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# 1 Introduction

This contribution is aimed at reporting the discussion and results of the following post email discussion:

* [Post122][060][AIML] Mapping of functions to physical entities (CMCC)

Scope: Starting from relevant contents in R2-2305613, attempt to produce an agreeable description of Mapping of functions to physical entities. UP to rapporteur to structure

Intended outcome: Report

Deadline: Long (4th Aug, 10:00 UTC)

For this email discussion, the outcome is expected to be used for discussions of possible solutions and specification impacts. The listed entities do not mean that any specification impacts for the involving entities.

As indicated by the Chair, the inactive period is:

July 1st – 30th 3GPP Inactive Period

The deadline is 4th Aug, 10:00 UTC. The summary will be provided by 8th Aug 10:00 UTC, and then companies can check it. The final summary will be submitted by the submission deadline (11th Aug).

Companies providing input to this email discussion are requested to leave contact information below.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Name** | **Email Address** |
| Apple | Peng Cheng | pcheng24@apple.com |
| OPPO | Jiangsheng Fan | fanjiangsheng@oppo.com |
| Mavenir | Fan Yang | Fan.yang@mavenir.com |
| vivo | Boubacar Kimba | kimba@vivo.com |
| Xiaomi | Xing Yang | Yangxing1@xiaomi.com |
| Mediatek | Yuanyuan Zhang | Yuany.zhang@mediatek.com |
| Lenovo | Congchi Zhang | Zhangcc16@lenovo.com |
| CATT | Da Wang | wangda@catt.cn |
| Qualcomm | Rajeev Kumar | rkum@qti.qualcomm.com |
| Ericsson | Felipe Arraño Scharager | felipe.arrano.scharager@ericsson.com |
| CMCC | Jiayao Tan | tanjiayao@chinamobile.com |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | Jun Chen | jun.chen@huawei.com |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | Sakira Hassan | sakira.hassan@nokia.com |
| LGE | Soo Kim | [soo.kim@lge.com](mailto:soo.kim@lge.com) |
| Spreadtrum | Xiaoyu Chen | xiaoyu.chen@unisoc.com |
| China Unicom | Tingting Liang | [liangtt11@chinaunicom.cn](mailto:liangtt11@chinaunicom.cn) |
| Interdigital | Oumer Teyeb | [Oumer.teyeb@interdigital.com](mailto:Oumer.teyeb@interdigital.com) |
| Sharp | Rudraksh Shrivastava | shrivastavar@sharplabs.com |
| Intel | Ziyi Li | [Ziyi.li@intel.com](mailto:Ziyi.li@intel.com) |
| Turkcell | Izzet Sağlam | izzet.saglam@turkcell.com.tr |
| Samsung | Chadi Khirallah | [c.khirallah@samsung.com](mailto:c.khirallah@samsung.com) |

# 2 Discussion

In last meeting, RAN2 agreed a general architecture covering the model based and/or functionality based LCM as shown in Fig.1. The general AI/ML framework consists of model training, inference, management, data collection and model storage.



Fig.1 General architecture for AI/ML

For model storage, RAN2#122 agreed that Model Storage in the figure is only intended as a reference point (if any) for protocol terminations etc for model transfer/delivery etc, and it is not intended to limit where models are actually stored. Thus, mapping of model storage to entities is not discussed in this email discussion.

For management, RAN2 agreed it may be model based management or functionality based management in last meeting. Based on previous discussion and RAN1’s progress, the rapporteur understands that management includes monitoring, selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback. In RAN1#113 meeting, RAN1 agreed that for model ID-based and functionality based LCM, the same or similar procedures may be used for their activation, deactivation, switching, fallback, and monitoring. To make it clear during the discussion, the rapporteur suggests to use model/functionality monitoring and control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) instead of management.

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#113 Agreement**  For functionality/model-ID based LCM,   * Once functionalities/models are identified, the same or similar procedures may be used for their activation, deactivation, switching, fallback, and monitoring. |

Considering data collection is discussed in sub-agenda 7.16.2.2, it is suggested to focus on the following LCM purposes in this email discussion:

* Model training
* Inference
* Model transfer/delivery
* Model/functionality monitoring
* Model/functionality control, including selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback

For different use case with different model type (e.g. UE-side model, two-sided model, gNB-side model, LMF-side model), the mapping of functions to physical entities may be different, so it is better to discuss per use case per model type.

In this email discussion, the rapporteur suggests to focus on non-split gNB architecture in this stage to make it clear and simple, i.e. CU-DU architecture is not considered in this email discussion.

## 2.1 CSI feedback enhancement

For CSI feedback enhancement, RAN1 agreed to study the following sub-use cases:

• Spatial-frequency domain CSI compression using two-sided AI model

• CSI prediction using UE-side model

### 2.1.1 CSI compression with two-sided model

* Model training and model transfer/delivery:

For CSI compression using two-sided AI/ML model use case, RAN1 agreed to further study AI/ML model training collaboration Type 1 and Type 3, and Type 2 is de-prioritized in R18 SI.

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#110 Agreement**  In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, the following AI/ML model training collaborations will be further studied:   * Type 1: Joint training of the two-sided model at a single side/entity, e.g., UE-sided or Network-sided. * Type 2: Joint training of the two-sided model at network side and UE side, repectively. * Type 3: Separate training at network side and UE side, where the UE-side CSI generation part and the network-side CSI reconstruction part are trained by UE side and network side, respectively.   **RAN1#111 Conclusion**  In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, training collaboration type 2 over the air interface for model training (not including model update) is deprioritized in R18 SI. |

For Type 1, the two-sided AI/ML model which includes a CSI generation part and a CSI reconstruction part is trained at network, and then the trained UE-side CSI generation part will be transferred from network to the UE, or vice versa. The model transfer/delivery between UE and network via air interface is needed for Type 1.

For Type 3, the UE-side CSI generation part and the network-side reconstruction part are trained by the UE side (may includes UE and OTT server) and network side separately. For example, the two-sided AI/ML model is trained at network, then the network sends the data set which includes input and output to the UE, and the UE side trains a UE-side CSI generation part using the data set. On the other hand, it is possible that the UE side trains the two-sided model and sends the data set to the network, and network side trains the network-side reconstruction part based the data set.

At RAN2#122, RAN2 assumed that for model training, training data can be generated by UE/gNB and terminated at gNB/OAM/OTT server. It is suggested that model training can reside at gNB/OAM/OTT server. Therefore, for training type 1, the model transfer/delivery can be from gNB to UE, or from OAM to gNB and UE, or from OTT server to gNB and UE. And for training type 3, the UE-side model can be transferred/delivered from OTT server to UE if it is trained at OTT server; for NW-side model, there is no model transfer/delivery if the NW-side model is trained at gNB, or the NW-side model is transferred/delivered from OAM to gNB if it is trained at OAM.

* Model inference:

For two-sided AI/ML model, it is obvious that model inference reside at UE and gNB side for UE-side CSI generation part and NW-side CSI reconstruction part separately.

* Model/functionality monitoring and control:

RAN1 agreed that NW and UE can both monitor the performance, NW makes the decisions of model control.

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#110b Agreement**   * NW-side performance monitoring: NW monitors the performance and make decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching * UE-side performance monitoring: UE monitors the performance and reports to Network, NW makes decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching |

Based on the above analysis and RAN1 agreements, the possible mapping of functions to physical entities for CSI compression with two-sided model is shown in following table.

Table 2.1-1: The mapping of functions to physical entities for CSI compression with two-sided model

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training | gNB, OAM, OTT server, UE |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | For training Type 1: gNB->UE, or OAM->gNB&UE, or OTT server->gNB&UE, or UE->gNB  For training Type 3:   * For UE part of two-sided model, OTT server->UE if the model is trained at OTT server, or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at UE; * For NW part of two-sided model, no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at gNB, or OAM->gNB if the model is trained at OAM; |
| c) | Inference | NW part of two-sided model: gNB  UE part of two-sided model: UE |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | NW-side: gNB monitors the performance  UE-side: UE monitors the performance and reports to NW |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, updating, fallback) | gNB |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult SA5.

Q1: Do you agree the mapping of functions to physical entities for CSI compression with two-sided model in Table 2.1-1?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes for which bullet(s)** | **No for which bullet(s)** | **Comments** |
| Apple | a), b), c), d) (but b/c/d has terminology issue) | e)  And dataset transfer is missed | For b)/c)/d), one terminology issue: since two-sided model is used for CSI compression, the term UE side/NW side model is not accurate:   * "UE side model" -->"UE part of two-sided model" * "NW side mode" --> "NW part of two-sided model"   [Rapp] OK to change the terminology.  For e), UE autonomous model switch was agreed in RAN1#112, as highlighted below:   * In functionality-based LCM   + Network indicates activation/deactivation/fallback/switching of AI/ML functionality via 3GPP signaling (e.g., RRC, MAC-CE, DCI).   + Models may not be identified at the Network, and UE may perform model-level LCM.     - Study whether and how much awareness/interaction NW should have about model-level LCM * In model-ID-based LCM, models are identified at the Network, and Network/UE may activate/deactivate/select/switch individual AI/ML models via model ID.   Meanwhile, during RAN1 discussion on AI 9.2.2.2, another solution is: gNB can configure a set of parameters, and UE will choose the UE part model within the parameters configuration, and let gNB know the corresponding NW-part model to use.  Thus, We don't see any reason that RAN2 can preclude one RAN1 agreed direction. So, e) should be updated to " gNB, UE".  [Rapp] According to RAN1 agreements, it is agreed that the UE and NW can monitor the performance, but RAN1 only agreed NW can make decisions. We should align with RAN1 agreements.   * NW-side performance monitoring: NW monitors the performance and make decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching * UE-side performance monitoring: UE monitors the performance and reports to Network, NW makes decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching   Meanwhile, we think dataset transfer is missed in the table. Note that it doesn't mean how NW to store dataset but it means which NW entity needs to receive dataset for training/inference/monitoring purpose. It may have spec impacts. Thus, we suggest to add row f)  f): dataset transfer:   * For training Type 3: For UE-side model, from UE to OTT server (if model is trained in OTT server), and from gNB to UE; For NW-side mode, from UE to gNB (if trained in gNB), or from UE to OAM (if trained in OAM) * For Monitoring: if NW monitors UE-side model, from UE to gNB; if UE monitors NW-side mode, from gNB to UE.   [Rapp] We understand that dataset transfer is a part of data collection, and it is suggested not to discuss it in this email discussion. |
| OPPO | All with comments and modification |  | For bullet a, we should make it clear that only offline model training is focused in this email discussion, this principle should be applied to all subsequent questions. Another point is that even if RAN2 agreed that training data can be generated by UE/gNB and terminated at gNB/OAM/OTT server in last RAN2 meeting, it still does not preclude the case that model is trained at UE side, the above RAN2 agreement only emphasize the possible training data exchange with other nodes, UE still can collect the training data and use it for model training without training data exposed to other node based on the following RAN1 agreements.    For bullet b, as clarified for bullet a, it’s still possible for UE to train the model.  so for training Type 1, the missing part is that UE->gNB, which is not explicitly precluded by RAN1 so far, we should consider this scenario also;  [Rapp] Fine to add the this part and let’s see other companies’ view.  For training Type 3, for UE side model, the missing part is that no model transfer/delivery if the UE-side model is trained at UE, For NW-side model, the possible missing part is that OTT->gNB if the NW-side model is trained at OTT, to differentiate with training Type 1 case, i.e. OTT server->gNB&UE, for training Type 3, network side OTT server is different than the OTT server to train UE side model, people should consider whether to consider this scenario also for training Type 3 as for training Type 1 we also consider gNB side model is trained at OTT server.  [Rapp] We understand that the OTT server mentioned in RAN1/RAN2 means UE side OTT server, whether a network side OTT server needs to be involved or defined can be further discussed.  For bullet d, firstly we’d like to clarify this is only for real-time model monitoring as SA5 is also considering something for non-real time model monitoring, which may or may not have RAN2 impact, to be safe, we may need to clarify this for all subsequent questions;  [Rapp] We prefer to avoid discussing real-time or non-real time for model monitoring in RAN2, since RAN1 has also no similar discussion and the terminology is not clear.  Another point is that for UE side model monitoring, based on above RAN1 agreement, even if UE-side model monitoring happens at UE side, UE still needs to report the collected metrics to network side, to make it clear, we have the following suggestion:  NW-side: gNB, i.e. gNB directly collects the model monitoring metrics.  UE-side: UE, i.e. UE directly collects full or partial model monitoring metrics and reports the collected metrics to gNB side.  [Rapp] We are fine to clarify it, but we prefer the following change to align with RAN1 agreements:  NW-side: gNB monitors the performance  UE-side: UE monitors the performance and reports to NW |
| Mavenir | Yes for (c)(d) but comments and modification for (a)(b) (e) |  | For a), Training Type conclusion was made in RAN1#110, as below:  In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, the following AI/ML model training collaborations will be further studied:  • Type 1: Joint training of the two-sided model at a single side/entity, e.g., UE-sided or Network-sided.  • Type 2: Joint training of the two-sided model at network side and UE side, repectively.  • Type 3: Separate training at network side and UE side, where the UE-side CSI generation part and the network-side CSI reconstruction part are trained by UE side and network side, respectively.  Since model can be trained at UE side, we suggest a) should be updated to “gNB, OAM, OTT server,UE”, and b) should be updated to “For training Type 1: gNB->UE, or OAM->gNB&UE, or OTT server->gNB&UE, UE->gNB”  [Rapp] It has been updated.  Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) can be implement at UE, we suggest e) should be updated to “gNB,UE”  [Rapp] Please see response to Apple.  For Apple’ s proposal of f) ,we suggest below   * For type1 training, For NW model, dataset is from UE to gNB(if model is trained at gNB), dataset is from UE to OAM(if model is trained at OAM),dataset is from UE to OTT server(if model is trained at OTT server) * For type3 we agree with Apple’s opinion |
| vivo | All with comments on a)b)c)d) |  | a)  If RAN2 can reach consensus on the assumption that the entity of model training and model storage is the same one, rephrase ‘Model training’ to ‘Model training& model storage’  For the mapped entities, the original agreement of RAN1 did not mention OTT server for model training at UE-side. However, due to limited capability, the UE may not be able to perform model training and may offload the training functionality to OTT server. Therefore, the OTT server can be clarified as ‘UE/OTT server’.  Besides, the training type shall be clarified:  For training type 1 (joint training): UE/OTT server (UE side training) or gNB/OAM (NW side training)  For training type 3 (separate training): UE/OTT server and gNB/OAM  [Rapp] ‘UE’ has been added.  b)  Rephrase as:  For training Type 1 UE side training: UE->gNB (if model training in UE) or OTT server->gNB&UE (if model training is offload to OTT server)  For training Type 1 NW side training: gNB->UE, or OAM->gNB&UE  For training Type 3 UE part model: No model transfer/delivery (if model training in UE) or OTT server to UE (if model is trained in OTT server)  For training Type 3 NW part model: No transfer/delivery (if model training in gNB) or OAM to gNB (if model is trained in OAM)  c)  Rephrase as:  UE (CSI generation part) and gNB (CSI reconstruction part)  d)  As only one of NW or UE may monitor the performance, rephrase as:  gNB (NW monitors the performance) or UE (UE monitors the performance and reports to Network)  [Rapp] It has been updated.  e)  Agree with the current one as RAN1 only agreed the cases that NW makes decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching. |
| Xiaomi | All with comments on e |  | In general, we support rapp’s proposals, which captures the current common understanding.  Regarding e) Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback), RAN1 made following agreement  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, study potential specification impact for performance monitoring including:***   * ***NW-side performance monitoring: NW monitors the performance and make decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching***   ***UE-side performance monitoring: UE monitors the performance and reports to Network, NW makes decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching***  Therefore, we suggest to add ‘updating’ as one potential control action.  [Rapp] It has been updated. |
| Mediatek | c) |  | For bullet a) model training, although the OTT server can be a NW-sided server or an UE-sided server, it should be the UE-sided OTT server concerned in the discussion.  Possible revision:  gNB, OAM, UE-sided OTT server  For bullet b), it’s better to differentiate model transfer and model delivery, because model transfer and model delivery have different meaning and specification impact.  For training type 1: Joint training of the two-sided model at a single side/entity, e.g., UE-sided or Network-sided.  Model transfer over air interface may be required either from network side to UE side (gNB->UE)or from UE side to network side (UE->gNB). If the model is trained by the NW at OAM, the model transfer is still from gNB to UE and OAM is invisible to UE.  The description of ‘For training Type 1: gNB->UE, or OAM->gNB&UE, or OTT server->gNB&UE’ is confusing. OAM->gNB&UE/ OTT server->gNB&UE means the two-sided model is delivered from OAM/OTT server to gNB and UE respectively? So gNB->UE means model transfer over air interface and OAM->gNB&UE/ OTT server->gNB&UE means model delivery from OAM/OTT through UP channel? But we don’t have direct model delivery from OAM to UE.  Possible revision:  For training Type 1:  Model transfer gNB->UE (together with model delivery from OAM to gNB if model is trained at OAM); or  Model transfer UE->gNB (together with model delivery from OTT server to UE), or  Model delivery OTT server->gNB&UE respectively.  [Rapp] As per RAN1 agreements, Type 1 means that *joint training of the two-sided model at a single side/entity*. For bullet b), we just want to rephrase the two-sided model can be trained at OAM or OTT server, so the model can be delivered from OAM/OTT server to gNB/UE. We think the current wording is more straightforward.  For training Type 3: For UE-side model, model delivery OTT server->UE if the UE-side model is trained at UE-side OTT server; For NW-side model, no model transfer/delivery if the NW-side model is trained at gNB, or model delivery OAM->gNB if the NW-side model is trained at OAM;  For bullet (d), for model/functionality monitoring, we may have long-term, medium-term and short-term monitoring. For short/medium-term monitoring, it can happen at gNB or UE. For long-term monitoring, it can be performed at OAM or UE-sided OTT server.  [Rapp] It seems to introduce new terminology for long-term, medium-term and short-term monitoring, and RAN1 has not discussed it. Therefore, we prefer to keep the current wording which is simple and aligned with RAN1 agreements.  For bullet (e), UE autoneouse control and UE report to network with UE monitoring should be allowed at the time being.  [Rapp] Please see respone to Apple.  For data share/transfer, I agree with Apple that it’s an important aspect to be considered. But it can be considered as one part of data collection and don’t need to be addressed in this email discussion. |
| Lenovo | c) d) are ok  a)b)e) see comments |  | Agree with the terminology comment from Apple, it should be “UE part of two sided model” and “gNB part of two sided model”  a) it would be good to distinguish between UE part model and gNB part model as well. And in our understanding:  - Training of UE part model: gNB/OAM/OTT server  - Training of gNB part mode: gNB/OAM (it’s actually upon RAN3’s decision, maybe RAN2 does not need to discuss this)  b) for training type 1, maybe more precise to say e.g.,  - UE part model: (OAM/OTT 🡪) gNB 🡪 UE  - gNB part model: (OAM 🡪) gNB. No proposal about the OTT 🡪 gNB solution yet. In addition, the option UE provides a trained gNB part model to gNB is also possible, i.e., UE 🡪 gNB.  c) d) ok  e) Again better to distinguish between UE part and NW part model  - UE part: both gNB decided, or UE decided model/functionality control are possible  - gNB part: gNB decided  [Rapp] Please see respone to Apple.  Some clarification on “Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed.”. What is the intention? Data collection applies to inference and monitoring as well.  [Rapp] The intention is to clarify only data collection part for model training has spec impacts, and how to train the model is up to implementation. Defining the mapped entities for model training is better to clarify the starting point of model transfer/delivery. We add “how to perform the model training is up to implementation” in Note 1. |
| CATT | All with comments and modifications |  | For a), we think model can also be trained at UE side, so UE should be added, as “gNB, OAM, OTT server, UE”.  For b), as mentioned in a), for training Type 1, if model is trained at UE side, “UE->gNB” should be added, as “gNB->UE, UE->gNB, or OAM->gNB&UE, or OTT server->gNB&UE”;  for training Type 3, for UE-side model, if model is trained at UE side, “no model transfer/delivery for UE-side model” should be added, and the model training can also at OAM, so propose to “no model transfer/delivery for UE-side model if the UE-side model is trained at UE, OTT server->UE if the UE-side model is trained at OTT server, OAM->UE if the UE-side model is trained at OAM”;  for training Type 3,for NW-side model, we think the model training can also at OTT server, so propose to “For NW-side model, no model transfer/delivery if the NW-side model is trained at gNB, or OAM->gNB if the NW-side model is trained at OAM, or OTT server->gNB if the NW-side model is trained at OTT server;”  In addition, we agree Apple’s suggestion that change “UE side model” to “UE part of two-sided model” and change “NW side mode” to “NW part of two-sided model” to align with RAN1 and the terms in TR 38.843.  For c), we think it is better to be changed to “NW part of two-sided model: gNB, UE part of two-sided model: UE” for accuracy.  [Rapp]It has been updated.  For d), it is also better to change to “Model monitoring at NW: gNB, Model monitoring at UE: UE” as “NW-side: gNB, UE-side: UE” is easy to be understanded to gNB monitors NW part of two-sided model, UE monitors UE part of two-sided model, however, the model monitoring is for entire two-sided model not separately.  For e), considering that RAN1 has agreed UE may activate/deactivate/select/switch individual AI/ML models via model ID, “UE” should be added, as “gNB,UE”.  [Rapp] Please see response to Apple. |
| Qualcomm | c) | a) b) d) e) | For a, the model training can happen within the CN at NWDAF, AS, AF, and others. There is no reason for excluding CN. Where model training can be performed should be left to vendor choice. Therefore, CN should be considered for model training.  [Rapp] For model training at CN, let’s see other companies’ views.  For b, we have option 2, where the model is transferred to the UE/gNB from the core network. Model training and storage can happen at different places. Therefore, model transfer from CN-> gNB/UE should be included for both type 1 and type 3 training.  For d, we would like to wait for RAN1 progress, i.e., whether, how, and where monitoring is performed. Furthermore, we agree with CATT that using NW-side and UE-side may be confusing (i.e., whether NW-side monitoring implies monitoring of network side model). Maybe we can modify by removing side  NW~~-side~~: gNB  UE~~-side~~: UE  For e, based on RAN1#110bis-emeeting agreements below  -------------------  Agreement  For model selection, activation, deactivation, switching, and fallback at least for UE sided models and two-sided models, study the following mechanisms:   * Decision by the network   + Network-initiated   + UE-initiated, requested to the network * Decision by the UE   + Event-triggered as configured by the network, UE’s decision is reported to network   + UE-autonomous, UE’s decision is reported to the network   + UE-autonomous, UE’s decision is not reported to the network   FFS: for network sided models  FFS: other mechanisms  ------------------  Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) can be performed by the UE.  [Rapp] The above agreement was achieved in RAN1 General aspects sub-agenda 9.2.1, we understand that this agreement is open/applicable to all use cases. For CSI compression sub-use case, we think the following agreement is more suitable which was achieved in RAN1 CSI feedback enhancement sub-agenda 9.2.2.2.  *Agreement*  *In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, study potential specification impact for performance monitoring including:*   * *NW-side performance monitoring: NW monitors the performance and make decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching* * *UE-side performance monitoring: UE monitors the performance and reports to Network, NW makes decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching* |
| Ericsson | a (with comments)  b, c), d)  e (with comments)  (Comment, b) could be impacted by our comment to a)) |  | For a), this seems very much linked to current RAN1’s discussion. But, at least for completeness, and to be in line with RAN1’s agreement, “UE” should be added to the list of entities. We are also OK to clarify, as proposed by some companies (e.g. Mediatek), that for the OTT server, we are here referring to the UE-side OTT server.  [Rapp] ‘UE’ has been added to the list of entities. Besides, we still do not understand why the CN should be involved. Therefore, we prefer not considering it for the moment.   For e), as argued by Apple and Mediatek, we also believe that one should consider the UE-autonomous control. Solutions/details might later follow.  [Rapp]Please see the response to Qualcomm.  Regarding Apple’s proposal (e.g., f) on dataset). OK to discuss but perhaps in a separate discussion. |
| CMCC | All |  | We are fine with the current wording.  For bullet a), we are ok to add the UE as entity for model training. However, we don’t think CN should be involved for model training because the CSI compression is purely over air interface which only involves UE and gNB, and it is hard for CN to understand the physical parameters and determine which AI/ML model is applicable for the specific use case. |
| ZTE | All |  | After the update from rapporteur, we generally agree with the current wording.  Regarding the functionality mapping of model training for CSI compression, the CN is not a good idea to become a logical entity for model training since the CN never touch the data related to CSI before, let alone the model training for CSI compression. Besides, the current data collection framework does not support to collect the CSI from UE to CN, for supporting this, RAN2 not only needs further discuss how to specify the CSI in the RRC message or other C-plane signaling, but also SA need to discuss whether the extra interface need to be introduced in the CN for supporting the model training of PHY layer data, which will dramatically increase the complexity of the discussion. So we think the CN can be excluded firstly for functionality mapping of the model training at NW side. |
| TCL | Yes for (c)(d) but comments for (a)(b)(e) |  | We agree with Apple’s comments about the terminology, which is clearer to use "UE part of two-sided model" and  "NW part of two-sided model" in the CSI compression case.  Furthermore, we understanding in the description in Q1, which imply that NW-sided indicates gNB only and excludes CN nodes in this case, which is still FFS, although we also prefer it.  For a): Based on the description of RAN1 agreement, model can be trained at UE side, as Rapp and MediaTek point out, we also think that UE side implies two parts: UE-itself and UE-sided OTT server. Hence, in order to avoid misunderstanding for model training in the CSI compression case, it is better to use indicates the OTT server can be UE-sided OTT server and NW-sided OTT server. In addition, form our perspective, it is too early to make the assumption that model can not be trained at UE without any analysis and evaluation. Hence, we kindly suggest to a) would be changed as below:  “gNB, OAM, OTT server(UE-sided/NW-sided),UE”  For b): As mentioned in a), b) is suggested to be updated as below:  For training Type 1:  gNB->UE, or OAM->gNB&UE,  OTT server(UE-sided/ Network-sided )->gNB&UE”,  or UE ->gNB;  For training Type 3: For UE-side model, OTT server(UE-sided)->UE if the UE-side model is trained at OTT server(UE-sided); no model transfer/delivery if the UE-side model is trained at UE-itself. For NW-side model, no model transfer/delivery if the NW-side model is trained at gNB, or OAM->gNB if the NW-side model is trained at OAM; or OTT server(NW-sided)->gNB if the NW-side model is trained at OTT server(NW-sided);  For e): Share similar view with some of above companies, UE is able to do the Model/functionality control autonomously (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback). For example, for UE part of two-sided model, once model monitoring and model training are located in UE part, why preclude the case that model selection/switching is controlled in UE. Therefore, e) is suggested to be changed to" gNB, UE” |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | a), b), d), e): some comments  c): ok |  | **a), b):** Usually the interaction between OAM and RAN is left to implementation, it is a bit unclear what aspects need to be considered here.  **Our suggestion:**  **For a), change OAM to [FFS: OAM]**  **For b), change OAM->gNB&UE to [FFS: OAM->gNB&UE]**  **Change OAM->gNB to [FFS: OAM->gNB]**  **d):** In the beginning, it mentions that “For this email discussion, the outcome is expected to be used for discussions of possible solutions and specification impacts”. We think this email can focus on the possible entities for now and later we can discuss more (e.g. necessity, possible solutions).  **Our suggestion:**  **UE-side: UE monitors the performance ~~and reports to NW~~**  **e):** As mentioned by some companies, for model/functionality control, UE can be invovled. Our understanding is that both RAN1 and RAN2 are discussing the necessity, possible solutions and spec impacts.  **Our suggestion:**  **Add “UE” for e).**  **For model training at CN**  How the CN related solutions support the use cases at PHY layer is unclear and needs to be clarified first. **So we are not sure whether CN should be discussed.** |
| Apple2 |  |  | **Addtional comments on latest table**  1. On d), we agree with Huawei that this table is just intended to focus on possible entries and no need to discuss/capture details of RAN1 agreement on monitoring. Because RAN1 related agreement is already captured in TS 38.843, we doubt what is point to capture details in this table. And RAN1 may add new monitoring solution, which may be conflicted with this table. Thus, we suggest below change:  NW-side: ~~gNB monitors the performance~~  UE-side: UE ~~monitors the performance and reports to NW~~  2. On a), we are fine to add "UE", although it is obvious.  3. On b), we actually doubt why we need to capture this complex row. Isn't already covered by section of model transfer? In addition, it seems not necessary to capture "or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at UE". It is obvious, and if it is captured, do we need to capture all scenarios without model transfer?  4. On OAM, we prefer to keep it because MDT seems to become necessary.  5. On CN, we share same view as Rapporteur. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell (Sakira) | (c) is ok with minor comments. For other functions, see details. |  | a) Model training:  - It might be good to clarify that the model training is offline.  - The model sideness needs to be explicit i.e. UE sided and NW sided  - UE sided model can be trained in UE, therefore, it might be good to include UE  - Although we may map both UE and gNB for offline training function, we should be cautious since gNB or UE may not be the appropriate entity for model training due to computational resources limitation, proprietary characteristics. So, we should add additional note for UE, gNB.  - According to RAN2#121 agreements, CN has been identified as a source for model delivery/transfer.  Thus, we suggest the following changes: Offline model training (UE sided): UE, gNB, OAM, OTT server, CN  Offline model training (NW sided): gNB, OAM, OTT server, CN  b) Model delivery/transfer:  - Remark for Type 2: In RAN1#111, RAN1 conclude that “In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, training collaboration type 2 over the air interface for model training (not including model update) is deprioritized in R18 SI.”. So, it is not clear to us whether we should still have a place holder for Type 2 or not. We need more discussion on this.  - We suggest adding ‘No model delivery/transfer’ option  - The entity CN is missing as agreed in RAN2#121 as well as pointed out by QC.  - Also, copying Type 3 definition for reference purpose from TR 38.834: “Type 3: Separate training at network side and UE side, where the UE-side CSI generation part and the network-side CSI reconstruction part are trained by UE side and network side, respectively.”  Thus, our suggestion to add: Training Type 1 UE sided: UE\*\*\*, gNB->UE, OAM->UE\*, OTT->UE\*\*, CN->UE\*  Training Type 1 NW sided: gNB\*\*\*, OAM->gNB, OTT->gNB\*\*, CN->gNB  Training Type 3 CSI generation part: UE\*\*\*, OTT->UE  Training Type 3 CSI construction part: gNB\*\*\*, OTT->gNB, OAM->gNB, CN->gNB \*There might be no direct interface from OAM/CN->UE. So, this can be FFS. \*\* OTT can be NW or UE vendor server. So, the 3gpp impact is not clear.  \*\*\* No model delivery/transfer  c) Model inference:  -It might be good to mention the mapping of model sideness to the entity. Therefore, we suggest UE sided model: UE NW sided model: gNB  d) Model/functionality monitoring:  - We suggest to split functionality monitoring from model monitoring.  Thus our suggestion to add:  UE sided Model monitoring\*: UE, gNB  NW sided Model monitoring\*: gNB  UE\*\*/NW sided Functionality monitoring\*: gNB  \*Whether to add CN/OAM/OTT is not clear to us as this might increase latency or overhead.  e) Model/functionality control:  - We believe the model and functionality level control should be in separate rows. Also, we support the justification of adding ‘UE’ by Apple, QC, MTK, Lenovo.  Thus our suggestion to add:  Model control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback): UE, gNB  Functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback): gNB  Additional comments:  - A placeholder for model update, model fine-tuning, data collection function for model fine-tuning, training, monitoring would be good.  - Separate the rows to accommodate model based LCM and functionality based LCM.  - We should identify the entities which are within RAN2 scope.  - We should identify which mapping cannot be in Rel-18 scope. |
| LGE | (c), (d), (e) | (a), (b) | For cases (a) and (b), we can consider CN for training and model transfer/delivery at least for the offline training. Although the model is trained on the gNB, it can also be delivered to the CN, which subsequently transfers the model to the UE. (CN->UE)  Fine with current phrase for (c), (d) and (e).  For (e), to synchronize the model between two entities in a two-sided model, we prefer that one entity decides on model control. |
| Spreadtrum | All with some comments |  | For a), We agree that **“UE” can be considered for model training**. As for CN, considering RAN CSI-related data may not available at CN unless some enhancement is done. We have no strong view whether CN should be considered for model training.  For b), The behaviors of OTT server is quite confusing. Why it can reach to gNB in Type1 and cannot reach to gNB in Type3? From our view, whether OTT server is UE-side node or not should have a common understanding.  Also **model transfer/delivery is also deprioritized in RAN1. If the principle also applies to CSI enhancement, the answer should be revised**.  From our view, the b) can be modified as:  For training Type 1:   * gNB->UE, or UE->gNB, or OTT server->gNB&UE, or OAM->gNB&UE;   For training Type 3:   * For UE part of two-sided model: (UE-side) OTT server->UE if the model is trained at (UE-side) OTT server, or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at UE. * For NW part of two-sided model: **(NW-side) OTT server->gNB if the model is trained at (NW-side) OTT Server**, or OAM->gNB if the model is trained at OAM, , or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at gNB.   For c) and e),We generally agree the with the current modifications:  For d), To align with RAN1 agreement and avoid conflict, we suggest to change it as below:  NW-side: ~~gNB~~**NW** monitors the performance  UE-side: UE monitors the performance and reports to NW  But we actually agree with the rapporteur that the NW-side should be gNB. |
| China Unicom | All |  | For model training at CN, we agree with the majority that CN should not be involved for model training in this case.  For d), we agree with the current revised sentence "UE monitors the performance and reports to NW", due to it has been agreed by RAN1 and it's clearer to be read.  For e), agree with Rapp's comments that RAN1 has agreed in the CSI feedback enhancement sub-agenda 9.2.2.2 that NW always make decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching.  For dataset transfer, it's not in the scope of this discussion. We agree with Rapporteur that dataset transfer is a part of data collection, and the following sentence in TR 38843-010 can prove it:  **Data collection:** A process of collecting data by the network nodes, management entity, or UE for the purpose of AI/ML model training, data analytics and inference. |
| Interdigital | a, b,c d: OK  e (with comments) |  | For e) We agree with Apple that “UE” should be included |
| Sharp | b,c,d  a, e (See Comments) |  | In option a, as pointed out by other companies as well, it is too early to preclude UE side model training. The definition and purpose of UE-side OTT server and network-side OTT server needs to be further clarified.  In option e, Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, updating, fallback) by the UE itself either autonomously or in a preconfigured manner should not be precluded. This can be further discussed considering UE/NW side model and one-sided or two-sided model respectively. Model and Functionality based control can be separately listed for better clarity.  For option e considering UE autonomous control, Agree with Ericsson, Apple, and Mediatek |
| Intel | All with comment |  | 1. Agree with above companies to clarify model training could also happen at UE side. Though the UE training capability could be limited, we don’t need to preclude it during study item phase. 2. Similarly, if model training at UE side is not precluded, model upload (UE -> gNB) should also be considered as part of mapping options. 3. The current wording is confusing. For CSI compression use case, both gNB and UE perform model inference. Vivo’s update looks good to us. 4. Agree with Vivo’s comment. Furthermore, we think it is also good to clarify where the performance is generated. Further updates as below:   gNB (NW monitors the NW’s performance) or UE (UE monitors the UE’s performance and reports to Network)  for dataset transfer raised by Apple, we think it should be studied together with data collection, which is out scope of this email discussion and needs further input from RAN1 based on the LS reply. |
| Turkcell | All |  | For a) and b) we can add UE. |
| Samsung | a, b, c d: OK.  e (with comments) |  | We are ok with the latest (updated) table for a, b, c, and d.  For (e) we agree with other companies that “UE” could be included. |

#### **Summary of Q1:**

For bullet a), i.e. model training, almost all companies agree that model training can reside at UE, gNB, OAM, OTT server, but have no consensus on CN for model training. More specifically,

* Regarding whether CN can be involved for model training, there are different opinions:
* Support (3 companies): QC, Nokia, LGE
* Object (5 companies): Ericsson, CMCC, ZTE, Apple, China Unicom
* Agree with the current wording (i.e., CN is not included for model training) (12 companies): OPPO, Mavenir, vivo, Xiaomi, MTK, Lenovo, CATT, Interdigital, Sharp, Intel, Turkcell, Samsung
* Others (3 companies): TCL (FFS), Huawei (not sure whether CN should be discussed), Spreadtrum (no strong view)
* Based on the above comments, Rapporteur suggests to add a FFS for CN for model training in the table, in order to respect all companies' views.
* For OTT server, 3 companies (MTK, E///, CMCC) point out the OTT server should be UE-side OTT server and 3 companies (TCL, Nokia, Spreadtrum) thinks OTT server can be UE-sided and NW-sided OTT server, Rapporteur suggests to keep the current wording “OTT server” to make it simple and it can refer to either UE-side or NW-side OTT server or both. Whether NW-side OTT server is feasible can be further discussed.
* For training type, 2 companies suggest to clarify the model training is offline training. Rapporteur thinks this should be common understanding since RAN2 has agreed to deprioritize aspects of on-line/real-time training for the whole SI (unless R1 identifies that it is needed for one of the studied use cases) in RAN2#121bis-e meeting, but is fine with this clarification.

For bullet b), i.e. model transfer/delivery, the following comments are proposed:

* For the terminology ”UE-side model” and “NW-side model”, some companies propose that it should be “UE part of two-sided model” and “NW part of two-sided model”.
* Similar to bullet a), there is no consensus on whether CN can be entity for model transfer/delivery.
* For details of wording, Apple thinks there is no need to capture this row so complex, prefers to remove the sentence “or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at UE”. Rapporteur will try to make it clear and simple.

For bullet c), i.e. model inference, almost all companies are fine with this.

For bullet d), i.e. model/functionality monitoring:

* Majority companies are fine with this bullet.
* 2 companies (HW, Apple) think the table is intended to focus on possible entities and no need to capture details of RAN1 agreements on monitoring, and prefer to remove “reports to NW”.
* One company (Nokia) suggests to split functionality monitoring from model monitoring.

For bullet e), i.e. model/functionality control, all companies agree that model/functionality control can be at gNB, but have no consensus on UE since there are two different RAN1 agreements:

* Support (13 companies): Apple, Mavenir, MTK, Lenovo, CATT, QC, E///, TCL, HW, Nokia, Interdigital, Sharp, Samsung
  + Proponent Companies’ view is that RAN1 agreed to support UE autonomous control.

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#110b Agreement**  For model selection, activation, deactivation, switching, and fallback at least for UE sided models and two-sided models, study the following mechanisms:   * Decision by the network   + - Network-initiated     - UE-initiated, requested to the network * Decision by the UE   + - Event-triggered as configured by the network, UE’s decision is reported to network     - UE-autonomous, UE’s decision is reported to the network     - UE-autonomous, UE’s decision is not reported to the network   FFS: for network sided models  FFS: other mechanisms |

* Not support (9 companies): vivo, Xiaomi, CMCC, ZTE, LGE, Spreadtrum, China Unicom, Intel, Turkcell
  + Opponent Companies’ view is that RAN1 only agreed NW can make decisions as follows:

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#110b Agreement**   * NW-side performance monitoring: NW monitors the performance and make decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching * UE-side performance monitoring: UE monitors the performance and reports to Network, NW makes decisions of model activation/ deactivation/updating/switching |

* Rapporteur suggests to add FFS for UE, and may wait for RAN1 further clarification.

For other aspects, Apple proposed to add a bullet for dataset transfer, but rapporteur and some companies understand it is a part of data collection, and suggest not to discuss it in this email discussion.

Based on the above comments, rapporteur tries to capture all companies’ view and updates the following table as starting point for further discussion.

**Proposal 1: The Table 1 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for CSI compression with two-sided model.**

Table 1: The mapping of functions to physical entities for CSI compression with two-sided model

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training(offline training) | gNB, OAM, OTT server, UE, [FFS: CN] |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | For training Type 1: gNB->UE, or OAM->gNB&UE, or OTT server->gNB&UE, or UE->gNB, [FFS: CN->gNB&UE]  For training Type 3:   * For UE part of two-sided model: OTT server->UE, [FFS: CN->UE]; * For NW part of two-sided model: OAM->gNB, [FFS: CN->gNB]; |
| c) | Inference | NW part of two-sided model: gNB  UE part of two-sided model: UE |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | NW-side: NW monitors the performance  UE-side: UE monitors the performance and may report to NW |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, updating, fallback) | gNB, [FFS: UE] |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: For b), no model transfer/delivery is expected if the entity for model training and model inference is the same one.

Note 3: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA5.

Note 4: Whether/how CN is to be involved may need to consult SA2.

### 2.1.2 CSI prediction with UE-side model

*Rapporteur’s notes: It is observed that CSI prediction with UE-side model can share similar analysis to beam management with UE-side model. However, considering there is no more discussion in RAN1, it may be better to wait for RAN1’s progress.*

## 2.2 Beam management

RAN1 agreed to support BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 for beam management with one-sided model (i.e. UE-side model or network-side model).

• BM-Case 1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction

• BM-Case 2: Temporal DL beam prediction

Based on RAN1 progress, the similar mechanism for LCM procedure is used for BM-Case1 and BM-Case2.

### 2.2.1 UE-side model

For beam management with UE-side model, the AI/ML model training and inference both at UE side is at least supported. Model training at NW side and model inference at UE side may be further studied based on the support of model transfer. RAN2 assumed that training data can be generated by UE/gNB and terminated at gNB/OAM/OTT server. It is suggested that model training can reside at gNB/OAM/OTT server, so the model can be transferred/delivered to the UE from gNB/OAM/OTT server.

For model monitoring and control, UE monitors the performance metric and UE make decisions of model control, or UE monitors the performance metric and gNB make decisions of model control are potential solutions based on RAN1 agreements.

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#110bis Agreement**  For BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 with a UE-side AI/ML model, study the following alternatives for model monitoring with potential down-selection:   * Atl1. UE-side Model monitoring   + UE monitors the performance metric(s)   + UE makes decision(s) of model selection/activation/ deactivation/switching/fallback operation * Atl2. NW-side Model monitoring   + NW monitors the performance metric(s)   + NW makes decision(s) of model selection/activation/ deactivation/switching/ fallback operation * Alt3. Hybrid model monitoring   + UE monitors the performance metric(s)   + NW makes decision(s) of model selection/activation/ deactivation/switching/ fallback operation   **RAN1#111 Agreement**  For the sub use case BM-Case1 and BM-Case2, at least support Alt.1 and Alt.2 for AI/ML model training and inference for further study:   * Alt.1. AI/ML model training and inference at NW side * Alt.2. AI/ML model training and inference at UE side * The discussion on Alt.3 for BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 is dependent on the conclusion/agreement of Agenda item 9.2.1 of RAN1 and/or RAN2 on whether to support model transfer for UE-side AI/ML model or not * Alt.3. AI/ML model training at NW side, AI/ML model inference at UE side |

The possible mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for beam management with a UE-side model is shown in the following table.

Table 2.2-1: The mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for beam management with UE-side model

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training | [FFS: gNB, OAM], OTT server, UE |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | [FFS: gNB->UE, or OAM->UE], or OTT server->UE, or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at UE |
| c) | Inference | UE |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | UE (UE monitors the performance, and may report to gNB), gNB (gNB monitors the performance) |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | gNB if monitoring resides at UE or gNB,  UE if monitoring resides at UE |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed.

Note 2: Whether/how OAM is to be invovled may need to consult SA5.

Q2: Do you agree the mapping of functions to physical entities for beam management with UE-side model in Table 2.2-1?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes for which bullet(s)** | **No for which bullet(s)** | **Comments** |
| Apple | a), b), c), d), e) | dataset transfer is missed | Similar to Q1, we think dataset transfer is missed. Thus, we suggest to add row f)  f): dataset transfer:   * For training: from UE to OTT server (if model is trained in OTT server), or from UE to gNB (if model is trained in gNB), or from UE to OAM (if model trained in OAM) * For Monitoring: if NW monitors, from UE to gNB.   [Rapp] Please see response in Q1. |
| OPPO | All with comments and modification |  | For bullet a, based on RAN1 agreements above, UE side model can be trained at UE, so this scenario should be considered also.  For bullet b, the missing part is that no model transfer/delivery if the UE-side model is trained at UE.  [Rapp] It has been updated.  For bullet d, it’s not very clear how to differentiate the three Alternatives given by RAN1, so we suggest:  UE if UE monitors the performance metrics, UE or gNB makes the decision of model selection/activation/ deactivation/switching/fallback operation.  gNB if gNB monitors the performance metrics. |
| Mavenir | a), b), c), d), e) |  | we agree with OPPO’ s opinion |
| vivo | All with comments on a)b)d) |  | a)  See above in Q1, the OTT server can be clarified as ‘UE/OTT server’.  b)  Rephrase as:  For training at NW side: gNB->UE, or OAM-> UE  For training at UE side: No model transfer/delivery (if model training in UE) or OTT server to UE (if model is trained in OTT server)  d)  Rephrase as:  gNB (NW monitors the performance) or UE (UE monitors the performance and reports to Network)  [Rapp] According to RAN1 agreements, the UE can monitor the performance and make decision for model control, in this case, it is no need to report the monitoring results to NW. Thus, we add “may” before reports to gNB. |
| Xiaomi | All with commet on b |  | Since Model training at NW side and model inference at UE side is not supported yet in RAN1, we propose to make corresponding model delivery as FFS to align with RAN1. Following change is suggesuted,  [gNB->UE, or OAM->UE], OTT server->UE’.  [Rapp] Fine to add the FFS for gNB->UE and OAM->UE. |
| Mediatek | c), e) |  | For bullet a) model training, same as Q1, the discussion concerns UE-sided OTT server.  For bullet b), still don’t know how model transfer/delivery from OAM to UE happen. We need to differentiate model delivery and model transfer  Possible revision:  [Model transfer: gNB->UE], or  Model delivery: [OAM->UE, or] UE-side OTT server->UE  For bullet d), same comment as Q1, For short/medium-term monitoring, it can happen at gNB or UE. For long-term monitoring, it can be performed at OAM or UE-sided OTT server. |
| Lenovo | All, with comments |  | Model training by UE itself should also be considered.  Clarification as commented by other companies could helpful.  Also, would be good to clarify the intention of “Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed.” |
| CATT | b), c) , d), e)  and a) with modification |  | For a) we share the same view that model training can be performed at UE side. So it can be revised as:  UE, gNB, OAM, OTT server; |
| Qualcomm | c) | a)b)d)e) | For a, the model training can happen within the CN at NWDAF, AS, AF, and others. There is no reason for excluding CN. Where model training can be performed should be left to vendor choice. Therefore, CN should be considered for model training.  For b, we have options 2a and 2b, where the model is transferred to the UE/gNB from the core network. Model training and storage can happen at different places. Therefore, mode transfer from CN-> UE should be included.  For d, we would like to wait for RAN1 progress, i.e., whether, how, and where monitoring is performed.  For e, based on RAN1#110bis-emeeting agreements below  -------------------  Agreement  For model selection, activation, deactivation, switching, and fallback at least for UE sided models and two-sided models, study the following mechanisms:   * Decision by the network   + Network-initiated   + UE-initiated, requested to the network * Decision by the UE   + Event-triggered as configured by the network, UE’s decision is reported to network   + UE-autonomous, UE’s decision is reported to the network   + UE-autonomous, UE’s decision is not reported to the network   FFS: for network sided models  FFS: other mechanisms  ------------------  We have a RAN1 agreement for this. The following are not required:  gNB ~~if monitoring resides at UE or gNB~~,  UE ~~if monitoring resides at UE~~  [Rapp] As per RAN1 agreements, UE can monitor the performance and make decisions, gNB can monitor the performance and make decisions, UE can monitor the performance and gNB can make decisions. The intention of current wording is to exclude the case ‘gNB monitors the performance and UE makes decisions of model control’ to align with RAN1 agreements. |
| Ericsson | a) -> only UE-side OTT server or UE  b) only OTT server->UE  c), d), e) (with comments) | a (gNB, OAM)  b (gNB->UE, or OAM->UE) | From RAN1’s agreement and as the email discussion Rapporteur has written: *“For beam management with UE-side model, the AI/ML model training and inference both at UE side is at least supported. Model training at NW side and model inference at UE side may be further studied based on the support of model transfer.”*  Therefore…  For a), the UE-sided training can happen either in the UE-itself (UE should be added in the list as commented by some companies), or in the UE-side OTT server. Therefore, RAN2 should focus on the agreed scenario.  [Rapp] Add FFS for gNB and OAM. However, it is not clear what is the benefit of considering the gNB or the OAM for UE-side training. The training of UE-sided models depends on radio configurations and measurements of the radio environment taken by the UE, which may be very UE vendor/hardware specific. For which having UE-sided training in the network (gNB/OAM) does not make sense to us. As this would increase the computational complexity and add signalling overhead, which will ultimately end up in a poor trained model that may not improve the UE performances.  For b), and as discussed for a), we’re now focusing on UE-sided models and operation. For which we see no real need to map towards other non-UE centric entities.  For e), we agree with Qualcomm that we do not need to discuss at this stage when the gNB or UE is in charge of performing the model/functionality control. We can just capture that gNB, UE could perform the the model/functionality control  [Rapp] Please see the response to Qualcomm. |
| CMCC | All |  | For a), we prefer not to include CN for model training with the similar reason as CSI compression sub-use case. |
| ZTE | All |  | Regarding the model training about the beam management, for (a), we also have a same reason with the case of AI based CSI that CN is not supported to be a logical entity for model training. |
| TCL | Yes for (c)(d)(e) but comments for (a)(b) |  | For a)： similar with Q1, model training can be occurred at UE-itself, and UE-sided/Network-sided OTT server, so, kindly suggest to update a) as below:  gNB, OAM, OTT server(UE-sided/Network-sided), UE  For b), as a) mentioned, there is a case to be added that no model transfer/delivery if the UE-side model is trained at UE in order to align with Q1, update b) as below:  gNB->UE, or OAM->UE, or OTT server->UE(UE-sided/Network-sided), no model transfer/delivery if the UE-side model is trained at UE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | a), b), d), e): some comments  c): ok |  | **a), b):** We share the same understandings as Ericsson. RAN2 can follow RAN1’s agreement and focus on UE/OTT server for UE-sided training for now.  **d), e):** In the beginning, it mentions that “For this email discussion, the outcome is expected to be used for discussions of possible solutions and specification impacts”. We think this email can focus on the possible entities for now and later we can discuss more (e.g. necessity, possible solutions).  **Our suggestion:**  **UE-side: UE monitors the performance~~, and may report to gNB~~**  **For e), gNB if monitoring resides at ~~UE or~~ gNB**  **For model training at CN**  How the CN related solutions support the use cases at PHY layer is unclear and needs to be clarified first.**So we are not sure whether CN should be discussed.** |
| Apple2 |  |  | **Addtional comments on latest table**  1. On d), e), we agree with Huawei that this table is just intended to focus on possible entries and no need to discuss/capture details of RAN1 agreement on monitoring. Thus, we suggest below change:  d):  UE ~~(UE monitors the performance, and may report to gNB)~~, gNB ~~(gNB monitors the performance)~~  e:  gNB ~~if monitoring resides at UE or gNB,~~  UE ~~if monitoring resides at UE~~  3. On b), we actually doubt why we need to capture this complex row. At least, we think it is not necessary to capture " or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at UE "=> does it bring any information?  4. On OTT server, we share same understanding as Ericsson/Huawei that it means UE OTT server. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell | (c) is ok |  | a) Model training:  - It might be good to clarify that the model training is offline.  - UE side model can be trained in UE, therefore, it might be good to include UE  - Although we may map UE for offline training function, we should be cautious since UE may not be the appropriate entity for model training due to computational resources limitation, proprietary characteristics. So, we should add additional note for UE  - According to RAN2#121 agreements, CN has been identified as a source for model delivery/transfer.  Thus, we suggest the following changes: Offline model training: UE, gNB, OAM, OTT server, CN  b) Model transfer/delivery  - We suggest adding ‘No model delivery/transfer’ option  - The entity CN is missing as agreed in RAN2#121 as well as pointed out by QC.  Thus, our suggestion to add: UE\*\*\*, gNB->UE, OAM->UE\*, UE OTT->UE\*\*, CN->UE\*  \*There might be no direct interface from OAM/CN->UE. So, this can be FFS. \*\* OTT can be NW or UE vendor server. So, the 3gpp impact is not clear.  \*\*\* No model delivery/transfer  d) Model/functionality monitoring  - We suggest to split functionality monitoring.  Thus our suggestion to add:  Model monitoring\*: UE, gNB  Functionality monitoring\*: gNB  \*Whether to add CN/OAM/OTT is not clear to us as this might increase latency or overhead.  e) Model/functionality control:  - We believe the model and functionality level control should be in separate row.  - It might be worth discussing if CN, OTT or OAM is involved in model/functionality control other than UE/gNB.  - While RAN2#121bis-e agreed to have UE initiated and gNB initiated, according to RAN1#110bis-e, RAN1 agreed that for UE sided model control, decision made by the NW can be NW initiated or UE initiated and decision made by the UE can be reported to NW, UE autonomous and may/may not report to NW. This is not reflected carefully.  Thus our suggestion to add:  Model control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback):  decision by NW (NW initiated): gNB  decision by NW (UE initiated) or  decision by UE (event triggered, reporting to NW) or  decision by UE (UE autonomous, reporting to NW): UE->gNB  decision by UE (UE autonomous): UE  Functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback):  gNB-initiated: gNB  UE-initiated: UE->gNB  Additional comments:  - A placeholder for model update, model fine-tuning, data transfer for model fine-tuning, training, monitoring would be good.  - Separate the rows to accommodate model based LCM and functionality based LCM.  - We should identify the entities which are within RAN2 scope.  - We should identify which mapping cannot be in Rel-18 scope. |
| LGE | (c), (d), (e) | (a), (b) | For cases (a) and (b), we can consider CN for training and model transfer/delivery at least for the offline training. Although the model is trained on the gNB, it can also be delivered to the CN, which subsequently transfers the model to the UE. (CN->UE)  Fine with current phrase for (c), (d) and (e).  For (e), to synchronize the model between two entities in a two-sided model, we prefer that one entity decides on model control. |
| Spreadtrum | All with comments |  | For a), we agree with other companies that **UE** should be included for model training. As for CN, we share the similar reason mentioned in Q1.  For b), Considering here the OTT server may be UE-side, b) can be modified as:  [FFS: gNB->UE, or OAM->UE], or **(UE-side)** OTT server->UE, or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at UE  For d), Suggest to align with RAN1 agreement and the previous description of Table 2.1-1.  **UE-side: UE monitors the performance metric(s) and may report to NW**  **NW-side: NW monitors the performance metric(s)**  For e), Considering UE may not perform model/functionality control in some cases. To make it clear, we suggest change it as:  gNB if monitoring resides at **gNB or receive report from UE**,  UE if monitoring resides at UE **and no report to NW**. |
| China Unicom | All |  | For a), on CN，we agree with majority that CN should not be involved for model training in this case. |
| Interdigital | a, c, d OK  b (with comment)  e (with comments) |  | b) in RAN1, so far no detailed agreement was made regarding model transfer for BM. However, since the intention of this table is to be used also for the UE side CSI prediction as recommended by the rapporteur (see 2.1.2), we are OK with the way it is captured now.  e) we agree with Qualcomm |
| Sharp | B,c,d,e,  a (with comments) |  | Model training at the UE should not be excluded. |
| Intel | All |  | 1. In our understanding, RAN2 agreement only focuses on where data collection may introduce specification impact. Hence, where model training is located cannot solely depend on RAN2 agreement in RAN2 #122 meeting. if model training is located at UE side, there’s no need for network to perform data collection for training data that are generated by UE, i.e. no specification impact. Though UE is not listed as termination for training data in the agreement, we agree with Oppo that model training at UE side still needs to be considered. 2. Agree with Oppo that model doesn’t need to be transfer if model training is located at UE.   d) a further update based on vivo’s version:  gNB (NW monitors the NW’s performance) or UE (UE monitors the UE’s performance and reports to Network) |
| Turkcell | All |  | For a) model training can be done also at UE. |
| Samsung | All |  | We are ok with the latest (updated) Table 2.2-1. |

#### **Summary of Q2:**

For bullet a), i.e. model training, the following comments are proposed:

* All companies agree that model training can reside at UE and OTT server. For OTT server, some companies (Apple, E///, HW, MTK, Spreadtrum) further indicate that it should be UE-side OTT server for UE-sided model.
* For model training at gNB and OAM, 2 companies (E///, HW) think that RAN2 can follow RAN1’s agreement to focus on UE/OTT server for now, and majority companies are fine with the updated table (i.e. FFS for gNB and OAM).
* For model training at CN, the comments are similar view to Q1, thus rapporteur suggests to add FFS for CN.

For bullet b), i.e. model transfer/delivery which is related to bullet a), whether CN can be entity for model transfer/delivery can be FFS for further discussion. For other parts in bullet b), majority companies are OK.

For bullet c), i.e. model inference, all companies are fine with this.

For bullet d), i.e. model/functionality monitoring:

* Majority companies are fine with this bullet.
* 2 companies (HW, Apple) think the table is intended to focus on possible entities and no need to capture details of RAN1 agreements on monitoring. Considering more companies prefer the current wording in table, Rapporteur suggest to keep it for now.
* One company (Nokia) suggests to split functionality monitoring from model monitoring.

For bullet e), i.e. model/functionality control, all companies agree that model/functionality control can be at gNB and UE, but have no consensus on the wording.

* Some companies (QC, E///, Apple, Interdigital) suggest to simplify the wording to “gNB and UE”, but other companies support the updated wording “gNB if monitoring resides at UE or gNB, UE if monitoring resides at UE” and think this can differentiate the three alternatives agreed by RAN1.

Based on the above comments, the mapping table for beam management with UE-side model can be updated as follows.

**Proposal 2: The Table 2 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for beam management with UE-side model.**

Table 2: The mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for beam management with UE-side model

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training(offline training) | UE-side OTT server, UE, [FFS: gNB, OAM, CN] |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | UE-side OTT server->UE, [FFS: gNB->UE, or OAM->UE, or CN->UE] |
| c) | Inference | UE |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | UE (UE monitors the performance, and may report to gNB), gNB (gNB monitors the performance) |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | gNB if monitoring resides at UE or gNB,  UE if monitoring resides at UE |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: For b), no model transfer/delivery is expected if the entity for model training and model inference is the same one.

Note 3: Whether/how OAM is to be invovled may need to consult RAN3, SA5.

Note 4: Whether/how CN is to be involved may need to consult SA2.

### 2.2.2 NW-side model

For beam management with NW-side model, model inference is naturally at gNB side. For model training, the model can be trained at gNB or OAM side, similarly to the mechanism studied in RAN3 AI for NG-RAN. If the model is trained at OAM side, model transfer/delivery is needed from OAM to gNB.

For model/functionality monitoring and control, gNB monitors the performance metric(s) and makes decision(s) of control is supported based on RAN1 agreements.

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#110bis Agreement**  For BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 with a network-side AI/ML model, study the NW-side model monitoring:   * NW monitors the performance metric(s) and makes decision(s) of model selection/activation/ deactivation/switching/ fallback operation |

The possible mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for beam management with a NW-side model is shown in the following table. For NW-side model, it seems that only data collection (e.g. for model training, inference, monitoring, control) has RAN2 impacts, and other LCM purposes can be up to NW implementation.

Table 2.2-2: The mapping of functions to physical entities for beam management with NW-side model

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training | gNB, OAM |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | OAM->gNB, or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at gNB |
| c) | Inference | gNB |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | gNB |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | gNB |

Note 1: For NW-sided model, only data collection part may be further discussed.

Note 2: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult SA5.

Q3: Do you agree the mapping of functions to physical entities for beam management with NW-side model in Table 2.2-2?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes for which bullet(s)** | **No for which bullet(s)** | **Comments** |
| Apple | a), b), c), d), e) | dataset transfer is missed | Similar to Q1/2, we think dataset transfer is missed. Thus, we suggest to add row f)  f): dataset transfer:   * For training: from gNB to OAM (if model trained in OAM) |
| OPPO | All with comments and modification |  | For bullet a, based on RAN2 agreements, OTT server is also one candidate:  For CSI enhancement and beam management use cases:  - For model training, training data can be generated by UE/gNB and terminated at gNB/OAM/OTT server.  So we just wonder why OTT server case is not included, my understanding is that this OTT server can be an operator trusted node to train network side model.  For bullet b, based on above comments for bullet a, we have the following suggestion:  OAM->gNB, OTT server to gNB, or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at gNB  [Rapp] We understand that the OTT server mentioned in RAN1/RAN2 means UE side OTT server, whether the OTT server can perform the training for gNB-side model and delivery directly to gNB needs more discussion. At this stage, we prefer to follow RAN3’s study direction, i.e. the gNB-side model can be trained at gNB or OAM. |
| Mavenir | a), b), c), d) , e) |  | We are ok with OPPO’ s suggestion about a) b) |
| vivo | All with comments on b) |  | b)  further clarified as:  No model transfer/delivery (if model training in gNB) or OAM to gNB (if model training in OAM) |
| Xiaomi | All |  |  |
| Mediatek | a),c),d),e) |  | Possible revision:  Model delivery: OAM->gNB, or  N/A if the model is trained at gNB |
| Lenovo | All, with comment |  | Ok to us, although it may not be upon RAN2 decision at the end where a gNB side model will be trained. |
| CATT | c), d), e)  and a), b) with comments |  | 1. We share the save view that OTT server should be included. So it can be revised as:   gNB, OAM, OTT server.   1. It can be revised as:   OAM->gNB, or N/A if the model is trained at gNB, OTT server->gNB |
| Qualcomm | c) | a) b) d) e) | For a, the CN and OTT server should be included.  For b, the model delivery from OTT server-> gNB, and CN-> gNB should be included.  For d, monitoring (at least long term) can be performed at the OAM.  For e) OAM can perform LCM for model running at gNB. |
| Ericsson | a) b) c) d) e) |  | For a), we prefer not including the OTT server, as commented by some companies above. It is not clear the role of it. Obviously the gNB/OAM can collect some data for the purpose of training and store such information in an OTT server. Whether/how to do that is obviously out of the scope of 3GPP/RAN2 and should not be discussed. |
| CMCC | All |  | For a), we prefer to follow RAN3 agreements that gNB-side model can be trained at gNB or OAM, and prefer not include OTT server or CN for model training. |
| ZTE | All |  | According to the comments from some companies above, we also think OTT server is not included in this use case since OTT server is from UE side, The model transfer must be via UE if OTT server deliver the model to gNB, however the model transfer from UE to gNB is not included in the RAN1 agreement for the NW sided model. |
| TCL | Yes for (c)(d)(e) but comments for (a)(b) |  | Similar with Q1 discussion.  For a), it may be revised as:  LMF, OTT server(UE-sided), UE  For b), it may be revised as:  LMF->UE, or OTT server(UE-sided) ->UE, no model transfer/delivery if the UE-side model is trained at UE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | a), b): some comments  c), d), e): ok |  | **a), b):** Usually the interaction between OAM and RAN is left to implementation, it is a bit unclear what aspects need to be considered here.  **Our suggestion:**  **For a), change OAM to [FFS: OAM]**  **For b), change OAM->gNB to [FFS: OAM->gNB]** |
| Apple2 |  |  | **Addtional comments on latest table**  1. On b), we actually doubt why we need to capture this complex row. At least, we don't need to capture "no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at gNB"  2. We prefer to keep OAM in a) and b). |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell (Sakira) | (c) is ok. For other functions, see details. |  | a) Model training:  - It might be good to clarify that the model training is offline.  - Although we may map gNB for offline training function, we should be cautious since gNB may not be the appropriate entity for model training due to computational resources limitation, proprietary characteristics. So, we should add additional note for gNB  - According to RAN2#121 agreements, CN has been identified as a source for model delivery/transfer.  - According to RAN2#122 agreements, OTT server can be a termination point for training data. Therefore, OTT server can be a potential candidate for training to avoid data forwarding overhead. Thus, we suggest the following changes: Offline model training: gNB, OAM, OTT server, CN  b) Model transfer/delivery  - The entity CN is missing as agreed in RAN2#121 as well as pointed out by QC.  Thus, our suggestion to add: gNB\*\*\*, OAM->gNB, NW OTT->gNB, CN->gNB  \*\*\* No model delivery/transfer  d) Model/functionality monitoring  - We suggest to split functionality monitoring.  Thus our suggestion to add:  Model monitoring\*: gNB  Functionality monitoring\*: gNB  \*Whether to add CN/OAM/OTT is not clear to us as this might increase latency or overhead.  e) Model/functionality control:  - We believe the model and functionality level control should be in separate row.  - It might be worth discussing if CN, OTT or OAM is involved in model/functionality control other than gNB.  Thus our suggestion to add:  Model control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback): gNB  Functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback): gNB  Additional comments:  - A placeholder for model update, model fine-tuning, data transfer for model fine-tuning, training, monitoring would be good.  - Separate the rows to accommodate model based LCM and functionality based LCM.  - We should identify the entities which are within RAN2 scope.  - We should identify which mapping cannot be in Rel-18 scope. |
| LGE | (c), (d), (e) | (a), (b) | We share a similar view with Nokia on (a) and (b) |
| Spreadtrum | All with some comments |  | For a), If (NW-side) OTT server exists, it should also be included for NW-side model training.  For b), FFS [(NW-side) OTT server->gNB] |
| China Unicom | All |  | We also support Rapp’s view that OTT server is from UE side, and CN should not be involved for model training in this case |
| Interdigital | All |  |  |
| Sharp |  |  | For a), we are ok to follow RAN3 agreements that gNB-side model can be trained at gNB or OAM. Additionally, CN maybe discussed and considered). |
| Intel | Agree |  |  |
| Turkcell | All |  | For a) and b) we can add OTT server. |
| Samsung | All |  | We are ok with the latest (updated) Table 2.2-2. |

#### **Summary of Q3:**

For bullet a), almost all companies agree to follow RAN3 agreement that gNB-side model can be trained at gNB or OAM, but there is no consensus on OTT server and CN:

* For gNB: All companies agree with this.
* For OAM: All but one (HW) companies are fine with this.
* For OTT server, 7 companies (OPPO, Mavenir, CATT, QC, Nokia, LGE, Turkcell) support to add OTT server, 13 companies (Apple, vivo, xiaomi, MTK, Lenovo, Ericsson, CMCC, ZTE, China Unicom, Interdigital, Sharp, Intel, Samsung) don’t support to involve OTT server, one company (Spreadtrum) thinks it is FFS depending on whether NW-side OTT server exists.
* For CN, 4 companies (QC, Nokia, LGE, Sharp) propose to consider CN for model training, but other companies does not support.
* Based on above comments, rapporteur suggests to add FFS for CN and OTT server.

For bullet b), the similar FFS can be added for CN and OTT server.

For bullet c), all companies are fine with gNB for model inference.

For bullet d) and e), all but two (QC, Nokia) companies agree with the current table. QC proposes to add OAM for monitoring and control, Nokia suggests to differentiate model and functionality. For now, rapporteur prefer to follow majority views.

Based on the above comments, the following proposal is proposed:

**Proposal 3: The Table 3 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for beam management with NW-side model.**

Table 3: The mapping of functions to physical entities for beam management with NW-side model

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training (offline training) | gNB, OAM, [FFS: CN, OTT server] |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | OAM->gNB, [FFS: CN->gNB, OTT server->gNB] |
| c) | Inference | gNB |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | gNB |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | gNB |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: For b), no model transfer/delivery is expected if the entity for model training and model inference is the same one.

Note 3: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA5.

Note 4: Whether/how CN is to be involved may need to consult SA2.

## 2.3 Positioning accuracy enhancement

RAN1 agreed the following cases for AI/ML-based positioning accuracy enhancement, which can be categorized to three model types, i.e. UE-side model, LMF-side model and gNB-side model.

* Case 1: UE-based positioning with UE-side model, direct AI/ML or AI/ML assisted positioning
* Case 2a: UE-assisted/LMF-based positioning with UE-side model, AI/ML assisted positioning
* Case 2b: UE-assisted/LMF-based positioning with LMF-side model, direct AI/ML positioning
* Case 3a: NG-RAN node assisted positioning with gNB-side model, AI/ML assisted positioning
* Case 3b: NG-RAN node assisted positioning with LMF-side model, direct AI/ML positioning

### 2.3.1 UE-side model

For case 1 and 2a with UE-side model, RAN2 assumed that training data can be generated by UE/gNB and terminated at LMF/OTT server. Thus, model training at LMF/OTT server is feasible. For model monitoring, at least UE and LMF can derive monitoring metric per RAN1 agreement. The decision of model control can be also made at least by UE or LMF.

|  |
| --- |
| **RAN1#112bis-e Agreement**  Regarding monitoring for AI/ML based positioning, at least the following entities are identified to derive monitoring metric   * UE at least for Case 1 and 2a (with UE-side model) * gNB at least for Case 3a (with gNB-side model) * LMF at least for Case 2b and 3b (with LMF-side model)   **RAN1#113 Agreement**  Regarding AI/ML model monitoring for AI/ML based positioning, the following entities are identified as candidates to derive monitoring metric in addition to entities from previous agreement   * LMF for Case 2a (with UE-side model) and Case 3a (with gNB-side model) at least when monitoring is based on provided ground truth label (or its approximation) |

The mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for case 1 and 2a with UE-side model is list in the following table.

Table 2.3-1: The mapping of functions to physical entities for positioning with UE-side model (case 1 and 2a)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Use case** | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training | LMF, OTT server, UE |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | LMF->UE, or OTT server->UE, or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at UE |
| c) | Inference | UE |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | UE, LMF |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | UE if monitoring resides at UE,  LMF if monitoring resides at UE or LMF |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed.

Note 2: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult SA5.

Note 3: Whether/how LMF is to be involved may need to consult SA2.

Q4: Do you agree the mapping of functions to physical entities for positioning with UE-side model (case 1 and 2a) in Table 2.3-1?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes for which bullet(s)** | **No for which bullet(s)** | **Comments** |
| Apple | a), b), c), d), e) | dataset transfer is missed | Similar to Q1, we think dataset transfer is missed. Thus, we suggest to add row f)  f): dataset Transfer:   * For training: from UE/PRU to OTT server (if model is trained in OTT server), or from UE/PRU to LMF (if model is trained in LMF). * For Monitoring: if LMF monitors, from UE to LMF.   Another issue is whether OAM can be used for training purpose (related to Note 2). We think it can be one alternative for UE-side model but open for discussion. In that case, we can update:  a) LMF, OTT server, OAM  b) LMF->UE, or OTT server->UE, or OAM->UE |
| OPPO | All |  |  |
| Mavenir | a), b), c), d), e) |  | We are ok with Apple’ s suggestion about a) b) |
| vivo | All with comments on a)b)d) |  | a)  See above in Q1, the OTT server can be clarified as ‘UE/OTT server’.  b)  Rephrase as:  For training at NW side: LMF->UE  For training at UE side: No model transfer/delivery (if model training in UE) or OTT server to UE (if model is trained in OTT server)  d)  Rephrase as:  LMF (NW monitors the performance) or UE (UE monitors the performance) |
| Xiaomi | All with comment on a and b |  | Seems OAM is excluded. No strong opinion, but we wonder why to exclude OAM training model. |
| Mediatek | c), d), e) |  | For bullet a) model training, same as Q1, the discussion concerns UE-sided OTT server.  For bullet b), We need to differentiate model delivery and model transfer  Possible revision:  [Model transfer: LMF->UE], or  Model delivery: UE-side OTT server->UE |
| Lenovo | All, with comment |  | Model training by UE itself should also be considered.  Also, would be good to clarify the intention of “Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed.” |
| CATT | All |  | 1. We think the training can also be performed by the UE, OAM. (UE is not excluded for model training based on RAN1 agreement, and whether OAM can be used for training for UE-side model can be discussed.)   May add OAM->UE. |
| Qualcomm | c) | a)b)d)e) | For a, the model training can happen within the CN at NWDAF, AS, AF, and others. There is no reason for excluding CN. Where model training can be performed should be left to vendor choice. Therefore, CN should be considered for model training.  For b, we have options 2a and 2b, where the model is transferred to the UE from the core network. Model training and storage can happen at different places. Therefore, mode transfer from CN-> UE should be included.  For d, we would like to wait for RAN1 progress, i.e., whether, how, and where monitoring is performed.  For e, based on RAN1#110bis-emeeting agreements below  -------------------  Agreement  For model selection, activation, deactivation, switching, and fallback at least for UE sided models and two-sided models, study the following mechanisms:   * Decision by the network   + Network-initiated   + UE-initiated, requested to the network * Decision by the UE   + Event-triggered as configured by the network, UE’s decision is reported to network   + UE-autonomous, UE’s decision is reported to the network   + UE-autonomous, UE’s decision is not reported to the network   FFS: for network sided models  FFS: other mechanisms  ------------------  We have a RAN1 agreement for this. The following are not required:  UE ~~if monitoring resides at UE~~,  LMF ~~if monitoring resides at UE or LMF~~ |
| Ericsson | a) -only UE-side OTT server  b) only OTT server->UE  c, d,  e (with comments) |  | For a), the UE-sided training can happen either in the UE-itself (UE should be added in the list as commented by some companies), or in the UE-side OTT server. However, it is not clear what is the benefit of considering the LMF or the CN for UE-side training. The training of UE-sided models depends on measurements of taken by the UE, which may be very UE vendor/hardware specific. Hence, it is not clear what would be the benefit of UE-sided training in the network (LMF). That would cause a large computational complexity and signalling overhead, which will ultimately end up in a poor trained model that may not improve the UE performances.  Regarding e), we do not need to specify at this stage when the gNB or the UE are in charge of the model/functionality control. |
| CMCC | All |  | For a), we understand that LMF is applicable for model training because it can collect data (e.g. measurements from UE) for training, but other CN entities is not suitable for model training. |
| ZTE | a,c,d,e | b | For b, it is not certain whether the model transfer between LMF to UE is supported, maybe in b we can add an FFS: LMF->UE(FFS) |
| TCL | Yes for (c)(d)(e) but comments for (a)(b) |  | Similar with Q1 discussion.  For a), it may be revised as:  LMF, OTT server(UE-sided), UE  For b), it may be revised as:  LMF->UE, or OTT server(UE-sided) ->UE, no model transfer/delivery if the UE-side model is trained at UE. |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | a), b), e): some comments  c), d): ok |  | **a), b):** Similar to our comments in section 2.2.1, we suggest of focus on UE/OTT server for UE-sided training for now.  **Our suggestion:**  **For a), change LMF to [FFS: LMF]**  **For b), change LMF->UE to [FFS: LMF->UE]**  **e):** Similar as our comments in section 2.2.1, we think this email can focus on the possible entities for now.  **Our suggestion:**  LMF if monitoring resides at ~~UE or~~ LMF |
| Apple2 |  |  | **Addtional comments on latest table**  1. On b), we actually doubt why we need to capture this complex row. At least, we don't need to capture " or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at UE"  2. On e), similarly we suggest below change:  UE ~~if monitoring resides at UE,~~  LMF ~~if monitoring resides at UE or LMF~~ |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell (Sakira) | (c) is ok. For other functions, see details. |  | **a) Model training:**  - It might be good to clarify that the model training is offline.  - Although we may map UE, and LMF to the offline training function, we should be cautious since UE, and LMF may not be the appropriate entities for model training due to limitations in computational resources, or proprietary characteristics. So, we should add an additional note for UE, and LMF.  Thus, we suggest the following changes: Offline model training: UE(PRU), OTT server, LMF  **b) Model transfer/delivery**  - We may map to UE but as mentioned earlier that there could be challenges in offline training in UE.  - Suggest adding ‘No model transfer/delivery’ option  Thus, our suggestion to add: UE/PRU\*\*\*, LMF->UE/PRU, UE OTT server->UE/PRU  \*\*\* No model delivery/transfer  d) Model/functionality monitoring  - We suggest treating functionality and model monitoring separately.  Thus, it is our suggestion to add:  Model monitoring\*: UE, LMF  Functionality monitoring\*: LMF  \*Whether to add OAM/OTT is not clear to us as this might increase latency or overhead.  **e) Model/functionality control:**  - We believe the model and functionality level control should be in separate rows.  - It might be worth discussing if OTT or OAM are also involved in model/functionality control.  - While RAN2#121bis-e agreed to have UE initiated and LMF initiated control, according to RAN1#110bis-e, RAN1 agreed that for UE sided model control, a decision made by the NW can be NW initiated or UE-initiated and a decision made by the UE can optionally be reported to NW. For UE-autonomous control, the decision might or might not be reported to the NW. This is not reflected carefully.  Thus, it is our suggestion to add:  Model control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback):   * decision by NW (NW initiated): LMF * decision by NW (UE initiated) or * decision by UE (event triggered, reported to NW) or * decision by UE (UE-autonomous, reported to NW): UE->LMF * decision by UE (UE autonomous): UE (not reported to the network)   Functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback):   * LMF-initiated: LMF * UE-initiated: UE->LMF   Additional comments:  - A placeholder for model update, model fine-tuning, data transfer for model fine-tuning, training, monitoring would be good.  - Separate the rows to accommodate model based LCM and functionality based LCM.  Additional comments:  - A placeholder for model update, model fine-tuning, data transfer for model fine-tuning, training, monitoring would be good.  - Separate the rows to accommodate model based LCM and functionality based LCM.  - We should identify the entities which are within RAN2 scope.  - We should identify which mapping cannot be in Rel-18 scope. |
| Spreadtrum | All with comments and modifications |  | For a), UE can be considered for UE-side model training. And we also need response from SA2 on whether LMF can do model training.  For b) If model transfer/delivery is not supported, it should be revised. And OTT server may be UE-side.  **FFS[LMF->UE], or (UE-side) OTT server->UE**, or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at UE.  For d) To align with RAN1 agreements and the previous description of Model/functionality monitoring of the table, it may be revised as:  **At least:**  UE-side: UE monitoring performance;  NW-side: LMF monitoring performance  For e), From our side, to make the hybrid mode clear, it should be:  UE if monitoring resides at UE and no report to NW;  LMF if monitoring resides at LMF or receives report from UE. |
| Interdigital | All , with some comments to a,b |  | We agree in general that the rapporteur’s proposed table is a good starting point. Some comments:   * We agree with the rapporteur’s addition to b) , “no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at the UE” * (a, b) We agree with the comments from other companies above OAM is also applicable |
| Sharp | All with comment |  | Model training by the UE should not be excluded.  Also, the intention to exclude CN and OAM can be clarified.  Intention of Note 1 can also be clarified. |
| Intel | All with comment |  | Agree with Apple’s update on OAM and Vivo’s update. |
| Turkcell | All |  |  |
| Samsung | All |  | We are ok with the latest (updated) Table 2.3-1. |

#### **Summary of Q4:**

For bullet a), the following entities are discussed:

* UE and OTT server: All companies agree with this, and some companies suggest to clarify it should be UE-sided OTT server.
* LMF: 2 companies (E///, HW) suggest to focus on UE/OTT server for now.
* OAM: 5 companies (Apple, Mavenir, CATT, Interdigital, Intel) support to add OAM.
* CN: 4 companies (QC, Nokia, LGE, Sharp) propose to consider CN for model training, but other companies does not support.
* Based on above comments, rapporteur suggests to add FFS for CN and OAM.

For bullet b), the similar FFS can be added for CN and OAM. In addition, 3 companies (ZTE, HW, spreadtrum) prefer to keep it FFS considering it is not sure whether model transfer between LMF and UE.

For bullet c), all companies are fine with UE for model inference.

For bullet d), all but three companies (QC, Nokia, Spreadtrum) agree with the current table. QC would like to wait for RAN1 progress on monitoring, Nokia suggests to differentiate model monitoring and functionality monitoring, Spreadtrum suggests to revise as “UE-side: UE monitoring performance; NW-side: LMF monitoring performance”. For now, rapporteur prefer to keep the current wording to follow majority views.

For bullet e), majority companies are fine but 3 companies (QC, E///, Apple) prefer to simplify it as “UE, LMF”, one company (Nokia) suggests to differentiate model control and functionality control.

Based on the above comments, the mapping table for positioning with UE-side model (case 1 and 2a) can be updated as follows:

**Proposal 4: The Table 4 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for positioning with UE-side model (case 1 and 2a).**

Table 4: The mapping of functions to physical entities for positioning with UE-side model (case 1 and 2a)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Use case** | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training (offline training) | UE-side OTT server, UE, [FFS: LMF, OAM, CN] |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | UE-side OTT server->UE, [FFS: LMF->UE, OAM->UE, CN->UE] |
| c) | Inference | UE |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | UE, LMF |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | UE if monitoring resides at UE,  LMF if monitoring resides at UE or LMF |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: For b), no model transfer/delivery is expected if the entity for model training and model inference is the same one.

Note 3: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA5.

Note 4: Whether/how CN/LMF is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA2.

### 2.3.2 LMF-side model

For case 2b and 3b with LMF-side model, it is straightforward that model training and inference are both at LMF side. In this case, model transfer/delivery is not needed. For monitoring and control, RAN1 agreed that at least LMF can derive monitoring metric and make decisions of control.

The mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for case 2b and 3b with LMF-side model is list in the following table. For LMF-side model, it seems that only data collection (e.g. for model training, inference, monitoring, control) has spec impacts, and other LCM purposes can be up to NW implementation.

Table 2.3-2: The mapping of functions to entities for positioning with LMF-side model (case 2b and 3b)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training | LMF |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | N/A |
| c) | Inference | LMF |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | LMF |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | LMF |

Note 1: For LMF-side model, only data collection part may be further discussed.

Note 2: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult SA5.

Note 3: Whether/how LMF is to be involved may need to consult SA2.

Q5: Do you agree the mapping of functions to physical entities for positioning with LMF-sided model (case 2b and 3b) in Table 2.3-2?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes for which bullet(s)** | **No for which bullet(s)** | **Comments** |
| Apple | a), b), c), d), e) | dataset transfer is missed | Similar to Q1, we think dataset transfer is missed. Thus, we suggest to add row f)  f): dataset transfer:   * For training: from UE/PRU to LMF (case 2b), from gNB to LMF (case 3b). * For Inferecne: from UE/PRU to LMF (case 2b), from gNB to LMF (case 3b). * For Monitoring: from UE/PRU to LMF (case 2b), from gNB to LMF (case 3b).   Another issue is whether OAM can be used for training purpose (related to Note 2). We think it may not a good solution for LMF-sided model because there seems no interface between LMF and OAM. If majority also think it can't, Note 2 can be removed. |
| OPPO | All |  |  |
| Mavenir | All |  |  |
| vivo | All |  |  |
| Xiaomi | All with comment on a and b |  | Seems OAM is excluded. No strong opinion, but we wonder why to exclude OAM training model. |
| Mediatek | all |  |  |
| Lenovo | All |  | OK to us, although it may not be upon RAN2 decision at the end where a LMF side model is trained. |
| CATT | All |  | 1. We think the training can also be performed by the OTT server, OAM; 2. May add OTT server ->LMF, OAM->LMF,   For d) and e), the monitoring entity or the Model/functionality control entity can also be: UE (for case 2b) or gNB (for case 3b). |
| Qualcomm | c)d)e) | a)b) | For a, OTT server and CN should be included as model training entities.  For b, add other CN entities ->LMF |
| Ericsson | a,b,c,d,e |  | For a) no need to involve OTT server or CN here. If the OTT server is used for storing some of the training information it can be left to implementation. That does not impact in any way the 3GPP/RAN2 specification work. |
| CMCC | All |  | For a), we share the similar view with Ericsson. |
| ZTE | All |  |  |
| TCL | Yes for (c)(d)(e) but comments for (a)(b) |  | Share similar views with CATT |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | All |  | For a), we share the similar view with Ericsson. |
| Apple2 |  |  | **Addtional comments on latest table**  1. On a), we share similar view as Ericsson  2. Note 2 can be removed because no OAM is mentioned in this table. |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell (Sakira) | (c) is ok. For other functions, see details. |  | **a) Model training:**  - It might be good to clarify that the model training is offline.  - Although we may map LMF to the offline training function, we should be cautious since LMF may not be the appropriate entity for model training due to a limitation in computational resources or proprietary characteristics. So, we should add additional note for LMF.  - It might be useful to add other entities, such as OTT  Thus, we suggest the following changes: Offline model training: OTT server\*, LMF  \*Whether the OTT server belongs to LMF vendor is not clear. This is out of scope of RAN2  **b) Model transfer/delivery**  - We may map to only LMF but as mentioned earlier that there could be challenges in offline training in LMF. Therefore, we suggest adding OTT. However this is out of scope of RAN2.  Thus, it is our suggestion to add: LMF\*\*\*, OTT server->LMF  \*\*\* No model delivery/transfer  **d) Model/functionality monitoring**  - We suggest treating functionality and model monitoring separately.  Thus, it is our suggestion to add:  Model monitoring: LMF  Functionality monitoring: LMF  **e) Model/functionality control:**  - We believe the model and functionality level control should be treated in separate rows.  - It might be worth discussing whether CN, OTT or OAM is involved in model and functionality control.  Thus, it is our suggestion to add:  Model control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback): LMF  Functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback): LMF  Additional comments:  - A placeholder for model update, model fine-tuning, data transfer for model fine-tuning, training, monitoring would be useful.  - Separate the rows to accommodate model-based LCM and functionality based LCM.  - We should identify the entities which are within RAN2 scope (for example, a, b, and e are out of RAN2 scope).  - We should identify which mapping cannot be in Rel-18 scope. |
| Spreadtrum | All |  | With no strong view. Need response from SA2 on whether LMF can do model training. |
| China Unicom | All |  |  |
| Interdigital | All |  |  |
| Sharp | All |  |  |
| Intel | All |  |  |
| Turkcell | All |  |  |
| Samsung | All |  |  |

#### **Summary of Q5:**

17 out of 22 companies agree with all bullets in Table 2.3-2.

In addition, 3 companies(CATT, Nokia, TCL) propose to add OTT server for model training and model transfer/delivery, 2 companies (CATT, TCL) propose to add OAM but one company (Xiaomi) has no strong view on this, one company (QC) propose to add other CN entities.

Rapporteur suggests to follow majority view at this stage and understands that the main discussion on LMF-side model should be in SA2 scope.

**Proposal 5: The Table 5 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for positioning with LMF-side model (case 2b and 3b).**

Table 5: The mapping of functions to entities for positioning with LMF-side model (case 2b and 3b)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training | LMF |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | N/A |
| c) | Inference | LMF |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | LMF |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | LMF |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: Whether/how LMF is to be involved may need to consult SA2.

### 2.3.3 gNB-side model

For case 3a with gNB-side model, model training can reside at gNB, OAM or LMF side. If model is not trained at gNB side, model transfer/delivery is needed. For monitoring, gNB and LMF can derive monitoring metric based on RAN1 agreements. For model/functionality control, it is feasible that gNB or LMF makes decisions based on monitoring metric.

The mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for case 3a with gNB-side model is list in the following table. For gNB-side model, it seems that only data collection (e.g. for model training, inference, monitoring, control) has spec impacts, and other LCM purposes can be up to NW implementation.

Table 2.3-3: The mapping of AI/ML functions to entities for positioning with gNB-side model (case 3a)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Use case** | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training | gNB, OAM, LMF |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | LMF-> gNB, or OAM->gNB, or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at gNB |
| c) | Inference | gNB |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | gNB, LMF |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | gNB, LMF |

Note 1: For gNB-side model, only data collection part may be further discussed.

Note 2: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult SA5.

Note 3: Whether/how LMF is to be involved may need to consult SA2.

Q6: Do you agree the mapping of functions to physical entities for positioning with gNB-side model (case 3a) in Table 2.3-3?

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes for which bullet(s)** | **No for which bullet(s)** | **Comments** |
| Apple | a), b), c), d), e) | dataset transfer is missed | Similar to Q1, we think dataset transfer is missed. Thus, we suggest to add row f)  f): dataset transfer:   * For training: from gNB to OAM (if model is trained in OAM), from gNB to LMF (if model is trained in LMF) * For Monitoring: from gNB to LMF (if LMF performs monitoring). |
| OPPO | All |  |  |
| Mavenir | All |  |  |
| vivo | All |  |  |
| Xiaomi | All |  |  |
| Mediatek | All |  |  |
| Lenovo | All |  | OK to us, although it may not be upon RAN2 decision at the end where a gNB side model is trained. |
| CATT | All |  | 1. We think the training can also be performed by the OTT server;   May add OTT server->gNB. |
| Qualcomm | c) d) e) | a) b) | For a, OTT server and CN should be included as model training entities.  For b), add CN->gNB |
| Ericsson | a) only OAM, gNB  b) only OAM->gNB  c), d), e) |  | For a), b), it is not clear why the LMF should be involved in the gNB-side model. Specification impact should be also evaluated. |
| CMCC | All |  |  |
| ZTE | All |  |  |
| TCL | Yes for (c)(d)(e) but comments for (a)(b) |  | General fine with us, but it make us confused , why preclude OTT server? We share same comments as Q1,  For a) gNB, OAM, LMF, OTT server(UE-sided )  For b) add OTT server(UE-sided )->gNB case, |
| Huawei, HiSilicon | a), b): some comments  c), d), e): ok |  | **a), b):** Usually the interaction between OAM and RAN is left to implementation, it is a bit unclear what aspects need to be considered here.  **Our suggestion:**  **For a), change OAM to [FFS: OAM]**  **For b), change OAM->gNB to [FFS: OAM->gNB]** |
| Apple2 |  |  | **Addtional comments on latest table**  1. On a), we prefer to keep OAM  2. On b), we actually doubt why we need to capture this complex row. At least, we don't need to capture " or no model transfer/delivery if the model is trained at gNB" |
| Nokia, Nokia Shanghai Bell (Sakira) | (c) is ok. For other functions, see details. |  | **a) Model training:**  - Clarify that the model training is offline.  - Although we may map gNB and LMF to the offline training function, we should be cautious since gNB and LMF may not be the appropriate entities for model training due to limitations in computational resources, and proprietary characteristics. So, we should add an additional note for gNB and LMF.  - Entities such as OTT or CN could be involved.  Thus, we suggest the following changes: Offline model training: gNB, OAM, OTT server, LMF, CN  **b) Model transfer/delivery**  Add the following mappings to the list: gNB\*\*, CN->gNB, OTT->gNB  \*\*No model transfer/delivery  **d) Model/functionality monitoring**  We suggest treating functionality and model monitoring separately. Therefore, the following should be added:   * Model monitoring: LMF, gNB, OAM * Functionality monitoring: LMF, gNB, OAM   **e) Model/functionality control:**  We believe functionality and model level control should be treated in separate rows.  It might be worth discussing whether CN, OTT or OAM are involved in functionality and model control.  Thus, our suggestion to add:  Model control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback): gNB, LMF  Functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback): gNB, LMF  Additional comments:  - A placeholder for model update, model fine-tuning, data transfer for model fine-tuning, training, monitoring would be useful.  - Separate the rows to accommodate model-based LCM and functionality-based LCM. |
| Spreadtrum | All with comments |  | For a), Need response from SA2 on whether LMF can perform model training.  For b) If model transfer/delivery is not supported. There should be **FFS[LMF->gNB]** |
| China Unicom | All |  |  |
| Interdigital | All |  |  |
| Sharp | All |  |  |
| Intel | All |  |  |
| Turkcell | All |  |  |
| Samsung | All |  | We are ok with the latest (updated) Table 2.3-3. |

#### Summary of Q6:

16 out of 22 companies agree with all bullets in Table 2.3-3.

In addition, 4 companies (CATT, QC, Nokia, TCL) propose to add OTT server for model training and model transfer/delivery, 2 companies (QC, Nokia) propose to add other CN entities, HW suggests to change OAM to [FFS: OAM], E/// thinks it is not clear whether LMF can be involved for model training.

Rapporteur suggests to follow majority view at this stage and other possible entities can be further discussed.

**Proposal 6: The Table 6 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for positioning with gNB-side model (case 3a).**

Table 6: The mapping of AI/ML functions to entities for positioning with gNB-side model (case 3a)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Use case** | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training (offline training) | gNB, OAM, [FFS: LMF] |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | OAM->gNB, [FFS: LMF->gNB] |
| c) | Inference | gNB |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | gNB, [FFS: LMF] |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | gNB, [FFS: LMF] |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: For b), no model transfer/delivery is expected if the entity for model training and model inference is the same one.

Note 3: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA5.

Note 4: Whether/how LMF is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA2.

# 3 Conclusion

Proposals for agreements:

***For CSI feedback enhancement:***

**Proposal 1: The Table 1 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for CSI compression with two-sided model.**

Table 1: The mapping of functions to physical entities for CSI compression with two-sided model

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training(offline training) | gNB, OAM, OTT server, UE, [FFS: CN] |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | For training Type 1: gNB->UE, or OAM->gNB&UE, or OTT server->gNB&UE, or UE->gNB, [FFS: CN->gNB&UE]  For training Type 3:   * For UE part of two-sided model: OTT server->UE, [FFS: CN->UE]; * For NW part of two-sided model: OAM->gNB, [FFS: CN->gNB]; |
| c) | Inference | NW part of two-sided model: gNB  UE part of two-sided model: UE |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | NW-side: NW monitors the performance  UE-side: UE monitors the performance and may report to NW |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, updating, fallback) | gNB, [FFS: UE] |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: For b), no model transfer/delivery is expected if the entity for model training and model inference is the same one.

Note 3: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA5.

Note 4: Whether/how CN is to be involved may need to consult SA2.

***For beam management:***

**Proposal 2: The Table 2 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for beam management with UE-side model.**

Table 2: The mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for beam management with UE-side model

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training(offline training) | UE-side OTT server, UE, [FFS: gNB, OAM, CN] |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | UE-side OTT server->UE, [FFS: gNB->UE, or OAM->UE, or CN->UE] |
| c) | Inference | UE |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | UE (UE monitors the performance, and may report to gNB), gNB (gNB monitors the performance) |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | gNB if monitoring resides at UE or gNB,  UE if monitoring resides at UE |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: For b), no model transfer/delivery is expected if the entity for model training and model inference is the same one.

Note 3: Whether/how OAM is to be invovled may need to consult RAN3, SA5.

Note 4: Whether/how CN is to be involved may need to consult SA2.

**Proposal 3: The Table 3 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for beam management with NW-side model.**

Table 3: The mapping of functions to physical entities for beam management with NW-side model

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training (offline training) | gNB, OAM, [FFS: CN, OTT server] |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | OAM->gNB, [FFS: CN->gNB, OTT server->gNB] |
| c) | Inference | gNB |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | gNB |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | gNB |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: For b), no model transfer/delivery is expected if the entity for model training and model inference is the same one.

Note 3: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA5.

Note 4: Whether/how CN is to be involved may need to consult SA2.

***For Positioning accuracy enhancement:***

**Proposal 4: The Table 4 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for positioning with UE-side model (case 1 and 2a).**

Table 4: The mapping of functions to physical entities for positioning with UE-side model (case 1 and 2a)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Use case** | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training (offline training) | UE-side OTT server, UE, [FFS: LMF, OAM, CN] |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | UE-side OTT server->UE, [FFS: LMF->UE, OAM->UE, CN->UE] |
| c) | Inference | UE |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | UE, LMF |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | UE if monitoring resides at UE,  LMF if monitoring resides at UE or LMF |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: For b), no model transfer/delivery is expected if the entity for model training and model inference is the same one.

Note 3: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA5.

Note 4: Whether/how CN/LMF is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA2.

**Proposal 5: The Table 5 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for positioning with LMF-side model (case 2b and 3b).**

Table 5: The mapping of functions to entities for positioning with LMF-side model (case 2b and 3b)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training (offline training) | LMF |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | N/A |
| c) | Inference | LMF |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | LMF |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | LMF |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: Whether/how LMF is to be involved may need to consult SA2.

**Proposal 6: The Table 6 can be used as starting point for discussion on mapping of AI/ML functions to physical entities for positioning with gNB-side model (case 3a).**

Table 6: The mapping of AI/ML functions to entities for positioning with gNB-side model (case 3a)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Use case** | **AL/ML functions (if applicable)** | **Mapped entities** |
| a) | Model training (offline training) | gNB, OAM, [FFS: LMF] |
| b) | Model transfer/delivery | OAM->gNB, [FFS: LMF->gNB] |
| c) | Inference | gNB |
| d) | Model/functionality monitoring | gNB, [FFS: LMF] |
| e) | Model/functionality control (selection, (de)activation, switching, fallback) | gNB, [FFS: LMF] |

Note 1: For a), only data collection part may be further discussed, how to perform the model training is up to implementation.

Note 2: For b), no model transfer/delivery is expected if the entity for model training and model inference is the same one.

Note 3: Whether/how OAM is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA5.

Note 4: Whether/how LMF is to be involved may need to consult RAN3, SA2.
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