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*START OF CHANGES*

#### 7.2.1.3 Data collection

Data collection plays a crucial role in enabling the different use cases. Therefore, it is important to define the best approaches for collecting data to support UE-side and network-side model inference, monitoring, and training.

Table 7.2.1.3-1 lists existing data collection mechanisms available in current RAN specifications for the UE to report measurements to another entity acting as termination point for this data. As highlighted in clause 4.2, the analysis/selection of the data collection frameworks should focus on the RRC CONNECTED state for both data generation and reporting. As such, the Table can provide useful insights into existing methods with respect to various categories identified as relevant for data collection method selection.

Table 7.2.1.3-1. Existing data collection methods identified.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Involved network entity (termination point)** | **RRC state to generate data** | **Max payload size per reporting\*** | **Contents to be collected** | 1) **End-to-End report latency\*\*** | **Report type** | **Security and Privacy** |
| **Method: Logged MDT** |
| TCE/OAM(Data can be utilized by gNB) | IDLE / INACTIVE | <9kbyte | - L3 cell/beam measurements- location information- sensor information- timing information | 1) Procedure latency\*\*\*:- Latency to enter CONNECTED state- Latency to receive gNB request signalling (~20ms)2) Air interface signalling latency\*\*\*\*: - ~20ms (RRC)3) Other latency:- Forwarding latency between gNB and TCE | Upon gNB request after entering RRC\_CONNECTED | AS security via RRC messagePrivacy via user consent  |
| **Method: Immediate MDT** |
| TCE/OAM(Data can be utilized by gNB) | CONNECTED | <9kbyte | - L3 cell/beam measurements- location information- sensor information | 1) Procedure latency:- Report interval:  120ms~30min for periodic report TTT for event triggered report2) Air interface signalling latency:- ~20ms (RRC)3) Other latency:- Forwarding latency between gNB and TCE  | - Event triggered- Periodic reporting  | AS security via RRC messagePrivacy via user consent |
| **Method: L3 measurements** |
| gNB | CONNECTED | <9kbyte | L3 cell/beam measurements | 1) Procedure latency:- Report interval:  l20ms~30min for periodic report TTT for event triggered report2) Air interface signalling latency:- 20ms (RRC) | - Event triggered report- Periodic reporting | AS security via RRC message |
| **Method: L1 measurement (CSI reporting)** |
| gNB | CONNECTED | <1706bit in PUCCH<3840bit in PUSCH | L1 CSI measurement | 1) Procedure latency:- Report interval:  4-320 slot for periodic and semi-persistent report  0-32 slot after reception of DCI for aperiodic report 2) Air interface signalling latency:- 1 TTI (PUCCH)  | - Aperiodic report- Semi-persistent report- Periodic report | No AS security |
| **Method: UE Assistance Information (UAI)** |
| gNB | CONNECTED | <9kbyte | Assistance information to show UE preference | 1) Procedure latency:- Upon generation of UE's preference2) Air interface signalling latency:- ~20ms (RRC) | Up to UE implementation when to report | AS security via RRC message |
| **Method: Early measurements** |
| gNB | IDLE / INACTIVE | <9kbyte | L3 cell/beam measurements | 1) Procedure latency:- Latency to enter CONNECTED state- Latency to receive gNB request signalling (~20ms)2) Air interface signalling latency: - ~20ms (RRC) | Upon gNB request after entering RRC\_CONNECTED | AS security via RRC message |
| **Method: LPP** |
| LMF | CONNECTED | <9kbyte | Location information | 1) Procedure latency:- Latency to get upper layer trigger (for UE triggered)- Or latency to receive network request message (~20ms)2) Air interface signalling latency: - ~20ms (RRC)3) Other latency:- Forwarding latency between gNB and LMF | - UE-triggered- Network-triggered | AS security via RRC message |
| \*: The payload size doesn't consider signalling overhead.\*\*: The End-to-End report latency is the latency from availability of the measurement report at the UE side to the availability of the measurement report at the terminated network entity. The time to generate data or perform measurements depends on RAN1/RAN4 specification.\*\*\*: Procedure latency is the latency caused by procedures, including procedure to ready for reporting (e.g., entering CONNECTED state, report interval).\*\*\*\*: Air interface signalling latency is the latency to transmit one report, e.g., RRC signalling latency or PUCCH signalling latency. |

*NEXT CHANGE*

##### 7.2.1.3.2 Data collection for UE-side model training

The following options were discussed in RAN2:

1a. UE collects and directly transfers training data to the data collection entity outside the MNO (e.g. Over-The-Top (OTT) server) for UE-side model training. No 3GPP specification impact is expected.

1b. UE collects training data and transfers it to the server for data collection for UE-side model training (inside the MNO) and then optionally from the server for data collection for UE-side model training to the OTT server (outside the MNO).

2. UE collects training data and transfers it to Core Network. Core Network transfers the training data to the server for data collection for UE-side model training/OTT server.

3. UE collects training data and transfers it to OAM. OAM transfers the training data to the server for data collection for UE-side model training/OTT server.

The options listed above were analysed to understand potential specification impact. The analysis included aspects such as termination entities, data transfer path, whether control plane (CP) or user plane (UP) should be used to transfer the data, protocol layers involved, MNO controllability and visibility over the collected data, etc. The result of this analysis can be found below in Table 7.2.1.3.2-1.

It is worth noting that different options for the data content visibility were discussed. The different levels of data content visibility are captured in the Note 3 in the Table 7.2.1.3.2-1.

Note: RAN2 discussed that, except for the case of standardized data content, the data content visibility and any level of controllability could be achieved via SLA (Service Level Agreement). However, SLA is out of RAN2 scope.

Table 7.2.1.3.2-1. Analysis of different data collection options for UE-side model training.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Option****Aspect** | **Option 1a)** | **Option 1b)** | **Option 2** | **Option 3** |
| **First termination entity** | Training entity (e.g., Over-The-Top (OTT) server) | Server for data collection for UE-side model training | Inside the CN  | Inside OAM domain |
| **AI/ML-specific Data Transfer Path** | UE to OTT server via either 3GPP or non-3GPP network | UE ->Server for data collection for UE-side model training/OTT server(Note 4) | UE-> CN -> Server for data collection for UE-side model training/OTT server(Note 4) | UE-> gNB->OAM -> Server for data collection for UE-side model training/OTT server(Note 4) |
| **UP/CP tunnel** | UP tunnel (for the case of data transfer from UE to OTT server via 3GPP network) | UP tunnel  | CP tunnel (provided that the data volume remains within the NAS signalling capacity)FFS: UP tunnel (Note 7) | CP tunnel (provided that the data volume remains within the RRC signalling capacity)FFS: UP tunnel(Note 7) |
| **Protocol layer for data transfer** | Application layer | Application layer | NAS layer for CP tunnelFFS: the protocol layer for UP tunnel | RRC layer for CP tunnelFFS: the protocol layer for UP tunnel |
| **Controllability of MNO on data transfer** | No AI/ML specific controllability | FFS: level of controllability(Note 5)(Note 1) | Full controllability (Note 1) | Full controllability(Note 1) |
| **Solution for network controllability** | N/A (the OTT server can directly request data from the UE) | Example: per PDU sessions  | Via NAS procedure or FFS other procedures | Via RRC procedure |
| **Possible Options for data content visibility in MNO** (Note 2, Note 3) | No standardized visibility | FFS on level of visibility(Note 5) | Opt A) Full visibility for standardized data contents.Opt B) Partial visibility for partially standardized data contents. (Note 6)Opt C) No standardized visibility.(Note 6) | Opt A) Full visibility for standardized data contents.Opt B) Partial visibility for partially standardized data contents. (Note 6)Opt C) No standardized visibility.(Note 6) |
| **Impacted WGs** | N/A | SA2, SA3, RAN2, RAN3, CT1 | SA2, SA3, RAN3, RAN2, CT1 and CT3 | RAN2, RAN3, SA3, SA5, SA2 |
| * Note 1: Full controllability: The MNO can manage data transfer to the server for UE-side data collection, without the need of SLA. This includes initiating, terminating, and fully managing data transfer.
* Note 2: Visibility of data content signifies that the MNO can, at least, be aware of, access, and comprehend the data without the need of SLA.
* Note 3: The following options are identified to realize the different levels of data content visibility to the MNO:
	+ Full visibility for standardized data content.
	+ Partial visibility for partially standardized data content (e.g. UE proprietary information can be included transparently together with the standardized data message).
	+ No standardized visibility (e.g. UE proprietary information can only be included transparently).
* Note 4: The potential involvement of NF or other higher layers entities/functionalities should be discussed in other WGs. Impact on the OTT server is not in the scope of RAN2 discussion.
* Note 5: RAN2 cannot reach consensus on the level of possible MNO controllability and visibility via Option 1b without input from SA groups.
* Note 6: RAN2 has not concluded on the need for partial and no visibility options.
* Note 7: RAN2 cannot reach consensus on the feasibility of UP tunnel in Options 2 and 3
 |

Related to privacy, it has been stressed in RAN2 the importance that any potential mechanism to collect UE side data for model training purposes (including the options 1a, 1b, 2, 3 listed above) must comply with privacy protection regulations, requirements, laws and/or policies. An informative Annex is included at the end of this document capturing examples of privacy concerns for different stakeholders participating in the discussion.

*NEXT CHANGE*

Annex <Y>:
Informative Annex: Privacy concerns

This Annex compiles some examples of privacy concerns on data collection for UE-side model training raised by stakeholders during RAN2’s discussion.

MNO:

* Network Information Disclosure: MNOs may inadvertently disclose sensitive network information, such as deployment strategies, network configurations, and performance metrics, to servers outside their network.
* Data Transfer Risks: MNOs are obliged to protect private and/or undisclosed information about the network of users/customers when transferring data to external servers. This information may be disclosed/leaked without authorization. This could include subscriber identities, locations, website visited, phone calls, etc.
* Regulatory Restrictions: Operators are bound by regulations which mandate the protection of customer data. Thus, any lack of control over data may lead to unwanted exposure of personal information. Non-compliance with regulatory guidelines due to improper data handling could result in significant fines or restrictions for the operators.

Network Vendor:

* Sensitive Information Leakage: Network vendors may possess proprietary algorithms, system designs, and other intellectual property that are integral to their competitive edge. Unintentional disclosure of such information to third parties could undermine their market position and lead to potential legal issues.
* Implementation Details Exposure: The specific details of how network equipment is implemented, including software and hardware design, are crucial for maintaining the security and integrity of the network. If such information is disclosed, it could be exploited for malicious purposes or used by competitors to gain insights into the vendor's technology.
* Radio Topology and Settings Disclosure: Disclosing details such as radio topology and specific radio configurations should be prevented, because such information is sensitive and could affect operational security.
* Violation of user privacy regulation: The equipment of the network vendor may be used for collecting user’s data without getting approval/consent from the user in advance, and this behaviour may violate the local regulations and risks the sales of the equipment.

Chipset Vendor:

* Proprietary Technology Exposure: Chipset vendors develop specialized hardware and software that may contain trade secrets or patented technologies. There is a risk that the sensitive data could be exposed to a second vendor without the original chipset vendor's knowledge, which could compromise their competitive advantage and innovation.
* Respect for Implementation Secrecy: There is a universal understanding within the industry that chipset vendors often add proprietary layers on top of standardized specifications, and these unique implementations are critical for maintaining a diverse and successful ecosystem. The non-disclosure of such proprietary information is seen as essential for the continued success of industry standards.

OEM:

* User Information Disclosure: OEMs handle a vast amount of user data, including personal information, usage habits, and location data. There is a significant privacy concern if this information is disclosed to external entities without user consent, potentially violating privacy laws and damaging the OEM's reputation. OEMs are adamant that user data should not be shared with third-party entities without explicit and informed user consent, since a UE vendor might be legally bound by a data protection agreement with the end-user.
* Proprietary Technology Exposure: OEM vendors develop specialized hardware and software that may contain trade secrets or patented technologies. There is a risk that this information could be unintentionally disclosed to unauthorized parties, leading to privacy breaches. Another risk is that some sensitive data of an OEM vendor may be exposed to third parties without the knowledge of the OEM vendor.

*END OF CHANGES*