

**Moderator's summary of discussion [94e-25-R18-AIML-NGRAN] - Version 0.0.7**  
**RAN**

**3GPP RAN TSG Meeting #94e RP-213505**

**Electronic meeting, 6 – 17th December, 2021**

**Agenda Item:** 8.6.3

**Source:** CMCC (Moderator)

**Title:** Moderator's summary of discussion [94e-25-R18-AIML-NGRAN]

**Document for:** Information and decision

This email discussion covers the discussion [94e-25-R18-AIML-NGRAN] as identified in the email “[94e-01-Organizational] RAN R18 summary RP-213469, list of email threads for RAN R18 discussion, and Monday's GTW” from the RAN Chair.

Deadlines for the discussion over NWM are provided by the RAN Chair in “Draft RAN#94-e\_Timeplan v0.zip” in the first page, “Time plan for RAN#94-e during the meeting week - Week 1.”

A summary of the Rel-18 Package, the proposed TU budget, and proposed detailed scope for each potential WI or SI are provided in RP-213469 along with the supporting documents contained therein.

As per the guidance from the RAN Chair, the objectives (and associated justifications) of the WID have been revised based on the detailed scope provided as the starting point for further discussion during RAN#94-e.

---

## 1 Initial Round

The initial round will focus on providing feedback on the revised WID based on the detailed scope provided by the RAN Chair. The revised WID with revision marking can be found at the following link.

[https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\\_ran/TSG\\_RAN/TSGR\\_94e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B94e-25-R18-AIML-NGRAN%5D/Initial%20round](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_94e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B94e-25-R18-AIML-NGRAN%5D/Initial%20round)

### 1.1 WID Justification

The following Justification section of the Draft WID is deemed to be stable. However, please, add here if you have any suggestion for revision of the draft **Justification** text.

**Table 1: Justification**

---

5G networks are expected to meet the challenges of consistent optimization of increasing numbers of key performance indicators (KPIs) including latency, reliability, connection density, user experience, energy efficiency, etc. Artificial Intelligence (AI) /Machine learning (ML) provides a powerful tool to help operators to improve the network management and the user experience, by analyzing the data collected and autonomously processed that can yield further insights.

The study item 880076 “Study on enhancement for data collection for NR and EN-DC” studied general high-level principles, AI/ML functional framework and the potential use cases, and the identified potential solutions for these use cases. The accomplishments of the study for AI enabled RAN are documented in TR37.817. The normative work based on the conclusion of R17 SI should be continued in R18.

**Feedback Form 1: WID justification**

<p><b>1 – Futurewei</b></p> <p>Futurewei agrees with the WID Justification.</p>
<p><b>2 – CATT</b></p> <p>We agree with the WID justification</p>
<p><b>3 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.</b></p> <p>We agree with the WID justification</p>
<p><b>4 – Verizon UK Ltd</b></p> <p>Agree</p>
<p><b>5 – ZTE Corporation</b></p> <p>The Rel-18 WI leverages the outcome of the Rel-17 SI, thus we agree with the WID justification.</p>
<p><b>6 – China Unicom</b></p> <p>Agree with the justification part.</p>
<p><b>7 – NEC Corporation</b></p> <p>We support the current WID justification.</p>
<p><b>8 – Spreadtrum Communications</b></p> <p>Thanks for the moderator’s effort. We agree with the WID justification.</p>
<p><b>9 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology</b></p> <p>Agree with the WID justification.</p>
<p><b>10 – Qualcomm Technologies Int</b></p> <p>We also are fine with the current WID justification.</p>

<p><b>11 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.</b></p> <p>We are ok for this.</p>
<p><b>12 – DOCOMO Communications Lab.</b></p> <p>We also are fine with the current WID justification.</p>
<p><b>13 – China Mobile International Ltd</b></p> <p>Agree with the justification</p>
<p><b>14 – LG Electronics Polska</b></p> <p>We are fine with the current WID justification.</p>
<p><b>15 – Huawei Tech.(UK) Co.. Ltd</b></p> <p>We are fine with the justification</p>
<p><b>16 – New H3C Technologies Co.</b></p> <p>We agree with the WID justification.</p>
<p><b>17 – Intel Deutschland GmbH</b></p> <p>We agree with the proposed WID justification. One minor comment to the wording: Considering normative work will not start in Rel-17, for the last sentence, we suggest using “should be undertaken in R18” instead of “should be continued in R18.”</p>
<p><b>18 – Ericsson LM</b></p> <p>It is fine!</p>
<p><b>19 – Nokia</b></p> <p>The current WID justification is fine.</p>
<p><b>20 – Apple Benelux B.V.</b></p> <p>We are OK with the justification.</p>
<p><b>21 – Deutsche Telekom AG</b></p> <p>We are fine with current justification.</p>
<p><b>22 – Orange</b></p> <p>We agree with the justification</p>
<p><b>23 – Samsung R&amp;D Institute UK</b></p> <p>We agree with the justification</p>

## 1.2 WID Objective

The Objective section of the Draft WID is deemed to be stable. However, please, add here if you have any suggestion for revision of the draft Objective text.

**Table 2: WID Objective**

<p>The detailed objectives of the WI are listed as follows: Specify data collection enhancements and signaling support within existing NG-RAN interfaces and architecture (including non-split architecture and split architecture) for AI/ML-based Network Energy Saving, Load Balancing and Mobility Optimization. (RAN3) Note: On security impacts, coordination with SA3 when needed. On OAM aspects, coordination with SA5 when needed. Editor's Note: The objectives and any other involved working groups are subject to further refinement when the Rel-17 SI is completed.</p>
---

**Feedback Form 2: WID Objective**

<p><b>1 – Futurewei</b> Futurewei agrees with the WID Objective.</p>
<p><b>2 – CATT</b> We are OK with the current version</p>
<p><b>3 – Verizon UK Ltd</b> We are fine with the WID objective</p>
<p><b>4 – Guangdong OPPO Mobile Telecom.</b> we are ok on this objective</p>
<p><b>5 – ZTE Corporation</b> We agree with the WID objective. The Rel-18 should focus on specifying the solution on prioritized AI/ML based use cases in Rel-17. Besides, we suggest to involve <b>RAN2</b> into the objective since how to support to transfer the data collected from UE to RAN is within RAN2 scope (e.g., enable UE measurements report needed by RAN node or new UE measurements if identified). Therefore, it seems safe to update the following objective as below: <i>Specify data collection enhancements and signaling support within existing NG-RAN interfaces and architecture (including non-split architecture and split architecture) for AI/ML-based Network Energy Saving, Load Balancing and Mobility Optimization. (RAN3, <u>RAN2</u>)</i></p>
<p><b>6 – China Unicom</b> We are fine with the scope.</p>
<p><b>7 – NEC Corporation</b> We support the current WID objective.</p>

<p><b>8 – Spreadtrum Communications</b></p> <p>We generally support the listed objectives of the R18 WID. And other involved groups could be added when the scope is clear.</p>
<p><b>9 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology</b></p> <p>Agree with the WID objectives.</p>
<p><b>10 – Qualcomm Technologies Int</b></p> <p>We agree with the WID objectives.</p>
<p><b>11 – vivo Mobile Communication Co.</b></p> <p>We are ok for this. However we also have sympathy that RAN2 shall be involved due to UE reporting. We can discuss whether RAN2 shall be add after SI completion (i.e., more clear about UE reporting).</p>
<p><b>12 – DOCOMO Communications Lab.</b></p> <p>Agree with the WID objectives.</p>
<p><b>13 – China Mobile International Ltd</b></p> <p>Agree with the WID objectives</p>
<p><b>14 – LG Electronics Polska</b></p> <p>We are fine with the WID objectives.</p>
<p><b>15 – Huawei Tech.(UK) Co.. Ltd</b></p> <p>Please see our update in the draft folder. It is mostly editorial clean-up. Some Clarification are details in RP-213169.</p>
<p><b>16 – New H3C Technologies Co.</b></p> <p>We are fine with current WID objective for SI.</p>
<p><b>17 – Intel Deutschland GmbH</b></p> <p>In general, we agree with the proposed WID objectives. Based on current progress of SI discussion, we think for the mobility optimization use case, it would be good to add RAN2 as secondary group, considering potential impact to mobility configuration. For data collection from UE side, RAN3 has agreed to reuse MDT framework for data collection from UE side, we are wondering if there's new data to be collected from UE, it would be worked in SON/MDT WI or AI/ML for NG-RAN WI based on the outcome of Rel-17 SI?</p>
<p><b>18 – Ericsson LM</b></p> <p>We propose to add "On UE impact, coordination with RAN2 when needed" in below:  "Note: On security impacts, coordination with SA3 when needed. On OAM aspects, coordination with SA5 when needed. <b>On UE impact, coordination with RAN2 when needed</b>"</p>

<p><b>19 – Nokia</b></p> <p>The current WID objectives are fine. Regarding potential RAN2 involvement, this can be considered based on the conclusions of the Rel-17 SI.</p>
<p><b>20 – Apple Benelux B.V.</b></p> <p>We are generally OK with the proposed objectives, but we have a concern with the level of details (or lack thereof). We assume that further details will be added when the Rel-17 SI is concluded, at which stage we would also need to clarify other WGs involvement (e.g. RAN2).</p>
<p><b>21 – InterDigital Germany GmbH</b></p> <p>We agree with Ericsson on the UE impact note, RAN2 probably should be included as a secondary working group on the objective but can wait. The very least is to capture that RAN2 might need to coordinate.</p>
<p><b>22 – Deutsche Telekom AG</b></p> <p>We are fine with current objectives.</p>
<p><b>23 – TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.</b></p> <p>We are generally fine with the current objectives.</p> <p>We suggest to add an objective on definition of the data format to be used (e.g. html or other formats)</p>
<p><b>24 – Orange</b></p> <p>We agree with the objectives</p>
<p><b>25 – Samsung R&amp;D Institute UK</b></p> <p>We are fine with current objectives.</p>

### 1.3 Way forward on WI and SI arrangement

Companies are invited to confirm following way forward on WI and SI arrangement:

- Approve the WID on this meeting.
- After completion of the WI, the SID can be revisited, 6 month TU is reserved.

#### **Feedback Form 3: Way forward on WI and SI arrangement**

<p><b>1 – Futurewei</b></p> <p>Futurewei agrees with this WI and SI arrangement.</p>
<p><b>2 – Verizon UK Ltd</b></p> <p>Approve WID and SID together. WI can start first and SI can start at a later time.</p>

<p><b>3 – ZTE Corporation</b></p> <p>We agree with the this organization of the R18 WI and SI.</p>
<p><b>4 – China Unicom</b></p> <p>Agree with the way forward.</p>
<p><b>5 – NEC Corporation</b></p> <p>We support reserving TUs for SI. If time allows, it may be good to discuss SID in this meeting.</p>
<p><b>6 – Spreadtrum Communications</b></p> <p>We agree with the WI and SI arrangement.</p>
<p><b>7 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology</b></p> <p>We also support reserving TUs for SI in Rel18. Besides, we can try to endorse a version of SID in this meeting which can be taken as baseline for further refinement after WI is finished.</p>
<p><b>8 – Qualcomm Technologies Int</b></p> <p>We also support reserving TUs for SI, and believe this is covered within the endorsed plan for the release. So from a time management perspective we think the matter is settled.</p> <p>Regarding SID detail, we are also fine to try to have at least some kind of baseline SID text (but of course there is no need to approve at this point).</p>
<p><b>9 – China Mobile International Ltd</b></p> <p><b>We agree with the way forward by the moderator which is consistent with the RAN guidance.</b></p> <p>We understand there is some worries during October email discussion that the new SI of AI for NG-RAN may not be considered in Rel-18. This matter has been settled down with the endorsed plan for the release, as Qualcomm mentioned. For the approval of the SID, we don't think it is the right time to do so. We even don't know what objectives we plan to eapprove, since the scope and objectives of the new SI was not carefully discussed in October. Furthermore, there seems no additional value to do so comparing with approving the SID later on.</p>
<p><b>10 – LG Electronics Polska</b></p> <p>We support the way forward on WI and SI arrangements.</p>
<p><b>11 – Huawei Tech.(UK) Co.. Ltd</b></p> <p>We are fine with the proposal, including booking TU for the SID.</p> <p>About the SID, Some companies have preference for a “some kind of baseline SID text”. We are fine with proposal and drop a revised proposal of RP-213283. We prefer to make it more neutral and have a clear Editor's Note.</p>
<p><b>12 – New H3C Technologies Co.</b></p> <p>In principal, we are fine with this arrangement. Of course it also depends on the progress of WI.</p>

**13 – ZTE Corporation**

After checking the updated draft SI version, it’s not acceptable for us.

It seems majority companies are fine with the WI and SI arrangement proposed by moderator, there seems no need to open the SI detail discussion in this meeting. If the majority is fine to discuss some kind of baseline SID text in the second round, that’s fine for us, but of course there is no need to approve any draft SID at this point.

**14 – Nokia**

We have the same view as CMCC. The RAN guidance is clear, and a draft SID can be further discussed ”later” (at/near the completion of the R18 WI).

**15 – Apple Benelux B.V.**

We are OK with the arrangement

**16 – InterDigital Germany GmbH**

we definitely support the TU allocation for the follow up study, but think we should have some discussion so that we have a baseline idea of the scope, which will get approved later when we are near the completion of the WID.

**17 – Deutsche Telekom AG**

We generally support to run the appropriate SI using the noted TU budget in Rel-18. We share the same view as Lenovo and other companies that we may try to discuss in further rounds of this e-mail thread a basic description of the SI content. This could be further refined during the WI run time.

**18 – Ericsson LM**

We support to work and approve the WID now. When the Rel-18 WID is finished, it would be more clear for what more is needed and the draft SID can be further discussed.

**19 – Samsung R&D Institute UK**

We are fine with the proposal, including booking TU for the SID. Regarding the SID, we are also fine to have some discussion and have a baseline for further revision when the WI is finalized.

1.4 Other

**Feedback Form 4: Other**

1.5 Moderator’s Summary

All companies agree with the WID justification section. One minor change is proposed on the last sentence: “The normative work based on the conclusion of R17 SI should be ~~continued~~ undertaken in R18.” Moderator thinks the change makes sense as normative work will start since Rel-18.

**Proposal 1: The justification part of the WID is approved, with the minor change: “The normative**

**work based on the conclusion of R17 SI should be ~~continued~~ undertaken in R18.”**

As for the objective part, majority companies are fine with scope.

Some companies suggest to add RAN2 into the objective, since how to support to transfer the data collected from UE to RAN is within RAN2 scope (e.g., enable UE measurements report needed by RAN node or new UE measurements if identified). Some companies proposed to add “On UE impact, coordination with RAN2 when needed” to the Note. Some companies think we can wait until the Rel-17 SI is concluded.

Moderator has the sympathy on the involvement of RAN2, but currently there is no consensus on how to capture the involvement. So, moderator would suggest to check companies’ view on the second round.

**Proposal 2: Further check companies’ view on involving RAN2 on the second round:**

**Option 1) Add RAN2 as the secondary working group.**

**Option 2) Add “On UE impact, coordination with RAN2 when needed” to the Note.**

**Option 3) Consider it based on the conclusions of the Rel-17 SI.**

One company proposed some editorial changes and clarifications in RP-213169, moderator would suggest to check companies’ views on the second round.

**Proposal 3: Further check companies’ view on the changes in RP-213169.**

One company suggested to add an objective on definition of the data format to be used (e.g. html or other formats) , moderator would suggest to check companies’ views on the second round.

**Proposal 4: Further check companies’ view on definition of the data format to be used.**

As for the Way forward on WI and SI arrangement, 13 companies support the proposal. 2 companies proposed to endorse a version of SID, 5 companies think it is fine to try to have some kind of baseline SID text. However, some companies cannot accept the draft SID or don’t think it is the right time to discuss the SID.

Since majority companies are fine with the way forward on WI and SI arrangement proposed by moderator, and there seems no additional value compared with approving the SID later (at/near the completion of the Rel-18 WI), moderator deems there is no need to open the SI detail discussion on this meeting.

**Proposal 5: Following way forward about the arrangement of WI and SI is approved:**

- Approve the WID on this meeting.
- After completion of the WI, the SID can be revisited, 6 month TU is reserved. Do not discuss and endorse SID on this meeting.

---

## 2 Intermediate Round

According to the summary from the initial round of email discussion, companies are invited to provide comments on following questions:

**About the involvement of RAN2, there are following options:**

**Option 1) Add RAN2 as the secondary working group.**

**Option 2) Add “On UE impact, coordination with RAN2 when needed” to the Note.**

**Option 3) Consider it based on the conclusions of the Rel-17 SI.**

**Feedback Form 5: Q2-1 About the involvement of RAN2,  
which option do you prefer?**

**1 – New H3C Technologies Co.**

We prefer Option 3 because it is enough that RAN1 is only involved in SI stage based on current scope of SID. After the completion of SI tage, we can consider whether RAN2 need be included or not.

**2 – New H3C Technologies Co.**

I would like to clarify the above our comment. We prefer Option 3 because it is enough that RAN3 is only involved in WI&SI stage . After the completion of SI tage, we can consider whether RAN2 need be included or not.

And we think current editor note ”The objectives and any other involved working groups are subject to further refinement when the Rel-17 SI is completed.” is clear and address this issue.

**3 – Apple Benelux B.V.**

We prefer option 3.

**4 – ZTE Corporation**

Thanks moderator’s summary. From our perspective, we suggest to involve RAN2 since currently RAN3 has been discussing UE measurements report needed by RAN node or new UE measurements if identified. Either option 1) or option 2) is fine for us.

**5 – CATT**

We prefer option 3

**6 – Spreadtrum Communications**

We prefer option 3). Other involved working groups (if have) can be added when the R17 SI is basically stable, and before the start of R18 WI.

**7 – Qualcomm Technologies Int**

In principle any of the 3 options are fine, as they recognize there could be some RAN2 involvement in the work. Also we agree with ZTE that there are discussions in RAN3 that would eventually require RAN2 work.

With that in mind, it seems that for now option 1 may be difficult to agree before the end of the SI; so perhaps option 3 would be best (but in that case we suggest to add a temporary note such as ”Whether and how RAN2 work is needed should be considered after completion of the SI”)

<p><b>8 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology</b></p> <p>The impact on RAN2 is not clear unless we identify relevant enhancement in Uu. We are fine with either Option 2) or 3), e.g., we can add a note as Option 2) and remove it if SI concludes no impact on RAN2, or vice versa.</p>
<p><b>9 – Samsung R&amp;D Institute UK</b></p> <p>Agree with ZTE that RAN2 involvement is needed. We prefer option 1 or option 2.</p>
<p><b>10 – MediaTek Inc.</b></p> <p>We are also ok with option 3). Please note that some R2 work may be overlapped with AI/ML air interface study, therefore, the actual work to be done should be considered later.</p>
<p><b>11 – NEC Corporation</b></p> <p>We prefer Option 3) considering that impact on RAN2 is not clear at this stage.</p>
<p><b>12 – LG Electronics Polska</b></p> <p>We prefer Option 3.</p>
<p><b>13 – China Mobile International Ltd</b></p> <p>Whether to involve RAN2 as secondary WG is for sure a decision point before the WI starts. We had a note "The objectives and any other involved working groups are subject to further refinement when the Rel-17 SI is completed." to address this issue.</p>
<p><b>14 – Nokia</b></p> <p>We prefer Option 3, which is already covered by the Editor's Note ("other involved working groups are subject to further refinement when the Rel-17 SI is completed")</p>
<p><b>15 – Deutsche Telekom AG</b></p> <p>It is currently sufficient to go with Option 3 which is covered already by an Editor's note in the Draft WID. The involvement of other WGs can be clarified based on the output of the Rel-17 SI.</p>
<p><b>16 – Intel Deutschland GmbH</b></p> <p>We prefer option 1), as RAN2 may not only impacted by UE measurement report, but also may be impacted by mobility configuration to the UE.</p>
<p><b>17 – Huawei Tech.(UK) Co., Ltd</b></p> <p>We have preference for option "3) Consider it based on the conclusions of the Rel-17 SI."</p>
<p><b>18 – InterDigital Germany GmbH</b></p> <p>We prefer option 1 but option 2 would be a ok compromise.</p>
<p><b>19 – Futurewei</b></p> <p>We support Option 3).</p>

<p><b>20 – Rakuten Mobile</b></p> <p>We prefer option 2.</p>
<p><b>21 – Ericsson LM</b></p> <p>We are preferring option 2.</p>
<p><b>22 – Verizon UK Ltd</b></p> <p>We prefer Option 3, but Option 2 could be acceptable as well.</p>

**Feedback Form 6: Q2-2 Do companies agree on changes in RP-213169?**

<p><b>1 – New H3C Technologies Co.</b></p> <p>Current description of objective in WID v01 is clear and changes in RP-213169 isn't needed.</p>
<p><b>2 – Apple Benelux B.V.</b></p> <p>The first change proposed is not just editorial, but an editorial which makes the text less clear. We don't think it is needed.</p> <p>The second change (on communications with SA3 and SA5) - it may or may not be needed, depending on the final WID draft. We suggest not to add those, at least for now.</p>
<p><b>3 – ZTE Corporation</b></p> <p>Generally fine. We suggest to explicitly clarify the non-split architecture and split architecture in the objective in order to avoid any confusion in future discussion since it was acknowledged that CU could be responsible for AI/ML inference, and the solutions on each AI/ML use cases include split architecture scenario. We recommend to keep the wording "including split architecture and non-split architecture"</p>
<p><b>4 – CATT</b></p> <p>We prefer to keep the current version. We do not think the normative work only focus on data collection enhancement for AI/ML. Based on the discussion in SI phase, the impact on the interface is not just data collection, but also some predicted information transfer and other information as well.</p>
<p><b>5 – Spreadtrum Communications</b></p> <p>No, we think current description of WI objectives is enough.</p>
<p><b>6 – Qualcomm Technologies Int</b></p> <p>We do not see the need for these changes. Without going into details, it seems enough to say that the current text is fine for us.</p>
<p><b>7 – Huawei Tech.(UK) Co.. Ltd</b></p> <p>We have two questions for clarification to the group:</p>

1) In principle any feature could potentially impact the split architecture i.e. F1/E1, then what is the principle to mentioned split architecture or not in the Work Item Description, unless the feature is dedicated to the split?

2) what is a coordination with (e.g.) SA3? is it a building block? some joint session? some liaison?

**8 – Samsung R&D Institute UK**

The version in the draft folder is fine. The change seems not necessary.

**9 – MediaTek Inc.**

We prefer the current version.

**10 – NEC Corporation**

We prefer the current version.

**11 – China Mobile International Ltd**

We prefer the current version. The changes are not necessary.

**12 – Deutsche Telekom AG**

We are fine with current version. No need to have the proposed changes.

**13 – Intel Deutschland GmbH**

We are fine with current version of WID v01.

**14 – InterDigital Germany GmbH**

we prefer the current version

**15 – Rakuten Mobile**

we also prefer the current version

**16 – Futurewei**

We prefer the current version.

**17 – Ericsson LM**

We are ok with the proposed changes

**18 – Verizon UK Ltd**

We are fine with the current version and do not see the need for these changes

**Feedback Form 7: Q2-3 Do companies agree to add an objective on definition of the data format to be used (e.g. html or other formats)?**

**1 – New H3C Technologies Co.**

The motivation on definition of the data format isn't clear to us. we hope the proponent to clarify it.

**2 – Apple Benelux B.V.**

This goes way beyond the level of detail that we currently have in the WID. We agree that at some stage the WID would have to include more details, but that discussion should not start from data's format. Furthermore, html is clearly not suitable for anything we discuss in this topic.

**3 – ZTE Corporation**

No. Rel-18 WI objective should leverage the outcome of Rel-17 SI, and there is no relate discussion on data format in RAN3 SI do far. Anyway, it does exclude the possibility to discuss the details during normative phase.

**4 – CATT**

Similar view as ZTE,we do not think the new objective is needed.

**5 – Spreadtrum Communications**

No, since it hasn't been discussed before, we do not get point of the purpose of "data format (e.g., html)".

If the data is associated with NW parameters, it certainly should be discussed and standardized, and from our point of view, this part of data should have similar format as the data in SON/MDT report. And we think it is the common view that reuse as much existing data and signaling as possible. In this case, the data format could be discussed within the signaling support of specific identified use cases.

If the data has no relation with NW parameters, then it should be out of the scope of this topic, which may part of AI/ML model implementation.

**6 – Qualcomm Technologies Int**

Not at this point. Since there will be anyway a need to check the WID after the SI completion, interested companies can make the case offline and/or bring this as a justified proposal in the next cycle(s).

**7 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology**

The motivation is unclear. Html is application layer data format, why shall RAN3 discuss that? So far in the Rel17 SI discussion, data is transmitted over the legacy interface using legacy format.

**8 – Samsung R&D Institute UK**

More justification is needed on this objective. It's better to have some further discussion in RAN3 during the SI phase.

**9 – MediaTek Inc.**

No, we do not see the need to agree such detail at this point of time.

<b>10 – NEC Corporation</b>
Could we have more explanation why RAN3 needs to specify data format?
<b>11 – China Mobile International Ltd</b>
Not needed, it is too detailed things.
<b>12 – Nokia</b>
Not needed. The objectives should be motivated by the discussion/outcome of the study phase.
<b>13 – Deutsche Telekom AG</b>
We don't support to add this issue as there are more explanations needed on background and motivation. We shouldn't go at this stage into details where we expect results from Rel-17 SI.
<b>14 – Intel Deutschland GmbH</b>
It is not clear to us the motivation of having an objective of data format definition. We don't support to add this issue.
<b>15 – Huawei Tech.(UK) Co., Ltd</b>
This is a technical discussion which must reach agreement in RAN3 and could be reflected in the conclusion of SID or decided later.
<b>16 – InterDigital Germany GmbH</b>
not at this point
<b>17 – Rakuten Mobile</b>
Agree with several other companies, not required at this point.
<b>18 – Futurewei</b>
No. We don't need to explicitly add an item in the objective for defining the data format.
<b>19 – Ericsson LM</b>
It is unclear to us and needs further clarification.

## 2.1 Moderator's Summary

Regarding the involvement of RAN2, 15 companies support option 3, 4 companies are fine for option 1, and 6 companies are fine for option 2. So, majority companies prefer to go to option 3.

Furthermore, as indicated by some companies, the current editor note: "The objectives and any other involved working groups are subject to further refinement when the Rel-17 SI is completed." is clear and address this issue, moderator would suggest to not to add more notes.

Regarding the changes in RP-213169, majority companies prefer the current version.

Regarding adding an objective on definition of the data format to be used (e.g. html or other formats), majority companies think it is unnecessary or not the right time to discuss it.

So, based on above summary, moderator would suggest to keep the current version of the WID.

**Proposal: Keep the current version of the WID.**

---

## 3 Final Round

Since no changes introduced after the discussion of the intermediate round, moderator just copy the current WID without any change to the final round folder for your convenience:

[https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg\\_ran/TSG\\_RAN/TSGR\\_94e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B94e-25-R18-AIML-NGRAN%5D/Final%20Round](https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/tsg_ran/TSG_RAN/TSGR_94e/Inbox/Drafts/%5B94e-25-R18-AIML-NGRAN%5D/Final%20Round). Companies are invited to double check whether it is ok as the final version of the WID.

**Feedback Form 8: If the current WID is agreeable? In case any further comments, please indicate here, otherwise, no feedback is needed**

<b>1 – New H3C Technologies Co.</b> We are fine with current WID and please include H3C in the list of supporting IM.
<b>2 – InterDigital Germany GmbH</b> We are fine with the current WID and please include InterDigital in the list of supporting companies.
<b>3 – Spreadtrum Communications</b> Thanks for the moderator’s effort. We are fine with the current WID and please include Spreadtrum in the list of supporting companies.
<b>4 – AT&amp;T</b> We are fine with the current WID. Please add AT&T to the list of supporting companies.
<b>5 – DOCOMO Communications Lab.</b> We are fine with the current WID. Please add ”NTT DOCOMO, INC.” to the list of supporting companies.
<b>6 – Samsung R&amp;D Institute UK</b> We are fine with the current WID. Please add Samsung to the list of supporting companies.
<b>7 – Lenovo Mobile Com. Technology</b> We are fine with the current WID and please include Lenovo and Motorola Mobility in the list of supporting companies
<b>8 – CATT</b> We are fine with the current version and please add CATT as the co-sign company

**9 – NEC Corporation**

We are fine with the current WID and please add NEC to the list of supporting companies.

**10 – MediaTek Inc.**

We thank moderator's good effort and please add "MediaTek Inc." to the list of supporting companies.

**11 – Qualcomm Technologies Int**

We are also fine with the current version, and would like to thank the moderator for the effort on this. Please also add "Qualcomm Incorporated" to the list of supporting companies.

**12 – ZTE Corporation**

Thanks moderator's effort to the summary. We support the current WID, and please include ZTE in the list of supporting companies.

**13 – Apple Benelux B.V.**

We are fine with the current WID and wish to be added as a supporting company.

**14 – Huawei Tech.(UK) Co.. Ltd**

Please add Huawei as supporting company. Thank you for the work!

**15 – Ericsson LM**

We are fine with the final draft of WID. Thanks!

**16 – CHTTL**

We are fine with the current WID. Please add CHTTL to the list of supporting companies. Thanks!

**17 – LG Electronics Polska**

We are fine with the current WID and please add LG Electronics to the list of supporting companies.

**18 – Intel Deutschland GmbH**

Thank you for the work, we are fine with the draft WID. Please add Intel as the supporting company.

**19 – TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.**

sorry to have missed the discussion on the data format, being the proponent.

The intention was to define a common format and avoid proprietary formats for the information to be sent to the higher levels. Clearly html was a bad example.

The point raised by Spreadtrum (to reuse SON/MDT) is likely a good solution and agree to finalize the issue in a later stage.

Said that, we can support the current version.

Please add Telecom Italia to the supporting companies

**20 – Honor**

We are fine with the current WID. Please add HONOR to the list of supporting companies. Thanks for the effort.

**21 – Telia Company AB**

We support the WID. Please add **Telia Company** to the list of supporting companies.  
Thank you for moderation work.

**22 – Verizon UK Ltd**

We support the current WID. Please add Verizon to the list of supporting companies.

**23 – VODAFONE Group Plc**

Thanks, please add Vodafone as a supporter.

---

## 4 Report and Conclusions

According to the email discussion, following conclusions achieved for the WID:

**Conclusion 1: The justification part of the WID is approved, with the change: “The normative work based on the conclusion of R17 SI should be ~~continued~~ undertaken in R18.”**

**Conclusion 2: No change is needed for the objective section of the WID.**

Regarding the arrangement of WI and SI,

**Conclusion 3: Following way forward is approved:**

- **Approve the WID on this meeting.**
- **After completion of the WI, the SID can be revisited, 6 month TU is reserved. Do not discuss and endorse SID on this meeting.**