3GPP TSG RAN WG1 #109-e R1-220xxxx

e-Meeting, May 9th – 20th, 2022

Source: Moderator (OPPO)

Title: Discussion summary#3 for other aspects on AI/ML for beam management

Agenda Item: 9.2.3.2

Document for: Discussion and Decision

# Introduction

The Rel-18 WID of AI/ML for NR Air Interface focuses on a subset of three typical use cases:

1. CSI feedback enhancement
2. Beam management
3. Positioning accuracy improvement.

This document focuses on the other aspects of AI/ML for beam managements, including representative sub use cases and potential specification impact. The company proposals are summarized, and offline proposals drafted passed on company contributions.

Regarding the file names, companies are encouraged to follow the guidance of R1-2203012 (Page 16) as below:

|  |
| --- |
| * + - To avoid ending-up with too long file names and downloading/opening issues, the following naming convention is recommended:       * Keep the previous company’s name (only the most recent one) in the filename, e.g.         + 5/Summary-1-v000-Moderator (HW)         + 5/Summary-1-v001-LG         + 5/Summary-1-v002-LG-CATT         + 5/Summary-1-v003-CATT-vivo         + 5/Summary-1-v004-Moderator(HW)       * It helps identifying on which previous version your input is based on and solve any crossing emails issue. Note the use of 3digit version numbers in the file names. |
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# Summary of Contributions and Offline Proposals

## Sub use cases

The objective on the use case of beam management is captured in R18 SID (RP-213599) as below:

|  |
| --- |
| Use cases to focus on:   * Initial set of use cases includes:   + CSI feedback enhancement, e.g., overhead reduction, improved accuracy, prediction [RAN1]   + **Beam management, e.g., beam prediction in time, and/or spatial domain for overhead and latency reduction, beam selection accuracy improvement [RAN1]**   + Positioning accuracy enhancements for different scenarios including, e.g., those with heavy NLOS conditions [RAN1] * Finalize representative sub use cases for each use case for characterization and baseline performance evaluations by RAN#98   + The AI/ML approaches for the selected sub use cases need to be diverse enough to support various requirements on the gNB-UE collaboration levels |

Following the SID, companies proposed a dozen of sub use cases for AI/ML-based beam management with different inputs, different outputs, different functionalities, different benefits and so on. The detailed observations and proposals are collected in Section 4.

### Categories and typical sub use cases

In order to facilitate the subsequent discussions, we categorize the diverse sub use cases, proposed by all the contributions of RAN1#109e, into the following types:

* Cat1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction
  + **BM-Case1:** Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams
* Cat2: Time-domain DL beam prediction
  + **BM-Case2:** Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams
* Cat3: Others
  + **BM-Case3:** Beam prediction for higher frequency band (e.g., a band in FR2) based on measurement results of lower frequency band(s) (e.g., a band in FR1)
  + **BM-Case4:** Beam prediction based on UE positioning/trajectory
  + **~~BM-Case5:~~** ~~Beam prediction in terms of Qos~~
  + **BM-Case6:** Spatial-domain UL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams
  + **BM-Case7:** beam measurement feedback compression
  + **BM-Case8:** Parameter optimization to improve performance of multi-beam system

For **BM-Case1**, the main idea is that AI/ML model is to predict the top-N1 DL beams out of Set A based on the measurement results of Set B of beams. There were different options proposed by contributions for Set A and Set B and companies’ views are as below:

* Set B is a sub set of Set A.
  + Huawei [1], ZTE [2], Ericsson [3], IDC[4], CATT [5], vivo [6], NEC [7], Xiaomi [9], Samsung[10], OPPO[11], Beijing Jiaotong University[12], Panasonic [13], FUTUREWEI[14], CIACT[16], Apple[17], CMCC[18], Lenovo[20], Spreadtrum[21], TCL[22], Nokia[23], Intel[24], NVIDIA[25], Mavenir [27], QC[28], Fujitsu[29]
* Set A consists of narrow beams whereas Set B consists of wide beams
  + CATT [5], vivo [6], DOCOMO[19], Nokia[23], QC[28]

When N1 > 1, a second stage may be needed, i.e., the best beam is further selected based on the sweeping of AI/ML-predicted N1 beams. While most companies discussed the DL Tx beam predictions, there was also some companies discussing the DL Rx beam predictions, e.g., SS[10], Intel[24].

For **BM-Case2**, the main idea is that AL/ML model is to predict the information of DL beam(s) for future time based on historic measurement results. There were different proposals based on the contributions for the information of beam(s):

* Top-N2 beams and the predicted L1-RSRP
  + Huawei [1], ZTE [2], Ericsson [3], IDC[4], CATT [5], vivo [6], NEC [7], Sony[8], Xiaomi [9] (lower priority compared to Case 1), Samsung[10], OPPO[11] (lower priority compared to Case 1), Panasonic [13], FUTUREWEI[14], LGE[15] (high priority), Apple[17], DOCOMO[19], Spreadtrum[21], TCL[22], Nokia[23], Intel[24], NVIDIA[25], Mavenir [27], QC[28]
* Beam dwelling time
  + ZTE[2], NEC [7], Apple[17]
* Beam failure / blockage
  + Panasonic[13], TCL[22], QC[28]
* New candidate beam
  + Panasonic[13], TCL[22]

For **BM-Case3**, the main idea is that AL/ML model is to predict the top-N3 DL beams for a frequency band in FR2 based on the measurement results of a lower frequency band, which can be in FR1. A second stage is usually used to further the best beam by utilizing the sweeping of AI/ML-predicted N3 beams.

For **BM-Case4**, the main idea is that AL/ML model is to predict the best beams based on UE location/trajectory. For this case, new type of UE measurement/reporting, rather than beam management measurement/reporting, will be used.

~~For~~ **~~BM-Case5~~**~~, the best beam is predicted according to the QoS class and its requirements. The main motivation is that UEs are sometimes scheduled to a beam that is not the strongest (signal strength wise) but a beam that can improve the UEs QoS metrics. Nokia [23] suggested reinforcement learning for this case.~~

For **BM-Case6**, the main idea is that AI/ML model is to predict the top-N6 UL beams out of Set A based on the measurement results of Set B of beams, where Set B is a subset of Set A. Generally speaking, BM-Case6 is the counterpart of BM-Case1 for the UL beam management.

For **BM-Case7**, the main idea is that UE generates the reported results by using AI/ML-based encoder (for compression) based on the beam measurement results and gNB recovers the beam information by using the corresponding AI/ML-based decoder.

For **BM-Case8**, one example in Mavenir[27] is that AI/ML model is to optimize the beam-specific cell individual offset (CFO) and Time-to-Trigger (TTT) parameters in real time or, near-real time. This would reduce the cases of too early, too late switches, ping-pong effects and switching failures and thus, reduce the latency and the outage rate. In general, it is to improve the beam-based mobility. Another example in Charter[30] is to optimize vector-quantized codebook for beam management on the gNB side.

Companies’ views are summarized in the following table:

Table 1: Sub use cases and categories

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Category | Sub use case | Supported or mentioned (but doesn’t explicitly say no or low priority) by companies |
| Cat1:  Spatial-domain DL beam prediction | **BM-Case1:** Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams | 26  Huawei [1], ZTE [2], Ericsson [3], IDC[4], CATT [5], vivo [6], NEC [7], Xiaomi [9], Samsung[10], OPPO[11], Beijing Jiaotong University[12], Panasonic [13], FUTUREWEI[14], CIACT[16], Apple[17], CMCC[18], DOCOMO[19], Lenovo[20], Spreadtrum[21], TCL[22], Nokia[23], Intel[24], NVIDIA[25], Mavenir [27], QC[28], Fujitsu[29] |
| **BM-Case3:** Beam prediction for higher frequency band (e.g., a band in FR2) based on measurement results of lower frequency band(s) (e.g., a band in FR1) | 2  Sony[8], Apple[17], |
| **BM-Case4:** Beam prediction based on UE positioning/trajectory | 2  Sony [8], Lenovo[20], PML[31] |
| **~~BM-Case5:~~** ~~Beam prediction in terms of Qos~~ | ~~1~~  ~~Nokia[23]~~ |
| **BM-Case6:** Spatial-domain UL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams | 1  Samsung[10], |
| **BM-Case9:** Joint DL/UL beam pair link prediction | Intel[24] |
| Cat2:  Time-domain DL beam prediction | **BM-Case2:** Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams | 22  Huawei [1], ZTE [2], Ericsson [3], IDC[4], CATT [5], vivo [6], NEC [7], Sony[8], Samsung[10], OPPO[11], Panasonic [13], FUTUREWEI[14], LGE[15], Apple[17], DOCOMO[19], Spreadtrum[21], TCL[22], Nokia[23], Intel[24], NVIDIA[25], Mavenir [27], QC[28], PML[31] |
| Cat3: Others | **BM-Case7:** beam measurement feedback compression | 1  Samsung[10], |
| **BM-Case8:** The beam-specific parameter optimization | 2  Mavenir[27], Charter[30] |

Please provide your input with regard to the following aspects:

* Is any sub use case proposed in some tdoc(s) missing? If so, please add the related information including the brief description of the new sub use cases, the corresponding tdoc, and so on
* Is the position of some company misunderstood or wrongly captured? If so, please correct me.
* Descriptions of the above sub use cases
* …

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We are fine to divide all use cases into two categories: 1) spatial domain beam prediction, 2) time domain beam prediction, 3) other. But it seems case 1, 3, 4, 5 are for spatial domain beam prediction, which should be under cat 1.  In addition, if case 2 includes beam dwelling time prediction, we suggest we explicitly mention that. From current formulation, it seems this only includes beam index prediction.  FL: It is listed as an alternative in Proposal 3-5. Hope it can avoid the confusion. |
| Lenovo | We are generally fine with this categorization, and we are also a supporter of case 2.  However, we understand that case 6 should belong to Cat 1 since they target a similar function. |
| SONY | We are fine with above categories but think that it should be clarified that BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 apply to both DL TX beam prediction and DL RX beam prediction. While the moderator has noted that for BM-Case1, “most companies discussed the DL Tx beam predictions, there was also some companies discussing the DL Rx beam predictions, e.g., SS [10], Intel [24]”, this statement is also true for BM-Case2. In [8], we consider the sub use case with DL RX beam prediction at the UE side. Since the movement/rotation of UE can bring larger changes of UE DL Rx beam while there are relatively small changes of gNB DL Tx beam, considering as an input the selected DL Rx beams at the UE side over a period as a beam set into an AI/ML model, UE Rx beam prediction at UE side can be performed to reduce UE measurement in beam maintenance/switching.  FL: Yes. The corresponding alternatives can be added by the proponents to Proposal 2-3(for input), 2-4(for output), 3-4(for input), 3-5(for output) |
| HW/HiSi | We agree with the categorization |
| LGE | OK with the current categorization. |
| Panasonic | We are not sure about the criterion for such categorization. For example, in current formulation, cases 1 and 2 are already broad to cover different sub use cases already. It is unclear whether some sub use cases can be separately studied. On the other hand, the other cases (cases 3-8) can somehow fit into either case 1 or case 2 (or both). For example, the case4 where AL/ML model is to predict the best beams based on UE location/trajectory. It could belong to either case 1 and case 2. So it seems important to discuss the criterion for categorization.  FL: The intention of categorization is to facilitate the discussion. Based on the tdoc review, I find there are more than 20 different use cases (e.g., different input, different out, different scenarios, …). It is difficult to discuss so many cases simultaneously. Thus, the categorization is to keep a manageable numbers of sub use cases by merging some similar sub use cases. Various aspects are considered, e.g., the input/output, the scenarios, the potential collaboration levels and so on. On the other hand, if all sub uses are categorized into one or two high-level use cases, it will not be helpful since each high-level use cases will be too complicated and it is difficult for further discussion. |
| Ericsson | We are fine with the categories, however, 3,4,5,6 should be part of category 1. |
| Nokia, NSB | * *Is any sub use case proposed in some tdoc(s) missing? If so, please add the related information including the brief description of the new sub use cases, the corresponding tdoc, and so on*   No   * *Is the position of some company misunderstood or wrongly captured? If so, please correct me.*   No   * *Descriptions of the above sub use cases*   It would be good to highlight that some sub-use cases are related to each other. As mentioned also by Apple & E///, there are 1) spatial domain beam prediction, 2) time domain beam prediction, 3) other. We think that BM-Case5 can also be with the first category.  With above BM-Case1 definition -i.e., the AI/ML model is to predict the top-N1 DL beams out of Set A based on the measurement results of Set B of beams, top-N1 is not defined as strongest beams (should not be the case as well) and can also be selected based on another objective (QoS, cell throughput, scheduling latency, etc..) and clearly up to ML model used by companies. We should not restrict companies using of different loss functions and study possible directions on beam prediction in spatial domain.  FL: I would like to make some clarification. In my understanding, the supervised learning is assumed in BM-Case1, whereas the reinforcement learning is proposed for BM-Case5. According to R1-2204570, the collaboration options may be different. Thus, I captured it as a separate case. Based on your reply, I add Question 1-1 to check other companies’ view on your proposal.  For 1) spatial domain beam prediction, support to study both cases: (1) Set B is a subset of Set A ;and (2) Set A consists of narrow beams whereas Set B consists of wide beams.  FL: They have been included in Proposal 2-2.  For 2) time domain beam prediction, support to study the cases: (1) Top-N2 beams IDs (but NOT predicted L1-RSRP)  FL: A new alternative in added to the updated Proposal 3-5 (i.e., 3-5a) |
| Samsung | We are fine with the categorization other than case 4. For clarification, we could like to know whether the UE location information in case 4 includes the position information obtained by CSI-RS/PRS measurement. If so, case 4 can be under case 1 and/or case 2, and position information can be regarded as e.g., assistance information.  FL: Let’s wait for clarification from the proponents of BM-Case4 |
| CMCC | Spatial-domain DL beam prediction can be a start point of the study of AI based BM. Case 5,6 should be under cat 1. |
| NVIDIA | This categorization is a good starting point. Whether some case(s) in Cat 3 can be recategorized to Cat 1 or 2 can be FFS. |
| CAICT | Fine with the description. |
| OPPO | We are fine with the categorization. |
| MediaTek | We suggest that **Inter-cell beam management (ICBM)** be included in BM-Case1 and BM-Case2. Instead of beam selection, we care about cell selection (e.g. in time-domain, predicting Cell ID of the best beam in future time slot). We think AI assistance brings more gains for inter-cell BM than intra-cell BM, e.g., more latency/interruption time could be saved.  Note that ICBM introduced in Rel-17 feMIMO WI does not support mobility (i.e., no serving cell change). Therefore, ICBM should be considered in the scope of BM use case in R18 AI SI.  FL: If I understand correctly, ICMB means the beam can be associated with a PCI different from the PCI of the serving cell. It seems the next-level detail. We can discuss it later. |
| Intel | OK with categorization. But we feel that BM-Case 6 should be part of category 1 and may be merged with BM-Case 1 since the problem is fundamentally the same. It’s a matter of where the model resides and where the inferencing is done.  FL: BM-Case6 and BM-Case1 are for UL BM and DL BM, respectively. It would ok to keep them as two cases.  We would also like to highlight **another important use case provided in our paper** [24] where **joint DL/UL beam pair link prediction** is considered. This has potential to reduce latency of beam selection and is similar to a joint P2/P3 procedure. We would like this use case also to be included as part of the sub-use cases. In our understanding, this is also similar to BM-Case 1 but with different specification impact as discussed in our paper.  FL: Add BM-Case9 under Cat1 |
| NTT DOCOMO | We think each BM case is well defined and no overlaps between BM cases. Regarding how to categorize, we are fine with existing category or one suggested by Apple. |
| FL | * As suggested by some companies (Apple, Lenovo, Ericsson. Nokia, CMCC, NVIDIA, DCM), BM-Case3/4/5/6 are moved to Cat1 * Since one of Intel’s proposal was not captured, BM-Case9 is added |
| BJTU | Fine with the categorization. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the categories proposed by FL. |
| InterDigital | Generally okay with the categorization, but we have some comments in the below.  **BM-Case3:** We think that this BM-Case 3 can be supported within FR2. For example, Beam prediction for higher frequency band (e.g., a band in FR2-2) based on measurement results of lower frequency band(s) (e.g., a band in FR2-1). Actually, as FR1 generally uses one fixed wide beam in most of implementation, considering relationship between FR2-1 and FR2-2 is more valid to us.  FL: Yes, MB-Case3 includes your example. In the description, I use higher frequency band and lower frequency band(s). FR1 and FR2 in the brackets are just examples.  **BM-Case6:** We also proposed this sub use case in our contribution as shown in the below.   |  | | --- | | **Association between beams with different beam widths**  Although wide beamwidth for SSB and narrow beamwidth for CSI-RS were considered for the initial design of NR from Rel-15, association between beams with different beam widths was not considered in efficient ways. For AI/ML based beam prediction, such association could be utilized to achieve better prediction accuracy. For example, robust estimation/identification of whole spatial characteristics could be done by utilizing wide beams and accurate beam identification could be done based on the acquired wide beam information by utilizing narrow beams.  ***Observation 6:*** *The current NR specification does not consider association between beams with different beam widths.*  ***Observation 7:*** *Utilizing association between beams with different beam widths can provide benefits for prediction accuracy e.g., robust estimation/identification of whole spatial characteristics with wide beams and accurate beam identification with narrow beams.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Study benefits of specification enhancements on association between beams with different beam widths*. |   Please capture our support in Table 1.  FL: Not sure whether I understand correctly. BM-Case6 is for UL beam management. The above proposal seems for DL beam management. I intended to capture the above use cases in BM-Case1, which is corresponding to Alt.2 of Proposal 2-2a. Anyway, I add IDC as a supporting companies of BM-Case6 in Table 1.  In addition, we would like to add one more case in Cat 1. As proposed in our contribution as shown below, we believe that identification of UE Rx beams is important for both training and prediction, however, in the current specification, handling of UE Rx beams is up to UE implementation. So, we prefer to add **BM-Case10: UE Rx beam identification**.  FL: As I explained in my reply to other companies, BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 are discussing DL beams, which include DL Rx beams and DL Tx beams. Thus, there are some alternatives regarding Rx beam in the details (e.g., in section 3.1.2)   |  | | --- | | **Handling of UE Rx beams**  For Rel-15 beam management, actual mapping between DL Tx beam and UE Rx beam is totally based on UE implementation and there’s no way to identify actual UE beam information for a DL Tx beam by gNB. The implementation-based UE Rx beam selection works for Rel-15 as the gNB needs to know only a beam index for actual transmission. However, for AI/ML based beam prediction, UE Rx beam information such as beam identity and beam direction is crucial to accurately predict beam qualities.  ***Observation 8:*** *For Rel-15 beam management, actual mapping between DL Tx beam and UE Rx beam is totally based on UE implementation.*  ***Observation 9:*** *The implementation-based UE Rx beam selection works for Rel-15, however, UE Rx beam information is crucial to accurately predict beam qualities for AI/ML based beam prediction.*  ***Proposal 6:*** *Study benefits of specification enhancements on acquiring UE Rx beam information*. | |
| Qualcomm | Agree with categorization. Further, as mentioned in our Tdoc [28], we believe *non-codebook-based* spatial domain beam prediction (which can be categorized under BM-case8) is a candidate that can be studied, given the gains we illustrate in our EVM Tdoc, based on preliminary simulations. The proposal is to consider the gains (e.g., spectral efficiency gains) obtained by tailoring beam creation at UE and/or gNB to raw channel characteristics (e.g., channel AoA/AoD), as opposed to relying on predefined (e.g., DFT-based) codebooks.  FL: In the sub use cases, we haven’t differentiated codebook-based and non-codebook-based beams. In section 3.1.2/3.1.3, some companies have proposed alternatives regarding beam angle or similar things. I find some inputs of BM-Case8. Depends on how these codebooks generalized or used, the proponents can choose the use case for input. |
| Charter | Agree with not relying on predefined codebooks  FL: Please see my reply to QC. |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the updated categories. |

###### Categorization (Round#2)

Please continue to input if there is any further comment

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| FL2 | I merged the inputs of Charter and Sony. Please double check whether I missed something or not. |
| FL3 | Delete BM-Case5 |
| Sony | Our previous comment was that “BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 apply to both DL TX beam prediction and DL RX beam prediction”. We noticed that feature lead has explained in the reply to IDC as follows. We are fine with this.  “BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 are discussing DL beams, which include DL Rx beams and DL Tx beams. Thus, there are some alternatives regarding Rx beam in the details (e.g., in section 3.1.2)” |
| FL3 | @Sony: I also replied your previous comments as below. The same meaning as my reply to IDC, but different wording: FL: Yes. The corresponding alternatives can be added by the proponents to Proposal 2-3(for input), 2-4(for output), 3-4(for input), 3-5(for output) |

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

As shown in the above table, majority companies support both **BM-Case1** and **BM-Case2**. Meanwhile, the other sub use cases are supported by a limited number of companies. Thus, it is suggested to focus on the sub use case **BM-Case1** and **BM-Case2** in the first step, and continue to discuss other sub use cases. The following proposal can be discussed, and further refined based on the inputs:

***~~Proposal 1-1: For AI/ML-based beam management, support BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 as the representative sub use case for characterization and baseline performance evaluations~~***

* ***~~BM-Case1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams~~***
* ***~~BM-Case2: Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams~~***
* ***~~FFS: details of BM-Case1 and BM-Case2~~***
* ***~~FFS: other sub use cases~~***

***Proposal 1-1a: For AI/ML-based beam management, support BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 as the representative sub use case for characterization and baseline performance evaluations***

* ***BM-Case1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***BM-Case2: Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***FFS: details of BM-Case1 and BM-Case2***
* ***FFS: other sub use cases***
* ***Note: Further down-selection on BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 based on further discussion and evaluation is NOT precluded.***

***Question 1-1: What’s your view on the proposal: BM-Case5 is merged to BM-Case1 and included in Proposal 1-1a***

* ***Yes (Support)***
* ***No (Not support)***

Please provide your input wrt description of the proposal as well as any other potential sub use cases that should be treated with high priority. In addition, please mention any other aspect that should be considered/included.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | OK |
| vivo | Support |
| AT&T | support |
| Futurewei | We are ok to consider prioritizing BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 as 2 sub use cases for BM use case to facilitate the discussion. It is recommended to avoid too many sub use cases per each high level use case. At study/SI level, final set of representative sub use cases should be discussed and agreed across use cases. |
| Xiaomi | Ok |
| Lenovo | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Sony | We are OK with the proposal. We understand that BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 apply to both DL TX beam prediction and DL RX beam prediction. |
| HW/HiSi | We agree for BM-Case1.  For BM-Case2, we are positive to evaluate it, but want to emphasize that spatial consistency reflecting the UE trajectory needs to be defined firstly before being able to proceed.  Therefore, we propose to update the Proposal as follows:    ***Proposal 1-1: For AI/ML-based beam management, support BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 as the representative sub use case for characterization and baseline performance evaluations***   * ***BM-Case1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams*** * ***BM-Case2: Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams and under consideration of spatial consistency reflecting the UE trajectory*** * ***FFS: details of BM-Case1 and BM-Case2*** * ***FFS: other sub use cases***   FL: Understood the motivation. In my understanding, “spatial consistency” will be discussed in EVM (i.e., AI9.2.31). I suggest not to discuss the EVM issue in the discussion of sub use cases |
| NEC | Support |
| LGE | OK |
| Panasonic | We are generally fine to have focused study. However, the definition of BM-Case 1 and BM-Case 2 is not so clear. For example, why two beam sets are needed for the time domain prediction in Case 2? Also, as commented above, other cases (cases 3-8) seemingly can fall into these two cases as well.  FL: Please see my reply in the previous table. Regarding the two sets for Case 2, please see the reply in Proposal 3-2 |
| Ericsson | Agree |
| Nokia, NSB | OK with the direction. But, as we commented before, not with descriptions to separate BM-cases #3-6.  We suggest rewording as below,  ***Proposal 1-1: For AI/ML-based beam management, support ~~BM-Case1 and BM-Case2~~ following ~~as the~~ representative sub use cases for characterization and baseline performance evaluations***   * ***~~BM-~~Case1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams*** * ***~~BM-~~Case2: Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams*** * ***FFS: details of ~~BM-~~Case1 and ~~BM-~~Case2***   ***FFS: other sub use cases***  FL: I add Question 1-1 to check other companies’ view |
| CATT | We are fine with the categorization. |
| Fujitsu | Since both BM-case1 and BM-case 2 may be categorized as collaboration level 1, the specification impacts (e.g. beam measurement, beam report, beam indication) are similar. To limit workload, it’s recommended to select case 1 as the only representative sub use case.  FL: Understood the motivation. Since there are many companies supporting BM-Case2, it would be ok to keep it. I add a note in the updated proposal and hope it can address your concern in some sense. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. |
| CMCC | Support. HW’s update is fine to us.  FL: Please see my reply to Huawei |
| NVIDIA | Support |
| CAICT | Support |
| OPPO | Support |
| MediaTek | We are okay with prioritizing BM-Case 1 and BM-Case 2. |
| Intel | We support the change from Huawei since we think that spatial consistency is very important for BM-Case 2 especially with 3GPP statistical channel models which is likely to be used for dataset generation.  FL: Please see my reply to Huawei |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support |
| FL | * Regarding Nokia’s proposal, I add Question 1-1 and companies are invited to share your views. * This proposal seems supported by most companies. I update this proposal to Proposal 1-1a by adding a note (Red part) and hope it is acceptable to the supporting companies.   Proposal 1-1a:   * Supported: (20+2?) Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, Huawei(?), Fujitsu(?) * I would like to check whether Nokia can accept this proposal for progress by considering that there are more than 20 supporting companies * The output of Question 1-1 can be added to Proposal 1-1a if needed. |
| BJTU | Support |
| LGE2 | Support the proposal 1-1a. Regarding Q1-1, we are not sure BM-case 5 can be merged into BM-case 1. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support the proposal 1-1a. |
| CATT | Support Proposal 1-1a.  For question Q1-1, BW-Case5 is different with BW-Case 1 in our understanding. Can they really be merged? |
| Samsung | Support proposal 1-1a.  For question 1-1, not support. It seems that Case 5 for MU-MIMO where the inputs from multiple UEs need to be considered (thus different evaluation assumption). However, for the current case 1 and case 2, it only targets for SU-MIMO. Hence, it is not necessary to merge case 5 into case 1. |
| Ericsson | Support proposal 1-1a. We don’t see any need to study BM-case 5 |
| CAICT | Support proposal 1-1a |
| Nokia | We are proposing a revision of proposal 1-1a as follows:  ***Proposal 1-1a: For AI/ML-based beam management, support ~~BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 as the representative~~ the following sub use case for characterization and baseline performance evaluations***   * ***~~BM-~~Case1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams*** * ***~~BM-~~Case2: Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams*** * ***FFS: details of ~~BM-~~Case1 and ~~BM-~~Case2*** * ***FFS: other sub use cases*** * ***Note: Further down-selection on Case1 and Case2 based on further discussion and evaluation is NOT precluded.***   The motivation is the following:  we think the agreement should not capture as such the cases defined above in the FL summary as it can be confusing and make reference to some particular schemes. It is more helpful to define the ways in which the beam prediction is happening w.r.t the two sets of beams A and B.  Also, as explained via email, we do not have any objection to the proposal, but clarifying the schemes in general direction. |
| HW/HiSi | Support proposal 1-1a |
| InterDigital | As we are in the first meeting of the SI, not WI, we prefer to include all the sub use cases in table 1 for study. Based on the study, RAN1 can decide which cases are needed or not.  FL: As I explained to other companies before, this proposal is not to preclude other cases. The other cases are still under discussion. Since these two use cases supported by majority companies, we select them as the first step. The final representative sub use cases are will be decided based on further discussion and evaluation. That is there is a Note in the proposal.  We are fine to merge BM-Case 5 into BM-Case 1. |
| NVIDIA | Support proposal 1-1a |
| MediaTek | We support this proposal. We feel that BM-Case 1 and BM-Case 2 should be enough to start with. |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 1-1a. Do not see the need/priority to study BM-Case5 at this stage. |
| Lenovo | Support proposal 1-1a.  Regarding BM-Case5, if it just uses the QoS metric for beam selection, we are fine to merger it in BM-Case1. |

Proposal 1-1 (Round#2)

For Question 1-1: Based on the inputs received so far, 4 companies (CATT, Samsung, Ericsson, QC) doesn’t support merge BM-Case5 into BM-Case1. 3 companies (Nokia, IDC, Lenovo) supports. 1 company (LGE) is not sure.

For Proposal 1-1a:

* Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, Huawei, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, ZTE, MTK, QC (25)

In order to address Nokia’s concern, let’s try to add the restriction on supervised learning to make BM-Case1 clearer. In order to address concerns of Nokia/IDC, I also change some wording of the main bullet. The change based on Proposal 1-1b is highlighted.

***Proposal 1-1b: For AI/ML-based beam management, support BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 ~~as the representative sub use case~~ for characterization and baseline performance evaluations***

* ***BM-Case1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***BM-Case2: Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***FFS: details of BM-Case1 and BM-Case2***
* ***FFS: other sub use cases***
* ***Beams in Sub A and Sub B are in the same band***
* ***Note: Further down-selection on BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 based on further discussion and evaluation is NOT precluded.***

Companies are invited to inputs for the proposal and question

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | BM-Case5 should not be merged to BM-Case1 for finer categorization.  FL: the question is deleted |
| CATT | Maybe no need to repeat our position, but we think BM-Case5 is far from BM-Case1. The input and output of the corresponding AI models/training strategies are likely to be quite different.  FL: the question is deleted |
| Nokia | We have a similar concern as before, where we already highlighted multiple times that FL definition of schemes in this document is not accurate, thus, not required to be in the RAN1 agreement. RAN1 agreements only required to define exactly the scope of the scheme and “naming” does not have to the follow FL summary.  This is the FL suggested definition for ***BM-case 1:*** ***Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams,*** and that should be valid definition for both supervised and RL based schemes (in Nokia contribution), so we do not agree on separating RL-based method as BM-case5 (the definition is aligned with BM-case1).  Also, there is no clear reason to highlight only supervised learning (is there any good comparison to down-select this already ?) and there is no such attempt in 9.2.1 discussions (at least for now). From use case discussion perspective, what is important is to define the scope of schemes such that companies can further check with agreements in evaluation methodology how the schemes work with different offline/online & collaboration frameworks. Our suggestion can be found in the earlier response, we would be ok with that. If the discussion is not progressing via email, we suggest FL to discuss this in GTW session.  FL: As reminded by some companies, the discussion on training approaches (supervised learning vs RL) in Agenda 9.2.1 (Section 3.8.4, Section 4.1) is still ongoing. We should avoid the overlapped discussion. Thus, we can leave the details for further discussion. |
| NEC | Support proposal 1-1b but not support BM-Case5 is merged to BM-Case1. In proposal 1-1b, it is noted that supervised learning is expected to be used in BM-Case1. Unlike other cases, for BM-Case5, reinforcement learning may be the most appropriate method.  FL: the question is deleted |
| Xiaomi | BM-Case5 should not be merged to BM-Case1 because of different principle for generation of dataset.  FL: the question is deleted |
| FL | As suggested by Nokia, the “supervised learning” is removed. Thus, companies please continue commenting the above Proposal 1-1b if needed.  BM-Case5 is deleted from the summary. Thus, no need to further discuss the connection between BM-Case1 and BM-Case5. |
| Fujitsu | NO. It’s not necessary to merge BM-case5 into BM-case1 in initial stage. Our understanding about difference between case 5 and case 1 is the metric for beam selection. For example, metric for case 1 is top-N largest RSRP and metric for case 5 is other QoS. Which metric for beam selection is better is implementation issue, especially for AI@NW.  FL: Yes, agree that there is some difference for different sub use cases. I think we can identify them with more discussions on next-level details. |
| CAICT | Fine with proposal 1-1b. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the current version of proposal 1-1b. |
| Panasonic | We are ok with Proposal 1-1b. |
| Ericsson | Support proposal 1-1b. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support proposal 1-1b. |
| LGE | Support proposal 1-1b. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with proposal 1-1b. |
| Samsung | Support proposal 1-1b. |
| MediaTek | Support proposal 1-1b. |
| HW/HiSi | Not support.  The original proposal contained a bullet for “supervised learning” which could be good to have at least as a baseline. Therefore, we have more sympathy for the old proposal 1-1b that spelled out “***Supervised learning is expected to use in BM-Case1 and BM-Case2”.***  However, if it is not possible to agree on the above directly, an acceptable compromise could be to add the following bullet to the updated Proposal.   * ***Supervised learning is expected to be used in BM-Case1 and BM-Case2***   + ***Optional reinforced learning can be considered as a complement.***   FL: As reminded by some companies, the discussion on training approaches (supervised learning vs RL) in Agenda 9.2.1 (Section 3.8.4, Section 4.1) is still ongoing. We should avoid the overlapped discussion. Thus, we can leave the details for further discussion. Hopefully Huawei can accept the current version of Proposal 1-1b. |
| Qualcomm | Support proposal 1-1b. |
| Intel | Support the proposal in general. For the highlighted restriction, let’s spell out clearly that the same band restriction is only for BM-Case 1 and 2. Therefore suggest the following   * ***For BM-Case1 and BM-Case2, beams in Sub A and Sub B are in the same band***   FL: I will update the proposal accordingly  Additionally, we prefer not to mention reinforcement learning or supervised learning at this early stage and keep it general for now. |
| NVIDIA | Support proposal 1-1b. |
| InterDigital | Generally fine with the proposal, but we have one clarification question for the following bullet.   * ***For BM-Case1 and BM-Case2, beams in Sub A and Sub B are in the same band***   Do we have clear definition of Sub A and Sub B? If Sub A and Sub B indicates Set A and Set B respectively, then it would be better to use Set A and Set B in the proposal.  FL: The typos are fixed in the updated proposal |

Proposal 1-1 (Round#3)

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 1-1b (Round#2):

* Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, ZTE, MTK, QC, IDC (25)

By checking with Keeth offline, Nokia can live with Proposal 1-1b.

Huawei preferred to explicitly capture the supervised learning and reinforcement learning in this proposal. As the discussion on training approaches (supervised learning vs RL) in Agenda 9.2.1 (Section 3.8.4, Section 4.1) is still ongoing, we would better avoid the discussion overlapped with Agenda 9.2.1. We can discuss the learning method later.

Intel suggested to clarify that “beam in Sub A and Sub B are in the same band” is only for BM-Case1 and BM-Case2. It makes sense since BM-Case 3 includes the case that Sub A and Sub B are in different FRs. Thus, Intel’s proposal is captured in the updated proposal, which is also the only change compared to Proposal 1-1b.

Hope Proposal 1-1c can be acceptable to all companies.

***Proposal 1-1c: For AI/ML-based beam management, support BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 for characterization and baseline performance evaluations***

* ***BM-Case1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***BM-Case2: Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***FFS: details of BM-Case1 and BM-Case2***
* ***FFS: other sub use cases***
* ***For BM-Case1 and BM-Case2, Beams in Set A and Set B are in the same band***

This proposal seems acceptable to most companies. Thus, the following table is only to check whether some company has strong concern.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Company/Reasons** |
| STRONG concern |  |
| FL | Closed. Please the corresponding agreement in the Appendix |

There were only a limited number of contributions to propose other sub use cases (i.e., BM-Case3, BM-Case4, BM-Case5, BM-Case6, BM-Case7, BM-Case8). However, since this is the first meeting, most of companies didn’t touch these sub use cases in their contributions. Thus, it would be good to check companies’ view to facilitate the decision how to proceed with these sub use cases.

***Collection of companies’ view:*** Companies are invited to input views on the following sub use cases and detailed explanation/ reasons are encouraged as well.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sub use cases for AI/ML based BM** | **Support** | **Not support** |
| BM-Case3 | Sony, Apple, |  |
| BM-Case4 | Lenovo; Sony, Ericsson, ~~Samsung~~, AT&T, NEC, MTK, |  |
| ~~BM-Case5~~ | ~~Nokia,~~ |  |
| BM-Case6 | Samsung, Intel |  |
| BM-Case7 | Samsung |  |
| BM-Case8 | AT&T, Qualcomm |  |
| BM-Case9 | Intel |  |

Detailed explanation/ reasons can be added to the following table

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We support case 3. But since this is the first meeting, do we really need to exclude any use case? We suggest we list all cases for further study and companies can investigate the pros and cons. |
| AT&T | We are interested in Case 4 and Case 8 and agree that down selection is not needed at this phase. Characterization of the cases relative to Case 1 and Case 2 would especially be relevant (especially to the extent that common evaluation assumptions and AI/ML modeling approaches can be applied). |
| Futurewei | For the study in Rel-18, we suggest not considering BM-Case3 to BM-Case8 and focus on BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 only. |
| Lenovo | BM-Case4 should also be supported since beam prediction with side information, e.g., UE positioning/trajectory is more beneficial for HST and highway scenario. andFurther, the UE trajectory is modeled in EVM. |
| Sony | We support both BM-case 3 and BM-case 4. For BM-case 3, since both FR1 and FR2 are supported/discussed in specifications, it is beneficial to develop the relationship between two frequency band by AI for other usages like BM. For BM-case 4, as there is also an objective in this Rel-18 SI on AI positioning, it seems natural to use the positioning information more efficiently to assist beam prediction. |
| HW/HiSi | At first glance, we are skeptical to the support of the BM-Case3 to BM-Case8. But we could give it more time to digest the proposals. If including too many use cases, we might not be able to progress with the other common issues we also need to align on |
| NEC | We support at least BM-Case4. However, before fully evaluating the advantages and disadvantages of each case, it seems that we should not preclude any one case. |
| Ericsson | We support case 4, but it could be part of category 1. This could be part of assistance information for gNB sided beam prediction. Or used directly for UE-sided beam predictions. |
| Nokia, NSB | Please see the comments under description of cases and P 1-1. |
| CATT | We suggest focus on BM-Case1 and BM-Case 2 only. |
| Fujitsu | To make a conclusion, we think the followings should be investigated firstly,   * The benefits of case3-8. * The differences on potential specification impacts between case3-8 and case 1-2. |
| Samsung | As discussed in our paper, both case 6 and case 7 are beneficial to leverage AI prediction. Besides, case 4 (subject to our clarification) is also very attractive since UE positioning information may significantly improve beam prediction accuracy. |
| CMCC | We are interested in case 6,7, and it is better to analyze the necessity, pros and cons of these cases before precluding some cases. |
| NVIDIA | At this early stage of the study item, all inputs are encouraged. |
| CAICT | We are open to study more sub use cases and no strong will to support a special cases for BM-Case 3- Case 8. |
| OPPO | Open to further study these sub use cases |
| MediaTek | BM-Case4 can also be considered. |
| Intel | As mentioned previously, BM-Case 6 is similar to case 1 and should be further considered. But we are also OK to consider Cases 3-8 with slightly lower priority than 1 and 2. |
| FL | * The is no plan to preclude some use case in the first meeting. The table is to collect views and check companies’ interests * The proponents are invited to share more details for each case so that other companies can have better understanding and study. I add table for each case. |
| InterDigital | We support BM-Case 3, BM-Case 4, BM-Case 6 and BM-Case 10 that we mentioned in the above. |
| Qualcomm | As mentioned in our Tdoc [28], we believe *non-codebook-based* spatial domain beam prediction (which can be categorized under BM-case8) is a candidate that can be studied, given the gains we illustrate in our EVM Tdoc, based on preliminary simulations. The proposal is to consider the gains (e.g., spectral efficiency gains) obtained by tailoring beam creation at UE and/or gNB to raw channel characteristics (e.g., channel AoA/AoD), as opposed to relying on predefined (e.g., DFT) codebooks. |
| Charter | Non-codebook-based spatial domain beam quantization (classifiable under BM-case8) enables a more dynamic quantization of ‘recent’ realizations of beams (with potential efficiency gains), which can be carried out online at the gNB where various, active UEs and their ‘optimal’ DL beams can be monitored. Recent realizations of DL beams may constitute the input of the AI/ML model, whose output are vector quantized beams that may be exchanged with the UE. These dynamically quantized beams can outperform beams based on predefined codebooks. |

The proponents are invited to share more details for each case, may include the following aspects

* Input of AI model
* Output of AI model
* Training: online, offline
* {Training at X, Inference at Y}
* Other aspects

###### BM-Case3 (Round#3)

Companies are encouraged to continue input or comment in the existing table. I will summary it if there are more inputs.

***(Draft) For the sub use case BM-Case3,***

* ***further study***
  + ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at NW side***
  + ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference and training at UE side***
* ***Regarding training, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: offline training***
  + ***Alt.2: online training***
* ***Regarding AI/ML inputs for lower frequency band (e.g., in FR1, FR2-1), further study***
  + ***Alt.1: CIR***
  + ***Alt.2: CSI feedback information***
  + ***Alt.3: Top-M wide beams with L1-RSRP***
* ***Regarding AI/ML output for higher frequency band (e.g., in FR2-1, FR2-2), further study***
  + ***Alt.1: Top-N3 beams and the associated cell***
  + ***Alt. 2: Top-N3 beams with L1-RSRP***

The proponents of BM-Case3 are invited to share information in this table. Other companies can also make comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | * Input of AI model: CIR of FR1 channel between UE and X cell(s) * Output of AI model: best N beams for FR2 between UE and one of the X cells * Training: both online offline * {Training at X, Inference at Y}: both at gNB or UE |
| Sony | * Input: CSIs information for lower frequency band for training. {CSI DL beam} for inference * Output: DL Tx beam prediction for higher frequency band * Training is done both online and offline * {Training at X, Inference at Y}: both at gNB |
| FL | If I understand correctly, the proposal from Apple and Sony is that: Input is from FR1, and the predicted beam is for FR2? Just to double check as IDC commented Set A and Set B can be in FR2. |
| Sony | Yes for the inference input is from FR1, and the predicted beam is for FR2. |
| InterDigital | As we commented before, we don’t want to focus on only FR1 and FR2 case as we believe that FR2-1 and FR2-2 case is also beneficial. Having said that, we propose to revise the proposal as follows:  ***(Draft) For the sub use case BM-Case3,***   * ***further study***   + ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at NW side***   + ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference and training at UE side*** * ***Regarding training, further study***   + ***Alt.1: offline training***   + ***Alt.2: online training*** * ***Regarding AI/ML inputs for lower frequency band, further study***   + ***Alt.1: CIR***   + ***Alt.2: CSI feedback information***   + ***Alt.3: Top-M wide beams with L1-RSRP*** * ***Regarding AI/ML output for higher freuqncy band, further study***   + ***Alt.1: Top-N3 beams and the associated cell***   ***Alt. 2: Top-N3 beams with L1-RSRP***  FL: Updated |

###### BM-Case4 (Round#3)

Companies are encouraged to continue input or comment in the existing table. I will summary it if there are more inputs.

***(Draft) For the sub use case BM-Case4,***

* ***further study***
  + ***[Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at NW side]*** (Only NEC/Lenovo/MTK provided the information and both of them prefer at UE side)
  + ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference and training at UE side***
* ***Regarding training, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: offline training***
* ***Regarding AI/ML inputs, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: UE location information and/or the associated uncertainty***
    - ***E.g., Location information can be obtained from GNSS and/or sensor (i.e., non-RAT positioning)***
  + ***Alt.2:***
* ***Regarding AI/ML output, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: Top-N4 beams for FR2***

The proponents of BM-Case4 are invited to share information in this table. Other companies can also make comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Ericsson | * Input of AI model : UE position, and uncertainty in such position estimate. * Output of AI model: Best N beams * Training: Offline training |
| NEC | We agree with the input, output of AI model and training suggested by Ericsson. In addition, for {Training at X, Inference at Y}, if the input of AI model involves the privacy, we prefer at least inference at UE side. |
| Lenovo | Input if AI model: UE position  Output of AI model: Best of N beams  Training: Offline at UE side |
| FL | It would be better to make it clearer whether UE position information is obtained from GPS, NR positioning, or some other sources. Some companies raised the question in previous comment. |
| NEC | We prefer UE position information is obtained from GNSS and/or sensor (i.e., non-RAT positioning), that is, prefer Alt1a.  FL: Considering Sony’s comment, Alt.1a/1b are removed, but keep the contents of Alt.1a as an example. Hope it is acceptable. |
| Sony | The discussion point might not be how to obtain the position information since there might be many ways of obtaining position information. The important point is where (UE or gNB side?) this information is obtained and how the information is used as input to AIML. In Sony’s case we assume that the position and direction (obtained by GPS as an example) can be reported by UE to the gNB. Thus, the gNB side can predict an optimal beam using a trained AIML model.  FL: Alt.1a/1b are removed, but keep the contents of Alt.1a as an example since that alternative is preferred by NEC. Hope it is acceptable. |
| MediaTek | Input of AI model: UE position (uncertainty may be hard to model so it may be optional)  Output of AI model: Best N4 beams  Training: Offline training (likely at UE side)  FL: “/or” is added: ***UE location information and/or the associated uncertainty*** |

~~BM-Case5 (Round#2)~~

~~Companies are encouraged to continue input or comment in the existing table. I will summary it if there are more inputs.~~

***~~(Draft) For the sub use case BM-Case5,~~***

* ***~~Reinforcement learning is expected to be used for BM-Case5~~***
* ***~~further study~~***
  + ***~~Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at NW side~~***
* ***~~Regarding training, further study~~***
  + ***~~Alt.1: online training~~***
* ***~~Policy, further study~~***
  + ***~~Alt.1:~~***
* ***~~Regarding AI/ML inputs, further study~~***
  + ***~~Alt.1: The beam measurement result reported by UE, and QoS requirement~~***
  + ***~~Alt.2:~~***
* ***~~Regarding AI/ML output, further study~~***
  + ***~~Alt.1: The best DL beam for QoS requirement~~***

~~The proponents of BM-Case5 are invited to share information in this table. Other companies can also make comments~~

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ~~Company~~ | ~~Comments~~ |
| ~~Nokia~~ | ~~We do not think the above proposal is needed. For companies to understand the details,~~   * ~~Input of AI model : beam measurements (L1-RSRP & beam index) from Set B, extra information (beam usage information and/or scheduler parameters (QoS))~~ * ~~Output of AI model: best beams from Set A (Output best beams can be strongest beams or most suited beams for the cell or other category, which can be controlled by the ML algorithm)~~ * ~~Training: Online, offline (with or without fine-tuning). These are for further discussion.~~   ~~As highlighted, we do not think this is separate sub-use case from BM-case1 definition as BM-Case1 is not explicit and have a large number of references.~~ |

###### BM-Case6 (Round#3)

Companies are encouraged to continue input or comment in the existing table. I will summary it if there are more inputs.

***(Draft) For the sub use case BM-Case6,***

* ***further study***
  + ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at NW side***
  + ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference and training at UE side***
* ***Regarding training, further study***
  + ***Alt.1:***
* ***Regarding the connection between Set A and Set B, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: Set B is a sub set of Set A***
  + ***Alt.2: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams***
* ***Regarding AI/ML input, further study***
  + ***L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of UL Tx beams***
* ***Regarding AI/ML output, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: Top-N6 UL beams of Set A [and the predicted L1-RSRP]***
* ***Note: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact***

The proponents of BM-Case6 are invited to share information in this table. Other companies can also make comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Samsung | As mentioned by FL, case 6 is a natural extension of case 1 for UL beam prediction, which can be described as:  BM-Case6: Spatial-domain UL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams. |
| Ericsson | There is no definition in 3GPP of such narrow/wide beams. We propose to add the note below.  Note: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact  FL: The note is added |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Ericsson’s note. |

###### BM-Case7 (Round#3)

Companies are encouraged to continue input or comment in the existing table. I will summary it if there are more inputs.

***(Draft) For the sub use case BM-Case7,***

* ***further study***
  + ***Joint inference at both NW side and UE side***
* ***Regarding training***
  + ***Alt.1: joint training at both NW side and UE side***
  + ***Alt.2:***
* ***Regarding training, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: Online training?***
  + ***Alt.2: Offline training?***
* ***Regarding AI/ML input, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: L1-RSRP measurement result [and the corresponding beam index]***
* ***Regarding AI/ML output, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: Top-N7 UL beams [and the predicted L1-RSRP]***

The proponents of BM-Case7 are invited to share information in this table. Other companies can also make comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Samsung | This case is similar to CSI compression. Beam reporting information is compressed via AI encoder at UE-side and the corresponding compressed vector are decompressed via AI decoder at gNB side. |
| Ericsson | We agree that it is similar to CSI compression. However, in comparison to CSI compression where the reconstruction of CSI enables improved beamforming. We don’t see how beam selection can be improved at the gNB side by being able to reconstruct all measured beams at the UE. In case the UE can measure on all beams, it would be sufficient if the UE reports its strongest beam, or the top-N7 beams. |
| InterDigital | In our view, reporting overhead for Rel-17 beam reporting is not a huge burden as it supports only up to 4 best beams with one L1-RSRP and 3 differential L1-RSRPs. Having said that, we think that we can discuss beam reporting overhead reduction when we introduce heavy reporting mechanism in future releases. |

###### BM-Case8 (Round#3)

Companies are encouraged to continue input or comment in the existing table. I will summary it if there are more inputs.

***(Draft) For the sub use case BM-Case8,***

* ***further study***
  + ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at UE side***
* ***Regarding training, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: offline training***
* ***Regarding AI/ML input, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: CIRs related to top-M beam pairs (having highest L1-RSRPs)***
* ***Regarding AI/ML output, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: Estimated channel AoA(s)/AoD(s) of raw mmWave channel based on which custom (non-codebook-based) beams can be created.***

The proponents of BM-Case8 are invited to share information in this table. Other companies can also make comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Qualcomm | * Input of AI/ML model: CIRs related to top-M beam pairs (having highest L1-RSRPs) * Output of AI/ML model: output can be estimated channel AoA(s)/AoD(s) of raw mmWave channel based on which custom (non-codebook-based) beams can be created. * Training: offline * Training at UE, inference at UE (for DL) |
|  |  |

###### BM-Case9 (Round#3)

Companies are encouraged to continue input or comment in the existing table. I will summary it if there are more inputs.

***(Draft) For the sub use case BM-Case9,***

* ***further study***
  + ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at NW side***
  + ***Alt.2:***
* ***Regarding training, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: Offline training***
  + ***Alt2:***
* ***Regarding AI/ML input, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: Measurement results of DL gNB Tx beams on selected sub-set of DL UE Rx beams***
  + ***Alt.2:***
* ***Regarding AI/ML output, further study***
  + ***Alt.1: Top N9 beam pair links***
    - ***E.g., each output consists of one DL Tx beam and one DL Rx beam. In case of beam correspondence or joint DL/UL TCI based operation, the DL Rx beam can also correspond to UL Tx beam at UE***

The proponents of BM-Case9 are invited to share information in this table. Other companies can also make comments

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Intel | We prefer the following:   * AI/ML inference and model training at network side * Regarding training, Offline training should be studied. For online training, if it means reinforcement learning, we don’t think that is necessary * For model input, Measurement results of DL gNB Tx beams on selected sub-set of DL UE Rx beams (since the problem is formulated for joint beam pair link prediction and emulates P2+P3 procedure) * AI/ML model output: Top N beam pair links i.e., each output consists of one DL Tx beam and one DL Rx beam. In case of beam correspondence or joint DL/UL TCI based operation, the DL Rx beam can also correspond to UL Tx beam at UE.   FL: the draft BM-Case9 is updated accordingly. |
|  |  |

### Details of sub use case **BM-Case1**

Where the AL/ML model is deployed is a key issue and has significant impact on the design and specification. Based on the contributions, there are different preferences for the AL/ML model deployment:

* AL/ML model deployed at NW side is preferred
* AL/ML model deployed at UE side is preferred
* both AL/ML model deployed at NW side and AL/ML model deployed at UE side are studied in R18
* Joint AL/ML model at NW and UE size can be studied

Additionally, AT&T[26] proposed to study centralized (e.g., across multiple gNBs) AI/ML operations. For the difference preferences, companies’ views are as below:

Table 2: AI model deployment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Preferred or mentioned | Not preferred |
| AI model deployed at NW side | Huawei [1], ZTE [2], Ericsson [3], IDC [4], CATT[5], Sony [8], Xiaomi[9], Samsung[10], LGE[15], CIACT[16], CMCC[18], DOCOMO[19], Spreadtrum[21], Nokia[23], AT&T[26], QC[28] |  |
| AI model deployed at UE side | Huawei [1], Ericsson [3], IDC [4], CATT[5], Sony [8], Xiaomi[9], Samsung[10], LGE[15], CAICT[16], CMCC[18], Spreadtrum[21], Nokia[23], AT&T[26], QC[28], Charter[30] | ZTE [2], |
| Joint AI at both NW and UE | Samsung[10], | Ericsson [3], |
| Joint AI across multiple gNB | AT&T[26] |  |
| Note:   * This table doesn’t differentiate the sub use cases. Some companies may prefer one deployment for one sub use case and prefer another deployment for other use cases. | | |

According to the above table, the first two types of AI/ML model deployment were supported or mentioned by most companies. Thus, the following proposal can be discussed, and further refined based on the inputs:

***~~Proposal 2-1: For the sub use case BM-Case1, down select one of the following AI/ML model deployments:~~***

* ***~~Alt.1: AI/ML models deployed at NW side~~***
* ***~~Alt.2: AI/ML models deployed at UE side~~***
* ***~~Alt.3: Both AI/ML models deployed at NW side and AI/ML models deployed at UE side~~***

***Proposal 2-1a: For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference at UE side***

Please provide your input wrt the above alternatives in the above proposal. In addition, feel free to provide other comment/suggestion

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We are not sure whether we understand the definition of “deployed” correctly, especially for Alt3. Does it mean training in one side but inference is in the other side? |
| Vivo | We prefer Alt 2, but we are open to study Alt 1 and Alt 3. |
| AT&T | We support Alt. 1 and are open to studying Alt. 2/3 as well |
| Futurewei | Alt.3. It is preferred to be flexible in deployment scenarios at this early stage of the SI. |
| Xiaomi | We want to clarify that deployment including both model training and inference?  For model training we prefer to be deployed at NW side.  For inference, we support either NW side or UE side. |
| Lenovo | We are open to both Alt1 and Alt2.  The AI/ML model for BM-Case1 can be flexibly deployed either at NW or UE side. From the expected performance aspect, Alt2 is preferred for overhead reduction. While considering deployment only at UE would be restrictive, e.g., some of the AI models may need more memory/complex to be executed at UE, we are also fine with Alt1.  Further, more clarification of Alt.3 is needed. Does Alt. 3 mean joint training and inference at both UE and NW sider? |
| SONY | We are OK with Alt 1 and Alt 2, but not support Alt3. Since different deployments on UE side or gNB side could be applied for different scenarios. |
| HW/HiSi | We would like to clarify of the “deployment” at one side, means training and inference at the same side? For Alt3, does it include that training is done on one side and inference on the other side?  We would prefer if model training and inference is performed at the same side. |
| NEC | We would like to clarify that, Alt.3 means that both Alt.1 and Alt.2 can be supported? If so, we support Alt.3. From our point of view, at least until we evaluate the advantages and disadvantages of Alt.1 and Alt.2, we should not preclude either of the two alternatives. |
| LGE | We are open but prefer Alt 1 considering limited computing power of UE side. |
| Panasonic | Same question as Xiaomi. If model training is at NW side and model inference is at UE side, is it the Alt.3 ? |
| Ericsson | Given the amount of companies proposing alt 1 & 2. We think both should be studied. Regarding the term deployed, we should use the terminology from the general aspect discussion. Such as single-sided UE/NW or dual-sided model. |
| Nokia, NSB | We are fine with studying these alternatives, and not required to mention down selecting these yet. Also, suggest rewording (same with the P 1-1),  ***Proposal 2-1: For the sub use case ~~BM-~~Case1, ~~down select one of the~~ further study following AI/ML model deployments:***   * ***Alt.1: AI/ML models deployed at NW side*** * ***Alt.2: AI/ML models deployed at UE side*** * ***Alt.3: Both AI/ML models deployed at NW side and AI/ML models deployed at UE side*** |
| CATT | We are OK with Alt.1 and Alt.2. For Alt.3, it gets less preference but can be discussed. We may end up with more than one deployment options. The proposal can be modified as:  ***For the sub use case BM-Case1, down select one or more of the following AI/ML model deployments:*** |
| Fujitsu | Supports Alt3. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal in principle. It seems that the wording of Alt-3 is confusing. We suggest to change Alt-3 as:  ***Alt.3: Both Alt1 and Alt2*** |
| CMCC | In our understanding, here “deployed” means inference instead of training. We think both Alt1 and Alt 2 can be considered. |
| NVIDIA | It does not appear necessary to make such down selection at this early stage of the study item. |
| CAICT | We think both NW and UE could use AI/ML model to predict the best beams. |
| OPPO | Support Alt.3. Samsung’s version is better |
| MediaTek | Where to “deploy” the AI/ML model depends on the results of our evaluation. Hence, we think at this moment we should keep it open. |
| Intel | No need to down-select at this stage. As mentioned in our paper, model may reside at either gNB or UE with different implications of specification impact. Ok with update from Nokia. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. To reduce the workload, it is preferred to focus on only one-sided ML model. |
| FL | * Based on the comments, it seems all companies support or keep open to both Alt.1 and Alt.2 (this is also the original intention of Alt.3). In order to simplify the discussion, we focus on AI/MI inference in this proposal. We can discuss the training in other proposals. Proposal 2-1 is updated to ***Proposal 2-1a*** * Regarding the terminologies suggested by Ericsson: I think the updated proposal 2-1a avoids the potential ambiguity. When there is some agreement on the terminologies in AI 9.2.1, we can update it accordingly.   Proposal 2-1a:  Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, Huawei, NEC, LGE, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, CAICT, OPPO, DCM, Panasonic(?), Nokia(?), NVIDIA(?), MTK(?), Intel(?) |
| LGE2 | Support proposal 2-1a. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| Panasonic | Support Proposal 2-1a. |
| CATT | We are generally OK with Proposal 2-1a.  But not sure it is good to preclude ‘***AI/ML inference at both sides’*** at this early stage.  FL: It is up to the consensus of the group |
| Samsung | Support Proposal 2-1a. |
| Ericsson | We are supportive of proposal 2-1a. We mainly objected the term “deployed” |
| CAICT | Support Proposal 2-1a. |
| Nokia | We still have the following editorial proposal, for the sake of improving readability:  ***Proposal 2-1a: For the sub use case ~~BM-Case1~~*** *Spatial-domain DL beam prediction****, consider ~~both~~the following alternatives A~~lt.1 and Alt.2~~ for further study:***   * ***~~Alt.1:~~ AI/ML inference at NW side*** * ***~~Alt.2:~~ AI/ML inference at UE side*** * ***Joint AI at both NW and UE is not considered.*** |
| Futurewei | We are ok for ***Proposal 2-1a.*** |
| HW/HiSi | We are wondering, why “training” is not mentioned. Is there any particular reason? Our understanding of Alt 1 and Alt 2 would be :  ***Proposal 2-1a: For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***   * ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at NW side*** * ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference and training at UE side***   FL: My plan is to stabilize the details step by step. Thus, my original plan is to focus inference in this proposal. And discuss training (including where training is done, online/offline training) later. Meanwhile, the discussion for training is ongoing in AI9.2.1 and it is better to wait for some progress of AI 9.2.1. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Huawei’s version.  FL: Please see my reply to Huawei |
| nvidia | Support proposal 2-1a. |
| Mediatek | We prefer Huawei’s proposal, as it mentions both inference and training  FL: Please see my reply to Huawei |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 2-1a. |
| Lenovo | Support Proposal 2-1a. |

Proposal 2-1 (Round#2)

For Proposal 2-1a, based on the inputs received so far, we have the following observation:

* Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, BJTU, ZTE, QC (24)

Huawei/IDC/MTK supports to include training as well. It is a further step on top of Proposal 2-1a. In my understanding, we can move forward step by step. I guess Huawei/IDC/MTK may also accept Proposal 2-1a Meanwhile, it would be better if we can make more progress. Thus, let’s make a try.

***Proposal 2-1a(Original): For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference at UE side***

***Proposal 2-1a(Huawei): For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference and training at UE side***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| FL | Q1: Whether Huawei/IDC/MTK can accept Proposal 2-1a(Original)?  Q2: Companies’ view on Proposal 2-1a(Huawei)  If there is no company against Proposal 2-1a(Huawei), we would go with Proposal 2-1a(Huawei) to make more progress. Otherwise, Proposal 2-1a(Original) could be a compromised result to move forward in this stage. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer the original proposal 2-1a.  It is unclear if we mix the entity of training and inference in one proposal. Also, it precludes the cases where model training and inference are performed in the separate entity. In AI 9.2.1, FL proposes the definition of offline training as training in non-operational environments, which is not covered in Alt.1 and Alt.2 of Proposal 2-1a (Huawei). |
| CATT | With further clarification of step-by-step way by FL, we prefer Proposal 2-1a (Original).  If training is involved, it is implicitly precluding the case where AI/ML model is trained at one side but infers at another side. |
| Nokia | Ok with P 2-1a.  It is not required to rule out other possibilities (such as training at NW and inference at the UE). For the moment, we do not think HW proposal is needed. |
| CMCC | Fine with the intention of proposal 2-1a, there may be more alternatives.   * ***Alt.3: AI/ML training at NW side and inference at UE side*** * ***Alt.4: AI/ML training at UE side and inference at NW side*** |
| NEC | We are fine to further study offline/online training at NW/UE side firstly, but it seems a little inappropriate to put them together because of completely different processes. And we prefer inference and training are divided into different proposals. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer the original proposal 2-1a.  We don’t prefer AI/ML training at UE side. |
| Fujitsu | It’s better to waiting for the conclusion of discussion on training in AI9.2.1. Currently, proposal 2-1 can be modified as   * ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference [and training] at NW side*** * ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference [and training] at UE side*** |
| CAICT | We think the original proposal is fine and training process could be discussed separately. |
| Spreadtrum | We prefer Proposal 2-1a(Original). We have similar view as DOCOMO that Proposal 2-1a(Huawei) doesn’t includes the alternatives of training and inference by different entities. |
| Panasonic | We support Proposal 2-1a(Huawei) to have more focused study. Spreading model training and model inference across UE and NW can have low priority for study.  FL: By going through all the comments, FL feels a number of companies cannot accept Proposal 2-1a(Huawei). Proposal 2-1a(original) seems the only choice. Could Panasonic live with Proposal 2-1a(Original)? |
| vivo | We prefer Proposal 2-1a(original) |
| Ericsson | Support, proposal 2-1a(Original), the training should be in a separate discussion. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | In the Proposal 2-1a(Huawei), the case that training at NW side and inference at UE side is precluded. Although we observe that AI/ML model transmission from NW to UE would introduce additional transmission overhead and model representation format issue, we’d better keep open to various possibilities. |
| LGE | Prefer Proposal 2-1a(original). |
| Samsung | We are fine with 2-1a. |
| Sony | Proposal 2-1a (Huawei) seems to be limited to the case that inference and training must be done at the same place. We suggest going with the original proposal and not limit the implementation scenarios. |
| MediaTek | We can support Proposal 2-1a (Original).  Online training, especially at UE side, may not be practical. |
| HW/HiSi | We would prefer our suggestion but are supportive of the proposal from Fujitsu above:  “It’s better to waiting for the conclusion of discussion on training in AI9.2.1. Currently, proposal 2-1 can be modified as   * ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference [and training] at NW side*** * ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference [and training] at UE side”***   FL: By going through all the comments, FL feels a number of companies cannot accept Proposal 2-1a(Huawei) or Fujitsu’s version. Proposal 2-1a(original) seems the only choice. Could Huawei live with Proposal 2-1a(Original)? |
| Qualcomm | Support 2-1a (Original). Training can be discussed in a separate context and the way Proposal 2-1a (Huawei) is written, it may be limiting and does not include other possible options such as training at one side (e.g., NW) and inference at the other side (e.g., UE). |
| Intel | We are supportive of the original Proposal 2-1a. Training can be separately discussed and may also be impacted by specific inputs/outputs selected for model training based on specific model implementations. |
| NVIDIA | Support 2-1a (Original). |
| InterDigital | We think that Huawei’s modified proposal with bracket’s could be a good starting point. In order to relieve other companies’ concerns on limiting possible options, we think that the following note can be added.  ***For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***   * ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference [and training] at NW side*** * ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference [and training] at UE side***   ***Other possible alternatives are not precluded.*** |
| Lenovo | Support 2-1a (Original).  From our perspective, inference and training can be separately discussed at least for offline training. |

Proposal 2-1 (Round#3)

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 2-1a(original)

* Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, NEC, LGE, Ericsson, CATT, Nokia, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, BJTU, ZTE, QC (24)

A number of companies don’t support Proposal 2-1a(Huawei). By going through all the comments, FL feels that some companies cannot accept the version from Fujitsu or IDC. Proposal 2-1a(original) seems the only choice. Moreover, it is natural to determine the details of each sub use case step by step. We can discuss the training issue later.

Proposal 2-1a(original) is copied as below without any change.

***Proposal 2-1a(Original): For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference at UE side***

This proposal seems acceptable to most companies. Thus, the following table is only to check whether some company has strong concern.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Company/Reasons** |
| STRONG concern |  |
| FL | Closed. Please the corresponding agreement in the Appendix |

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

For an AI/ML-based mechanism, two basic factors are the input and output. Thus, in order to finalize a specific sub use case, the input and output should be clearly defined. As we discussed in Section 3.1.1, there are different proposals for the Set A and Set B. Thus, based on the contributions, the following proposal can be discussed, and further refined based on the inputs:

***~~Proposal 2-2: For the sub use case BM-Case1, down select one of the following alternatives:~~***

* ***~~Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A~~***
  + ***~~FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B~~***
  + ***~~FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)~~***
* ***~~Alt.2: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams~~***
  + ***~~FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B~~***
* ***~~Alt.3: both Alt1 and Alt.2~~***

***Proposal 2-2a: For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider the following alternatives for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
* ***Alt.2: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: QCL relation between beams in Set A and beams in Set B***
* ***Note: Set A is for DL beam prediction and Set B is for DL beam measurement.***

Please provide your input wrt the above alternatives in the above proposal. In addition, feel free to provide other comment/suggestion. Further refinement will be based on the inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We think Alt3 should be the most straightforward way. Both sub-sampling and hierarchical based approaches should be valid. We failed to see any reason to preclude one.  In addition, we suggest adding the following:   * ***Alt.4: set A and set B beams are in different bands***   FL: It may be better to discuss it in BM-Case3. Thus, this alternative is not included in the update roposal |
| vivo | Alt 3 with the understanding that Alt 1 and Alt2 have the same core issue: finding an AI algorithm with good prediction performance gain and also provide sufficient flexibility on AI model deployment. |
| AT&T | We support Alt. 3 |
| Futurewei | Alt.3, be flexible and open to both options at the early stage of the SI. Down selection may be discussed/considered when evaluation results (including overhead) are available. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer Alt 3 |
| Lenovo | From the overhead reduction point of view, both Alt1 and Alt2 can be considered.  Regarding Alt2: suggest to add an FFS to Alt2 to discuss the QCL relation between beams in set A and beams in set B?   * ***Alt.2: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams***   + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***   + ***FFS: QCL relation between beams in Set A and beams in Set B*** |
| HW/HiSi | We prefer Alt3 |
| NEC | We currently support Alt.3. At least from the simulation results provided some companies, significant gains can be obtained by using Alt.1 and Alt.2. However, if the workload is limited, e.g., only one sub use case is finalized for each use case, Alt.1 is our preferred one. |
| LGE | Support Alt 1. |
| Panasonic | We support Alt 3. |
| Ericsson | We think alt 3 should be used, no need to down select and prohibit studies on both alternatives |
| Nokia, NSB | Please reword “BM”, ok with the proposal otherwise. And support Alt.3.  FL: no matter BM-Case5 is merged to BM-Case1 or not, we can still discuss BM-Case1 itself. |
| CATT | Alt 3. Final selections can be made based on subsequent evaluation results. We don’t need to make decision now. |
| Fujitsu | Supports Alt3. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal in principle. However, the definition of Set A and Set B is missing in this proposal. Hence, we suggest to add the following note.  ***Note: Set A is for DL beam prediction and Set B is for DL beam measurement.*** |
| CMCC | Prefer Alt3. |
| NVIDIA | It does not appear necessary to make such down selection at this early stage of the study item. Hence, our preference is Alt 3 to explore both. |
| CAICT | We support Alt.3. |
| OPPO | We prefer Alt.1 |
| MediaTek | We support Alt. 3. |
| Intel | OK to support Alt-3. Both are valid use cases. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. AI/ML gain of Alt1 and Alt2 should be studied, before down-selection. |
| FL | Based on inputs, Proposal 2-2 is updated to Proposal 2-2a.  **Proposal 2-2a:**  Supported: vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Lenovo, Xiaomi, Huawei, NEC, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, Apple(?), LG(?), Nokia(?) |
| LGE2 | Support proposal 2-2a. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| CATT | We are fine with Proposal 2-2a. |
| Samsung | Support Proposal 2-2a. |
| Ericsson | Agree with proposal **2-2a** |
| CAICT | Support Proposal 2-2a. |
| Nokia | We are Ok with the proposal, as mentioned also before, we prefer to replace the terms ***BM-Case1***with the actual scheme name *“****Spatial-domain DL beam prediction”*** *or use* ***“Case1”.*** |
| Futurewei | We are ok with proposal 2-2a. |
| HW/HiSi | Support 2-2a, with the understanding that both Alt1 and Alt2 can be studied. |
| InterDigital | Support 2-2a and both Alt.1 and Alt.2. |
| NVIDIA | Support proposal 2-2a |
| MediaTek | Support 2-2a with bot Alt. 1 and Alt. 2 |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 2-2a. Further, we suggest adding the prospect of designing efficient set of measurement beams (for set B)-as opposed to relying on a regular pre-defined codebook of wide beams- as Alt. 3 or mentioning as FFS for Alt. 2 that set B is not limited to regular pre-defined codebook of wide beams and can be efficiently and purposefully designed for beam prediction purpose. |
| Lenovo | Support proposal 2-2a. |

Proposal 2-2 (Round#2)

For Proposal 2-2a, based on the inputs received so far, we have the following observation:

* Supported: vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Lenovo, Xiaomi, Huawei, NEC, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, ZTE, IDC, Apple, LG, QC (24)
* Nokia is Ok with the proposal, as mentioned also before, we prefer to replace the terms ***BM-Case1***with the actual scheme name *“****Spatial-domain DL beam prediction”*** *or use* ***“Case1”.***
* Additionally, QC suggested adding some FFS part.

Thus, Proposal 2-2a seems acceptable to all companies. Let’s try to whether companies agree to add a FFS part. The proposal is updated by adding a new FFS (highlighted by Yellow) as below:

***Proposal 2-2b: For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider the following alternatives for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
* ***Alt.2: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: QCL relation between beams in Set A and beams in Set B***
  + ***FFS: construction of Set B***
* ***Note: Set A is for DL beam prediction and Set B is for DL beam measurement.***

Please provide your input wrt the above proposal. In addition, feel free to provide other comment/suggestion. Further refinement will be based on the inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Nokia | Similar comments as in earlier round. |
| CMCC | Fine with the highlighted FFS.  What is the intention to mention QCL relation here?  FL: The FFS part regarding QCL is proposed by Lenovo. |
| NEC | Support |
| Xiaomi | Prefer to clarify the meaning of construction.  FL: Please see the explanation from QC. An “e.g., ” part is added to clarified the comment from several companies. |
| Fujitsu | Support it. |
| CAICT | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | Support Proposal 2-2b. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal.  Note that there is no definition in 3GPP of such narrow/wide beams. We propose to add the note below.  *Note: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact*  FL: The note is added in the updated proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Details about beam construction in the FFS need to be clarified. It seems that purposefully designed codebook of Set A and B are up to implementations and don't need to be aligned.  FL: Please see the explanation from QC. It is an FFS part and whether it is need to be aligned or not is up to the group. An “e.g., ” part is added to clarified the comment from several companies. |
| LGE | Support. |
| Samsung | For the new FFS, could FL clarify ‘construction’ since we are not sure the intention of this wording.  FL: Please see the explanation from QC. An “e.g., ” part is added to clarified the comment from several companies. |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal |
| HW/HiSi | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal. To elaborate on the ‘construction’ of Set B, the baseline option can be to rely on regular pre-defined codebook options for wide beams (e.g., SSB beams) to predict Set A of narrow beams (e.g., CSI-RS beams). An alternative approach is to consider other options for set B that is not limited to regular pre-defined codebook of wide beams and can be efficiently and purposefully designed for beam prediction purpose. An example of this ‘construction’ aspect is to consider different linear combinations of narrow beams in Set A as Set B and try to predict beams from Set A accordingly. The fundamental question that we think is worth exploring is whether the beams in Set B can be ‘designed’ in such a way so as to facilitate and improve the spatial prediction. |
| Intel | OK in general but we prefer some clarification or examples for what “construction of Set B” means. Some examples as part of FFS text would be good.  FL: Please see the explanation from QC. An “e.g., ” part is added to clarified the comment from several companies. |
| NVIDIA | Support |
| InterDigital | Support the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Support |

###### Proposal 2-2 (Round#3)

Summary of discussion on Proposal 2-2b:

* Supported: vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Lenovo, Xiaomi, Huawei, NEC, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, ZTE, IDC, Apple, LG, QC, Nokia (25)

Xiaomi, Samsung, ZTE and Intel requested some clarifications on “construction of Set B”. QC made some clarifications in the inputs. An “e.g.,” part is also added to the proposal to make the clarification.

Ericsson suggested a note to clarify that the terminologies of wide beam and narrow beam are only used for discussion purpose, which is also added to the update version (Proposal 2-2c).

***Proposal 2-2c: For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider the following alternatives for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
* ***Alt.2: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: QCL relation between beams in Set A and beams in Set B***
  + ***FFS: construction of Set B (e.g., regular pre-defined codebook, codebook other than regular pre-defined one)***
* ***Note1: Set A is for DL beam prediction and Set B is for DL beam measurement.***
* ***Note2: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact***

This proposal seems acceptable to most companies. Thus, the following table is only to check whether some company has strong concern.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Company/Reasons** |
| STRONG concern | Nokia : Not a strong concern on the direction of the proposal. We have some concerns on some texts. It is not clear why we discuss construction only for Set B in Alt.2. We suggest deleting that bullet. Also, better to change the wording of Alt.2 as “Set A and Set B are different (Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams)”)  FL: As explained by some companies, they are considering different types of beams. It would be ok to keep it at this stage. How to deal with this FFS part is up to further discussion.  For the wording change, these seems no much difference.  Let’s hear other companies’ view.  QC: Response communicated through email, also repeated here:   * we suggest rewording the FFS to the following, clarifying the intent:   + ***FFS: construction of Set B (e.g., beam patterns of set B being optimized to enhance prediction accuracy of Set A)***   Ericsson: Regarding construction of Set B. Agree with Nokia, we also suggest deleting the bullet. In the proposed update from QC, it is unclear how set B is selected otherwise, if not for the cause of optimizing the prediction accuracy on Set A? Is there a trade-off between set A prediction accuracy and performances for other procedures such as initial access? We think the update adds more confusion. |

The following is copied from the email discussion

***(Proposal 2-2c is updated to 2-2d , the change is the highlighted part in Alt.2 )***

***Proposal 2-2d: For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider the following alternatives for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
* ***Alt.2: Set A and Set B are different (e.g. Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams)***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: QCL relation between beams in Set A and beams in Set B***
  + ***FFS: construction of Set B (e.g., regular pre-defined codebook, codebook other than regular pre-defined one)***
* ***Note1: Set A is for DL beam prediction and Set B is for DL beam measurement.***
* ***Note2: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| FL | Nokia suggested to delete the FFS part for construction of Set B.  Would some proponents (e.g., QC) like to make some further clarification to convince Nokia? |
| FL2 | @Keeth   Please check whether QC’s clarification/modification for 2-2d is acceptable   * QC suggested rewording the FFS to the following, clarifying the intent:   + ***FFS: construction of Set B (e.g., beam patterns of set B being optimized to enhance prediction accuracy of Set A)*** |
| HW/HiSi | Fine with the proposal |
| Nokia | ML solution applied for beam prediction in spatial domain and not on construction of Set B. If companies wish to further define their preferences on Set B, companies can bring those suggestions. We think the following Note may be more suitable, and suggest to delete the FFS as the note may address the concerns.  ***Note3: The codebook constructions of Set A and Set B can be clarified by the companies.*** |
| Samsung | Fine with the proposal. |
| CATT | Fine with the proposal and also Nokia’s Note3. |
| Ericsson | Regarding construction of Set B. Agree with Nokia, we also suggest deleting the bullet, and add the note 3 above. In the proposed update from QC, it is unclear how set B is selected otherwise, if not for the cause of optimizing the prediction accuracy on Set A? Is there a trade-off between set A prediction accuracy and performances for other procedures such as initial access? We think the update adds more confusion. |
| LGE | OK with the proposal and Note3 commented by Nokia. |

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

For AI/ML input, there are also different proposals for companies. Thus, based on the contributions, the following proposal can be discussed, and further refined based on the inputs:

***~~Proposal 2-3: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML input with potential down-selection:~~***

* ***~~Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams~~***
* ***~~Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and the corresponding beam ID~~***
* ***~~Alt.3: …~~***

***Proposal 2-3a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML input:***

* ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and the corresponding DL Tx beam ID***
* ***Alt.3: CIR based on Set B of DL Tx beam(s)***
* ***Alt.4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, beam ID, beam angle or position information***
* ***Alt.5: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, assistance information and expected information which the output of AI model is predicted partial RSRPs corresponding to expected Rx angle in AI input.***
* ***Alt.6: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and the corresponding DL Tx beam ID and DL Rx beam ID***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***

Please provide your input wrt the above alternatives in the above proposal as well as any other potential alternative that should be treated with high priority. In addition, feel free to provide other comment/suggestion. Further refinement will be based on the inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We suggest adding the following alternative:   * ***Alt.3: CIR based on Set B of DL Tx beam(s)*** |
| vivo | From our perspective, 3 alternatives can be studies,   * ***Alt 1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt 2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, beam ID, beam angle or position information*** * ***Alt 3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, assistance information and expected information which the output of AI model is predicted partial RSRPs corresponding to expected Rx angle in AI input.***   Thus, different assistance information can be discussed in Alt 2 or Alt 3. |
| Futurewei | Regarding the input, we prefer leaving it open to company’s implementation. |
| Xiaomi | As for the corresponding beam ID, we want to clarify that is it only related to Tx beam ID or both Tx and Rx beam ID?  FL: Alt.6 is added and Alt.2 is updated to make it clearer |
| Lenovo | More clarification on Alt1 is needed.  Does Alt1 mean that the measured L1-RSRP corresponding to all the beams in Set B are taken as AI/ML input?  FL: Yes |
| HW/HiSi | At least Alt 1 can be studied, open to Alt 2 as well |
| NEC | Neither of the two alternatives should be precluded at the beginning of the study. So, we prefer adding the following alternative:   * ***Alt.3: both Alt.1 and Alt.2***   FL: it is a list for further study, not to preclude any alternative. If the proponent can share their preferred alternatives, other companies can have better understanding on them. |
| LGE | We think we don’t need to restrict the AI/ML input, Companies can provide their input such as Tx/Rx beam ID, UE position related information, etc. But, Alt 1 or Alt 2 can be the baseline.  FL: it is a list for further study, not to preclude any alternative. If the proponent can share their preferred alternatives, other companies can have better understanding on them. |
| Ericsson | We don’t think the input should be restricted to RSRP measurements but could also include information such as UE position information. Avoid restricting the input open for now.  FL: it is a list for further study, not to preclude any alternative. If the proponent can share their preferred alternatives, other companies can have better understanding on them. |
| Nokia, NSB | Agree LGE, inputs consider at the ML model can be proprietary, and there can be other inputs to consider than the ones listed in the proposal. Not sure there is enough evidence to remove different alternatives.  ***Proposal 2-3: Regarding the sub use case ~~BM-~~Case1, further study at least the following alternatives for AI/ML input with potential down-selection:***   * ***Alt.1: Only one input parameter type (e.g., L1-RSRP, CIR) measurementconsidered based on Set B of DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt.2: More than one input parameter types (e.g., L1-RSRP, beam ID, , beam angle) measurementconsideredbased on Set B of DL Tx beams ~~and the corresponding beam ID~~*** * ***Alt.3: One or more input parameter type(s) (e.g., L1-RSRP, beam ID, beam angle) measurement consideredbased on Set B of DL Tx beams with other assistance information.***   ***For each alternative, companies to provide details on any impacts to Air-interface signaling to generate input parameters to ML model.***  FL: The AI/ML model can be proprietary for commercial products. In this AI/ML study item, we need some “nominal inputs” to facilitate the discussion. Otherwise, it is very difficult for other companies to understand the use case and AI/ML solution from a company. Thus, we can consider that all the inputs are “nominal” and are used for discussion purpose. I can have a note to make it clear |
| CATT | We don’t need to make decision at this early stage. Companies can choose their input for the purpose of study.  FL: it is a list for further study, not to make any down selection. If the proponent can share their preferred alternatives, other companies can have better understanding on them. I also add a note to clarify that it is open to other alternatives. |
| Fujitsu | We think beside the L1-RSRP measurement based on set B, whether additional inputs are required depends on AI/ML model and its evaluation results. It should be open and not necessary to limit the AI/ML model input in initial stage.  FL: it is a list for further study, not to make any down selection. If the proponent can share their preferred alternatives, other companies can have better understanding on them. I also add a note to clarify that it is open to other alternatives. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal in general and we are also fine to additionally include Alt 2 provided by vivo. Moreover, L1-RSRP can be considered as baseline, and additional metrics can be considered as potential AI input, but justification is needed, e.g., the gain achieved with or without the additional metrics. |
| CMCC | Alternatives from vivo is fine. The relationship between different alternatives may be not exclusive. The selection of Alt1 or Alt2 may depend on whether sparse beam pattern is fixed or variable. Alt3 intends to make one AI model applicable to Ues with different Rx beam number. |
| NVIDIA | It does not appear necessary to make such down selection at this early stage of the study item. It should be up to companies to explore. Support to further study this.  FL: it is a list for further study, not to make any down selection. If the proponent can share their preferred alternatives, other companies can have better understanding on them. I also add a note to clarify that it is open to other alternatives. |
| CAICT | We think L1-RSRP should be included and other input could also be considered for performance further enhancement. It may depend on company’s input.  FL: it is a list for further study, not to make any down selection. If the proponent can share their preferred alternatives, other companies can have better understanding on them. I also add a note to clarify that it is open to other alternatives. |
| OPPO | We prefer Alt.2 and open to other alternatives |
| MediaTek | At this moment we can leave it open, as we believe more discussions and clarifications are required.  FL: it is a list for further study, not to make any down selection. If the proponent can share their preferred alternatives, other companies can have better understanding on them. I also add a note to clarify that it is open to other alternatives. |
| Intel | This should be discussed later. At this point all options should be on the table.  FL: it is a list for further study, not to make any down selection. If the proponent can share their preferred alternatives, other companies can have better understanding on them. I also add a note to clarify that it is open to other alternatives. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer to make an inclusive list where each component is not a combination (e.g., each component is L1-RSRP, Beam ID, or etc.), because combinations could be large and diverse. In that case, maybe Option can be used instead of Alternative.  FL: Let’s try our best, but it is really difficult in some cases. |
| FL | Proposal 2-3 is updated to Proposal 2-3a. Please continue to comment on the updated proposal. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer to revise Alt 4 as below:   * ***Alt.4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, Tx/Rx beam ID, Tx/Rx beam angle or position information*** |
| LGE2 | Similar comment as proposal 3-4a. Alt 4 can be revised as below on top of Xiaomi’s revision.   * ***Alt.4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, Tx/Rx beam ID, Tx/Rx beam angle or position information, and etc.***   + ***Companies can provide detailed assistance information other than above example.*** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Xiaomi and LGE2’s update is fine to us. For Alt.4, assistance information about beam ID, beam angle, beam width or beam pattern for both transmit beam and receive beam may be helpful for further prediction accurate improvement. |
| Panasonic | To some extent, we share similar view as DOCOMO that it would be less effort to list the components. On the other hand, by listing the combinations explicitly, it can help for companies to understand each other, which is useful in this early stage of SI. So we think the current approaches could be fine. |
| CATT | With the understanding and the Note that other potential alternatives are not precluded, we are OK with this Proposal 2-3a.  Also OK with Xiaomi and LG’s update. |
| Vivo | We would like to reword Alt5 as following:   * ***Alt.5: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, assistance information and expected beam for the prediction, e.g., expected Tx or Rx angle or beam ID for the prediction ~~which the output of AI model is predicted partial RSRPs corresponding to expected Rx angle in AI input~~.*** |
| Samsung | Agree the proposal in principle. However, the current proposal includes too many similar alternatives, and most of them can be combined with Alt-2. Hence, we suggest the following revision:  ***Proposal 2-3a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML input:***   * ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information*** * ***Alt.3: CIR based on Set B of DL Tx beam(s)*** * ***~~Alt.4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, beam ID, beam angle or position information~~*** * ***~~Alt.5: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, assistance information and expected information which the output of AI model is predicted partial RSRPs corresponding to expected Rx angle in AI input.~~*** * ***~~Alt.6: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and the corresponding DL Tx beam ID and DL Rx beam ID~~*** * ***FFS: Assistance information (e.g., beam ID, beam angel, position information, expected RSRPs, etc.)*** * ***~~Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)~~*** * ***Note~~2~~: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***   Also, as we mentioned earlier, a lot of potential metrics can be considered as potential AI input, but justification is needed, e.g., the gain achieved with or without the additional metrics. |
| Ericsson | Agree with the update from Xiaomi. However, unclear what is the definition of a beam angle. Is the beam angle in respect to the antenna? Or to an earth-bounded coordinate system? Suggest removing references to beam angles. Change alternative 4 :  ***Alt.4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, Tx/Rx beam ID, position information, and etc.*** |
| CAICT | We support Samsung’s proposal. |
| Nokia | We have a general proposal as commented before, and we think that is a good direction as this is the first meeting. Anyways, we are Ok with the proposal by FL provided that Note1 is captured as Alt7. This is the very first meeting and we think we should be open on these aspects. |
| Futurewei | Proposal 2-3a contains too many options which may be confusing. We think Samsung’s wording is ok to be a starting point. |
| HW/HiSi | We support with some reservation. We think that there are too many alternatives on the table but we can accept it for the sake of progress during this stage. |
| InterDigital | We support Proposal 2-3a. |
| NVIDIA | Understand the intention of Proposal 2-3a. But a long list of items may be confusing and counterproductive. The condensed version from Samsung is a better starting point. |
| MediaTek | We think the Proposal contains too many options. Samsung’s wording can be a good starting point. |
| Qualcomm | Agree in principle, and suggest the following revision, which abstracts the additional information under the umbrella of assistance information, to make the wording succinct and add beam shape information:  ***Proposal 2-3a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML input:***   * ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and ~~the corresponding DL Tx beam ID~~ assistance information*** * ***Alt.3: CIR based on Set B of DL Tx beam(s)*** * ***~~Alt.4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, beam ID, beam angle or position information~~*** * ***~~Alt.5: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, assistance information and expected information which the output of AI model is predicted partial RSRPs corresponding to expected Rx angle in AI input.~~*** * ***~~Alt.6: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and the corresponding DL Tx beam ID and DL Rx beam ID~~*** * ***FFS: Assistance information can be beam ID, beam shape information (e.g., beam pattern, beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, etc.), position information, etc.*** * ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)*** * ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.*** |
| Sony | Firstly, we prefer to use DL Tx/Rx beam instead of DL Tx beam in Proposal 2-3a for the reason that DL Rx beam prediction at UE side has not been ruled out at this stage.    Secondly, we suggest to revise alt 4 as   * ***Alt.4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and*/or *assistance information which may include, beam ID, beam angle or position information***   FL: Would you like to clarify if L1-RSP is not used, what is the assistance information? If only positioning information is used without L1-RSRP, it seems more like BM-Case4. Please correct me if I missed something. |
| Lenovo | Agree with QC and Samsung that Alt4, Alt5 and Alt6 can be merged and we prefer QC version.  To be more accurate, we suggest the following update Alt 1, Alt2 and Alt 3:   * ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement ~~based on Set B~~ of all DL Tx beams in Set B*** * ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement ~~based on Set B~~ of all DL Tx beams in Set B and ~~the corresponding DL Tx beam ID~~ assistance information*** * ***Alt.3: CIR of part ~~based on Set B~~ of DL Tx beam(s) in Set B*** |

Proposal 2-3 (Round#2)

For Proposal 2-3a, the alternatives are quite diverse. A number of companies suggest to merge some alternatives to keep the proposal more concise. Following this approach, a new version of the proposal is provided based on Samsung’s version and other companies’ inputs. For the assistance information, FL tried to include all companies’ inputs even though some other companies may not support. It is FFS part and FL thinks companies are likely to be more flexible on it.

***Proposal 2-3b: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML input:***

* ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information***
* ***Alt.3: CIR based on Set B of DL Tx beam(s)***
* ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companions in the discussion: Tx/Rx beam ID, beam shape information (e.g., beam pattern, beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, etc.), expected beam for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx/ Rx angle, beam ID for the prediction), position information, etc.***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| OPPO | Thanks for re-organizing it as Proposal 2-3b to which we are supportive.  One editorial comment within the FFS is that could we consider to change “Tx/Rx beam ID” into “Tx and/or Rx beam ID” which is more inclusive to allow the beam pair link (Tx beam and Rx beam) to be input to AI/ML model.  FL: Xiaomi’s version is included in the updated proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal and fine with OPPO’s revision. |
| CATT | We think Proposal 2-3b is OK, and also OK with OPPO’s update. |
| Nokia | Fourth sub-bullet (FFS) should be within Alt.2.  FL: Fixed in the updated proposal |
| CMCC | Support. |
| NEC | Support FL’s proposal and agree with OPPO’s suggestion.  FL: Xiaomi’s version is included in the updated proposal |
| Xiaomi | As for FFS, we prefer the following modification   * ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companions in the discussion: Tx and/or Rx beam ID, Tx and/or Rx beam shape information (e.g., Tx and/or Rx beam pattern, Tx and/or Rx beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, etc.), expected Tx and/or Rx beam for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx/ Rx angle, Tx and/or Rx beam ID for the prediction), position information, etc.***   FL: Included in the updated proposal |
| Fujitsu | Basically, we support it. We have one comment on L1-RSRP. Since L1-RSRP is measured on beam pair (DL Tx beam and Rx beam), it will make confusion to emphasize Tx beams only. It’s recommended to delete “DL Tx beams”   * ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beams~~*** * ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beams~~ and assistance information***   FL: Reflected in the updated proposal |
| CAICT | Support the proposal. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal with OPPO’s revision. |
| Panasonic | We are ok with OPPO’s revision. |
| Ericsson | Support in general. It is recommended to include Rx beam based on the issue raised by Fujitsu, “…Set B of DL Tx/Rx beams….”.  FL: According to Fujitsu’s comment, “ DL Tx beam” is removed |
| ZTE, Sanechips | OPPO and Xiaomi’s update is fine to us. |
| LGE | We are also OK with OPPO and Xiaomi’s update. |
| Futurewei | In general, we are ok with proposal 2-3b. However, we suggest only specifying ”Set B beams”, i.e., removing “ of DL Tx” from both options.  FL: Reflected in the updated proposal |
| Samsung | We are fine with OPPO’s revision. |
| Sony | Add UE moving direction information as assistance information.   * ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companions in the discussion: Tx/Rx beam ID, beam shape information (e.g., beam pattern, beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, etc.), expected beam for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx/ Rx angle, beam ID for the prediction), position information, UE moving direction information, etc.***   To answer FL’s following comment, Yes, we think it is case 4.  FI: “If only positioning information is used without L1-RSRP, it seems more like BM-Case4. Please correct me if I missed something.” |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal |
| HW/HiSi | We support Alt 1 and Alt 2. For Alt 3, we do not think it is needed.  FL: Since Alt.3 is supported by some companies and this is the first meeting, it is suggested to keep it as a starting point. Moreover, Note1 allows companies to have other alternatives. Further down-selection can be discussed later.  For the FFS part, the mentioned assistance information (e.g. ***beam shape information***) is implementation related information at the gNB side. We are concerned whether this kind of information can be disclosed and shared with the opposite node.  FL: It is FFS part. The detailed information provided there is to facilitate companies to better understand the schemes. Whether some information can be disclosed or have some spec impact is another story. |
| Qualcomm | Support the proposal and OK with OPPO’s revision. |
| Intel | Support the proposal in general.  We also think Alt-3 may not be needed and Alt-1 and 2 are sufficient. The only concern is that with the reformulation and list of assistance information, we should make sure that BM-Case1 does not evolve into multiple sub-use-cases with different assistance information where comparison of results is difficult.  FL: Understand the intention. Since this is the first meeting, we can focus on the common part and leave details as FFS (e.g., assistance information). Otherwise, it seems impractical for the group to converge on some consensus in this first meeting. Additional comment please see my reply to Huawei. |
| NVIDIA | We support the proposal |
| InterDigital | We prefer Proposal 2-3a as we don’t think that multiple alternatives could be a problem at the initial stage for the further study. |
| Lenovo | We support the proposal. |

###### Proposal 2-3 (Round#3)

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 2-3b

* Supported: OPPO, DCM, CATT, Nokia, CMCC, NEC, Xiaomi, Fujitsu, CAICT, Spreadtrum, Panasonic, Ericsson, ZTE, LGE, FUTUREWEI, Samsung, Sony, MTK, QC, Intel, NVIDIA, IDC, Lenovo (23)
* Huawei (?)

The comments are mainly related to the Rx beams. Xiaomi’s suggestion is included to update the proposal.

Fujitsu proposed to remove “of DL Tx beams” for each alternative since the measurement is based on beam pairs rather only Tx beams. This suggestion is also captured in the updated proposal.

There was some concern on Alt.3 and/or different types of assistance information. Since there are supported by some companies and this is the first meeting, it is suggested to keep them as a starting point. Otherwise, it seems impractical for the group to converge on some consensus in this first meeting. Further down-selection can be discussed later.

IDC raised a valid point in the comment for Proposal 3-4. Thus, Alt.4 is added. Accordingly, the “Tx/Rx beam ID” is removed from the FFS part since it is captured by Alt.4.

Based on the above information, Proposal 2-3b is updated as below

***Proposal 2-3c: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML input:***

* ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beams~~***
* ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beams~~ and assistance information***
  + ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companions in the discussion: ~~Tx/Rx beam ID,~~ Tx and/or Rx beam shape information (e.g., Tx and/or Rx beam pattern, Tx and/or Rx beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, etc.), expected Tx and/or Rx beam for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx and/or Rx angle, Tx and/or Rx beam ID for the prediction), UE position information, UE direction information, Tx beam usage information, etc.***
    - ***Note: The provision of assistance information is probably infeasible due to the concern of disclosure proprietary information to the other side.***
* ***Alt.3: CIR based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beam(s)~~***
* ***Alt.4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and the corresponding DL Tx and/or Rx beam ID***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***

This proposal seems acceptable to most companies. Thus, the following table is only to check whether some company has strong concern.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Company/Reasons** |
| STRONG concern | Nokia: We do not have a strong concern, but some of the wording in the above agreement should be improved. For example,   * what is a “pointing angle”? It is better fitted to mention “Angle of Departure”.   FL: Wait for the views of the proponent of “beam pointing angle”   * “Position information” should be “UE position information”.   FL: Seem no ambiguity here. It is also added to make it clearer.  We also suggest adding “Tx beam usage information” as assistance information.  FL: added |
|  | HW/HiSi: We still have a concern on the FFS, which requires to disclose the implementation related information. However, for progress we would be fine with the FFS if the following note is added:   * + ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companions in the discussion: ~~Tx/Rx beam ID,~~ Tx and/or Rx beam shape information (e.g., Tx and/or Rx beam pattern, Tx and/or Rx beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, etc.), expected Tx and/or Rx beam for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx and/or Rx angle, Tx and/or Rx beam ID for the prediction), position information, etc.***     - Note: The provision of assistance information is probably infeasible due to the concern of disclosure proprietary information to the other side.   FL: added |
|  | Lenovo: we just want to clarify that the difference between Alt2 and Alt3 is that only part of beams in Set B are measured for Alt3?  FL: For Alt.3, the input is CIR, rather than L1-RSRP. |
|  | NTT DOCOMO: We think the list misses the inputs containing both Tx and/or RX beam ID and assistance information such as UE position information. To avoid precluding options, we prefer to add  ***Alt.5 L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B, the corresponding DL Tx and/or Rx beam ID, and assistance information***  or we are ok with DL Tx and/or Rx beam ID as an assistance information like the previous version of proposals. |
|  | Qualcomm: No strong concern, just a minor edit:   * ***Note: The provision of assistance information ~~is probably~~ may be infeasible due to the concern of ~~disclosure~~ disclosing proprietary information to the other side.***   Also, response regarding ‘beam pointing angles’ communicated over email, also repeated here:   * The formal terminology for ‘beam pointing angle’ which is already used in TS 37.355 for PRS beams is ‘beam boresight direction’ which is meant to refer to direction (azimuth and elevation) of peak beam gain for beams from analog beamforming codebook. It is important to highlight the difference between ‘beam boresight direction’ and ‘angle of departure’ as the former is a property of the beam whereas the latter is a property of the channel. So we suggest changing ‘beam pointing angle’ to ‘beam boresight direction (azimuth and elevation)’. |
|  | Ericsson: We prefer keeping the note by HW/HiSi. We also suggest adding “UE orientation information”. Understanding the current orientation in earth-bounded coordinate system can improve the selection of RX-beam. |

The following is copied from email discussion

***Proposal 2-3c: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML input:***

* ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B***
* ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and assistance information***
  + ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companions in the discussion:  ~~Tx and/or Rx beam ID,~~ Tx and/or Rx beam shape information (e.g., Tx and/or Rx beam pattern, Tx and/or Rx ~~beam pointing angles~~*** ***beam boresight direction (azimuth and elevation), 3dB beamwidth, etc.), expected Tx and/or Rx beam for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx and/or Rx angle, Tx and/or Rx beam ID for the prediction), UE position information, UE direction information, Tx beam usage information, UE orientation information, etc.***
    - ***Note: The provision of assistance information may be infeasible due to the concern of disclosing proprietary information to the other side.***
* ***Alt.3: CIR based on Set B***
* ***Alt.4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and the corresponding DL Tx and/or Rx beam ID***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s) including the combination of some alternatives***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| FL | Nokia suggested to replace “***beam pointing angles***” by “Angle of Departure”.   Would the proponents of “beam pointing angles” like to confirm whether this change is acceptable or suggest some other better wording? |
| FL2 | Based on QC’s input/email, “beam pointing angle” is changed to “beam boresight direction (azimuth and elevation)”. |
| FL3 | 1. As suggested by DCM, keep “***Tx and/or Rx beam ID***” as an example of assistance information  2. Editorial change for the note suggested by QC as below:   * ***Note: The provision of assistance information ~~is probably~~ may be infeasible due to the concern of ~~disclosure~~ disclosing proprietary information to the other side.*** |
| HW/HiSi | We still think that the provision is probably infeasible, but we are ok with “may be infeasible  FL: Thanks for your flexibility |
| FL4: | 1.“Tx and/or Rx beam ID” is deleted based on Lenovo’s comment, and  add “including the combination of some alternatives” in Note2 to address DCM’s concern  2. UE orientation information is added in FFS part based on Ericsson’s input |
| Nokia | We are fine with the update. We do not fully see a need for newly added note. The details are anyways for study purpose alone, and companies can always not disclose relevant ML algorithms + input/output in minimal level. Assistance information is only useful to identify if there is anything that needs to support via signaling.  FL: The new note is supported by Huawei/Ericsson. In my understanding, the intention is to ensure that NW vendor has the right not to disclose the implementation and some schemes may not be workable. I think there is no harm if we keep it. |
| Samsung | We are fine to keep the example of beam ID in Alt-2. For Alt-4, could FL clarify the intention to explicit mention Alt 4?  FL: some companies thought the beam ID is important than RSRP and there should be a basic alternative including beam ID. If we only keep Alt.-2, the beam ID is optional. Thus, Alt-4 is added. More information please see FL4 above. |
| CATT | We are fine with the latest update. |
| LGE | Although beam shape information related requirement is not defined in RAN4 specification, we are fine with the latest update for study purpose. |

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

***~~Proposal 2-4: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output with potential down-selection:~~***

* ***~~Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams~~*** 
  + ***~~FFS: N1~~***
* ***~~Alt.2: …~~***

***Proposal 2-4a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output:***

* ***Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams*** 
  + ***FFS: N1***
* ***Alt.2: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.3: Beam ID(s) and possibility for the beam to be the best beam of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.4: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL beams with L1-RSRP higher than a threshold.***
* ***Alt.5: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams and an updated set B***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: Beam ID is only used for discussion purpose***
* ***Note3: All the outputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose***

Please provide your input wrt the above alternatives in the above proposal as well as any other potential alternative that should be treated with high priority. In addition, feel free to provide other comment/suggestion. Further refinement will be based on the inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We suggest adding the following. Compared to predicted L1-RSRP in Alt1, the possibility for the beam to be the best beam could be more important.  ***Alt.2: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams***  ***Alt.3: Beam ID(s) and possibility for the beam to be the best beam of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams*** |
| vivo | This is first meeting. We can make the categories more generic and inclusive.  ***Proposal 2-4: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output with potential down-selection:***   * ***Alt.1: L1-RSRP*** * ***Alt.2: Beam information, such as beam ID, beam angle.*** * ***Alt 3: confidence level*** * ***Alt 4:…***   FL: I tend to agree with DCM’s comment “We prefer to make an inclusive list where each component is not a combination (e.g., each component is L1-RSRP, Beam ID, or etc.), because combinations could be large and diverse.”. It would be easier for companies to understand each alternative. Would you like to add some alternatives with concrete output? |
| Futurewei | We suggest leaving the output also open to company’s implementation choice as long as we agree on the set of performance evaluation metrics. For example, if companies agree to use Top-1/optimal/best beam prediction accuracy as one of the KPIs, then directly predicting L1-RSRP may not be required. If, however, companies agree to use measured RSRP or RSRP gap as one of the KPIs, then at least the predicted L1-RSRP (for the Top-1 or Top-K beams) has to be available from the output (either directly as a prediction output or not).  FL: it is a list for further study, not to make any down selection. If the proponent can share their preferred alternatives, other companies can have better understanding on them. I also add a note to clarify that it is open to other alternatives. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer to separate L1-RSRP and beam ID as two alternatives.  FL: Alt.2 is added |
| Lenovo | Suggest to add another Alt.  ***Alt.2: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL beams with L1-RSRP higher than a threshold.*** |
| HW/HiSi | In this early stage the output can be left to implementation. However, if and alignment across companies is desired, then we prefer Alt 1. |
| NEC | We suggest adding the following alternative:   * ***Alt.2: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams***   + ***FFS: N1*** |
| LGE | Predicted beam ID(s) and predicted RSRP of predicted beam(s) are fine for us. |
| Panasonic | Agree with Apple that best beam ID(s) are more important than predicted L1-RSRP values. Furthermore, we think a new set B (updated from old set B) can also be considered as the output.  FL: Add Alt.5. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Alt2. Note that beam ID is not defined in current standard. However, there are TCI states.  We propose another alternative.  ***Alt.2: TCI states and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 TCI states***  FL: Add a note to clarify beam ID is only use for discuss purpose. In fact, the beam is associated with SSB/CSI-RS and in some case it is not clear whether the corresponding TCI state is configured or not |
| Nokia, NSB | As AI/ML models are proprietary, there can be other outputs. In general, it is hard to define outputs at this stage. If the P.2-3 update looks ok, we can consider a similar approach to cover alternatives.  FL: please see my reply to Proposal 2-3 |
| CATT | At this early stage, the output shall be open for companies to choose their implementation. For example, the confidence of the predicted beams to be the best beam, or, the confidence of the predicted RSRP higher than a threshold.  FL: please see my reply to Proposal 2-3 |
| Fujitsu | To decide the AI/ML output, it needs to clarify if the AI/ML model includes some post-processing or not. For example, the best beam ID can be derived from predicted L1-RSRP with some post-processing. In this case, the basic outputs may select “***the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams***”, and other expected outputs are derived from it with some conventional methods. We suggest adding the flowing alternative in initial stage.  Alt2: ***the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams***  FL: I don’t fully understand it. Would you like to elaborate a bit more how to determine the predicted Tx beams only based on N1 L1-RSRP values? |
| Samsung | We fine with the Alt-1 in the proposal. Also, Alt-2 provided by Apple is also acceptable to us. |
| CMCC | To predict Top-N1 DL Tx beams, the output of AI model may include RSRP of Top-N1 DL Tx beams, or RSRP of all DL Tx beams and Top-N1 DL Tx beams are selected based on all RSRP. The number of predicted DL Tx beams of AI model does not need to be fixed.  ***Proposal 2-4: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output with potential down-selection:***   * ***Alt.1: L1-RSRP*** * ***Alt.2: Beam information, such as beam ID, beam angle.*** * ***Alt 3: L1-RSRP and beam information.***   ***…***  FL: If we consider the final ouput, your proposal seems to consider “Top-N1 DL Tx beams” without the RSRP. The RSRP of all DL Tx beams can be considered as the intermediate result.  For the suggest proposal, please see my reply to vivo. |
| NVIDIA | It does not appear necessary to make such down selection at this early stage of the study item. It should be up to companies to explore.  FL: Please see m reply to Proposal 2-3 |
| CAICT | We are fine with Alt.1 for BM-Case1 as baseline. |
| OPPO | We are fine with Alt-1 and Alt-2 proposed by Apple |
| MediaTek | L1-RSRP in Alt 1 can be considered as the baseline. However, instead of accurate number of L1-RSRP in future time slots, we may want AI/ML to predict who will be the Top-N1 beams, this can be just a list of beam IDs or associated with some probabilities.  Moreover, in case of inter-cell beam management, we suggest the following:  ***Alt.x: Cell ID(s) which the predicted Top-N1 DL beams belong to.***  FL: Not sure whether it should be a separate alternative here. If AL/ML model predicts the Top-N1 DL beams, the Cell ID is known accordingly. In my understanding, this alternative is the same as Alt.2 |
| Intel | L1-RSRP output for all beams from ML model should also be considered. This is the case where the ML model learns the RSRP distribution across all beams. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We also prefer making a inclusive list as suggested by vivo, as there are a variety of combinations. In that case, maybe Option can be used instead of Alternative. |
| FL | Proposal 2-4 is updated to Proposal 2-4a. Please continue to comment on the updated proposal. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with CMCC that the measured L1-RSRP of all DL Tx beams can be an alternative for AI output without beam ID. Note that apart from best beam ID(s), the predicted L1-RSRP also matters because it can imply the transmission quality and the beam with largest predicted L1-RSRP is not always selected for transmission from the perspective of NW scheduling. Since the FL mentioned that “the RSRP of all DL Tx beams can be considered as the intermediate result”, it’s better to clarify the difference between AI output and intermediate result.  FL: In my understanding, if Beam ID(s) can be obtained from data structure of the predicted (e.g., the location in a matrix, vector, …), it means AL/ML outputs the information of Beam ID as well. Thus, it seems belonging to Alt.1. |
| CATT | With the understanding and the Note that other potential alternatives are not precluded, we are OK with this Proposal 2-4a.  To resolve CMCC and ZTE’s concern, maybe we can consider changing Alt.1 to:   * ***Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams***    + ***FFS: N1*** |
| vivo | We would like to add the following alternatives:  ***Alt. 6: The predicted RSRP of all potential beams***  ***Alt. 7: The predicted RSRP corresponding to the expected beam direction which is input to the model.***  FL: In my understanding, if Beam ID(s) can be obtained from data structure of the predicted (e.g., the location in a matrix, vector, …), it means AL/ML outputs the information of Beam ID as well. Thus, Alt.6 seems belonging to Alt.1. Could the updated Alt.1 can cover Alt.6?  Alt. 7 is added. |
| Samsung | Support Proposal 2-4a. We think the FFS should be placed at the same level of Alts.  ***Proposal 2-4a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output:***   * ***Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams***    + ***~~FFS: N1~~*** * ***Alt.2: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt.3: Beam ID(s) and possibility for the beam to be the best beam of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt.4: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL beams with L1-RSRP higher than a threshold.*** * ***Alt.5: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams and an updated set B*** * ***FFS: N1*** * ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)*** * ***Note2: Beam ID is only used for discussion purpose*** * ***Note3: All the outputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose***   FL: “FFS: N1” is removed. We can discuss it later if needed. |
| Ericsson | Agree in general. However , for alternative 3, the term “possibility” does not make sense as an ML-output, it is too vague. Suggesting rephrasing possibility to **probability**.  FL: updated |
| CAICT | We can support FL’s proposal. |
| Nokia | We are fine with the proposal provided that Note1 is captured as Alt6 |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the updated proposal (2-4a). As discussed in our response in the first round, companies should be given the flexibility of deciding what AI/ML model output should contain as long as the agreed-upon KPIs are aligned. Thus, note 1 is an ok alternative. |
| HW/HiSi | We accept FL 2-4a |
| InterDigital | Generally fine with the proposal, but we would like to add one more alternative as shown in the below.  ***Alt.6: Predicted L1-RSRP values for set A of beams***  The idea is that AI/ML output could be just estimated L1-RSRP values for set A of beams and gNB can choose best beam ID based on the estimated L1-RSRP values.  FL: In my understanding, if Beam ID(s) can be obtained from data structure of the predicted (e.g., the location in a matrix, vector, …), it means AL/ML outputs the information of Beam ID as well. Thus, Alt.6 seems belonging to Alt.1. Could the updated Alt.1 can cover Alt.6? |
| NVIDIA | In principle fine with Proposal 2-4a. That said, the list might become too long as more and more are added, and might become confusing for an agreement. |
| MediaTek | We are fine with this proposal |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 2-4a, in principle. Also suggest adding the following (similar to Proposal 3-5a):   * ***Alt.6: Beam angle(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt.7: Beam angle(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams***   FL: These two alts are combined in to Alt.6 in the updated proposal |
| Lenovo | We are fine with proposal 2-4a. |

Proposal 2-4 (Round#2)

For Proposal 2-4a, the alternatives are quite diverse. a new version of the proposal is provided based on Samsung’s version and other companies’ inputs.

* Updated Alt.1 as suggested by CATT to address the concerns from Fujitsu, CMCC, ZTE, vivo. Accordingly, Alt.2 is deleted since it is included by the update Alt.1.
* Add other alternatives suggested by companies
* Tx/Rx is added to some alternatives as suggested by Sony
* Alt.6 from vivo and Alt.6 for IDC have not been added in the Proposal 2-4b. Please see my reply in the above table.

***Proposal 2-4b: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output:***

* ***Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx/Rx beams***
* ***Alt.2: Beam ID(s) and probability for the beam to be the best beam of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx/Rx beams***
* ***Alt.3: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx/Rx beams with L1-RSRP higher than a threshold.***
* ***Alt.4: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx/Rx beams and an updated set B***
* ***Alt.5: The predicted RSRP corresponding to the expected beam direction which is input to the model.***
* ***Alt.6: Beam angle(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP (optional) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.7: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL beams with a sum probability of being the best beams higher than a threshold.***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: Beam ID is only used for discussion purpose***
* ***Note3: All the outputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose***

Please provide your input wrt the above proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| OPPO | We are generally fine with Proposal 2-4b.  One general clarification question to ask in our mind is about “Beam ID(s)”. Perhaps this type of question has been asked and well responded. If that’s the case, sorry for missing that. **Does the Beam ID(s) in almost each alternative refer to**  **a) DL Tx beam ID(s)**  **b) DL Rx beam ID(s)**  **c) DL Tx and/or Rx beam ID(s) or**  **d) still open for discussion?**  At current stage, we hope the concept of Beam ID for discussion could be non-exclusive.  FL: Tx/Rx will be changed to “Tx and/or Rx” in the updated proposal |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| CATT | We support the proposal |
| Nokia | Direction is ok.  However, we think that the number of alternatives are too much and does not have to list all of these. Also, it is not clear why Rx is mentioned as the Proposal 2-3b is not having Rx beam consideration. We suggest having a clearer scope and list all other flavors in Alt.3. We do not support any extending of the list at this moment to list all flavors (similar procedure as P 2-3b).  ***Proposal 2-4b: Regarding the sub use case ~~BM-~~Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output:***   * ***Alt.1: Only Beam ID(s) ~~and/or the predicted L1-RSRP~~ of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx~~/Rx~~ beams of Set A*** * ***Alt.2: Beam ID(s) and L1-RSRP(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams of Set A***    + ***L1-RSRP(s) can be higher than a threshold*** * ***Alt.3: Beam ID(s) and/or L1-RSRP(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams of Set A with other outputs***    + ***FFS: Other outputs.*** * ***Note1: Beam ID is only used for discussion purpose***   FL: A number of companies proposed Rx beams (please see the comments for Proposal 2-3 and 2-4). |
| CMCC | Support. |
| NEC | Support FL’s proposal and agree with OPPO’s suggestion. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer to summarize the alternatives like proposal 2-3b and version from Nokia. |
| Fujitsu | Basically, we support it. We have one comment on “Beam ID(s)”. in current stage, the beam ID(s) should have more alternatives like Tx beam ID, Rx beam ID, Tx and/or Rx beam ID.  FL: reflected in the updated proposal |
| CAICT | Support. |
| Spreadtrum | Support Proposal 2-4b. Agree with OPPO that clarification for ‘beam ID’ is needed. We prefer DL Tx beam ID or DL Rx beam ID. Joint Tx and Rx beam inference can be added as a new alternative if there are supporting companies.  FL: “Tx and/or Rx beam ID” is used in the updated proposal. It is more concise than listing them separately. Hope it is acceptable. |
| Panasonic | Support Proposal 2-4b. |
| Ericsson | Agree with Nokia. The number of alternatives is too much, and it can potentially lead to problems in comparing evaluation results. We support the updated proposal by Nokia, except that our preference is to keep “TX/RX beams”, and update proposals 2-3b accordingly. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support the proposal. |
| Futurewei | We are generally ok with proposal 2-4b. For Alt.3, it can be derived from Alt.1 if the output includes L1-RSRP prediction. In addition, there are many options, we suggest including only the first 2-3 alternatives and indicate companies can provide other alternatives. |
| Samsung | Support proposal 2-4b. |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal with Nokia’s suggestion. |
| HW/HiSi | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 2-4b in principle. Agree with Nokia’s update that having a concise wording at this stage is better compared to exhaustively listing all possible options. |
| Intel | Similar to our previous comment, we would like to add an alternative:   * ***Alt.8: The predicted L1-RSRP of all beams in set A***   We are also OK with a note under Alt.1 which can say that N1 of Top-N1 can be the cardinality of set A.  FL: reflected in Note4 of the updated proposal |
| NVIDIA | We support the proposal |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Lenovo | Support Proposal 2-4b. |

###### Proposal 2-4 (Round#3)

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 2-4a

* Similar to Proposal 2-3a, there are many comments related to the Rx beams. The similar change as for Proposal 2-3b is reused to update the proposal.

There are a number of companies suggesting a concise version of the proposal. Following the similar principle of Proposal 2-3a, some alternatives were merged. The detailed modifications are as below

* Alt.2 and Alt.4 in Proposal 2-4b are merged to Alt.2 in Proposal 2-4c.
* Alt.3/7 in Proposal 2-4b is merged to the first FFS part of Alt.1 in Proposal 2-4c.
* Alt.8 proposed by Intel is reflected in Note4 of Proposal 2-4c.

***Proposal 2-4c: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output:***

* ***Alt.1: Tx and/or Rx Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx and/or Rx beams*** 
  + ***FFS: how to select Top-N1 DL Tx and/or Rx beams (e.g., L1-RSRP higher than a threshold, a sum probability of being the best beams higher than a threshold.***)
* ***Alt.2: Tx and/or Rx Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx and/or Rx beams and other information*** 
  + ***FFS: other information (e.g., probability for the beam to be the best beam, an updated set B)***
* ***Alt.3: The predicted RSRP corresponding to the expected Tx and/or Rx beam direction which is input to the model.***
* ***Alt.4: Tx and/or Rx Beam angle(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP (optional) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx and/or Rx beams***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: Beam ID is only used for discussion purpose***
* ***Note3: All the outputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose***
* ***Note4: Values of N1 is up to each company.***

Please provide your input wrt the above proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CMCC | Support |
| Nokia | It seems that our inputs were not considered much.  We suggested an update in last round and there seems to have a good support on it. We do not think listing different options helps here specially as some of these alternatives are not fully clear. We suggest only to list alternatives that have general understanding, and other alternatives can anyways propose and not excluded.  ***In the latest version,***   * For Alt 1: as there “and/or”, people may derive three sub-variants. With Tx/Rx considerations, we may have more variants. How to list all these in one alternative. * For Alt 2: It is not clear the reason to exclude having other information with all sub-variants in Alt.1. “Other information” can always present with any combination listed in Alt. 1. FL: If Nokia has interest for this combination, please see Note1   We do not think current formulation is helps RAN1 to discuss and converge later.  FL: Nokia’s comments were well considered. Meanwhile, there are also comments from other companies to keep the list of detailed alternatives. FL has to find some mid-ground. The number of alternatives is reduced from 7 to 4. On the other hand, even we only use 1 or 2 high-level options, the sub-variants are still there, no more no less.  If Nokia thinks some alternatives are not clear, FL thinks the proponent is willing to make some clarification. |
| HW/HiSi | Support |
| Futurewei | We are ok with proposal 2-4c. |
| caict | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support it. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Samsung | Support proposal 2-4c. |
| Ericsson | Support. A minor edit to Alt3, it unclear what expectation that is used as model input.  ***Alt.3: The predicted RSRP corresponding to the ~~expected~~ Tx and/or Rx beam direction which is input to the model.*** |
| CATT | Support. Also OK with Ericsson’s update. |

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

There may be some other issues for each sub use cases. For example, whether online training or offline training is assumed, which is also related to the discussion/output of AI 9.2.1. We can discuss these issues later.

Please provide your input wrt any other issues that should be discussed with higher priority, any other suggestion/comment, …

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CMCC | We suggest that following problems can also be discussed.  1) Which side does AI model perform training, NW side or UE side?  2) Does training performed online or offline?  3) Does model inference procedure of spatial domain beam prediction include P1 or P1 and P2 process? |
| FL | Thanks for the valuable suggestion. I will trigger the discussions on 1) and 2) in the next round.  For 3), would you like to elaborate a bit more what’s the difference from the perspective of AI/ML? |
| Sony | we suggest to add an additional alternative as:   * ***Alt.7: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL beams with a sum probability of being the best beams higher than a threshold.***   FL: Added in Proposal 2-4b |
| FL2 | Regarding the online/offline training issue raised by CMCC, I plan to discuss it later since AI9.2.1 are discussing how to differentiate/defining offline/online training. |
| CMCC | Re FL’s question, it is related to the definition of KPI “Beam selection accuracy for top-N1 beams” discussed in AI 9.2.3.1.  For example, when P1 and P2 are considered for AI based BM, AI/ML is used for select the top-N1 DL beams during P1. During P2, UE would measure the predicted top-N1 DL beams and report the real RSRP to gNB. gNB indicates the transmission beam based on the real RSRP of top-N1 DL beams. In such case, beam selection accuracy for the top-N1 beam means the probability of best beam among all beams belongs to the top-N1 predicted beam.  When P1 is considered for AI based BM, AI/ML is used for select the top-N1 DL beams during P1, then gNB indicates the transmission beam based on the predicted RSRP of top-N1 DL beams. In such case, beam selection accuracy for the top-N1 beam means the probability that best beam among all beams is the same as the best beam among the top-N1 predicted beams. Beam selection accuracy of P1 may be smaller than that of P1 and P2. |

### Details of sub use case **BM-Case2**

***~~Proposal 3-1: For the sub use case BM-Case2, down-select one of the following AI/ML model deployments:~~***

* ***~~Alt.1: AI/ML models deployed at NW side~~***
* ***~~Alt.2: AI/ML models deployed at UE side~~***
* ***~~Alt.3: Both AI/ML models deployed at NW side and AI/ML models deployed at UE side~~***

***Proposal 3-1a: For the sub use case BM-Case2, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference at UE side***

Please provide your input wrt the above alternatives in the above proposal. In addition, feel free to provide other comment/suggestion. Further refinement will be based on the inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | Similar to proposal 2-1, we are not sure whether we understand the definition of “deployed” correctly, especially for Alt3. Does it mean training in one side but inference is in the other side? |
| Vivo | Similar to proposal 2-1 |
| AT&T | We support Alt. 1 and are open to studying Alt. 2/3 |
| Futurewei | Alt.3. It is preferred to be flexible in deployment scenarios at this early stage of the SI. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer Alt 1 |
| Lenovo | We are open to both Alt1 and Alt2.  The AI/ML model for BM-Case1 can be flexibly deployed either at NW or UE side. From the expected performance aspect, Alt2 is preferred for overhead reduction. While considering deployment only at UE would be restrictive, e.g., some of the AI models may need more memory/complex to be executed at UE, we are also fine with Alt1.  Further, more clarification of Alt.3 is needed. Does Alt. 3 mean joint training and inference at both UE and NW sider? |
| SONY | We are OK with the classification. But for Alt 2 It is better to specify the usage of AI model deployed at UE side either for gNB beam prediction or for UE-beam prediction.  We would prefer to not perform a down selection at this stage, but to study the merits of the three alternatives. |
| HW/HiSi | Similar comment as to proposal 2-1 |
| NEC | As we mentioned in proposal 2-1, we are not sure whether Alt.3 means that both Alt.1 and Alt.2 are supported. If so, we support Alt.3. |
| LGE | We are fine with studying Alt 1 with priority, but not sure down selection is needed given that this is very first meeting. In addition, it is unclear to use how Alt3 works. Does it mean beam prediction at both sides? |
| Panasonic | Both Alt.1 and Alt.2 can be considered. Alt.3 needs more clarification. Does it mean both NW and UE have model inference? Or it means training and inference are split between UE and NW. |
| Ericsson | Alt.3. Both alternative 1 & 2 should be studied. It is unclear which node is the best location for such model at this stage. Regarding the term deployed, we should use the terminology from the general aspect discussion. Such as single-sided UE/NW or dual-sided model. |
| Nokia, NSB | Alt.3.  Suggest removal of “BM” as in earlier comments.  We are fine with studying these alternatives, and not required to mention down selecting yet. |
| CATT | We are ok with Alt.1 and Alt.2. Alt.3 can also be discussed. We may end up with more than one deployment options. The proposal can be modified as:  ***For the sub use case BM-Case1, down select one or more of the following AI/ML model deployments:*** |
| Fujitsu | Support alt.3 |
| Samsung | Support the proposal in principle. Similar to proposal 2-1, it seems that the wording of Alt-3 is confusing. We suggest to change Alt-3 as:  ***Alt.3: Both Alt1 and Alt2*** |
| CMCC | Similar to proposal 2-1 |
| NVIDIA | It does not appear necessary to make such down selection at this early stage of the study item. |
| CAICT | We think BM-Case2 is more gNB specific and Alt.2 should be considered. |
| OPPO | Support Alt.3. Samsung’s version is better. |
| MediaTek | We prefer Alt.3. |
| Intel | Alt-3 is OK at this point |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the proposal. |
| FL | Proposal 3-1 is updated to Proposal 3-1a  Proposal 3-1a:  Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, Huawei, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, CAICT, OPPO, DCM, MTK, Intel, Nokia(?), NVIDIA(?) |
| LGE2 | Support proposal 3-1a. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support. |
| CATT | We are generally OK with Proposal 2-1a.  But not sure it is good to preclude ‘***AI/ML inference at both sides’*** at this early stage. |
| Samsung | Support proposal 3-1a. |
| Ericsson | Support proposal 3-1a. |
| CAICT | Support |
| Nokia | Ok, the wording depends on P-1.1a updates. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with proposal 3-1a. |
| HW/HiSi | We are wondering why only inference is described here. We think the proposal should be:  ***Proposal 3-1a: For the sub use case BM-Case2, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***   * ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at NW side*** * ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference and training at UE side***   FL: Please see my reply for Proposal 2-1a |
| InterDigital | As we commented for BM-Case 1, we are fine with Huawei’s updated proposal.  FL: Please see my reply for Proposal 2-1a |
| NVIDIA | Support proposal 3-1a. |
| MediaTek | Agree with Huawei’s suggestions |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 3-1a. |
| Lenovo | Support Proposal 3-1a. |

Proposal 3-1 (Round#2)

The situation is similar to Proposal 2-1a. Thus, let’s try the same way as Proposal 2-1a.

***Proposal 3-1a(Original): For the sub use case BM-Case2, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference at UE side***

***Proposal 3-1a(Huawei): For the sub use case BM-Case2, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference and training at UE side***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| FL | Q1: Whether Huawei/IDC/MTK can accept Proposal 3-1a(Original)?  Q2: Companies’ view on Proposal 3-1a(Huawei)  If there is no company against Proposal 2-1a(Huawei), we would go with Proposal 2-1a(Huawei) to make more progress. Otherwise, Proposal 2-1a(Original) could be a compromised result to move forward in this stage. |
| NTT DOCOMO | The same comments above. We prefer original proposal 3-1a.  It should not preclude the cases where model training and inference are performed in the separate entity. In AI 9.2.1, FL proposes the definition of offline training as training in non-operational environments, which is not covered in Alt.1 and Alt.2 of Proposal 2-1a (Huawei). |
| CATT | The same comment in 2-1a. We prefer Proposal 2-1a (Original). |
| Nokia | Q1 : Original  Q2 : Similar comments as in “training” proposal. |
| CMCC | Fine with the intention of proposal 3-1a, there may be more alternatives.   * ***Alt.3: AI/ML training at NW side and inference at UE side*** * ***Alt.4: AI/ML training at UE side and inference at NW side*** |
| NEC | Similar to proposal 2-1a. We prefer inference and training are divided into different proposals. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer original Proposal 3-1a. And not prefer training at UE side. |
| Fujitsu | The same comments on proposal 2-1a |
| CAICT | Proposal 3-1a(Original) is preferred. |
| Spreadtrum | Same view as for Proposal 2-1a.  We prefer Proposal 3-1a(Original), Proposal 3-1a(Huawei) doesn’t includes the alternatives of training and inference by different entities. |
| Panasonic | We support Proposal 3-1a(Huawei) to have more focused study. Spreading model training and model inference across UE and NW can have low priority for study. |
| vivo | We prefer proposal 3-1a(Original) |
| Ericsson | We support proposal 3-1a(Original) |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Similar to proposal 2-1a. AI/ML inference and training at different sides can be studied. |
| LGE | Prefer proposal 3-1a(Original). |
| Samsung | Support 3-1a. |
| Sony | Proposal 3-1a (Huawei) seems to be limited to the case that inference and training must be at the same place. We suggest going with the original proposal and not limit the implementation scenarios. |
| MediaTek | We support Proposal 3-1a (Original). |
| HW/HiSi | Same comment as for 2-1a |
| Qualcomm | Support 3-1a (Original). |
| Intel | Support the original version |
| NVIDIA | Support 3-1a (Original). |
| InterDigital | In our view, we can reuse our previous proposal for BM-Case1. |
| Lenovo | Support 3-1a (Original). |

Proposal 3-1 (Round#3)

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 3-1a(original)

* Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, NEC, LGE, Ericsson, CATT, Nokia, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, BJTU, ZTE, QC (24)

A number of companies don’t support Proposal 3-1a(Huawei). By going through all the comments, FL feels that some companies cannot accept the version from Fujitsu or IDC. Proposal 3-1a(original) seems the only choice. Moreover, it is natural to determine the details of each sub use case step by step. We can discuss the training issue later.

***Proposal 3-1a(Original): For the sub use case BM-Case2, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference at UE side***

This proposal seems acceptable to most companies. Thus, the following table is only to check whether some company has strong concern.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Company/Reasons** |
| STRONG concern |  |
| FL | Closed. Please the corresponding agreement in the Appendix |

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

There are different proposals from companies for the Set A and Set B. Thus, based on the contributions, the following proposal can be discussed, and further refined based on the inputs

***~~Proposal 3-2: For the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives with potential down-selection:~~***

* ***~~Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A~~***
  + ***~~FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B~~***
  + ***~~FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)~~***
* ***~~Alt.2: Set A and Set B are the same~~***
  + ***~~FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B~~***
* ***~~Alt.3: …~~***

***Proposal 3-2: For the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives with potential down-selection:***

* ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
* ***Alt.2: Set A and Set B are the same***
* ***Note: Set A is for DL beam prediction and Set B is for DL beam measurement.***

Please provide your input wrt the above alternatives in the above proposal as well as other potential alternatives should be with high priority. In addition, feel free to provide other comment/suggestion. Further refinement will be based on the inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | For beam prediction, it seems there is no need to define the connection between set A and set B. |
| vivo | Support. |
| AT&T | We support the proposal and prefer Alt. 2 |
| Futurewei | Alt.2 may be a more typical case in time domain beam prediction. Depending on evaluation results, Alt.1 may be ok as well. In summary, we prefer leaving this open at the early stage of SI. |
| Xiaomi | Prefer alt 1 for beam prediction in time domain. |
| Lenovo | If we also consider overhead reduction for BM-Case2, we prefer to Alt1. |
| Sony | We are OK to study both alternatives and do not need to down-select at this stage. |
| HW/HiSi | We agree with the comment from Apple, there is no need to define the connection between set A and B.  Otherwise, we would like a more generic approach:   * Set A and Set B are subset of Set C.   + FFS: the number of beams in Set A, B, and C.   FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set C (e.g., fixed pattern, by AI/ML model prediction)  FL: Not fully understand it. Could you elaborate a bit more on the connection between Set A and SetC  [HW/HiSi] Assume that the input are wide beams and output are narrow beams. Set C could in this case be the super set consisting of A and B. We think that this would be a more generic approach that at this stage does not need to be precluded. |
| NEC | It is noted that the main idea of beam prediction in time domain is to predict the information of DL beam(s) for future time based on historic measurement results of some beams. And it is hard for us to see the connection between the future beams (Set A) and the historic beams (Set B). So, we agree with Apple’s comments. |
| LGE | We are fine with study but it is unclear why a FFS point is needed for Alt2 given that set A=set B? From our understanding, number of beam should be the same. |
| Panasonic | For time domain beam prediction, the motivation to define two sets are not so clear to us. |
| Ericsson | Agree with NEC/Apple. We need to clarify the relation between set A & B. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK in general. Agree with Apple, NEC, E///.  Suggest also removing “BM” in the proposal. |
| CATT | Alt.2 seems to be the baseline, while other options can still be considered, e.g., Set A and Set B are different sets of beams with different beam width. |
| Fujitsu | For beam prediction in time domain, the definition of set A and B needs more clarification. It seems no needs to define the relation between set A and set B. |
| Samsung | We think that Alt-1 and Alt-2 can be somehow combined. We suggest the following formulation:   * ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***   + ***Note: Set B equals to Set A is a special case.***   + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***   + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***   Also, the definition of Set A and Set B is missing in this proposal. Hence, we suggest to add the following note. |
| CMCC | Support |
| NVIDIA | Support further study. It does not appear necessary to make such down selection at this early stage of the study item. |
| CAICT | We think the prediction in time domain could combine with spatial domain. Alt.1 could be considered. Purely time domain prediction could use more history information and there is no need for the bundling of Set A and B. |
| OPPO | We prefer Alt.2 |
| MediaTek | We prefer Alt.2 |
| Intel | Not sure if such formulation is needed at this point. Better to keep this open till problem formulation is finalized. Based on current understanding, we may not need to define such relation between measurement and predicted beams for temporal beam prediction. |
| NTT DOCOMO | As commented above, we prefer to make an inclusive list where each component is not a combination (e.g., each component is L1-RSRP, Beam ID, or etc.), because combinations could be large and diverse. In that case, maybe Option can be used instead of Alternative. |
| FL | The relationship between Set A and Set B: By reviewing the tdocs, there are two different types of sub use cases (assuming AI/ML at NW side predicts the best beam(s) for the whole set of 64 beam   * UE measures 64 beams and reports the best 4 beams associated with the RSRP, and AI/ML model predicts the best beam(s) among these 64 beams based on the reported measurement results. In this case, Set A and Set B are the same. * UE measures 8 beams and reports the measurement results (e.g., all 8 beams) , and AI/ML model predicts the best beam(s) among these 64 beams based on the reported measurement results. In this case, Set B is a sub set of Set A.   Hope it can clarify the common question from companies.  Proposal 3-2 is updated to Proposal 3-2a. |
| Apple | Maybe we can revise the definision of set A and set B as follows?  ***Proposal 3-2: For the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives with potential down-selection:***   * ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***   + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)*** * ***Alt.2: Set A and Set B are the same*** * ***Note: Predicted beam(s) are selected from Set A and beams in the past measurement used as input are selected from Set B*** |
| LGE2 | OK with proposal 3-2a. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Apple’s update is fine to us. Besides, for Alt.1, there would be superimposed inference errors originated from both spatial-domain and time-domain beam prediction. Additionally, the difference between set A and set B (like wide beam set B and narrow beam set A) may make it hard for beam reporting and indication. Nevertheless, we’d better to keep it open at the current stage. |
| Panasonic | Thanks FL for the explanation of introducing Set A and Set B for BM-Case 2. As a result, it seems BM-Case 2 already shares some spirit of BM-Case 1 (i.e. partial beam set measurement). From our perspective, Alt 2 (Set A = Set B) could be the baseline for study BM-Case 2, in order not to mix two cases together. |
| CATT | We are fine with Proposal 3-2a. |
| Samsung | We have different understanding on the relationship between Set A and Set B. As some of the companies mentioned, Alt-1 means the combination of spatial domain prediction and time domain beam prediction, while Alt-2 means time domain beam prediction only. Also, in FL’s example, the first example still can be considered as a special case of Alt 1. |
| Ericsson | To make BM case 2 more clear. Indicate that the predictions are for a future time instance for beam set A. One option is to use the term “forecast” for Case 2. Propose a slight modification to the proposal by Apple.  ***Note: Forecasted ~~Predicted~~ beam(s) are selected from Set A and beam~~s in the past~~ measurement used as input are selected from Set B*** |
| CAICT | We can support proposal 3-2a |
| Nokia | Apple’s update looks fine. We think that the possibility of having Set A and Set B different from each other should also be listed as an alternative.  ***Proposal 3-2: For the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives with potential down-selection:***   * ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***   + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)*** * ***Alt.2: Set A and Set B are the same*** * ***Alt.3: Set A and Set B are different***   ***Note: Predicted beam(s) are selected from Set A and beams in the past measurement used as input are selected from Set B*** |
| Futurewei | We are ok with the updated proposal 3-2. |
| HW/HiSi | We would like to hear companies view why the input needs to be the same or a subset form the output? This would preclude the case that input could use wide beams and predicts future narrow beams. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with Proposal 3-2. |
| NVIDIA | In general fine with the updated Proposal 3-2. Perhaps adding a note that other alternatives are not precluded would address some of the concerns raised above. |
| Mediatek | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Suggest the following changes:  ***Proposal 3-2: For the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives with potential down-selection:***   * ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***   + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)*** * ***Alt. 2: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams*** * ***Alt.~~2~~3: Set A and Set B are the same*** * ***Note: Set A is for DL beam prediction and Set B is for DL beam measurement.***   This way, Alt. 1 and Alt. 2 are indicative of different aspects of spatial + temporal beam prediction and Alt. 3 is about temporal beam prediction.  We think Alt. 2 should not be precluded with the example of using multiple past SSB measurement information to predict best CSI-RS ID, as an illustrative use case. Similar to proposal 2-2a, the prospect of wide to narrow beam prediction should also be considered in this context. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sony | Just for clarification, DL beam in Note (Red) contains DL Tx beam and DL Rx beam, right? If it is, we are OK with Proposal 3-2a.    The note could be clarified as:     * ***Note: Set A is for DL TX/RX beam prediction and Set B is for DL beam measurement.*** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Lenovo | Fine with QC’s updated proposal 3-2. |

Proposal 3-2 (Round#2)

Most companies are fine with Proposal 3-2a. During the discussions, there were more alternatives proposed. A new version of Proposal 3-2 is provided and hope it can address the concerns of Huawei, Nokia, QC and can still be acceptable to the supporting companies of Proposal 3-1. Sony’s comment is reflected as well.

***Proposal 3-2b: For the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives with potential down-selection:***

* ***Alt.1:*** ***Set A and Set B are different***
  + ***Alt.1a: Set B is a subset of Set A***
    - ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
  + ***Alt.1b: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams***
* ***Alt.2: Set A and Set B are the same***
* ***Note1: Forecasted beam(s) are selected from Set A and beams measurement used as input are selected from Set B.***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***

Please provide your input wrt the above proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| CATT2 | Support in general.  One more clarification for ‘***Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams***’, we would like to clarify whether Set A and Set B are in the same FR?  If Set A and Set B are in different FR, the correlation/scenario may not be valid, since the corresponding antennas for Set A and Set B will be very different.  FL: For BM-Case1 and BM-Case2, they are in the same FR. Please see Proposal 1-1c |
| Nokia | Alt.1.a is not matching within Alt.1, so it should be separate alternative.   * ***Alt.1:*** ***Set A and Set B are different (e.g. Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams)*** * ***Alt.2: Set B is a subset of Set A***   + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)*** * ***Alt.3: Set A and Set B are the same*** |
| CMCC | Support. |
| NEC | Support |
| Xiaomi | Support |
| Fujitsu | Support it |
| CAICT | Support |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal. |
| Panasonic | We are ok with Proposal 3-2b. |
| Ericsson | Support the proposal.  Note that there is no definition in 3GPP of such narrow/wide beams. We propose to add the note below.  *Note: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact*  FL: The note is added |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support. |
| LGE | Support. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with proposal 3-2b. |
| Samsung | Support proposal 3-2b. We think the same FFSs in Proposal 2-2b are needed. |
| Sony | Thank you for addressing our comment we noticed that feature lead has explained in the reply to IDC as follows.  “BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 are discussing DL beams, which include DL Rx beams and DL Tx beams. Thus, there are some alternatives regarding Rx beam in the details (e.g., in section 3.1.2)”  Furthermore, just to revise Alt.1b as follows to include case3   * + ***Alt.1b: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams (can be from different bands)***   FL: As in proposal 1-1b/1-1c, we focus on the same band. Proposal1-1c are quite stable now and it is not preferred to reopen the discussion. If they are in different bands, it would be included in BM-Case3 or a counterpart of BM-Case3 for temporal prediction. Would it be ok for Sony? |
| MediaTek | Support |
| HW/HiSi | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 3-2b. Just a minor edit to Note 1:   * ***Note1: Forecasted beam(s) are selected from Set A and ~~beams measurement~~ measured beams (or measurement beams) used as input are selected from Set B.*** |
| Intel | Support with changes from Nokia and Qualcomm. We are OK to add clarification from Ericsson as well. |
| NVIDIA | Support |
| InterDigital | We support the updates from Nokia and Qualcomm except “(or measurement beams)” as it is redundant. |
| Lenovo | Fine with Nokia and Qualcomm’s update. |

###### Proposal 3-2 (Round#3)

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 3-2b

* Supported: vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Lenovo, Xiaomi, Huawei, NEC, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, ZTE, IDC, Apple, LG, QC, Nokia (25)
* Sony (?)

Almost all the comments are reflected in the updated proposal. The proposal from Sony is not well aligned with Proposal 1-1b/1-1c and has not been included so far. Please see my reply in the above table (Round#2).

***Proposal 3-2c: For the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives with potential down-selection:***

* ***Alt.1:*** ***Set A and Set B are different***
* ***Alt.2: Set B is a subset of Set A***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
  + ***Alt.1b: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams***
* ***Alt.3: Set A and Set B are the same***
* ***Note1: Forecasted beam(s) are selected from Set A and ~~beams measurement~~ measured beams used as input are selected from Set B.***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact***

This proposal seems acceptable to most companies. Thus, the following table is only to check whether some company has strong concern.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Company/Reasons** |
| STRONG concern | CMCC: Alt1b is a special case of Alt1 and should be under Alt1.  FL: Based on the discussion, there are different views among companies. From LF’s perspective, whether Alt.2 is set as a sub bullet of Alt.1 is not a big issue and the important thing is the typical alternatives are all captured. Let’s hear other companies’ view.  Nokia: we suggest changing the wording “Forecasted” to “predicted”  FL: They seem the same meaning. Let’s hear other companies’ view.  NTT DOCOMO: We prefer to move Alt2 and Alt1b under Alt1 as Proposal 3-2b. If Set B ia a subset of Set A, it is clear that Set A and Set B are different. Also, we prefer the wording modification Nokia mentioned.  CATT: Not strong concern, but since Alt.1 and Alt.2 is listed parallel, it seems implying that Alt.1 means the ‘Types of beams in Set A and Set B’ are different, e.g. one is CSI-RS and the other one is SSB. |

The following is copied from email discussion.

***(Proposal 3-2c is updated to 3-2d, the change is the highlight part in Alt.1 and delete Alt.1b from Alt.2 )***

***Proposal 3-2d: For the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives with potential down-selection:***

* ***Alt.1:*** ***Set A and Set B are different (e.g. Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams)***
  + ***FFS: QCL relation between beams in Set A and beams in Set B***
* ***Alt.2: Set B is a subset of Set A (Set A and Set B are not the same)***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
  + ***~~Alt.1b: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams~~***
* ***Alt.3: Set A and Set B are the same***
* ***Note1: Predicted ~~Forecasted~~ beam(s) are selected from Set A and measured beams used as input are selected from Set B.***
* ***Note2: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note3: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| FL | Proposal 3-2c is updated to 3-2d based on CMCC’s comment. Alt.1b is moved from Alt.2 to Alt.1 in the form of “e.g.,”. I misunderstood the comments in the summary. Sorry for that.  Nokia/DCM suggested to change “Forecasted” to “Predicted” . The two words have similar meaning. For the description of BM-Case2, the wording “prediction” is used. Thus, it is reasonable to make this change to align the language.  “Forecasted” is proposed by Ericsson in order to emphasize that the predictions are for a future time instance. Would Ericsson like to confirm whether this change is acceptable or not? |
| HW/HiSi | Support |
| FL2 | Add FFS part for Alt.1 based on Lenovo’s input |
| Nokia | support |
| Samsung | Support. To better differentiate Alt-2 and Alt-3, a note can be added to Alt-2, “Note: Set A and Set B are not the same”.  FL: Seem a “good-to-have” modification. Please see the main bullet of Alt.2 |
| CATT | Support the proposal, especially for the update example for Alt.1 to make it consistence with 2-2d. |
| Ericsson | We are ok to use the term “predicted”. |
| LGE | Support the proposal. |

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

For the historic measurement results, it is natural to have a window or a number on the past measurement instances. Thus, the following proposal can be discussed, and further refined based on inputs.

***~~Proposal 3-3: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, the measurement results of K (K>=1) past measurement instances are used for AI/ML model input:~~***

* ***~~FFS: values of K~~***

***Proposal 3-3a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, the measurement results of K (K>=1) latest measurement instances are used for AI/ML model input:***

* ***The value of K is up to companies***

Please provide your input wrt the description of the above proposal. In addition, feel free to provide other comment/suggestion. Further refinement will be based on the inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | OK in principle, but we think the K instances should be with the same interval, right?  FL: I think so. We can wait to check there are any other views. |
| Vivo | Fine |
| AT&T | Ok |
| Futurewei | We prefer not fixing the K (K>=1)value and leave it to implementation decision. |
| Xiaomi | Ok |
| Lenovo | Generally Fine.  But we are confused with the term of ‘past’, does it correspond to the latest K beam report or beam measurement before the current beam measurement? |
| Sony | We support this proposal in principle. |
| HW/HiSi | We think there is no need to fix this number, it should be left for implementation. Companies can report their selected value, would be our preference. However, if it is really necessary to take one value for calibration, we are open to discuss. But even if we pick a value of K here for calibration, it should not preclude other values for evaluation. |
| NEC | Support |
| LGE | OK |
| Panasonic | OK. Here we do not see a notion of set A and set B. As commented above, it seems not necessary to define two sets. |
| Ericsson | We support this proposal. But it needs clarification. Important to also describe the timestamp assumed for the K past measurements. The amount of historical measurements can limit when the model can start to be used to perform predictions.  FL: In my understanding, it is related to Apple’s question. If the interval between consecutive instance, the timestamp is implicitly determined. |
| Nokia, NSB | OK in general. Up to Companies to disclose their measurement patterns and measurement procedure in the observation window.  Suggest removing “BM” in the proposal. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Fujitsu | Support it. But the value of K depends on the evaluation results. |
| Samsung | The intention of this proposal is understandable. But we don’t think there is a need to limit the number of K at this stage unless it is for calibration purpose in the parallel agenda item. |
| CMCC | OK |
| NVIDIA | Support |
| CAICT | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Support |
| MediaTek | OK in principle |
| Intel | OK |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| FL | * Proposal 3-3 is updated to Proposal 3-3a by adding a sub-bullet “***The value of K is up to companies***”, which based on the suggestion from companies. It seems acceptable to all companies   Proposal 3-3a  Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, Ok, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, Huawei, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Nokia, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with the FL proposal. Besides, if the AI inference is performed at the UE side, the value range of K may be closely related to UE capabilities (such as storage resources) and thus need to be discussed at a later stage. |
| CATT | Support. |
| Samsung | Support proposal 3-3a. |
| CAICT | Support |
| Nokia | Ok, wording is subjected to P 1.1-a |
| Futurewei | We are ok for proposal 3-3a. |
| Hw/HiSi | We support proposal 3-3a. |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| NVIDIA | Support Proposal 3-3a. |
| Mediatek | We support Proposal 3-3a |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| FL2 | Please see Offline agreement #1 in Section 3.3.1 |

***~~Proposal 3-4: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives of measurement results for AI/ML input (for each past measurement instance) with potential down-selection:~~***

* ***~~Alt.1: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and the corresponding beam ID~~***
* ***~~Alt.2: …~~***

***Proposal 3-4a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives of measurement results for AI/ML input (for each past measurement instance):***

* ***Alt.1: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and the corresponding beam ID***
* ***Alt.2: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt 3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, beam ID, beam angle or position information***
* ***Alt 4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, assistance information and expected information which the output of AI model is predicted partial RSRPs corresponding to expected Rx angle in AI input.***
* ***Alt.5: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, the corresponding beam ID and assistance information***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***

Please provide your input wrt the above alternatives in the above proposal as well as any other potential alternative that should be treated with high priority. In addition, feel free to provide other comment/suggestion. Further refinement will be based on the inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We are a bit confused with the definition of set B, does it mean the reported beam(s) or the measured beam(s). If it includes reported beam(s), maybe beam index needs to be added as input in addition to L1-RSRP. |
| Vivo | Similar to proposal 2-3. And we believe spatial domain beam prediction algorithm is an essential precondition for time domain beam prediction study. Thus, proposal 3-4 should be a supplement with time domain specific parameters on proposal 2-3. |
| Futurewei | Alt.1 is ok while companies are free to decide whether to use both as input to their AI/ML model. |
| Xiaomi | Support Alt 1. In addition, We think that the input of AI/ML model for time domain beam prediction may be the output of the AI/ML model for spatial domain beam prediction. So it is better to discuss it after spatial domain beam prediction. |
| Lenovo | Generally fine with FL proposal. |
| HW/HiSi | Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and/or the corresponding beam ID |
| NEC | We suggest adding the following alternative:   * ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, the corresponding beam ID and assistance information*** |
| LGE | UE velocity, orientation, and/or rotation are also useful for beam prediction. In addition, the increase ratio of L1-RSRP for best N beams can be used as AI/ML input. For example, it can be the ratio of L1-RSRP at past T measurement instance and at past T-τ measurement instance for best N beams. So, companies can provide their additional input for AI/ML model. But, Alt 1 can be the baseline. |
| Panasonic | The motivation to define two sets are not so clear to us. |
| Ericsson | Alt 1 can be baseline. But it should be possible to study additional model inputs. |
| Nokia, NSB | Similar concern here as in P 2-3. There are other possibilities. Suggest capturing the variants in general level than defining inputs explicitly. |
| CATT | We’re ok with Alt 1. But as also mentioned by many companies above, the candidate solutions should be open for now. |
| Fujitsu | The comments are like proposal 2-3. It should be open and not necessary to limit the AI/ML model input in initial stage. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal in general. Also, assistance information such as position information can be added as one of the alternatives. Moreover, L1-RSRP can be considered as baseline, and additional metrics can be considered as potential AI input, but justification is needed, e.g., the gain achieved with or without the additional metrics. |
| CMCC | Similar to proposal 2-3. |
| NVIDIA | At this early stage, should be up to companies to explore all possible options. |
| CAICT | We are fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Alt.1 can be the baseline. Open to other alternatives. |
| MediaTek | We are fine with Alt. 1. |
| Intel | We agree that it is too early to conclude on this. Different combination of inputs and outputs can be studied for this problem. |
| NTT DOCOMO | As commented above, we prefer to make an inclusive list where each component is not a combination (e.g., each component is L1-RSRP, Beam ID, or etc.), because combinations could be large and diverse. In that case, maybe Option can be used instead of Alternative. |
| FL | Proposal 3-4 is updated to Proposal 3-4a by adding suggested alternatives and some similar modification as Proposal 2-3 |
| Xiaomi | ***Prefer to revise Alt 3 as below***   * ***Alt 3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, Tx/Rx beam ID, Tx/Rx beam angle or position information*** |
| LGE2 | In our view, Alt 3 includes Alt 5. So, we suggest to **remove Alt 5** and revise Alt 3 as below on top of Xiaomi’s revision.   * ***Alt 3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, Tx/Rx beam ID, Tx/Rx beam angle or position information, and etc.***   + ***Companies can provide detailed assistance information other than above example.*** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with Xiaomi and LGE2’s update and are open to discuss more assistance information to be adopted as AI input for inference performance improvement, such as UE positioning/trajectory, UE velocity, doppler frequency, positioning-related measurement (such as Multi-RTT), beam pattern for both transmit beam and receive beam. Thus, we suggest the following revision.   * ***Alt 3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, Tx/Rx beam ID, Tx/Rx beam angle, positioning-related measurement (such as Multi-RTT) or position information*** |
| CATT | With the understanding and the Note that other potential alternatives are not precluded, we are OK with this Proposal 3-4a.  Also OK with ZTE’s further update based on Xiaomi and LGE’s version. |
| vivo | ***We would like to update Alt 4 as following***  ***Alt 4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, assistance information and expected beam/occasion for the prediction, e.g., expected Tx or Rx beam angle for the prediction, expected occasions of the prediction.*** |
| Samsung | Similar with Proposal 2-3a, we suggest the following revision:  ***Proposal 3-4a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives of measurement results for AI/ML input (for each past measurement instance):***   * ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and ~~the corresponding beam ID~~ assistance information*** * ***~~Alt 3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, beam ID, beam angle or position information~~*** * ***~~Alt 4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, assistance information and expected information which the output of AI model is predicted partial RSRPs corresponding to expected Rx angle in AI input.~~*** * ***~~Alt.5: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, the corresponding beam ID and assistance information~~*** * ***~~Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)~~*** * ***FFS: Assistance information (e.g., beam ID, beam angel, position information, expected RSRPs, etc.)*** * ***Note~~2~~: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.*** |
| Ericsson | We agree with update from Xiaomi or LGE2. However the term beam angle is unclear. Is the beam angle in respect to the antenna? Or to an earth-bounded coordinate system? Prefer to update Alt 3 as:  ***Alt 3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, Tx/Rx beam ID, ~~Tx/Rx beam angle~~ or position information*** |
| CAICT | We are fine with this proposal. |
| Nokia | Ok with the proposal and note1 should be Alt.6 |
| Futurewei | We are ok with proposal 3-4a. |
| HW/HiSi | We can accept 3-4a |
| InterDigital | We are fine with the proposal. |
| NVIDIA | Understand the intention of Proposal 3-4a. But a long list of items may be confusing and counterproductive. The condensed version from Samsung is a better starting point. |
| MediaTek | We support Alt 1.Samsung’s proposal could be acceptable. |
| Qualcomm | Similar to proposal 3-a, we suggest the following edits to make the wording succinct and add beam shape information:  ***Proposal 3-4a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives of measurement results for AI/ML input (for each past measurement instance):***   * ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt 2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and ~~the corresponding beam ID~~ assistance information*** * ***~~Alt 3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information which may include, beam ID, beam angle or position information~~*** * ***~~Alt 4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, assistance information and expected information which the output of AI model is predicted partial RSRPs corresponding to expected Rx angle in AI input.~~*** * ***~~Alt.5: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams, the corresponding beam ID and assistance information~~*** * ***FFS: Assistance information can be beam ID, beam shape information (e.g., beam pattern, beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, etc.), position information, etc.*** * ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***   ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.*** |
| Sony | As it is captured in BM-Case1, both DL Tx beam and DL Rx beam predictions, e.g., SS [10], Intel [24] are discussed, we also support both DL Tx beam and DL Rx beam predictions for BM-Case2. Considering as an input the selected DL Rx beams at UE side over a period into an AI/ML model, UE Rx beam prediction at UE side can be performed to reduce UE measurement in beam maintenance/switching. Therefore, we prefer to use DL Tx/Rx beam instead of DL Tx beam in Proposal 3-4a. |
| Lenovo | Agree with QC and Samsung that Alt4, Alt5 and Alt6 can be merged, and we prefer QC version.  To be more accurate, we suggest the following update Alt 1, Alt2 and Alt 3:   * ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement ~~based on Set B~~ of all DL Tx beams in Set B*** * ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement ~~based on Set B~~ of all DL Tx beams in Set B and ~~the corresponding DL Tx beam ID~~ assistance information*** * ***Alt.3: CIR of part ~~based on Set B~~ of DL Tx beam(s) in Set B*** |

Proposal 3-4 (Round#2)

For Proposal 3-4a, the alternatives are quite diverse. Since the situation is quite similar to Proposal 2-3a, the proposal is updated following the same way.

***Proposal 3-4b: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives of measurement results for AI/ML input (for each past measurement instance):***

* ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt 2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B of DL Tx beams and assistance information***
* ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companies in the discussion: Tx/Rx beam ID, Tx/Rx beam angle, position information, positioning-related measurement (such as Multi-RTT), expected beam/occasion for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx or Rx beam angle for the prediction, expected occasions of the prediction), beam shape information (e.g., beam pattern, beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, etc.)***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***

Please provide your input wrt the above proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| OPPO | We are in principle fine with updated Proposal 3-4b.  Similar comments as for BM-Case1. In the FFS, we suggest slight rewording “Tx/Rx beam ID” into “Tx and/or Rx beam ID”. Thank you for considering this again. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal and fine with the revision by OPPO. |
| CATT | We think the proposal is OK, and also OK with OPPO’s update. |
| Nokia | Third sub-bullet (FFS) should be within Alt.2. |
| CMCC | Support. |
| NEC | Support FL’s proposal and agree with OPPO’s suggestion. |
| Xiaomi | Suggest the following modification   * ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companies in the discussion: Tx and/or Rx beam ID, Tx and/or Rx beam angle, position information, positioning-related measurement (such as Multi-RTT), expected beam/occasion for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx and/or Rx beam angle for the prediction, expected occasions of the prediction), Tx and/or Rx beam shape information (e.g., Tx and/or Rx beam pattern, Tx and/or Rx beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, etc.)*** |
| Fujitsu | The same comments on proposal 2-3b |
| CAICT | Fine with proposal 3-4b. |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal with OPPO’s revision. |
| Ericsson | Agree with a modification to use “…Set B of DL Tx/Rx beams.” |
| ZTE, Sanechips | Support. OPPO and Xiaomi’s update is also fine to us. |
| LGE | We are also OK with OPPO and Xiaomi’s update. And, we prefer to add one of the example of assistance information as below.   * ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companies in the discussion: Tx/Rx beam ID, Tx/Rx beam angle, position information, positioning-related measurement (such as Multi-RTT), expected beam/occasion for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx or Rx beam angle for the prediction, expected occasions of the prediction), beam shape information (e.g., beam pattern, beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth~~, etc.~~), increase ratio of L1-RSRP for best N beams, etc.*** |
| Futurewei | We are ok with proposal 2-3b in general. Like Bm-Case1, we suggest only indicating “Set B beams”. |
| Samsung | Support OPPO’s revision. Also, “etc.” can be added at the end of the FFS. |
| Sony | Add UE direction information   * ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companies in the discussion: Tx/Rx beam ID, Tx/Rx beam angle, position information, direction information, positioning-related measurement (such as Multi-RTT), expected beam/occasion for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx or Rx beam angle for the prediction, expected occasions of the prediction), beam shape information (e.g., beam pattern, beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, etc.)*** |
| MediaTek | We support the proposal with OPPO’s update. |
| HW/HiSi | We support Alt1 and Alt 2.  For the FFS, similar to Proposal 2-3a, we have concerns, the assistance information (e.g. ***beam shape information***) is implementation related information, and don’t think it should be disclosed and shared with the opposite node. |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 3-4b and agree with OPPO’s update. |
| Intel | Support the proposal in general.  Similar comment as Proposal 2-3 above regarding further sub-use-cases due to different assistance information. |
| NVIDIA | We support the proposal. |
| InterDigital | We do not support the proposal. In our view, beam ID is essential information which could be more important than L1-RSRP as beam ID indicates actual beam direction. In addition, beam ID is already supported in NR from Rel-15. Having said that, we don’t believe that beam ID shouldn’t be a part of assistance information for the further study and should be included in the alternatives.  FL: I think IDC raised a good point that the output including beam ID should be one of the basic alternatives. Thus, a new alternative is added. |
| Lenovo | We support the proposal. |

###### Proposal 3-4 (Round#3)

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 3-4b

* Supported: OPPO, DCM, CATT, Nokia, CMCC, NEC, Xiaomi, Fujitsu, CAICT, Spreadtrum, Panasonic, Ericsson, ZTE, LGE, FUTUREWEI, Samsung, Sony, MTK, QC, Intel, NVIDIA, Sony, Lenovo (23)
* Huawei(?)

The comments are mainly related to the Rx beams. Xiaomi’s suggestion is included to update the proposal.

Similar to Proposal 2-3b, Fujitsu’s proposal to remove “of DL Tx beams” is also included in Proposal 3-4c.

There were some concerns on the assistance information. Please see my reply to each company for Proposal 2-3.

IDC raised a valid point. Thus, Alt.4 is added. Accordingly, the “Tx/Rx beam ID” is removed from the FFS part since it is captured by Alt.4.

Based on the above information, Proposal 3-4c is updated as below.

***Proposal 3-4c: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives of measurement results for AI/ML input (for each past measurement instance):***

* ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beams~~***
* ***Alt 2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beams~~ and assistance information*** 
  + ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companies in the discussion: ~~Tx/Rx beam ID~~, Tx and/or Rx beam angle, position information, direction information, positioning-related measurement (such as Multi-RTT), expected Tx and/or Rx beam/occasion for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx and/or Rx beam angle for the prediction, expected occasions of the prediction), Tx and/or Rx beam shape information (e.g., Tx and/or Rx beam pattern, Tx and/or Rx beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, increase ratio of L1-RSRP for best N beams, etc.)***
    - ***Note: The provision of assistance information is probably infeasible due to the concern of disclosure proprietary information to the other side.***
* ***Alt.3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and the corresponding DL Tx and/or Rx beam ID***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***

This proposal seems acceptable to most companies. Thus, the following table is only to check whether some company has strong concern.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Company/Reasons** |
| STRONG concern | HW/HiSi: Same comment as for 2-3, the following note should be added to the FFS:  Note: The provision of assistance information is probably infeasible due to the concern of disclosure proprietary information to the other side.  FL: added |
|  | Lenovo: we just want to clarify that the difference between Alt2 and Alt3 is that only part of beams in Set B are measured for Alt3?  FL: For Alt.3, RSRP plus beam ID is used. For Alt.2 , RSRP plus assistance information is used |
|  | NTT DOCOMO: the same comment as 2-3. We think the list misses the inputs containing both Tx and/or RX beam ID and assistance information such as UE position information. |
|  | Ericsson: the same comment as 2-3, we propose adding UE orientation information |

The following is copied from the email discussion.

***Proposal 3-4c: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives of measurement results for AI/ML input (for each past measurement instance):***

* ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B***
* ***Alt 2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and assistance information*** 
  + ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companies in the discussion: ~~Tx and/or Rx beam ID~~, Tx and/or Rx beam angle, position information, UE direction information, positioning-related measurement (such as Multi-RTT), expected Tx and/or Rx beam/occasion for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx and/or Rx beam angle for the prediction, expected occasions of the prediction), Tx and/or Rx  beam shape information (e.g., Tx and/or Rx beam pattern, Tx and/or Rx beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, increase ratio of L1-RSRP for best N beams, UE orientation information, etc.)***
    - ***Note: The provision of assistance information may be infeasible due to the concern of disclosing proprietary information to the other side.***
* ***Alt.3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and the corresponding DL Tx and/or Rx beam ID***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)  including the combination of some alternatives***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comment |
| FL1 | 1. Editorial change for the note suggested by QC as below:   * ***Note: The provision of assistance information ~~is probably~~ may be infeasible due to the concern of ~~disclosure~~ disclosing proprietary information to the other side.***   2. As suggested by DCM, keep “***Tx and/or Rx beam ID***” as an example of assistance information |
| HW/HiSi | Ok |
| FL2 | 1. Same modifications as Proposal 2-3c  2. UE orientation information is added in the FFs part based on Ericsson’s input |
| Nokia | similar comment as P 2-3c |
| Samsung | Similar comment as proposal 2-3c. |
| CATT | We are fine with the latest update. |
| LGE | Fine with the proposal. One correction is needed that ***increase ratio of L1-RSRP for best N beams, UE orientation information*** can be out of bracket, since these are not beam shape information. |

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

***~~Proposal 3-5: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output (one prediction for a future time instance) with potential down-selection:~~***

* ***~~Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams~~*** 
  + ***~~FFS: N1~~***
* ***~~Alt.2: Beam ID(s) and the corresponding beam dwelling time~~***
* ***~~Alt.3: Predicted Beam failure and the corresponding bream ID(s)~~***
* ***~~Alt.4. Predicted new candidate beam(s)~~***
* ***~~Alt.5. …~~***

***Proposal 3-5a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output (one prediction for a future time instance) with potential down-selection:***

* ***Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.2. Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.3: Beam ID(s) and possibility for the beam to be the best beam of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt 4: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N2 DL beams with L1-RSRP higher than a threshold.***
* ***Alt.5: Beam ID(s) and the associated confidence of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.6: Beam angle(s) of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.7: Beam angle(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.8: Beam ID(s) and the corresponding beam application time/dwelling time***
* ***Alt.9: Predicted Beam failure and the corresponding beam ID(s)***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: Beam ID is only used for discussion purpose***
* ***Note3: All the outputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose***

Please provide your input wrt the above alternatives in the above proposal as well as any other potential alternative that should be treated with high priority. In addition, feel free to provide other comment/suggestion. Further refinement will be based on the inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We suggest adding Alt 1b/1c as follows and change “Alt1” into “Alt1a”:   * ***Alt.1b: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt.1c: Beam ID(s) and possibility for the beam to be the best beam of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams*** |
| vivo | Similar to proposal 2-4, and we suggest following modifications in proposal 3-5:  ***Proposal 3-5: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output (one prediction for a future time instance) with potential down-selection:***   * ***Alt.1: L1-RSRP*** * ***Alt.2: Beam information, such as beam ID, beam angle.*** * ***Alt 3: confidence level*** * ***Alt 4: Beam dwelling time*** * ***Alt.5: Predicted Beam failure*** * ***Alt.6. Predicted new candidate beam(s)*** * ***Alt.7. …***   FL: please see my reply to Proposal 2-4 |
| AT&T | Ok the additional alternatives from vivo, although “confidence level” may need a more detailed definition (e.g. absolute, relative?) |
| Futurewei | Per description provided before, this question should be for BM-Case2.  Alt.1 for BM-Case2. However, we suggest modifying the wording a bit to **“*Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams”***. We may discuss/decide whether both are needed once the EVM discussion is more stable/clearer. |
| Xiaomi | We prefer to separate L1-RSRP and beam ID to two alternatives. |
| Lenovo | Firstly, the main bullet seems should be for ***BM-Case~~1~~2.***  Suggest to add another Alt:  ***Alt 5: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL beams with L1-RSRP higher than a threshold.*** |
| HW/HiSi | Can you please clarify what “one prediction for a future time instance means” in BM-case. Shouldn’t in then be BM-Case2? |
| NEC | We suggest the following modifications:   * ***Alt.1: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt.2: Beam ID(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams*** * ***Alt.3: Beam ID(s) and the corresponding beam dwelling time*** * ***Alt.4: Predicted Beam failure and the corresponding bream ID(s)*** * ***Alt.5. Predicted new candidate beam(s)*** * ***Alt.6. …*** |
| LGE | In our view, beam confidence for predicted beams, and application time information for the predicted beams also can be considered. Beam dwelling time is one example of the time information however we prefer to capture it more generally. |
| Panasonic | We are fine with modification from vivo. |
| Ericsson | Is there a typo in the proposal ? We assume case 2 is meant.  There is no definition of beam ID. We could use the following instead  **Updated Alt 1**. TCI states and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 TCI states  Alt 2. No  Alt 3: Agree in principle. We however need to agree on the term beam ID.  Alt 4: This is same as alt 1 in our view. |
| Nokia, NSB | ML outputs can be proprietary. Similar concern here as in P 2-3/2-4. Suggest capturing the variants in general level than defining outputs explicitly. |
| CATT | We are fine with the listed alternatives. We are also open to consider more, but ‘potential down-selection’ may not be needed at this early stage. |
| Fujitsu | The comments are like proposal 2-4. We support “***the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams***” and other outputs may be derived from it through some post-processing. We suggest adding the flowing alternative in initial stage  Alt5: ***the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams***  FL: Please see my reply to Proposal 2-4 |
| Samsung | Support the proposal and also fine with Alt-1b provided by Apple. |
| CMCC | Similar to proposal 2-4, we suggest following alternatives.  ***Proposal 2-4: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output with potential down-selection:***   * ***Alt.1: L1-RSRP*** * ***Alt.2: Beam information, such as beam ID, beam angle.*** * ***Alt 3: L1-RSRP and beam information.***   ***…***  FL: For Alt.1, I have the question as for Fujitsu (Proposal 2-4). Alt.2 and Alt.3 are captured in the updated proposal (Alt.1,2,6,7) |
| NVIDIA | At this early stage, should be up to companies to explore all possible options. |
| CAICT | We support Alt.1. |
| OPPO | Support the proposal with a preference on Alt.1 |
| MediaTek | Beam dwelling time may be considered.  Also, in case of inter-cell beam management, we suggest the following:  ***Alt.x: Cell ID(s) which the predicted Top-N2 DL beams belong to.*** |
| Intel | It is too early to preclude any option. If the intention is to list all possible options, then we ok to do so.  There are typos in the main bullet “BM-Case 2” and in Alt-3 “beam ID(s)” |
| FL | The proposal is updated to Proposal 3-5a by adding the suggested alternatives. |
| BJTU | Support the proposal |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with Futurewei and Xiaomi that beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP can be taken as alternatives separately for AI/ML output. Besides, we are open to discuss other output options. |
| CATT | With the understanding and the Note that other potential alternatives are not precluded, we are OK with this Proposal  We also support Futurewei’s update to resolve the concern that possibly only one of beam ID and L1-RSRP is predicted:   * ***Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx beams*** |
| vivo | The following can be further added into the alternatives.  ***Alt. 6: The predicted RSRP of all potential beams***  ***Alt. 7: The predicted RSRP corresponding to the expected beam direction and expected timing occasions which are input to the model.***  FL: please see my reply for BM-Case1 |
| Samsung | Support proposal 3-5a. Also, FFS: N2 is needed. |
| Ericsson | We don’t understand how a beam angle can be an output in alternative 6 & 7. Is the beam angle in respect to the antenna? Or to an earth-bounded coordinate system? It should be sufficient with what is now discussed as beam ID, Propose to remove alternative 6 & 7 . |
| CAICT | Support. |
| Nokia | Too many variants. Also fine to keep with max five variants and list Alt.6 : other variants. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with proposal 3-5a. However, we share the view with Nokia that there are too many options. Consider including only the first few and just allow companies to provide other variants. |
| HW/HiSi | We are ok in principle, but we think there are a lot of schemes on the table. Would it be possible to get some consensus about prioritized outputs, e.g. Alt 1? |
| InterDigital | As we commented for BM-Case 1, we suggest to add one more alternative as shown in the below.  ***Alt.10: Predicted L1-RSRP value for each beam of set A of beams at a given instance.***  FL: please see my reply for BM-Case1 |
| NVIDIA | In principle fine with Proposal 3-5a. That said, the list might become too long as more and more are added, and might become confusing for an agreement. |
| Mediatek | Support the proposal with Alt. 1 as the preferred option. |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 3-5a. |
| Sony | Similar to the comment in Proposal 3-4a, we prefer to use DL Tx/Rx beam instead of DL Tx beam in Proposal 3-5a. |
| Lenovo | Support Proposal 3-5a. |

Proposal 3-5 (Round#2)

For this proposal, the situation and comments are similar to Proposal 2-4a. Thus, the proposal is updated following the similar way. Alt.6 from vivo and Alt.10 for IDC have not been added in the Proposal 2-4b. Please see my reply in the above table.

***Proposal 3-5b: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output (one prediction for a future time instance) with potential down-selection:***

* ***Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.2: Beam ID(s) and probability for the beam to be the best beam of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx/Rx beams***
* ***Alt.3: Beam ID(s) and the associated confidence of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx/Rx beams***
* ***Alt 4: Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx/Rx beams with L1-RSRP higher than a threshold.***
* ***Alt.5: Beam angle(s) of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.6: Beam angle(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams***
* ***Alt.7: The predicted RSRP corresponding to the expected beam direction and expected timing occasions which are input to the model.***
* ***Alt.8: Beam ID(s) and the corresponding beam application time/dwelling time***
* ***Alt.9: Predicted Beam failure and the corresponding beam ID(s)***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: Beam ID is only used for discussion purpose***
* ***Note3: All the outputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose***

Please provide your input wrt the above proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| OPPO | We are supportive.  It seems one editorial type in Alt.1 which should be below, if we didn’t get it wrong.   * ***Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx/Rx beams*** |
| NTT DOCOMO | We prefer OPPO’s modification. |
| CATT | Support this proposal. |
| Nokia | Similar to Case 1, we think that the number of alternatives are too much. We do not think it is beneficial to list down all variants as it will not allow Ran1 to converge to a solution later.  ***Proposal 3-5b: Regarding the sub use case ~~BM-~~Case2, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output (one prediction for a future time instance) with potential down-selection:***   * ***Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams with other outputs***    + ***FFS: Other outputs (probability for the beams to be the best beam, associated confidence, Beam angle(s), expected timing occasions, corresponding beam application time/dwelling time, predicted Beam failure)*** * ***Alt.2: only Beam ID(s) ~~and probability for the beam to be the best beam~~ of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx/Rx beams*** * ***~~Alt.3: Beam ID(s) and the associated confidence of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx/Rx beams~~*** * ***Alt 3: Beam ID(s) and L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx/~~Rx~~ beams***   + ***~~L1-RSRP(s) can be higher than a threshold~~*** * ***~~Alt.5: Beam angle(s) of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams~~*** * ***~~Alt.6: Beam angle(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx beams~~*** * ***~~Alt.7: The predicted RSRP corresponding to the expected beam direction and expected timing occasions which are input to the model.~~*** * ***~~Alt.8: Beam ID(s) and the corresponding beam application time/dwelling time~~*** * ***~~Alt.9: Predicted Beam failure and the corresponding beam ID(s)~~*** |
| CMCC | Support. |
| NEC | Support FL’s proposal and agree with OPPO’s suggestion. |
| Xiaomi | Support the modification from OPPO, and prefer to summarize the alternatives like Proposal 3-4b and the version from Nokia. |
| Fujitsu | The same comments on proposal 2-4b |
| CAICT | General fine with FL’s proposal and with some modifications on Tx/Rx beams |
| Spreadtrum | Support the proposal with OPPO’s revision. |
| Ericsson | The number of alternatives is too much, and it can potentially lead to problems in comparing evaluation results. Our proposal is to keep alternative 1-2, and add notes for each alternative. Our proposal is the following:   * ***Alt.1: Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx/Rx beams***   + ***FFS: predicted L1-RSRP can include an associated confidence***   + ***Note: Beam failure can be predicted by comparing the predicted L1-RSRP with a certain threshold for a beam ID***   + ***Note: Beam ID(s) can be provided in case the corresponding predicted L1-RSRP is above a certain threshold*** * ***Alt.2: Beam ID(s) and probability for the beam to be the best beam of the ~~of the predicted Top-N2~~ DL Tx/Rx beams in Set A*** |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with OPPO’s modification. |
| Futurewei | We are generally ok with proposal 3-5b. Like our response to proposal 2-4a, Alt4 can be derived from Alt.1 if L1-RSRP is part of the output. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. |
| Sony | ok |
| MediaTek | We support Nokia’s version. |
| HW/HiSi | Support |
| Qualcomm | Support Proposal 3-5b and prefer a more concise wording similar to one mentioned by Nokia. |
| Intel | Prefer version from Nokia. We are also OK with just Alt-1 and Alt-2 since other alternatives can be derivatives of these alternatives. Current list looks too big. |
| NVIDIA | Fine with Proposal 3-5b, though a simplified version would be more preferred. |
| InterDigital | We prefer Proposal 3-5b not the updated version from Nokia or Ericsson as we don’t think that multiple alternatives could be a problem at the initial stage for the further study.  FL: I am trying to find some middle ground. Some alternatives are merged, but the details are kept in the “e.g.,” part. Hopefully it can be acceptable to all companies. |
| Lenovo | Support |

###### Proposal 3-5 (Round#3)

For this proposal, the situation and comments are similar to Proposal 2-4b. Thus, the proposal is updated by following the similar way.

* “Tx and/or Rx” is added
* Alt.4 in Proposal 3-5b is merged to Alt.1 in Proposal 3-5c.
* Alt.2 and Alt.3 in Proposal 3-5b are merged to Alt.2 in Proposal 3-5c.
* Alt.5 and Alt.6 in Proposal 3-5b are merged to Alt.3 in Proposal 3-5c.
* If an alternative is merged to other alternatives, its details is kept in the “e.g.,” part.

***Proposal 3-5c: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output (one prediction for a future time instance) with potential down-selection:***

* ***Alt.1: Tx and/or Rx Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx and/or Rx beams*** 
  + ***FFS: how to select Top-N1 DL Tx and/or Rx beams (e.g., L1-RSRP higher than a threshold, a sum probability of being the best beams higher than a threshold.***)
* ***Alt.2: Tx and/or Rx Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx and/or Rx beams*** 
  + ***FFS: other information (e.g., probability for the beam to be the best beam, the associated confidence)***
* ***Alt.3: Tx and/or Rx Beam angle(s) and/or and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx and/or Rx beams***
* ***Alt.4: The predicted RSRP corresponding to the expected Tx and/or Rx beam direction and expected timing occasions which are input to the model.***
* ***Alt.5: Tx and/or Rx Beam ID(s) and the corresponding beam application time/dwelling time***
* ***Alt.6: Predicted Beam failure and the corresponding Tx beam ID(s)***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: Beam ID is only used for discussion purpose***
* ***Note3: All the outputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose***

Please provide your input wrt the above proposal

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CMCC | Support |
| Nokia | We do not think our comments were addressed. We still have a similar view.  FL: Nokia’s comments were well considered. Meanwhile, there are also comments from other companies to keep the list of detailed alternatives. FL has to find some mid-ground. The number of alternatives is reduced from 9 to 6. On the other hand, even we only use 1 or 2 high-level options, the sub-variants are still there, no more no less.  If Nokia thinks some alternatives are not clear, FL thinks the proponent(s) is willing to make some clarification. |
| NEC | We just would like to clarify that, for “predicted beam failure” in Alt.6, it refers to an indication (e.g., 0/1) representing whether beam failure occurs or not? Generally speaking, output of AI/ML model should be a real number. But it is noted that, except “predicted beam failure” in Alt.6, the outputs in the other alternatives having this characteristic obviously.  FL: In my understanding, there may be different ways. Your example is a possible way. It would be better that some proponent(s) can make further clarification. |
| Futurewei | We are ok with proposal 3-5c. |
| caict | We are fine with the proposal. |
| Fujitsu | support |
| Qualcomm | support |
| Samsung | Support proposal 3-5c. |
| Ericsson | Support  Regarding the concern raised by NEC, the output of an AI/ML model could comprise a binary value (1/0), i.e. a classifier model. A “real value” instead of a non-binary value could include the probability of beam failure, value in range of [0,1]. |
| HW/HiSi | Ok |
| CATT | Support. |

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

As the AI/ML model predicts the beam information for future time, it should be clear how many future time instances the prediction are made. Thus, the following proposal can be discussed, and further refined based on inputs.

***~~Proposal 3-6: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, AI/ML model output should be F predictions for F future time instances, where each prediction is for each time instance.~~***

* ***~~At least F = 1~~***
* ***~~FFS: other values of F~~***

***Proposal 3-6a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, AI/ML model output should be F predictions for F future time instances, where each prediction is for each time instance.***

* ***At least F = 1***
* ***The other value(s) of F is up to companies***

Please provide your input wrt the description of the above proposal. In addition, feel free to provide other comment/suggestion. Further refinement will be based on the inputs.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | OK in principle, but should the F instances with the same interval?  FL: please see my reply to Proposal 3-3 |
| vivo | Fine |
| AT&T | Ok |
| Futurewei | At least 1 and let companies to decide how many future time instances should be. |
| Xiaomi | Ok |
| Lenovo | Generally fine with FL proposal. |
| HW/HiSi | At least F = 1, other values can be up for companies to report. |
| NEC | Support |
| LGE | OK |
| Panasonic | OK. |
| Ericsson | Ok |
| Nokia, NSB | OK. Up to Companies to disclose the prediction window. |
| CATT | OK. |
| Fujitsu | Support it. |
| Samsung | Support the proposal. |
| CMCC | OK |
| NVIDIA | OK |
| CAICT | Fine with the proposal. |
| OPPO | Ok |
| MediaTek | OK |
| Intel | OK but may not be necessary at this early stage. Companies can report based on model used. |
| NTT DOCOMO | Support the proposal. |
| FL | * Proposal 3-6 is updated to Proposal 3-6a by adding a sub-bullet “***The other value(s) of F is up to companies***”, which based on the suggestion from companies. It seems acceptable to all companies   Proposal 3-6a  Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, Ok, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, Huawei, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Nokia, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM |
| BJTU | OK |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We are fine with the FL proposal. |
| CATT | We are fine with the update. |
| Samsung | Support proposal 3-6a. |
| Ericsson | OK |
| CAICT | Fine |
| Nokia | ok |
| Futurewei | We are ok with proposal 3-6a. |
| HW/HiSi | Fine |
| InterDigital | Ok |
| NVIDIA | Support proposal 3-6a. |
| Mediatek | Support the proposal. |
| Qualcomm | Support |
| Lenovo | Support |
| FL2 | Please see Offline agreement #2 in Section 3.3.1 |

There may be some other issues for each sub use cases. For example, whether online training or offline training is assumed, which is also related to the discussion/output of AI 9.2.1. We can discuss these issues later.

Please provide your input wrt any other issues that should be discussed with higher priority, any other suggestion/comment, …

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| CMCC | We suggest that following problems can also be discussed.  1) Which side does AI model perform training, NW side or UE side?  2) Does training performed online or offline?  3) Does model inference procedure of time domain beam prediction include P1 or P1 and P2 process? |
| FL | Please see my reply in Section 3.1.2 |
| FL2 | Regarding the online/offline training issue raised by CMCC, I plan to discuss it later since AI9.2.1 are discussing how to differentiate/defining offline/online training. |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## Potential spec impacts

Generally speaking, the spec impacts heavily depend on the detailed sub use cases, e.g., some related aspects are as below:

* What type of training: online or offline?
* Where the AI/ML is deployed: at UE side, at NW side, at both UE and NW side?
* What the input is?
* What the output is?
* …

Thus, the spec impacts discussed in contributions are usually targeted to some specific sub use cases and the potential spec enhancements are quite diverse. Considering the group are still discussing what sub use cases should be supported, a brief summary is trying to capture the key aspects of potential spec enhancement, without many details:

* New or enhanced mechanism(s) to facilitate data collection for UE/NW model, e.g., training, fine-tuning, verification, e.g., some examples are mentioned by contributions
  + Enhanced BM procedures (including signalling/configuration, reporting) to facilitate the training data collection
  + Introduction of some new information, e.g., UE positioning, information from sensor (e.g., velocity, orientation, rotation)
  + Other assistance information for training
* New or enhanced mechanism(s) to facilitate AI/ML inference, e.g., some examples are mentioned by contributions
  + Enhanced BM measurement/reporting for AI inference
  + Signaling/configuration for enhanced BM measurement/reporting
  + Assistance information for AI inference
* New or enhanced mechanism(s) to facilitate AI model life cycle management, e.g., some examples are mentioned by contributions
  + Mechanisms/assistance information for AI/ML model activation, deactivation
  + Mechanisms/assistance information for AI model selection
  + Mechanisms/assistance information for Performance monitoring
  + May include the exchange of some assistance information
* AI-related UE capability and reporting
* Interface of AI model, e.g., input, output
* Other enhancements

This brief summary is not a complete list, and is just used for information. Please see Section 4 for more information. More details will be provided and more discussions will proceed according to the progress of sub use case discussion.

Please share your comment/suggestion on the discussion on spec impact.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Apple | We agree with FL that spec impact depends on use cases. This may be discussed after we identified the use cases. |
| Futurewei | We believe the discussions on specification impact can wait till the discussions on sub use cases and deployment options are more stable. |
| Sony | We agree with FL that this can be discussed later according to the progress. |
| NEC | We are fine with the listed potential spec impact. |
| LGE | We prefer to focus on use case first given that spec impacts are diverge depending on use case. |
| Ericsson | Agree that it should be discussed at a later stage. Upon agreeing to the use cases. |
| CATT | The list looks good. We can further discuss this in a later phase. |
| Fujitsu | Specification impact should be discussed after the finalization of the sub use cases. |
| Samsung | Agree with the FL’s assessment. The details of spec impact can be discussed after the representative sub cases are selected. |
| CMCC | Spec impact can be discussed per sub use case. |
| NVIDIA | This can be discussed after sub use case discussion progresses materially. |
| CAICT | We agree with FL’s observations. |
| Intel | This discussion will be more meaningful once the details of sub-use cases are finalized. |
| NTT DOCOMO | We support the idea to fucus on the representative sub use-case first. |
| BJTU | We agree with the listed potential spec impact. |
| ZTE, Sanechips | We agree with FL’s observations that spec impacts assessment should be sub-use-case specific and discussed in a later phase. |
| InterDigital | We agree with FL that specification impacts should be further discussed based on the agree sub use cases. |
| Spreadtrum | We agree with FL’s assessment. |
| Qualcomm | Agree with FL’s assessment |

* 1. Output of the discussion
     1. Summary of the 1st round discussion

Based on the inputs received so far, the following proposals seems accepted by all companies:

***Proposal 3-3a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, the measurement results of K (K>=1) latest measurement instances are used for AI/ML model input:***

* ***The value of K is up to companies***
* Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, Huawei, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Nokia, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, ZTE, IDC, MTK, QC (27)
* Nokia suggested to replace the terms BM-Case1with the actual scheme name “Temporal DL beam prediction” or use “Case2”.

From FL’s perspective, it would be ok for proponents to discuss and determine details for BM-Case1. For other cases, we have separate table for discussion. If we change “BM-Case1” as suggested by Nokia, it will lead to more confusion, e.g., what’s the connection between case2 and the sub use cases listed in Section 3.1.1. Based on these considerations, FL suggest to take Proposal 3-3a as an offline agreement.

###### Offline agreement #1

***Proposal 3-3a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, the measurement results of K (K>=1) latest measurement instances are used for AI/ML model input:***

* ***The value of K is up to companies***

Please share the reason if there is strong concern

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Nokia | Not an offline agreement with the change of wording. Wording “BM” should be changed. |
| FL | Closed. Please the corresponding agreement in the Appendix |

***Proposal 3-6a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, AI/ML model output should be F predictions for F future time instances, where each prediction is for each time instance.***

* ***At least F = 1***
* ***The other value(s) of F is up to companies***
* Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, Huawei, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Nokia, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, ZTE, IDC, MTK, QC (27)
* Nokia suggested to replace the terms BM-Case1with the actual scheme name “Temporal DL beam prediction” or use “Case2”.

###### Offline agreement #2

***Proposal 3-6a: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, AI/ML model output should be F predictions for F future time instances, where each prediction is for each time instance.***

* ***At least F = 1***
* ***The other value(s) of F is up to companies***

Please share the reason if there is some strong concern

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Company | Comments |
| Nokia | Not an offline agreement with the change of wording. Wording “BM” should be changed. |
| FL | Closed. Please the corresponding agreement in the Appendix |

Based on the inputs received so far, it seems following proposals can be accepted by majority companies

***Proposal 1-1a: For AI/ML-based beam management, support BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 as the representative sub use case for characterization and baseline performance evaluations***

* ***BM-Case1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***BM-Case2: Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***FFS: details of BM-Case1 and BM-Case2***
* ***FFS: other sub use cases***
* ***Note: Further down-selection on BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 based on further discussion and evaluation is NOT precluded.***

Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, Huawei, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, ZTE, MTK, QC (26)

Two companies have different views:

* IDC: As we are in the first meeting of the SI, not WI, we prefer to include all the sub use cases in table 1 for study. Based on the study, RAN1 can decide which cases are needed or not.
* Nokia supports the following proposal

***Proposal 1-1a-Nokia: For AI/ML-based beam management, support ~~BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 as the representative~~ the following sub use case for characterization and baseline performance evaluations***

* ***~~BM-~~Case1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***~~BM-~~Case2: Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***FFS: details of ~~BM-~~Case1 and ~~BM-~~Case2***
* ***FFS: other sub use cases***
* ***Note: Further down-selection on Case1 and Case2 based on further discussion and evaluation is NOT precluded.***

For Proposal 1-1a, we continue discussion on it.

***Proposal 3-1a: For the sub use case BM-Case2, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference at UE side***

Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, BJTU, ZTE, QC (24)

Huawei’s version of Proposal 3-1a:

***Proposal 3-1a-Huawei: For the sub use case BM-Case2, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference and training at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference and training at UE side***

Huawei proposed an updated version by including training. IDC and MTK are fine with this version. I guess the original Proposal 3-1a is also acceptable to them since we will discuss the details one by one and the training will be discussed later.

Nokia: replace the terms BM-Case1with the actual scheme name “Temporal DL beam prediction” or use “Case2”.

For Proposal 3-1a, we continue discussion on it.

* + 1. Summary of the 2st round discussion

Based on the inputs received so far, the following proposals seems relatively stable:

###### Proposal 1-1c

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 1-1b (Round#2):

* Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, NEC, LGE, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, ZTE, MTK, QC, IDC (25)

By checking with Keeth offline, Nokia can live with Proposal 1-1b.

Huawei preferred to explicit capture the supervised learning and reinforcement learning in this proposal. As the discussion on training approaches (supervised learning vs RL) in Agenda 9.2.1 (Section 3.8.4, Section 4.1) is still ongoing, we would better avoid the discussion overlapped with Agenda 9.2.1. Thus, we can discuss the learning method later.

Intel suggested to clarify that “beam in Sub A and Sub B are in the same band” is only for BM-Case1 and BM-Case2. It makes sense since BM-Case 3 includes the case that Sub A and Sub B are in different FRs. Thus, Intel’s proposal is captured in the updated proposal, which is also the only change compared to Proposal 1-1b.

Hope Proposal 1-1c can be acceptable to all companies.

***Proposal 1-1c: For AI/ML-based beam management, support BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 for characterization and baseline performance evaluations***

* ***BM-Case1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***BM-Case2: Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams***
* ***FFS: details of BM-Case1 and BM-Case2***
* ***FFS: other sub use cases***
* ***For BM-Case1 and BM-Case2, Beams in Set A and Set B are in the same band***

###### Proposal 2-1a

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 2-1a(original)

* Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, NEC, LGE, Ericsson, CATT, Nokia, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, BJTU, ZTE, QC (24)

A number of companies don’t support Proposal 2-1a(Huawei). By going through all the comments, FL feels that some companies cannot accept the version from Fujitsu. Proposal 2-1a(original) seems the only choice. Moreover, it is natural to determine the details of each sub use case step by step. We can discuss the training issue later.

Proposal 2-1a(original) is copied as below without any change.

***Proposal 2-1a(Original): For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference at UE side***

###### Proposal 2-2c

Summary of discussion on Proposal 2-2b:

* Supported: vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Lenovo, Xiaomi, Huawei, NEC, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, ZTE, IDC, Apple, LG, QC, Nokia (25)

Xiaomi, Samsung, ZTE and Intel requested some clarifications on “construction of Set B”. QC made some clarifications in the inputs. An “e.g.,” part is also added to the proposal to make the clarification.

Ericsson suggested a note to clarify that the terminologies of wide beam and narrow beam are only used for discussion purpose, which is also added to the update version (Proposal 2-2c).

***Proposal 2-2c: For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider the following alternatives for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
* ***Alt.2: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: QCL relation between beams in Set A and beams in Set B***
  + ***FFS: construction of Set B (e.g., regular pre-defined codebook, codebook other than regular pre-defined one)***
* ***Note1: Set A is for DL beam prediction and Set B is for DL beam measurement.***
* ***Note2: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact***

###### Proposal 2-3c

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 2-3b

* Supported: OPPO, DCM, CATT, Nokia, CMCC, NEC, Xiaomi, Fujitsu, CAICT, Spreadtrum, Panasonic, Ericsson, ZTE, LGE, FUTUREWEI, Samsung, Sony, MTK, QC, Intel, NVIDIA, IDC (22)
* Huawei (?)

The comments are mainly related to the Rx beams. Xiaomi’s suggestion is included to update the proposal.

Fujitsu proposed to remove “of DL Tx beams” for each alternative since the measurement is based on beam pairs rather only Tx beams. This suggestion is also captured in the updated proposal.

There was some concern on Alt.3 and/or different types of assistance information. Since there are supported by some companies and this is the first meeting, it is suggested to keep them as a starting point. Otherwise, it seems impractical for the group to converge on some consensus in this first meeting. Further down-selection can be discussed later.

IDC raised a valid point in the comment for Proposal 3-4. Thus, Alt.4 is added. Accordingly, the “Tx/Rx beam ID” is removed from the FFS part since it is captured by Alt.4.

Based on the above information, Proposal 2-3b is updated as below

***Proposal 2-3c: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML input:***

* ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beams~~***
* ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beams~~ and assistance information***
  + ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companions in the discussion: ~~Tx/Rx beam ID,~~ Tx and/or Rx beam shape information (e.g., Tx and/or Rx beam pattern, Tx and/or Rx beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, etc.), expected Tx and/or Rx beam for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx and/or Rx angle, Tx and/or Rx beam ID for the prediction), position information, etc.***
* ***Alt.3: CIR based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beam(s)~~***
* ***Alt.4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and the corresponding DL Tx and/or Rx beam ID***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***

###### Proposal 3-1a

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 3-1a(original)

* Supported: Apple, vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Xiaomi, Lenovo, Sony, NEC, LGE, Ericsson, CATT, Nokia, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, BJTU, ZTE, QC (24)

A number of companies don’t support Proposal 3-1a(Huawei). By going through all the comments, FL feels that some companies cannot accept the version from Fujitsu. Proposal 3-1a(original) seems the only choice. Moreover, it is natural to determine the details of each sub use case step by step. We can discuss the training issue later.

***Proposal 3-1a(Original): For the sub use case BM-Case2, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: AI/ML inference at NW side***
* ***Alt.2: AI/ML inference at UE side***

###### Proposal 3-2c

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 3-2b

* Supported: vivo, AT&T, FUTUREWEI, Lenovo, Xiaomi, Huawei, NEC, Panasonic, Ericsson, CATT, Fujitsu, Samsung, CMCC, NVIDIA, CAICT, OPPO, MTK, Intel, DCM, ZTE, IDC, Apple, LG, QC, Nokia (25)

Almost all the comments are reflected in the updated proposal. The proposal from Sony is not well aligned with Proposal 1-1b/1-1c and has not been included so far. Please see my reply in the above table (Round#2).

***Proposal 3-2c: For the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives with potential down-selection:***

* ***Alt.1:*** ***Set A and Set B are different***
* ***Alt.2: Set B is a subset of Set A***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
  + ***Alt.1b: Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams***
* ***Alt.3: Set A and Set B are the same***
* ***Note1: Forecasted beam(s) are selected from Set A and ~~beams measurement~~ measured beams used as input are selected from Set B.***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact***

###### Proposal 3-4c

Summary of the discussion on Proposal 3-4b

* Supported: OPPO, DCM, CATT, Nokia, CMCC, NEC, Xiaomi, Fujitsu, CAICT, Spreadtrum, Panasonic, Ericsson, ZTE, LGE, FUTUREWEI, Samsung, Sony, MTK, QC, Intel, NVIDIA, Sony (22)
* Huawei(?)

The comments are mainly related to the Rx beams. Xiaomi’s suggestion is included to update the proposal.

Similar to Proposal 2-3b, Fujitsu’s proposal to remove “of DL Tx beams” is also included in Proposal 3-4c.

There were some concerns on the assistance information. Please see my reply to each company for Proposal 2-3.

IDC raised a valid point. Thus, Alt.4 is added. Accordingly, the “Tx/Rx beam ID” is removed from the FFS part since it is captured by Alt.4.

Based on the above information, Proposal 3-4c is updated as below.

***Proposal 3-4c: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives of measurement results for AI/ML input (for each past measurement instance):***

* ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beams~~***
* ***Alt 2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B ~~of DL Tx beams~~ and assistance information*** 
  + ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companies in the discussion: ~~Tx/Rx beam ID~~, Tx and/or Rx beam angle, position information, direction information, positioning-related measurement (such as Multi-RTT), expected Tx and/or Rx beam/occasion for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx and/or Rx beam angle for the prediction, expected occasions of the prediction), Tx and/or Rx beam shape information (e.g., Tx and/or Rx beam pattern, Tx and/or Rx beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, increase ratio of L1-RSRP for best N beams, etc.)***
* ***Alt.3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and the corresponding DL Tx and/or Rx beam ID***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***
  + 1. Summary of the 3rd round discussion

###### Proposal 2-2e

***Proposal 2-2e: For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider the following alternatives for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
* ***Alt.2: Set A and Set B are different (e.g. Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams)***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: QCL relation between beams in Set A and beams in Set B***
  + ***~~FFS: construction of Set B (e.g., regular pre-defined codebook, codebook other than regular pre-defined one)~~***
* ***Note1: Set A is for DL beam prediction and Set B is for DL beam measurement.***
* ***Note2: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact***
* ***Note3: The codebook constructions of Set A and Set B can be clarified by the companies.***

Background information: Proposal 2-2d is supported by QC, but Nokia/Ericsson have concern. CATT/LGE also prefer Proposal 2-2e.

***Proposal 2-2d: For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider the following alternatives for further study:***

* ***Alt.1: Set B is a subset of Set A***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
* ***Alt.2: Set A and Set B are different (e.g. Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams)***
  + ***FFS: the number of beams in Set A and B***
  + ***FFS: QCL relation between beams in Set A and beams in Set B***
  + ***FFS: construction of Set B (e.g., regular pre-defined codebook, codebook other than regular pre-defined one)***
* ***Note1: Set A is for DL beam prediction and Set B is for DL beam measurement.***
* ***Note2: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact***

###### Proposal 2-3c

Same as the version of Proposal 2-3c in the email

***Proposal 2-3c: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML input:***

* ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B***
* ***Alt.2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and assistance information***
  + ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companions in the discussion:  Tx and/or Rx beam shape information (e.g., Tx and/or Rx beam pattern, Tx and/or Rx beam boresight direction (azimuth and elevation), 3dB beamwidth, etc.), expected Tx and/or Rx beam for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx and/or Rx angle, Tx and/or Rx beam ID for the prediction), UE position information, UE direction information, Tx beam usage information, UE orientation information, etc.***
    - ***Note: The provision of assistance information may be infeasible due to the concern of disclosing proprietary information to the other side.***
* ***Alt.3: CIR based on Set B***
* ***Alt.4: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and the corresponding DL Tx and/or Rx beam ID***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s) including the combination of some alternatives***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***

###### Proposal 2-4d

***Proposal 2-4d: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case1, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output:***

* ***Alt.1: Tx and/or Rx Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx and/or Rx beams*** 
  + ***FFS: how to select Top-N1 DL Tx and/or Rx beams (e.g., L1-RSRP higher than a threshold, a sum probability of being the best beams higher than a threshold.***)
* ***Alt.2: Tx and/or Rx Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx and/or Rx beams and other information*** 
  + ***FFS: other information (e.g., probability for the beam to be the best beam, an updated set B)***
* ***Alt.3: The predicted RSRP corresponding to the ~~expected~~ Tx and/or Rx beam direction which is input to the model.***
* ***Alt.4: Tx and/or Rx Beam angle(s) and the predicted L1-RSRP (optional) of the predicted Top-N1 DL Tx and/or Rx beams***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: Beam ID is only used for discussion purpose***
* ***Note3: All the outputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose***
* ***Note4: Values of N1 is up to each company.***

Supported: all companies except Nokia

###### Proposal 3-2d

Same version as that in the email discussion.

***Proposal 3-2d: For the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives with potential down-selection:***

* ***Alt.1:*** ***Set A and Set B are different (e.g. Set A consists of narrow beams and Set B consists of wide beams)***
  + ***FFS: QCL relation between beams in Set A and beams in Set B***
* ***Alt.2: Set B is a subset of Set A (Set A and Set B are not the same)***
  + ***FFS: how to determine Set B out of the beams in Set A (e.g., fixed pattern, random pattern, …)***
* ***Alt.3: Set A and Set B are the same***
* ***Note1: Predicted beam(s) are selected from Set A and measured beams used as input are selected from Set B.***
* ***Note2: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note3: The narrow and wide beam terminology is for SI discussion only and have no specification impact***

###### Proposal 3-4c

Same version as Proposal 3-4c in the email discussion except the highlight part for correction.

***Proposal 3-4d: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives of measurement results for AI/ML input (for each past measurement instance):***

* ***Alt.1: Only L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B***
* ***Alt 2: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and assistance information*** 
  + ***FFS: Assistance information. The following were mentioned by companies in the discussion:, Tx and/or Rx beam angle, position information, UE direction information, positioning-related measurement (such as Multi-RTT), expected Tx and/or Rx beam/occasion for the prediction (e.g., expected Tx and/or Rx beam angle for the prediction, expected occasions of the prediction), Tx and/or Rx  beam shape information (e.g., Tx and/or Rx beam pattern, Tx and/or Rx beam pointing angles, 3dB beamwidth, ~~increase ratio of L1-RSRP for best N beams, UE orientation information,~~ etc.) , increase ratio of L1-RSRP for best N beams, UE orientation information***
    - ***Note: The provision of assistance information may be infeasible due to the concern of disclosing proprietary information to the other side.***
* ***Alt.3: L1-RSRP measurement based on Set B and the corresponding DL Tx and/or Rx beam ID***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s) including the combination of some alternatives***
* ***Note2: All the inputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose.***

###### Proposal 3-5c

***Proposal 3-5c: Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, further study the following alternatives for AI/ML output (one prediction for a future time instance) with potential down-selection:***

* ***Alt.1: Tx and/or Rx Beam ID(s) and/or the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx and/or Rx beams*** 
  + ***FFS: how to select Top-N1 DL Tx and/or Rx beams (e.g., L1-RSRP higher than a threshold, a sum probability of being the best beams higher than a threshold.***)
* ***Alt.2: Tx and/or Rx Beam ID(s) of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx and/or Rx beams*** 
  + ***FFS: other information (e.g., probability for the beam to be the best beam, the associated confidence)***
* ***Alt.3: Tx and/or Rx Beam angle(s) and/or and the predicted L1-RSRP of the predicted Top-N2 DL Tx and/or Rx beams***
* ***Alt.4: The predicted RSRP corresponding to the expected Tx and/or Rx beam direction and expected timing occasions which are input to the model.***
* ***Alt.5: Tx and/or Rx Beam ID(s) and the corresponding beam application time/dwelling time***
* ***Alt.6: Predicted Beam failure and the corresponding Tx beam ID(s)***
* ***Note1: It is up to companies to provide other alternative(s)***
* ***Note2: Beam ID is only used for discussion purpose***
* ***Note3: All the outputs are “nominal” and only for discussion purpose***

Supported: all companies except Nokia

# Detailed Proposals / Observations

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Huawei [1] | ***Observation 1: NW-oriented AI/ML beam management with the AI/ML model trained and inferred both at gNB side can operate under the collaboration level without AI/ML model exchange over the air-interface.***  ***Observation 2: UE-oriented AI/ML beam management with the AI/ML model trained and inferred both at UE side may require the NW to train the AI/ML model and deliver to the UE.***  ***Proposal 1****:* ***For AI/ML-based beam management, the following two sub use cases can be studied:***  ***Beam management in spatial domain***  ***Beam prediction in time domain***  ***Proposal 2: Study whether potential specification impact is needed for AI/ML-based beam prediction considering the following aspects:***  ***AI/ML model training procedure***  ***Enhancement for RSRP report and beam ID report***  ***AI/ML model monitoring procedure*** |
| ZTE [2] | ***Observation 1:*** *The traditional beam training method with brute-force sequential beam searching may result in excessive training overhead, measurement power consumption and processing delay.*  ***Observation 2:*** *Compared with the traditional exhaustive search-based beam training method, the learning-based beam prediction methods can significantly reduce the training overhead and processing delay.*  ***Proposal 1:*** *Both the AI/ML-based spatial-domain beam prediction and time-domain beam prediction should be taken into consideration for possible applicability.*  ***Proposal 2:*** *At least the scenario where AI model is deployed at base station should be considered for specification enhancements on beam management.*  ***Proposal 3:*** *Study potential enhancements on receive beam-related information to the base station reported by UE to assist gNB for more accurate beam prediction and improved generalization of the trained AI/ML model.*  ***Proposal 4:*** *Study potential enhancements to support more flexible beam measurement and reporting, in order to adapt to different AI/ML based beam prediction.*  ***Proposal 5:*** *Consider predictable mobility for beam management as an enhancement aspect for improving UE experience in FR2 high mobility scenario (e.g., high-speed train and high-way) in Rel-18 AI-PHY, which at least includes beam-management-related enhancements for predictable mobility, involving beam measurement, beam report and beam indication.* |
| Ericsson [3] | [Observation 1 Proprietary beam management procedures executed on the UE side (resp. NW side) effect NW side (resp. UE side) data quality and, therefore, AI/ML model generation and performance.](#_Toc102160598)  [Observation 2 Single-sided AI/ML models in the UE, which are transparent to the NW, may make beam management and AI/ML model generation more difficult.](#_Toc102160599)  [Observation 3 UE-side beam prediction AI/ML capability signalling can enable improving NW performance.](#_Toc102160600)  [Proposal 1 Study UE-sided AI enhancements for beam management.](#_Toc102160601)  [Proposal 2 Study NW-sided AI enhancements for beam management.](#_Toc102160602)  [Proposal 3 Do not study dual-sided joint AI enhancements for beam management.](#_Toc102160603)  [Proposal 4 Study enhanced beam management procedures to aid data collection for (offline) single-sided UE/NW model generation, for example potential assistance information.](#_Toc102160604)  [Proposal 5 Study specification impacts for beam prediction AI/ML model configuration activation, deactivation, and monitoring.](#_Toc102160605)  [Proposal 6 Study AI/ML model capability reporting associated with beam predictions from UE.](#_Toc102160606)  [Proposal 7 Study the benefit of signalling predicted values and associated confidence levels for beam management.](#_Toc102160607)  [Proposal 8 Quantify the benefits of site-specific beam prediction models AI/ML models trained on site-specific data.](#_Toc102160608)  [Proposal 9 Study requirements and solutions for enabling trained site-specific beam prediction AI/ML models to UEs](#_Toc102160609) |
| IDC [4] | ***Observation 1:*** *The current NR specification supporting UE reporting with up to 4 best CRIs/SSBRIs with L1-RSRP or L1-SINR can be very limited for gNB estimation.*  ***Observation 2:*** *Partial beam measurement which allows beam prediction by measuring only a subset of beams could be beneficial for reducing RS overheads and reporting latency.*  ***Observation 3:*** *For partial beam measurement, both UE side beam prediction and gNB side beam prediction have benefits.*  ***Observation 4:*** *The current NR specification supports measurement restriction to limit UE measurement, however, measurement restriction is to efficiently utilize RS transmissions for multiple beams not to consider time domain characteristics of beam measurement.*  ***Observation 5:*** *For gNB which predicts beams by using AI/ML, time domain characteristics of beam measurements are essential as well as spatial domain characteristics.*  ***Observation 6:*** *The current NR specification does not consider association between beams with different beam widths.*  ***Observation 7:*** *Utilizing association between beams with different beam widths can provide benefits for prediction accuracy e.g., robust estimation/identification of whole spatial characteristics with wide beams and accurate beam identification with narrow beams.*  ***Observation 8:*** *For Rel-15 beam management, actual mapping between DL Tx beam and UE Rx beam is totally based on UE implementation.*  ***Observation 9:*** *The implementation-based UE Rx beam selection works for Rel-15, however, UE Rx beam information is crucial to accurately predict beam qualities for AI/ML based beam prediction.*  ***Proposal 1:*** *Study benefits of simple specification extension of UE reporting such as* *increasing number of possible best CRIs/SSBRIs, introduction of absolute RSRPs for other CRIs/SSBRIs than the best and other possible extensions and other possible extensions*.  ***Proposal 2:*** *Study benefits of partial beam measurement for specification enhancement to reduce RS overheads and UE reporting latency*.  ***Proposal 3:*** *Study benefits of both UE side beam prediction and gNB side beam prediction for partial beam measurement*.  ***Proposal 4:*** *Study benefits of specification enhancements such as UE reporting with associated time slot domain information*.  ***Proposal 5:*** *Study benefits of specification enhancements on association between beams with different beam widths*.  ***Proposal 6:*** *Study benefits of specification enhancements on acquiring UE Rx beam information*. |
| CATT [5] | ***Proposal 1: The following sub use cases can be considered in Rel-18*** ***AI/ML-based beam management:***  ***Narrow beam prediction based on wide beam measurement.***  ***All beam prediction based on partial beam measurement.t***  ***Beam prediction in time domain.***  ***Proposal 2: The following spec impact of AI/ML based beam management can be considered:***  ***Signaling/procedure of AI model training/updating/fallback;***  ***Interface of AI model, i.e. relationship between measured RS and reported information;***  ***New procedure for RS measurement and reporting;***  ***Signaling/procedure design on exchanging AI-related/non-AI-related assistance information.*** |
| Vivo [6] | Two main sub use cases can be considered for spatial domain beam prediction to reduce overhead and/or improve beam searching accuracy.  Fine beam prediction based on coarse beam measurement  Super-resolution beam prediction based on partial beam measurement.  Study different variations for each sub-use case, considering generalization performance for different number of Tx and Rx beams.  The sub use case of time domain prediction is to predict future beam RSRP with historical RSRPs for both of the following purposes,  Time domain beam prediction for overhead reduction  Time domain beam prediction for accurate beam switching time  Spatial domain beam prediction algorithm is an essential precondition for time domain beam prediction study.  Study impact of different beam sweeping patterns for time domain beam prediction.  Study model deployment procedure and specification impact for both cases that beam prediction functionality resides in UE side and the functionality resides in gNB side.  Study sub-use cases from collaboration level 0~ level 3 for beam management cases.  Study configuration method of beam angle with minimum exposures of implementation details.  Study the gains and impact of different beam input orders.  Study the impact of input beam patterns to model performance monitoring for both spatial and time predictions. |
| NEC [7] | ***Observation 1: At least from the perspective of supporting various gNB-UE collaboration levels and having significant potential specification impact, beam prediction in spatial/time domain can be final representative sub use cases, while*** ***beam selection accuracy improvement can’t.***  ***Observation 2: In order to ensure the performance of the AI model in the real environment, verification of dataset including training, validation and testing is essential.***  ***Observation 3: For sub use case, multiple AI models may be arranged or deployed.***  ***Observation 4: For periodic or semi-persistent beam reporting, overhead of beam measurement and reporting resources can be reduced with beam prediction in time domain.***  ***Proposal 1: Support beam prediction in spatial/time domain as the final representative sub use cases.***  ***Proposal 2: Study the mechanism of exchanging information indicting verification results between gNB and UE.***  ***Proposal 3: Study the mechanism of reporting more beams, e.g., K>4.***  ***Proposal 4: Study the mechanism of model selection.***  ***Proposal 5: Study the mechanism of discontinuous reporting in periodic or semi-persistent beam reporting.***  ***Proposal 6: Study the method of indicating the future beam and the application time of beam.*** |
| Sony [8] | **: Support using AI/ML model trained with all locations and directions of UE for beam prediction and selection at gNB.**  **: Support using dynamic/aperiodic CSI-RS resource set to inform UE candidate beams.**  **: Beam prediction at gNB based on UE’s measurement report can be supported.**  **: Support beam prediction at gNB by using multi pieces of prior CSI information at low frequency for model training.**  **: Propagation environment based AI/ML model selections can be considered at gNB.** |
| Xiaomi[9] | ***Proposal 1: Study sub use case of beam prediction in spatial domain with high priority.***  ***Proposal 2: Prefer AI/ML model training at gNB side and the collaboration level Cat.2 since Rx beam information should be included in beam report for data set collection.***  ***Proposal 3: To discuss whether a common AI model or separate AI models will be trained for UE with different number of Rx beam.***  ***Proposal 4: To input beam information associated with each L1-RSRP to AI/ML model and study how to indicate the Tx beam information of gNB to UE for UE side inference.***  ***Proposal 5: To indicate Rx beam ID to UE for obtaining L1-RSRP input to AI/ML model.*** |
| Samsung[10] | **Proposal 1: Study the sub use cases for beam prediction in spatial domain.**  **Consider gNB-side beam prediction as a sub use case, and**  **Consider UE-side beam prediction as a sub use case.**  **Proposal 2: Study the sub use cases for beam prediction in time domain.**  **Consider gNB-side beam prediction as a sub use case, and**  **Consider UE-side beam prediction as a sub use case.**  **Proposal 3: Study the combination of spatial domain beam predication and time domain beam predication.**  **Proposal 4: Study beam measurement feedback compression as a candidate sub use case.** |
| OPPO[11] | ***Collaboration framework 0a and 0b involves no AI/ML-specific signaling nor model exchange, but they can enable AI/ML-based beam prediction with the aid of existing NR mechanism or modified/enhanced NR system;***  ***Collaboration framework 1b involves AI/ML-specific signaling but no model exchange and it facilitates inference at both sides for AI/ML beam prediction.***  ***For overhead and latency reduction, study the sub use case of AI/ML-based beam prediction in spatial domain as a starting point.***  ***Beam prediction in time domain can be studied and evaluated, but not with top priority.***  ***Study the mechanism and necessity of collaboration framework(s) on a per use case basis for AI/ML beam management.*** |
| Beijing Jiaotong University[12] | ***Proposal #1: Study*** ***image-reconstruction-based beam selection scheme as a use case for beam management enhancement.***  ***Proposal #2: Study the necessary specification change to support AI-based beam selection, considering collaboration level between UE and network, and additional signaling enhancement from the side of network for the adaptive beam measurement.*** |
| Panasonic[13] | **Observation 1: Initial beam establishment is one sub use case.**  **Observation 2: For beam tracking and refining, the following can be considered as sub use cases:**  **Adjustment of measurement/reporting interval**  **Predictive beam switching**  **Partial beam set measurement**  **Observation 3: For beam failure recovery, the AI/ML approaches would be similar to beam tracking and refining sub use cases.**  **Observation 4: For sub use case of initial beam establishment, all AI/ML functionalities located at UE can be considered as baseline, and it can be FFS to spread AI/ML functionalities between UE and network.**  **Observation 5: For sub use case of adjustment of measurement/reporting interval, network based AI/ML can be considered as baseline, and it can be FFS to spread AI/ML functionalities between UE and network.**  **Observation 6: For sub use case of predictive beam switching for RRC\_CONNECTED, network based AI/ML can be considered as baseline, and it can be FFS to spread AI/ML functionalities between UE and network.**  **Observation 7: For sub use case of partial beam measurement, both network based and UE based AI/ML can be considered as baseline, and it can be FFS to spread AI/ML functionalities between UE and network.**  The proposals are as follows:  **Proposal 1: AI/ML mapping within the network (such as gNB or OAM) is up to RAN2/3 discussion. RAN1 discussion should focuses network-UE relation.**  **Proposal 2: Consider the following mapping between sub use cases and network-UE collaboration levels for further study:**   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Sub use cases** | **Cat-1-UE**  (allAI/ML functionalities at UE) | **Cat-1-network**  (allAI/ML functionalities at network) | **Cat-2**  (Data Collection, Model Training and Model Inference at network; Actor at UE) | **Cat-3**  (Date Collection at network; Model Training, Model Inference and Actor at UE) | **Cat-4**  (Date collection and Model training at network; Model Inference and Actor at UE) | **Cat-5**  (Model Training and Model Inference at both network and UE ) | | **Initial beam establishment** | **Baseline** | **Deprioritzed** | **Deprioritized** | **FFS** | **FFS** | **FFS** | | **Adjustment of measurement/reporting interval** | **FFS** | **Baseline** | **Baseline** | **FFS** | **FFS** | **FFS** | | **Predictive beam switching** | **FFS** | **Baseline** | **Baseline** | **FFS** | **FFS** | **FFS** | | **Partial beam set measurement** | **Baseline** | **Baseline** | **Baseline** | **Baseline** | **FFS** | **FFS** | |
| FUTUREWEI[14] | ***Observation 1: AI/ML-based beam prediction in spatial domain and AI/ML-based beam prediction in time domain can potentially reduce the overhead, improve beam selection accuracy, and improve UE experience/performance.***  ***Proposal 1: Support “AI/ML-based beam prediction in spatial domain” and “AI/ML-based beam prediction in time domain” as sub use cases for AI/ML-based Beam Management use case.*** |
| LGE [15] | **Proposal #1: Consider DL Tx beam prediction in time domain with priority for sub-use cases of AI/ML for beam management.**  **Proposal #2: Potential specification impact for DL Tx beam prediction can be additional UE reporting which can include assistant information for gNB side AI/ML or predicted beam information from UE side AI/ML.** |
| CIACT[16] | ***Proposal 1: AI/ML based algorithm could be used to simplify the beam measurement process.***  ***Proposal 2: Both AI/ML model(s) from gNB based solution and preassemble AI/ML model(s) based solution could be considered for further study.*** |
| Apple[17] | ***Proposal 1: Study spatial domain beam prediction with measurement for limited number of beams as well as a flexible beam measurement and report framework to support dynamic activation/deactivation of beam measurement reference signal and beam report.***  ***Proposal 2: Study FR2 spatial domain beam prediction with FR1 measurements as well as CSI enhancement in FR1 to facilitate the beam prediction in FR2***  ***Proposal 3: Study time domain beam prediction based on past measurement results as well as TCI activation/indication to facilitate the beam prediction in time domain.***  ***Proposal 4: Study beam dwelling time prediction based on past measurement results as well as UE power saving schemes for beam measurement with regard to predicted beam dwelling time.***  ***Proposal 5: Since AI based beam prediction cannot provide 100% beam prediction accuracy, it is necessary to study hybrid AI based and non-AI based beam management.***  ***Proposal 6: Study how to management multiple AI processing simultaneously.*** |
| CMCC[18] | **Proposal 1: Spatial domain beam prediction can be a representative sub use case for beam management.**  **Proposal 2: The model inference procedure of spatial domain beam prediction includes P1 and P2 process.**  **Proposal 3: For spatial domain beam prediction, both model inference operated at gNB side and UE side can be studied.**  **Proposal 4: The same sort method of beam pairs is pre-defined so that gNB and UE have the same understanding of index of beam pairs.**  **Proposal 5: For model inference of spatial domain beam prediction at gNB side, CSI report framework and beam indication need further enhancement.**  **Proposal 6: For model inference of spatial domain beam prediction at UE side, CSI report framework and beam indication need further enhancement.** |
| DOCOMO[19] | **Proposal 1: Time-domain beam prediction should be studied as a sub use-case of beam management in Rel-18 AI/ML for AI.**  **Proposal 2: CSI report should be enhanced to improve the performance of time-domain beam prediction, if time-domain beam prediction is supported as sub use-case.**  **Proposal 3: Spatial-domain beam estimation should be studied as a sub use-case of beam management in Rel-18 AI/ML for AI.**  **Observation 1: Enhancements on beam selection policy in CSI reports might be potential specification impacts for spatial-domain beam estimation.** |
| Lenovo[20] | **Beam measurement and beam selection are important for initial beam assignment procedure during initial access in FR2.**  **Beam measurement and beam selection procedure is the key procedure for all beam management procedures.**  **Beam prediction at gNB/TRP side with model management-related collaboration between gNB and UE (i.e., Cat. 2) can be taken as a sub-use case for beam management in predictable trajectory scenario.**  **Beam selection from a larger number of candidate beams based on the measurement of a small number of configured beams at the UE side using AI model can be taken as another sub-use case.**  **Study UE/NW capability related signaling corresponding to AI-based beam management under correspondent network-UE collaboration levels.**  **Study how to signal AI related parameters for a beam measurement procedure.** |
| Spreadtrum[21] | ***Proposal 1: AI/ML based beam selection can be considered as one of the representative sub use cases.***  ***Proposal 2: AI/ML based beam prediction can be considered as one of the representative sub use cases.***  ***Proposal 3: For AI/ML based beam selection, training could be conducted by gNB, while inference could be conducted by UE for better performance.***  ***Proposal 4: For AL/ML based beam selection, support to configure AI model related information to UE.***  ***Proposal 5: For AL/ML based beam selection,***  ***The current CSI framework can be reused as starting point***  ***The 1/2-port CSI-RS resource and SSB can be reused as measurement resource***  ***Define new reporting quantity for beam that was not directly measured***  ***Define new UE processing capability for AI/ML based beam reporting***  ***Proposal 7: For AL/ML based beam prediction, AI model is implemented by gNB and transparent to UE.***  ***Proposal 8: For AL/ML based beam prediction, the Rel-17 TCI framework can be reused, no more enhancement is required.*** |
| TCL[22] | ***Proposal 1: The configuration of SSB beam scanning at initial access stage can be improved by ML.***  ***Proposal 2: The subsets of beams at the gNB side and UE side, can be constructed with an ML model to reduce the beam training overhead.***  ***Proposal 3: The UE position information is not necessary for predictive beam switching.***  ***Proposal 4: The predictive beam switching shall be discussed in sub use cases of inter-cell beam switching and intra-cell beam switching for latency reduction.***  ***Proposal 5: The beam failure detection performance can be enhanced by an AI/ML model based on historical beam measurements.***  ***Proposal 6: The new candidate beam qnew can be jointly determined by an ML model when beam failure occurs.*** |
| Nokia[23] | The potential use cases that can be beneficial from ML spatial domain beam prediction are:  Use wide beam measurements to predict the best refined beam(s).  Use a subset of wide/refined beam measurements to predict the best wide/refined beam(s).  Utilize the QoS metric to assist the beam prediction for improving system throughput and reducing latency.  Supervised learning ML model beam prediction can be used for finding the highest RSRP wide/refined beam(s) by reducing the beam management overhead significantly.  In order to find beam selections that increase the QoS class specific performance metrics, reinforcement learning approaches can be used for searching the beams than the ones with highest RSRP.  For RL based methods, occasional exploration may be needed to train and validate the ML model.  Support RAN1 to further consider spatial beam prediction based on both supervised learning and reinforcement learning for   * + Beam prediction for reducing beam management resource overhead and latency.   + QoS based beam prediction for improving system throughput and reducing latency.   For beam prediction based on supervised learning, the ML model consider the followings:   * + Model input: RSRP measurements of all/subset of Tx beams from gNB GoB#1, extra info can be included.   + Model output: Prediction of beam ranking or beam RSRP for all/subset of Tx beams from gNB GoB#2.   + **Offline training for the ML model generation.**   For beam prediction based on reinforcement learning, the ML model considers the following   * + Model input: Standard CSI measurements and optionally beam usage statistics and scheduling information if available   + Model output: best beam for QoS class or DRB   + Optionally explorative data collection and training   To enable the supervised learning gNB-based beam inference operation, the existing CSI measurement/report framework can be sufficient.  To enable the supervised learning UE-based beam inference operation  Additional gNB-UE collaboration and signaling may be needed for the ML model selection, model input, model validation and model fine-tuning.  Enhanced CSI measurement/report framework may be needed.  For supervised learning spatial beam prediction, support RAN1 to further study both gNB-based and UE-based beam inference, including   * + The necessary collaboration and signal exchange between gNB and UE for ML model input, model validation, model fine-tuning and model version selection.   + The necessary signaling for CSI reporting to enable ML model inference.   To enable gNB-based QoS aware beam prediction, additional signaling could be introduced so that UEs can expect transmissions from a beam that is not with the highest RSRP.  To enable flexibility of beam prediction in spatial domain, it may be required to have control over the ML model on the exact context of beam prediction in the spatial domain.  For spatial beam prediction, support RAN1 to further study UE-based beam inference, where beam predictions are performed according to the required context set by the gNB.  Spatial-temporal domain beam prediction can be used for reducing beam management resource overhead especially for mobile UE.  Both supervised learning and local online learning provide a framework to track the best beam over time with reduced measurement overhead.  Support RAN1 to further consider the spatial-temporal beam prediction with ML methods, including:   * + Further study spatial-temporal beam prediction with supervised learning method   + Further study spatial-temporal beam prediction local online learning method   + Further study the tradeoffs between the supervised learning method and the online learning method.   To enable the supervised learning or local online learning gNB-based spatial-temporal beam inference operation, the existing CSI measurement/report framework can be sufficient.  To enable the supervised learning or local online learning UE-based spatial-temporal beam inference operation  Additional gNB-UE collaboration and signaling may be needed for the ML model input, model validation, model fine-tuning, and model selection.  Enhanced CSI measurement/report framework may be needed.  Framework supporting model reliability may be needed.  For supervised learning or local online learning spatial-temporal beam prediction, support RAN1 to further study both gNB-based and UE-based beam inference, including   * + The necessary collaboration and signal exchange between gNB and UE for ML model input, model validation, model fine-tuning, model-reliability, and model version selection.   + The necessary signaling for reporting the ML model output. |
| Intel[24] | **For AI/ML assisted beam management use-case, consider both spatial and temporal domain beam prediction sub-use cases within the purview of an offline learning framework.**  **The ML model may reside either at UE or gNB**  **One possible area of specification impact for AI/ML model integration may be for triggering of beam measurement reports and reference signal transmissions, as well new L1 reporting formats.** |
| NVIDIA[25] | **Observation 1: AI/ML techniques can be used to predict beam in time and spatial domain, which can reduce the overhead and latency associated with the P1/P2/P3 beam management procedures.**  **Proposal 1: Beam prediction should be selected as one representative sub use case.**  **Proposal 2: Study the signalling support for the training and execution of AI/ML models for beam prediction.**  **Proposal 3: Study the data required by AI/ML models for beam prediction (e.g., data reported by UE to gNB, assistance data from gNB to UE).**  **Proposal 4: Study how to deliver outputs generated by AI/ML models for beam prediction from gNB to UE and from UE to gNB.** |
| AT&T[26] | **Proposal 1: Both centralized (e.g. across multiple gNBs) and decentralized (e.g. a single gNB or UE) approaches for AI/ML based beam management should be evaluated.** |
| Mavenir [27] | **Proposal 1: RAN WG1 should study the application of AI/ML-based algorithms on the following Use Cases to understand if any specification improvement is required:**  **Reducing the P-1 overhead by optimizing the intra/inter TRxP (e.g., gNB) transmit beam-sweeping directions and periodicity.**  **Reducing the P-2 overhead by predicting the best set of P-2 beams.**  **Improving the beam-based mobility by determining beam-specific cell individual offset (CFO) and Time-to-Trigger (TTT).**  **Proposal 2:** **RAN WG1 should consider the following KPIs while studying the application of AI/ML-based algorithms in beam management:**  **Throughput**  **Beam-switching success rate**  **Number of too early beam-switches**  **Number of too late beam-switches**  **Number of ping-pong cases**  **Link failure rate**  **Outage rate** |
| QC[28] | **Proposal 1: RAN1 should study temporal beam prediction and identify aspects of temporal beam prediction where AI/ML-assisted methods are beneficial.**  **Proposal 2: For UE-side training, RAN1 should focus on offline training scenario, in which the development and training of the AI model for temporal beam prediction happens offline without the need to involve 3gpp signaling.**  **Proposal 3: RAN1 should study the signalling aspects related to gNB sending assistance information to help UE with data collection for training, for the purpose of temporal beam prediction.**  **Proposal 4: RAN1 should study and evaluate the benefits of temporal beam prediction at UE and gNB and the associated signalling needed to assist or enable beam prediction at each side.**  **Proposal 5: For temporal beam prediction, RAN1 should study the signalling aspects related to exchanging information about beam prediction quality and a metric for beam prediction quality**  **Proposal 6: For temporal beam prediction, RAN1 should study the signalling aspects related to gNB sending assistance signalling to help UE in comparing predicted measurements with actual measurements.**  **Proposal 7: RAN1 should study codebook-based spatial domain beam prediction and identify aspects of codebook-based spatial domain beam prediction where AI/ML-assisted methods are beneficial.**  **Proposal 8: For UE-side training, RAN1 should focus on offline training scenario for codebook-based spatial domain beam prediction, in which the AI/ML model design and training does not involve 3gpp signalling.**  **Proposal 9: For UE-side training, RAN1 should study the signalling aspects related to gNB sending assistance information to help UE with data collection for training, for the purpose of codebook-based spatial domain beam prediction.**  **Proposal 10: RAN1 should study and evaluate the benefits of codebook-based spatial (+time) domain beam prediction at UE and gNB and the associated signalling needed to assist or enable beam prediction at each side.**  **Proposal 11: For spatial domain beam prediction, RAN1 should study the signalling aspects related to exchanging information about beam prediction quality and a metric for beam prediction quality.**  **Proposal 12: For spatial domain beam prediction, RAN1 should study the signalling aspects related to gNB sending assistance signalling to help UE in comparing predicted measurements with actual measurements.**  **Proposal 13: RAN1 should study methods for non-codebook-based spatial domain beam prediction and study signalling aspects needed to enable such a prediction.** |
| Fujitsu[29] | **Proposals 1: To limit the workload for evaluation, beam predication in spatial domain can be selected as the only sub use case for beam management.**  **Proposal 2: New signaling carrying beam information in spatial domain should be studied.** |
| Charter[30] | **Observation 1**:DFT based codebooks break down when the angular spread increases (correlation decreases); it is possible to train a ML/DL network in order to derive and update a vector-quantized codebook for beam management on the gNB side, using ML/DL.  **Proposal 1:**Consider the option to enhance beam management with a dynamic vector-quantized codebook based on SVD and ML, and have it exchanged with the UE using appropriate interaction mechanisms between gNB and UE(s). |
| PML[31] | ***Observation 1:*** *For FR2 high mobility in track-based high-speed scenarios such as HSR and highway, it can be observed that*   * *Due to limited service range, narrow beam width, high UE mobility and short beam dwelling time, the current beam management suffers from large beam training overhead, significant time delay, and frequent handover.*   ***Proposal 1:*** *Consider predictable mobility for beam management as an enhancement aspect for improving UE experience in FR2 high mobility scenario (e.g., high-speed railway and high-way) in a Rel-18 WI.*   * *Study the implementation and design of predictable mobility for beam management in various scenarios.* * *Evaluate the performance gain and cost of predictable mobility for beam management in a more concrete and comprehensive manner.* |
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# Appendix: Previous Agreements

## RAN1#109-e

Agreement

For AI/ML-based beam management, support BM-Case1 and BM-Case2 for characterization and baseline performance evaluations

* BM-Case1: Spatial-domain DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on measurement results of Set B of beams
* BM-Case2: Temporal DL beam prediction for Set A of beams based on the historic measurement results of Set B of beams
* FFS: details of BM-Case1 and BM-Case2
* FFS: other sub use cases

Note: For BM-Case1 and BM-Case2, Beams in Set A and Set B can be in the same Frequency Range

Agreement

Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, the measurement results of K (K>=1) latest measurement instances are used for AI/ML model input:

* The value of K is up to companies

Agreement

Regarding the sub use case BM-Case2, AI/ML model output should be F predictions for F future time instances, where each prediction is for each time instance.

* At least F = 1
* The other value(s) of F is up to companies

Agreement

For the sub use case BM-Case1, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:

* Alt.1: AI/ML inference at NW side
* Alt.2: AI/ML inference at UE side

Agreement

For the sub use case BM-Case2, consider both Alt.1 and Alt.2 for further study:

* Alt.1: AI/ML inference at NW side
* Alt.2: AI/ML inference at UE side