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# Introduction

The draft covers following offline discussion:

1, Generalization issue i.e. the simulation combination of UE speed

2, Open simulation assumptions for measurement event and RLF prediction and SLS.

# Discussion

## Generalization issue

During online discussion RAN2 agreed:

|  |
| --- |
| **Agreements**   1. Reuse the evaluation methodology in TR38.843 for generalization study, i.e., the generalization performance is evaluated with the following cases,  * *Baseline:* The AI/ML model is trained using the dataset with Configuration #B and tested using the dataset with Configuration #B. * *Generalization Case #1 (GC#1):* The AI/ML model is trained using the dataset with Configuration #A but tested using the dataset with Configuration #B. * *Generalization Case #2 (GC#2):* The AI/ML model is trained using mixed datasets with both configurations and tested using the dataset with Configuration #B.   2 Companies can choose which case they compare with and should report it with simulation results.  3 Generalization issues on RRM measurement prediction are prioritized.  4 Start the study with generalization issue with RRM measurement prediction in temporal domain. Companies can chose to study frequency domain prediction cases and report what they have simulated. |

* Study generalization over UE speeds
* The simulation assumption of FR1 temporal domain case B is reused for generalization study with 3 UE speeds i.e. 30Km/h, 60Km/h and 90Km/h. FFS on combinations
* The simulation assumption of FR2 temporal domain case A is reused for generalization study with 3 UE speeds i.e. 60Km/h, 90Km/h and 120Km/h. FFS on combinations

In order to understand better, the following table list all the simulation combinations for 1 baseline UE speed i.e. 30km/h for FR1 temporal domain case B:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Training @Dataset: 30km/h | Training @Dataset: 60km/h | Training @Dataset: 90km/h | Inference @30km/h | Inference @60km/h | Inference @90km/h |
| Baseline | Yes |  |  | Yes |  |  |
| GC#1 | Yes |  |  |  | Yes |  |
| GC#1 | Yes |  |  |  |  | Yes |
| GC#2 | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  |
| GC#2 | Yes | Yes | Yes |  | Yes |  |
| GC#2 | Yes | Yes | Yes |  |  | Yes |

Table 2.1-1 simulation combinations

If the UE speed in baseline is changed to e.g. 60km/h, then more training and more inference are needed. Here is the statistics:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Baseline UE speed | Number of models to be trained | Number of inferences |
| 1 | 2 | 6 |
| 2 | 3 | 9 |
| 3 | 4 | 12 |

**Question 1: Do you share rapporteur’s understanding of the simulation combination?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/no | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |

If company think there is too much simulation combinations, one potential way is to set less UE speed e.g. only one UE speed as baseline.

**Question 2: Do you agree one potential way to limit the simulation combination is to limit the number of UE speed as baseline? If yes, please indicate whether 1 UE speed is sufficient. If no, please provide your opinion in detail.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/no | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes | We could consider the lowest and the highest speed as input and for inference. |

## Measurement event prediction (part 1)

After post email discussion [1], here is part of proposal 9 by removing direct prediction specific parameters. In addition, in current TR the set of UE speed is 60/90/120 km/h for 2nd study goal, we need respect that and hence 30km/h is removed from 3rd column. The main discussion point is baseline value in 2nd column. Note the removed parameters related to direct prediction will be discussed as part 2 in section 2.5.

**Proposal 1: To agree the baseline value for the listed parameters for intra-frequency temporal domain case A and open for more values for some of the parameters as indicated in the table below:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameters | baseline value | Note |
| A3 event offset (db) | 2 |  |
| TTT (ms) | 320 | Open for one shorter value |
| UE speed (km/h) | 90 | Open for ~~30 ,~~ 60 and 120km/h |
| OW length (ms) | N/A | Up to implementation |
| PW length (ms) | 400 | Open for more values |
| Max ETD (ms, note1) | 80 | Open for more values |
| ~~Event occurrence Window Length (ms, note 2)~~ | ~~N/A~~ | ~~Up to conclusion under question 2~~ |
| ~~Probability threshold (%, note 2)~~ | ~~80%~~ | ~~Open for more values~~ |

*Note1: parameters for indirect prediction*

Table 2.2-1 Parameters for measurement event prediction of temporal domain case A

**Question 2: Do you agree with the content listed in the table 2.2-1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No? | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

For temporal domain case B, here is proposal 10 in [1]:

**Proposal 3: To agree the baseline value for the listed parameter for intra-frequency temporal domain case B and open for more values for some of the parameters as indicated in the table below:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Parameters | baseline value | Note |
| A3 event offset (db) | 2 |  |
| TTT (ms) | 320 | Open for one shorter value |
| UE speed (km/h) | 30 | Open for 60 and 90km/h |
| OW length (ms) | N/A | Up to implementation |
| PW length (ms) | N/A | Up to implementation |
| Max ETD (ms, note1) | 40 | Open for more values |
| MRRT | 50% | Open for more values |

Table 2.2-2 Parameters for measurement event prediction of temporal domain case B

In table 2.2-2, one more parameter i.e. MRRT is added in the same table by combining proposal 11 as below:

Proposal 11: For intra-frequency temporal domain case B, RAN2 is invited to discuss whether MRRT=50% could be baseline value

**Question 4: Do you agree with the content listed in the table 2.1-2?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No? | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

Another issue for temporal domain case B is the filtering options for input L3 RSRP of the model. There are 3 options listed in the proposal 12 as below:

**Proposal 12: For intra-frequency temporal domain case B company can report following filtering options for input L3 RSRP measurement in sub-use case 2:**

**Filtering option 1: L3 filtering is based on its L1 filtered result and the immediate last skipped measurement result;**

**Filtering option 2: L3 filtering is based on its L1 filtered result i.e. no L3 filtering if the immediate last result is skipped;**

**Filtering option 3: L3 filtering is based on the L1 filtered result and last actual measurement result i.e. the skipped result(s) in between is ignored.**

**For indirect prediction, the skipped result refers to predicted L3 RSRP measurement result previously by the RRM measurement prediction model**

**For direct prediction, the skipped result refers to skipped L1 measurement result**

It could be difficult to reach consensus about the options. But it will be helpful to understand preference from company so that RAN2 can know which option is preferred by the majority company.

**Question 5: Which option are your favourite option?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option 1/2/3 | Comments |
| Ericsson | Option 1 |  |
|  |  |  |

## RLF prediction (part 1)

Here is the parameter for RLF prediction by combining proposal 18 and proposal 23 in [1] by removing direct prediction specific parameters. Note the removed parameters related to direct prediction will be discussed as part 2 in section 2.5. In addition, for indirect prediction OW length and PW length should be also assumed.

**Proposal 18: To agree on following parameter for RLF prediction:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Parameter | Value |
| Qin threshold | -6db |
| Qout threshold | -8db |
| Sample rate (TIndication\_interval) | 20ms(FR2)/40ms(FR1) |
| Qin evaluation period | 100ms |
| Qout evaluation period | 200ms |
| T310 | 1000ms |
| N310 | 1 |
| N311 | 1 |
| Max ETD (ms, note1) | 20ms(FR2)/40ms(FR1) |
| ~~Event occurrence Window Length (ms, note 2)~~ | ~~Under discussion in question 13~~ |
| ~~Probability threshold (%, note 2)~~ | ~~80%~~ |
| The number of beams for FR1 fixed beam pattern | 1 |
| The number of beams for FR2 fixed beam pattern | ~~4~~ |
| PW length (ms) | 400 |
| OW length (ms) | Up to implementation |

Table 2.3-1 Parameters for RLF prediction

**Question 6: Do you agree with the content listed in the table 2.3-1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/No? | Comments |
| KDDI | No. See comments | We suggest to consider blockage in a channel model to ensure realistic performance evaluation of RLF prediction. We see some companies want to consider blockage. Considering the workload, option1 can be chosen.  **Proposal: RAN2 to choose from the following options in order to collect more RLF event.**  **Option1. Blockage in a channel model is allowed to consider and how to model the blockage can be up to companies.**  **Option2. Parameters related to blockage in a channel model are added below.**  Considering the workload, Model A can be selected (clause 7.6.4 of TR 38.901).  For Blockage model A of RLF prediction, unify required parameters of Blockage model A, or determine the rules for describing parameters.   * + - The number of blocker *K* (the standard number is *K* = 4).     - Scenarios for deciding non-self-blocking regions parameters given in Table 7.6.4.1-2 of TS 38.901.     - Scenarios for deciding spatial correlation distance given in Table 7.6.4.1-4 of TS 38.901.     - Whether the blocker has movement speed *v.*     - Are there any other missing configurable parameters? |
| Ericsson | Partly | We think ETD can be 80 ms, the prediction needs to be very precise otherwise. |

## System level simulation (part 1)

The issue left for SLS is the handover model for both temporal domain case A and case B. To facilitate the discussion, this section focuses on case that measurement event is predicted indirectly so that the predicted time instance i.e., t1 in the context is clear.

For temporal domain case B, if the last measurement results to derive the measurement event is actual measurement, then there is the time to report the measurement result i.e. t0 and the time of event occurrence i.e. t1 is the same, then there is no ambiguity about handover model because legacy handover model can be adopted. But if the last measurement result is predicted one, then t1>t0. In this case there are two options:

 

Figure 2.4-1 Option 1 for case B Figure 2.4-2 Option 2 for case B

**Option 1:** UE report measurement report @t0 as illustrated in Figure 2.3-1 when it is predicted. Network start handover preparation once the measurement report is received. Since t1>t0, handover command could be received @ max(HO prep, t1-t0)

**Option 2:** UE delay to t1 to report measurement result as if the predicted measurement event occurs there. Network starts the preparation after receiving the measurement report. And handover command will be received after handover preparation.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Case B | Pro | Con |
| Option 1 | (partial) handover preparation time can be saved so that HO CMD can be received early | Mixed the study between case A and case B |
| Option 2 | The evaluation is purely for 1st study goal i.e. decouple from case A | the benefit of the model is wasted |

Table 2.4-1 analysis between 2 options

**Question 7: Which option of handover model for temporal domain case B do you prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option 1/2 | Comments |
| Ericsson | Out of these options, option 1 | No benefits of predictions with option 2. We could also leave it to company implementation. |
|  |  |  |

As for handover model for temporal domain case A, there are two options in the summarized proposal 25:

Proposal 25: As for simulation base on temporal domain case A, RAN2 conclude one of the two options to decide exactly when to transmit handover command:

**Option 1:** if there is an actual measurement event occurring (@ t2) before the predicted measurement event (@t1), then network will transmit handover command based on actual measurement event ,or otherwise on predicted measurement event(@t1).

**Option 2:** network transmit handover command purely based on actual measurement event regardless whether an actual measurement result(@t2) is earlier or later than predicted measurement event((@t1))

Another option is proposed in [3] as following:

Proposal 1(**Option 3**): For AI mobility, HO preparation starts when an event is predicted to happen (i.e., t0), and HO command is sent when A3 entering conditions are met based on actual/real measurement and an event is predicted to be met for the duration of TTT. Using the timing from the figures: HO command is sent at t3, where t3=t0+max(HO prep time, t1-t0-TTT), provided that entering conditions of the event are met based on real/actual measurement at t3.

 

Figure 2.4-3 Figure 2.4-4



Figure 2.4-5 Figure 2.4-6

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Case | Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
| Case 1: Actual event is earlier than predicted event | Figure 2.3-4 @ t2 | Figure 2.3-4 @ t2 | Figure 2.3-6 @ t1-TTT |
| Case 2: actual event is later than predicted event | Figure 2.3-3 @ t1 | Figure 2.3-5 @ t2 | Figure 2.3-6 @ t1-TTT |

Table 2.4-2 when HO CMD is received

For all 3 options, if HO preparation can’t be completed before the time supposing to receive HO CMD, then HO CMD is delayed until HO preparation is finished.

**Question 8: Which option of handover model for temporal domain case A do you prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Option 1/2/3 | Comments |
| Ericsson | Out of these options, option 1 | Regarding option 3, the formula should not contain TTT, since it is already taken into account when the event prediction is triggered (at t1). The event prediction is triggered when the cell quality is predicted to be higher than a certain threshold for the TTT time. So, the predicted event is triggered (at t1) TTT ms in advance. |
|  |  |  |

## Direct prediction

### Common issue

The common issue for both measurement event prediction and RLF prediction is how to interpret the time window where a measurement event/RLF can be predicted. Rapporteur put two interpretations on the table for temporal domain case A:



Figure 2.5.1-1 Interpretation 1 of time window



Figure 2.5.1-2 Interpretation 2 of time window

In the summary of post email [1] some company propose there could be multiple time windows in the prediction window. Rapporteur think it is not aligned with the agreement in RAN2#127 bis meeting as following:

For direct measurement event prediction, the model output is the probability of event occurrence within a time window



Figure 2.5.1-3 intermediate time windows

But it seems gives a way to achieve interpretation 1 by the model. It can be assumed that model can predict several time windows in future, among which there are different probability. Then there must be a time window with highest probability and hence this time window should be chosen if the probabilty is higher than preconfigured threshold. However, if a model can only predict one time window in future, then interpretation 2 is feasible.

**Question 9: Which interpretation of time window for direct prediction do you prefer?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Interpretation 1/2 | Comments |
| Ericsson | Interpretation 1 |  |
|  |  |  |

Regardless which interpretation is chosen, we still need figure the length of the time window for both measurement event prediction and RLF prediction. To align with indirect prediction, it could be equal to the parameter max ETD for interpretation 1 and equal to length of PW for interpretation 2.

Here is recommended value for time window length and probability threshold:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Measurement event prediction | RLF prediction |
| Time window length (Interpretation 1) | 80ms | 20ms |
| Time window length (Interpretation 2) | 400ms | 400ms |
| Probability threshold | 80% | 80% |

Table 2.5.1-1

**Question 10: Do you agree with the parameters in table 2.5.1-1?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/no | Comments |
| Ericsson | Partly | We think ETD can be the same for RLF prediction as for event prediction, i.e. 80 ms. |
|  |  |  |

### System level simulation (part 2)

For the handover model option 1 and option 3, it matters when the predicted measurement event occurs i.e., t1. For both interpretation 1 and 2. For direct prediction, a straight way is that t1 is in the middle of the time window. If option 2 is approved, then this issue is not valid any more.

**Question 11: Do you agree predicted measurement event occurs in the middle of the time window for the sake of handover modelling?**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Company | Yes/no | Comments |
| Ericsson | Yes |  |
|  |  |  |

# Conclusion
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