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# Introduction

This paper summarizes the discussion for agenda item 9.2.2.2.
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# Potential specification impact for CSI compression with two-sided model

## Training collaboration

Three types of training collaboration were agreed in RAN1 110. Following table summarize company’s proposals and observations related to each type of training collaboration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Huawei | Observation 4: For CSI compression with two-sided model, training Type 1 may suffer software/hardware compatibility issue, and the following restrictions/issues may need to be considered to relieve the compatibility issue:   * Network may have to interoperate with various UE vendors/UE versions to dedicatedly train the CSI generation part for UE, which harms the engineering isolation. * Network, in particular gNB, may have to maintain/store multiple CSI generation parts trained for different UE vendors/UE versions. * Network vendor may not freely develop the CSI generation part for UE, which may restrict the pairing with the CSI reconstruction part and thereby result in sub-optimal performance.   Observation 5: For training Type 1 of CSI compression, compared with joint training at Network side, performing joint training at UE side and delivering the model to the Network incurs extra challenges for Network due to the following reasons:   * Inconvenience of training cell/scenario specific models. * Inflexible model update. * Burden of inference/storing/running multiple Network part models at gNB delivered from different UE vendors/UE versions.   Proposal 10: For training Type 1 of CSI compression, deprioritize the mode of joint training at UE side and delivering the model to the Network.  Observation 6: For training Type 2 of CSI compression and model updating, it relies on complex design to support real-time interaction of FP/BP iterations between Network side and UE side, which causes strong challenges to engineering isolation especially for the case of multi-Network vendors to multi-UE vendors.  Observation 7: For training Type 3 of CSI compression,   * The shared dataset is constituted by the CSI-related data which may be irrelevant with the user privacy (e.g., user position, etc.). * The dataset sharing/delivery can be performed under the contract agreement between the Network vendors/MNOs/UE vendors to mitigate the data ownership problem.   Observation 8: For training Type 3 of CSI compression, compared with NW first training, performing UE first training incurs extra challenges for Network due to the following reasons:   * Inconvenience of training cell/scenario specific models. * Inflexible model update. * Burden of maintaining/storing multiple Network part models at gNB to pair with multiple UE vendors/UE versions. |
| ZTE | Proposal 1: Prioritize Type 1 joint training at NW side for further study and model transfer/delivery can be further discussed in agenda item 9.2.1.  Proposal 2: For training Type 3, prioritize NW-first training as a starting point for further study.  Proposal 3: For training Type 3, further study potential specification impact on the dataset used for the model training at the other side/entity.  Proposal 4: Conclude the pros and cons of different training collaboration types and prioritize training collaboration types in RAN1#112bis-e meeting. |
| OPPO | Proposal 1: In training collaboration type 3,   * For NW first training, NW needs to be able to provide UE with training data sets that meet different requirements, e.g. on model performance, transmission cost, data characteristics and CSI input types * For UE first training, UE needs to be able to provide NW with training data sets that meet different requirements, e.g. on model performance, transmission cost and data characteristics   Observation 1: For training collaboration types 1 and type 3, the conclusions for most of the questions listed below are the same, but the implementation methods are different. These two training collaboration types are not exclusive, and both can be considered in subsequent research. |
| vivo | 1. Pros/cons for training collaboration type 1: 2. Pros: Optimal performance 3. Pros: Provide highest flexibility in developing scenario-/configuration-/site-specific models via model transfer and model updating 4. Cons: Model proprietary could not be kept during model transfer. However, if trivial models are used, model proprietaries issue does not exist. 5. Cons: Require UEs to report the supported model design to develop device-specific models 6. Pros/cons for training collaboration type 2: 7. Pros: Model proprietary could be kept. However, if trivial models are used, model proprietaries issue does not exist. 8. Pros: Support device-specific models without the need to share model information to other entities 9. Cons: Need to share real-time information on forward /backward propagation result and label data. The overhead is very high to achieve near-optimal performances. 10. Cons: Lower flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model. Consequently, both sides need to train and store a large number of models to adapt to various scenarios/configurations 11. Pros/cons for training collaboration type 3: 12. Pros: Model proprietary could be kept. However, if trivial models are used, model proprietaries issue does not exist, 13. Pros/Cons: Support device-specific models without the need to share model information to other entities, but device-specific data distribution may not be supported. 14. Cons: Need to share information on dataset. May have risk in disclosing data from one user to another one. 15. Cons: Performance will degrade if shared dataset is insufficient or model structures are not aligned. 16. Cons: lower flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model. Consequently, both sides need to train and store a large number of models to adapt to various scenarios/configurations 17. The Extendibility issues (including training new UE-side model compatible with NW-side model in use and the support of “one-to-multi”/“multiple-to-one” configuration) could be addressed via proper training strategies for all training collaborations. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 1: Legacy CSI framework can be reused for the sub use case - Spatial-frequency domain CSI compression. Additional enhancement can be considered.  Proposal 2: To facilitate the discussion, views on Pros and Cons of all of Training types are needed to be aligned. What shown in Table 1 can be considered. |
| Nokia | Proposal 13: RAN1 shall investigate the appropriate dataset sharing without disclosing the mapping from (quantized) latent representation to the codeword.  Proposal 14: RAN1 may study the performance of the ML-based CSI-compression where the training datasets by the UE and gNB vendors are not matched. Also, it is necessary to study the case where the test scenario is not matched with the training scenarios of the encoder and decoder. |
| CATT | Observation 1: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for training collaboration Type 1, it has the following pros and cons:   * Pros:   + Optimal performance can be achieved;   + For joint training at UE side,     - Dataset sharing might not be needed.     - Maintaining/storing a single/unified model at UE side can be supported.   + For joint training at NW side,     - Cell/site/scenario specific model can be supported easily.     - Maintaining/storing a single/unified model at NW side can be supported. It is possible that UE does not need to maintaining/storing models for lots of gNBs. * Cons:   + Model transfer is needed.   + Model updating is lack of flexibility after deployment.   + For joint training at UE side,     - It is challenging for a UE to support cell/site/scenario specific model.     - A gNB has to maintain/store multiple models for multiple UEs.     - gNB specific optimization is not supported.   + For joint training at NW side,     - UE specific optimization is not supported.     Observation 2: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for training collaboration Type 2, it has the following pros and cons:   * Pros:   + gNB/device specific optimization is supported.   + Model transfer is not needed, which can keep model proprietary. * Cons:   + The latency on model training is large.   + There is heavy burden in air interface on real-time information exchange between NW side and UE side.   + Model updating is lack of flexibility after deployment.   + Further study is needed on maintaining/storing a single/unified model at both sides of network and UE.   + It is not easy to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model.   Observation 3: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for training collaboration Type 3, it has the following pros and cons:   * Pros:   + Model transfer is not needed.   + gNB/device specific optimization is supported.   + For sequential training starting with NW side,     - Good extendibility.     - Cell/site/scenario specific model can be supported by NW side easily.     - It is feasible to maintaining/storing a single/unified model at NW side.   + For sequential training starting with UE side,     - It is feasible to maintaining/storing a single/unified model at UE side.     - Model transfer is not needed, which can keep model proprietary. * Cons:   + Dataset transfer from the starting with side to the other side requires extra data transfer overhead.   + For sequential training starting with NW side,     - Further study is needed on the feasible of maintaining/storing a single/unified model at UE side to adapt to various NW sides.   + For sequential training starting with UE side,     - Bad extendibility.     - It is difficult to support cell/site/scenario specific model.     - Further study is needed on the feasible of maintaining/storing a single/unified model at NW side to adapt to various UEs. |
| Ericsson | Observation 1: Type 1 training collaboration seem not feasible in near term  Observation 2: Type 2 training collaboration seem not feasible in practice  Observation 3: Type 3 training collaboration where NW trains first may be a feasible approach to training  Observation 4: [Type 4] training collaboration where NW trains first, freeze the decoder and provide gradient transfer to UE side using API (for UE side training) may be a feasible approach to training  [Proposal 2 For CSI compression use case, it is a requirement that only training types and methods that enables a single decoder to be implemented in the network side is to be considered, irrespectively of the vendor origins of the connected UE devices and/or UE chipsets.](#_Toc131752939)  [Proposal 3 For CSI use case in this SI, down-prioritize any studies on model transfer unless it is the only solution that provides performance benefits over legacy CSI reporting](#_Toc131752940)  [Proposal 4 Define a training collaboration [Type 4], using a frozen decoder and gradient transfer using API, as a training method, according to the following description.](#_Toc131752941)  [Proposal 5 In the remaining work in this SI, for training collaborations that include the multi-vendor situation, assume [Type 4], NW first, frozen decoder and gradient transfer using API.](#_Toc131752942) |
| Xiaomi | Observation 1: NW may store and manage a lot of NW-sided part models for joint training of the two-sided model at UE side and UE-first separate training.  Proposal 1: Both joint training of two-sided model at NW side for Type 1 and NW-first separate training for Type 3 can be considered to train two-sided CSI compression AI/ML model. |
| Panasonic | Observation 10: Type 1 training involves the exchange of AI/ML model and then, requires some common AI/ML inference algorithm and common reference for model inference.  Observation 11: For Type 2 with offline training, if the consideration on the air interface specification impact on FP/BP interaction is not needed, there might be no Type 2 specific specification impact.  Observation 12: For Type 3 training collaboration with network-first training, at least the option that network generates training dataset to enable UE side supervised learning should be studied.  Observation 13: For Type 3, 3GPP may need to define some kind of requirement of CSI encoding by input and output relation, performance test or something else. The input for the training can be 3GPP specified channel model or field raw data. The output for the training can be something 3gpp defined output or network vendor specific information. The UE model performance can be checked by 3gpp specification or inter-operability test (IOT).  Observation 14: Type 3 with network-first separate training might be feasible options at least Re.18/19 timeline from standardization effort perspective. Type 1 with network sided training can be potential in the long-term. |
| CAICT | Proposal 1: Training type 1 at gNB/UE should be supported and training type 1 at gNB could be considered as starting point.  Proposal 2: Training type 3 should be supported for two-side model training. UE side AI/ML model information exchanging between UE and NW should be considered for dataset size control. |
| ETRI | Proposal 1: Consider further studies on performance improvement of AI models with training datasets from realistic channel estimation.  Observation 1: One possible performance improvement of AI models with training datasets from realistic channel estimation, is training a denoising function additionally.  Observation 2: To train the additional denoising function of the AI model for CSI compression, obtaining a training dataset with pairs can be required. |
| MediaTek | 1. For training type 2, discuss alignment of quantization/dequantization as well as format/precision of gradient vectors, latent vectors, and CSI samples. 2. For single-encoder multi-decoder setting in training type 2, UE should not break down the training session into multiple single-encoder single-decoder training sub-sessions. 3. In training type 2 for multi-encoder setting, if UE-specific datasets are used, the type of target CSI should be aligned among UE vendors. 4. Discuss feasibility of synchronization/alignment required for different update scheduling in training type 2. 5. If UE-specific datasets are used for multi-encoder training, consider sharing information on training-related parameters such as size of datasets, statistics of datasets, training loss, and update schedule. 6. Consider sharing information about encoders’/decoders’ architecture type and complexity from entities doing training first to other entities. 7. Prioritize the study of training-aware quantization methods 8. Study alignment requirement and influence of different training awareness techniques for enabling backpropagation between quantizers and dequantizers. 9. For training type 2, gNB should inform UE about the training awareness technique used for its dequantizer. |
| Apple | Proposal 1: Model update using training collaboration type 2 over 3GPP air interface incur high complexity and large overhead. It can be deprioritized for R18 study  Proposal 2: To facilitate future discussion on necessity and benefit of each training collaboration type,   * Further categorize the training collaboration type 1 as: 1a-training at UE side, 1b-training at NW side. * Further categorize the training collaboration type 3 as: 3a-UE first and 3b-NW first. |
| Lenovo | 1. Study the training collaboration types considering the communication overhead and/or the corresponding latency, based on whether the communication between the network and UE sides during model training and model adaptation occurs over the NR air interface or via proprietary signaling 2. Study the advantages/disadvantages of joint training at the UE side vs. joint training at the network side with Type 1 training collaboration 3. Study the performance of iterative separate training as one of the methods to improve the performance of sperate training when multiple vendors are involved in training on the two sides of communication 4. For FDD systems with network-based Type-1 model training as well as Type-3 training collaboration, signaling the CSI training data from the UE to the network is needed 5. Evaluate schemes related to transfer of CSI dataset for different stages of the LCM 6. Evaluate the following CSI training data signaling techniques:  * Alt1. Proprietary signaling via non-3GPP techniques * Alt2. Legacy CSI dataset feedback where the NR codebook-based CSI is utilized as CSI training data * Alt3. Explicit CSI-dataset feedback via enhanced 3GPP-based signaling of the CSI training data  1. Evaluate the following CSI training data formats:  * Alt-A. Legacy codebook-based dataset points generated via multiple occasions of NR codebook-based CSI feedback * Alt-B. High-resolution codebook-based dataset points generated via high-resolution variants of NR-based CSI codebooks * Alt-C. Floating point representation of raw CSI data, e.g., raw channel matrices or sets of channel eigenvectors |
| Qualcomm | Observation 1: For the AI/ML-based CSI feedback enhancement use case, the use of an AI/ML model for inference within a device would require prior offline device-specific optimization and testing.  Observation 2: Type 1 training with device-agnostic encoder would result in a UE-side model that:   * + is not optimized in a device-specific manner for the intended UE-side device,   + assumes a structure and input format that is not compatible with the UE-side implementation capabilities, and   + may have sub-optimal performance due to a discrepancy between the training and inference data distribution due to device-side variations.   Observation 3: Type 1 training performed on the NW-side with involvement of the UE-side vendor requires the UE-side to provide information (such as model structure, pre-processing, post-processing, datasets and ground truth) to the training entity to ensure that the trained models are suitable for inference.  Observation 4: For NW-side type 1 training with UE-side involvement, developing a new model for a new UE device type or vendor can result in a large engineering effort across multiple vendors.  Observation 5: It is feasible to train a two-sided AI/ML model using an offline Type 2 (multi-vendor) training approach with performance comparable to Type 1 training.  Observation 6: For type 2 training, developing a new model for a new UE device type or vendor can result in a large engineering effort across multiple vendors if the NW-side or UE-side use a common model for multiple models on the opposite side.  Observation 7: As compared to Type 2 training, the Type 3 offline training approach is more flexible as it does not require coordination during the training process.  Observation 8: For Type 3 separate training, the engineering effort of adding a new UE type or new UE-side vendor is contained and does not propagate to other vendors even if the NW-side or UE-side use a common model for multiple models on the opposite side.  Observation 9: For NW-first sequential training, the training based on gradient exchange provides several benefits in terms of flexibility in the input type, better alignment between the UE-side and NW-side model training, aligned dataset and avoiding disclosure of proprietary information.  Observation 10: It is feasible to train a common NW-side model that is compatible with multiple UE-side models using Type 2 or Type 3 training approach with performance comparable to Type 1 training.  Observation 11: Training type 1 (with device-specific encoder), training type 2 and training type 3 are applicable to both collaboration level y and level z.  *Proposal 1:* For data collection for model training, RAN1 should focus on what data should be collected. Mechanism for training data collection needs architectural considerations and should be handled by other working groups.  Proposal 2: For AI/ML-based CSI feedback using two-sided model, the procedure used to process the downlink measurements and derive the input to the UE-side model during inference should be left to UE implementation.  Proposal 3: While generating the training dataset, the target CSI corresponding to a downlink measurement should be derived by the UE side to reflect the UE processing during inference (e.g., channel estimation, eigen-vector derivation, etc.).  Proposal 4: Study assistance signalling for UE’s data collection in the form of a zone ID, scenario ID, and configuration ID.  Proposal 5: Model development and training options should consider the need for the UE-part of two-sided AI/ML models to be designed based on the UE capabilities and optimized in a device-specific manner.  Proposal 6: Model development and training options should strive for the principle of engineering isolation, i.e., confining engineering effort needed for a new chipset/UE development to the given chipset/UE vendor.  Proposal 7: Model development and training options need to consider whether the model is developed for common use across a group of UEs or is developed for an individual UE.  Proposal 8: Model development and training options need to consider feasibility of disclosing proprietary model information to the other side.  Proposal 9: For AI/ML-based CSI feedback enhancement use-case, take offline training as a starting point.  Proposal 10: Deprioritize Type 1 training with device-agnostic encoder in the R18 study.  Proposal 11: Adopt the following two-sided model development/training framework:   * Case 1: Initial (non-backward-compatible) development/training of “nominal encoder + nominal decoder”   + The use of the nominal encoder at the UE-side is not mandated     - If needed, UE-side may implement a different proprietary encoder based on this decoder using Case 2.     - As the encoders are only nominal, input used in the training process is only a nominal input. The actual input to the CSI encoders may be different and of proprietary choice.   + The use of the nominal decoder at the NW-side is not mandated     - If needed, NW-side may implement a different proprietary decoder based on this encoder using Case 3. * Case 2: Encoder development/training to be interoperable with existing decoders (e.g., encoders for new UEs or updating encoders for existing UEs):   + UE-side vendor trains new encoders based on the existing decoders.   + Infra vendor should make the existing decoders available (via either a run-time image or an API for training) for the encoder training. * Case 3: Decoder development/training to be interoperable with existing encoders (e.g., decoders for new cell sites or updating decoders for existing cell sites):   + Network-side vendor trains new decoders based on the existing encoders.   + FFS: Need for encoder availability for decoder training |
| AT&T | Proposal 1: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case with training collaboration type 1, further study potential specification impact on:   * Protocol and signalling mechanism to enable CSI compression specific model transfer.   Proposal 2: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case with training collaboration type 3, for sequential training, further study necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact on:   * Training dataset and/or other information delivery from UE side to NW side for UE first training * Training dataset and/or other information delivery from NW side to UE side for NW first training * Data sample format/type and the dataset size * Quantization/de-quantization related information * Note: other aspects are not precluded. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Observation 1: The performance of joint training is the upper bound of sequential training.  Observation 2: Three type of training procedures provides the similar performance, when the pre-/post-processing is aligned.  Observation 3: Type 2 and type 3 training procedure requires large signalling overhead due to the dataset transfer or the exchange of forward/back propagation from one side to the other.  Observation 4: Type 1 training procedure can provide good performance and requires less overhead signalling. However, the feasibility of model transfer is questionable in terms of the proprietary and hardware aspects.  Proposal 1: Categorize type 3 training procedure (sequential training) as follows.   * Type 3-A: sequential training via the dataset delivery   + Step 1 Joint training at one side   + Step 2 Delivery of the dataset produced by trained encoder/decoder to the other side   + Step 3 Training encoder/decoder based on the delivered dataset within the other side * Type 3-B: sequential training via the gradient exchange   + Step 1: Joint training at one side   + Step 2: Share the common dataset for training at Step 3   + Step 3: Training encoder/decoder at the other side via FP/BP exchange with the frozen decoder/encoder   Proposal 2: Deprioritize type 2 training procedure even for the model update. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2-6: Deprioritize two-sided model training collaboration that requires extensive sharing of training, validation and testing datasets over the air-interface in this study item.  Proposal 2-7: Study the impact of the following factors on two-sided model development approaches:   * Requirements on privacy-sensitive dataset sharing * Scalability, i.e., whether the number of models one vendor should develop increases with the number of collaborating vendors * Whether two-sided model development approaches adhere to 3GPP’s open and fair framework   Proposal 2-8: For Type 3 training collaboration, study performance impact of training/testing an encoder with a reference decoder or dataset.  Proposal 2-9: For AI/ML based CSI compression sub-use case, study and verify model update of the encoder at the UE, where the gNB’s training strategy is not disclosed while transferring/configuring the AE. |

### Summary:

Metrics to facilitate pros/cons discussion of each training collaboration type were captured in RAN1 112. Companies have provided views on the pros/cons of each training collaboration type. For training type 1 and training type 3, some analysis further separates it into UE side/NW side, and UE first/NW first. With early agreement that type 2 training collaboration is implementation-based solution based on multi-vendor agreement, some companies did not include type 2 training collaboration in the analysis. R1-2302919 further categorize each training collaboration type into multiple sub-types for detailed analysis.

FL tries to include high level aspects submitted to get comprehensive view. The following table summarizes the discussion.

### ***Proposed observation 2-1-1 (closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, the following table capture the pros/cons of different offline training collaboration types:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Training types  Characteristics | Type 1 | | Type 2 | Type 3 | |
| NW-sided | UE-sided |  | NW first | UE first |
| Whether model can be kept proprietary | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Whether require privacy-sensitive dataset sharing | No (Note 1) | No | No (Note 1) | No (Note 1) | No (Note 1) |
| Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model | Yes | Yes. With assisted information signaling | Difficult | Semi-flexible. | Semi-flexible. With assisted information signaling |
| Whether gNB/device specific optimization is allowed | Restricted | Restricted | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | Flexible | Flexible | Not flexible | Semi-flexible | Semi-flexible |
| Feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited  (Note 2) | Infeasible | Feasible | Feasible |
| Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model | Yes | No | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |
| Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model | No | Yes | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |
| Extendibility: to train new UE-side model compatible with NW-side model in use; Or to train new NW-side model compatible with UE-side model in use | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited | Support | Support |
| Whether training data distribution can match the inference device | Restricted | Yes | Restricted | Restricted | Yes |
| Software/hardware compatibility (Whether device capability can be considered for model development) | Limited | Limited | Compatible | Compatible | Compatible |
| Model performance based on evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |

Note 1: Assume high accuracy PMI is not privacy sensitive data. FFS: other information such as channel matrix and assisted information.

Note 2: For example, after deploying Model 1 on the UE side, a new UE model can be obtained by using Model 1 as the teacher model and using knowledge distillation method.

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Google** | Support in principle. One minor thing could be that for the two rows: “Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model” and “Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model”, we think we should add “For a CSI report configuration”.  If the NW provides different CSI report configurations with different CSI-RS, e.g., different CSI-RSs with different ports, a single/unified model may not work.  Mod: Updated. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We could not find why the model update after deployment is flexible only for type 1 model training. The proponent should clarify it.  Mod: Please see Huawei’s comments on type 1. For type 2, offline engineering to align multiple vendors are required, which is clearly not flexible. For type 3, new dataset sharing, new offline training and alignment are required. So it is semi-flexible.  As reference, below are text discussion from R1-2302359. “Compared with Type 1 joint training at Network side though, it may be less flexible for model updating, since for Type 1, the delivered model can be directly used, or implemented after compiling; while for Type 3, UE side still needs to perform training in prior. But compared with Type 2 or Type 3 with offline dataset delivery, it is more flexible due to less offline co-engineering.  ” |
| CATT | Generally OK, but:  (1) What does ‘training data distribution can match the inference device’ mean, and why only UE-sided/UE-first training can do it? Does ‘inference device’ only mean UE-side here? Can proponent clarify?  (2) Should we consider a column for *parallel training* in Type 3 collaboration?  Mod: On (1), this item is for UE part model. NW can do it with UE assisted information to categorizing UE device type. On (2), parallel training has not been agreed, and proposals in previous meeting about using a reference model or reference dataset raised many questions on feasibility. Therefore, it is not included in this table. We can certainly extend the table once parallel training itself is agreed. |
| Huawei/HiSi | **For “Model update flexibility after deployment”**  – for Type 1-UE side, if the flexibility can only be achieved based on the assisted information to achieve, it should be changed as “conditional, with assisted information”, or directly say “Restricted”.  – for Type 3-UE first, similarly, changed as “conditionally semi-flexible, with assisted information”, or directly say “Restricted”.  **For “Whether training data distribution can match the inference device”**-for Type 1-NW side and Type 3-NW first, it should be symmetric with the impact of “Model update flexibility after deployment” to UE side/UE first, both either aligned as “conditional, with assisted information” or aligned as “Restricted”.  **For “Model update flexibility after deployment”** – for Type 1-NW side, gNB can grab data from all UEs in the cell to quickly generate the updated dataset, and train the model on gNB; for Type 1-UE side, a UE vendor can only rely on its own UEs which is only a portion of UEs in that cell; moreover, the data needs to be uploaded to the non-3GPP entity from UE device rather than training on UE. So Type 1-UE side is “less flexible than Type 1-NW side”.  **For “Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model”** – For Type 1-NW side, due to the software/hardware compatibility issue at UE, different UE/chipset vendors may have different flavors on the model structure, so the gNB has to store multiple CSI generation parts from different UE vendors/versions. So it should be changed to “No”  **For “Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model”** – for Type 1-NW side, Type 2, Type 3-NW first, and Type 3-UE first, we believe that the UE part models are maintained at the UE side non-3GPP entity rather than the UE device, so it is feasible to store only one encoder at the UE device. In that sense, all 5 modes should be “Yes”  Mod: Updated except the last comments. |
| vivo | We are generally ok with the table with some minor comment:  1. In “whether model can be kept proprietary in training type 3”, we believe “Yes” should be “Partially Yes”, as information on model structure may be required to disclose.  2. For note2, we understand that model 1 can also refer to a nominal model while the real deployed model can be developed based on the nominal model.  3. We want to know, to which training collaboration the method of freezing decoder and updating encoder belongs when FL summarizes the table?  Mod: updated to capture 1 and 2. For 3, there were discussion in 9.2.1.1 on whether this is training type 2 or 3. At this moment, training type 3 does not include updating encoder via gradient exchange. |
| Ericsson | Knowledge distillation method needs to be defined. Also, I think this is seen as a starting point for further discussion. We may update or fine tune the observations later. |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with proposal. But we prefer to discussing Type I-NW side and Type 3-NW first with high priority. |
| LG Electronics | Support in principle. For the rows with pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1, we can skip those rows. If relevant agreement/conclusion are made in 9.2.2.1, we can add that rows.  Mod: placehold, since those metrics were captured in RAN1 112 already. |
| OPPO | **For “Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model”**  - for type 3 NW side first training, we think the answer is also **“Yes”.** Because NW can collect cell/site/scenario/configuration specific data and train the NW model, and transmit related **cell/site/scenario/configuration specific data** (to train the CSI encoder) to UE to help finishing the UE side model training. It is necessary to clarify what restrictions exist if it is “Semi flexible”  **For “Model update flexibility after deployment”,**  - What causes “Semi flexible” in type 3 training? Adding a note to clarify the difference between “flexible” and “semi flexible” would be helpful, if needed.  Mod: dataset exchange for training type 3 can be an overhead. There can be limitation on the amount of data files, and data files updates after deployment. This is the main reason for semi-flexible.  And agree with Xiaomi, we should focus on type1 and type3 since we have concluded 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”.  Mod: Training type 2 has no spec impact. The pros/cons of the implementation based solution still need to discussed to conclude whether this is a viable solution if 3GPP does not specify anything. |
| CMCC | For “Model update flexibility after deployment”, not sure why type 1 training can be flexible while type 3 training is semi-flexible.  Both of them need some additional dataset, the difference between them is just type 1 training need model delivery while type 3 training need dataset delivery.  Mod: See comments to OPPO and NTT Docomo. |
| CAICT | Fine in general. |
| Lenovo | For “**Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model**” for type-3 what do we mean by “Semi-flexible”? Similar to Type-1 the NW-first and UE-first can update their local model and then signal the other party with the required dataset for updating. Even in some cases, like freezed decoder, the UE side can update its encoder based on the local data. So, we suggest using “yes” in these cases as well  For “**Whether model can be kept proprietary**”  **@vivo**: for type-3 we can manage to keep even the model structure in private by iterative execution of training, please take a look at “iterative type-3” that we have discussed in our tdoc. So, we suggest to keep this part as “yes”  **For “Model update flexibility after deployment”**  We are not sure what is the meaning of “Semi-flexible” vs “flexible”?  Mod: See comments to OPPO and NTT Docomo. |
| NVIDIA | Support the observation in principle. |
| ZTE | Generally fine with the table. |
| Intel | For **For “Model update flexibility after deployment”**, our view is aligned with comment from Huawei/HiSi: some level optimization is still possible (based on assistance info e.g., UE capability). |
| Panasonic | For “model update flexibility after deployment”, we share the same view with Huawei. For UE-side Type 1 training, instead of “flexible”, “conditional, with assisted information”, or directly say “Restricted” would be better. |
| AT&T | Support in principle. |
| Qualcomm | * For this discussion, for Type 1 offline training, the location where training happens does not matter. What matters is whether the training is done in a device-agnostic manner or device-specific manner with vendor collaboration. Hence, we propose to consider the two categories of Type 1 training as “Type 1 with device agnostic encoder” and “Type 1 with device specific encoder”.   Mod: These are sub-categorizing under NW side training. If UE side training, the issue does not exist.   * The term “semi-flexible” is not clear. For example, why it Type 3 NW-first support for cell-specific model different from Type 1?   Mod: See comments to OPPO and NTT Docomo.   * For NW-first Type 3 training, a flavor where the UE-side model is trained by freezing the decoder and exchanging gradients with the NW-side training entity is being discussed in the evaluation agenda. This type has different properties from what is captured above for Type 3. For example, training data distribution can be chosen to match the inference device since the dataset is decided by the UE-side. We ask to capture this training type also. For clarity, it may be named Type 4.   Mod: there were discussion in 9.2.1.1 on whether this is training type 2 or 3. We can further discuss whether to define type 4 depending the conclusion of 9.2.1.1 discussion.   * We have also submitted a table (Section 4.6, Table 1) with a comparison of the training types in our contribution. We request the moderator to please include the same in the Appendix 4.   Mod: Sorry for the miss. Updated. |

***Summary of 1st round comments:***

Thanks for the comments! FL tries to capture the comments to update the table. Red color text captured comments less controversial. Yellow high-lighted text are aspects multiple companies raised questions, which require more discussion and alignment. Some comments are addressed directly in the comments table, please double check and we can further clarify in the 2nd round discussion.

### ***Proposed observation 2-1-1(v1closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, the following table capture the pros/cons of different offline training collaboration types:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Training types  Characteristics | Type 1 | | Type 2 | Type 3 | |
| NW-sided | UE-sided |  | NW first | UE first |
| Whether model can be kept proprietary | No | No | Yes | Yes (Note 3) | Yes (Note 3) |
| Whether require privacy-sensitive dataset sharing | No (Note 1) | No | No (Note 1) | No (Note 1) | No (Note 1) |
| Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model | Yes | Yes. With assisted information signaling. Less flexible than Type 1-NW side. | Difficult | Semi-flexible. | Semi-flexible. With assisted information signaling |
| Whether gNB/device specific optimization is allowed | Restricted | Restricted | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | Flexible | ~~Flexible~~  Conditional, with assisted information | Not flexible | Conditional semi-flexible, with assisted information | Semi-flexible |
| Feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited  (Note 2) | Infeasible | Feasible | Feasible |
| Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model for a CSI report configuration | ~~Yes~~ No | No | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |
| Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model for a CSI report configuration | No | Yes | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |
| Extendibility: to train new UE-side model compatible with NW-side model in use; Or to train new NW-side model compatible with UE-side model in use | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited | Support | Support |
| Whether training data distribution can match the inference device | ~~Restricted~~  Conditional, with assisted information from UE | Yes | Restricted | ~~Restricted~~  Conditional, with assisted information from UE | Yes |
| Software/hardware compatibility (Whether device capability can be considered for model development) | Limited | Limited | Compatible | Compatible | Compatible |
| Model performance based on evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |

Note 1: Assume high accuracy PMI is not privacy sensitive data. FFS: other information such as channel matrix and assisted information.

Note 2: For example, after deploying model 1 on the UE side, a new UE model can be obtained by using model 1 as the teacher model and using knowledge distillation method. Model 1 can also refer to a nominal model while the real deployed model can be developed based on the nominal model.

Note 3: Assume information on model structure is not required to be disclosed in training collaboration type 3.

Note 4: Yellow highlighted rows are for further discussion.

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Regarding the model update flexibility after deployment, we still think flexible, semi-flexible, and not flexible are determined very subjectively. According to FL’ comments, they are determined based on the amount of offline engineering required for each type training procedure. However, there is no conclusion that model delivery is simpler offline co-engineering than dataset delivery. If the majority still prefer to capture the amount of offline engineering in the table, the exact required offline co-engineering (e.g., model delivery, dataset delivery) instead of subjective word (e.g., flexible, semi-flexible) should be mentioned in the table or at least in the Note for the fair comparison.  Also, the boundary between type 2 and type 3 training is still under the discussion. According to that conclusion, the table might need to be updated. Hence, it is better to mention that possibility in the proposal. |
| vivo | We have some comments for HW’s view “For “Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model” – For Type 1-NW side, due to the software/hardware compatibility issue at UE, different UE/chipset vendors may have different flavors on the model structure, so the gNB has to store multiple CSI generation parts from different UE vendors/versions. So it should be changed to “No” ”:  We agree that when NW wants to support multiple UE/chipset vendors with different model structure flavors, multiple CSI generation parts have to be stored at NW in type1. However, we understand that type3 training could also face the same issue especially for NW-first training: NW may need to generate different datasets based on different CSI generation model to guarantee that different UE vendors can receive proper training datasets. By “proper”, we mean that if a UE vendor prefers some model structure such as CNN, sending him a dataset generated based on a transformer CSI generation model will make it challenging to train a CNN CSI generation model with satisfying performance. In fact, to support other features such as area-specific models, model finetuning, etc., it is always needed to store multiple models at NW for all training collaborations.  In addition, we see in 9.2.1 that HW also says that “In our understanding, if UE side and NW side can align somehow on the profile of the model, such as the backbone, layers, etc. (rather than exactly the full structure), NW side can develop a unified model supported by all/multiple UE vendors”. As demonstrated in our initial simulation results, CSI compression model is quite robust to UE antenna imbalance and antenna spacing, which means that a unified model is enough.  Thus we believe it is possible to maintain a single model at the network side for Type 1 training and should be changed back to "YES". |
| Samsung | Thank you FL for your efforts. We are Ok the above table in general.  We share the same view as vivo. |
| Intel | It is not apparent to us that gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model for Type 1 NW-side training, in our understanding it may be the case that all the UEs supporting AI/ML CSI compression with Type 1 NW-side training can support a unified model. |
| CATT | Thanks FL for the explanation and your great effort.  Regarding ‘**Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model**’, we think ‘Yes’ should be kept at least for nominal AI/ML reconstruction model. Or at least consider ‘conditional’. For example, gNB can just keep one unified pair of model, and only transfer/delivery CSI construction part to suitable UEs. Other UEs keep using legacy CSI report.  Regarding ‘**Regarding the model update flexibility after deployment**’, DOCOMO’s suggestion sounds reasonable. We can capture what is required to achieve flexibility for different training, e.g. need model transfer/delivery, need E2E OTA gradient exchange, need dataset transfer/delivery, need assisted information…rather than using ambiguous terms like semi-flexible etc. |
| Nokia/NSB | Type 2 is deprioritized and not need to be included in the Table.  Overall, we agree with DCM that flexibility criteria is not clearly defined.  Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model  Not clear why Type 1 is flexible here. If the model is site/cell-specific, Type 1 or Type 3 does not fully matter as it means more models have to be trained/managed and nothing seems flexible in that angle.  Model update flexibility after deployment  Not sure Type 1 has any additional flexibility over Type 3. The model update may still require further considerations (e.g. data collection for the model update, delivery for Type 1, etc..) and does not seem to be having addtional flexibility over Type 3. |
| CMCC | Regarding “**Regarding the model update flexibility after deployment**”, agree with DCM’s suggestion. If we think it acquire additional condition to achieve flexibility, we could just say “conditional, with assisted information”, rather “semi-flexible”. |
| ZTE | We are not clear whether gNB cannot maintain/store a single/unified model for Type 1 NW-side training, in our understanding, Type 1 NW-side training can support a unified model for multiple UE vendors. Therefore, we think it is **YES**. |
| Lenovo | We appreciate the moderator’s comments and responses. It looks to us like “semi-flexible” in most cases is equivalent to “yes with assisted signaling”. Is it possible to add a note clarifying what “flexible” and “semi-flexible” mean? This can also help address concerns of NTT Docomo. Please find below suggested definitions:  ***Flexible:*** *can be supported with signaling of negligible overhead, alignment across multiple vendors not needed*  ***Semi-flexible:*** *can be supported with signaling of notable overhead, alignment across multiple vendors not needed*  ***Not flexible:*** *alignment across multiple vendors is needed* |
| Qualcomm | We thank the moderator for including our table in the appendix.  For Type 1, the answers to the pros and cons questions will be the opposite depending on whether the joint training is done in a device agnostic or device-specific manner. For example, whether device capability can be considered, whether training data distribution is matched, and whether gNB needs to maintain multiple models – all are no for device-agnostic Type 1, but yes for Type 1 with device-specific encoder. Mixing these into one column will create confusion.  Type 1 UE-sided – software/hardware compatibility, why is it marked as “limited”? The UE-side training can incorporate the UE capability.  Extensibility for new UE and new NW-side model should be considered as different rows, as the answer may not be the same for UE-first and NW-first. |
| Ericsson | We are, also similar to ZTE, not clear whether gNB cannot maintain/store a single/unified model for Type 1 NW-side training, in our understanding, Type 1 NW-side training can support a unified model for multiple UE vendors. |
| Futurewei | We share similar view as some other companies regarding “Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model”. It depends on how the unified model is trained. If it is trained to learn the invariant across different potential encoder outputs across UE types/vendors, then it is feasible (there may be some tradeoff between “unified” model and performance). Our suggestion is to keep “YES”, or “YES with some restriction” is also ok. |
| Xiaomi | In our view, “For “Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model” – For Type 1-NW side, at least CSI reconstruction part model should be a single/unified model for different UE vendors. Whether CSI generation part model is a single/unified model depends on the hardware/software of UE device. |

***Summary of 2nd round discussion:***

On model update flexibility after deployment: @NTT DOCOMO, @CATT, @Nokia: model update flexibility after deployment is evaluated by the amount of offline cross-vendor co-engineering effort. Support of model transfer, particularly parameters update, does not require additional offline co-engineering. Drawback of model transfer is captured in “proprietary model” and “Software/hardware compatibility” row. Based on Lenovo’s comments, I added clarification of flexible/semi-flexible in the note.

On whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model, it changed back to Yes. @Huawei, @ Intel, please check vivo, CATT, ZTE, Ericsson, Futurewei and Xiaomo’s comment.

On flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model, @Nokia, for training type 3, each case will require additional dataset exchange, and then perform 1:M training. Additional steps/overheads are involved comparing to type 1.

On extendibility, @Qualcomm, on comment related to split extendibility row is split into two rows (separated by “Or”), would you please elaborate which answer will be changed?

On further split NW side type 1 into two column of device agnostic and device-specific, @Qualcomm, FL try to capture directly instead of splitting column. Ericsson provided a very detailed table based on different type of model transfer in the appendix.

@Nokia, regarding remove type 2 column as it has no specification impact, FL recommend to keep it to have full understanding of the feasibility and pros/cons of each training type. Many aspects discussed related to offline engineering, particularly cross-vendor offline engineering.

### ***Proposed observation 2-1-1(v2closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, the following table capture the pros/cons of different offline training collaboration types:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Training types  Characteristics | Type 1 | | Type 2 | Type 3 | |
| NW-sided | UE-sided |  | NW first | UE first |
| Whether model can be kept proprietary | No | No | Yes | Yes (Note 3) | Yes (Note 3) |
| Whether require privacy-sensitive dataset sharing | No (Note 1) | No | No (Note 1) | No (Note 1) | No (Note 1) |
| Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model | Yes | Yes. With assisted information signaling. Less flexible than Type 1-NW side. | Difficult | Semi-flexible. | Semi-flexible. With assisted information signaling |
| Whether gNB/device specific optimization is allowed | Restricted | Restricted | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | Flexible  (note 4) | Conditional, with assisted information (note 4) | Not flexible  (note 4) | Conditional semi-flexible, with assisted information  (note 4) | Semi-flexible  (note 4) |
| Feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited  (Note 2) | Infeasible | Feasible | Feasible |
| Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model for a CSI report configuration | Yes ~~No~~ | No | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |
| Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model for a CSI report configuration | No | Yes | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |
| Extendibility: to train new UE-side model compatible with NW-side model in use; Or to train new NW-side model compatible with UE-side model in use | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited | Support | Support |
| Whether training data distribution can match the inference device | Conditional, with assisted information from UE for device specific model. | Yes | Restricted | Conditional, with assisted information from UE | Yes |
| Software/hardware compatibility (Whether device capability can be considered for model development) | Yes for device specific model. No for device-agnostic model. | ~~Limited~~ Yes | Compatible | Compatible | Compatible |
| Model performance based on evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |

Note 1: Assume high accuracy PMI is not privacy sensitive data. FFS: other information such as channel matrix and assisted information.

Note 2: For example, after deploying model 1 on the UE side, a new UE model can be obtained by using model 1 as the teacher model and using knowledge distillation method. Model 1 can also refer to a nominal model while the real deployed model can be developed based on the nominal model.

Note 3: Assume information on model structure is not required to be disclosed in training collaboration type 3.

Note 4: Flexibility after deployment is evaluated by the amount of offline cross-vendor co-engineering effort. Flexible indicates minimum additional co-engineering between vendors, semi-flexible indicates additional co-engineering effort between vendors.

Note 5: Yellow highlighted rows are for further discussion.

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo | Support |
| CATT | OK. |
| vivo | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Huawei/HiSi | We appreciate FL for the updates. Please see some follow-ups:  **For “Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model”, for Type 3-UE first –** should also add “Less flexible than Type 3-NW first” (consistent to Type 1-UE side to Type 1-NW side)?  **For “Model update flexibility after deployment”, for Type 3-NW first**  “Conditional semi-flexible, with assisted information”- as per our comments in the 1st round, this should be added to the “UE first” column (same reason as “Type 1-UE side”)? Did I miss something?  **For “Model update flexibility after deployment”**  – **for Type 1-UE side**, “Conditional flexible, with assisted information”  – **for Type 3-NW first, same as the previous comment, “**Conditional semi-flexible, with assisted information**”** should be swap with **“**semi-flexible**”** at the Type 3-UE first coloumn?  Mod: Yes. My mistaken.  **For “Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model for a CSI report configuration”** – appreciate vivo to find our comments in 9.2.1. Yes, we do hope that NW can maintain one unified encoder to all UE vendors, but that is only possible under Case z5 in 9.2.1; for other cases, it seems not likely. I would suggest correcting this entry to be “Depends on model transfer method” to keep open. Note: for Type 3-NW first, we do not think one gNB has to develop multiple decoders to pair different UEs – NW side generate a unified dataset with TF and share it to different UE vendors; if a UE vendor prefer a simple and low performance model (like MLP/CNN), it cannot well match with the decoder, but that is UE vendor’s choice, and there is nothing gNB can do: even gNB develops a separate MLP/CNN, the performance is still bad; there is no big difference if you adopt TF to match CNN or CNN to match CNN. In that regard, we suggest **for “Type 3-NW first”,** it is changed to “Yes”  **For “Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model for a CSI report configuration”** – why cannot a UE device maintain a single model **for Type 3-NW first** and **Type 1-NW side**? UE device only camps in one gNB, so it can choose to store the single model corresponding to that gNB, right? When UE hands over to other cells or other NW vendor’s gNB (the latter of which we believe happens quite infrequently), UE can redownload the encoder if the previous one does not match any longer. |
| Xiaomi | For Note3, we wonder whether the backbone of model structure is proprietary. In our view, it is not proprietary information. Is it common understanding? For training type 3, we think it is necessary to indicate the backbone of model to UE in order to obtain better performance according to our simulation evaluation. |
| OPPO | **For “Model update flexibility after deployment”**  Agree with FL's clarification on the boundary between type1 and type3 training. For the differences between type1 UE side and type1 NW side, we still have some concerns.  In the first round, it was proposed “*for Type 1-UE side, if the flexibility can only be achieved based on the assisted information to achieve, it should be changed as “conditional, with assisted information, or directly say “Restricted”*. Here, we are not sure what will be the assisted information mentioned in the proposal? And we try to check the tdoc, seems related description is *“the model update for the joint training at Network side is much easier than model update at the UE side which cannot train the model at the UE device due to the limitation of the UE capability”.* And it is still unclear what is the required assisted information.  We suggest,   * **For type 1 UE side,** before we have a clear and common understanding on the purpose of “assisted information”, we prefer to change back to “Flexible” or “Flexible, Less flexible than Type 1-NW side(consider the UE side training may be limited by capability)”. * **For type3 NW first,** before we have a clear and common understanding on the term “conditional” and the purpose of “assisted information”, we prefer to change back to “Semi-flexible” (if it is for “UE first” column, same concern mentioned in type1 UE side).   **For “Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model”.** Similarly，not sure why we need and what will be the assisted information(e.g. the purpose needs to be clarified).  Is it possible to add a note clarifying the “assisted information”, if we need to address it? |
| CAICT | Support |
| LG Electronics | Support |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Qualcomm | We thank the moderator for the responses, but we still have a concern regarding the type 1 column. The answers to many of the questions are the complete opposite for the two flavors of type 1 training – device agnostic and device specific. Capturing them in a single column will result in a lot of confusion.   * Whether gNB can store a single model also depends on device-agnostic vs. device specific. This is currently not captured. * For the two points involving “Flexibility” (site-specific, and after deployment), the answer should be yes for device-agnostic but semi-flexible for device-specific. Just saying “yes” gives a wrong impression – for example, it suggests that Type 1 can achieve flexibility (no co-engineering) and SW/HW device compatibility at the same time, which is not the case.   Regarding extensibility, in response to the moderator’s question, Type 3 NW-first training (gradient-exchange based) can allow new UE model with existing NW-model. However, this does not apply for new NW model. Similarly, Type 3 UE-first training can allow new NW model with existing UE-model. However, this does not apply for new UE model. (Please refer to our table as well)  Regarding note 2, this means the new UE’s encoder is sequentially trained, so this should not be considered Type 1, but instead this falls under Type 3 training. In fact, this could be viewed as an example of the training framework in Proposal 11 of our contribution, where the initial training could happen based on Type 1, 2, or 3, and for new NW/UE model, sequential training can be used. Please change “Limited (Note 2)” to “No” for Type 1 in all the places.  Regarding flexibility to support site-specific model, UE-sided Type 1 and UE-first Type 3 mention “assisted information signaling”. But UE-sided/UE-first training need not imply UE-side data collection. Similarly, NW-side/NW-first training need not imply NW-side data collection, and could still benefit from assisted information signaling if UE-side data collection is used. We ask to remove “With assisted information signaling” from that row, since it could apply to all cases. |
| AT&T | Support |
| ZTE | Support in general.  Regarding **Software/hardware compatibility (Whether device capability can be considered for model development) for NW-sided Type 1**, we think it should be modified to **‘Conditional, with assistance information from UE’** since device-specific and device-agnostic have no clear definition and our modification can align with the other wordings in the table, which can also include these two specific case.  Regarding **Model update flexibility after deployment for NW-first Type 3**, we are not clear why it is conditional semi-flexible, compared with UE-first. To our understanding, it should be aligned with UE-first (i.e. **semi-flexible**), which needs clarification.  Mod: Mistake. Corrected.  Regarding the 4th Note, we think minimum additional co-engineering is hard to define, e.g. which operations are low co-engineering, it may need further clarification. |

***Summary of 3rd round discussion:***

Thanks for the comments!

Two main comments from Qualcomm are related to the overall column structure of the table: (1) further split column UE-sided type 1 training into two columns: device specific model and device agnostic model. By doing this, some debated related to flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model can be easier as well. (2) Gradient exchange based sequential training. Whether we capture it as type 2 or type 3 or new type 4. There is a concurrent discussion in 9.2.2.1 as well, and it does not seem to converge easily. To proceed, FL first would like to confirm this sequential gradient exchange is not over the air interface, so we can at least be deprioritized in R18 for potential specification impact discussion.

### ***Proposal 2-1-1(closed)***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, to capture observation of different training collaboration types, separate UE side training collaboration type 3 into device-specific and device agnostic.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Training types  Characteristics | Type 1 | | | Type 2 | Type 3 | |
| NW-sided | | UE-sided |  | NW first | UE first |
| Device agnostic | Device specific |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supporting companies |  |
| Objecting companies |  |

Additional comments if any:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Fujitsu | Is it supposed to be type 1? |
| CATT | Device agnostic or not may also impact Type 1 NW-side? For example, ‘maintain/store a single/unified model’ may be different. |
| Huawei/HiSi | “***UE side training collaboration type 3***” should be “NW-sided training collaboration type 1”?  BTW, for Type-1 UE side, the same issue occurs to the gNB – gNB cannot implement an unseen structure. So, both NW-sided and UE-sided should split into “agnostic” and “specific”: NW-sided – {Device agnostic vs Device specific }; UE-sided - { gNB agnostic vs gNB specific }.  But to be honest, we do not think it needs to be so complicated. The “agnostic vs specific” is to be discussed at 9.2.1, so what we need to do here is to say “Pending in 9.2.1” (On “Software/hardware compatibility” and “Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model for a CSI report configuration” entries) |
| CMCC | Sane view with CATT and Huawei. |
| ZTE | Regarding “***Device agnostic and Device specific***” , to our understanding, it belongs to NW-sided Type 1, since whether NW-sided model training involves the UE vendor’s work.  However, we agree with Huawei that the table is so complicated now, and “agnostic vs specific” has no corresponding definitions in this agenda and companies have no common understandings. So, we suggest reusing the previous framework for Type 1 training (i.e. NW-sided and UE-sided), not splitting the two columns for device agnostic and device specific. As we commented in 3rd round, we prefer a high-level wording **‘Conditional, with assistance information from UE’** since our modification can align with the other wordings in the table, which can also be applicable to the cases of device agnostic and device specific. |
| Mod | Corrected. It should be under NW side. |
| Qualcomm | We thank the moderator for incorporating our comment, but want to clarify one aspect. If the single training entity jointly trains models for more than one type/vendor of UE, then the term “UE-sided” is not clear as there are multiple UE-sides. Hence, instead of classifying based on the training entity’s location, i.e., NW-sided vs. UE-sided, what matters more is whether the training was done with or without device-specific considerations. Our contribution compares the device-agnostic vs. device-specific cases in more detail.  We suggest to further simplify Type 1 into just two columns:   * Type 1, Device-agnostic: The training entity trains the two-sided model for common use with all devices. * Type 1, Device-specific: The training entity trains a two-sided model specific to each type of device, in collaboration with the device-side vendor(s).   More generally, before discussing the observations, ***we need to discuss and achieve common understanding on the assumptions for each column*** regarding:   * Training location (NW, UE, Other place) * Device-specific v. device-agnostic * Training method 1/2/3/4 * Multi-vendor related assumptions, e.g., meaning of UE-sided when there are multiple UE vendors * Others that affect the observations: e.g., Data collection side, Storage location   We do not need a column for every combination – we can select the main ones – but we need to clarify these assumptions for the selected cases. Otherwise, each company may have a different option in mind when discussing the same column.  Mod: For type1, the main difference is whether the model is transferred from NW to UE, or from UE to NW. NW side type 1 means model is transferred from NW to UE, UE side type 1 means model is transferred from UE to NW. Training location is not the main concern. All vendors can use AWS to train for example. Storage location is also not part of the discussion here.  Overall, the exercise is to capturing high level key point in the table. |
| Ericsson | It seems more discussion is needed |
| LG Electronics | We agree with Huawei, Btw, the main bullet also needs to be corrected. |
| ETRI | We also prefer to keep the table from the previous round as commented by ZTE. |
| OPPO | Share the same view with HW.  We do not think the table needs to be too complicated. The “agnostic vs specific” can be addressed in the table content, if needed. |
| Xiaomi | In principle, we are fine that collaboration training type is classified into NW-side/UE side or NW-first/UE-first. But, we are open to study how to classify them as commented by QC, such that we achieve the common understanding what does it mean of each column. |
| Samsung | Better to keep the Table as it was. We didn’t properly analyzed device/gNB specific models. It can be added in the future, if relevant. |

Majority companies prefer previous table, without separating into device agnostic and device specific. FL suggest moving forward with previous table.

### ***[Rd 5] Proposed conclusion 2-1-1(v1)***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, to capture observation of different training collaboration types, there is no consensus to further separate NW side training collaboration type 1 into device-specific and device agnostic.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Training types  Characteristics | Type 1 | | | Type 2 | Type 3 | |
| NW-sided | | UE-sided |  | NW first | UE first |
| Device agnostic | Device specific |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supporting companies | Futurewei |
| Objecting companies | vivo (only the device agnostic case should be considered in Rel-18 due to the lake of time, while the device specific case should be deferred to Rel-19 via a normative work).  Qualcomm (comment below) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Huawei/HiSi | A clarification question: If we do not touch this discussion/separation, then how to fill this entry in the observation? It is possible that different companies have different understandings on the operation mode.  Maybe we can make this entry as FFS for time being? |
| Xiaomi | As commented by us in the last round, it has better to achieve common understanding for collaboration training type. Considering the workload and available TU, we should study one of the Device agnostic and Device specific for joint training type 1. |
| Qualcomm | It is too early to conclude this. As mentioned, many answers in Type 1 column depend on whether the training was done in a device-specific manner or not. Instead, more discussion is needed to agree on a common set of assumptions for each column to get a common understanding among companies.  Alternately, we can decide to prioritize the device-specific flavor of Type 1, since the device-agnostic flavor has the concern that the model structure does not account for the device capability. |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

To confirm FL’s understanding that the proponents of the gradient-exchange sequential training method are not proposing to perform the gradient exchange over the air interface, instead it is through offline co-engineering,

### ***Proposal 2-1-2 (For email approval)***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, gradient-exchange based sequential training over the air interface is deprioritized in R18 SI.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supporting companies | Fujitsu, Futurewei, Qualcomm, Ericsson, ETRI, OPPO, ZTE |
| Objecting companies |  |

Additional comments if any:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| CATT | This case seems duplicated discussion with 9.2.2.1. We suggest to handle the categorization of this case in 9.2.2.1 first.  If we would like to make decision here, our view is Yes. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Does it mean “freeze-and-train” based on gradient change? If so, we agree.  Mod: Yes. It is the freeze-and-train. |
| CMCC | Support. If the gradient-exchange is performed over the air interface, it should be deprioritized, it is also the intention why we deprioritize Type 2 training. |
| ZTE | Agree with CATT. |
| Qualcomm | Agree. The gradient exchange is assumed to happen offline between training entities, not over the air-interface. |
| OPPO | Online training should be deprioritized in R18 |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| Samsung | Ok |

If the above is confirm, FL suggest to further split type 2 training into type 2 joint and type 2 sequential.

### ***Proposal 2-1-3 (Hold until 9.2.2.1 discussion conclude)***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, to capture observation related to gradient-exchange based sequential training, separate training collaboration type 3 into joint training and sequential training.***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Training type  Characteristics | Type 1 | | | Spec transparent way | | Type 3 | |
| NW-sided | UE-sided | | Type 2: Joint gradient exchange | Sequential gradient exchange | NW first | UE first |
| Device agnostic | Device specific |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Supporting companies |  |
| Objecting companies | Samsung |

Additional comments if any:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Fujitsu | Is it supposed to be type 2? |
| CATT | Depends on proposals ahead. |
| Huawei/HiSi | This issue is overlapped with 9.2.2.1. As a kind remind, we may keep discussing from evaluation and spec impact perspectives separately, but the decision should be jointly made to avoid duplication/conflict. |
| ZTE | This proposal can be further discussed after some outcomes from 9.2.2.1, since whether this case belongs to Type 2 or a new Type 4 has not been determined. After some conclusions have been drawn in 9.2.2.1, we can refer to them here. |
| Mod | There is a concurrent discussion in 9.2.2.1, and it does not seem to converge quickly. As most company believe there is no spec impact on this training type, and given current type 2 definition, let me revise the table for another try. |
| Qualcomm | It helps that sequential gradient exchange is in a separate column as that allows to capture the pros and cons clearly without mixing with other training types. However, earlier agreement ***defined Type 2 as joint training***. Sequential training is a form of separate training, and hence should be considered Type 3. Alternatively, we can follow the proposal being discussed in 9.2.2.1 where it is proposed to be called **Type 4**.  The reason to mention “spec transparent way” in this table only for Type 2 is not clear. |
| Ericsson | Type 4 seems easier to end the endless discussion. Agree with Qualcomm why spec transparent only ends up in Type 2? All types have a spec transparent way. |
| Xiaomi | For type 2, we think it should be a joint training. While sequential gradient exchange for type 2 has not discussed and achieved a common understanding. So, we suggest to firstly discuss what is sequential gradient exchange for type 2. |
| Samsung | Should be Type 2. May be typo |
| ZTE | We agree with Ericsson, since all training types can have a spec transparent way. In addition, for the training types of joint gradient exchange and sequential gradient change, we think the characteristics for both types may be similar and these two types can be incorporated in Type 2 training. So, we suggest changing the table as   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Training type  Characteristics | Type 1 | | | ~~Spec transparent way~~ Type 2 | Type 3 | | | NW-sided | | UE-sided | Joint gradient exchange/Sequential gradient exchange | NW first | UE first | | Device agnostic | Device specific |  | |

On the comments related to

*Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model:* @Huawei, Type 1 UE side is less flexible is to consider NW side taking different decoders from UE can be quite difficult. However, for type 3 UE first, NW perform offline training based on multiple UE’s dataset. Overall process is similar to type 3 NW first. I would not see why it is less flexible than type 3 NW first.

*Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model for a CSI report configuration:* @Huawei, on comment to change “Type-3-NW first to Yes”, let us update it after 9.2.2.1 agreed on the observation. @Huawei, @xiaomi, @vivo, let us further discuss whether type 3 training need to be exchanged between vendors during offline model identification.

@OPPO, assisted information refers to the categorizing assisted information in data collection agreement in RAN1 112. Some gNB has proprietary implementation such as antenna virtualization, will be abstracted to certain assistance info to have UE perform the configuration specific training.

### ***Proposed observation 2-1-1(v3 hold):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, the following table capture the pros/cons of different offline training collaboration types:***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Training types  Characteristics | Type 1 | | Type 2 | Type 3 | |
| NW-sided | UE-sided |  | NW first | UE first |
| Whether model can be kept proprietary | No | No | Yes | Yes (Note 3) | Yes (Note 3) |
| Whether require privacy-sensitive dataset sharing | No (Note 1) | No | No (Note 1) | No (Note 1) | No (Note 1) |
| Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model | Yes | Yes. With assisted information signaling. Less flexible than Type 1-NW side. | Difficult | Semi-flexible. | Semi-flexible. With assisted information signaling |
| Whether gNB/device specific optimization is allowed | Restricted | Restricted | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | Flexible  (note 4) | Conditional, flexible with assisted information (note 4) | Not flexible  (note 4) | Semi-flexible | Conditional semi-flexible, with assisted information  (note 4) |
| Feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited  (Note 2) | Infeasible | Feasible | Feasible |
| Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model for a CSI report configuration | Yes ~~No~~ | No | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |
| Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model for a CSI report configuration | No | Yes | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |
| Extendibility: to train new UE-side model compatible with NW-side model in use; Or to train new NW-side model compatible with UE-side model in use | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited  (Note 2) | Limited | Support | Support |
| Whether training data distribution can match the inference device | Conditional, with assisted information from UE for device specific model. | Yes | Restricted | Conditional, with assisted information from UE | Yes |
| Software/hardware compatibility (Whether device capability can be considered for model development) | Yes for device specific model. No for device-agnostic model. | ~~Limited~~ Yes | Compatible | Compatible | Compatible |
| Model performance based on evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Pending evaluation in 9.2.2.1 |

Note 1: Assume high accuracy PMI is not privacy sensitive data. FFS: other information such as channel matrix and assisted information.

Note 2: For example, after deploying model 1 on the UE side, a new UE model can be obtained by using model 1 as the teacher model and using knowledge distillation method. Model 1 can also refer to a nominal model while the real deployed model can be developed based on the nominal model.

Note 3: Assume information on model structure is not required to be disclosed in training collaboration type 3.

Note 4: Flexibility after deployment is evaluated by the amount of offline cross-vendor co-engineering effort. Flexible indicates minimum additional co-engineering between vendors, semi-flexible indicates additional co-engineering effort between vendors.

Note 5: Yellow highlighted rows are for further discussion.

## Data collection

Following table summarize company’s proposals related to data collection.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Huawei | Proposal 2: For the enhancement of CSI-RS configurations for Network/UE side data collection under CSI compression, separate CSI-RS resources/CSI reports can be adopted for generating ground-truth CSI labels (e.g., measured with higher power/density CSI-RS) and model inputs (e.g., measured with lower power/density CSI-RS) to support the super resolution of using low resolution input to infer high resolution output.  Observation 1: It is necessary to support real time UE report of the monitoring results to gNB to enable fast identification of network performance fluctuation/degradation and AI/ML model failure.   * E.g., in case of performance degradation, event-triggered monitoring window can be activated so that gNB can efficiently collect data and thereby quickly identify whether the degradation is due to the AI/ML model failure.   Observation 2: For Network side monitoring based on intermediate KPI, the reporting of the ground-truth CSI and the associated CSI report by the UE via L1 signaling has comparable overhead with L3 signaling but with much less latency which can enable fast identification of AI/ML model failure.  Proposal 3: For the container of Network side data collection under CSI compression,   * Both of L1 signaling and RRC signaling can be supported for model training. * At least L1 signaling should be supported for model monitoring to enable fast identification of AI/ML model failure.   Proposal 4: For data sample format of Network side data collection under CSI compression:   * Both of scalar quantization and codebook-based quantization can be supported for model training. * Codebook-based quantization should be supported for model monitoring.   Proposal 5: For the Network side data collection of ground-truth CSI, the number of ranks and the index(es) of layer(s) for the report of ground-truth CSI can be designated by the gNB rather than autonomously calculated and reported by UE.  Observation 3: The applicable cases for the categorization ID for assisting UE side data collection may need to be further clarified with respect to the following points:   * Generalized model can be trained at UE side over scenarios/antenna layouts. * UE can autonomously sense the scenario without being notified by gNB. * The categorization or granularity of the scenarios identified by Network may not match the categorization principle of the UE side.   Proposal 6: The data categorization ID, if justified, should be determined by Network side in forms of virtualized ID without specifying the physical meaning.   * The physical meaning of such ID and the granularity of such ID is up to Network implementation without being indicated to the UE side.   Proposal 7: In CSI compression using two-sided model with training collaboration Type 3, further study potential specification impact of dataset delivery over air-interface on the following aspects:   * Training dataset and/or other information delivery from UE side to Network side for UE first training. * Training dataset and/or other information delivery from Network side to UE side for NW first training. * The specification impact includes dataset ID, the size of the dataset, format of data sample, type(s) of the data sample, quantization/de-quantization related information etc.   Proposal 8: For the dataset delivery of CSI compression over air-interface, the following approaches can be considered to largely alleviate the overhead/power consumption of per UE:   * Quantization on the ground-truth CSI with high resolution quantization format, e.g., R16 Type II-like method with new parameters. * Network splits the overall dataset into massive subsets each with limited number of data samples (e.g., with comparable overhead as RRC signaling). The subsets can be separately sent to numerous UEs, and all subsets are associated with a common dataset ID for UE side combination.   Proposal 9: For the dataset delivery of CSI compression over air-interface, the dataset ID associated with the delivered dataset can be used to achieve the pairing of the Network part model and the UE part model.   * E.g., for NW first separate training, UEs receive the dataset associated with a dataset ID to perform the training; after the UE part model is trained, UE and gNB will use the dataset ID to achieve the pairing. |
| ZTE | Observation 1: When model training or monitoring is performed at network side, the overhead of the ground-truth label transmitted over the air-interface from UE to network is a huge concern if the ground-truth CSI is an ideal CSI (e.g., raw channels, eigenvectors).  Observation 2: The overhead of enhanced Type II CB (i.e., PC10) for one training sample increases by 50% compared with the maximal payload of Rel-16 TypeII CB (i.e., PC8) but keeps similar model performance as ideal CSI, which can be acceptable to be carried on UCI.  Proposal 5: For network side data collection, support to further study   * Enhanced Rel-16 TypeII codebook to get high-resolution CSI; * PHY signaling or RRC signaling to report the high-resolution CSI.   Proposal 6: To enable high-quality data collection, at least support:   * UE reports associated information to NW, e.g., SINR, CQI, positioning information * NW configures a threshold of data quality to UE and UE only reports the qualified data to NW   Observation 3: For Type 3 training collaboration of a two-sided model, common understanding on the dataset used for model training is necessary, which can facilitate the pairing of CSI generation part and CSI reconstruction part.  Observation 4: Dataset alignment between UE and network can be used for testing/monitoring the model/functionality performance.  Observation 5: Dataset ID can avoid sharing the proprietary information explicitly across vendors during data collection.  Proposal 7: Support to use dataset ID for collected data and for delivered dataset of Type 3 training collaboration. |
| vivo | 1. Meta information reporting for data collection should be studied to facilitate the development of scenario-/area-/configuration-specific models. 2. The necessity of reporting certain kind of meta information in data collection depends on model’s generalization ability on it. 3. Enhanced legacy codebook can be used for data collection (CSI measurement), and enhancements for different data collection purpose can be different 4. RAN1 could send LS to RAN2 to clarify the requirement of data collection in CSI compression (and other use cases). |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 3: For AI/ML model training type 2 and type 3, data collection is needed.  Proposal 4: For AI/ML model training Type 1, data collection may be not needed to be specified other than assisted signalling, e.g, antenna layout for one CSI-RS resource  Proposal 5: Offline AI/ML model training is the first priority.  Proposal 6: If model transfer supported, data collection procedure is not needed.  Proposal 7: If model transfer not supported, for UE side, data collection procedure may be needed.  Proposal 8: If model transfer not supported, for NW side, data collection procedure may be needed or not depending on whether SRS can be utilized.  Observation 1: It may be not necessary to do data collection for model monitoring |
| Nokia | Proposal 9: In CSI compression using a two-sided model, consider the following for the data collection,   * Data collection shall be mainly focused on performance monitoring or model fine-tuning, and considerations on the data collection for model training shall not be the main focus. * UE-sided data collection,   + Existing CSI-RS configuration shall be used as the starting point for any form of data collection * NW-sided data collection, * Enhancement of CSI reporting to enable higher accuracy reporting * FFS: Assistance information reporting |
| CATT | Proposal 1: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, focus on studying NW side data collection in Rel-18 SI.  Proposal 2: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for NW side data collection for model training, focus on studying CSI-RS measurement based data collection.  Observation 4: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for data collection for model training, enhancement on CSI-RS is not needed.  Proposal 3: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, on ground-truth CSI reporting for NW side data collection for model training, study potential specification impact on the following schemes:   * Option 1: Ground-truth CSI samples are reported by physical layer signaling, with legacy CSI feedback framework reused; * Option 2: Ground-truth CSI samples are reported by RRC signaling, with a batch of ground-truth CSI samples reported together.   Proposal 4: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for NW side data collection for model training, collecting ground-truth data in type of precoding matrix is supported.  Proposal 5: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for NW side data collection for model training, codebook-based quantization for ground-truth data is with higher priority. |
| NEC | Proposal 2: Study the mechanism of obtaining RSs specific for data collection in model training, model update and model monitoring, e.g., explicit configuration, implicit acquirement. |
| Ericsson | [Proposal 1 For CSI compression use case, it is required that standardized procedures and associated data format for UE to gNB data collection of a high-resolution CSI (target CSI) is supported to enable model monitoring and to provide data for enabling decoder fine tuning.](#_Toc131752938)  [Proposal 6 For CSI use case in this SI, down-prioritize studies on model transfer](#_Toc131752943)  Observation 5: 3GPP specifications needs to support a mechanism to update/fine tune the decoder to consider implementation reality (e.g., UE and gNB RF and antennas at UE and gNB) and to ensure good generalization performance in scenarios not part of the pre-deployment training dataset  Observation 6: A Target CSI definition approach based on the eType-II framework, with more selected beams, taps, and coefficients compared to existing eType-II, and with finer resolution in the quantization of the coefficients has the potential to accurately describe the true Tx-eigenvector.  Observation 7: Specification of UE to network data collection of UE measurements of target CSI is motivated by both monitoring and decoder adaptation purposes  Observation 8: An initial estimate of the data size for collection in the CSI compression use case is in the range of 10k-40kbit. Further detailed studies are needed. |
| Xiaomi | Observation 2: For UE side and network side collection, it is not necessary to enhance CSI-RS resource since higher accuracy channel measurement can be obtained by current CSI-RS resource configuration.  Observation 3: For UE side and network side data collection, the data ID is not necessary to report as an assistance information considering that the data ID can be obtained in a proprietary way or network configuration.  Proposal 2: For network side data collection, cell-specific CSI-RS resource configuration can be supported to reduce configuration signalling overhead.  Proposal 3: The design trigger signalling between UE and network should be specified.  Proposal 4: The methods on overhead reduction for AI/ML model training should be studied for updating or monitoring AI/ML model. |
| Panasonic | Observation 1: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, it is necessary to use the ground-truth CSI of realistic DL channel measured by UE and report to network.  Observation 2: Data collection for model training is not required to be real-time and then latency requirement can be larger.  Observation 3: At least for data collection for performance monitoring, in order to handle multiple UE vendors and/or UE models, the reporting of ground-truth CSI should be performed using 3GPP signaling to avoid the complexity of handling multiple formats.  Observation 4: Depending on the requirement of latency, grouped reporting could be realized through MAC-CE RRC or U-plane, and sample-by-sample reporting is better to be implemented via UCI.  Observation 5: On data sample type / format for ground-truth CSI reporting, high resolution codebook-based format e.g., legacy codebook (e.g., eType II codebook) with potential enhancements such as extend more configurations in some parameters, should be studied.  Observation 6: For network-side data collection, at least time stamps/cell ID and UE location should be considered as the assistance information.  Observation 7: For network-side data collection, the necessity and feasibility of UE reporting Rx antenna spacing and Rx RF gain imbalance to network should be studied.  Observation 8: For UE-side data collection, to identify the scenario / configuration in which the data is being collected, virtualized configuration ID should be studied as the assistance information.  Observation 9: If CSI-RS / SRS configurations in current NR specification is not sufficient for higher accuracy measurement, enhanced CSI-RS and/or SRS may be considered for the data collection. |
| LGE | Proposal #1: For UE side data collection, deprioritize discussions on enhancement on CSI-RS configuration.  Proposal #2: For NW side data collection, deprioritize discussions on latency requirement and enhancement on SRS and/or CSI-RS configuration. |
| MediaTek | 1. While gNB is main entity in establishing data collection procedure, UE should provide gNB with a range of possible options for configurations of the data collection procedure including but not limited to:  * Types of input CSI * Types of assistant information * Quantization parameters * Periodicity of data collection * Maximum amount of data collected per period  1. Discuss the quantization of data in the following aspects:  * Decisioning entity * Incorporation of non-quantized CSI for possible finetuning * Quantizable information (CSI samples and assistant information) * Configuration changes (per sample or per dataset) |
| Nvidia | Proposal 6: For AI/ML model training for CSI feedback enhancement, study potential specification impact related to training data type/size, training data source determination, and assistance signalling and procedure for training data collection.  Proposal 7: For AI/ML based CSI feedback, study potential specification impact related to assistance signalling and procedure for model configuration, model activation/deactivation, model recovery/termination, and model selection.  Proposal 8: For AI/ML based CSI feedback, study potential specification impact related to assistance signalling and procedure for model performance monitoring and model update/tuning.  Proposal 9: For AI/ML based CSI feedback, study potential specification impact related to report/feedback of model input for inference (e.g., quantization and feedback message size), type of model input, and model input acquisition and pre-processing.  Proposal 10: For AI/ML based CSI feedback, study potential specification impact related to report/feedback of model inference output (e.g., quantization and feedback message size) and post-processing. |
| CMCC | Proposal 1: For CSI compression using two-sided model, when using Type 1 training collaboration, the potential spec impact on AI model transfer need to be studied.  Proposal 2: For CSI compression using two-sided model, when using Type 1 training collaboration, the potential spec impact on dataset collection for training need to be studied.  Proposal 3: For CSI compression using two-sided model, when using Type 3 training collaboration, the potential spec impact on assistance signaling for AI model information need to be studied.  Proposal 4: For CSI compression using Type 1 training collaboration, whether model can be kept proprietary is up to whether the model is transferred in open format or proprietary format.  Proposal 5: For CSI compression using Type 3 training collaboration, the model could be kept proprietary.  Proposal 6: For CSI compression using Type 1 and Type 3 training collaboration, the dataset for sharing is not privacy-sensitive.  Proposal 7: For CSI compression, the model update after deployment using Type 3 training can be more flexible than using Type 1 training. |

### Summary:

For training collaboration type 3, additional dataset needs to be delivery from NW to UE in NW first training, and from UE side to NW side in UE first training. In R1-2302359, it has been proposed that at least for NW first training, the CSI generation part training dataset delivery should be over the air interface. The dataset is segmented into small piece with the same dataset ID, transmit over the air interface to many UEs. Different UEs then forward the small data piece to UE side server to re-assemble the dataset for CSI generation model training. Many companies assumed this dataset sharing can be shared between NW side and UE side transparent to RAN. Proposal 2-2-1 tries to align understanding on the necessity and methods to share the CSI generation model dataset in NW first training and/or CSI reconstruction model dataset in UE first training over the air interface.

Proposal 2-2-2 and proposal 2-2-3 are follow up proposals based on RAN1 112 agreement for NW side data collection. RAN2 is discussing data collection framework for offline training. Therefore only L1 signaling is proposed to be discussed for data collection for performance monitoring.

### ***Proposal 2-2-1 (closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case with training collaboration type 3, for sequential training, further study necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact on:***

* ***CSI reconstruction model training dataset and/or other information delivery from UE side to NW side for UE first training***
* ***CSI generation model training dataset and/or other information delivery from NW side to UE side for NW first training***
* ***Data sample format/type***
* ***Quantization/de-quantization related information***
* ***Note: other aspects are not precluded.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Google** | OK |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support. |
| vivo | Support |
| Ericsson | The proposal is ok with the understanding that the necessity study should be on each of these bullets individually. For example, we don’t see the necessity for using 3GPP interface of model training dataset delivery from NW to UE. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG Electronics | OK |
| OPPO | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| CAICT | Support. |
| Futurewei | Ok |
| Lenovo | As we have discussed in our contribution, in “iterative type 3” samples are exchanged between the UE and NW in both sides so we suggest the following change:   * ***CSI reconstruction model training dataset and/or other information delivery from UE side to NW side ~~for UE first training~~*** * ***CSI generation model training dataset and/or other information delivery from NW side to UE side ~~for NW first training~~***   Also prefer to add  “Data sample format/type **and related information, e.g., quality of the sample**”    Mod: this belongs to other aspects. Target CSI quality based on CSI-RS measurement has not been discussed and evaluated. |
| NVIDIA | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| InterDigital | Ok |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| Qualcomm | We do not support the first two items of this proposal. Dataset delivery or other information exchange for offline sequential type 3 training happens between training servers and should not have any RAN specification impact.  If a dataset has to be delivered from one server to another, then transmitting portions of it over the air-interface to individual UEs and having them upload the data to the other server using the air-interface again would be inefficient and the motivation is not clear.  Mod: Understand the concern. The main bullet list necessity/feasibility. To further address the concern, additional FFS is added in 1st and 2nd bullet. |
| Samsung | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |

Thanks for the comments! 1st and 2nd bullets are more controversial than the 3rd and 4th bullet. To address the concern, additional FFS is added.

### ***Proposal 2-2-1 (v1closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case with training collaboration type 3, for sequential training, further study necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact on:***

* ***FFS: CSI reconstruction model training dataset and/or other information delivery from UE side to NW side ~~for UE first training~~***
* ***FFS: CSI generation model training dataset and/or other information delivery from NW side to UE side ~~for NW first training~~***
* ***Data sample format/type***
* ***Quantization/de-quantization related information***
* ***Note: other aspects are not precluded.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Ok |
| CATT | OK, although it is a little strange to see FFS under ‘*study necessary, feasibility…*’. |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not sure listing FFS in a further study proposal.  The Data collection framework is under study in RAN2. RAN1 shall only focus on the content of the data collection for training. If the proposal is generic for update/monitoring, RAN1 can discuss the details. But this does not seems to be the case with the FL proposal. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| ZTE | We think **FFS should be removed,** since the main body already has ‘ ***further study necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact on....***’, which is overlapped. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the update of the first two FFS points.  Regarding data sample. can we just modify to:  ***Data sample format/type/quality***  In our opinion, it may be important to label/order the data based on the significance, occurrence, we at least prefer to keep the option included for further discussion  Mod: in CSI evaluation, data sample significance and occurrence was never discussed. Would you please clarify how to decide which data sample is more significant than the other samples? Also occurrence? |
| Qualcomm | It would be helpful if the motivation was clarified first. It is not clear why communication between two training servers needs 3GPP air-interface standardization. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Qualcomm’s comment. It should first be discussed whether there is a necessity to standardize procedures for the actual model training within 3GPP. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal with FFS added. |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| InterDigital | Ok |
| Huawei/HiSi | Have the same view as ZTE, that the main text already includes the necessity, feasibility, and potential spec impact, the whole proposal is FFS; no need to add FFS to the sub-bullets.  For the need of air-interface signaling, as far as we know, there is no precedence for two vendors or even more than two vendors to jointly develop the algorithms with offline co-engineering manner (IoDT test is only for alignment of the spec/signaling). We may face the risk of failing to justify the feasibility of the two-sided model in the end of the SI, if we have to put loads of things to the offline server to server behaviors, which means the interface is totally customized without any specification – avoiding the customized offline co-engineering is a critical reason why 3GPP was built. Specifying the signaling of the dataset delivery is one way to largely relieve this customization by moving all the offline to a specified air-interface. |
| Xiaomi | For the first two subbullets, only data transfer/deliver through 3GPP air-interface is required to study the specification impact. Therefore, we suggest the first two subbullets are reword as follows   * ***CSI reconstruction model training dataset and/or other information delivery from UE side to NW side via 3GPP air-interface***   ***CSI generation model training dataset and/or other information delivery from NW side to UE side via 3GPP air-interface*** |

***Summary of 2nd round discussion:***

The main question is still whether there is a need to deliver the CSI generation/reconstruction part model data set over the air interface. Some commented offline data sharing is the approach to go. To move forward, the proposal is separated into two parts.

### ***Proposal 2-2-1-1 (v2closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case with training collaboration type 3, for sequential training, further study necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact on:***

* ***Data sample format/type***
* ***Quantization/de-quantization related information***
* ***Note: other aspects are not precluded.***

### ***Proposal 2-2-1-2 (closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case with training collaboration type 3, for sequential training, further discuss whether CSI reconstruction/CSI generation model training dataset delivery via 3GPP air interface is required.***

Please provide your view for above 2 proposals below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. |
| CATT | Separating the proposal makes the whole picture incomplete. We prefer the previous version even though there are hierarchical FFSs. The need and feasibility is part of the study. |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Huawei/HiSi | If the two FFS bullet in the last proposal is removed, then what is the end of only specifying the format/type/quantization information? What are they used for? How to test?  If it is FL’s feeling that the dataset delivery over air interface is controversial issue, we propose the following change in below (to add a note) as a compromise:  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case with training collaboration type 3, for sequential training, further study necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact on:***   * ***CSI reconstruction model training dataset and/or other information delivery from UE side to NW side ~~for UE first training~~*** * ***CSI generation model training dataset and/or other information delivery from NW side to UE side ~~for NW first training~~*** * ***Data sample format/type*** * ***Quantization/de-quantization related information*** * ***Note: other aspects are not precluded.*** * ***Note: the necessity and feasibility of the specified dataset delivery to be discussed and clarified with respect to the alternative of 3gpp-transparent training dataset delivery*** |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Lenovo | We also believe that proposal should be as before in one proposal.  Also in RAN112, we had an agreement:  Agreement   * …. * Contents of the ground-truth CSI including:   + Data sample type, e.g., precoding matrix, channel matrix etc.   + Data sample format: scaler quantization and/or codebook-based quantization (e.g., e-type II like).   + Assistance information (e.g., time stamps, and/or cell ID, Assistance information for Network data collection for categorizing the data in forms of ID for the purpose of differentiating characteristics of data due to specific configuration, scenarios, site etc., and data quality indicator) * Latency requirement for data collection * Signaling for triggering the data collection     In fact sending the assistance information may have some potential specification impact which should be studied. Based on this agreement we suggest the following change in the proposal:   * ***Data sample format/type/* Assistance information** |
| CAICT | Fine with the proposal and support to merge the two proposals as Xiaomi proposed in last round. |
| ETRI | Support for both proposals |
| Qualcomm | For 2-2-1-2, it is not clear why communication between two training servers needs 3GPP air-interface standardization. The motivation should be clarified first by the proponents.  For 2-2-1-1, is this study not contingent upon the outcome of 2-2-1-2? If there is no need for specifying dataset delivery between servers using air interface, then is there a need to specify the data format, quantization, etc.?  Mod: Proposal is even dataset is changed between servers, at least the format of the dataset are the same for easier multi-vendor training. |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| Fujitsu | We share a similar view to that of CATT’s. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| NEC | Support |
| AT&T | We have similar view as CATT and Fujitsu. The previous proposal already covers the requirement to study the necessity and feasibility of dataset delivery over the air interface. |
| ZTE | Fine with the proposal. |
| CMCC | Still prefer the previous version. But we can support the two proposals for progress. |

Given the feedback, let us try Huawei’s suggestion to see whether Qualcomm can accept the high-lighted sentences.

### ***Proposal 2-2-1(v3 on hold)***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case with training collaboration type 3, for sequential training, further study necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact on:***

* ***CSI reconstruction model training dataset and/or other information delivery from UE side to NW side***
* ***CSI generation model training dataset and/or other information delivery from NW side to UE side***
* ***Data sample format/type/assistance information***
* ***Quantization/de-quantization related information***
* ***Note: other aspects are not precluded.***
* ***Note: the necessity and feasibility of the specified dataset delivery to be discussed and clarified with respect to the alternative of 3gpp-transparent training dataset delivery***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Lenovo** | Support |
| CAICT | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSi | OK |
| CMCC | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Qualcomm | Repeating our concern here -– what would be the reason or benefit to study air-interface standardization for dataset exchange between two training servers? If gNB sends the dataset to the UE and the UE sends the dataset to the server, then the data has to traverse the air-interface once on the downlink and then again on the uplink (Option 2 in figure below). Since training data is typically voluminous, this could cause unnecessary burden on air-interface resources, and power consumption on the UE-side and NW-side. This could be avoided if the transfer happens directly from one server to the other without involving the UE or the air-interface (Option 1 in figure below).    The figure shows the two options for NW-first Type 3 training.  Considering this, unless a clear benefit is identified, we propose to **deprioritize** this aspect. |
| Ericsson | Not clear why its necessary that the training need to go over the air interface, and the impact on other traffic needs to be studied in that case. |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| ETRI | Support |
| Xiaomi | It has included the other information in the first and second sub-bullet. In our understanding, the other information includes the assistance information added in the third sub-bullet. Therefore, it is not necessary to add the assistance information in the third sub-bullet. |
| Samsung | Ok |

### ***Proposal 2-2-2 (closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact on ground truth CSI report for NW side data collection for model training:***

* ***Scalar quantization***
* ***Codebook-based quantization*** 
  + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook.***
* ***Whether UE or NW determine the number of ranks and the index(es) of layer(s) for ground-truth CSI report.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Google** | In our view, this should be deprioritized. We already have SRS to achieve the same functionality.  Mod: this is a follow up RAN1 112 agreements on NW side data collection. Some use case include: FDD deployment, different UE RF aspects etc. |
| NTT DOCOMO | The third sub-bullet should be deleted. We do not find the reason why NW determines the number of ranks for ground-truth CSI instead of the maximum rank. After model training, the rank will be determined by UE based on the rank restriction. Even if NW obtains the higher rank than UE determines, that higher rank CSI will not be compressed and reported by UE.  Mod: This is for offline training. Which layer to feedback can depend on layer common, layer specific or rank specific/rank common model design. During inferencing, UE will determine rank and feedback corresponding PMI based on the rank. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| Ericsson | Support. A key question to be answered (codebook based) and included in the proposal is whether the existing eType-II report format is sufficient or whether a more high resolution codebook for ground truth brings better trained models resulting in improved user throughput performance during inference. |
| Xiaomi | For the third bullet, it is not necessary to report the index of layers if the data of layers are reported in sequence. In addition, these three bullets are only applied to precoding matrix. Therefore, we suggest it is reworded as follows  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact on ground truth CSI report for NW side data collection for model training when data type of ground truth CSI report is precoding matrix:***   * ***Scalar quantization*** * ***Codebook-based quantization***    + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook.*** * ***Whether UE or NW determine the number of ranks ~~and the index(es) of layer(s)~~ for ground-truth CSI report.*** |
| LG Electronics | As Google commented, we first discuss the necessity of introducing new reporting for ground-truth CSI.  Mod: See comment to Google. |
| OPPO | Support |
| CMCC | We are generally OK with this proposal.  But for the third bullet, not sure whether NW need to determine the index(s) of layer(s). Even NW determine the number of ranks *N*, UE just select the proper *N* layers, like the layers with maximum values of eigenvalues.  Mod: See comments to NTT DOCOMO. |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| CAICT | Support. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with Xiaomi’s update. |
| Lenovo | We suggest to add the following bullet:   * **Additional information associated with a data sample, e.g., quality of the sample**   Also, does the second bullet correspond to eType-II CSI feedback, possibly with higher-resolution/ larger parameters? |
| NVIDIA | Support |
| ZTE | Support in principle. A minor comment for clear clarification on quantization for ground-truth CSI:   * ***Scalar quantization for ground-truth CSI*** * ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI*** |
| InterDigital | Support |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| Qualcomm | The training data set size can be a useful input to RAN2 for evaluating mechanisms for data collection. RAN1 can study the impact of quantization of the data samples on ML performance for this purpose. However, the exact format and contents for data collection for training can be left to implementation and need not be specified.  We also suggest removing the item under FFS. Our results show that the performance using a training dataset quantized with R16 Type II PC 8 codebook is close to the performance with unquantized floating point training dataset.  Mod: I see many companies are proposing higher accuracy ground truth. I update the FFS with pending conclusion in 9.2.1.1.  We propose the following version:  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study*** ***~~potential specification impact on ground truth CSI report~~*** ***the following aspects related to the ground truth CSI dataset size for*** ***NW side data collection for model training:***   * ***Scalar quantization*** * ***Codebook-based quantization***    + ***~~FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook.~~*** * ***Number of layers for which the ground truth data is collected ~~Whether UE or NW determine the number of ranks and the index(es) of layer(s) for ground-truth CSI report~~.*** |
| Samsung | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Fine to have study, and provide information for RAN2. But data collection for model training may be no spec impact, e.g., for offline training. So we have the following suggestion:  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study ~~potential specification impact~~ the following aspects on ground truth CSI report for NW side data collection for model training:***   * ***Scalar quantization*** * ***Codebook-based quantization***    + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook.***   ***Whether UE or NW determine the number of ranks and the index(es) of layer(s) for ground-truth CSI report.***  Mod: The ground truth CSI format is specified, for offline training. |

### ***Proposal 2-2-2(v1closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact on ground truth CSI report for NW side data collection for model training when data type of ground truth CSI report is precoding matrix:***

* ***Scalar quantization for ground-truth CSI***
* ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI***
  + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook, based on evaluation results in 9.2.1.1***
* ***Number of layers for which the ground truth data is collected. And whether UE or NW determine the number of layers ~~and the index(es) of layer(s)~~ for ground-truth CSI report.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Thanks for the reply in the previous round. However, we think that reply does not answer concerns from CMCC and ours.  The point is it seems useless to collect the data that will not be used in the inference phase. Even if higher rank CSI is obtained in the training phase, the training dataset should consist of the data that will be used in the inference phase. What is the benefit to train the model with the layer which will not be compressed by UE in the inference? This logic can be applied regardless of layer common, layer specific or rank specific/rank common model design.  For example, if UE will determine rank =2 (layer#0 and layer#1) from CSI#1, it is not reasonable to train the model with layer#2, layer#3…layer#max from CSI#1, because those layers will not be anyway compressed/reported in the inference phase. If it is for increasing the size of dataset, it makes sense to some extent. However, the simulation results verifying that gain should be provided first. Without verifying results, it is reasonable to assume the legacy approach where UE determines the rank from the NW configured rank restriction. Proponents should clarify that point first.  Mod: For training, the dataset needs to contain different eigen vectors of each layer, particularly for layer specific model. During inferencing, for each CSI instance, UE will send rank and use corresponding model for inferencing. Even max rank 4 selected with certain probability, the model still needs to be offline trained. I am not sure I understand your point that data collection for training is useless if it is not used in inferencing. |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Support. |
| CATT | Support. Minor correction: 9.2.1.1 should be 9.2.2.1 |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | We suggest changing the wording and not mentioning “***data collection for model training”.*** Data collection enhancements can be generic for performance monitoring, update.  Mod: Monitoring is updated in the next proposal, mainly due to different latency requirement for data collection. |
| CMCC | Support this proposal.  Although the number of layers might need to be determined, the indexes of layers is not needed in my opinion. |
| ZTE | A minor typo should be revised as:   * ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI***   + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook, based on evaluation results in ~~9.2.1.1~~ 9.2.2.1*** |
| Qualcomm | The necessity for RAN1 to specify new reporting for ground truth CSI for training data collection should be studied first. It is not clear if this proposal is about the reporting or about the format. We suggest the following version:  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study*** ***~~potential specification impact on ground truth CSI report~~*** ***the following aspects related to the ground truth CSI format for*** ***NW side data collection for model training:***   * ***Scalar quantization for ground-truth CSI*** * ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI***   + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1*** * ***Number of layers for which the ground truth data is collected. And whether UE or NW determine the number of layers ~~and the index(es) of layer(s)~~ for ground-truth CSI ~~report~~ data collection.*** |
| Nokia/NSB | We also suggest adding an FFS under scalar quantisation:  *FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scalar quantisation* |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Futurewei | We are ok with ZTE’s updates. |
| LG Electronics | We slightly prefer QC’s updates. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |

Thanks for the comments. Proposal is updated.

### ***Proposal 2-2-2(v2closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the following aspects related to the ground truth CSI format for*** ***NW side data collection for model training:***

* ***Scalar quantization for ground-truth CSI***
  + ***FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scalar quantization***
* ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI***
  + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1***
* ***Number of layers for which the ground truth data is collected. And whether UE or NW determine the number of layers for ground-truth CSI data collection.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Ericsson** | **Support** |
| Lenovo | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Even though we still think NW should not determine number of layers for ground truth data, we are fine with the proposal to move forward. But let us repeat our concern.  Our concern of NW rank determination is the change of the dataset property between training and inference. UE determines the rank in the inference phase. If the rank determination mechanism is different between training and inference, the dataset properties becomes different, which leads to the performance degradation. |
| CATT | Still prefer the previous version. But for the sake of progress we are OK to move forward with v2. |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Huawei/HiSi | Generally fine. One question to the newly added “***FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scalar quantization***”: can proponent provide an example of the possible processing?  @DOCOMO: different UEs may have different RI determination algorithms, so gNB can collect the data for desired layer from one UE (which may not determine rank=4 at a certain SNR region) and train the model to serve other UEs (which may determine rank=4 at the same SNR region). |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| CAICT | Support |
| Qualcomm | Please add “***the necessity of, and*** ” before “***the following aspects***”. |
| LG Electronics | We have the same question as HW on the newly added FFS bullet. If some preprocessing is needed, it can be applied to both scalar and codebook based quantization. |
| Fujitsu | We suggest that we use similar wording formula to proposals/agreements if there are concerns from companies.  “***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impacts on ground truth CSI report for ~~the following aspects related to the ground truth CSI format for~~*** ***NW side data collection for model training:*** ” |
| InterDigital | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| ZTE | Support in principle.  For the sub-bullet in the 1st bullet, we are not sure the meaning of any processing, please proponents clarify that. To our understanding, if any processing is to obtain the eigenvectors from raw channel, it is needed here for SQ for ground-truth CSI, since codebook-based quantization implicitly includes the processing before quantization.  Otherwise, if any processing is applicable to both 1st bullet and 2nd bullet, FFS should be listed as the fourth bulet as  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the following aspects related to the ground truth CSI format for*** ***NW side data collection for model training:***   * ***Scalar quantization for ground-truth CSI***   + ***~~FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scalar quantization~~*** * ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI***   + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1*** * ***Number of layers for which the ground truth data is collected. And whether UE or NW determine the number of layers for ground-truth CSI data collection.*** * ***FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before quantization*** |
| CMCC | Support.  As for the newly added FFS part, dose it means some SVD processing or data compression procedure? Maybe the proponent could clarify it. |

Thanks for the comments. Reply to question on FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scaler quantization, here are two examples from proponent.

* Example 1: Phase rotation. For scalar quantization, if for example phase is adjusted such that the first element of each eigenvector is real-valued, the operation affects the quantization format because the phase of the first element does not need reporting.
* Example 2: Givens’s rotations. If givens rotation is used to represent the eigen-vectors, instead of having amplitude and phase quantisation of complex coeff. we have only phase quantisation. Also these rotations need to be undone at the other end, to reconstruct the eigenvectors. The feedback based on givens rotation was standardized in WiFi close loop MIMO feedback scheme. The point of studying this kind of processing is to see if scalar quantisation can outperform Type-II based codebook quantisation of ground-truth.

 Hope this clarify the questions from Huawei, LG, ZTE and CMCC, for both proposal 2-2-2 and 2-2-3.

### ***Proposal 2-2-2(v3 updated proposal for email approval):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the necessity of***, ***and*** ***the following aspects related to the ground truth CSI format for*** ***NW side data collection for model training:***

* ***Scalar quantization for ground-truth CSI***
  + ***FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scalar quantization***
* ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI***
  + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1***
* ***Number of layers for which the ground truth data is collected. And whether UE or NW determine the number of layers for ground-truth CSI data collection.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| CAICT | Support |
| CATT | Support |
| Huawei/HiSi | Thanks FL for the clarification. But we are still hesitate to discuss the potential spec impact before evaluating what could be the candidate rotation method, and what is the performance and the overhead reduction. Therefore, it is changed as below:  ***FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scalar quantization, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1*** |
| CMCC | Support this proposal.  Thanks for FL’s clarification. We are open to study these kinds of processing method. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal and edits from Huawei/HiSi. |
| ZTE | Thanks FL for the clarification. We are fine with the Huawei’s version on FFS. |
| Ericsson | Support, perhaps “the benefits of” is a milder description than “necessity”. To us it’s clear the the ground truth should be represented in canonical form to avoid unnecessary overhead. |
| LG Electronics | Thanks for the FL’s clarification. We are also fine with Huawei’s revision as codebook based quantization has the same statement. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with HW’s updated version. |
| Samsung | ok |

### ***Proposal 2-2-3(closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact on ground truth CSI report for NW side data collection for model performance monitoring:***

* ***Codebook-based quantization*** 
  + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook.***
* ***L1 signaling procedure to enable fast identification of AI/ML model failure.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Google** | We do not think the ground truth CSI report is needed for performance monitoring. Similar to RLM/BFD, we think the performance monitoring should be based on the wireless performance, e.g., hypothetical BLER, instead of the actual CSI. From the simulation results, SGCS cannot reflect the wireless performance.  Mod: This is to follow up on intermediate KPI based monitoring. Foe eventual KPI based monitoring, the key issue is to separate whether the performance degradation is due to PMI, or other aspects. Many companies observed that it is not feasible to separate the impact of PMI based on throughput/actual BLER or hypothetical BLER. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support.  For the motivation of reporting intermediate KPI (ground-truth), we believe that gNB needs it to identify whether the good/bad performance is due to AI/ML model or other factors (channel status, interference, etc.), since the AI/ML algorithm may not be so robust and trustworthy as legacy UE features/algorithms.  To clarify the motivation of the “fast identification” bullet: there are two modes of monitoring: periodic monitoring and aperiodic (event-triggered) monitoring. For the latter mode, it is generally due to the sudden performance fluctuation. E.g., when the throughput of the UE running a specific UE part/UE side model suddenly degrades, gNB has to fast identify what is the reason leading to this degradation – whether it is due to the failure of the AI/ML model(s), or due to the gNB strategies of scheduling, MU pairing, etc. If it is due to the failure of the UE part/UE side model, gNB can disable it immediately. The slow L3/MDT report can hardly satisfy this requirement as its interval is up to 30min – this means the degradation persists yet gNB can do nothing but wait.  In the end, this event-triggered monitoring window expires after the identification is finished, rather than always-on, so there is no concern on overhead. |
| vivo | Support |
| Ericsson | Support. We also have the same comments is in P2-2-2. We Agree with Google that SGCS cannot reflect the performance unless for low load and rank restricted to 1 for all UEs.  Mod: high accuracy type II codebook is separately discussed for offline training and performance monitoring. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG Electronics | It depends on metrics and which entity performs model monitoring. Thus, necessity of ground-truth CSI report for model monitoring should be discussed first. |
| OPPO | Support |
| CMCC | We are fine with the main bullet for ground truth CSI reporting. But for quantization method, we think other quantization method is still possible, like scalar quantization. So, we suggest:   * ***Scalar quantization*** * ***Codebook-based quantization***    + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook.***   ***L1 signaling procedure to enable fast identification of AI/ML model failure.*** |
| Fujitsu | Support in general. We suggest that we do not restrict the signaling to L1 at this SI stage.  Mod: RAN2 is discussing data collection framework for offline training. Therefore only L1 signaling is proposed to be discussed for data collection for performance monitoring. |
| CAICT | Support. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with adding scalar quantization to the list. |
| NVIDIA | Support |
| ZTE | Generally fine with the proposal. We think ‘enable fast identification of AI/ML model failure’ in the second bullet is just an intention, which is no need to voice it and we suggest rewording it from a high level as   * ***L1 signaling procedure to ~~enable fast identification of AI/ML model failure.~~ report ground truth CSI*** |
| InterDigital | It is unclear how ground truth CSI with codebook-based quantization can help network for model performance monitoring. We tend to agree with Google that model performance monitoring should be done with other metrics. As LG proposed, we may need to discuss which metric to use for model performance monitoring and see if ground truth CSI reporting is necessary for model monitoring.  Mod: see comments to Google. Intermediate KPI is SGCS. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| Intel | It is not clear for us how L1 signaling procedure to enable fast identification of AI/ML model failure related to NW-based model performance monitoring and ground truth CSI quantization. It looks like it is UE-based model performance monitoring.  Mod: please see Huawei’s comments. This is NW based monitoring. For UE based monitoring, no need to feedback target CSI. |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| Qualcomm | UE-side monitoring is being studied (Proposal 2-4-1) and methods such as direct SGCS estimation using a simple model show promise for good monitoring performance with low complexity and signaling overhead. In contrast, NW-side monitoring incurs overhead to report the ground truth, latency if the reporting is not continuous, and additional UE-side complexity to compute both ML-based CSI and quantized ground truth CSI. Moreover, detecting model failure reliably requires a statistically significant sample set of data and cannot be done in a fast L1 timescale using only a few samples. The L1 signaling of ground truth is therefore not justified.  Considering this, the need for specifying ground truth reporting for NW-side monitoring is not clear. Hence, we propose to add “***the necessity, complexity, overhead, latency and*** ” before “***potential***”.  UE-side and NW-side monitoring should be studied together to evaluate the necessity of the schemes.  Mod: This is NW based monitoring, as the proposal is under data collection section. |
| AT&T | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support |

### ***Proposal 2-2-3(v1closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the necessity, complexity, overhead, latency and potential specification impact on ground truth CSI report for NW side data collection for model performance monitoring:***

* ***Scalar quantization***
* ***Codebook-based quantization*** 
  + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook.***
* ***L1 signaling procedure to enable fast identification of AI/ML model failure.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Ok |
| CATT | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Please check the earlier comment. We suggest having a generic proposal for data collection.  Last bullet is not clear as it is not a data collection discussion. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| ZTE | For aligning the wording with Proposal 2-2-2, we suggest modifying the 1st bullet and 2nd bullet as   * ***Scalar quantization for ground-truth CSI*** * ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI***    + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook.***   For the 3rd bullet, we suggest replacing the model failure with ‘**model performance**’, since AI/ML model may not always be failed, and it may suffer from the performance degradation instead.   * ***L1 signaling procedure to enable fast identification of AI/ML model ~~failure~~ performance.*** |
| Nokia/NSB | We also suggest adding an FFS under scalar quantisation as in the previous proposal:  *FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scalar quantisation*  To expand on the reason why the last bullet seems out of place, in this proposal we are discussing complexity/overhead/latency related to measurement and reporting of ground truth CSI. The signalling procedure can be the same as legacy CSI (periodic/semi-persistent/aperiodic).  Mod: current assumption is data collection for offline training is delay tolerant. RAN2 is discussing data collection framework such as using MDT as baseline, or extend EVEX framework defined in SA4 to support offline data collection. For performance monitoring, it is obvious MDT or EVEX framework will not apply. To avoid duplication with RAN2 discussion, only the L1 signaling is emphasized in data collection for monitoring, which is RAN1 scope. For proposal 2-2-2, report itself will use RAN2 solution. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Support, also fine with ZTE’s updates for clairity. |
| InterDigital | Ok |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support FL version or ZTE updates. We understand the ground-truth CSI is “UE report”, so we disagree with QC’s version. |
| Xiaomi | Support |

### ***Proposal 2-2-3(v2):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the necessity, complexity, overhead, latency and potential specification impact on ground truth CSI report for NW side data collection for model performance monitoring:***

* ***Scalar quantization for ground-truth CSI***
  + ***FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scalar quantization***
* ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI***
  + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1***
* ***L1 signaling procedure to enable fast identification of AI/ML model ~~failure~~ performance.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Ericsson** | **Support** |
| Lenovo | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| CATT | OK. |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Huawei/HiSi | OK. Same question to 2-2-2 on the newly added FFS. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| CAICT | Support |
| LG Electronics | Generally fine with the proposal. And the same question on the first FFS bullet. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| ZTE | Fine, the same opinion as 2-2-2. |
| CMCC | OK.  Same question on the newly added FFS part. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We request to remove “L1” from the last item. Which type of signaling is needed should be the outcome of the study.  Mod: Actually L1 indication is the key part differentiating monitoring versus training. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Samsung | ok |

## Inference related spec impact

Following table summarize company’s proposals related to inferencing.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Huawei | Proposal 11: For CQI determination of CSI compression, consider Option 1 (CQI is NOT calculated based on the output of CSI reconstruction part from the realistic channel estimation) as a starting point.  Proposal 12: For Network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a set of candidate CSI payload sizes for each layer separately.  Proposal 13: For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the index of the actual CSI payload size (among the set of candidate CSI payload sizes) for each layer subject to the selected RI.   * FFS how to map the CSI report on the two parts CSI to avoid redundant feedback.   Proposal 14: In CSI compression using two-sided model, further study potential specification impact on the vector quantization and scalar quantization.   * For vector quantization,   + The format/size of the vector quantization dictionary.   + Segmentation of the encoder output.   + Configuration/reporting/updating of the quantization dictionary. * For scalar quantization,   + Uniform and non-uniform quantization.   + The configuration of the quantization granularity.   Proposal 15: For the CSI priority rules and CSI processing Unit, on top of the legacy CSI reporting principles, following AI/ML specific aspects may need to be further considered:   * The priority rules for different LCM procedures of training data collection, inference, and monitoring data collection; and the priority rule within the latent space of per CSI report. * The required CPU value of CSI calculation for per AI/ML model basis. |
| ZTE | Proposal 8: For model inference operation, further study at least the following aspects:   * Data required for model input, e.g., reference signal configurations and assistance information delivery * Report feedback based on the model output, e.g., UCI mapping order and priority * Inference latency, e.g., the relationship between inference latency and CSI reference resource   Observation 6: For CQI calculation based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement, UE may over-estimate the channel condition and reconstructed PMI and CQI are not matched. Our simulation results show that the system performance loss is obvious if no advanced CQI adjustment algorithm is used.  Observation 7: For CQI calculation based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement and adjusted by previous CSI reconstruction output provided by NW, this method needs to send back the output of CSI reconstruction part from NW side to UE, which will lead to additional latency. However, the channel condition may already change a lot (e.g., interference) so that PMI and CQI mismatch is unavoidable. In addition, the recovered CSI should be quantized (e.g., by eType II codebook), which will lead to additional quantization loss. Moreover, sending the recovered CSI needs enhanced specification to support it.  Observation 8: For CQI calculation based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement and adjusted by CQI adjustment table provided by NW, NW can construct a CQI adjustment table according to some channel characteristics based on some priori information at gNB side. Then, UE can calculate the similarity-related metrics between measured channel and the channel characteristics to do corresponding CQI adjustment.  Observation 9: For CQI calculation based on legacy codebook, UE my not support traditional codebook and AI/ML codebook simultaneously, which will largely increase the UE complexity. Meanwhile, PMI and CQI mismatching is also unavoidable. If traditional codebook can already get accurate PMI, it is not necessary to implement AI/ML models.  Observation 10: For CQI calculation based on CSI reconstruction output, where CSI reconstruction part at the UE is the same as the actual CSI reconstruction part used at the NW. UE may also be not expected to have CSI reconstruction model as it increases UE computation/storage/power consumption burden to a large extent. In addition, the CSI reconstruction model is generally a proprietary design by network side.  Observation 11: For CQI calculation based on the output of CSI reconstruction model assumed at UE, this method can be applicable for CSI compression using two-sided model sub use case and shows that the average system UPT can be achieved almost the same as the case of CQI calculation based on the output of actual CSI reconstruction model (i.e., performance upper-bound for all options).  Observation 12: For CQI calculation using two stage approach, it is already supported (i.e., when the report quantity is cri-RI-CQI) and less specification impact is foreseen. Besides, the two-step procedure increases the time span of the CQI determination process, which may face the channel variation/aging so that the current CQI cannot match the previous CSI.  Proposal 9: The performance of different CQI determination options should be evaluated in agenda item 9.2.2.1.  Proposal 10: Further categorize the Option 1b as following:   * Option 1b-1: CQI is calculated based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement and adjusted by previous CSI reconstruction output provided by gNB * Option 1b-2: CQI is calculated based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement and adjusted by CQI adjustment table provided by gNB.   Proposal 11: Further categorize the Option 2a as following:   * Option 2a-1: CQI is calculated based on CSI reconstruction output, where CSI reconstruction part at the UE is the same as the actual CSI reconstruction part used at the NW. * Option 2a-2: CQI is calculated based on CSI reconstruction output assumed at UE side, where CSI reconstruction part at the UE is different from the actual CSI reconstruction part used at the NW.   Proposal 12: According to initial evaluations on performance and specification impacts, the following down-selections are proposed:   * Further study the specification impacts (including the feasibility and necessity) on Option 1a, Option 1b-2 and Option 2a-2. * No further discussion on specification impacts for Option1b-1, Option 1c, Option 2a-1 and Option 2b.   Proposal 13: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, LI determination should be studied along with CQI determination.  Proposal 14: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, if RI is configured to be reported, legacy RI determination can be reused as a starting point.  Proposal 15: Further study potential specification impact on more channel information reported for MU-MIMO scheduling, e.g., full rank report based on the AI/ML model.  Proposal 16: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the following quantization alignment options:   * For scalar quantization scheme, the quantization dictionary should be aligned including quantization type, quantization level, quantization pattern, etc. * For vector quantization scheme, the quantization codebook should be aligned including the length of codeword, the size of codebook, etc. * The configuration/reporting/update of the quantization dictionary/codebook.   Proposal 17: The performance of different monitoring cases based on intermediate KPIs and the related evaluation KPIs should be discussed for companies to compare the monitoring performance in agenda item 9.2.2.1.  Proposal 18: Further study the specification impacts on least the following two cases for model performance monitoring,   * Case 1: UE-side monitoring based on the output of the CSI reconstruction model assumed at the UE-sid , e.g., Intermediate KPIs are calculated by UE based on the output of the CSI reconstruction model assumed at the UE side, which is not the same as the actual CSI reconstruction model used at the NW side. * Case 2: NW-side monitoring based on the target CSI with realistic channel estimation associated to the CSI report, reported by the UE or obtained from the UE-side, e.g., Intermediate KPIs are calculated by NW based on traditional CSI and CSI reconstruction model output.   Proposal 19: For NW-side monitoring based on the target CSI with realistic channel estimation associated to the CSI report, further study a high-resolution CSI based on traditional codebook as ground-truth label.  Observation 13: For training type 3, CSI generation model and CSI reconstruction model are actually two separate models. Therefore, if the performance of output CSI is degraded, it cannot be decided whether it’s due to the performance loss of CSI generation model or CSI reconstruction model.  Proposal 20: Further study the potential mechanisms and specification impacts on monitoring model performance of the CSI generation model and CSI reconstruction model separately.  Proposal 21: Deprioritize the model performance monitoring based on eventual KPIs.  Proposal 22: Further study the feasibility of input/output-based monitoring methods in Agenda item 9.2.2.1.  Proposal 24: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the methods and potential specification impact on mapping priority and omission rule for AI/ML CSI report,   * Dynamic quantization resolution to reduce payload * Divide the CSI into multiple groups with different priority and omit the CSI groups with low priority, e.g., according to layer, subband, port * CSI reporting is separated into multiple reports, e.g., to establish the association among the multiple reports |
| OPPO | * Proposal 2: CQI should be calculated based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement. * Proposal 3: Regarding the CSI input,   + when UE obtains the CSI generation part from NW in a 3GPP non-transparent way, the network needs to explicitly or implicitly indicate the input interface format of the CSI generation part, e.g. data type, dimension size, normalization/quantification schemes.   + when UE obtains the CSI generation part in a 3GPP transparent way, no need to indicate the input interface through 3GPP protocols * Proposal 4: The training complexity, inference complexity, signaling cost for indication and standardization impact of different quantization/dequantization methods need to be evaluated.   + If the quantization/dequantization scheme is not a key contributor to CSI compression/recovery performance, the quantization/dequantization scheme(s) that is relatively simple, easy to indicate and have less standardization impact(e.g. case 2-1) should be selected first. * Proposal 5: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact on the quantization/dequantization method for the compressed CSI, including   + At least for training collaboration type3, quantization/dequantization methods should be specified and aligned to ensure the encoder and encoder to be well trained and could work together     - For NW first training, network should indicate the quantization [or the dequantization] method for the compressed CSI to UE.     - For UE first training, UE should indicate the dequantization [or the quantization] method for the compressed CSI to NW.   + Study potential signaling and procedure to indicate the quantization/dequantization method |
| vivo | 1. Quantization-non-aware training for CSI compression would suffer from a significant performance loss compared with Quantization-aware training. 2. If quantization method at CSI generation part and dequantization method at CSI reconstruction part are not aligned, there will be an unacceptable performance loss for AI/ML models. 3. Study the potential specification impact of the alignment of quantization method at UE side and dequantization method at NW side based on different training collaboration types for CSI compression. 4. Similarity and orthogonality loss can be used for CQI adjustment based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement 5. It is possible for AI/ML models in CSI compression to support the priority rule regarding CSI collision handling and CSI omission if payload truncation is considered during training. 6. Study the feasibility and specification impacts for AI/ML models in CSI compression to support the priority rule regarding CSI collision handling and CSI omission. Considering payload truncation during training can be set as one starting point. 7. Legacy codebook subset restriction (CBSR) framework can be directly supported in AI/ML based CSI compression by constraining the input CSI towards particular direction while reusing the same model as ordinary cases. 8. Study the CSI processing Unit design for AI/ML based CSI compression. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 9: Aperiodic CSI reporting should be considered firstly.  Proposal 10: The configuration of CSI-ResourceConfig and/or CSI-ReportConfig should be enhanced  Proposal 11: CQI/RI still should be included in the CSI report.  Proposal 12: Regarding CQI calculation, option 1a and/or option 1b can be considered.  Proposal 13: The priority for AI/ML based CSI feedback needs to be considered.  Proposal 14: Introducing for CSI reports carrying CSI compression information enabled by AI/ML operation in the priority rule for CSI reports.  Observation 2: Codebook subset restriction can be not considered in CSI compression and recovery using two-sided model use case.  Proposal 15: How to define/reflect the complexity of the AI/ML operation in the specification should be considered. |
| Nokia | Proposal 5: Regarding the quantization scheme for CSI feedback, a scalar quantization scheme with a limited bit size needs to be studied especially for bounded input to the AI encoder use case, e.g., channel eigenvector compression.  Proposal 6: Regarding vector quantization scheme for CSI feedback for Type 2 or Type 3 two-sided model training collaboration scenarios, the degree of required alignment between quantizer/dequantizer at UE-side/NW-side respectively needs to be studied, e.g., the length of a codeword, the size of a codebook, and the distance metric (or quantization rule) in use.  Observation 1: The size of VQ codebook can cause limitations/difficulties in using VQ and needs to be investigated.  Proposal 7: RAN1 may investigate sharing the relevant quantization architecture and parameters from one network entity to the other. For example, the type of quantization and quantization parameters can be shared with the other network node. The quantization parameters depend on the quantization type and may include:   * For scalar uniform quantization: number of quantization bits/levels, the minimum and maximum range of quantization * For scalar non-uniform quantization: number of quantization bits/levels, the minimum and maximum range of quantization, type of non-linear function and its parameters * For vector quantization: Codebook size and all the codewords   Proposal 10: RAN1 shall study the possible specification changes when supporting multiple compression ratios and how to enable progressive training.    Proposal 11: RAN1 shall study the possible specification changes when accommodating various CSI-RS configurations (e.g., bandwidths, ports) and multiple payload sizes.  Proposal 12: RAN1 shall study the possible use of CSI part 1 and CSI part 2 like approach for the compressed CSI reporting. |
| CATT | Proposal 14: For AI/ML based CSI feedback, the overheads of CSI feedback for rank 3 and rank 4 are expected to be comparable with that of rank 2.  Proposal 15: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, if CQI in CSI report is configured, for CQI determination in CSI report, one of the sub options of Option 1 is adopted:   * Option 1: CQI is NOT calculated based on the output of CSI reconstruction part from the realistic channel estimation, including   + Option 1a: CQI is calculated based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement   + Option 1b: CQI is calculated based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement and potential adjustment   + Option 1c: CQI is calculated based on legacy codebook   Proposal 16: For CQI reporting in CSI compression using two-sided model use case, the same quantization schemes as that in Rel-17 for codebook based CSI feedback is considered. |
| Intel | Proposal 5:   * It is expected that AI/ML model is trained assuming a particular pre/post processing   + If an AI/ML model is configured at the UE for inference, information on pre-processing for that model should be provided to the UE (e.g. specified, configured, downloaded etc.)   + Pre/post-processing may include at least linear transforms (DFT across different dimensions), down selection of matrix elements and normalization   Proposal 6:   * The dimensions of the input are defined by parameters similar to parameters L/M for Enhanced Type II PMI codebook (considering that input corresponds to the neural network input after pre-processing)   + In some cases, information from pre-processing step shall be reported by the UE together with CSI bits generated by the neural network (e.g., selected basis vectors, basis rotation factor, etc.)   Proposal 7:   * Consider existing principles for RI and CQI for spatial-frequency domain CSI compression using two-sided AI model sub-use case   Proposal 8:   * The following alternatives for CQI adjustment determination can be considered for Option 1b CQI determination   + CQI adjustment is configured via higher layers   + CQI adjustment is determined by the UE based on reference CQI (e.g., measured from precoder CSI-RS)   + CQI is calculated using precoding matrix corresponding to the target CSI with added AWGN |
| Interdigital | Proposal 1: Perform a trade-off analysis of the performance, complexity and standardization impacts of both precoding matrix and explicit channel matrix before prioritizing.  Observation 1: Different pre-processing types are beneficial under different deployment scenarios and channel characteristics.  Observation2: Different pre-processing types lead to different AI/ML encoder outputs which need to be known at the decoder.  Proposal 2: Study support of multiple pre-processing options.  Proposal 3: Study UE selection and reporting of pre-processor type.  Proposal 4: Study UE determination and reporting of the RI and CQI based on the input to the AI/ML model at the UE.  Observation 3: A UE without an up-to-date AI/ML decoder cannot independently detect CQI mismatch.  Proposal 5: Study means to detect and identify when there is mismatch between a UE’s AI/ML encoder input and the NW’s AI/ML decoder output.  Proposal 6: Study methods to enable CQI adjustment based on detected CQI mismatch.  Proposal 7: Study specification impacts of CSI compression using AI/ML including: CSI compression type, support of multiple AI/ML models, new CSI reporting mechanisms and fallback to legacy CSI reporting. |
| Interdigital | Proposal 16: Study quantizer/dequantizer updating separate from AI/ML model switching.  Proposal 17: Study different alignment levels between quantizer and dequantizer.  Proposal 18: For models with quantization non-aware training, study non-uniform quantization as means to determine actual CSI payload size within the NW configured constraints. |
| Fujitsu | Proposal-1: For the sub use case of CSI compression using two-sided AI/ML models, study the mechanism that UE and NW align their supported AI/ML models in the multi-vendor collaborations.  Proposal-2: For the sub use case of CSI compression using two-sided AI/ML models, study the method for indicating the pairing information of the AI/ML-based CSI generation and reconstruction parts. The pairing ID can be studied as a starting point. |
| Ericsson | [Proposal 7 Target CSI is standardized by use of the implicit CSI reporting principle (precoding vector) and is based on the eType-II framework. Study further the parameter values, e.g., of L, p\_v, β,..](#_Toc131752944)  [Proposal 8 RAN1 to study whether the number of quantization levels per encoder output should be fixed or configurable by the network in CSI report configuration.](#_Toc131752945)  [Proposal 9 Re-use the legacy CSI reporting principle with CSI Part 1 and Part 2 where Part 1 has a network configured fixed size and Part 2 size is dynamic, determined by information in Part 1.](#_Toc131752946)  [Proposal 10 The UCI for an AI-CSI report consists of bits carried in CSI part 1 for the auxiliary information common across all the transmission layers, bits carried in CSI part 2 used to complete the interpretation of the output CSI, and bits carried in CSI part 2, representing the quantized latent space output of the encoder.](#_Toc131752947)  [Proposal 11 Support Option 1 with CQI being calculated based on a hypothetical CSI which is derived from target CSI. Further study the details of mechanisms for CQI adjustments.](#_Toc131752948)  [Proposal 12 If target CSI being an explicit channel tensor is supported (i.e. full Tx \* Rx MIMO channel), an alternative solution is that the CSI report doesn’t contain CQI and RI, but contains an interference plus noise (IpN) report.](#_Toc131752949)  Observation 9: Given the potential complexity arising from unmatched quantization, proponents of non-standardized quantization need to motivate the benefits to why the quantization should not be standardized.  Observation 10 : It is feasible to have a quantization-common model, the performance difference to a quantization-specific model is non-substantial.  Observation 11: If the pre-processing contains removal of raw channel subspace (by the UE), then information about the remaining subspace (e.g., the SD and FD basis vectors) needs to be reported to the network side along with the encoder output bits.  Observation 12: The importance of CBSR will increase due to more complicated interference situations in coming deployments and bands  Observation 13 : A benefit of a Target CSI definition based on eType-II is that CBSR can straightforwardly be applied by gNB to UE configuration of the target  Observation 14 : Since a CSI-RS measurement may be used for multiple purposes (monitoring, inference, data collection), and processed by different hardware in the UE, RAN1 can consider discussing CPU and measurement processing units (MPU) as two decoupled entities used to define the UE processing load |
| xiaomi | Proposal 5: Alt2b, i.e., CQI is calculated using two stage approach, where UE derives CQI using precoded CSI-RS transmitted with a reconstructed precoder should be supported.  Proposal 6: The legacy priority rule can be reused to define the priority the AI/ML based CSI reporting, and a priority value with new parameter value or introducing new parameter is used to indicate the priority of CSI reporting.  Proposal 7: CSI reporting with two parts, i.e., Part 1 and Part 2 or only one part for AI/ML based CSI feedback with two-sided model can be supported.  Proposal 8: The compressed quantization information is divided into N>1 groups for CSI omission, where the values N and how to divide into N groups needs to further study.  Proposal 9: RAN 1 should study the AI processing unit capability report and AI processing unit number determination for various cases of AI based CSI enhancement. |
| Panasonic | Observation 15: For each option of training collaboration, handling of rank of AI/ML model should studied.  Observation 16: Both quantization non-aware training and quantization-aware training should be studied.  Observation 17: For CQI determination in CSI report, further study Option 1a, 1b, and 2a.  Observation 18: Legacy CSI reporting mechanism, i.e., mapping of compressed CSI into fixed/configurable/known-payload part (similar to CSI part 1) and variable/predictable size (similar to CSI part 2) may also be required for CSI compression using two-sided models. |
| LGE | Proposal #3: For CSI reporting for AI/ML based CSI compression, two-part encoding can be considered where # of actual bits for AI/ML generated CSI can be included in Part 1 CSI. FFS on it can be across layer or per layer.  Proposal #4: For CQI determination of AI/ML based CSI compression, prioritize option 1 (CQI is NOT calculated based on the output of CSI reconstruction part from the realistic channel estimation).  Proposal #5: Consider CSI compression ratio information as CSI reporting contents.  Proposal #6: Consider enhancement of CSI restriction at least followings   * Configuration associated with form of ids such as configuration id, site id, zone id, etc. * Dynamic configuration switching   Proposal #7: Consider defining new CSI processing unit to handle the AI/ML based CSI. |
| ETRI | Proposal 2: In CSI compression using two-sided AI model, further study the following potential specification impacts on UCI configuration.   * NW configures UE to generate the UCI payload in a certain size. * UE generates the UCI payload within the maximum UCI payload size. UE delivers to or shares details of the UCI payload (including quantization-related information)   Observation 3: By setting asymmetric quantization levels for the encoder output allows dynamic adjustments of UCI payload. |
| CMCC | Proposal 8: In AI based CSI compression, for NW side data collection, the following two high resolution quantization methods could be considered for ground-truth CSI reporting:  • High resolution scalar quantization, e.g., Float32, Float16, etc.  • High resolution codebook quantization, e.g., R16 Type II-like method with new parameters  Proposal 9: For CSI compression using two-sided model use case, the enhancement on CSI processing time and the definitions of Z and Z’ could be studied. |
| MediaTek | 1. For VQ, UE and gNB should align their codebook and segmentation approach. 2. Prioritize SQ methods over VQ. |
| Apple | Proposal 4: For eigen-vector based CSI compression, NW configure the maximum UCI size and list of candidates NN IDs via RRC configuration.  Proposal 5: For eigen-vector based CSI compression, the UE determine which AI model to use based on rank and include the model ID as part of the CSI report.  Proposal 6: To enable quantization alignment in AI based CSI compression training type 3, specify at least the size/dimension of CSI generation model output before quantization.  Proposal 7: If vector quantization is supported in AI based CSI feedback, the input/output size of vector quantization codebook should be specified.  Proposal 8: When domain transformation pre-processing is used, legacy CSI report principle can be applied to input CSI directly.  Proposal 9: When domain transformation pre-processing is not used,   * Prioritization rule is indirectly support by selecting different AI model with different UCI bit size. * CBSD can be supported by projecting the input CSI in the subspace orthogonal to restricted sub-space before AI model. |
| Lenovo | 1. The quantization/dequantization method of the AI/ML model output is pre-configured prior to CSI feedback process 2. Study different alternatives for quantization/dequantization methods for CSI compression, considering rank common/specific design, as well as layer common/specific design 3. Study different alternatives of reporting the AI-based CSI framework configuration parameters based on the design details of the AI-based CSI compression framework 4. Study potential CSI report characteristics for AI-based CSI compression under different network-UE training collaboration levels 5. Prioritize Option 1a and Option 2a for CSI compression format in spatial-frequency domain 6. For the mapping order of CSI fields corresponding to AI-based spatial-frequency CSI compression, the CSI feedback is composed into two parts:  * Part 1: comprising RI, CQI and size of CSI Part 2, where the size of CSI Part 1 is fixed * Part 2: comprising the AI encoder output, where the size of Part 2 is indicated in CSI Part 1  1. Strive to design the AI-based spatial-frequency CSI compression codebook so that (i) the overall CSI feedback is fixed for different *RI* values and/or different channel conditions, or (ii) the CSI fields are mapped in an order that enables partial UCI omission of the CSI feedback without jeopardizing the un-omitted CSI feedback 2. Assuming two-sided AI models for CSI compression under training collaboration Type 3, further enhancements are needed to ensure precise CQI characterization in the presence of mismatch between the nominal decoder at the UE side and the actual decoder at the network side 3. Consider Option 1b for CQI reporting, where the UE appends side information to the CQI calculated based on the nominal decoder, such that the side information helps quantify the encoder/decoder mismatch to enable more accurate CQI adjustment to the actual CQI value 4. CBSR is supported for AI-based CSI reporting 5. Reuse legacy DFT-based CBSR, where a DFT-based restricted vector *r* implies that no precoding vector *v* within a pre-determined angular distance from the vector *r* can be selected |
| Qualcomm | Observation 16: Only UCI and final format of the reported CSI (e.g., the precoding matrix) are specified in legacy CSI feedback framework. The PMI search algorithm and its input are proprietary.  Observation 17: In CSI feedback via two-sided model, PMI searching algorithm is replaced by UE-side model while PMI codebook is replaced by NW-side model. The general principle for specification impact should be preserved. The need for specifying UE-side input and pre-processing is not clear.  Observation 18: Post-processing of NW-side model output into the final CSI format can be absorbed into the specification of the final CSI format.  Observation 19: Channel matrix feedback (i.e., H-in-H-out) creates additional and unnecessary complexity for multi-vendor operation.  Observation 20: Eigen-value or soft-rank feedback, along with precoder, achieves similar merit as the channel matrix feedback in terms of flexibility for network scheduling without causing significant increase in implementation complexity.  Observation 21: Quantization non-aware training (case-1) leads to noticeable performance degradation compared with quantization aware training (case-2).  Observation 22: Trainable quantization offers more flexibility and better performance compared to fixed quantization, e.g., trainable vector quantization can improve the performance.  Proposal 15: Reuse current CSI report configuration framework with new signaling of pairing ID and necessary information related to the CSI feedback, e.g., rank restriction, antenna port configuration, payload information.  Note: A pairing ID is a logical ID that indicates compatibility between the UE-side and NW-side model of a two-sided model. For example, all encoders developed from a two-sided multi-vendor training session may be associated with a single pairing ID. As another example, in NW-side first training, UE-side encoders trained based on the same NW-side model may be associated with a single pairing ID.  Proposal 16: Study payload scalability with number of subbands, number of ports and rank.  Proposal 17: UE-side actual payload determination should be based on only reported rank for two-sided ML-CSI feedback.  Proposal 18: The input to the UE-side model should be left to UE implementation, the output at the NW-side model can be specified.  Proposal 19: Preprocessing at UE-side is upto UE-implementation and should not be specified.  Proposal 20: For AI-based CSI feedback, the size of the UCI payload and the final CSI format can be specified.  Proposal 21: Study reporting the precoding matrix together with eigen-values or soft-rank for two-sided AI/ML CSI feedback.  Proposal 22: Deprioritize channel matrix feedback for the R18 study item.  Proposal 23: Quantization method should be considered a part of the UE-side model and dequantization method should be considered a part of the NW-side model. The quantization method should be aligned for good performance, but there is no need for separate specification support to align the quantization method. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Observation 5: Model and assistance information can be used for paring of trained two-sided models in CSI compression.  Observation 6: There is another mechanism to help MCS selection, such as HARQ-ACK mechanism, in addition to CQI reporting.  Observation 7: For CSI compression, the constraint on channel for CSI reporting can be the same as subband type II codebook.  Observation 8: For CSI compression, CSI reporting can consist of two parts; CSI part 1 including RI/encoder model ID/CQI, and CSI part 2 including compressed bits.  Observation 9: For CSI compression, the legacy priority rules for CSI collision handling and CSI omission can be reused except for the priority reporting level within the compressed bits.  Observation 10: NW side monitoring with target CSI reporting suffers from the signalling overhead and quantization error of target CSI reporting.  Observation 11: UE side monitoring with NW indication of reconstructed CSI suffers from the signalling overhead and quantization error of reconstructed CSI indication.  Observation 12: The feasibility of UE side monitoring with reconstruction model at UE side is questionable due to the additional model storage and processing for the reconstruction model at UE side.  Observation 13: Empirical system performance does not require the additional signalling and measurement. However, the relevance to the model performance is low compared to the inference accuracy KPI.  Proposal 3: Clarify what model is identified by model ID in the two-sided model. Until the clarification is made, it is better to introduce paired model ID, encoder model ID, and decoder model ID for the discussion purpose.  Proposal 4: Study the mechanism to align the paired trained models for two-sided models.  Proposal 5: Reuse legacy CSI reporting principle, unless technical issue is observed.  Proposal 6: It is unnecessary to explicitly indicate/configure the CSI payload size. Instead, CSI payload size can be implicitly calculated based on the rank and model ID/functionality information.  Proposal 7: CQI calculated based on target CSI is sufficient for CSI compression.  Proposal 8: For CSI compression, the legacy priority rules for CSI collision handling and CSI omission can be reused except for the priority reporting level within the compressed bits. |
| Samsung | Proposal 2-2: For AI/ML based CSI compression sub-use case, study the specification impact of UCI format for quantized output of CSI generation part.  Proposal 2-3: For AI/ML based CSI compression sub-use case, study flexible configuration of quantization method and quantization resolution that enables the network to  1) Adapt to different AI/ML models and channel environments/scenarios  2) Control the feedback payload size.  Proposal 2-4: For AI/ML based CSI compression sub-use case, study the specification impact of adaptable CSI feedback payload size that enables the UE to adapt to available size of uplink resources.  FFS: whether priority and CSI dropping rules have to be introduced.  Proposal 2-5: For AI/ML based CSI compression sub-use case, study methods to configure and apply codebook subset restriction (CBSR) including:   * Whether the legacy SD basis vectors based restriction applies * How to apply CBSR for when Output-CSI-UE is in 1) spatial-frequency domain 2) angle-delay domain * Whether soft amplitude restriction is possible   Proposal 2-10: In CSI compression using two-sided model, adopt Option 1a: CQI is calculated based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement.  Observation#1  In case of MU-MIMO, the network may not directly apply the precoder based on reported PMI, e.g., for interference nulling, etc. Thus, even in legacy systems, some level of mismatch exists between the PMI (precoder network reconstructs from PMI) and the precoder network applies for data transmission.  Observation#2  In CSI compression using two-sided model, for CQI determination in CSI report, for Option 1a: CQI is calculated based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement   * + Is computationally friendly as UE does not require to perform CSI reconstruction or additional measurements for CQI calculation   + The mismatch between CQI determined conditioned on target CSI (precoder) and CQI determined conditioned on the reconstructed CSI (precoder) is insignificant when CSI reconstruction loss is insignificant   Observation#3  In CSI compression using two-sided model, for CQI determination in CSI report, for Option 1b: CQI is calculated based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement and potential adjustment:   * + The adjustment can be handled in a spec. transparent manner.   Observation#4  In CSI compression using two-sided model, for CQI determination in CSI report, for Option 2a: CQI is calculated based on CSI reconstruction output, if CSI reconstruction model is available at the UE and UE can perform reconstruction model inference with potential adjustment:   * + The availability of Network’s reconstruction output at the UE is not guaranteed, as network may be willing to share it, thus, may not be feasible.   + Network may use heavier model, which may not fit in to UE’s computational capability, thus, may not be feasible.   Observation#5  In CSI compression using two-sided model, for CQI determination in CSI report, for Option 2b: CQI is calculated using two stage approach in which UE derives CQI using precoded CSI-RS transmitted with a reconstructed precoder:   * + It incurs additional CSI-RS overhead   + The delay between CSI (precoder) generation and CQI determination introduces mismatch. |

### Summary:

Quantization is an essential part of the CSI compression use case. Alignment of quantization methods are required. It is important to identify the aspects that required standardization to facilitate multi-vendor joint training procedure. Proposal 2-3-1 summarize companies’ proposal on potential spec impact related to quantization.

In legacy CSI feedback framework, the gNB has the flexibility to configure the maximum CSI feedback payload size by configuring the maximum rank number, the codebook type, CSI feedback granularity and the codebook parameter combinations. The UE can autonomously determine the RI and the number of non-zero coefficients which are fed back to the gNB so that the UE also has the flexibility of determining the CSI feedback payload and adapting the UCI report based on radio environment. For AI/ML-based solutions, methods to enable similar level of flexibility of configuring/determining the CSI payload size by both gNB and UE need further discussion. Related information to ensure paired AI models are used is one main aspects of CSI configuration and reporting.

The logic model ID linking paired CSI generation model and CSI reconstruction model need to be defined for CSI configuration and reporting purpose. For training collaboration type 3, with 1 to M training, it is possible that one decoder maps to multiple encoders. It is also possible that different encoders are trained for different decoders in NW first training. In addition, based on the assisted information in categorizing the dataset, different encoder and/or decoder are trained for different dataset or common encoder/decoder are trained for different dataset. The logical model ID needs to flexibly and efficiently indicate encoder/decoder pair to ensure correct inferencing (reference R1-2303706).

Proposal 2-3-2 and 2-3-3 discuss the CSI configuration and model ID options.

### ***Proposal 2-3-1 (closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study at least the following potential specification impact on quantization alignment including:***

* ***For vector quantization scheme,*** 
  + ***The format and size of the VQ codebook, the distance metric (or quantization rule)***
  + ***Size and segmentation method of the CSI generation model output***
  + ***Configuration/reporting/updating of the VQ codebook***
* ***For scaler quantization scheme,***
  + ***Uniform and non-uniform quantization***
  + ***Configuration of the quantization granularity.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | We think the quantization should be part of model, which does not require spec impact.  Mod: This is for training collaboration type 3. The alignment of quantization is needed for sequential training. For sequential training, quantization can be trained together as part of quantization aware training. However, the quantization methods need to be aligned for second step for encoder/decoder training respectively. Otherwise sequential training will fail. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Same view as Google.  Mod: See comments to google. |
| CATT | It seems the proposal depends on how the model is trained, i.e. quantization -aware or non-quantization aware. So quantization is possible to be part of the model.  Mod: See comments to google. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support the proposal in principle, except for the distance metric: it should be implementation at the training entity or the VQ CB updating entity? As long as the VQ CB is finished, the updating entity only needs to deliver the CB to the other side.  Mod: With a VQ CB, how to choose the codeword needs to be aligned. Training entity train the VQ CB based on certain assumption of how to select the codebook. The other side need to use the same metric together with the codebook. |
| vivo | Support |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Xiaomi | According to our simulation, there are no much difference for the two quantization methods. Therefore, we can firstly discuss which one is adopted based on the evaluation results in AI9.2.2.1.  Mod: We can remove VQ if 9.2.2.1 can conclude only support scaler quantization. |
| LG Electronics | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Whether it is necessary to consider vector quantization methods depends on the evaluation results in 9.2.2.1.  If the quantization/dequantization scheme is not a key contributor to CSI compression/recovery performance, the quantization/dequantization scheme(s) that is relatively simple, easy to indicate and have less standardization impact(e.g. scaler quantization scheme) should be studied with high priority.  Mod: see comments to Xiaomi. |
| CMCC | We think the quantization part and the dequantization part should be paired well so that the whole performance can be good. At least for quantization -aware training, the quantization part should be part of model and there seems no extra spec impact.  Mod: See comments to google. |
| CAICT | Fine with the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We agree with Huawei that the training/updating entity will train/update the VQ codebook then transfer/deliver to the other entity; distance function doesn’t need to be explicitly share between entities, i.e., gNB and UE.  Mod: See comments to Huawei. |
| NVIDIA | Support |
| ZTE | We are fine with the proposal.  For VQ codebook, to our understanding, the distance metric may be an implementation manner, which may not need specification. We suggest removing it as   * ***For vector quantization scheme,***    + ***The format and size of the VQ codebook, ~~the distance metric (or quantization rule)~~***   In addition, a minor typo should be revised:   * ***For ~~scaler~~ scalar quantization scheme,***   + ***Uniform and non-uniform quantization***   + ***Configuration of the quantization granularity.*** |
| InterDigital | OK with proposal |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| Qualcomm | Quantization method has to be aligned between the two sides. However, the need for specification impact is not clear. Is this proposal about training or inference?  During training, it can be aligned between training entities offline when the model is initially developed and trained. Evaluation results have shown that it is better to select the quantization method based on the model and the dataset, compared to selecting a fixed standardized option.  During inference, specification impact may be needed to ensure the compatibility between the UE-side and NW-side models anyway, and since the quantization and dequantization can be viewed as a part of the model, no additional spec change is needed.  Further, the details of the quantization scheme discussed above should be left to implementation.  Mod: for training, mainly to ease the complexity of multi-vendor inter-operability.  For inferencing, as you commented, it is part of the paired model. |
| ETRI | We support the proposal. In our view, CSI generation model can contain quantization (i.e. the output of CSI generation model is a binary sequence), or CSI generation model can be operated with functionally separable quantization functions (i.e., the output of CSI generation model is latent variables). For the latter case, quantization should be aligned between NW and UE side. |
| Samsung | Ok |

### ***Proposal 2-3-1 (v1closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study at least the following potential specification impact on quantization alignment including:***

* ***For vector quantization scheme,*** 
  + ***The format and size of the VQ codebook, [the distance metric (or quantization rule)]***
  + ***Size and segmentation method of the CSI generation model output***
  + ***Configuration/reporting/updating of the VQ codebook***
* ***For scalar quantization scheme,***
  + ***Uniform and non-uniform quantization***
  + ***Configuration of the quantization granularity.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We still think no spec impact is expected for the quantization alignment. Even in sequential training with quantization-aware training, the quantization alignment can be performed offline. There is no motivation to consider 3GPP-based quantization alignment only for the sequential training. |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Ok |
| CATT | OK. Thanks FL for clarification. This is at least for Type3 sequential training. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| CMCC | Support.  Thanks FL’s clarification, at least for Type 3 training, quantization alignment outside model paring might needed. |
| ZTE | We still think the distance metric can be an implementation manner, which may not need to align. To our understanding, for VQ, UE only needs to report the indices of selected vectors and NW can dequantize the indices according to the aligned codebook. Therefore, it is enough for us to align the codebook information and may not be necessary to align the distance metric, which can be an implementation manner. We suggest **removing the distance metric**. |
| Qualcomm | Thanks for the clarification that this is for training. However, we share the view of NTT DOCOMO that during training, it can be aligned between training entities offline when the model is initially developed and trained. Evaluation results have shown that it is better to select the quantization method based on the model and the dataset, compared to selecting a fixed standardized option. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Futurewei | We share the same view as ZTE and suggest removing the “distance metric” wording. |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| InterDigital | Ok |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support |

***Discussion***

@NTT DOCOMO, @Qualcomm, proposal here is not to fix the VQ codebook in specification. It is to align the dimension to facilitate multi-vendor training. An example in M:1 UE first training, to train a model with CSI 60 bits, UE vendor 1 trained float point dimension of 30 with VQ codebook size of (5, 1024) (i.e., segment size is 5, every 5 float point vector quantize into 10 bits). UE vendor 2 trained float point latent output of 40, with VQ codebook of (4, 64), UE vendor 3 train float point latent output of 36, with VQ codebook of (6, 1024). When NW side received all different datasets from each UE vendor, due to mis-alignment of many parameters, train one decoder to work with all the UE side encoder can be difficult.

### ***Proposal 2-3-1 (v2, updated proposal for email approval):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study at least the following potential specification impact on quantization alignment including:***

* ***For vector quantization scheme,*** 
  + ***The format and size of the VQ codebook, ~~the distance metric (or quantization rule)~~***
  + ***Size and segmentation method of the CSI generation model output***
  + ***Configuration/reporting/updating of the VQ codebook***
* ***For scalar quantization scheme,***
  + ***Uniform and non-uniform quantization***
  + ***Configuration of the quantization granularity.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Ericsson | Support. It would also be interesting to study the issue pointed out by the feature lead to quantify “can be difficult”. |
| CATT | OK. |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Huawei/HiSi | OK |
| CAICT | Support. |
| ETRI | Support |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| ZTE | Support. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | We thank the moderator for the clarification of the intent. From the current wording it is not clear whether the proposal is for alignment during training stage or during inference. The moderator clarified in the comments that the intent is for training. It would be important to capture that in the proposal to ensure correct understanding across companies.  Moreover, since this is for training, the air-interface impact is not clear. Hence, we request to add “necessity” to the study.  ***“In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study ~~at least the following~~ the necessity and potential specification impact ~~for~~ on quantization alignment during the training stage, including at least…”***  Also, please add a note to confirm that the VQ codebook itself is not in the scope of this proposal:  “***Note: The quantization method / VQ codebook is left to implementation.***” |

### ***Proposal 2-3-2 (closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the potential specification impact for CSI configuration and report:***

* ***For Network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of model ID indicating the potential CSI generation models UE can choose.*** 
  + ***FFS: whether the configuration is per layer or common to all layers***
  + ***FFS: the model ID format***
* ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the model ID indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the selected RI.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | We think there is similar problem for RI report as CQI report. We need to firstly study whether to support one-stage or two-stage report for RI. CQI can be compensated by OLLA, but RI may not. Thus, two-stage report could be more beneficial for RI report. We suggest the last bullet as follows:   * ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, study the following options:***   + ***Option 1: UE reports the selected RI and the model ID indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the selected RI.***   + ***Option 2: UE reports the model ID indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the maximum number of DL layers.***     - ***The gNB may configure another CSI report including at least the rank related report***   Mod: Option 2 has large feedback overhead when UE always report PMI according to max rank. Not sure any company evaluated this approach in 9.2.2.1. For RI determination, separate proposals can be drafted similar to CQI later. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal |
| CATT | While we think further study is OK, the wording seems only considers model-ID based LCM.  If the group would like to support two-sided model in functionality-based LCM, ‘model ID’ should better be rewritten in a more general way, e.g. pairing ID used in agenda 9.2.1:  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the potential specification impact for CSI configuration and report:***   * ***For Network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of ~~model~~ pairing ID indicating the potential CSI generation models UE can choose.***    + ***FFS: whether the configuration is per layer or common to all layers***   + ***FFS: the ~~model~~ pairing ID format*** * ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the ~~model~~ pairing ID indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the selected RI.***   ***Note: model ID may serve as pairing ID in model-ID based LCM.***  Mod: depending on discussion on proposal 6-13a in 9.2.1. Model ID is more generic term, and the necessity of additional paring ID depends on 9.2.1 discusison. |
| Huawei/HiSi | We think the proposal in this form only address one of the possibilities.  Technically, there can be a number of solutions to support various CSI payload sizes: 1) developing scalable models, 2) configure various granularities of the SQ/VQ CB, etc., while 3) configuring a number of models is one of them.  Model-based LCM is still under discussion in 9.2.1. At this stage, to make a unified solution regarding the determination of the CSI payload size, we think this issue should be decoupled from the model ID discussion. gNB can simply configure a set of candidate CSI payload sizes and UE reports the index of the actual CSI payload size along with the selected RI.  Mod: model ID is logic index to pair encoder with proper decoder, it can indicate scalable models/scalable SQ/VQ CB as well. As long as UE/NW need to align the information to get proper PMI, the logic ID can be used.  Depending on generalization, multi-vendor 1:M training etc, it is very possible with the same number of UCI bits, different models are trained. In this case, proper paring of encoder/decoder can not only rely on CSI payload size. |
| vivo | This proposal implies that the model with different CSI payload size needs different model ID for CSI generation models. One way in our discussion, however, is that UE can use a single CSI generation model by means of payload truncation mechanism to fit the payload, and NW needs a CSI deconstruction model associated with the truncated payload. This works with a single model ID, as long as UE implicitly/explicitly informs the payload size of reporting to NW.  Mod: Puncturing is included. NW side still need to know the proper decoder to use. Refer to proposal 2-3-3, where model ID can be represented by decoder ID only. |
| Ericsson | Agree with CATT that pairing ID should be used to identify a paired set of models (plus used dataset) from a training collaboration process.  We Cannot support the proposal to signal a list, as the gNB only use one decoder, i.e. one pairing ID at a time due to complexity reasons with handling multiple parallel models. So there is no need to signal a list to the UE since the UE cannot freely switch between different encoder models. Agree with Huawei there are many different options to adapt the overhead.  Mod: Different payload size/model ID can be realized by just adding one adaptation layer. Refer comments to CATT. |
| Xiaomi | Before discussing the proposal, we should have the common understanding whether the two-sided model is managed by functionality identification or model identification.  Mod: discussion here limit to CSI configuration and report to ensure proper paired models are used. Model identification is already done at this stage. |
| LG Electronics | We are not sure on the necessity of configuration of a list of model IDs for CSI payload determination and reporting of model ID. Similar to CQI determination, RI also can be calculated based on the realistic channel estimation.  Mod: This is mainly to support rank 2,3,4 report has similar payload size, similar to e-type 2. For example, for layer common model, when RI=2, model output size of 50 bits will be selected. When RI=4, model output size of 25 bits will be selected, so total max CSI size is similar to RI=2. |
| OPPO | We prefer keep this discussion open, decoupled from the model ID discussion and collect more views and candidate solutions. |
| CMCC | Agree with Huawei. There might more than one option to deal with multi ranks issues. One model could be scaled with variable ranks. |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| CAICT | Prefer to discuss the details of CSI configuration and report with more conclusions from 9.2.1 on Model ID.  Mod: per offline discussion with 9.2.1 FL, focused discussion in CSI agenda might be helpful as well. |
| Futurewei | Whether/how functionality-based LCM and Model ID based LCM will be used is still being discussed in 9.2.1, so it’s better to use general term (e.g., a list of CSI payload sizes) vs. “Model ID”. |
| Lenovo | The network configuration bullet is not clear. Does the UE determine the RI? If so, the CSI payload should be roughly the same for all RI values. If the rank is determined by the network, further justification is needed on how the network can precisely compute the best rank, at least for FDD where reciprocity does not hold  Mod: Yes. UE determine RI. RI=2,3,4 are roughly the same. This is the main reason why different model /adaptation method will be used. See example to LG. |
| NVIDIA | This proposal appears to be too early to discuss.  Mod: This is major open in CSI discussion. Other aspects have at least some potential spec impact agreement captured for down-selection. |
| ZTE | Agree with Huawei that there are multiple options for achieving different CSI payload size. In addition, for Network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can also configure the specific model for UE to apply, not necessarily a list of models. For ‘model ID’, we think it should be replaced with ‘**pairing ID**’ since functionality-based LCM should also be considered.  Mod: see comments to CATT. |
| InterDigital | Agree with some other companies that it would better to decouple it from the model ID if we want to progress further. Or, wait until we have solid understanding on model identification and functionality identification. |
| MediaTek | Support. |
| AT&T | Prefer to discuss it after Model ID and functionality based LCM are clarified in 9.2.1 |
| Qualcomm | Some clarification is needed. Is the list of model IDs a semi-static configuration, or is the gNB selecting UE-side models dynamically? In our view, the gNB configures a pairing ID semi-statically, and the UE selects a UE-side model that is compatible with the configured pairing ID.  Mod: Yes. Same understanding here. List of IDs are semi-static configuration. UE select model from the list based on rank.  The need for UE to report the model ID is not clear. If the UE selects a physical UE-side model that is compliant with the configured pairing ID, then there should be no need to additionally indicate a CSI reconstruction model. Whether the model is layer-specific, rank-specific, etc. is determined offline at model development time. During inference, the pairing ID configuration is sufficient to align these aspects.  Mod: If NW configure 4 model IDs (paring IDs) to choose. And UE choose one, then 2 bits are required to indicate which one. Layer specific requires model ID per layer indication. Layer common/rank common require one ID for all layers. Example of model ID is associated to different CSI size, 50, 100, 150, 200 for example. This can be implemented by different models, model with many common layer/weights and one or few additional adaptation layer/weights, or puncturing.  It may be too early to discuss the model ID format and it may be better to let RAN2 study such aspects.  Mod: Intend to clarify the requirement of model ID from CSI compression point of view. |
| ETRI | In our view, the actual CSI payload size can be varied by adopting different quantization. For that case, UE needs to report the (selected) model ID and (selected) quantization-related information if required.  Mod: model ID is logic ID. Same model ID can have models where only one-layer weights are different, or only quantization layer is different. |
| Samsung | We do not agree with this proposal. We also do not see the point of considering model ID for this.  Mod: |

### ***Proposal 2-3-3(closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the following options to define the model ID for CSI configuration and report:***

* ***Option 1: The model ID indicates the CSI reconstruction model ID that NW will use.***
* ***Option 2: The model ID indicates the CSI generation model ID that the UE will use.***
* ***Option 3: The model ID indicates the paired CSI generation model and CSI reconstruction model.***
* ***Option 4: The model ID indicates by the dataset ID during training type 3 offline training.***
* ***Other options are not excluded.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | We think we can add “reference” between the word “model” for each option. The UE and NW should communicate based on some logical model instead of actual/physical model.  Mod: updated. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think option 2 is reasonable and consistent with one-sided model. The decoder paired to each model ID can be included in mete info. That way, NW can implicitly indicate the NW side model via indicating the model ID that represents the encoder. |
| CATT | Generally OK.  As we suggest in previous proposal, ‘model ID’ is better to be rewritten as ‘pairing ID’ to incorporate functionality-based LCM. This is also makes Option 4 less confusing…  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the following options to define the ~~model~~ pairing ID for CSI configuration and report:***   * ***Option 1: The ~~model~~ pairing ID indicates the CSI reconstruction model ID that NW will use.*** * ***Option 2: The ~~model~~ pairing ID indicates the CSI generation model ID that the UE will use.*** * ***Option 3: The ~~model~~ pairing ID indicates the paired CSI generation model and CSI reconstruction model.*** * ***Option 4: The ~~model~~ pairing ID indicates by the dataset ID during training type 3 offline training.*** * ***Other options are not excluded.***   Mod: note added |
| Huawei/HiSi | We think this proposal is tangled with the model/functionality identification, and should be discussed in 9.2.1 along with other issues related to the model-based LCM.  E.g., in our understanding, the dataset ID in Option 4 can operate under the functionality identification manner.  Mod: note added. If it was agreed paring ID is used for functionality based LCM and model ID is used for model ID based LCM, and CSI compression applies to both cases, the term can be updated easily. |
| vivo | We are supportive of the opption3. We want to clarify that in case of single CSI generation model and N multiple CSI reconstruction models working for the truncation of payload (i.e., N truncated payloads), one model ID is only associated with paired single CSI generation model and single CSI reconstruction model (only for one truncated payload). In this case, it requires N model IDs. |
| Ericsson | Add **Option 5**, The pairing ID indicates a reference to a prior training session (e.g. using an API) between NW and UE, associated with a specific dataset. Hence the ID doesn’t refer to a model but instead a process used to obtain the models at each side. |
| Xiaomi | As commended in the last proposal, we should firstly discuss whether the two-sided model is managed by functionality identification or model identification.  In our view, Option 3 is a simple way.  Mod: see comments to Huawei. |
| LG Electronics | Similar view with proposal 2-3-2. It can be further discussed after some progress in above issue. |
| OPPO | More conclusions on the model/functionality ID issue in 9.2.1 are needed before discussing how to design/associate/use a model ID in CSI part. |
| CMCC | We are generally OK. But for the different definitions of model ID, the feasible option can be different. For example, if the model is logical model, Option 3 is more suitable, while if it is physical model, Option 1 or 2 is also possible. |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| CAICT | Fine to list all options for CSI configuration and report. It seems that there is similar discussion in 9.2.1 on pairing ID. |
| Futurewei | In general, we think using “pairing ID” would be better. However, this proposal is coupled with the LCM related discussion in 9.2.1 and tied to the previous proposal, thus, we suggest waiting for some progress is made in 9.2.1 and company’s views on the previous proposal. |
| Lenovo | We believe this proposal should be discussed after we have clear view on functionality/mode of LCM. |
| NVIDIA | Support the proposal in principle. |
| ZTE | We should deprioritize this issue. |
| InterDigital | It is better to wait until the definition of model identification and functionality identification becomes clearer under AI 9.2.1 as proposed by few other companies |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal in principle. We think in the option 4, we can add training type 2 as well. |
| AT&T | Prefer to discuss it after Model ID and functionality based LCM are clarified in 9.2.1 |
| Qualcomm | The ID included in the CSI report configuration framework should be a pairing ID. A pairing ID is a logical ID that indicates compatibility between the UE-side and NW-side model of a two-sided model. For example, all encoders developed from a two-sided multi-vendor training session may be associated with a single pairing ID. As another example, in NW-side first training, UE-side encoders trained based on the same NW-side model may be associated with a single pairing ID.  The UE can select any physical model that is compatible with the configured pairing ID. |
| ETRI | In our view, separate model IDs are required for both CSI generation models and CSI reconstruction models. We also think this proposal can be discussed after the discussion of model identification for two-sided model in the agenda 9.2.1. |

***Summary of discussion:***

Proposal 2-2-2 and 2-2-3 are major opens on CSI compression potential spec impact discussion. The proposals are harder to converge by its nature, as it tightly related to terminology, ID definition, LCM framework discussion etc. FL tried to address comments to each individual feedback. Please check whether the comments clarify the intention of the discussion. The discussion here is assume model identification is already done.

The proposals are further revised for 2nd round comments.

### ***Proposal 2-3-2 (v1closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the potential specification impact for CSI configuration and report:***

* ***For Network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of model ID indicating the potential CSI generation models UE can choose.*** 
  + ***FFS: whether the configuration is per layer or common to all layers***
  + ***FFS: the model ID format***
* ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the model ID indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the selected RI.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Do not agree. We see different proposals on how to pair the CSI generation and reconstruction parts, e.g., model level (via model ID), dataset level (dataset ID), implicit manner (etc), and or no need (vendor agnostic models at both sides). Thus, this proposal can definitely wait until sufficient progress in 9.2.1 and 9.2.2.1 is made. If this is for payload size alignment it can be modified as follows: ***Proposal 2-3-2(v1):***  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the potential specification impact for CSI configuration and report:***   * ***For Network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of ~~logical model~~ Configuration IDs implicitly or explicitly indicating the potential CSI generation models UE can choose.***    + ***FFS: whether the configuration is per layer or common to all layers***   + ***~~FFS: the model ID format~~*** * ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the ~~logical model~~ Configuration ID indicating the corresponding ~~CSI reconstruction model~~ CSI payload size for each layer subject to the selected RI.*** * ***~~Note: terminology of Model ID is placeholder. It can be replaced by pairing ID if agreed in 9.2.1 (proposal 6-13a).~~*** * ***~~Note: model ID is to align CSI generation model and CSI reconstruction model. Detailed implementation of different models with different logical ID via adaptation layer, puncturing or quantization are up to implementation.~~*** |
| CATT | This proposal is trying to move further from the previous agreement on payload size determination. As HW mentioned, it captures one possibility, i.e. the payload size is determined by [logical] model ID. But there may be other promising ways as pointed out by Samsung.  If we still go with model ID, preferred by majority, we are fine with the new note.  If we go with Samsung’s way, we can add a FFS for the representation/details of configuration ID, which may be payload size ID, model ID, pairing ID, dataset ID, or others. |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not support.  First bullet: Why consider any logical model ID ? Need some clarification on that as 9.2.1 is not having a clear agreement on that. FFS points and logical model ID details can be removed from the first bullet.  Second bullet: a similar comment.  Notes shall also be removed. |
| ZTE | From our perspective, there is no clear definition for ‘logical model ID’, so we suggest removing it and using **‘pairing ID’** in 9.2.1 to replace it since it can be a logical ID. ***Proposal 2-3-2(v1):***  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the potential specification impact for CSI configuration and report:***   * ***For Network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of ~~logical model~~  pairing IDs indicating the potential CSI generation models UE can choose.***    + ***FFS: whether the configuration is per layer or common to all layers***   + ***FFS: the model ID format*** * ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the ~~logical model~~ pairing ID indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the selected RI.*** * ***Note: terminology of Model ID is placeholder. It can be replaced by pairing ID if agreed in 9.2.1 (proposal 6-13a).*** * ***Note: model ID is to align CSI generation model and CSI reconstruction model. Detailed implementation of different models with different ~~logical ID~~ pairing ID via adaptation layer, puncturing or quantization are up to implementation.*** |
| Lenovo | We are OK with the proposal, and we appreciate the moderator’s response on our comments in the first round. If possible, we would like the moderator’s responses to us (as well as LG) are captured in a sub-bullet, e.g.,   * ***For Network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of ~~logical model~~ Configuration IDs implicitly or explicitly indicating the potential CSI generation models UE can choose.***    + ***FFS: whether the different configurations correspond to different RI values selected by the UE***   + ***FFS: whether the configuration is per layer or common to all layers***   + ***~~FFS: the model ID format~~*** |
| Qualcomm | It is not clear why the gNB has to configure a list of IDs. The configured ID should be such that the UE can select its CSI generation model correctly based on that ID, i.e., one that would be compatible with the NW-side model. Then, there is also no need for the UE to report a model ID in its report. These aspects need justification. We propose the following simplified wording for the first two items:  ***For Network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a ~~list of~~ logical model ID that enables the UE to choose a CSI generation model compatible with the CSI reconstruction model used by the gNB. ~~IDs indicating the potential CSI generation models UE can choose~~.***  ***o ~~FFS: whether the configuration is per layer or common to all layers~~***  ***~~o FFS: the model ID format~~***  ***• For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the gNB selects the CSI reconstruction model based on the RI indicated by the UE and the logical model ID that it configured to the UE ~~and the logical model ID indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the selected RI~~.***  Mod: One ID will result in linear scale of payload size with rank. |
| Nokia/NSB | Some additional concerns/suggestions on this proposal  First bullet:   * Why consider any logical model ID ? Need some clarification on that as 9.2.1 is not having a clear agreement on that. * gNB does not need to configure a list of logical model ID to determine the payload size. The payload size is the result of gNB parameter configuration and UE choices such as rank, etc. * We think this bullet should be about studying the mechanism to ensure that CSI generation and reconstruction models are aligned and whether additional signalling configuration is needed. For example, if model alignment has been achieved during offline training, the encoder model(s) compatible with a gNB decoder model may be implicitly derived by a UE from the CSI reporting setting configuration * FFS points and logical model ID details can be removed from the first bullet.   Second bullet   * a similar comment on logical model ID * UE does not need to report the encoder logical model ID if model pair alignment is already achieved. * To determine the actual UCI payload we need to discuss what CSI quantities are reported, how many UCI parameters (fields) are needed and their format/size. |
| Ericsson | Why is a list of ID needed? A single ID is sufficient to align the models on the NW and UE side. Qualcomm proposal is quite ok with us but we can replace “logical model ID” with simply an “identifier” of which details and exact definitio is FFS. Also, it is not mandated that the gNB selects the CSI reconstruction model based on the RI. This is up to gNB implementation.  My suggestion:  ***For Network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure the UE with an identifier that enables the UE to choose a CSI generation model compatible with the CSI reconstruction model used by the gNB***   * ***Details of the identifier is FFS (e.g. pairing ID, logical model ID etc)***   ***For aligning the actual CSI payload size between UE and gNB, the selected RI by the UE is reported to the gNB and it may be a factor in determining the actual CSI payload size*** |
| LG Electronics | Not support. Similar view with other companies, logical model needs to be clarified in 9.2.1. Also, from our earlier comment and also from Samsung, we are still not convinced with model id reporting for payload determination. Hence, we prefer Samsung’s updates. |
| InterDigital | Similar comments last time. Better wait till we have clear definition of model identification. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Changing “model ID” to “logical model ID” does not address our concern in the first round. We think above Samsung proposal is a better starting point.  For the multiple layer/rank specific models at the UE side, it may be viewed as one model at the gNB side, and only one model ID is assigned to achieve the pairing. |
| Xiaomi | It is premature to list logic model ID at this stage. We are fine with Ericsson’s suggestion. |

***Summary:***

There are two major issues: first issue is whether to allow UE to choose the proper model based on rank. Or the CSI payload size linear scale with rank, which departed from e-type II principle. The second major issue is ID, which can be generic. First issue was discussed in RAN1 112 off-line, with 3 options listed. FL did not see proposals related to other options in this meeting, therefore reduce to one option.

@Lenovo, sorry I am not sure I get what you mean by “FFS: whether the different configurations correspond to different RI values selected by the UE”. Are you proposing: RI=1, list 1, RI=2 list 2, RI=3 list 3 and RI=4 list 4, for rank specific model?

Based on feedback, proposals are updated:

### ***Proposal 2-3-2(v2closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the potential specification impact for CSI configuration and report:***

* ***Option 1:*** 
  + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure the UE with an identifier that enables the UE to choose a CSI generation model compatible with the CSI reconstruction model used by the gNB***
  + ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI.***
  + ***Note: CSI payload size linear scale with RI for layer common and layer specific model.***
  + ***FFS: how to support rank specific configuration.***
* ***Option 2:***
  + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of identifiers indicating the potential CSI generation models UE can choose that are compatible with the CSI reconstruction models used by the gNB.***
  + ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the identifier indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the selected RI.***
  + ***Note: UE can choose different model or different adaptation layer or punction bits, to ensure rank 2, 3, and 4 has similar payload size, following eType 2 design principle.***
  + ***FFS: whether the list of identifier is per layer or common to all layers***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Ericsson** | Almost ok but in option 1, it is mandated that CSI payload scales linearly with RI, I think this is too restrictive at this point |
| Lenovo | Similar comment as Ericsson, the payload does not necessarily scale linearly if the selected model/quantization is rank-specific, hence, we prefer removing the note under Option 1: o **~~For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI.~~** |
| CATT | Similar to Ericsson and Lenovo, the note in Option 1 is too restrictive. Even for Option 1, the Note in Option 2 can still be applied, it is up to UE implementation as long as the selected model/puncture/adaptive layer is compatible with NW side CSI reconstruction model.  We suggest either remove the Note in Option 1, or replace it with the Note in Option 2. |
| Panasonic | We share the same view with Ericsson, Lenovo, and CATT. We support Lenovo’s suggestion to remove the Note under Option 1. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Our comments in the 1st round is still not addressed: what if the model is a scalable one, which supports multiple dimensions of latent spaces? How to configure, and how to report?  Suggest a unified description in below:   * ***Option 3:***    + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure the UE with a set of identifiers ~~that enables the UE to choose a CSI generation model compatible with the CSI reconstruction model used by the gNB~~***     - ***Each identifier is associated with the information of factors that represent the a specific CSI payload size, e.g., UE part model compatible with the NW part model used by the gNB, rank value, quantization method/granularity, size of latent space from scalable dimensions for each layer, etc.***   + ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the selected identifier.***   + ***~~Note: CSI payload size linear scale with RI for layer common and layer specific model.~~***   Mod: intention is to cover this in option 2. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| CAICT | We also think the note in Option 1 should be removed. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Option 1.  @Moderator: Responding to your comment above “Mod: One ID will result in linear scale of payload size with rank.”   * Even if there are different models for different layers and/or ranks, the UE-side and NW-side can be aligned using a single identifier for pairing purposes. In our understanding, even with a single identifier, the payload size of each layer can be different.   There is no need for a list of identifiers. The Note and the FFS in option 1 are not needed.  Another aspect to study is how the CSI payload size scales with the number of subbands and number of ports, and whether/how different payload config is needed for a certain number of subband/port. Hence, we propose to add an FFS to both options:  “***FFS: other payload related aspects including how payload scales with number of subbands, number of ports, different payload configs, etc.***” |
| LG Electronics | Same view with other companies that the note in Option 1 should be removed. |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| AT&T | Same view as other companies regarding note in option 1 to be removed. |
| ZTE | Due to the conflict with actual payload size and ID information, we need further study and discuss the issues, so we propose the following generic wording for the first two items in current stage:  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the potential specification impact for CSI configuration and report:***   * ***Option 1:***    + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure the UE with an identifier that enables the UE to choose a CSI generation model compatible with the CSI reconstruction model used by the gNB***   + ***~~For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI.~~***   + ***~~Note: CSI payload size linear scale with RI for layer common and layer specific model.~~***   + ***~~FFS: how to support rank specific configuration.~~*** * ***Option 2:***   + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of identifiers indicating the potential CSI generation models UE can choose that are compatible with the CSI reconstruction models used by the gNB.***   + ***~~For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the identifier indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the selected RI.~~***   + ***~~Note: UE can choose different model or different adaptation layer or punction bits, to ensure rank 2, 3, and 4 has similar payload size, following eType 2 design principle.~~***   + ***~~FFS: whether the list of identifier is per layer or common to all layers~~*** |
| CMCC | Regarding the Note in Option 1 it is not needed, which is too restricted to force each layer has the same payloads.  Regarding the Note in Option 2, for AL based solution, the rank 2, 3 and 4 could have different payloads, it is up to the specific model design. So, we suggest:   * ***Option 1:***    + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure the UE with an identifier that enables the UE to choose a CSI generation model compatible with the CSI reconstruction model used by the gNB***   + ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI.***   + ***~~Note: CSI payload size linear scale with RI for layer common and layer specific model.~~***   + ***FFS: how to support rank specific configuration.*** * ***Option 2:***   + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of identifiers indicating the potential CSI generation models UE can choose that are compatible with the CSI reconstruction models used by the gNB.***   + ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the identifier indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the selected RI.***   + ***Note: UE can choose different model or different adaptation layer or punction bits~~, to ensure rank 2, 3, and 4 has similar payload size, following eType 2 design principle~~.***   + ***FFS: whether the list of identifier is per layer or common to all layers*** |

Thanks for the comments. Proposal is updated. @Huawei, the intention is to capture scalable one in option 2. The identifier is logical one, it can be implemented by one scaler model, or with puncture, or multiple models, or different quantization methods. I update the notes based on your test.

### ***Proposal 2-3-2(v3closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the potential specification impact for CSI configuration and report:***

* ***Option 1:*** 
  + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure the UE with an identifier that enables the UE to choose a CSI generation model compatible with the CSI reconstruction model used by the gNB***
  + ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI.***
  + ***~~Note: CSI payload size linear scale with RI for layer common and layer specific model.~~***
  + ***FFS: how to support rank specific configuration.***
* ***Option 2:***
  + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of identifiers indicating the potential CSI generation models UE can choose that are compatible with the CSI reconstruction models used by the gNB.***
  + ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the identifier indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the selected RI.***
  + ***Note: ~~UE can choose different model or different adaptation layer or punction bits, to ensure rank 2, 3, and 4 has similar payload size, following eType 2 design principle~~. Each identifier is associated with the information of factors that represent the a specific CSI payload size, e.g., UE part model compatible with the NW part model used by the gNB, rank value, quantization method/granularity, size of latent space from scalable dimensions for each layer, etc.***
  + ***FFS: whether the list of identifier is per layer or common to all layers***
* ***FFS: other payload related aspects including how payload scales with number of subbands, number of ports, different payload configs, etc***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Lenovo** | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| CAICT | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Thanks FL for the clarification. Our view is that, the UE needs to be configured with a set of CSI payload sizes, where the model ID is only one factor to decide it (other factors include quantization, scalability ID, etc.); therefore, only indicating the model ID cannot completely make it work.  Let’s consider Opt1: if the model is a scalable one, supporting multiple sizes of latent spaces (e.g., Set#A = {100bits, 120bits, 140bits,…, 200bits}), after gNB indicates the model ID to UE, how can UE further understand the (set of) configured size(s) of latent spaces (e.g., gNB configures a subset including Set#B = {100bits, 140bits, 180 bits} to UE)? How can gNB understand the specific CSI payload chosen by the UE (e.g., UE selects a specific 140bits from Set#B)? We still need to introduce other configuration/reported indexes, right? Same issue for the current Opt2.  Our point is that a unified indexing mechanism, i.e., each identifier is associated to all aspects of {model ID, a specific scalable latent space size, quantization level, etc.} that decides an exact CSI payload size supported by UE. gNB configures a set of identifiers to UE, and UE reports the selected identifier to gNB, so that the two sides can exactly understand the CSI payload size addressed by the other side. In that sense, the identifier is not “***indicating the potential CSI generation models***”, but indicating “***CSI payload size***”.   * + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of identifiers indicating the CSI payload sizes ~~potential CSI generation models UE can choose that are compatible with the CSI reconstruction models used by the gNB~~.***   + ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the identifier indicating the corresponding CSI payload sizes ~~CSI reconstruction model~~ for each layer subject to the selected RI.***   + ***Note: ~~UE can choose different model or different adaptation layer or punction bits, to ensure rank 2, 3, and 4 has similar payload size, following eType 2 design principle~~. Each identifier is associated with the information of factors that represent the a specific CSI payload size, e.g., UE part model compatible with the NW part model used by the gNB, rank value, quantization method/granularity, size of latent space from scalable dimensions for each layer, etc.*** |
| vivo | We are not supportive of the updated note in Option 2. The newly updated note makes us confusion. We refer the previous version.  Mod: The updated text is more generic. Would you please elaborate the exact concern of the updated text? |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Futurewei | For NW configuration, we prefer to use CSI payload sizes vs. model(s) as included in Huawei/HiSi’s edits that “***gNB can configure a list of identifiers indicating the CSI payload sizes”.***  Typo in the note:  ***Each identifier is associated with the information of factors that represent a specific CSI payload size, e.g., …*** |
| ZTE | For a scalability model configured by gNB, it has different CSI payload size, thus an identifier may not represent the actual CSI payload size and additional identifiers may be needed to indicate/report to gNB. It may be applicable to both option 1 and option 2. |
| Qualcomm | We prefer Option 1 as a starting point. Why is the FFS on rank-specfic configuration needed?  In option 2, the need for the UE to dynamically select from multiple options needs justification.  For option 2, is the intent of the newly added text to specify what the identifier means? The information associated with the identifier should be left to implementation. Specifying the information in the standards could restrict the options. |
| Ericsson | Support. Prefer 1 |
| LG Electronics | Our understanding and preference is more likely to Huawei’s revision. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| ETRI | We agree on Huawei’s comment of configuring only an identifier may not be sufficient to indicate the CSI payload size. |
| Xiaomi | For the FFS on ram-specific configuration in Option, do it mean rank restriction configured by gNB? We think it has better to clarify.  For CSI payload size, in our understanding, one way is that the size depends on the AI/ML model. The other way is that UE can flexibly determine the size depends on the selected rank, the configured size by gNB or some else factors. |
| Samsung | Ok. |
| NEC | If the “identifier” indicates “model”.  - Support Option 1.  - Open to study Option 2. From our point of view, the alignment between the CSI generation model and the CSI reconstruction model should have been completed before model inference. Unless the situation where NW configures multiple models is inevitable, this situation (i.e., Option 2) is unnecessary. |

@Huawei, FL’s understanding of option 1 in your example is NW configure 140bits directly. Proponents of option 1 please clarify if there is a different understanding.

FL clarification: the identifier indicates a set of parameters including at least:

* Information needs to align the UE encoder to the exact NW decoder (whether vendor specific model is used, site/cell/configuration specific model etc)
* Specific latent space payload size
* Quantization level
* Rank specific, rank common, layer specific and layer common related information.

Therefore the note under option 2 is moved one level up to clarify that we are using a unified indexing mechanism.

### ***[Rd 5] Proposal 2-3-2(v4):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the potential specification impact for CSI configuration and report:***

* ***Option 1:*** 
  + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure the UE with an identifier ~~that enables the UE to choose a CSI generation model compatible with the CSI reconstruction model used by the gNB~~***
  + ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI.***
  + ***~~Note: CSI payload size linear scale with RI for layer common and layer specific model.~~***
  + ***~~FFS: how to support rank specific configuration.~~***
* ***Option 2:***
  + ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure a list of identifiers ~~indicating the CSI payload size and the potential CSI generation models UE can choose that are compatible with the CSI reconstruction models used by the gNB.~~***
  + ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and the identifier ~~indicating the corresponding CSI reconstruction model for each layer subject to the selected RI~~.***
* ***~~Each~~ An identifier ~~is~~ may be associated with the information of factors that represent a specific CSI payload size and/or model, e.g., UE part model compatible with the NW part model used by the gNB, rank value, quantization method/granularity, size of latent space from scalable dimensions for each layer, etc.***
* ***FFS: other payload related aspects including how payload scales with number of subbands, number of ports, different payload configs, etc***

***Proposal 2-3-2(v4merged version):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the potential specification impact for CSI configuration and report:***

* ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure the UE with one or more identifiers***
* ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and/or selected identifier.***
* ***An identifier may be associated with the information of factors that represent a specific CSI payload size and/or model, e.g., UE part model compatible with the NW part model used by the gNB, rank value, quantization method/granularity, size of latent space from scalable dimensions for each layer, etc.***
* ***FFS: other payload related aspects including how payload scales with number of subbands, number of ports, different payload configs, etc***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Ericsson** | I think the Options can be merged and say “one or more identifiers” and then we add to the study to assess the benefits and neccessity of having a list of multiple identifiers and UE to gNB reporting of an identifier (in case of multiple).  Then the new bullet in red should read “~~Each~~ An identifier is associated….” |
| **Futurewei** | We have a small comment on the added bullet:  “***Each identifier ~~is~~ may be associated with the information of factors that represent a specific CSI payload size and/or model,…”***  If “identifier” is a CSI payload size, then there may be more than 1 UE side model that can support the specified payload size. |
| **CATT** | Somehow the meaning/difference of Option 1 and Option 2 become ambiguous in this version.  In previous version, the differentiation is clear:   * Option 1 is more like ‘CSI generation model-agnostic’ manner, in which UE does not need to report the used CSI generation model but just need to guarantee the compatibility. * Option 2 is more like ‘CSI generation model-aware’ manner, in which UE will need to report the used model.   But in the latest version, due to the new bullet of ***Identifier***, both ‘agnostic and aware’ can be applied to Option 1 and Option 2. Meanwhile, Option 1 seems to be a special case of Option 2, i.e. only one identifier in the list. If we go with this way, we agree with Ericsson that they can be merged. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Thanks FL for the updates. We are general fine with the current proposal. Some minor questions/comments.  1) A follow-up question for Option 1:  “FL’s understanding of option 1 in your example is NW configure 140bits directly.” – then is UE enabled to report a lower CSI payload size which is smaller than 140 bits? If not, then Option 1 can work standalone; otherwise, we need to consider how UE reports a selected actual CSI payload size?  2) As “*An identifier may be associated with the information of factors that…, rank value,…*”, as the RI may also be represented by the identifier, the UE report can either be “RI + identifier” (if rank value is not represented by identifier) or “identifier only” (if rank value is represented by identifier). So, the UE report should be “*RI and/or the identifier*”  *For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and/or the identifier*  3) We are fine to merge both options; or, alternatively, we can add a note that “Note: merge of the two options are not precluded”  Mod: On 1), it is my understanding UE report 140 bits as configured in option 1. UE can not select an actual size that is smaller than 140bits. In other word, 140 is the actual, not maximum bits like e-type II.  Would appreciate Ericsson and QC to align understanding.  On 2), Yes. You are right. And this is for option 1 rank specific model, right? |
| Xiaomi | We are fine with merging the two options, since even more than one identifier are configured, it is possible that the UE has the same reporting as configuring one identifier, as interpret by HW. |
| Mod | A merged proposal is drafted based on comments so far. |
| Qualcomm | Some aspects of this proposal need more discussion.  Different parameters may need to be indicated – how to select a compatible model, rank restriction, specific payload size for scalable model, etc. Some of them may be implicitly indicated as part of the identifier and may even be considered a part of the AI/ML model (e.g., quantization), while others may be explicitly indicated using a separate configuration parameter. Some may need semi-static signaling, while others may need dynamic signaling. We need further discussion on those aspects before deciding which parameters can be combined into one index or identifier, and whether multiple identifiers need to be configured.  It is not clear why only one method is down-selected (a unified indexing where one identifier implicitly indicates everything) even before studying. We should also study other options for how to indicate the parameters – explicitly vs. implicitly. For example, the option where the identifier is a pairing ID should also be included – in this case, the identifier indicates to the UE how to select a model compatible with the gNB’s reconstruction model. Other parameters may then be separately configured.  In this proposal, is the mapping between the identifier and the parameters expected to be specified or left to implementation?  Mod: The mapping between the identifier and the parameters are next step discussion, after we agree on the concept of using identifier to indicate. |

### ***Proposal 2-3-3(v1 on hold):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the following options to define the logical model ID for CSI configuration and report:***

* ***Option 1: The logical model ID indicates the CSI reconstruction model ID that NW will use.***
* ***Option 2: The logical model ID indicates the CSI generation model ID that the UE will use.***
* ***Option 3: The logical model ID indicates the paired CSI generation model and CSI reconstruction model.***
* ***Option 4: The logical model ID indicates by the dataset ID during training type 3 offline training.***
* ***Option 5: The logical model ID indicates a reference to a prior training session (e.g. using an API) between NW and UE, associated with a specific dataset. Hence the ID doesn’t refer to a model but instead a process used to obtain the models at each side.***
* ***Other options are not excluded.***
* ***Note: terminology of model ID is placeholder. It can be replaced by pairing ID if agreed in 9.2.1 (proposal 6-13a).***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal, and we prefer option 2 for the consistency with one-sided model. The decoder logical model information can be included in the meta info of logical model ID in Option 2. We could not find the strong motivation to introduce the paring ID from this stage. |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | For the same reason as 2-3-2, we would like to modify as follows: ***Proposal 2-3-3(v1):***  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the following options ~~to define the logical model ID for CSI configuration and report:~~ for model pairing.***   * ***Option 1: ~~The logical model ID indicates~~  Indication for the CSI reconstruction model ~~ID~~ that NW will use.*** * ***Option 2: ~~The logical model ID indicates~~ Indication for the CSI generation model ID that the UE will use.*** * ***Option 3: ~~The logical model ID indicates~~ Indication for the paired CSI generation model and CSI reconstruction model.*** * ***Option 4: ~~The logical model ID indicates by~~ Indication for the dataset ~~ID~~ during training type 3 offline training.*** * ***Option 5: ~~The logical model ID indicates~~ a reference to a prior training session (e.g. using an API) between NW and UE, associated with a specific dataset. Hence the ID doesn’t refer to a model but instead a process used to obtain the models at each side.*** * ***Other options are not excluded.*** * ***~~Note: terminology of model ID is placeholder. It can be replaced by pairing ID if agreed in 9.2.1 (proposal 6-13a).~~*** |
| CATT | If majority prefer using model ID directly, we are fine with the new note.  Otherwise, Samsung’s version is more general. |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | Not support yet. Let 9.2.1 progress on this. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| ZTE | For the same reason as 2-3-2, we would like to modify the proposal as follows: ***Proposal 2-3-3(v1):***  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the following options to define the logical model ID for CSI configuration and report:***   * ***Option 1: The ~~logical model~~ pairing ID indicates the CSI reconstruction mode~~l ID~~ that NW will use.*** * ***Option 2: The ~~logical model~~ pairing ID indicates the CSI generation model ~~ID~~ that the UE will use.*** * ***Option 3: The ~~logical model~~ pairing ID indicates the paired CSI generation model and CSI reconstruction model.*** * ***Option 4: The ~~logical model~~ pairing ID indicates ~~by~~ the dataset ~~ID~~ during training type 3 offline training.*** * ***Option 5: The ~~logical model~~ pairing ID indicates a reference to a prior training session (e.g. using an API) between NW and UE, associated with a specific dataset. Hence the ID doesn’t refer to a model but instead a process used to obtain the models at each side.*** * ***Other options are not excluded.*** * ***Note: terminology of model ID is placeholder. It can be replaced by pairing ID if agreed in 9.2.1 (proposal 6-13a).***   In addition,we are not clear about the Option 5, which needs further clarification. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with this proposal, however we prefer Samsung’s version above |
| Qualcomm | As the ID is a part of the configuration from NW to UE, the main requirement is that the UE can clearly interpret the indicated model ID, i.e., it should allow the UE to select a CSI generation model for use that would be compatible with the network side CSI reconstruction model. In other words, it should indicate the pairing between the UE-side and NW-side model. There may be different options for how to achieve this requirement, and that could be left to implementation. We are open to study but do not see any need to down-select among the options. |
| Ericsson | Supports Samsung’s version, it’s better at this stage just to use “identifier” |
| LG Electronics | Supports Samsung’s version. |
| InterDigital | Not support with the same reason for 2-3-2. Samsung’s update is acceptable. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Fine with Samsung’s version. In addition, can proponent provide an example of Option 5? What is the difference with Option 4? |
| Xiaomi | Support Samsung’s version |
| Panasonic | We are fine with Samsung’s version. |
| NEC | OK with Samsung’s version. “Indication” may be more general. |
| ZTE | Fine with Samsung’s version. We are still not clear about Option 5, which needs proponent to clarify that. |

## Performance monitoring, model update, activation/de-activation/switching

Following table summarize company’s proposals related to model performance monitoring, activation/de-activation/switching.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Huawei | Proposal 16: The input or output data based monitoring should be evaluated at 9.2.2.1 before being further discussed at 9.2.2.2, including: what metrics can be adopted for evaluating the distribution, how to generate the distribution of data, how accurate the data drift reflects the AI/ML model performance.  Observation 9: If monitoring of input data drift is to be further studied, the data drift or out-of-distribution can be reflected by probability distribution function (PDF) or centroids between monitored input data and training data.  Observation 10: Motivation for output data drift is not clear, since the failure of AI/ML model may not be reflected by the output drift.  Observation 11: In CSI compression, if eventual KPI is adopted as monitoring metric, the potential spec impact for methods of removing the impacts of other factors other than model performance   * is up to the Network implementation for the Network side monitoring mode. * can be studied for the UE side monitoring mode.   Proposal 17: To assist the model monitoring by taking into account the aspect of power consumption, it can be considered to introduce the metric report of power consumption from UE to gNB, e.g., whether the power consumption of the undergoing AI/ML model is higher (and how much higher if so) than the legacy non-AI/ML method.  Proposal 18: For Network side monitoring based on intermediate KPI, study the reporting of the target CSI and the associated CSI report by the UE via UCI with higher priority.  Proposal 19: For UE side monitoring based on intermediate KPI, study the indication of the recovery CSI with RRC signaling.   * The association to the corresponding CSI report fed back at the inference stage can be indicated in together.   Proposal 20: For UE side performance monitoring, Network may configure a threshold criterion to facilitate UE to perform model monitoring from the following aspects:   * Usage of the threshold criterion, e.g., UE to perform conditional report of monitoring metrics, or to make the conditional monitoring decisions such as deactivation, switching, etc., based on the threshold. * Types of the threshold criterion, e.g., eventual KPI (e.g., ACK/NACK ratio, throughput, RSRP, etc.) and/or intermediate KPI (e.g., SGCS, NMSE, etc.).   Proposal 21: For the co-existence between AI/ML-based CSI feedback and legacy CSI feedback, further study:   * Configuration/indication of AI/ML-based measurement/report and legacy CSI measurement/report, e.g., configuring separate time durations of different CSI feedback mechanisms, indicating differentiated measurement resources, etc. * Configuration/indication of the precoding type applied to the PDSCH transmission for UE side performance monitoring, e.g., PDSCH precoded by using AI/ML-based CSI feedback or non-AI/ML-based CSI feedback. |
| OPPO | Proposal 6: Regarding the performance monitoring metrics/methods for AI/ML model monitoring, eventual KPIs(e.g., hypothetical BLER) should be utilized for the performance monitoring, other options can be used to equivalent convert the eventual KPI.  Proposal 7: The stability of the performance evaluating and decision-making mechanism should be further studied to avoid the interference of random effects on the evaluation results.   * multiple attempts within an evaluation window both in PHY and high layers would be helpful to obtain a relatively stable evaluation result * multi-user involved mechanism should be addressed |
| vivo | 1. Monitoring inference accuracy is the most direct and reliable performance monitoring method for CSI compression with two-sided models. 2. Legacy codebook with potential enhancement can be used to report CSI measurement for performance monitoring at NW side in CSI compression. 3. Study monitoring inference accuracy at NW side as a baseline for performance monitoring in CSI compression. 4. For NW-side monitoring based on intermediate KPIs, study the necessity and specification impacts of enhancing legacy codebook configurations for CSI measurement reporting. 5. For UE-side monitoring based on the output of the CSI reconstruction model at NW side, study the feasibility and specification impacts of compressing output CSI indication over-the-air. 6. Using system KPIs for performance monitoring in CSI compression might have difficulties in judging whether an observed system performance degradation is caused by an outdated CSI compression model or some other reasons. 7. Monitoring based on data distribution can be viewed as a special case of monitoring based on applicable condition. 8. There could be accuracy and reliability issues for monitoring methods based on applicable condition. 9. Design of applicable condition-based performance monitoring methods and development of scenario-/configuration-/site-specific models should be jointly considered in CSI compression. 10. Study model ID based LCM procedure for CSI compression with two-sided models. 11. Study mechanisms for the two sides to jointly select a model among multiple candidate models, including:  * Triggering conditions * How to conduct multi-model performance monitoring for purpose of model selection * Sharing of model selection results between NW and UE in CSI compression, where model ID based solution can be considered as a starting point.  1. Study the potential specification impact of triggering conditions for Model selection, switching/activation/deactivation, fallback. 2. For ID based model management, study the following options for signaling design for model switching/activation/deactivation among multiple models: RRC-based, MAC CE-based, DCI-based. |
| Spreadtrum Comm | Observation 3: For UE-side performance monitoring, eventual KPIs and input data based monitoring metric can be considered.  Observation 4: For NW-side performance monitoring, eventual KPIs, legacy CSI based monitoring and output data based monitoring metric can be considered. |
| Nokia | Proposal 8: For CSI compression, RAN1 shall study the potential specification impact on performance monitoring by considering   * Methods of performance monitoring (NW-sided, UE-sided, hybrid) * Changes to the reporting framework (e.g., ground-truth reporting to enable performance monitoring at the gNB, KPI reporting when UE considers performance monitoring) * Changes to the measurement framework (e.g., configuring monitoring KPIs and measurement resources) |
| CATT | Proposal 6: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for NW side intermediate KPIs based monitoring, further study the signaling and procedures for reporting target CSI, with the following two options considered:   * Option 1: The target CSI is reported together with its associated CSI report; * Option 2: The target CSI is reported separately from its associated CSI report.   Proposal 7: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for NW side intermediate KPIs based monitoring, potential specification impact includes the following:   * How to determine the association of target CSI and CSI report by the NW side; * Signaling and procedures for triggering target CSI reporting; * Types of 3GPP signaling takes responsibility on target CSI reporting, e.g., physical signaling, RRC signaling; * Types of target CSI for model monitoring, e.g., precoding matrix, channel matrix etc.; * Formats of target CSI for model monitoring: scaler quantization and/or codebook-based quantization (e.g., e-type II like).   Proposal 8: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE side intermediate KPIs based monitoring, obtaining the output of the CSI reconstruction model based on the CSI reconstruction model by the UE is only supported for AI/ML model trained with training collaboration Type 1 at UE side.  Proposal 9: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE side intermediate KPIs based monitoring, further study the signaling and procedures for transmitting output-CSI-UE from NW side to UE side, with the following options considered:   * Option 1: The output-CSI-UE is transmitted to the UE in form of quantization values, e.g., scalar quantization or codebook-based quantization; * Option 2: The output-CSI-UE is transmitted to the UE in form of transmitting precoded CSI-RS that precoded with the output-CSI-UE.   Proposal 10: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE side intermediate KPIs based monitoring, potential specification impact includes the following:   * How to determine the association of output-CSI-UE and CSI report by the UE; * Signaling and procedures for indicating output-CSI-UE transmission; * Types of 3GPP signaling takes responsibility on transmitting output-CSI-UE, e.g., physical signaling, RRC signaling; * Types of output-CSI-UE for model monitoring, e.g., precoding matrix, channel matrix etc.; * Formats of output-CSI-UE for model monitoring: scaler quantization and/or codebook-based quantization (e.g., e-type II like).   Proposal 11: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side model performance monitoring, study potential specification impacts on the following:   * Content on model performance that UE reports to the network   + Value of monitoring metric;   + Judgement on whether a model is failed, etc. * Signaling/procedure for reporting the performance.   Proposal 12: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side model performance monitoring, if UE side reports the judgement on whether the model is failed to the NW side, study potential specification impact on the criterion on determining whether an AI/ML model is failed or not. |
| NEC | Proposal 3: For UE-side performance monitoring, study how to report the performance metric(s).  Proposal 4: For one AI/ML model of CSI compression, consider monitoring the performances of multiple different ranks.  Proposal 5: Study simultaneous model monitoring for multiple AI/ML models of CSI compression. |
| Intel | Observation 1: Model performance monitoring based on intermediate KPI or eventual KPI calculated based on one AI-ML model is not giving enough information for proper configuration of AI-ML Model  Proposal 1: Testing of different AI-ML models with the measured channel should be considered for model performance monitoring  Proposal 2: For CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact of intermediate KPIs based monitoring for   * NW-side monitoring based on the target CSI from SRS and output CSI obtained from SRS measurements using the two-sided model (assuming that CSI generation part of the model is known at the gNB)   Proposal 3: Co-existence and fallback mechanism between AI/ML-based CSI feedback mode and legacy non-AI/ML-based CSI feedback mode should be based on existing CSI framework   * AI/ML based CSI report can be configured by using CSI-ReportConfig with the corresponding measurements and trigger states (for aperiodic CSI) configuration   Proposal 4: Consider existing NR features as baseline for data collection (e.g., SRS, CSI-RS, CSI reporting)   * The following enhancements can be considered: new codebook design (ground-truth CSI quantization), relaxed timing requirements, reporting of CSI for multiple CSI instances in one CSI report |
| Interdigital | Observation 4: It is possible that the AI/ML encoders do not generalize well across all realistic channel conditions.  Proposal 8: Study means to configure/reconfigure the UE with the monitoring configuration, including the monitoring metric.  Proposal 9: For UE-side monitoring, study triggers and means for reporting the monitoring metrics, including periodic and aperiodic reporting.  Proposal 10: For UE-side monitoring, study appropriate monitoring metrics to avoid unnecessary model updating or switching.  Proposal 11: For UE-side monitoring, study the UE-side monitoring metrics (including report size, metrics quantization, report frequency) to avoid increasing the feedback overhead.  Observation 5: Potential specification impacts of UE-side monitoring based on the output of the (NW-side) CSI reconstruction model include (but may not be limited to): format of the reconstructed CSI, CSI type (full channel matrix or eigenvector), identification of the corresponding CSI report, information on quantization of the reconstructed CSI.  Observation 6: UE-side monitoring based on the output of the NW-side CSI reconstruction model may increase the downlink overhead, because the output CSI reconstructed at the NW needs to be indicated by the NW to the UE.  Observation 7: Potential specification impacts of UE-side monitoring based on the output of the CSI reconstruction model at the UE-side include (but may not be limited to): UE indication of the ID of the UE-side reconstruction model, and means to adjust the intermediate KPI to account for the difference between the UE-side and NW-side CSI reconstruction models.  Observation 8: UE-side monitoring based on the output of the CSI reconstruction model at the UE-side appears to have lower overhead compared to UE-side monitoring based on the output of the NW-side CSI reconstruction model.  Observation 9: NW-side monitoring based on the target CSI with realistic channel estimation associated to the CSI report has the potential to increase the feedback overheads as the target CSI is reported by the UE or obtained from the UE-side.  Proposal 12: In case of NW-side monitoring, study monitoring approaches with low signaling overhead.  Proposal 14: For CSI compression using two-sided model use case, study AIML model switching or AI/ML model (parameter) update to mitigate AI/ML model performance degradation.  Proposal 15: Study mechanisms for fallback to legacy CSI reporting (e.g. for cases when AIML model performance is poor). |
| Fujitsu | Proposal-3: For the CSI compression using two-sided AI/ML models use case, study the procedures and signaling needed for intermediate KPI-based AI/ML performance monitoring and the follow-up mechanism after the monitoring, including the falling back to codebook-based CSI report from AI/ML-based CSI report.  Proposal-4: For the AI/ML model performance monitoring of the CSI compression using two-sided AI/ML models use case, study the potential specification impacts on monitoring the performance of an AI/ML model in inactivate mode, taking at least the following cases into consideration.   * Initial activation of an AI/ML model. * Re-activation of an AI/ML model. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 10: In order to improve the reliability of model performance monitoring, legacy CSI based feedback, e.g., eType II-based CSI feedback, should be adopted as a reference. |
| Panasonic | Observation 19: Further study Direction 1 and Direction 3 with proxy model framework.   * Direction 1: Network-side monitoring based on the target CSI with realistic channel estimation associated to the CSI report, reported by the UE or obtained from the UE side. * Direction 3: UE-side monitoring based on the output of the CSI reconstruction model at the UE side. |
| Google | Proposal 10: Study the AI/ML model monitoring for CSI compression based on the following options:   * Option 1: NW-based model monitoring, where the performance for the CSI compression is monitored by the gNB and the UE may report some assistant information * Option 2: UE-based model monitoring, where the performance for the CSI compression is monitored by the UE and the UE can report an indication to the NW if it identifies an AI/ML model performance failure   Proposal 11: The metric for AI/ML model monitoring for CSI compression based on the hypothetical BLER measured from precoded CSI-RS with the precoder selected from decompressed CSI in the most recent ML based CSI report.  Proposal 12: Do not support to use SGCS as the metric for ML performance monitoring. |
| LGE | Proposal #8: Consider at least following aspects for fallback operation   * Condition of Fallback mode * NW initiated Fallback mode |
| CAICT | Proposal 3: Original CSI information to be compressed at UE side could be feedback to NW side for model monitoring/training/updating.  Proposal 4: Both periodic and non-periodic original CSI feedback need to be considered.  Proposal 5: NW-side monitoring based on target CSI with realistic channel estimation feedback from UE could be considered as baseline for AI/ML model monitoring.  Proposal 6: UE-side monitoring based on the output of the CSI reconstruction model at the UE-side or indicated by the NW from the network side could be considered as assistant. |
| ETRI | Proposal 3: Consider further studies on potential specification impacts of model selection using the performance monitoring result.  Proposal 4: Consider further studies on potential specification impacts of model changes and fallback operation using the performance monitoring result.  Proposal 5: Study the potential specification impacts on transferring results of CSI prediction.  Proposal 6: Study the potential specification impacts on the level y collaboration for model monitoring.  Observation 4: For AI/ML based CSI prediction, the performance reduction occurs significantly depending on changes of UE speeds and carrier frequency. |
|  |  |
| MediaTek | 1. Study spec impact, signalling requirements, and candidate representative information of AI/ML models for activation, deactivation, switching, and fallback. 2. Discuss methods and apparatus for monitoring AI/ML models other than the one which is already being used by UE and gNB. 3. Given promising features of input/output-based monitoring, accuracy of possible solutions shall be further studied. 4. Prioritize UE-side (Alternative 1) proxy-based model monitoring as the initial monitoring method for tracking intermediate KPI. 5. System-level indicators cannot be regarded as the single point of decisioning for detection of monitoring events. 6. Study multi-stage monitoring approach where a low-overhead low-accuracy method triggers a more accurate intermediate-KPI based solution with higher overhead. 7. Study signalling and ID assignment procedure for AI/ML models generalized over multiple input, output, and latent dimensions. |
| Lenovo | 1. Study the specification impact corresponding to AI model performance monitoring, as well as the corresponding scheme adaptation decision 2. The following four scheme adaptation decisions under AI model performance monitoring are considered as a starting point: (i) No AI model change, (ii) CSI parameters update, (iii) AI model parameter update, (iv) AI model switching, and (v) Fallback to non-AI scheme 3. Fallback to non-AI CSI feedback scheme is considered a part of the scheme adaptation mechanism 4. Network-based performance monitoring and model adaptation are supported by default 5. Further study the specification impact corresponding to the model monitoring schemes: (i) The network configuring the UE to report performance metrics that aid model monitoring, (ii) the network transmitting performance metrics to aid UE-based model monitoring, and (iii) Event-triggered AI model monitoring |
| Qualcomm | Observation 12: Real-time performance monitoring that incurs overhead and/or additional processing complexity is unnecessary.  Observation 13: Model monitoring based on ground-truth provided by UE to the network requires large signaling overhead and may be sensitive to large latency.  Observation 14: Model monitoring using a proxy model that outputs the intermediate KPI directly shows an accurate inference accuracy prediction.  Observation 15: Model monitoring based on metrics derived by comparison between input samples inference and training samples can have strong relationship with the inference accuracy. As a result, input-based monitoring appears promising.  Proposal 13: For model performance monitoring, specification change for reporting the target CSI with high resolution from UE to network requires clear justification as it incurs additional overhead and may not be necessary.  Proposal 13: Study specification impact of methods that directly outputs intermediate KPI at the UE side.  Proposal 14: Study specification impact of input-based model monitoring on the UE-side by comparing input samples at inference time to the training samples. |
| AT&T | Proposal 3: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact needed to enable model performance monitoring using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference to compare whether/how much AI/ML outperforms the existing CSI feedback scheme. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Proposal 9: Discuss the feasibility of the model monitoring based on the input/output data distribution in CSI compression, before the specification impact discussion related to it. |

### ***Proposal 2-4-1(closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side monitoring, further study potential specification impact on triggering and means for reporting the monitoring metrics, including periodic and aperiodic reporting.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | We suggest we add “UE initiate” before “periodic and aperiodic”. We can define a certain event, if the event happens, the UE can initiate the report, similar to BFR. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support in principle. |
| vivo | Support. |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG Electronics | Fine with proposal. |
| OPPO | Support. |
| CMCC | Support in principle.  “semi-persistent” can also be added after “including”. |
| NEC | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support in general. |
| CAICT | Support |
| Futurewei | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Support |
| ZTE | Generally fine with the proposal. We suggest rewording it from a high level as  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side monitoring, further study potential specification impact on triggering and means for reporting the monitoring metrics~~, including periodic and aperiodic reporting.~~***  since the reporting configuration not only includes periodic and aperiodic reporting, but semi-persistent reporting is also applicable. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| ETRI | We support |
| Samsung | Ok |
| Spreadtrum | OK |

### ***Proposal 2-4-1(v1closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side monitoring, further study potential specification impact on triggering and means for reporting the monitoring metrics, including UE initiated reporting, periodic/semi-persistent and aperiodic reporting.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Ok |
| CATT | OK |
| Fujitsu | Support in general. |
| Nokia/NSB | UE-initiated reporting shall be removed or put in brackets. We do not think that shall be in the same level as other types of reporting. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| ZTE | OK |
| Lenovo | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | We haven’t discussed yet if there is a need for UE initiated reporting for CSI compression in addition to periodic/SP/aperiodic reporting |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Supports |

### ***Proposal 2-4-2 (closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact needed to enable model performance monitoring and fall back using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference to compare whether/how much AI/ML performance compare to the existing CSI feedback scheme.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | It seems this has no spec impact? The NW can configure two CSI report configurations, one for ML, the other for legacy.  Mod: spec impact is on how to link of legacy report to AI based report for performance monitoring. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | Assuming the concurrent use of AI/ML CSI feedback and non-AI/ML CSI feedback is always guaranteed, we are OK with the proposal.  If not, we should add ‘feasibility’ as part of the study.  Mod: may not the concurrent. Non-AI/ML CSI might be feedback in separate report, and linked together with AI based one in some way, based on specification. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support.  As the AI/ML may suffer model failure in case the environment changes, it is essential for NW and UE to monitor the performance with legacy and trigger/request the fall back on demand. In addition, the comparison metric includes both intermediate KPI (e.g., SGCS) and eventual KPI (e.g., UPT) to provide comprehensive perspectives to identify the model failure.  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact needed to enable model performance monitoring and fall back using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference to compare whether/how much AI/ML performance compare to the existing CSI feedback scheme***   * ***The metric for monitoring and comparison includes intermediate KPI and eventual KPI.*** |
| vivo | Support. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Google such behaviour is already in the CSI framework. The discussion here is whether and how to enable and disable an AI based CSI compression report, the fallback to legacy is business as usual and already in spec. We object to Autonomous UE fallback within a single configured CSI report.  Mod: Refer comments to Google and CATT. |
| Xiaomi | Support. |
| LG Electronics | Similar view with Google.  Mod: Refer comments to Google and CATT. |
| OPPO | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Fujitsu | We suggest revise the wording as “… ***to compare whether/how much the AI/ML performance is beneficial compared to*** …” |
| CAICT | Support |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal in general. However, the first part is more essential (i.e., “***enable model performance monitoring and fall back using an existing CSI feedback scheme”***) as it may have potential spec impact (configuration, triggers, etc.) and using an existing CSI feedback approach as reference to determine the performance of AI/ML based method is just one of the potential uses for this. We suggest removing the second part of the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Agree with Google’s comment. Can we suggest to modify to “***further study potential specification impact, if needed, to enable model performance monitoring and fall back …***” |
| NVIDIA | Support the proposal in principle. |
| ZTE | We think this proposal should be evaluated in 9.2.2.1. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| ETRI | We support |
| Spreadtrum | OK |

### ***Proposal 2-4-2 (v1closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study feasibility and potential specification impact to enable model performance monitoring and fall back using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference, to compare whether/how much AI/ML performance is beneficial compare to the existing CSI feedback scheme.***

* ***The metric for monitoring and comparison includes intermediate KPI and eventual KPI.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** | |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support | |
| vivo | Support | |
| Samsung | Ok | |
| CATT | OK. | |
| Fujitsu | | | Support in general. | |
| Nokia/NSB | | | Suggest following changes,  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study feasibility and potential specification impact to enable ~~model~~ performance monitoring and fall back using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference, to compare whether/how much AI/ML performance is beneficial compare to the existing CSI feedback scheme.***   * ***The metric for monitoring and comparison includes intermediate KPI and eventual KPI.*** | |
| CMCC | | | Support. | |
| ZTE | | | According to the explanation from FL, we think the association between AI/ML scheme and existing CSI feedback scheme for monitoring should be added, since it may have potential specification. For example, spec impact is on how to link legacy report to AI based report for performance monitoring.  So we suggest rewording it as  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study feasibility and potential specification impact to enable model performance monitoring and fallback using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference, to compare whether/how much AI/ML performance is beneficial compare to the existing CSI feedback scheme.***   * ***The association between AI/ML scheme and existing CSI feedback scheme for monitoring*** * ***The metric for monitoring and comparison includes intermediate KPI and eventual KPI.*** | |
| Lenovo | | | Same views as ZTE doe monitoring | |
| LG Electronics | | | Support with ZTE’s version | |
| Xiaomi | | | We think intermediate KPI is enough. Eventual KPI is impacted by many factors. It is not clear why we should include eventual KPI. | |

***Discussion:***

Proposal is updated based on GTW discussion for NW side monitoring. For UE side monitoring, UE can calculate additional legacy PMI by itself for intermediate KPI calculation. For eventual KPI, NW need to indicate the precoder type is AI or eType II since it is transparent to UE. For throughput/NACK/ACK based eventual KPI, it is PDSCH indication, for hypothetical BLER, it is precoding used on top of CSI-RS.

### ***Proposal 2-4-2 (v2closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for NW-side monitoring, further study feasibility and potential specification impact to enable performance monitoring and fallback using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference.***

* ***The association between AI/ML scheme and existing CSI feedback scheme for monitoring***
* ***Note: The metric for monitoring and comparison includes intermediate KPI and eventual KPI.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Ericsson | ok |
| Lenovo | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| CATT | Support. |
| Panasonic | Support |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support. Suggest to add “others are not precluded” to be safe.  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for NW-side monitoring, further study feasibility and potential specification impact to enable performance monitoring and fallback using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference.***   * ***The association between AI/ML scheme and existing CSI feedback scheme for monitoring*** * ***Note: The metric for monitoring and comparison includes intermediate KPI and eventual KPI.*** * ***Other aspects are not precluded.*** |
| CAICT | Support |
| Qualcomm | Please include “***necessity,*** ” before “***feasibility***”.  Also, there could be many different responses based on monitoring – fallback, model switch, functionality switch, etc. The need to mention only fallback is not clear, and it would be better to remove “and fallback”. |
| LG Electronics | Support. Also fine with modification from Huawei. |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| CMCC | Support |

Updated based on comments. @Qualcomm, fallback is one aspect of this legacy based on approach as company proposed. Otherwise, we need to draft another proposal almost the same with fallback wording. For switching, companies have raised questions on how to do AI monitoring over multiple models for switching purpose. More detailed solutions are welcome for next meeting discussion.

### ***Proposal 2-4-2 (v3 closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for NW-side monitoring, further study the necessity, feasibility and potential specification impact to enable performance monitoring and fallback using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference.***

* ***The association between AI/ML scheme and existing CSI feedback scheme for monitoring***
* ***Note: The metric for monitoring and comparison includes intermediate KPI and eventual KPI.***
* ***Other aspects are not precluded.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Lenovo** | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| CAICT | Support |
| Fujitsu | The “necessity” is not needed in this proposal. Specifically, the decision of fallback should be made by gNB, which is why “fallback” is removed in Proposal 2-4-2-2. |
| CATT | Almost OK. Not sure why ‘necessity’ is still being questioned in two-sided model monitoring. If ‘necessary’ is added in 2-4-2, it should also be added in 2-4-2-2. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Qualcomm | Performance monitoring need not be coupled with the reaction to the monitoring result. As we mentioned in the previous round, the reaction could be different from fallback. Also, fallback may be triggered by other types of monitoring as well. Therefore, it should be studied separately – it is not clear why fallback related specification impact should be studied only for this type of monitoring. |
| LG Electronics | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| OPPO | Support, and the “necessity” is needed because we need further check whether the monitoring can be solved through NW implementation |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Samsung | Ok |

### ***Proposal 2-4-2-2(closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side monitoring, further study feasibility and potential specification impact to enable performance monitoring and fallback using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference.***

* ***Configuration/indication of the precoding type applied to the PDSCH transmission or CSI-RS.***
* ***UE initiated fall back request procedure.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Lenovo | The UE should only report a performance metric without requesting a specific configuration, i.e., the fallback should be a NW-based decision and not UE-based. Hence, we prefer removing the sub-bullet for UE initiated fall back request |
| NTT DOCOMO | The fallback in the main text and sub-bullet should be removed, as the fallback operation should be controlled by NW. |
| CATT | Generally OK. We think CSI-RS can provide either eventual KPI monitoring and intermediate KPI monitoring, which is up to UE if UE only need to report the decision of valid/failure of its model.  For fallback, final decision should be made by NW. But we are open to UE send the request for NW to confirm/decide. |
| Panasonic | We think either UE report a performance metric or UE report the model failure can be considered. For both approaches, the final decision should be made by network. |
| Huawei/HiSi | 1) UE side also needs to know the association between AI/ML and non-AI/ML (may be even more strongly needed than NW side monitoring?).  2) Suggest to add “others are not precluded” to be safe.  3) We are also fine to remove “fallback” from main text and the 2nd bullet. How to trigger the fallback is the subsequent story after monitoring.  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side monitoring, further study feasibility and potential specification impact to enable performance monitoring and fallback using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference.***   * ***The association between AI/ML scheme and existing CSI feedback scheme for monitoring*** * ***Configuration/indication of the precoding type applied to the PDSCH transmission or CSI-RS.*** * ***UE initiated fall back request procedure.*** * ***Other aspects are not precluded.*** |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| CAICT | Similar view as CATT. |
| ETRI | Support. |
| Qualcomm | We have a similar comment as in 2-4-2(v2). It would be better to keep the proposal focused on model monitoring and so ask to remove “and fallback”.  For the first item, for clarity, please add “***, i.e., whether precoding is based on reference scheme or AI/ML scheme***”. |
| Fujitsu | We share a similar view to that of Docomo’s. |
| InterDigital | Support |
| AT&T | We have similar view as DOCOMO and Fujitsu that NW should control fallback operation. |
| ZTE | From our perspective, performance monitoring should be discussed clearly first and then discuss the decision manner (e.g. fallback, model switching/updating, etc.). For UE-side monitoring, we should discuss the performance monitoring using the proxy model, and fallback decision can be discussed later,since it should be made by NW. So, we suggest removing the 2nd bullet. Besides, we are not clear about the 1st bullet, which needs further clarification. In addition, we suggest adding two bullets about the UE-sided monitoring:   * ***Report monitoring metrics by UE*** * ***Other information to enable the proxy model***   For the second bullet, for example, maybe the dataset for proxy model output should be delivered to enable the proxy model training in the Type 3 training. Therefore, we suggest rewording this proposal as ***Proposal 2-4-2-2:***  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side monitoring, further study feasibility and potential specification impact to enable performance monitoring using the proxy model. ~~and fallback using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference.~~***   * ***[Configuration/indication of the precoding type applied to the PDSCH transmission or CSI-RS.]*** * ***~~UE initiated fall back request procedure.~~*** * ***Report monitoring metrics by UE*** * ***Other information to enable the proxy model*** |

Updated based on comments.

@ZTE, the proposal is about using legacy codebook, following up previous agreement in #110bis-e on performance monitoring, “Legacy CSI based monitoring: schemes using additional legacy CSI reporting”. UE reporting for UE side monitoring was agreed in Tuesday GTW, no need to duplicate it. For proxy decoder-based monitoring, it was captured in RAN1 112 agreement. On first bullet, in previous summary of discussion, the purpose was explained. “For UE side monitoring, UE can calculate additional legacy PMI by itself for intermediate KPI calculation. For eventual KPI, NW need to indicate the precoder type is AI or eType II since it is transparent to UE. For throughput/NACK/ACK based eventual KPI, it is PDSCH indication, for hypothetical BLER, it is precoding used on top of CSI-RS”.

### ***Proposal 2-4-2-2(v1 On hold):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side monitoring, further study feasibility and potential specification impact to enable performance monitoring ~~and fallback~~ using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference.***

* ***Configuration/indication of the precoding type applied to the PDSCH transmission or CSI-RS, i.e., whether precoding is based on reference scheme or AI/ML scheme.***
* ***The association between AI/ML scheme and existing CSI feedback scheme for monitoring***
* ***Other aspects are not precluded.***
* ***~~UE initiated fall back request procedure.~~***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Lenovo** | We are fine with the updated version |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| CATT | Almost OK, but if ‘necessary’ is added in 2-4-2, it should also be added here. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| ZTE | Thanks for FL’s reply. We still have concerns on the feasibility of UE-side monitoring using an existing CSI feedback scheme. In the RAN1#110bis-e meeting, we have an agreement about the legacy CSI based monitoring: schemes using additional legacy CSI reporting. To our understanding, it is suitable for NW-sided monitoring, and we are not clear how UE monitors the performance using an existing CSI feedback scheme.  In RAN1#112 meeting, we have agreed with the options for NW-sided monitoring and UE-sided monitoring, which is also heatedly discussed in 9.2.2.1. Proposal 2-4-2 is an extended discussion for NW-sided monitoring, while the spec impact for UE-sided monitoring here is totally different from the agreement (i.e. UE-sided monitoring based on the proxy model). In addition, we have no evaluation results for UE-sided monitoring using the existing CSI feedback scheme.  Therefore, we propose to discuss about the spec impact on the UE-sided monitoring based on the proxy model as following:  ***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side monitoring, further study feasibility and potential specification impact to enable performance monitoring using the proxy model.***   * ***Report monitoring metrics by UE*** * ***Other information to enable the proxy model*** * ***Other aspects are not precluded.*** |

### ***Proposal 2-4-3(closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, potential specification impact for input or output data-based monitoring will be further discussed after initial evaluation is performed in 9.2.2.1, including:***

* ***What metrics can be adopted for evaluating the distribution,***
* ***How to generate the distribution of data,***
* ***How accurate the data drift reflects the AI/ML model performance.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| CATT | OK. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support |
| vivo | Support. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| LG Electronics | Fine with proposal. |
| OPPO | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| NEC | Support |
| CAICT | Support |
| Futurewei | In general, we are ok. However, we would like to point out that the distribution of the input to the encoder change does not always cause the distribution change of the encoder output (which is a latent representation of the input). Input data distribution change is an issue ONLY if the performance is impacted. Thus, in such case, the potential issue with monitoring the encoder input distribution change is that it may have many false alarms. Monitoring the encoder output distribution change is more relevant to the performance as the encoder output distribution change is more related to CSI reconstruction part’s performance. |
| Lenovo | Support |
| NVIDIA | Support |
| ZTE | Support |
| InterDigital | Support |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Intel | We prefer to start discussion/evaluation in AI 9.2.2.1 directly. |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| Qualcomm | The UE-side inference accuracy based method covered in Proposal 2-4-1 is also input-based. To clarify the scope of the current proposal, we propose to change the wording as follows  “… for input ***distribution-based*** or output data ***distribution-***based monitoring …”. |
| Spreadtrum | OK |

### ***Proposal 2-4-3(v1closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, potential specification impact for input distribution-based or output distribution-based ~~data-based~~ monitoring will be further discussed after initial evaluation is performed in 9.2.2.1, including:***

* ***What metrics can be adopted for evaluating the distribution,***
* ***How to generate the distribution of data,***
* ***How accurate the data drift reflects the AI/ML model performance.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Ok |
| CATT | Support. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| CMCC | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| Ericsson | OK |
| Futurewei | We do not agree we should blindly study “***input distribution-based”*** monitoring for UE side monitoring case. As explained in our response, CSI input distribution change does not always imply the distribution of the output of the CSI generation part would change and the two may change at different level/degree/magnitude. The performance impact due to such change varies, depending partially on how the AI/ML model is trained as well.  We are ok with monitoring the output distribution change of the CSI generation part at UE side or the input distribution change of the CSI reconstruction part at gNB side.  Mod: proposal is to discuss after evaluation in 9.2.2.1. If we conclude none of them works, or one of them work, then we further discuss spec impact. |
| LG Electronics | Supports |
| InterDigital | Ok |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Futurewei | We think FL’s explanation. Our concern is that it is actually very difficult to construct practical test cases in 9.2.2.1 to draw realistic conclusion. We are ok (not ideal but ok) for NW side input distribution monitoring as the input (i.e., quantized output of CSI generation part) distribution change may have better correlation with the output distribution change. On the UE side, input distribution monitoring may be more problematic as the input distribution change may partially impact the distribution of the encoder output and this distribution impact/change may also be different between the original encoder output (before quantization) and the output after the quantization. In addition, the distribution change impact may also depend on NN architecture (the degree/magnitude of impact may be different). In summary, this can be more complicated and providing such information (i.e., input distribution change at UE side) may later become just FYI.  It is not our intention to hold the discussion. We are ok to move forward with the following modification.   * ***What metrics can be adopted for evaluating the distribution,*** * ***How to generate the distribution of data,*** * ***How accurate the data drift reflects the AI/ML model performance.*** * FFS on how different the AI/ML model performance impact due to input data drift across (very) different AI/ML architectures. * FFS on UE side input distribution-based monitoring. |
| Panasonic | Support |
| ETRI | Support |
| NEC | Support |
| AT&T | Support |

Updated based on Futurewei’s comment. The last bullet of Futurewei’s comment is crossed out, as both input and output distribution will be studied.

### ***Proposal 2-4-3(v2closed):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, potential specification impact for input distribution-based or output distribution-based monitoring will be further discussed after initial evaluation is performed in 9.2.2.1, including:***

* ***What metrics can be adopted for evaluating the distribution,***
* ***How to generate the distribution of data,***
* ***How accurate the data drift reflects the AI/ML model performance.***
* ***FFS on how different the AI/ML model performance impact due to input data drift across (very) different AI/ML architectures.***
* ***~~FFS on UE side input distribution-based monitoring.~~***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Lenovo** | Support |
| **CATT** | OK |
| Huawei/HiSi | We are fine with the current version.   * ***FFS on how different the AI/ML model performance is impacted by the ~~due to~~ input data drift across (very) different AI/ML architectures.*** |
| CMCC | We prefer following more general wording:   * ***FFS on how different the AI/ML model performance impact due to input data drift across (very) different AI/ML models.*** |
| Futurewei | We still do not think UE side input distribution-based monitoring will be useful as explained in our previous response and we re-elaborate here:  - For CSI compression, AI/ML model performance can be evaluated using intermediate KPIs like SGCS/NMSE, thus this is a more effective way to detect model performance issue and to determine proper actions from model management perspective.  - The reconstructed CSI at gNB side takes the received CSI as input to generate the reconstructed CSI. The CSI input at gNB side is the CSI feedback generated by the UE which is a quantized form of the output of the CSI generation part. Thus, the CSI input at UE side is only an indirect input to the CSI reconstruction part. Monitoring the direct input is more relevant and has higher priority than monitoring the indirect input.  - The output of the CSI generation part at UE side is a latent representation of the CSI input whose distribution may be impacted by the CSI input very differently depending on how the model was trained and sometimes depending on ML model architectures as well. With potentially various combinations of training methods (not necessarily training collaboration types) and model architectures leveraged across companies, the usefulness of monitoring the raw/original CSI input at UE side becomes questionable.  - Wireless environment is very dynamic and channels are changing frequently. Most likely companies will develop their own roust solutions or AI/ML models whose performance will not and cannot be extremely sensitive to input data distribution changes, and there are various mechanisms to achieve that. It is not reasonable/acceptable to do model switching, fall back to legacy or model updates in a frequent manner. Therefore, an indication of the indirect input distribution change is like providing just some FYI information.  - The purpose of performance monitoring is to generate actionable outcome to facilitate model management (e.g., triggering proper actions). Providing FYI type of information is nice to have but it cannot effectively generate actionable model management task.  In summary, we don’t see input distribution-based monitoring will be helpful from model management perspective when comparing to monitoring the direct input at gNB side. |
| ZTE | We are generally fine with the proposal. However, we are not clear about the newly added FFS and need a clarification by proponents, does it mean different AI/ML structures have different tolerance of performance degradation impacted by the input data drift? |

The main point is the wait for 9.2.2.1 results before we further discuss. The sub-bullets are for information only, and how to evaluate is up to 9.2.2.1 anyway. Since the sub-bullets cannot be agreed, let us try the main bullet only.

### ***[Rd 5] Proposal 2-4-3(v3):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, potential specification impact for input distribution-based or output distribution-based monitoring will be further discussed after initial evaluation is performed in 9.2.2.1.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| **Futurewei** | Currently, 9.2.2.1 has been discussing intermediate KPI-based model monitoring; does “***after initial evaluation is performed in 9.2.2.1”*** mean that this topic will be discussed after some evaluation for intermediate KPI-based monitoring is performed or does it mean that 9.2.2.1 will discuss an evaluate input distribution-based monitoring?  Could FL clarify it a bit?  Mod: It means the topic will be discussed after evaluation for input/output distribution ~~intermediate KPI~~- monitoring is performed. |
| **CATT** | Support this high-level version. |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support.  To Moderator: To clarify, do you mean “It means the topic will be discussed after evaluation for input/output distribution ~~intermediate KPI~~-based monitoring is performed”? The evaluation of intermediate KPI based monitoring at 9.2.2.1 is a separate issue (which is based on the agreement of the last meeting at 9.2.2.2). No issue triggered for input/output distribution based monitoring at 9.2.2.1 yet.  Mod: Yes. Sorry my reply to Futurewei cause confusion. How to evaluate is up to 9.2.2.1. Correct my reply to Futurewei. Thanks. |
| ZTE | Support the high-level version. |
| Xiaomi | Support |

## Framework, UE capability, and other topics

Following table summarize company’s proposals related to framework.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Key Proposals/Observations/Positions** |
| Huawei | Proposal 22: Study the potential specification impact for UE capability, including the following as a starting point: data collection, dataset delivery, training, model switching, model updating, monitoring, and CSI report timeline. |
| ZTE | Proposal 23: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact of the following UE capability options:   * Framework for defining and reporting UE dynamic capability for model inference. * Whether and how LCM-related procedures are captured into UE capability. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 1: Legacy CSI framework can be reused for the sub use case - Spatial-frequency domain CSI compression. Additional enhancement can be considered.  Proposal 2: To facilitate the discussion, views on Pros and Cons of all of Training types are needed to be aligned. What shown in Table 1 can be considered. |
| Nokia | Proposal 1: For the two-sided CSI feedback compression sub-use case, RAN1 shall define applicable conditions for functionalities to enable functionality-based LCM.  Proposal 2: For the two-sided CSI feedback compression sub-use case, RAN1 to study the following applicable conditions for functionalities,  • CSI-RS measurement conditions  • CSI-RS and CSI reports configuration conditions  • CSI calculation conditions (i.e., number of occupied CPUs)  • Output CSI conditions  • Compression ratio conditions (e.g., CR4, CR8, …)  • Quantizer conditions (e.g., SQ1, VQ1, …)  • Pairing ID (e.g., model ID, dataset ID)  • Generic conditions on supporting ML functionalities  Proposal 3: For the two-sided CSI feedback compression sub-use case, UE reports applicable conditions for functionalities by using UE capability reporting.  Proposal 4: For the two-sided CSI feedback compression sub-use case, the NW creates/configures functionalities to the UE with each functionality referring to a configuration message (e.g., RRC) that contains NW-selected applicable conditions (according to the UE capability). |
| CATT | Proposal 13: For AI/ML based CSI feedback, the CSI reporting framework in Rel-17 for codebook based CSI feedback can be reused. |
| NEC | Proposal 1: Support the adjustment of CSI feedback rate/ CSI reporting pattern based on the predicted CSI variation points as a sub-use case of the time-domain CSI prediction. |
| Sony | Proposal 5: RAN1 should study whether the compressed channel information is treated as a new PMI type or new CSI feedback information.  Proposal 6: RAN1 should study specification impact of new PMI type for the CSI compression using two-sided model use case. |
| Xiaomi | Proposal 11: UE side model or UE part model for CSI compression feedback can be identified through AI/ML functionality, AI/ML model, or both functionality and model. How to define AI/ML functionality and/or AI/ML model for CSI compression feedback should be firstly studied. |
| China Telecom | Proposal 1: A new CSI feedback signaling framework design should be standardized based on the legacy non-AI/ML-based CSI feedback mode in Rel-17, e.g., CSI-RS/CSI reporting configurations and CSI processing procedures.  Proposal 2: In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact of the UE capability, including the framework for defining and reporting UE capability, model training/updating/monitoring/inference. |
| Google | Proposal 1: The study of AI/ML based CSI compression should be based on the CSI framework in Rel-17.  Proposal 2: The input of CSI compression based on the eigenvectors of the raw channel with a wideband precoder selected as SD basis, e.g. HW1.  Proposal 3: The output of CSI compression should be the compressed eigenvectors for the raw channel with a wideband precoder selected as SD basis, e.g. HW1.  Proposal 4: The CSI report for CSI compression should comprise the beam index(es) for W1 selection and compressed eigenvectors for the raw channel with a wideband precoder selected as SD basis, e.g. HW1.  Proposal 5: If the input of the ML is the frequency domain channel, the UE reports L1-SINR only instead of reporting RI/CQI.  Proposal 6: If the input of the ML is the channel eigenvector or W2, the UE reports a list of CRIs and CQI based on a set of port selection CSI-RS resources.  The gNB applies the decompressed precoders to each CSI-RS resource  Proposal 7: The priority for non-ML based CSI report should be higher than the priority of ML based CSI report.  Proposal 8: The AI/ML based CSI compression should consider the following types of UE:  Type 1 UE (low performance UE): CSI compression is based on general processing unit (GPU)  Type 2 UE (high performance UE): CSI compression is based on neural processing unit (NPU)  Proposal 9: Study the AI/ML model adaptation for CSI compression, where different AI/ML models may be with different compression ratio. |
| Apple | Proposal 3: NW can configure AI based CSI compression with enhanced MIMO related RRC configuration. |
| AT&T | Proposal 4: The study of AI/ML based CSI compression should be based on the legacy CSI feedback signaling framework. Further study the necessity and benefits of any potential specification enhancement for   * CSI-RS configurations * CSI reporting configurations * CSI processing procedures. * Other aspects are not precluded. |

### ***Proposal 2-5 (closed):***

***The study of AI/ML based CSI compression should be based on the legacy CSI feedback signaling framework. Further study potential specification enhancement on***

* ***CSI-RS configurations***
* ***CSI reporting configurations***
* ***CSI processing procedures.***
* ***Other aspects are not precluded.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | Support |
| NTT DOCOMO | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Huawei/HiSi | We are OK with the proposal in principle. As in the last meeting we have agreed to discuss the priority/omission rule and CPU (which also impacts the omission); in this meeting, we propose that how to map the AI/ML based CSI feedback to the 2 parts CSI may also have spec impact. Therefore, add one sub-bullet on “CSI report mapping/priority/omission”.   * ***CSI-RS configurations*** * ***CSI reporting configurations*** * ***CSI report mapping/priority/omission*** * ***CSI processing procedures.*** * ***Other aspects are not precluded.*** |
| vivo | Support. |
| Ericsson | OK |
| Xiaomi | Support and we are fine with HW’s updated version. |
| LG Electronics | Fine with proposal. Also fine with HW’s modification. |
| OPPO | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| NEC | OK |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| CAICT | Support |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal and Huawei’s edits. |
| Lenovo | We do not support CSI-RS configuration enhancements, this is out of scope and further studying CSI-RS configuration is not a realistic goal given the time remaining before the conclusion of the study  Mod: This is not CSI-RS overhead reduction which is outside scope. An example of this is CSI-RS configuration with additional assisted information to categorizing data collection. Another example is CSI-RS enhancement for higher accuracy measurement, or separate CSI-RS configuration for data collection comparing to inferencing etc. |
| NVIDIA | Support the proposal in principle. |
| ZTE | Agree with Huawei. |
| InterDigital | OK |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| AT&T | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| ETRI | We support |
| Samsung | OK |
| Spreadtrum | Support |

### ***Proposal 2-5 (v1 closed):***

***The study of AI/ML based CSI compression should be based on the legacy CSI feedback signaling framework. Further study potential specification enhancement on***

* ***CSI-RS configurations***
* ***CSI reporting configurations***
* ***CSI report mapping/priority/omission***
* ***CSI processing procedures.***
* ***Other aspects are not precluded.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support. |
| vivo | Support |
| Samsung | Ok |
| CATT | Support. |
| Fujitsu | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| CMCC | Support. |
| ZTE | Support |
| Lenovo | We appreciate the moderator’s response regarding the inclusion of CSI-RS configurations. We believe any enhancement to RS design enhancement (for either overhead reduction or performance enhancement) are out of scope. We are OK to discuss CSI-RS configuration following legacy design, e.g., which of the supported CSI-RS configuration values can be paired/associated with, e.g., data collection. Please find suggested text below ***Proposal 2-5 (v1):***  ***The study of AI/ML based CSI compression should be based on the legacy CSI feedback signaling framework. Further study potential specification enhancement on***   * ***CSI-RS configurations (No discussion on CSI-RS pattern design enhancements)*** * ***CSI reporting configurations*** * ***CSI report mapping/priority/omission*** * ***CSI processing procedures.***   ***Other aspects are not precluded.*** |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Nokia/NSB | Small addition for clarification “CSI report UCI-mapping/priority/omission” |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal. |
| LG Electronics | Supports |
| Panasonic | Support |

# Potential specification impact on CSI prediction

Following table summarize company’s proposals related to CSI prediction sub-use case.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Huawei | Proposal 1: Start the study of the potential spec impact of CSI prediction after RAN1#112b-e meeting. |
| ZTE | Observation 14: Based on current evaluation assumptions in 9.2.2.1, AI-based CSI prediction shows better performance gain when baseline is the nearest historical CSI. However, AI-based CSI prediction almost has similar performance when the baseline is non-AI/ML based CSI prediction.  Proposal 25: Deprioritize the specification impact discussion on the sub-use case of time domain CSI prediction in Rel-18 SI. |
| OPPO | Proposal 8: For R18 time domain CSI prediction, the two following aspects should be studied to evaluate the performance gain and identify the potential spec impacts.   * Improvement of throughput * Reduction of CSI-RS overhead |
| vivo | Specification impact of AI based CSI prediction should be discussed in R18 AI/ML   1. The model training of AI-based CSI prediction should be discussed with the consideration of NW-side training and UE-side training. 2. For the data collection of historical CSIs, the continuity and sequential order of CSIs in one sample should be guaranteed, which impacts the storage of CSIs and the reporting mode of CSIs to the NW (if needed). 3. Data collection of future CSIs is different for periodic and aperiodic CSI prediction. 4. If data transfer is needed, the delay requirement of data collection differs between model training and monitoring, which may result in different transmission solutions. 5. Data collection of AI-based CSI prediction should be studied. 6. New or combined RS configurations to support the collection of labels if labels are not on the future instances of model input. 7. The assistance information (applicable condition) of collected data for AI based CSI prediction should be configured or reported. 8. The monitoring and a level y/z collaboration-based model adjustment such as model selection/switching, finetuning, deactivation and fall back, are needed to ensure the real time performance of AI-based CSI prediction. 9. Monitoring of AI-based CSI prediction needs to be under the control of NW. 10. Monitoring of AI-based CSI prediction should be studied with the consideration of NW-side calculating and UE-side calculating. 11. The update of applicable condition should be configured/reported after the gNB/UE monitoring. 12. The model adjustment such as model selection/switching, finetuning, deactivation and fallback is essential for CSI prediction to overcome the generalization problem. 13. The decision of model adjustment of AI-based CSI prediction should be controlled by NW. 14. The triggering and signaling to support model adjustment of AI-based CSI prediction should be studied. |
| Spreadtrum | Proposal 16: For CSI predication, the potential specification impact includes model identification, model activation/deactivation/update/switching/monitoring by UE or NW, and assisted signaling such as measurement resources and predicted CSI window. |
| Nokia | Proposal 15: As basic channel prediction scheme report Type II CSI like W1, W2, and Wf for the future time instance tpredict. The AI/ML model of the UE predicts the CSI from N semi-persistent CSI RSs with a repetition rate of, e.g., 5 ms within the observation window of length tobserve.  Proposal 16: Support wideband CSI RS configurations, where all active UEs predicting CSI can observe the radio channel with the widest possible RF bandwidth.  Proposal 17: For high speed UEs consider options to ensure sufficient oversampling for the CSI RS based channel observations as basis for proper channel prediction and generalization UE-sided CSI prediction, RAN1 shall define applicable conditions for functionalities to enable functionality-based LCM.  Proposal 19: For UE-sided CSI prediction, RAN1 to support at least the following applicable conditions for functionalities,   * Support Type II CSI prediction (Supported CSI prediction mode (e.g., TypeII, delay Doppler domain) * Measured CSI RS periodicity (e.g., 5ms, 10ms, 20ms), Prediction time steps (K = 1, 2, 4, [8]), Measured allocation of CSI RS (AE, beam), Measured CSI RS dimension (e.g., 4, 8, 16, 32), Measured CSI RS pattern (e.g., periodic, semi-persistent, aperiodic) * NW-sided performance monitoring conditions (e.g., support measurements of Predicted DL RS set (full Set A, partial Set A), Measurement periodicity (100 ms, 200 ms)) * Conditions on supporting ML functionalities (e.g., Max number of supported functionalities (1, 2, 4, 8,.), Delay on activating a functionality (2 ms, 4 ms), Generalization condition of functionalities (yes, no))   Proposal 20: For UE-sided CSI prediction, RAN1 to study the following additional applicable conditions for functionalities,   * Conditions for UE-sided performance monitoring * Conditions for data collection * Conditions for CSI prediction as predicted time instance versus in the delay Doppler domain * Conditions for assistance info required at the UE like the expected prediction time horizon   Proposal 21: Consider the possibility of overfitting/fine-tuning of UE models for improved CSI prediction. |
| NEC | Proposal 6: Study discontinuous periodic or semi-persistent CSI report.  Proposal 7: Support the location/CQI report timing set mapping table based on AI/ML.  Proposal 8: Support the location/CQI periodicity mapping table based on AI/ML. |
| Intel | Proposal 9:   * CSI prediction with AI/ML model at the UE side shall be discussed in application to Rel-18 CSI enhancements for high/medium mobility   Proposal 10:   * Study model performance monitoring based on intermediate metrics (e.g., GCS) calculated from the measured CSI-RS and predicted channel at the UE side |
| Interdigital | Proposal 19: Specification impact for time domain CSI prediction using UE sided model is not studied in Rel-18. |
| xiaomi | Proposal 12: The specification impact on time domain CSI prediction using UE sided model selected as a representative sub-use case for CSI enhancement could be studied in Rel-18.  Proposal 13: The number of CSI-RS resources and the interval of adjacent CSI-RS resources discussed in Rel-18 MIMO CSI enhancement for medium/high velocities should be as a starting point to study its potential specification impact. |
| China Telecom | Observation 1: Based on current evaluation assumptions in 9.2.2.1, AI-based CSI prediction shows better performance gain when baseline is the nearest historical CSI. However it is not clear how much performance gain can be obtained when baseline is non-AI/ML algorithm based CSI prediction (AR, linear filtering, etc ), and need FFS.  Proposal 3: In CSI prediction using one-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact of the following UE-side training case and NW-side training case:   * Case 1: Both training and inference at UE-side without model transfer * Case 2: Training at NW-side and inference at UE-side with model transfer, e.g., the model structure, model parameters, etc.   Proposal 4: Further study potential specification impact of the procedure of NW-side training and UE-side training based CSI prediction, including data transfer, model transfer, monitoring and adjustments.  Proposal 5: For the UE based CSI prediction, potential specification impact including UE capability signalling, NW and UE’s alignment on prediction related time domain configuration information. |
| Google | Proposal 13: Study the following output of CSI prediction:   * Predicted RI/PMI based on Type1 codebook * Predicted CSI dwelling time |
| LGE | Proposal #9: Study potential specification impacts on UE-sided CSI prediction including at least followings   * AI/ML model monitoring procedure/metric, * enhancement of CSI reporting. |
| CMCC | Proposal 10: For CSI prediction, regarding the spec impact during inference phase, we could take the agreements achieved in Rel-18 9.1.2 sub-agenda as a starting point.  Proposal 11: For CSI prediction, Some CSI related parameters agreed in 9.1.2 sub-agenda might need revision to adapt AI/ML-enabled CSI prediction.  Proposal 12: For CSI prediction, regarding the LCM related potential specification impact, we could take the UE-sided model related agreements achieved in Rel-18 9.2.3.2 sub-agenda as a starting point. |
| MediaTek | 1. For AI/ML-based CSI prediction, discuss the potential specification impact of CSI feedback mechanism. Codebook-based feedback can be used as a baseline (legacy codebook or Rel-18 codebook), but AI/ML-based CSI compression is not precluded. 2. For AI/ML-based CSI prediction, discuss the potential specification impact of the signalling between UE and gNB. |
| Apple | Proposal 10: For CSI prediction use case, potential specification impact including UE capability signaling, UE request and NW activation/de-activation signaling. |
| Lenovo | 1. For AI-based CSI prediction, the baseline for comparison is based on (i) multiple realizations of Rel-16 eType-II codebook-based CSI feedback, and (ii) MIMO Rel-18 codebook design outline 2. CSI feedback for AI-based CSI prediction should follow the same format as legacy CSI feedback in terms of the spatial domain and frequency domain transformations 3. For observation window and prediction window in AI-based CSI prediction, reuse the definitions agreed in Rel-18 MIMO CSI enhancements for high speed 4. Three intermediate KPI values are considered for CSI prediction sub-use case: (i) at the first slot of the prediction window, (ii) at the median slot of the prediction window, and (iii) at the last slot of the prediction window |
| AT&T | Proposal 5: Resume the specification impact discussion for the CSI prediction using UE sided model.  Proposal 6:   * In CSI prediction using UE sided model use case, study the necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact of UE side data collection enhancement including at least   + Additional CSI configuration information   + Assistance information for UE data collection for categorizing the data in forms of ID for the purpose of differentiating characteristics of data due to specific configuration, scenarios, site etc.     - The provision of assistance information needs to consider feasibility of disclosing proprietary information to the other side.   + Signaling for triggering the data collection * In CSI prediction using UE sided model use case, study the necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact for NW side data collection including at least:   + Additional CSI configuration information   + Contents of the ground-truth CSI including:     - Data sample type, e.g., precoding matrix, channel matrix etc.     - Data sample format: scaler quantization and/or codebook-based quantization (e.g., e-type II like).     - Assistance information (e.g., time stamps, and/or cell ID, Assistance information for Network data collection for categorizing the data in forms of ID for the purpose of differentiating characteristics of data due to specific configuration, scenarios, site etc., and data quality indicator)   + Latency requirement for data collection   + Signaling for triggering the data collection   Proposal 7: For CSI prediction using UE sided model study the following configurations and their granularity that will be signaled through the functionality, and the corresponding specification impact in functionality-based LCM   * UE speed * Frequency PRB’s * Prediction window * Observation window * Scenario (Uma etc.) * Performance requirement/monitoring * Other additional configurations   Proposal 8: For CSI prediction using UE sided model, study the requirement for model-ID based LCM to support additional functionalities that will not be supported through functionality-based LCM. |
| Samsung | Proposal 1-1: Study the specification impacts of UE-side time-domain CSI prediction under network-UE collaboration level y.  Proposal 1-2: For the AI/ML based CSI prediction sub-use case, study the necessity and specification impact of   * CSI measurement and reporting framework enhancement. * LCM assistance from gNB including, model monitoring, dataset collection, model activation, model deactivation, model switching, etc. |

### ***Proposal 3-1(closed):***

***In CSI prediction using UE-side model use case, start the study of the potential spec impact of CSI prediction after RAN1#112b-e meeting.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Google | OK. Now we already supported CSI prediction based on an enhanced eType2 CSI codebook in MIMO agenda, we think the CSI prediction could focus more on Type1 codebook and CSI dwelling time prediction. |
| CATT | If most of the potential spec impacts for CSI compression are already identified, we are fine to start discussion on CSI prediction case. |
| Huawei/HiSi | We can support the proposal. |
| vivo | We are supportive of the proposal.  The EVMs have already shown benefit of AI-based CSI prediction from both the intermediate and eventual KPIs. Therefore, it is appropriate to start the study of the potential spec impact of CSI prediction after RAN1#112b-e meeting.  In our viewpoint, the definition, configuration of observation window, prediction window and the reporting of predicted CSI can reuse the agreement in Rel-18 MIMO CSI enhancements for high speed.  For AI-based CSI prediction, the specification aspect on the following 3 aspects are prominent:   * data collection procedure, mainly including RS configuration, signalling for alignment of dada collection configuration between NW and UE. * monitoring procedure and metric for AI-based CSI prediction. * model adjustment (model selection/switching and finetuning) procedure.   Other LCM related potential specification impact can follow the high- level principle of general framework and other one-sided model sub-cases.  Thanks to the Rel-18 MIMO WI and the study in other one-sided sub-cases, the workload of AI-based CSI prediction has already been reduced significantly, and the remaining part can be studied from next meeting. |
| Ericsson | Support |
| Xiaomi | We are fine and prefer to firstly discussion on the specification impact for CSI compression. |
| LG Electronics | Fine with proposal. |
| OPPO | Support |
| CMCC | Support. |
| Fujitsu | Support. |
| CAICT | Support |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. However, due to the very limited time remaining to study spec impact of CSI prediction (only two meetings after RAN1#112bis-e), **we suggest the following:**  1. The aspects to be studied as part of spec impact discussion are determined in this meeting  2. We have different views from Google regarding the scope of CSI prediction. We strongly prefer reusing the Rel-18 eType-II framework for CSI prediction, which can help significantly reduce the workload needed towards the study. There isn’t enough time to discuss a new framework |
| NVIDIA | Support. |
| InterDigital | No. We have a strong concern on increasing any scope considering current AI/ML overall progress is way behind the schedule. We only finished 30% of study item and just 3 meetings left including this meeting to finalize the study. |
| MediaTek | Support |
| Sony | Support |
| Panasonic | Support |
| AT&T | We are fine with the proposal. However, we have similar view as Lenovo that due to limited time remaining, in this meeting we should agree on the aspects that will be discussed as part of spec impact discussion. |
| Samsung | Support |

### ***Proposal 3-1(v1clsoed):***

***In CSI prediction using UE-side model use case, start the study of the potential spec impact of CSI prediction after RAN1#112b-e meeting, including at least:***

* ***data collection procedure, mainly including RS configuration, signalling for alignment of dada collection configuration between NW and UE.***
* ***monitoring procedure and metric for AI-based CSI prediction.***
* ***model selection/switching and finetuning procedure.***
* ***Note: No discussion on potential specification impact which would duplicate the work in Rel-18 MIMO WI.***
* ***Note: Minimize LCM related potential specification impact discussion that follow the high-level principle of other one-sided model sub-cases.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| vivo | We are fine with the proposal.  We believe that the specification impact is only limited to KPI determination and UE report. For this, we are further clarifying as follows.  The discussion on the specification impact should be classified into two cases, based on the UE trained model and NW trained model, respectively.  **Case-1: the model is trained by UE**   * UE needs to report its capability of prediction, such as CSI report format and dimension (e.g., predictable single CSI instance or multiple CSI instance) and prediction interval. All of them in the specification belongs to UE report. It cannot mimic beam prediction, and has to be newly specified, but the specification impact is small. * Based on the UE capability, NW configures CSI-RS, and UE trains the model based on its implementation. There is no additional specification. * The KPI for monitoring is either determined by NW based on UE capability or by UE-self. In the former, NW configures the KPI and informs it to UE, and in the latter, UE determines the KPI and reports it to NW. It cannot mimic beam prediction, and has to be newly specified. For instance, SGCS or NMSE can be simply considered as a KPI for monitoring. * It needs to specify the model monitoring procedure (including model adjustment) between UE and NW. However, as long as the KPI for monitoring is specified, the procedure can mimic beam prediction.   + Either UE monitors the KPI and determines the model adjustment, and UE informs the new/adjusted model in use to NW.   + Or UE monitors the KPI and reports the KPI to NW, and NW informs/transfer the new/adjusted model to UE if necessary.   **Case-2: the model is trained by NW**   * UE needs to report its capability of prediction, such as device capability. All of them in the specification belongs to UE report. It can mimic beam prediction. * Based on the UE capability, NW configures CSI-RS with the CSI-prediction parameters (e.g., historic data, label data, dimension), and UE reports the collected data to NW accordingly. All of them in the specification belongs to UE report. It cannot mimic beam prediction, and has to be newly specified, but the specification impact is small. * NW trains the model based on the UE capability and transfers the model to UE with the specified prediction parameters (e.g., historic data, label data, dimension). It can mimic beam prediction, but parameters should be newly specified. * The KPI for monitoring is either determined by NW based on UE capability or by UE-self. In the former, NW configures the KPI and informs it to UE, and in the latter, UE determines the KPI and reports it to NW. It cannot mimic beam prediction, and has to be newly specified. For instance, SGCS or NMSE can be simply considered as a KPI for monitoring. * It needs to specify the model monitoring procedure (including model adjustment) between UE and NW. However, as long as the KPI for monitoring is specified, the procedure can mimic beam prediction.   + Either UE monitors the KPI and determines the model adjustment, and UE informs the new/adjusted model in use to NW.   + Or UE monitors the KPI and reports the KPI to NW, and NW informs/transfer the new/adjusted model to UE if necessary. |
| Samsung | We are fine with the proposal.***Proposal 3-1(v1):***  ***In CSI prediction using UE-side model use case, start the study of the potential spec impact of CSI prediction after RAN1#112b-e meeting, including at least:***   * ***data collection procedure, mainly including RS configuration, signalling for alignment of dada collection configuration between NW and UE.*** * ***monitoring procedure and metric for AI-based CSI prediction.*** * ***Model/functionality selection/switching and finetuning procedure.*** * ***Note: No discussion on potential specification impact which would duplicate the work in Rel-18 MIMO WI.*** * ***Note: Minimize LCM related potential specification impact discussion that follow the high-level principle of other one-sided model sub-cases.*** |
| CATT | Generally OK.However, the sub-bullet ‘**model selection/switching and finetuning procedure**’ seems to be a general item. Do not foresee CSI prediction-specific spec impact. This should better be discussed or designed in 9.2.1, no need to duplicate here. |
| Nokia/NSB | OK |
| CMCC | Support in principle. |
| ZTE | Generally OK. However, we think a clear scope only for CSI prediction sub use case is necessary. For the 1st sub-bullet, we suggest adding ‘**measurement and report configuration**’ to align with the agreement for data collection in RAN1#112 as follows.   * ***data collection procedure, mainly including RS configuration, measurement and report configuration, signalling for alignment of ~~dada~~  data collection configuration between NW and UE.***   In addition, we are not clear about ‘***signalling for alignment of data collection configuration between NW and UE****’,* which needs further clarification. For the 3rd sub-bullet ‘**model selection/switching and finetuning procedure**’, it seems to be a general issue for all sub use case, which obeys the first Note ‘**Minimize LCM related potential specification impact discussion**’. So we suggest removing the 3rd sub-bullet as follows  * ***~~model selection/switching and finetuning procedure.~~*** |
| Lenovo | We are fine with this proposal. We propose a slight modification to the note: ***Note: ~~No~~ discussion on potential specification impact is limited to aspects which would not duplicate the work in Rel-18 MIMO WI.*** |
| Huawei/HiSi | Support |

### ***Proposal 3-1(v2closed):***

***In CSI prediction using UE-side model use case, start the study of the potential spec impact of CSI prediction after RAN1#112b-e meeting, including at least:***

* ***data collection procedure, mainly including RS configuration, measurement and report configuration.***
* ***monitoring procedure and metric for AI-based CSI prediction.***
* ***~~model selection/switching and finetuning procedure.~~***
* ***Note: Discussion on potential specification impact is limited to aspects which would NOT duplicate the work in Rel-18 MIMO WI.***
* ***Note: Minimize LCM related potential specification impact discussion that follow the high-level principle of other one-sided model sub-cases.***

Please provide your view below:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **View** |
| Ericsson | ok |
| Lenovo | Support |
| Samsung | We are evaluating CSI prediction by comparing Level x and Level y/z. Thus, LCM assistance from gNB such as model/functionality selection/switching and finetuning procedures, is the major differentiating factor from the implementation based solution (Level x). At the end of the day, the model selection assistance may not be explicit but network can help the UE to understand the scenarios and configurations it is supposed to operate at. We ask our ZTE colleagues to be a bit open so that the below is included.   * ***Model/functionality selection/switching and finetuning procedure.*** |
| CATT | Support.  We think performance of model switching/fine-tuning can be evaluated in 9.2.2.1, but the spec impact on model switching/fine-tuning is unlikely to be different from the outcome of 9.2.1. |
| vivo | We agree with Samsung’s comment. This is because, for each use case, UE capability/report，triggering event，validation metric，applicable condition are quite different, and should be use-case specifically defined. |
| Huawei/HiSi | OK |
| Xiaomi | Considering remained time of SI, we prefer that the collaboration type is level x for CSI prediction, which has little impact on specification discussion. |
| CAICT | Support |
| ETRI | Support |
| LG Electronics | Support. |
| InterDigital | Not support. Any up-scoping should not be allowed at this point with current progress. |
| NEC | Support in general. |
| AT&T | We have similar view as Samsung that we need to have the bullet for   * ***Model/functionality selection/switching and finetuning procedure.*** |
| ZTE | Support.@Samsung: For ‘**model selection/switching and finetuning procedure**’, it seems to be a generic issue for all sub use case, which may follow other one-sided use case. In this proposal, we hope to study and discuss specific issues for CSI prediction. |
| CMCC | We tend to agree with Samsung. Although we have the last Note, there still might be use case specific spec impact on LCM. |

# Proposals for April 18 GTW

### ***Proposal 2-5 (v1):***

***The study of AI/ML based CSI compression should be based on the legacy CSI feedback signaling framework. Further study potential specification enhancement on***

* ***CSI-RS configurations (No discussion on CSI-RS pattern design enhancements)***
* ***CSI reporting configurations***
* ***CSI report mapping/priority/omission***
* ***CSI processing procedures.***
* ***Other aspects are not precluded.***

### ***Proposal 2-4-1(v1):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side monitoring, further study potential specification impact on triggering and means for reporting the monitoring metrics, including [UE initiated reporting], periodic/semi-persistent and aperiodic reporting.***

### ***Proposal 2-4-2 (v1):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study feasibility and potential specification impact to enable performance monitoring and fallback using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference, to compare whether/how much AI/ML performance is beneficial compared to the existing CSI feedback scheme.***

* ***The association between AI/ML scheme and existing CSI feedback scheme for monitoring***
* ***The metric for monitoring and comparison includes intermediate KPI and eventual KPI.***

# Proposals for April 20 GTW

### ***Proposal 3-1(v2):***

***In CSI prediction using UE-side model use case, start the study of the potential spec impact of CSI prediction after RAN1#112b-e meeting, including at least:***

* ***data collection procedure, mainly including RS configuration, measurement and report configuration.***
* ***monitoring procedure and metric for AI-based CSI prediction.***
* ***Model/functionality selection/switching and finetuning procedure.***
* ***Note: Discussion on potential specification impact is limited to aspects which would NOT duplicate the work in Rel-18 MIMO WI.***
* ***Note: Minimize LCM related potential specification impact discussion that follow the high-level principle of other one-sided model sub-cases.***

# Proposals for April 24 GTW

### ***Proposal 2-4-2 (v3):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for NW-side monitoring, further study the necessity, feasibility and potential specification impact to enable performance monitoring and fallback using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference.***

* ***The association between AI/ML scheme and existing CSI feedback scheme for monitoring***
* ***Note: The metric for monitoring and comparison includes intermediate KPI and eventual KPI.***
* ***Other aspects are not precluded.***

### ***Proposal 2-4-2-2(v1):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, for UE-side monitoring, further study the necessity, feasibility and potential specification impact to enable performance monitoring ~~and fallback~~ using an existing CSI feedback scheme as the reference.***

* ***Configuration/indication of the precoding type applied to the PDSCH transmission or CSI-RS, i.e., whether precoding is based on reference scheme or AI/ML scheme.***
* ***The association between AI/ML scheme and existing CSI feedback scheme for monitoring***
* ***Other aspects are not precluded.***

### ***Proposal 2-4-3(v2):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, potential specification impact for input distribution-based or output distribution-based monitoring will be further discussed after initial evaluation is performed in 9.2.2.1, including:***

* ***What metrics can be adopted for evaluating the distribution,***
* ***How to generate the distribution of data,***
* ***How accurate the data drift reflects the AI/ML model performance.***
* ***FFS on how different the AI/ML model performance is impacted by the input data drift across (very) different AI/ML ~~architectures~~ models.***
* ***~~FFS on UE side input distribution-based monitoring.~~***

### ***Proposal 2-2-2(v3):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the ~~necessity~~ benefit of, and*** ***the following aspects related to the ground truth CSI format for*** ***NW side data collection for model training:***

* ***Scalar quantization for ground-truth CSI***
  + ***FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scalar quantization, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1***
* ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI***
  + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1***
* ***Number of layers for which the ground truth data is collected. And whether UE or NW determine the number of layers for ground-truth CSI data collection.***

### ***Proposal 2-2-3(v2):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the ~~necessity~~ benefit of, complexity, overhead, latency and potential specification impact on ground truth CSI report for NW side data collection for model performance monitoring:***

* ***Scalar quantization for ground-truth CSI***
  + ***FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scalar quantization, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1***
* ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI***
  + ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1***
* ***L1 signaling procedure to enable fast identification of AI/ML model performance.***

### ***Proposal 2-3-1 (v2):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study ~~at least the following~~ the necessity and potential specification impact on quantization alignment during the training stage, including at least:***

* ***For vector quantization scheme,*** 
  + ***The format and size of the VQ codebook***
  + ***Size and segmentation method of the CSI generation model output***
  + ***Configuration/reporting/updating of the VQ codebook***
* ***For scalar quantization scheme,***
  + ***Uniform and non-uniform quantization***
  + ***Configuration of the quantization granularity.***
* ***Note: The quantization method / VQ codebook is left to implementation***

# Proposals for April 26 GTW

The following two proposals have been stable for over 24 hours (almost 48 hours). Copied here for quick approval.

***Proposal 2-1-2:***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, gradient-exchange based sequential training over the air interface is deprioritized in R18 SI.***

***Proposal 2-2-2(v3):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the necessity ~~benefit of~~, and*** ***the following aspects related to the ground truth CSI format for*** ***NW side data collection for model training:***

·        ***Scalar quantization for ground-truth CSI***

·       ***FFS: any processing applied to the ground-truth CSI before scalar quantization, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1***

·        ***Codebook-based quantization for ground-truth CSI***

·       ***FFS: Parameter set enhancement of existing eType II codebook, based on evaluation results in 9.2.2.1***

* ***Number of layers for which the ground truth data is collected. And whether UE or NW determine the number of layers for ground-truth CSI data collection.***

This proposal was discussed in the email, and the latest version is here.

***Proposal 2-3-1 (v2):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study ~~at least the following~~ the necessity and potential specification impact on quantization alignment during the model training/updating/fine-tuning ~~stage~~, including at least:***

·       ***For vector quantization scheme,***

* ***The format and size of the VQ codebook***
* ***Size and segmentation method of the CSI generation model output***
* ***~~Configuration/reporting/updating of the VQ codebook~~***

·       ***For scalar quantization scheme,***

* ***Uniform and non-uniform quantization***
* ***The format, e.g., quantization granularity, the distribution of bits assigned to each float.***
* ***~~Configuration of The quantization granularity~~.***

* ***~~Note: The quantization method / VQ codebook is left to implementation~~***
* ***FFS:*** ***Quantization alignment via*** ***quantization codebook/dictionary*** ***transfer/configuration/updating*** ***using*** ***3GPP aware*** ***mechanism.***

***Proposal 2-4-3(v3):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, potential specification impact for input distribution-based or output distribution-based monitoring will be further discussed after initial evaluation is performed in 9.2.2.1.***

***Proposal 2-3-2(v4merged version):***

***In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the potential specification impact for CSI configuration and report:***

* ***For network configuration to determine CSI payload size, gNB can configure the UE with one or more identifiers***
* ***For UE determination/reporting of the actual CSI payload size, UE reports the selected RI and/or selected identifier.***
* ***An identifier may be associated with the information of factors that represent a specific CSI payload size and/or model, e.g., UE part model compatible with the NW part model used by the gNB, rank value, quantization method/granularity, size of latent space from scalable dimensions for each layer, etc.***
* ***FFS: other payload related aspects including how payload scales with number of subbands, number of ports, different payload configs, etc***

# Appendix: Companies input on training collaboration type comparison table.

***Huawei:***

Table 2 Brief comparison of the training types for two-sided model

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Type 1 | | Type 2 | Type 3 | |
|  | NW-sided | UE-sided |  | NW first | UE first |
| Whether model can be kept proprietary | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Whether require privacy-sensitive dataset sharing | No | No | No | No | No |
| Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model | Yes | No | No | Yes | No |
| Whether gNB/device specific optimization is allowed | Restricted | Restricted | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Overhead | Model | Model | N/A | Dataset | Dataset |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | Flexible | Not flexible | Not flexible | Semi-flexible | Not flexible |
| Engineering isolation (feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately) | Non-isolable | Non-isolable | Strongly non-isolable | Isolable | Isolable |
| Model performance | Suboptimal | Suboptimal | Suboptimal | Suboptimal | Suboptimal |
| Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model | No | No | Yes | Yes | Restricted |
| Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Extendibility | Support | Restricted | Support | Support | Support |
| Whether training data distribution can match the inference device | Restricted | Yes | Restricted | Restricted | Yes |
| Software/hardware compatibility (Whether device capability can be considered for model development) | Compatibility issue exists | Compatibility issue exists | Free of compatibility issue | Free of compatibility issue | Free of compatibility issue |

***ZTE:***

Table 1. Brief comparison of the training types for two-sided model

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Training types  Characteristics | Type 1 | | Type 3 | |
| NW side | UE side | NW-first | UE-first |
| Whether model can be kept proprietary | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Requirements on privacy-sensitive dataset sharing | No | No | No | No |
| Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| gNB/device specific optimization – i.e., whether hardware-specific optimization of the model is possible, e.g. compilation for the specific hardware | Restricted (only when the model structure of UE-part model is known by network) | Restricted (only when the model structure of NW-part model is known by network) | Yes | Yes |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | Flexible | Inflexible | Semi-flexible | Inflexible |
| Feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately | Infeasible | Infeasible | Feasible | Feasible |
| Model performance based on evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | Optimal | Optimal | Sub-optimal | Sub-optimal |
| Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Extendability: to train new UE-side model compatible with NW-side model in use; Or to train new NW-side model compatible with UE-side model in use | Non-extendable (possible only when UE knows NW-part model in use) | Non-extendable  (possible only when NW knows UE-part model in use) | Extendable | Extendable |
| Whether training data distribution can be matched to the device that will use the model for inference | No for UE device | Yes for UE device | Possible for UE device only when ground-truth CSI is shared from target UE device. | Possible for UE device only when ground-truth CSI is shared from target gNB device |
| Whether device capability can be considered for model development | Yes (when the supported UE-part model structure is known by network side) | UE-part model is up to UE implementation | UE-part model is up to UE implementation | UE-part model is up to UE implementation |

***OPPO***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Training collaboration type 1 | Training collaboration type 3 |
| Whether model can be kept proprietary | NO  NW/UE needs to deliver a model or a sub-model to the other side | YES  Model or sub-model delivery is not needed |
| Requirements on privacy-sensitive dataset sharing | NO  Training data transmission is not needed in training collaboration type 1 | YES, if CSI training data belongs to privacy-sensitive dataset  Training data transmission is the fundamental requirement of training collaboration type 3.  NW may need to transmit cell level CSI training data to a given UE.  UE may need to transmit UE level CSI training data to NW  FFS whether the CSI training data belongs to privacy-sensitive dataset |
| Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model | Support  For NW side training: YES  Cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model could be supported and delivered from NW to UE  For UE side training: Also feasible, if there is some information identifying such kind of cell/site/scenario/ configuration for the data collection | Support  For NW first training: YES  Cell/site/scenario/configuration specific training data could be supported and delivered from NW to UE  For UE first training: Also feasible, if there is some information identifying such kind of cell/site/ scenario/configuration for the data collection |
| gNB/device specific optimization | Support, under condition.  For example, (1) NW/UE prepares models that match different devices. For example, when some devices are more compatible with transformer type models, while others require deployment of other model structures (CNN or fully connected networks), model providers must prepare multiple models to meet device specific optimization requirements. Alternatively, (2) NW/UE does not directly use the obtained decoder/encoder, but instead regenerates training data for matching devices based on the obtained model. | Support.  For example, UE can achieve device specific optimization based on the obtained training data and its capabilities. |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | Support  NW can send new models to UE to update the UE side model, or vice versa | Support  NW can send new training data to UE to update the UE side model, or vice versa |
| Feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately | Support  For example, after deploying Model 1 on the UE side, a new UE model can be obtained by using Model 1 as the teacher model and using knowledge distillation method | Support  For example, UE can retrain new models based on the obtained training data |
| Model performance based on evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | No extra performance loss caused by mismatched two sided models and separate training procedures. | May cause extra performance loss.  The performance of training depends on the quality and quantity of the transmitted training date. |
| Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model | For NW side training: NW needs to store multiple models, especially when it needs to transmit different models to UE according to different scenarios | For NW first training: NW needs to store multiple models as well as datasets corresponding to multiple models, especially when the network needs to transmit different datasets to help UE complete type 3 training in different scenarios |
| Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model | For UE side training: UE needs to store multiple models, especially when it needs to transmit different models to NW according to different scenarios | For UE first training: UE needs to store multiple models and datasets corresponding to multiple models, especially when the network needs to transmit different datasets to help NW complete type 3 training in different scenarios |
| Extendability: to train new UE-side model compatible with NW-side model in use; Or to train new NW-side model compatible with UE-side model in use | Support  As discussed above, after deploying Model 1 on the UE side, the update of the UE model can be achieved by using Model 1 as a teacher model and using knowledge distillation to obtain a new UE model | Support  As discussed above, UE can retrain a new model by the obtained training data |
| Whether training data distribution can be matched to the device that will use the model for inference | Support, under condition.  For NW side training: If UE directly uses the model passed to UE by NW, there is no guarantee that training data distribution can be matched to the device that will use the model for inference.  Unless (1) NW prepares models that match to different devices, or (2) UE does not directly use the obtained encoder locally, but instead regenerates training data for matching devices based on the obtained encoder.  For UE side training: vice versa | Support, under condition.  For NW side training: If UE directly uses the data passed to UE by NW, there is no guarantee that the training data distribution can be matched to the UE that will use the model for inference.  Unless (1) NW prepares different training data that match to different devices, or (2) UE does not directly use the obtained training data locally, but instead adjusts/ regenerates training data for matching devices based on the obtained training data sets.  For UE side training: vice versa |
| Whether device capability can be considered for model development | Support, under condition.  NW/UE needs to prepare different models that match the capabilities of different devices. | Support  NW/UE can construct and train local models based on received training data and their own abilities to complete Type 3 training. However, due to mismatched CSI encoders and decoders, it may result in extra performance loss. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Training collaboration type 1 | Training collaboration type 3 |
| Whether model can be kept proprietary | NO | YES |
| Requirements on privacy-sensitive dataset sharing | NO | YES |
| Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model | Support | Support |
| gNB/device specific optimization | Support, under condition. | Support. |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | Support | Support |
| Feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately | Support | Support |
| Model performance based on evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | No extra performance loss | May cause extra performance loss |
| Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model | For NW side training: YES | For NW first training: YES |
| Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model | For UE side training: YES | For UE first training: YES |
| Extendability | Support | Support |
| Whether training data distribution can be matched to the device that will use the model for inference | Support, under certain condition. | Support, under certain condition. |
| Whether device capability can be considered for model development | Support, under certain condition. | Support. |

***vivo***

To summarize our comments regarding this issue, we provide the following table:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| General aspects | Detailed issues | Type1 | Type2 | Type3 |
| Performance | Model performance based on evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | optimal | Near-Optimal | Suffer from losses in some cases. Near-optimal in some other cases. |
| Proprietary issues (model and data) | Whether model can be kept proprietary | No | Yes | Information on model structure may be required to disclose. |
| Requirements on privacy-sensitive dataset sharing | No concerns | No concerns | Concerns on disclosing data from one user to another one. |
| Flexibility issues (model update and engineering separation) | Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model | Good. New model can be flexibly transferred to UE when UE enters a new cell/site/scenario/ etc. | Not good, since setting up a new training session is required to obtain a new model for the current cell/site/scenarios etc. | Not good, since setting up a new training session is required to obtain a new model for the current cell/site/scenarios etc. |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | Good with re-transferring updated model | Not good, since setting up a new model training session with exchanging FP/BP information is required. | Not good, since setting up a new separate training session is required. |
| Extendibility to multi-vendor configuration/ Engineering isolation | Extendibility: to train new UE-side model compatible with NW-side model in use; Or to train new NW-side model compatible with UE-side model in use | Support by solely training an encoder compatible with existing decoders (and potential other encoders) at a single entity\* | Support by solely training an encoder compatible with existing decoders (and potential other encoders) via FP/BP exchange\* | Support by sending input/output data to the newly arrived UE’s encoder |
| Feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately | Not Support | Support | Support |
| Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model. | Support by training common decoder for multiple encoders at a single entity | Support by training common decoder for multiple encoders via FP/BP exchange | Support by training common decoder via collecting data from multiple UEs |
| Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model | Support by training common encoder for multiple decoders at a single entity | Support by training common encoder for multiple decoders via FP/BP exchange | Support by training common encoder via collecting data from multiple gNBs |
| Support of device specific models | gNB/device specific optimization – i.e., whether hardware-specific optimization of the model is possible, e.g. compilation for the specific hardware | Support when devices report their supported model designs | Support | Support device-specific model design. Not support device-specific data distribution in NW-first training. |
| Whether training data distribution can be matched to the device that will use the model for inference | Support when devices report its data to the training entity | Support | Support when device reports its data to the “first training entity” |
| Whether device capability can be considered for model development | Support with device capability reporting | Support | Support |

***Spreadtrum Comm***

Table 1 Analysis on Pros and Cons of Training type 1, 2 and 3

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Training Type 1** | **Training Type 2** | **Training Type 3** |
| Whether model can be kept proprietary |  |  |  |
| Requirements on privacy-sensitive dataset sharing |  |  |  |
| Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model |  |  |  |
| gNB/device specific optimization – i.e., whether hardware-specific optimization of the model is possible, e.g. compilation for the specific hardware |  |  |  |
| Model update flexibility after deployment |  |  |  |
| feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately |  |  |  |
| Model performance based on evaluation in 9.2.2.1 | good | well | well |
| Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model | , if gNB generates the model; otherwise |  |  |
| Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model | , if UE generates the model; otherwise |  |  |
| Extendability: to train new UE-side model compatible with NW-side model in use; Or to train new NW-side model compatible with UE-side model in use |  |  |  |
| Whether training data distribution can be matched to the device that will use the model for inference |  |  |  |
| Whether device capability can be considered for model development |  |  |  |

***Ericsson:***

**Summary**

To summarize the discussion around Type 1 training, we provide the following table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspect | Type 1a-i | Type 1a-ii | Type 1a-iii | Type 1a-iv | Type 1b-i | Type 1b-ii | Type 1b-iii | Type 1b-iv |
| Proprietary models | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| Requires dataset sharing | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Support site specific models | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| gNB specific hardware optimization | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Low | No |
| UE specific hardware optimization | No | Yes | Low | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Allows single unified model on gNB side | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Allows single unified model on UE side | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | Yes | Delayed and Partial | Partial | Yes | Yes | Delayed and Partial | Partial | Yes |
| Engineering isolation | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Supports UE-proprietary input | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Supports NW-proprietary input | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Supports NW-proprietary output | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Matching data distribution | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Capability consideration | Maybe | Maybe | Maybe | Maybe | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **Overall feasibility** | No | No | Unclear | Maybe long-term | No | No | No | No |

**Summary**

To summarize the discussion around Type 2 training, we provide the following table.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspect | Type 2a-i | Type 2a-ii | Type 2b-i | Type 2b-ii |
| Proprietary models | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Requires dataset sharing | Yes | Partially | Yes | Partially |
| Support site specific models | No | No | No | No |
| gNB specific hardware optimization | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| UE specific hardware optimization | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Allows single unified model on gNB side | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Allows single unified model on UE side | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | No | No | No | No |
| Engineering isolation | No | No | No | No |
| Supports UE-proprietary input | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Supports NW-proprietary input | Maybe | No | No | No |
| Supports NW-proprietary output | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Extendibility | No | No | No | No |
| Matching data distribution | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| **Overall feasibility** | No | No | No | No |

**Summary**

To summarize the discussion around Type 3 training, we provide the following table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Aspect | Type 3a-i-1 | Type 3a-i-2 | Type 3a-i-3 | Type 3a-ii | Type 3b-i-1 | Type 3b-i-2 | Type 3b-ii-1 | Type 3b-ii-2 |
| Proprietary models | Yes | No | No | Yes | Partially | Yes | No | No |
| Requires dataset sharing | Partially | Partially | Partially | Partially | Partially | Partially | Partially | Partially |
| Support site specific models | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Partially | Partially |
| gNB specific hardware optimization | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| UE specific hardware optimization | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Allows single unified model on gNB side | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Allows single unified model on UE side | No | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Model update flexibility after deployment | Partial | Partial | Partial | Partial | Partial | Partial | Partial | Partial |
| Engineering isolation | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate | Moderate |
| Supports UE-proprietary input | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| Supports NW-proprietary input | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Supports NW-proprietary output | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Matching data distribution | No | No | No | Yes | Yes/No | Yes/No | Yes/No | Yes/No |
| Capability consideration | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| **Overall feasibility** | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |

**Summary**

To summarize the discussion around Type 4 training, we provide the following table.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Aspect | [Type 4] |
| Proprietary models | Yes |
| Requires dataset sharing | Partially |
| Support site specific models | Yes |
| gNB specific hardware optimization | Yes |
| UE specific hardware optimization | Yes |
| Allows single unified model on gNB side | Yes |
| Allows single unified model on UE side | No |
| Model update flexibility after deployment |  |
| Engineering isolation | Moderate |
| Supports UE-proprietary input | Yes |
| Supports NW-proprietary input | No |
| Supports NW-proprietary output | Yes |
| Matching data distribution | Yes |
| Capability consideration | Yes |
| **Overall feasibility** | Yes |

***Xiaomi:***

Table 1: The pros and cons of joint training of two-sided model at NW sided and NW-first separate training

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Items | Type 1  (Joint training of the two-sided model at NW side) | Type 3  (NW-first separate training) |
| *Whether model can be kept proprietary* | NO | YES |
| *Requirements on privacy-sensitive dataset sharing* | NO | NO |
| *Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model* | YES | YES (Depends on UE capability of training AI/ML model) |
| *gNB/device specific optimization – i.e., whether hardware-specific optimization of the model is possible, e.g. compilation for the specific hardware* | NO（Only NW -sided hardware optimization ） | YES |
| *Model update flexibility after deployment* | YES | YES |
| *Feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately* | NO | YES |
| *Model performance based on evaluation in 9.2.2.1* | Optimization | Less than Type I |
| *Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model* | YES | YES |
| *Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model* | NO | NO |
| *Extendability: to train new UE-side model compatible with NW-side model in use; Or to train new NW-side model compatible with UE-side model in use* | NO | YES |
| *Whether training data distribution can be matched to the device that will use the model for inference* | Depends on the collected training data | Depends on the collected training data |
| *Whether device capability can be considered for model development* | YES | YES |

***Apple***

**Table I: Comparison of different training collaboration**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Type 1 | | Type 2 | Type 3 | |
|  | UE side | NW side |  | UE first | NW first |
| Model proprietary | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Require privacy data sharing | No | UE share dataset to NW | UE share target CSI to NW | UE share target CSI and encoder output to NW | UE share dataset to NW. NW share encoder training dataset |
| Flexibility to support config specific model | Yes, with NW assisted info | Yes | No. | Yes, with NW assisted info | Yes |
| Model upgrade flexibility | Flexible | Most flexible | Not flexible | Flexible | Flexible |
| Develop separately | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Single model at gNB | No | Yes | Difficult | Yes | Yes |
| Single model at UE | Yes | Yes via frequent download | Difficult | Yes | Performance might degrade |
| Extendibility | Limited | Limited | Limited | Limited | Limited |
| Device specific training data | Yes | Yes, with UE assisted info | Yes | Yes | Yes, with UE assisted info |
| Device capability considered in training | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

***Qualcomm:***

Table 1: Comparison of training types

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Type 1  (with device-agnostic encoder) | Type 1  (with device-specific encoder) | Type 2 | Type 3 NW-first (dataset exchange) | Type 3 NW-first (gradient exchange) | Type 3 UE-first |
| Model structure accounts for device capability | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Data distribution matched to device? | No | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Yes |
| Applicable to non-backward compatible deployment | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Applicable to train new UE-side model backward compatible with existing NW-side model | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| Applicable to train new NW-side model backward compatible with existing UE-side model | No | No | No | No | No | Yes |

# Appendix: Previous meeting agreements

## RAN1 #109e

Agreement

Spatial-frequency domain CSI compression using two-sided AI model is selected as one representative sub use case.

* + Note: Study of other sub use cases is not precluded.
  + Note: All pre-processing/post-processing, quantization/de-quantization are within the scope of the sub use case.

Conclusion

* Further discuss temporal-spatial-frequency domain CSI compression using two-sided model as a possible sub-use case for CSI feedback enhancement after evaluation methodology discussion.
* Further discuss improving the CSI accuracy based on traditional codebook design using one-sided model as a possible sub-use case for CSI feedback enhancement after evaluation methodology discussion.
* Further discuss CSI prediction using one-sided model as a possible sub-use case for CSI feedback enhancement after evaluation methodology discussion
* Further discuss CSI-RS configuration and overhead reduction as a possible sub-use case for CSI feedback enhancement after evaluation methodology discussion
* Further discuss resource allocation and scheduling as a possible sub-use case for CSI feedback enhancement after evaluation methodology discussion
* Further discuss joint CSI prediction and compression as a possible sub-use case for CSI feedback enhancement after evaluation methodology discussion.

## 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, respectively.
* 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.
* Note: Joint training means the generation model and reconstruction model should be trained in the same loop for forward propagation and backward propagation. Joint training could be done both at single node or across multiple nodes (e.g., through gradient exchange between nodes).
* Note: Separate training includes sequential training starting with UE side training, or sequential training starting with NW side training [, or parallel training] at UE and NW
* Other collaboration types are not excluded.

**Conclusion**

CSI-RS configuration and overhead reduction is NOT selected as one representative sub-use case for CSI feedback enhancement use case.

**Conclusion**

Resource allocation and scheduling is NOT selected as one representative sub-use case for CSI feedback enhancement use case.

Agreement

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact on CSI report, including at least

* CSI generation model output and/or CSI reconstruction model input, including configuration(size/format) and/or potential post/pre-processing of CSI generation model output/CSI reconstruction model input.
* CQI determination
* RI determination

Agreement

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact on output CSI, including at least

* Model output type/dimension/configuration and potential post processing

Agreement

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further discuss at least the following aspects, including their necessity/feasibility/potential specification impact, for data collection for AI/ML model training/inference/update/monitoring:

* Assistance signaling for UE’s data collection
* Assistance signaling for gNB’s data collection
* Delivery of the datasets.

## RAN1 #110bis-e

Conclusion

Joint CSI prediction and CSI compression is NOT selected as one representative sub-use case for CSI feedback enhancement use case.

Conclusion

CSI accuracy enhancement based on traditional codebook design is NOT selected as one representative sub-use case for CSI feedback enhancement use case.

Conclusion

Temporal-spatial-frequency domain CSI compression using two-sided model is NOT selected as one representative sub-use case for CSI enhancement use case.

• Up to each company to report whether past CSI is used as model input for spatial-frequency domain CSI compression

***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

***Agreement***

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact related to assistance signaling and procedure for model performance monitoring***.***

***Agreement***

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact related to potential co-existence and fallback mechanisms between AI/ML-based CSI feedback mode and legacy non-AI/ML-based CSI feedback mode.

***Agreement***

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study at least the following options for performance monitoring metrics/methods:

* Intermediate KPIs as monitoring metrics (e.g., SGCS)
* Eventual KPIs (e.g., Throughput, hypothetical BLER, BLER, NACK/ACK).
* Legacy CSI based monitoring: schemes using additional legacy CSI reporting
* Other monitoring solutions, at least including the following option:
  + Input or Output data based monitoring: such as data drift between training dataset and observed dataset and out-of-distribution detection

***Agreement***

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study at least use cases of the following potential specification impact on quantization method alignment between CSI generation part at UE and CSI reconstruction part at gNB:

* Alignment of the quantization/dequantization method and the feedback message size between Network and UE

## RAN1 #111

**Agreement**

Time domain CSI prediction using UE sided model is selected as a representative sub-use case for CSI enhancement.

Note: Continue evaluation discussion in 9.2.2.1.

Note: RAN1 Defer potential specification impact discussion at 9.2.2.2 until the RAN1#112b-e, and RAN1 will revisit at RAN1#112b-e whether to defer futher till the end of R18 AI/ML SI.

Note: LCM related potential specification impact follow the high level principle of other one-sided model sub-cases.

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.

Note:

* To align terminology, output CSI assumed at UE in previous agreement will be referred as output-CSI-UE.
* To align terminology, input-CSI-NW is the input CSI assumed at NW

## RAN1 #112

*Agreement*

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study potential specification impact of the following output-CSI-UE and input-CSI-NW at least for Option 1:

* Option 1: Precoding matrix
  + 1a: The precoding matrix in spatial-frequency domain
  + 1b: The precoding matrix represented using angular-delay domain projection
* Option 2: Explicit channel matrix (i.e., full Tx \* Rx MIMO channel)
  + 2a: raw channel is in spatial-frequency domain
  + 2b: raw channel is in angular-delay domain
* Note: Whether Option 2 is also studied depends on the performance evaluations in 9.2.2.1.
* Note: RI and CQI will be discussed separately

Agreement

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the following options for CQI determination in CSI report, if CQI in CSI report is configured.

* Option 1: CQI is NOT calculated based on the output of CSI reconstruction part from the realistic channel estimation, including
  + Option 1a: CQI is calculated based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement
  + Option 1b: CQI is calculated based on target CSI with realistic channel measurement and potential adjustment
  + Option 1c: CQI is calculated based on legacy codebook
* Option 2: CQI is calculated based on the output of CSI reconstruction part from the realistic channel estimation, including
  + Option 2a: CQI is calculated based on CSI reconstruction output, if CSI reconstruction model is available at the UE and UE can perform reconstruction model inference with potential adjustment
    - Note: CSI reconstruction part at the UE can be different comparing to the actual CSI reconstruction part used at the NW.
  + Option 2b: CQI is calculated using two stage approach, UE derive CQI using precoded CSI-RS transmitted with a reconstructed precoder.
* Other options are not precluded
* Note1: feasibility of different options should be evaluated
* Note2: Gap analyses between the UE side CQI calculation results and the NW side results, as well as the impact on the scheduling performance should be evaluated
* Note3: Complexity of CQI calculation needs to be evaluated, including the computing complexity and potential RS/signaling overhead

Conclusion

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further discuss the pros/cons of different offline training collaboration types including at least the following aspects:

* Whether model can be kept proprietary
* Requirements on privacy-sensitive dataset sharing
* Flexibility to support cell/site/scenario/configuration specific model
* gNB/device specific optimization – i.e., whether hardware-specific optimization of the model is possible, e.g. compilation for the specific hardware
* Model update flexibility after deployment
* feasibility of allowing UE side and NW side to develop/update models separately
* Model performance based on evaluation in 9.2.2.1
* Whether gNB can maintain/store a single/unified model
* Whether UE device can maintain/store a single/unified model
* Extendability: to train new UE-side model compatible with NW-side model in use; Or to train new NW-side model compatible with UE-side model in use
* Whether training data distribution can be matched to the device that will use the model for inference
* Whether device capability can be considered for model development
* Other aspects are not precluded
* Note: training data collection and dataset/model delivery will be discussed separately

Agreement

* In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact of UE side data collection enhancement including at least
* Enhancement of CSI-RS configuration to enable higher accuracy measurement.
* Assistance information for UE data collection for categorizing the data in forms of ID for the purpose of differentiating characteristics of data due to specific configuration, scenarios, site etc.
  + The provision of assistance information needs to consider feasibility of disclosing proprietary information to the other side.
* Signaling for triggering the data collection
* In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further discuss the necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact for NW side data collection including at least:
* Enhancement of SRS and/or CSI-RS measurement and/or CSI reporting to enable higher accuracy measurement.
* Contents of the ground-truth CSI including:
  + Data sample type, e.g., precoding matrix, channel matrix etc.
  + Data sample format: scaler quantization and/or codebook-based quantization (e.g., e-type II like).
  + Assistance information (e.g., time stamps, and/or cell ID, Assistance information for Network data collection for categorizing the data in forms of ID for the purpose of differentiating characteristics of data due to specific configuration, scenarios, site etc., and data quality indicator)
* Latency requirement for data collection
* Signaling for triggering the data collection

Agreement

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the following aspects for CSI configuration and report:

* NW configuration to determine CSI payload size, e.g., possible CSI payload size, possible rank restriction and/or other related configuration.
* How UE determines/reports the actual CSI payload size and/or other CSI related information within constraints configured by the network.

Agreement

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the feasibility and methods to support the legacy CSI reporting principles including at least:

* The priority rule regarding CSI collision handling and CSI omission
* Codebook subset restriction
* CSI processing Unit

Agreement

In CSI compression using two-sided model use case, further study the necessity, feasibility, and potential specification impact for intermediate KPIs based monitoring including at least:

* NW-side monitoring based on the target CSI with realistic channel estimation associated to the CSI report, reported by the UE or obtained from the UE-side.
* UE-side monitoring based on the output of the CSI reconstruction model, subject to the aligned format, associated to the CSI report, indicated by the NW or obtained from the network side.
  + Network may configure a threshold criterion to facilitate UE to perform model monitoring.
* UE-side monitoring based on the output of the CSI reconstruction model at the UE-side
  + Note: CSI reconstruction model at the UE-side can be the same or different comparing to the actual CSI reconstruction model used at the NW-side.
  + Network may configure a threshold criterion to facilitate UE to perform model monitoring.
* FFS: Other solutions, e.g., UE-side uses a model that directly outputs intermediate KPI. Network-side monitoring based on target CSI measured via SRS from the UE.

Note: Monitoring approaches not based on intermediate KPI are not precluded

Note: the study of intermediate KPIs based monitoring should take into account the monitoring reliability (accuracy), overhead, complexity, and latency.
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