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# 1 Introduction

This is the summary of below offline discussion:

[R2-2300708](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cjohan%5COneDrive%5CDokument%5C3GPP%5Ctsg_ran%5CWG2_RL2%5CRAN2%5CDocs%5CR2-2300708.zip) Open issues on AI/ML model delivery and data collection in post-meeting email discussion Apple discussion Rel-18 FS\_NR\_AIML\_air

- QC think we need the requirement.

* The table in this doc is endorsed as starting point
* Offline 025 (Apple) progress the table of methods and characteristics. Aim to endorse.

# 2 Discussion

The table 2 of R2-2300708 was endorsed as starting point of discussion. So, the table is copied below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Terminated entity | Allowed payload size  | Report latency | Supported report type | Security and Privacy |
| Logged MDT | Between UE and TCE/OAM | <=64kbyte (MDT buffer size limit) | Long (Reported after entering CONNECTED) | Upon gNB request after entering CONNECTED | Security via RRC message,Privacy via user consent  |
| Immediate MDT | Between UE and TCE/OAM | <=9kbyte or 144kbyte(with 16 segments) | Medium(~20ms RRC signaling latency) | Event triggered report,Periodic reporting | Security via RRC message,Privacy via user consent |
| L3 measurements | Between UE and gNB | <=9kbyte or 144kbyte(with 16 segments) | Medium(~20ms RRC signaling latency) | Event triggered report,Periodic reporting | Security via RRC message |
| L1 measurement (CSI reporting) | Between UE and gNB | Small(<1706bit in PUCCH, <3840bit in PUSCH) | Short(can be symbol or slot level) | Aperiodic report,Semi-persistent report,Periodic report | No security |
| UAI | Between UE and gNB | <=9kbyte or 144kbyte(with 16 segments) | Medium(~20ms RRC signaling latency) | Up to UE implementation when to report | Security via RRC message |
| Early measurements | Between UE and gNB | <=9kbyte or 144kbyte(with 16 segments) | Long (Reported after entering CONNECTED) | Upon gNB request after entering CONNECTED | Security via RRC message |
| LPP | Between UE and LMF | <=64K payload (NAS payload container limit) | Longer than L3 measurement (Extra forward latency between LMF and gNB) | UE-triggered or NW-triggered | Security via RRC message |

To make progress, Rapporteur would like to collect companies' view on below 2 questions. The table will be updated based on companies' input.

First, Rapporteur would like to collect companies' comments on reviewing the existing contents of the table.

**Q1: Companies are invited to share their comments on the existing contents of the table (Please do not insert comments or make trackable edits in above table, which will be hard for Rapporteur to track and respond your comments)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Comments on existing contents of the table** | **Rapporteur response** |
| Intel | We think report latency may misleading it is the delay of the whole data collection framework. We prefer to change it into “signaling delay” to reflect it is the signaling processing delay, rather than collection, etc. More latency could also be considered, measurement duration, report interval, etc, as we raised in next response.  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Then, during online discussion, some companies suggested to add more columns for the table (i.e. other performance metrics of data collection framework). To make progress,Rapporteur would like to collect companies' view. Meanwhile please note that EVEX framework was agreed that it can be discussed next meeting because companies need more time to understand this framework.

* R2 may consider including the existing EVEX framework for this SI, FFS exactly what this means, can discuss next meeting.

Thus, **we will not discuss EVEX framework in this offline discussion**.

**Q2: Companies are invited to share their view whether / what other performance metrics can be added as new column(s) of the table.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Please provide other performance metric(s) you think necessary. If any, please also provide your analysis of the new metric(s) for these data collection framework.** | **Rapporteur response** |
| Intel | we think it would be good to also consider other aspects to compare: 1) suitable data type, 2) measurement duration, 3) report interval, as those may reflect the potential latency of different data collection framework. Hence, we propose to merge below information in R2-2300418 with above table:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Suitable data type | Measurement duration | Report interval |
| Logged MDT | Non-urgent data, including location info | Min: 10minMax: 120min | Min: 320msMax: infinity |
| Immediate MDT | Min: 120msMax: 30min | Min: 120msMax: 30min |
| RRM measurement reports | Real-time radio performance |
| UE assistance information | Assistance information to show UE preference  | Sec-levelVaries from 0s to 600s depends on the reported data | Configuration or upon change of problem information |
| LPP Provide location information | Location information | immediate | Per request |
| CSI reporting framework | CSI reporting  | Slot-levelMin: 4 slotMax: 320 slot | Slot-levelMin: 4 slotMax: 320 slot |

 |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# 3 Conclusion

We will update table based on companies' input.
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