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# 1 Introduction

**CB: # AIRAN5\_MoblitySolution**

**- Discuss the solution, input/output, standard impacts on the Load Balancing**

**- Merging any agreement parts; provide TP if agreeable**

**- Capture agreements and open issues**

(CMCC - moderator)

Summary of offline disc in [R3-214223](file:///C:\Users\zhangxy\Downloads\Inbox\R3-214223.zip)

The deadline for the first phase of the email discussion is Friday 6 pm UTC.

# 2 For the Chairman’s Notes

**To be added after email discussion.**

# 3 Discussion

In last RAN3 #112e meeting, RAN3 agreed the use case description of mobility, and it was further agreed that: Mobility aspects of SON that can be enhanced by the use of AI/ML include

* Reduction of the probability of unintended events
* UE Location/Mobility/Performance prediction
* Traffic Steering

The first round of the CB will be structed as follows:

* Solutions and AI/ML functionality location
* Inputs required for UE trajectory prediction
* Outputs generated from AI-based mobility prediction model
* Feedback/ Rewarding information
* New events

## 3.1 Solutions and AI/ML functionality location

In contribution 3715, AI/ML based mobility optimization is classified into two types:

* Type 1 AI/ML-assisted mobility optimization: Handover strategy is generated by conventional method based on the predicted trajectory information, where the predicted trajectory information is generated by AI/ML model.
* Type 2 AI/ML-generated mobility optimization: Handover strategy is generated by AI/ML model based on the UE and node information.

**Q1: Companies are invited to provide views on whether to classify the solutions into AI/ML-assisted mobility optimization and AI/ML-generated mobility optimization?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Reasons/Comments/Suggestions** |
| Nokia | No | We don’t see the need why we need to classify the mobility solution in these two types. This is just algorithm-specific. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Several options are proposed regarding where the AI/ML functionality may be placed:

1. Both the training function and the inference function are deployed in LMF (3471)
2. Both the training function and the inference function are deployed in OAM (3542)
3. The training function is deployed in OAM, while the inference function resides within the RAN node (3542, 3724, 3759, 4113, 4130)
4. Both the training function and the inference function reside within the RAN node (3542, 3759)

**Q2: Companies are invited to provide views on which of the above options they prefer:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1-4** | **Reasons/Comments/Suggestions** |
| Nokia | 2,3,4 | In our view option 1) should not be in the scope of this SI. The rest of the options are acceptable options for the study with different pros and cons each. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Furthermore, for CU-DU split scenario, following alternatives are proposed:

1. CU is the suitable node for AI model to reside in terms of mobility optimization (3715, 3895, 3780)
2. ML training is located in CU-CP or OAM, and ML inference function is located in CU-CP (3724)
3. The AI/ML component can be located in the gNB-DU, in case of beam-based AI/ML mobility solutions (3895)

**Q3: Companies are invited to provide views on which of the above options they prefer for CU-DU split:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Option 1-3** | **Reasons/Comments/Suggestions** |
| Nokia | 1,2,3 | All the options can be considered for the study |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.2 Input data

Following information is proposed to be the input data for mobility prediction in many papers (3648, 3724, 3759)

* UE historical location information, e.g. Latitude, longitude, altitude
* UE moving direction
* UE velocity
* Radio measurements related to serving cell and neighbouring cells associated with UE location information, e.g., RSRP, RSRQ.
* UE historical serving cells and their locations
* UE trajectory prediction output, local load prediction output, load prediction output from the neighbor node, legacy information collected from UE and the neighbor nodes (for mobility decision)

**Q4: Companies are invited to provide views on whether agree on above input data for AI-based mobility?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Reasons/Comments/Suggestions** |
| Nokia | a) UE historical location information, e.g. Latitude, longitude, altitude -> yes  b)UE moving direction -> yes  c)UE velocity -> yes  d)Radio measurements related to serving cell and neighbouring cells associated with UE location information, e.g., RSRP, RSRQ. -> yes  e)UE historical serving cells and their locations ->yes  f)UE trajectory prediction output, local load prediction output, load prediction output from the neighbor node, legacy information collected from UE and the neighbor nodes (for mobility decision) ->yes |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Furthermore, it is proposed to discuss the input data from different component (3297, 3648, 3715, 3787):

**Long-term information from NWDAF**

**Input Information from CN** (the input can be based on the information from AI based CN function):

* UE mobility statistics parameters, e.g., UE location statistics (duration of the time slot)
* UE mobility predications, e.g., predicated UE location information in the analytical period

**Input Information from UE:**

* Current and past location statistical information, e.g. GPS, GNSS, cell and UE’s staying duration information
* UE may also have the training model on its locations, thus UE can report the predicated location to RAN
* trajectory, moving velocity, measurement report

**Input Information from the neighbor RAN nodes:**

* UE’s successful handover information in the past and received from neighboring RAN nodes
* UE’s successful DC offloading information in the past and received from neighboring RAN nodes
* UE’s history information from neighbor
* position, resource status, QoS parameters of historical HO-ed UE (e.g. loss rate, delay, etc.)
* After successful handover, UE QoE reports for handed over user
* During DC, UE QoE reports for data handled by the SN
* Predicted load
* Resource status and utilization prediction/estimation
* SON Reports of handovers that are successful, too-early, too-late, or handover to wrong (sub-optimal) cell

**Q5: Companies are invited to provide views on whether agree on above input data from different component?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Reasons/Comments/Suggestions** |
| Nokia | **Input Information from CN** ->No  **Input Information from UE**  -Current and past location statistical information, e.g. GPS, GNSS, cell and UE’s staying duration information -> No  -UE may also have the training model on its locations, thus UE can report the predicated location to RAN->No  -trajectory, moving velocity, measurement report -> Yes  **Input Information from the neighbor RAN nodes:**  -UE’s successful handover information in the past and received from neighboring RAN nodes -> Yes  UE’s successful DC offloading information in the past and received from neighboring RAN nodes -> No  UE’s history information from neighbor ->Yes  position, resource status, QoS parameters of historical HO-ed UE (e.g. loss rate, delay, etc.) -> No  After successful handover, UE QoE reports for handed over user -> No  During DC, UE QoE reports for data handled by the SN -> No  Predicted load -> Yes  Resource status and utilization prediction/estimation -> Yes  SON Reports of handovers that are successful, too-early, too-late, or handover to wrong (sub-optimal) cell -> Yes | In our view, core network input should not be in the scope of the SI.  When it comes to input from UE, we do not support that UE provides current and past location statistical information since this would require a different processing capability at the UE. Also, we do not support that UE reports its predicted location to RAN since AI/ML at the UE is not in the scope of the SI.  Regarding information from the neighbour RAN nodes, we do not understand the meaning of “UE’s successful DC offloading information”. We need some more explanation before agreeing to it. It is also unclear whose resource status and position are reported. We also do not support to exchange QoE Reports since QoE WI is still not completed. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.3 Output data

Following information is proposed to be the output data (3648, 3715, 3724, 3759, 3787, 4130):

* UE trajectory prediction (Latitude, longitude, altitude of UE over a future period of time)
* the predicated UE’s location with the confidence of the predication
* predicted moving coordination
* estimated arrival probability in CHO and relevant confidence interval, Estimated arrival probability in CPAC and relevant confidence interval
* predicted handover strategy
  + predicted handover decision: handover or not handover
  + predicted DC activation decision
  + predicted handover target node, candidate cells in CHO, target PSCell in PSCell addition and change, candidate PSCells in CPAC; may together with the confidence of the predication
  + predicted handover source node
  + predicted handover time
  + predicted data forwarding strategy
  + HO admission

**Q6: Companies are invited to provide views on whether agree on above output data for AI-based mobility?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Reasons/Comments/Suggestions** |
| Nokia | UE trajectory prediction (Latitude, longitude, altitude of UE over a future period of time) -> Yes  the predicted UE’s location with the confidence of the predication ->No  predicted moving coordination->No  estimated arrival probability in CHO and relevant confidence interval, Estimated arrival probability in CPAC and relevant confidence interval ->Yes  predicted handover strategy ->No | Regarding predicted UE location, in our view this is not needed if we support UE trajectory prediction. Location can be deduced through the trajectory.  Regarding predicted moving coordination it is not clear what this means.  The predicted handover strategy is algorithm dependent and we don’t think is necessary to be provided with the Output data. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.4 Feedback/Rewarding information

Both UE side and network side information are discussed for feedback/rewarding information:

UE side measurements (3724, 3780):

* whether the mobility decision is good or not
* Trajectory information (e.g. speed, position, etc.)
* Assistance Information on Traffic
* Quality of experience e.g., buffer level
* Successful HO measurements
* Radio link failure information

Network side measurements (3724,3780, 4230)

* whether the mobility decision is good or not (e.g. if HO is successful)
* Traffic steering configuration used for the UE e.g., multi-connectivity and carrier aggregation
* Load information
* DL/UL throughput
* DL/UL latency
* Cell dwelling time
* HO failure, too late HO, too early HO, HO to wrong cell

**Q7: Companies are invited to provide views on whether agree on above feedback/rewarding information for AI-based mobility?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Reasons/Comments/Suggestions** |
|  | **UE side measurements**  whether the mobility decision is good or not -> Yes  Trajectory information (e.g. speed, position, etc.) -> Yes  Assistance Information on Traffic ->No  Quality of experience e.g., buffer level -> No  Successful HO measurements ->Yes  Radio link failure information ->Yes  **Network side measurements**  whether the mobility decision is good or not (e.g. if HO is successful)->Yes  Traffic steering configuration used for the UE e.g., multi-connectivity and carrier aggregation -> No  Load information -> Yes  DL/UL throughput -> Yes  DL/UL latency ->Yes  Cell dwelling time -> Maybe  HO failure, too late HO, too early HO, HO to wrong cell ->Yes | In general, we support existing UE measurements but not to introduce new ones, especially ones with high UE impacts. Regarding the network side measurements, it is unclear how network can use traffic steering configuration on a per a UE basis. Regarding Cell dwelling time, we would need to understand more how it can benefit the network. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## 3.5 New events

It is proposed in 4081 to include following events as unintended events for mobility:

* Successful Handover: During a successful handover, there is underlying issue.
* Too late PSCell change: an SCG failure occurs after the UE has stayed for a long period of time in the PSCell; a suitable different PSCell is found based on the measurements reported from the UE.
* Too early PSCell change: an SCG failure occurs shortly after a successful PSCell change from a source PSCell to a target PSCell or a PSCell change failure occurs during the PSCell change procedure; source PSCell is still the suitable PSCell based on the measurements reported from the UE.
* Triggering PSCell change to wrong PSCell: an SCG failure occurs shortly after a successful PSCell change from a source PSCell to a target PSCell or a PSCell change failure occurs during the PSCell change procedure; a suitable PSCell different with source PSCell or target PSCell is found based on the measurements reported from the UE.

**Q8: Companies are invited to provide views on whether to include above events as unintended events for mobility?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Yes/No** | **Reasons/Comments/Suggestions** |
| Nokia | No | It would make sense to first focus on single connectivity handover scenarios before we look into DC scenarios. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 4 Conclusion, Recommendations

To be edited, if needed**.**
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