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# Introduction

The following email discussion is re-triggered to collect open issues on AI for Air Interface Feature TS38300 Stage 2 CR:

\* **[POST131][025][AI PHY] 38.300 (Vivo)**

  Intended outcome: Agree to final CR and merge RAN3 CR

     Deadline:  Sept 19th

Companies are invited to provide feedback on open issue list by: **Sept. 19th 00:00 UTC**.

# Open issues

Companies are invited to describe any identified open issues based on latest TS 38300 CR [1].

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue-num (Company)** | **Identified open issues** | **Suggested change** | **Rapp comment** |
| Issue-x(vivo) | The description of issue xxx | This change xxx | Agree, ,,, |
| Issue – 1 (Lenovo) | [Terminology Alignment] There is a mix use of “NW-side model” and “gNB-side model”. Although the meanings of them are the same, considering LMF is not in the context. | Since in AIML-based positioning it has to be “gNB-side model” to differ from “LMF-side model”, we suggest to use “gNB-side model” when possible. “NW-side model” can be interpreted in a generic way including model deployed in CN. |  |
| Issue – 2 (Lenovo) | [Terminology Alignment]  As raised also over email, we have been using "buffer" during our WI discussion. On the other hand, when it comes to spec terminology w.r.t logging, we notice the term "memory" is actually used in MDT/QoE description at least in stage 3 331 and 306. | We honestly believe “memory” is the most precise term and aligned with the term used for QoE and MDT.  It is a common question to also 38.331 and 38.306 CR. |  |
| Issue – 3 (Nokia) | Abbreviation of AI/ML is missing in Clause 3.1 | Clause 3.1 should add the abbreviation:  AI/ML Artificial Intelligence/Machine Learning  Coverpage should include 3.1 in *clauses affected* |  |
| Issue – 4 (Nokia) | [Terminology alignment of ‘inference’ vs ‘prediction’]  We observed the term ’prediction’ is used in TS 38.331 while in TS 38.300 uses ‘inference’. For example,  a) In TS 38.300: ‘inference configuration’  In TS 38.331: ‘prediction configuration’ b) In TS 38.300: ‘Inference related parameters’  In TS 38.331: ‘prediction related parameters’ | The impact is in the whole document and to replace ‘inference configuration’ with ‘prediction configuration’ and ‘inference related parameters’ with ‘prediction related parameters’. |  |
| Issue – 5 (Nokia) | In clause X.Y.2.3 and Figure X.Y.2.3-1 Step 1 and Step 2 are unnecessary. Note that,  note that, the indication of UE capability is already well captured in TS 38.300 in clause 14  *The UE capabilities in NR rely on a hierarchical structure where each capability parameter is defined per UE, per duplex mode (FDD/TDD), per frequency range (FR1/FR2), per band, per band combinations, … as the UE may support different functionalities depending on those (see TS 38.306 [11]).* | We suggest to remove Step 1 and Step 2 from Clause X.Y.2.3 and Figure X.Y.2.3-1  That is,  ~~1. The network inquires about the UE capability information.~~  ~~2. The UE indicates its supported functionalities to the network via~~ *~~UECapabilityInformation~~* ~~message.~~ |  |
| Issue – 6 (Nokia) | [Use of stage 3 parameters]  In clause X.Y.2.3, Step 3 contains stage 3 parameter ‘*OtherConfig*’ We suggest to remove to have a clear separation between Stage-2 and Stage-3.. | We suggest to remove ‘OtherConfig’ in Step 3 of Clause X.Y.2.3  3. The network may provide inference configuration with NW-side additional conditions (e.g., associated ID) to UE via CSI report configuration or inference related parameters configuration ~~via~~ *~~OtherConfig~~*. |  |
| Issue – 7 (Nokia) | [Consideration of latest agreements in Step 7 of Clause X.Y.2.3]  In accordance to the latest agreement in RAN2#131, UE can report the updates of applicability reporting via UAI. Therefore, the first sentence in the Step 7 should be updated. Moreover, we suggest to remove the Stage-3 parameter.  **Impacted content:**  7. When the network enables applicability reporting via *OtherConfig*, and applicability of the functionality changes, the UE can report updated functionality applicability status in *UEAssistanceInformation* message. When an activated AI/ML functionality becomes inapplicable, the UE does not autonomously deactivate it, but the UE indicates to the network the change in the applicability. Upon reception of UE indication of the functionality becoming inapplicable, the network should deactivate or release this activated functionality.  **RAN2#131 agreements**   1. RAN2#131 agreements  3 Include RAN2 feature ‘UE can provide update of applicability reporting via UAI’ as part of RAN1 FGs (e.g., 58-0-1 and/or FG 58-1-2/3/4/5, the details of those feature group depend on RAN1 progress) once implemented. 2. 4 Introduce two conditional mandatory capabilities (with signaling) for AI/ML based BM Option A and Option B, if UE supports FG58-0-1 and/or FG58-1-2/3/4/5 (the details of those feature group depend on RAN1 progress). 3. 5 Include RAN2 feature ‘providing UE preferred configuration for UE-side data collection’ as part of RAN1 FG58-1-7/FG58-3-4 (once implemented). 4. 6 UAI is mandatory for both Option A and B | Proposed change:  7: **UE can report changes of applicability of AI/ML functionality via *UEAssistanceInformation* message.** When an activated AI/ML functionality becomes inapplicable, the UE does not autonomously deactivate it, but the UE indicates to the network the change in the applicability. Upon reception of UE indication of the functionality becoming inapplicable, the network should deactivate or release this activated functionality. |  |
| Issue – 8 (Nokia) | [Terminology alignment issue with TS 38.331]  The use of the word ‘functionality applicability’ is not consistent with the ‘information related to the applicability configurations subject to the applicability determination procedure’ in TS 38.331.  The word ‘functionality applicability’ are captured in the current TS 38.300 as follows:  **a) Clause 7.9**  - If its AI/ML functionality applicability status changes.  **b) Clause X.Y.2.3 Applicability Reporting**  <text omitted>  5. The UE reports its functionality applicability in RRCReconfigurationComplete message.  **c) Figure X.Y.2.3**  Step 4 and Step between Step 6 and Step 7 contain ‘applicability functionality’ | Proposed changes:  **a) Clause 7.9**  - If its ~~functionality applicability~~ **applicability status of AI/ML functionality** changes.  **b) Clause X.Y.2.3 Applicability Reporting**  <text omitted>  5. The UE reports its ~~functionality applicability~~  **applicability status of AI/ML functionality** in *RRCReconfigurationComplete* message.  **c) Figure X.Y.2.3**  Step 4 and Step between Step 6 and Step 7 contain ‘applicability functionality’ |  |
| Issue – 9 (ZTE) | [Term alignment]  It is observed that the term ‘supported AI/ML functionality’ has defined in subclause as below:  **Supported AI/ML functionality:** AI/ML functionality which can be indicated by using UE capability information.  However, this term is never used in the main text | Suggestion#1: Add a bracket to include AI/ML on definition from subclause 3.2  **Supported (AI/ML) functionality:** AI/ML functionality which can be indicated by using UE capability information.  Suggestion#2: modify the step 2 for fig.x.y.2.3-1 as below:  2. The UE indicates its supported AI/ML functionalities to the network via *UECapabilityInformation* message. |  |
| Issue -10 (ZTE) | [Feature Description Reallocation]  It is observed that the description regarding the following UE side data collection is captured in the X.Y.2.2 which is under the subclause X.Y.2 (AI/ML beam management)  **X.Y.2.2 Data Collection for Offline Model Training**  /omit for short/  For UE-side data collection for UE-side model training, the network can configure whether UE is allowed to initiate a request for data collection configuration (e.g., UE’s preference to start or to stop data collection, preferred configuration from a list of candidate configurations provided by network). The network can also provide UE with data collection configuration or release the data collection configuration at any point in time, with or without UE request.  however, the UE side data collection is also supported to the CSI prediction which is in Subclause X.Y.3 | Suggest to upgrade the level of subclause of data collection for offline model training so that the subclause for data collection is the same level as X.Y.2, X.Y.3..  Upgrading the level of subclause for data collection also benefits the forward compatibility, that means, this subclause can be extended for the NW side data collection and/or UE side data collection of the future use case (i.e. AI/ML mobility) |  |

Summary:

# Conclusion

In this contribution, we have the following proposals/open issue list:
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