiency exchange can help to realize the global optimization.  For 4, it is better to start with cell switch on/off as Q3.  For 5, energy efficiency is more accurate.  For 6, yes. When predicted load status is high, nodes can send the predicted overload indication to peer node. In such mechanism, no request is needed so that the overload information can be transferred timely. For split architecture, DU and CUUP can send the predicted overload indication to CU.  For 7, the energy efficiency definition can refer to 28.310 as the Data Volume divided by the Energy Consumption.  For 8, the energy efficiency is kinds of resource status, and the detailed procedure can take the resource status reporting as the baseline.  For 9 and 10, yes. The energy saving strategy can be the action for a time point/period for future. For example, a node predicts it will be switched off in one minute. The node can exchange such as predicted cell switch-on/off decision with its neighbours to inform the action plan in advance, so the neighbour cells can take it as reference information to make proper decision (such as UE handover, load transferring, switch on/off and so on) to avoid the unnecessary handover, handover ping-pong, switch-off/on ping-pong, local overload etc.  For 11, yes. The predicted time information for the current activation/deactivation help the neighbor node to set SON decision to select target node to offload load or to handover UE.  For 12, yes. If deciding to switch off a cell, the existing load needs to be offloaded to neighbor node. AI/ML model generates the predicted traffic/load transferring action for a period for future. For example, a node predicts it will switch off in the future and generates the predicted handover strategy or load transferring plan in advance to avoid local overload and consecutive handover. If the target neighbor node can not accept the load, the node can make other proper candidate plans to guarantee the successful handover/transferring. Otherwise, the energy saving action may be delayed due to remaining load that has not transferred out successfully. Thus, it is beneficial for energy saving plan.  For 13, partial yes. The UL/DL data rate is fine, but handover interruption time is a little bit unclear.  For 14 and 15, the cell throughput is related to multiple factors, such as resource allocation policy, service type, UE mobility, etc. Thus per cell performance can not reflect the impact of energy saving decision directly.  For 16, yes but RVQoE should be the parameters of handed-over UEs due to energy saving decision. It can help to see whether the energy saving decision and related offloading policy are good or not.  For 17, UE energy consumption seems not in the scope of current energy saving. Now, it mainly focus on the base station energy saving.  For 18, yes but the UE level performance should be the parameters of handed-over UEs due to energy saving decision. It can help to judge the impact of energy saving decision. |
| vivo |  | Input: 1, 3  Output: none as all are internal output without standard impact.  Feedback: 14, cell level feedback is needed |

## Load Balancing

Following information as input which has standard impacts for AI/ML based load balancing use case are summarized based on contributions (except the overlapped information e.g., predicted own resource status and predicted resource status from neighbouring NG-RAN nodes):

|  |
| --- |
| **Input Information** |
| 1. Predicted UE performance received from a target NG-RAN node [52] |
| 1. Predicted or measured UE traffic over E1 [11] |
| 1. Current and Predicted resource status information of neighbouring NG-RAN node(s) |
| **Output Information** |
| 1. Predicted resource status information of neighbouring NG-RAN node(s) [6] |
| 1. Predicted load balancing strategy [26] |
| 1. Indentification of an incoming handover for the purpose of AI based load balancing [36] |
| **Feedback** |
| 1. UE level performance metrics (e.g., UL/DL throughput, packet delay, packet loss) [36][45][52] |
| 1. RVQoE measurements [45] |

**Q5:** **Companies are invited to provide their views on which information listed above has the standard impact with priority order. And Elaborate more on the detailed standard impact.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which?** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo | Input: 2  Feedback: 6 | 2: In case of CU-CP CU-UP split architecture, some enhancements are needed for CU-CP to receive either actual UE traffic measurement, e.g., data volume from CU-UP to make a prediction, or CU-CP requests the CU-UP to provide a prediction result. |
| Huawei | See comments | Input: predicted resource status information (output from neighbor node), 3  Output: predicted resource status information, 3  Feedback: UE level performance metrics as feedback info, 6 |
| Qualcomm |  | Input – 2, 3  Output – 4, Mobility Actions  Feedback – 6 |
| Samsung | Yes for 1, 2, 3, 5  Yes but more description is needed: 7, 8 | For 1, yes. Predicted UE performance from target node can help source node to choose proper target node to offload load to guarantee the UE performance during handover.  For 2, yes. CUUP has the information of UE traffic information. E1 impact should be studied.  For 3, yes. The current resource status of neighbour node can be collected by existing resource status reporting. The predicted resource status reporting can take the existing scheme as the baseline.  For 4, the node can collect the resource status of neighbor nodes and then do the prediction to provide the reference information for SON decision. However, there is no need to transfer the predicted status back to the neighbor nodes.  For 5, yes. Same as energy saving. AI/ML model generates the predicted traffic/load transferring action for a period for future. For example, a node predicts it will switch off in the future and generates the predicted handover strategy or load transferring plan in advance to avoid local overload and consecutive handover. If the target neighbor node can not accept the load, the node can make other proper candidate plans to guarantee the successful handover/transferring. Otherwise, the energy saving action may be delayed due to remaining load that has not transferred out successfully.  For 6, it is a little bit unclear about the identification of an incoming handover.  For 7, yes but the UE level performance should be the parameters of handed-over UEs due to load balancing decision. It can help to judge the impact of load balancing decision.  For 8, yes but RVQoE should be the parameters of handed-over UEs due to load balancing decision. It can help to see whether the related offloading policy are good or not. |
| vivo |  | Input: 2, 3  Output: none as all are internal output without standard impact.  Feedback: 7 UE level performance feedback. |

## Mobility Optimization

Following information as input which has standard impacts for AI/ML based Mobility Optimization use case are summarized based on contributions (except the overlapped information as predicted own resource status, and predicted resource status from neighbouring NG-RAN nodes):

|  |
| --- |
| **Input Information** |
| 1. Predcited UE traffic over Xn/E1 [5][8][13][16] [27] |
| 1. Predicted QoS performanceo of UE. [53] |
| 1. Prediction regading an expected (incident) load from target NG-RAN node.[53] |
| 1. RSRP prediction from UE [20] |
| **Output Information** |
| 1. UE trajectory prediction over Xn (e.g., predicted serving cell, …) [8][13][16][27][41] |
| 1. Handover execution timing [5][23][35] |
| 1. Estimated Arrival Probability in CHO [5][16][23] |
| 1. Predicted resource reseveration time window for CHO [5] |
| 1. Predicted priority of selecting predicted target cell [23] |
| 1. Confidence level [23] |
| **Feedback** |
| 1. Existing SON reports [35] |
| 1. QoS parameters of handed-over UE [27] |
| 1. UE level performance metrics (e.g., UL/DL throughput, packet delay, packet loss) [16] |
| 1. RVQoE measurements [46] |
| 1. Actual UE trajectory [13] [20][41] |
| 1. Actual UE traffic [13] [20] |

**Q6: Companies are invited to provide their views on which information listed above has the standard impact with priority order. And Elaborate more on the detailed standard impact.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Which?** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo | Input: 1 with clarification,  Output: 5, 10  Feedback: 12 or 13, 15, 16 | 1: measured or predicted UE traffic sent from CU-UP to CU-CP can be input for mobility optimization. In another scenario, the target gNB can receive predicted UE traffic over Xn interface from source gNB and use it for further mobility optimization.  5: the target gNB can receive predicted UE trajectory over Xn interface from source gNB and use it for further mobility optimization.  10: confidence level could be provided together with the prediction result.  15, 16: In one scenario, assuming the source gNB has made prediction on UE traffic and UE trajectory and then handover the UE to another gNB, the source gNB needs to understand if the previously made prediction is correct or not. Thus, some method is needed for the source gNB to get the actual UE traffic/trajectory after the handover. This can be considered as part of the AI/ML model performance monitoring. |
| Huawei | See comments | Input: predicted resource status information, predicted trajectory  Output: the timestamp of the HO, 6  Feedback: UE level performance metrics as feedback info, 13 |
| Qualcomm |  | Input – 1, predicted resource status information, predicted trajectory  Output – 1, predicted resource status information, predicted trajectory, Mobility Action and 6  Feedback – 13 and 14  RSRP prediction from UE, Actual UE trajectory, Actual UE traffic should are not needed for input and feedback. |
| Samsung | Yes for 1, 2, 5, 11, 12  Yes but more description is needed: 13, 14 | For 1, yes. UP has the knowledge of traffic, so that UP is a proper location for traffic prediction. UP can do the prediction to provide reference info to set resource allocation policy, and UP can transfer the traffic prediction results to CP to assist CP to set HO decision.  For 2, yes. The predicted QoS information of UE can help source node to choose the proper target node to guarantee the UE performance during handover.  For 3, it needs more clarification of expected (incident).  For 4, at current stage, it is better to not involve UE inference.  For 5, yes. The predicted trajectory helps target node for further mobility optimization. For high-mobility UEs, the collected data amount of a small-coverage cell (i.e. mmW cell) is small, which is not sufficient for AI/ML model to generate accurate predicted UE trajectory information. And the node capability to support AI/ML model is diverse, so there may exist some nodes with no ability for AI/ML model inference or the function for UE trajectory prediction. Thus, exchanging predicted UE information is beneficial for node to get the accurate predicted UE position information and set the proper further mobility optimization strategy to improve the handover robustness and efficiency.  For 6 and 8, they can be used internally to choose the candidate cells for CHO. If transferring the handover execution timing and predicted resource reservation time window to the target node, the target node may release the reserved resource based on the handover timing or the received time window. As the model inference result can not achieve 100% accuracy, the UE finds the condition is met just after node releasing the resource, so the CHO is failure.  For 7, it is already supported by current spec.  For 9, it can be used internally to choose the candidate cells and set the execution policy. It seems no need to transfer such information.  For 10, it needs to be discussed case by case.  For 11, yes, the SON report can be enhanced to carry the feedback information.  For 12, yes. QoS parameters of handed-over UE can help to judge whether mobility decision is good or not.  For 13 and 14, yes but should be the handed-over UE. Same reason as 12.  For 15 and 16, UE trajectory prediction and UE traffic prediction are help to set the handover decision. When the QoS/QoE performance of handed-over UE is good, it means the handover decision is good, so that the UE trajectory prediction and UE traffic prediction results are proper. Hence, to save the signaling, there is no need to transfer actual UE trajectory and actual UE traffic. |
| vivo |  | Input: 1 Predicted UE traffic over E1. 4, RSRP prediction from UE  For the 1 over Xn, the predicted UE traffic shall be internal output at the source node. 4 is quite beneficial to address HO to wrong cell issues via initial simulation.  Output: 7 Predicted Arrival Probability for CHO.  Feedback: 15, 16. |

## Validity time

Validity time has been discussed several times during SI phase, and it is left to be discussed in the normative phase. [2] thinks that validity time is a local node model output with no standard impacts unless an output is sent to another node in assistance, or an action is triggered to be initiate in another gNB or the UE. [8] think that validity time is included for each predictions as optional IE. [10][41] propose to include the information related to validity time (e.g., requested time and limited time, start time and duration) in the request message. [20] thinks validity time should be needed for the external output. [47] thinks validity time of the predicted data (model inference output) should also be included in the messages of requesting/responding/updating predicted data between the current and neighbouring NG-RAN nodes.

**Q7: Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the validity time is needed for the predicted information or decision? If agree, should it be explicitly indicated in request/response/update message?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo | Yes | It would be very strange, if the prediction receiving node doesn’t know the prediction is about what time point in the future.  It seems most reasonable for the requesting node to indicate some time information when requesting the prediction, e.g., the peer node should provide prediction result about what time point or time window. |
| Huawei | See comment | We are open to discuss the necessity of validity time, technically validity time could take effect when inference output is sent to neighbor node, however one could argue that new inference output could be generated before validity (i.e. validity time is not needed); while on the other hand, if further inference output could not be provided in time, some implementations have to be considered at target side. |
| Qualcomm |  | As mentioned in our paper, Validity time is needed. Any predicted information should have a validity associated to it.  Response and Feedback messages where predicted data is sent, a validity time should also be sent along. |
| Samsung | Yes, maybe can be discussed case by case | For prediction information, it should show for which future time interval that the information is valid. If applying the predicted information in a wrong time period, the network performance may downgrades.  Maybe it can be discussed case by case. Suggest to identify which inputs/outputs/feedback have the spec impact and then to study whether to need validity time for each of them. |
| vivo |  | The model output validity time is needed for the external output that does not associate with a timestamp. That is, if one output is for internal use or is already associated with a timestamp, the validity time is not needed.  It should be explicitly indicated in the response/update message. |

## MDT enhancement

There is one Note in the objectives that specify MDT enhancement if needed.

[41] proposes to enhance the MDT procedure to support the consecutive AI/ML data collection for the certain time-series AI/ML model. When UE location information needs to be leveraged as input, model training or model inference in NG-RAN node shall collect the historical UE information including UE location information in the past period of time. And [47][54] thinks the existing MDT and RRM measurement procedures are re-used for data collection for AI/ML in NG-RAN without further enhancement.

[13] asks RAN3 to discuss mechanisms for the old NG-RAN node, that has made UE trajectory prediction before transferring UE to RRC Inactive/Idle state, to obtain logged UE trajectory information when UE enters RRC Connected state and reports to the new NG-RAN node. Such that the old NG-RAN node can understand how accurate the prediction was, and retrain the AI/ML model if necessary.

[49] finds that EM can directly send the m-based MDT activation to gNB-DU or gNB-CU-UP without gNB-CU-CP involvement, and the gNB-DU or gNB-CU-UP can send the MDT report to TCE without gNB-CU-CP involvement. And ask RAN3 to discuss how the gNB-CU-CP obtains the MDT measurement that is directly activated to gNB-DU or gNB-CU-UP by EM.

Moderator concludes the potential MDT enhancements proposed by companies below:

1. Enhance the MDT procedure to solve the issue how to support the consecutive AI/ML data collection for the certain time-series AI/ML model.
2. How the gNB-CU-CP obtains the MDT measurement that is directly activated to gNB-DU or gNB-CU-UP by EM
3. How the source NG-RAN node obtains logged UE trajectory information when UE enters RRC Connected state and reports to the new NG-RAN node.

**Q8: Companies are invited to provide their views on whether the MDT enhancement proposed above is needed?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Comment** |
| Lenovo | Yes | The raised MDT related issues seem reasonable and would be good to resolve from data collection and model performance monitoring point of view. The exact solution can be further discussed. |
| Huawei | Maybe not | From the discussions happened so far, no new measurement quantity is needed, which means that there is no need to enhance MDT. In addition, using MDT is for the purpose of training, the more important point for training is the amount of data collected, not the time spent for data collection. |
| Qualcomm | NO | For 1st bullet – As mentioned in our paper R3-224308, no new UE measurements are identified for AI/ML. Also MDT measurements from the UE can be reused for AI/ML purposes. We do not understand what is meant by consecutive AI/ML data collection.  2nd bullet – CU-CP can request for MDT information from DU or CU-UP as and when needed for AI/ML training. MDT information need not be sent to CU, whenever it is enabled in DU or CU-UP.  3rd bullet – UE Trajectory prediction can be done at NG-RAN based on UE history information and the HO related information. UE need not send the logged or predicted trajectory to the network. This simply complicates the procedure and needs RAN2 and SA3 interactions. |
| Samsung | Yes for 3 | For 1, yes, but it seems belong to RAN2 scope.  For 2, the current MDT procedure to collect location info is CUCP to send configuration to UE via RRC signaling. So there is no need of additional activation.  For 3, yes, the way for source node to get logged location info needs to be discussed. |
| vivo | Yes for 1 | The MDT enhancement shall focus on the new measurements or new formats. The consecutive AI/ML data is a new format of existing measurements. |

## Others

**Q9: Any other essential issues are needed to be discussed in this meeting?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comment** |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Conclusion, Recommendations [if needed]
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44. R3-224488 AI/ML Network Energy Saving (Ericsson) Discussion
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