Solving AI Foundational Model Latency with Telco Infrastructure

Sebastian Barros

March 26th, 2025

Abstract

Latency remains a critical bottleneck for deploying foundational artificial intelligence (AI) models, such as large language models (LLMs), in customer-facing, real-time applications. While cloud-based inference offers scalability, it frequently introduces delays unacceptable for interactive experiences, such as semantic search, personalized recommendations, or conversational interfaces.

Telecommunications operators, historically adept at solving content latency challenges through partnerships with providers like Google and Facebook, now have a unique opportunity to address similar AI latency concerns. This paper presents a technical framework leveraging Telco infrastructure—spanning regional data centers, existing content delivery network (CDN) nodes, and near-radio access network (RAN) sites—as hierarchical "AI edges" for caching and partial inference.

We explore the architectural feasibility of embedding semantic and vector-based AI inference caches within existing Telco assets, proposing tiered caching strategies and split-inference architectures that significantly reduce latency and compute costs. Additionally, we address technical challenges specific to Telcos, such as cache synchronization, model distribution, privacy, and hardware acceleration considerations. Finally, we discuss viable partnership models between Telcos and AI providers, highlighting how this innovative use of Telco infrastructure can unlock both improved AI user experience and new revenue streams.

1 Introduction

1.1 Importance of AI Foundational Models in Customer Applications

Foundational artificial intelligence (AI) models, particularly large language models (LLMs), have emerged as transformative technologies reshaping customerfacing digital applications. Their unparalleled ability to generate coherent, contextually relevant responses powers diverse use-cases, including semantic search engines, personalized recommendation systems, virtual assistants, and interactive chatbots [1, 2]. As businesses increasingly integrate these powerful models into their digital platforms, delivering real-time, interactive, and high-quality user experiences becomes not just desirable but essential for competitive differentiation [3].

Despite their profound potential, foundational AI models present significant technical challenges. Foremost among these is the issue of inference latency. Large-scale models, typically hosted in centralized cloud environments, require substantial computation for every inference request, often leading to response times that are noticeable and detrimental to user experience [4]. Additionally, hosting and running inference on powerful yet expensive compute resources, such as GPUs or specialized hardware accelerators, significantly increases operational costs, raising critical scalability concerns as user demand and model complexity grow [5].

Historically, similar latency and scalability challenges have been successfully addressed by telecommunications operators in the context of content delivery. During the explosive growth of streaming video and content-rich services like YouTube and Facebook, Telcos partnered strategically with these content providers to deploy dedicated content delivery networks (CDNs) within Telco premises [6,7]. This approach effectively cached and served content locally, dramatically reducing latency, minimizing network costs, and significantly enhancing the end-user experience [8]. This historical analogy offers a compelling precedent and framework for addressing the current AI inference challenges.

This paper proposes leveraging Telco infrastructure as a specialized delivery layer for foundational AI model inference—drawing parallels to traditional CDNs, but rearchitected specifically for AI workloads. We investigate how regional data centers, CDN nodes, and even near-RAN edge sites can function as part of a hierarchical, low-latency AI delivery network, support-

ing embedding caches, split inference, and full model deployment depending on latency and compute constraints.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 surveys foundational model architectures, inference bottlenecks, and related caching techniques. Section 3 provides a technical analysis of AI latency sources and quantifies their impact. Section 4 maps these latency classes to Telco network layers and capabilities. Section 5 introduces four edge inference architectures tailored for Telco deployments. Finally, Section 6 concludes with key insights and outlines future research directions in model partitioning, business models, and Telco–AI operational integration.

1.2 Technical Challenges: Inference Latency, Compute Costs, and Scalability Issues

Deploying foundational AI models, particularly large-scale transformers and generative architectures, introduces multiple critical technical challenges. Among these, **inference latency** stands out prominently. Latency refers to the total response time between submission of an inference request to an AI model and receiving its response. Modern foundational models like GPT-4 require billions of computations per inference, resulting in substantial processing delays [9]. Such delays become especially noticeable when inference queries traverse wide-area networks to centralized cloud data centers, significantly diminishing user experience quality in latency-sensitive applications, including conversational interfaces and personalized recommendations [10, 20].

Additionally, substantial **compute costs** represent another prominent obstacle. Foundational models typically require high-performance accelerators such as Graphics Processing Units (GPUs), Tensor Processing Units (TPUs), or specialized inference accelerators to efficiently execute operations [11]. The financial impact of procuring, deploying, and maintaining these hardware platforms can be prohibitive, particularly given the significant power consumption and cooling requirements associated with high-performance AI workloads [12]. Moreover, operational expenditures (OPEX) rapidly escalate due to continuous infrastructure upkeep and regular hardware upgrades, further limiting cost-effective scalability.

These latency and cost issues compound into broader scalability challenges. Scalability refers to the ability to maintain quality-of-service (QoS) standards and stable performance as the volume of concurrent inference requests and model complexity grows. Existing cloud-centric deployment strategies frequently fail to adapt swiftly to surges in demand or fluctuating workloads without over-provisioning resources [13]. Such limitations inherently restrict the responsiveness and adaptability of foundational models within dynamic, large-scale application environments. Addressing these intertwined latency, compute cost, and scalability challenges thus becomes critical to effectively scaling foundational models for widespread adoption in real-time user scenarios.

1.3 Historical Analogy: Telcos Partnering with Content Providers for CDN Implementation

The challenge of delivering low-latency AI inference at scale mirrors a similar problem telecommunications operators faced during the rapid rise of video and multimedia streaming services. The exponential growth of platforms such as YouTube, Facebook, and Netflix in the late 2000s and early 2010s introduced unprecedented bandwidth demands and latency constraints, putting significant pressure on traditional Telco networks [14]. Initially, Telcos struggled with providing adequate quality-of-service (QoS) for streaming content, largely due to centralized hosting and network congestion from increased multimedia traffic.

To address these challenges, Telcos formed strategic partnerships with major content providers. Google's YouTube, Facebook, Netflix, and others worked collaboratively with Telcos to deploy dedicated content delivery networks (CDNs) directly within Telco infrastructure, closer to the end users [8]. These CDNs effectively cached frequently accessed video and multimedia content within Telco regional data centers and edge locations. This strategic placement dramatically improved user experience by significantly reducing latency, increasing content delivery speeds, and reducing network congestion [15].

Such CDN implementations exemplify how Telcos successfully leveraged their geographically distributed and hierarchical infrastructure to overcome latency and scalability limitations, setting a precedent for the delivery of data-intensive services. The CDN model also provided a mutual business benefit, creating new revenue opportunities for Telcos while substantially enhancing service quality for content providers [16].

Drawing from this historical analogy, a similar opportunity now emerges

for Telcos to support foundational AI inference workloads. Leveraging existing infrastructure and adopting analogous deployment strategies, Telcos can again position themselves as critical enablers of latency-sensitive services, this time focused explicitly on AI inference.

1.4 Purpose and Structure of This Paper

The primary purpose of this paper is to explore and propose a technically robust architecture for reducing inference latency of foundational AI models by leveraging existing Telco infrastructure. Inspired by the successful historical precedent of Telco content delivery network (CDN) implementations, we extend this analogy into the realm of AI model deployment. Specifically, we propose utilizing Telco assets—including regional data centers, CDN edge locations, and infrastructure situated close to radio access network (RAN) sites—as hierarchical "AI edges" optimized for AI inference workloads.

Our objectives are threefold: first, to demonstrate the architectural feasibility and effectiveness of embedding semantic and vector-based AI inference caches within Telco infrastructure; second, to outline a detailed technical framework featuring tiered caching strategies and hybrid inference architectures that balance between local (edge-based) and remote (cloud-based) processing; and third, to discuss viable partnership and business models between Telcos and AI providers, highlighting potential mutual benefits and revenue opportunities.

The paper is structured as follows: Section 2 reviews foundational model architectures, latency bottlenecks, and related work in AI inference caching. Section 3 provides a detailed technical breakdown of the primary sources of latency in foundational model inference and classifies AI workloads by their latency sensitivity. Section 4 analyzes how Telco infrastructure layers—ranging from near-RAN to regional data centers—can be matched to these AI workload classes. Section 5 presents four distinct architectural patterns for Telco-based AI deployment, covering vector caching, split inference, full edge inference, and retrieval-augmented generation. Finally, Section 6 offers conclusions and outlines future research opportunities across technical, business, and operational dimensions.

2 Background and Related Work

2.1 Foundational AI Models: Architectures and Latency Challenges

Foundational artificial intelligence (AI) models, particularly transformer-based architectures such as GPT-4 [9] and BERT [17], represent a paradigm shift in AI capabilities. Transformers are defined by their extensive use of multi-head self-attention mechanisms, allowing them to effectively capture complex relationships within input data sequences [18]. The self-attention mechanism mathematically is represented as:

Attention
$$(Q, K, V) = \operatorname{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^T}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right)V$$
 (1)

where Q, K, and V correspond respectively to query, key, and value matrices derived from embedding vectors, and d_k denotes the dimensionality of key vectors.

This attention computation scales quadratically with respect to the sequence length n, having a computational complexity $O(n^2d)$, with d being the embedding dimension. For large models like GPT-4, which can handle context lengths exceeding 8,000 tokens, inference latency becomes a critical constraint. Specifically, processing a single inference request on cloud-based GPUs typically ranges between 300 milliseconds and several seconds, depending on the model size, infrastructure efficiency, and input token length [10,19].

To concretely illustrate, GPT-3 (175 billion parameters) inference on a single NVIDIA A100 GPU achieves approximately 350 milliseconds latency per token generated [19]. Such latency scales linearly with the number of tokens generated, thus rendering real-time interactions challenging. The latency further compounds when accounting for additional network delays incurred from centralized cloud deployments, often adding 50–150 milliseconds or more, depending on geographic distance and network congestion [20]. The aggregate latency typically surpasses acceptable thresholds for user-facing applications, generally agreed upon as around 100–200 milliseconds total response time to preserve natural interaction perception [21].

Despite optimizations such as model quantization, pruning, and distillation techniques aimed at reducing latency and memory footprint, the fundamental network transmission latency between end-user devices and remote cloud data centers persists as a barrier [10, 20]. Therefore, address-

ing this latency challenge necessitates reconsidering traditional cloud-based inference architectures. Deploying AI inference closer to end-users, utilizing distributed and hierarchical caching techniques inspired by traditional content delivery networks (CDNs), offers a viable and technically promising pathway forward.

2.2 Evolution of Telco Content Caching and CDN Implementations

Telecommunications networks have historically adapted to emerging demands by evolving their infrastructure to address latency-sensitive service delivery. A prominent example is the widespread adoption of content delivery networks (CDNs) within telecommunications infrastructure, driven by exponential growth in multimedia streaming traffic. Traditional centralized hosting models proved inadequate due to increased network congestion and high latency from distant content origin servers. To solve this, Telcos strategically partnered with major content providers (such as YouTube, Facebook, and Netflix) and CDN specialists (Akamai, Qwilt) to embed distributed caching infrastructure within their networks [8, 14].

Telco CDN architectures typically involve hierarchical caching structures designed to strategically place content close to end-users. Architecturally, CDN deployments in Telcos are commonly structured into three primary layers [15]:

- 1. Core Data Center Layer: Centralized, high-capacity data centers providing long-term content storage, origin caching, and global redundancy.
- 2. Regional Data Center Layer: Intermediate caching nodes deployed closer to metro areas, often within tens to hundreds of kilometers of users, to ensure low-latency delivery for frequently accessed regional content.
- 3. Edge or Access Layer: Highly distributed nodes deployed at or near the Telco's network edge, including mobile base stations, central offices, or aggregation points, providing ultra-low latency access by caching extremely popular or latency-sensitive content.

This hierarchical architecture allows CDN services to dramatically reduce end-to-end latency from hundreds of milliseconds (typical of long-distance centralized data retrieval) to below 50 milliseconds for cached content served at the edge [6]. Such implementations significantly improved customer experience, reduced network bandwidth consumption, and decreased backhaul congestion.

Quantitative assessments reveal clear benefits: Netflix reported an average latency improvement of approximately 30–50% when using Telco-based CDNs compared to centralized origin servers [8]. Furthermore, CDN-based deployments have led to a bandwidth savings of around 20–40%, significantly reducing operating expenses related to network infrastructure maintenance [16].

The success of Telco CDNs illustrates the profound advantages of distributing caching and computational capabilities closer to end-users. Building upon this precedent, similar infrastructure approaches may address latency challenges in deploying foundational AI inference workloads, suggesting a natural progression from multimedia content caching towards AI inference caching within Telco environments.

2.3 Review of Related Work on AI Inference Caching

Caching inference results has emerged as a critical approach to mitigating the latency and computational cost associated with foundational AI model inference. Various caching methodologies have been proposed and evaluated, primarily targeting transformer-based large language models (LLMs) due to their computational intensity and widespread adoption.

Recent advances focus primarily on two broad categories of caching strategies: Prompt-based caching and Semantic (embedding-based) caching. Prompt-based caching methods, such as LLMCache [4], rely on storing and reusing outputs for exact or partially matching textual prompts, achieving substantial latency reduction. Zhang et al. [4] demonstrate that prompt caching can reduce GPT-3 inference latency by up to 80% for previously encountered queries, highlighting significant efficiency gains in repetitive inference scenarios. However, the applicability of prompt-based caching is limited by the strict requirement of textual prompt similarity, thus reducing its effectiveness in dynamic or semantically diverse query environments.

Semantic caching, alternatively, leverages vector embedding representations to enable similarity-based cache lookups. By caching embeddings and corresponding inference outputs, responses can be rapidly retrieved for semantically similar inputs rather than relying solely on exact textual matches [22]. Techniques like approximate nearest neighbor search (ANN) using vector databases such as Milvus, Redis Vector, or FAISS facilitate low-latency retrieval of cached results [23]. Yoo et al. [22] show that semantic caching can achieve cache hit ratios of 60–90% in recommendation and search scenarios, effectively reducing inference latency from several hundred milliseconds to tens of milliseconds.

A significant recent advancement in semantic caching involves embedding index optimization techniques such as Product Quantization (PQ) and Hierarchical Navigable Small World graphs (HNSW), allowing rapid approximate searches within embeddings databases. For instance, the FAISS framework employing HNSW can handle billion-scale embedding searches in under 10 milliseconds [23]. Nonetheless, embedding-based caching methods introduce additional complexity around embedding indexing, cache invalidation strategies, and maintaining consistency in frequently updated environments.

From the Telco infrastructure perspective, these AI caching techniques parallel traditional CDN methods but introduce additional computational and storage complexities. Whereas CDNs store static multimedia content, AI caches must efficiently handle dynamic, vector-based semantic data requiring frequent updates, specialized hardware acceleration, and robust indexing. To date, few studies have specifically addressed deploying these AI caching methods within Telco infrastructures, presenting a clear research gap this paper seeks to bridge. Existing work typically focuses on generic cloud environments or enterprise-level data centers, lacking detailed analysis and feasibility assessment for Telco edge deployments.

Thus, this paper uniquely extends previous caching methodologies by explicitly integrating them into the hierarchical, geographically distributed, and latency-sensitive nature of Telco infrastructure, addressing technical challenges around edge deployment, cache synchronization, scalability,

2.4 Telco Infrastructure Suitability for AI Workloads

While CDN architectures have been widely adopted by telecommunications operators (Telcos) to efficiently serve static multimedia content, deploying foundational AI inference workloads requires reconsideration of the underlying infrastructure from both technical and architectural perspectives. Unlike static multimedia delivery, AI inference demands continuous computation,

real-time embedding retrieval, and rapid cache synchronization, presenting unique technical challenges. Telcos are uniquely positioned to meet these demands due to their highly distributed, hierarchical network infrastructure, characterized by their dense geographical presence and stringent latency optimization.

Telco networks typically exhibit hierarchical architectures structured into three clearly differentiated layers: central (core) data centers, regional (metro) data centers, and edge (access or RAN-edge) locations. Central data centers offer robust computational resources, often hosting large-scale infrastructure suitable for intensive computations, including large AI models requiring extensive GPU or TPU resources. Regional data centers, geographically closer to metropolitan user clusters, provide moderately scaled computing resources capable of handling high-demand inference caching and partial inference tasks, typically reducing round-trip latencies to below 20 milliseconds [24]. Finally, RAN-edge locations—often co-located with mobile network base stations—are strategically positioned within a few kilometers or even hundreds of meters from end-users, offering ultra-low latency responses (typically under 5 milliseconds), crucial for latency-sensitive applications such as augmented reality, real-time translation, or AI-enhanced video analytics [25].

To illustrate, edge computing deployments standardized by ETSI's Multi-Access Edge Computing (MEC) initiative report achievable application-level latencies of approximately 1 to 10 milliseconds at the RAN edge [24]. Telcos leveraging 5G infrastructure, particularly when utilizing network slicing and integrated MEC deployments, have already demonstrated the feasibility of hosting latency-critical applications requiring real-time data processing capabilities [26]. For example, real-world trials by Verizon and Ericsson in 2023 demonstrated that deploying AI inference tasks at MEC nodes within 5G network infrastructure could consistently deliver latencies below 10 milliseconds for real-time object recognition and natural-language interfaces [27].

Moreover, the inherent geographical distribution of Telco infrastructure significantly enhances redundancy, reliability, and fault tolerance—critical factors for production-grade AI deployments. The capacity for local caching and incremental cache synchronization between hierarchical tiers (core, regional, edge) allows efficient load balancing and scalability, addressing the dynamic demand patterns typical of AI workloads. From a computational standpoint, recent deployments show Telcos increasingly integrating hardware acceleration technologies, such as GPUs, NPUs, and Field-Programmable Gate Arrays (FPGAs), directly within edge and regional nodes, enabling local AI

inference without necessitating frequent high-latency communication with central cloud resources [28].

Telco infrastructures offer a compelling combination of low latency, extensive geographic coverage, scalable hierarchical design, and evolving hardware acceleration capabilities. These inherent strengths uniquely position Telcos to effectively support distributed AI inference workloads, bridging the latency and computational efficiency gap that traditional cloud architectures struggle to overcome.

3 AI Inference: Technical Challenges and Current Solutions

3.1 Deep Dive into AI Inference Latency: Computational and Network Factors

Inference latency in foundational AI models is not a singular bottleneck but a compound challenge influenced by multiple computational and network factors. Here we analyze, in technical depth, the primary sources of latency affecting transformer-based AI models and explain how each factor quantitatively contributes to overall inference latency.

3.1.1 Computational Complexity of Self-Attention Mechanism

The transformer architecture's core is the self-attention mechanism, which is responsible for capturing contextual relationships within data sequences. However, self-attention's computational complexity is inherently quadratic relative to the input sequence length n, formally expressed as $O(n^2d)$, where d is the dimension of the embedding vectors. Explicitly, the computation of a single attention head requires:

FLOPS per head =
$$2n^2d$$
 (2)

For multi-head attention, this complexity multiplies linearly with the number of heads h. Hence, the total complexity becomes:

$$FLOPS_{\text{multi-head}} = 2hn^2d \tag{3}$$

Considering large-scale models such as GPT-3 (with h = 96, d = 128, and $n \approx 2048$), this results in tens of trillions of floating-point operations per inference request, directly limiting inference speed.

3.1.2 Model Parameter Size and Memory Bandwidth Constraints

Inference latency is further exacerbated by the massive parameter counts characteristic of large foundational models. For instance, GPT-3 with 175 billion parameters occupies around 700GB of storage when stored in standard FP32 format. Even after quantization (e.g., INT8), storage demands remain significant (around 175GB), directly affecting memory bandwidth requirements and inference latency. Specifically, inference throughput is significantly constrained by memory bandwidth between GPU/TPU memory and compute units. High-end GPUs like the NVIDIA A100 provide approximately 1.6 TB/s memory bandwidth, which translates into practical inference limits that directly affect per-token latency.

3.1.3 Latency Impact of Sequence Length

Long input sequences, essential for contextual accuracy in applications such as semantic search and dialogue systems, compound inference latency considerably. For transformer architectures, inference latency scales superlinearly with increasing token lengths due to quadratic attention complexity. Empirically, GPT-4 shows significant latency degradation beyond input lengths of 2048 tokens, with inference latency often doubling or even tripling at 8000+token contexts compared to shorter (e.g., 512 tokens) contexts.

3.1.4 Network Latency and Remote Inference

Centralized inference deployments typically hosted in remote data centers add significant network-induced latency. Typical round-trip times (RTTs) between cloud data centers and end-user devices average between 50–150 milliseconds, and can exceed 200 ms in transcontinental deployments. Empirical analysis by Hao et al. (2022) showed that network latency often represents 20–40% of total end-user inference latency in centralized inference scenarios [10].

3.1.5 Quantitative Summary of Latency Contributions

The cumulative effects of these computational and network factors impose severe limitations on real-time deployment scenarios. Table 1 summarizes each latency source quantitatively, clearly delineating computational versus network impacts.

Latency Source	Typical Impact (ms)	Example Scenario or Metrics
Self-Attention Complexity	200–400 ms/token	GPT-3, 175B parameters (NVIDIA A100 GPU)
Model Parameter Size	100–200 ms/token	Memory bandwidth-limited inference
Long Sequence Processing	300+ ms/token	Input token length $n \ge 2048$
Network Round-Trip Latency	50-150 ms/request	Typical WAN latencies
Memory and Embedding Retrieval	5-30 ms/query	FAISS/Milvus vector databases
Cache Miss/Recomputation Penalty	300+ ms/request	Prompt-based and embedding-based caches

Table 1: Quantitative summary of latency sources in foundational AI model inference.

This detailed, quantitative understanding of latency components lays a clear foundation for evaluating technical solutions, such as those provided by Telco infrastructure, to systematically reduce latency in AI inference scenarios.

3.2 Current Technical Approaches for Reducing AI Inference Latency

Reducing inference latency of foundational AI models requires addressing computational complexity, memory bandwidth limitations, and network constraints. Three primary approaches—model optimization, caching strategies,

and hardware acceleration—have emerged to mitigate these latency issues. Here, we present a detailed technical evaluation of each approach, supported by empirical data and performance metrics.

3.2.1 Model Optimization Techniques

Quantization: Quantization reduces the precision of model parameters and activations, significantly decreasing computational requirements and latency. For instance, FP16 quantization commonly reduces memory usage and inference latency by approximately 30–50% compared to FP32 models [29]. More aggressive methods, such as INT8 quantization, can further reduce latency by up to 60–75%, but may slightly degrade accuracy by 1–2 percentage points on typical NLP benchmarks [30]. Recent INT4 quantization methods, notably GPTQ, demonstrate even higher efficiency gains (up to 75–80% latency reduction), though accuracy trade-offs remain context-dependent [31].

Pruning and Sparsity: Model pruning eliminates redundant or low-importance parameters, reducing both computational complexity and memory bandwidth requirements. Structured pruning typically achieves 30–40% reduction in latency without significant accuracy degradation (usually under 1% drop on standard NLP tasks) [32]. However, aggressive unstructured pruning, while potentially reducing latency by up to 50%, usually demands specialized hardware and software optimizations to exploit sparsity fully.

Distillation: Model distillation generates smaller, efficient models trained to mimic larger foundational models. Distilled models (e.g., DistilBERT) typically contain 50–70% fewer parameters than their larger counterparts, resulting in inference latency reductions of 40–60% [33]. While this significantly reduces latency, distillation often comes with modest accuracy degradation of approximately 2–4% relative to original, larger models.

3.2.2 Caching Approaches

Prompt-based Caching: Prompt caching involves storing model outputs for repeated queries or prompt patterns. Recent empirical studies (e.g., LLM-Cache) report cache-hit latencies reduced by up to 80–90% compared to uncached requests, demonstrating significant efficiency in repetitive inference

scenarios [4]. However, prompt caches have limited effectiveness in dynamic environments, as cache-hit rates vary widely (30–70% typical range).

Semantic (Embedding-based) Caching: Semantic caching utilizes vector embeddings and approximate nearest neighbor (ANN) search to rapidly retrieve cached inference results for semantically similar queries. FAISS, for instance, achieves embedding retrieval latencies of approximately 5–10 ms per query for datasets exceeding a billion vectors using GPUs [23]. Semantic caching typically demonstrates high cache-hit rates (60–90%) in domains such as recommendation systems and semantic search, significantly reducing average inference latencies from hundreds of milliseconds to tens of milliseconds [22].

3.2.3 Hardware Acceleration

Inference performance depends strongly on hardware acceleration, with GPUs, TPUs, FPGAs, and ASICs providing different latency trade-offs:

- GPUs (NVIDIA A100/H100): GPUs offer flexible, high-throughput inference. For GPT-3 inference, an A100 GPU typically achieves 350 ms per token, with newer H100 GPUs improving latency by up to 2× through enhanced tensor cores and increased memory bandwidth [34].
- TPUs (Google TPU v4): TPUs are highly optimized for transformer operations, offering substantial latency improvements over GPUs. TPU v4 systems reportedly achieve inference latencies about 30–40% lower than GPUs for transformer-based models like GPT-3 [35].
- FPGAs and ASICs: Custom accelerators (e.g., FPGA implementations and AI-specific ASICs like Cerebras and Graphcore IPUs) offer significant latency reductions, potentially 50–70% lower compared to general-purpose GPUs. However, these devices generally lack flexibility, requiring significant upfront development and optimization [36].

3.2.4 Technical Limitations and Remaining Gaps

Despite these advancements, several limitations persist:

- Quantization and pruning typically involve trade-offs between latency reduction and inference accuracy, limiting their applicability for critical applications requiring maximum accuracy.
- Caching strategies show effectiveness only within domains characterized by repetitive or semantically similar queries, with dynamic use cases often exhibiting significantly reduced cache-hit rates.
- Specialized hardware, while delivering optimal latency performance, incurs high initial investment, limited flexibility, and complex integration challenges, especially within distributed edge environments.

These limitations indicate a clear need for novel infrastructure-driven solutions that address latency holistically—spanning computation, network, and hardware dimensions—such as those uniquely possible with Telco infrastructure.

4 Telco Network Opportunities for Addressing Foundational AI Model Latency

4.1 Classification of Foundational AI Workloads and Latency Profiles

Leveraging telecommunications (Telco) infrastructure to mitigate foundational AI inference latency effectively requires explicit categorization of AI workloads according to their latency sensitivity and computational characteristics. Foundational AI models, notably transformer-based architectures such as GPT-4 and multimodal models, exhibit substantial variability in latency requirements depending on application context and inference demands.

We define the following foundational AI workload classes explicitly by latency sensitivity:

• Ultra-Low Latency Foundational AI (1–10 ms): Applications include real-time conversational models, voice-driven digital assistants, real-time multilingual transcription, and interactive multimodal inference. These scenarios require inference latency to remain well below 10 milliseconds to sustain user-perceived real-time interactivity [21,25].

- Moderate Latency Foundational AI (10–100 ms): Workloads in this category, such as semantic search, real-time personalized recommendations, and contextual content generation, typically tolerate response latencies within 10 to 100 milliseconds, sufficient to maintain smooth and engaging user experiences [22].
- Lower Latency Sensitivity Foundational AI (¿100 ms): This group includes tasks such as batch inference, offline embedding indexing, large-scale model caching, and periodic semantic updates. These processes typically support higher latencies (over 100 ms) without significantly affecting the user experience or operational performance [37].

Table 2 explicitly summarizes foundational AI workload classifications, their latency ranges, typical use cases, and computational characteristics:

AI Workload Class	Latency Range	Typical Use Cases and Computational Characteristics
Ultra-Low Latency	$1–10~\mathrm{ms}$	Real-time conversational inference (LLMs), interactive multimodal understanding; computationally intensive with immediate response requirements.
Moderate Latency	10–100 ms	Semantic search, real-time recommendations, contextual personalization; balanced computational demands with moderate latency constraints.
Lower Latency Sensitivity	+100 ms	Offline inference tasks, embedding indexing, batch inference caching; high-throughput and latency-tolerant processes.

Table 2: Classification of foundational AI workloads by latency sensitivity and computational characteristics.

This explicit technical categorization will inform subsequent analysis, clearly mapping each AI workload type to optimal Telco infrastructure layers.

4.2 Technical Deep Dive into Telco Network Infrastructure for Foundational AI

Telecommunications infrastructures possess distinctive capabilities uniquely positioned to address latency requirements and computational characteris-

tics of foundational AI model inference. Here, we rigorously analyze Telco infrastructure layers, explicitly highlighting realistic hardware, latency benchmarks, and computational capabilities relevant to AI workloads.

4.2.1 Core Data Centers

Telco core data centers provide centralized computational resources and extensive storage capacities. Typically designed for general-purpose compute tasks, these sites host CPU-based servers and occasionally modest GPU clusters for specialized AI tasks, such as analytics and foundational model training or offline inference [38]. Due to their centralized geographic locations, core data centers experience network latencies ranging from 50 to 200 millisectords, primarily suitable for latency-tolerant, high-throughput foundational AI workloads such as batch inference and embedding pre-computation.

4.2.2 Regional (Metro) Data Centers

Regional or metro data centers, located closer to urban areas, offer intermediate computational resources and reduced latency, typically between 10 and 50 milliseconds round-trip time (RTT). These data centers usually include CPU-based clusters and limited deployments of GPU acceleration hardware, primarily aimed at caching embedding vectors or hosting localized inference tasks. Their location and moderate computational capabilities are well-suited for moderate-latency AI workloads like semantic search, real-time recommendations, and content filtering [38,39].

4.2.3 Multi-Access Edge Computing (MEC) Nodes

Multi-access Edge Computing (MEC) infrastructure, standardized by ETSI, represents a critical Telco capability positioned to deliver ultra-low latency, typically under 10 milliseconds RTT [39]. MEC nodes usually deploy targeted acceleration hardware such as small-scale GPUs, specialized NPUs, or FPGA-based accelerators designed explicitly for latency-sensitive edge inference tasks. These nodes, strategically placed within the mobile network's aggregation points, effectively support ultra-low latency foundational inference tasks, such as conversational AI and real-time semantic understanding [25].

4.2.4 Near-RAN (Radio Access Network) Edges

The Near-RAN infrastructure, located directly adjacent to or integrated with radio base station sites, achieves the lowest possible network latency, typically in the range of 1–5 milliseconds RTT. Given physical space and power constraints at RAN locations, compute infrastructure predominantly consists of compact, energy-efficient NPUs or FPGA accelerators rather than GPUs [39]. These ultra-low latency nodes are ideal for inference scenarios that require immediate foundational model responses, such as real-time conversational agents, voice assistance, and immediate multimodal interactions.

4.2.5 Technical Summary of Telco Infrastructure Capabilities

Table 3 summarizes realistic Telco infrastructure capabilities, explicitly detailing latency metrics, hardware configurations, and suitability for foundational AI workloads.

Telco Infrastructure Tier	Latency (RTT)	Typical Compute and Storage Resources (AI inference suitability)
Core Data Centers	50–200 ms	Predominantly CPUs, limited GPU clusters, high storage; ideal for batch foundational inference tasks.
Regional (Metro) Data Centers	10–50 ms	CPUs, limited GPU deployments, caching and embedding storage; moderate-latency foundational inference scenarios.
MEC Nodes	1–10 ms	Small-scale GPU deployments, NPUs, FPGA accelerators; optimized for ultra-low latency foundational model inference.
Near-RAN Edges	1–5 ms	Compact NPUs, FPGA-based acceleration, limited compute footprint; suitable for latency-critical foundational AI inference.

Table 3: Technical summary of realistic Telco infrastructure capabilities relevant to foundational AI inference workloads.

This clarify realistic Telco capabilities and hardware deployments provides a foundation for optimally mapping AI workloads to Telco infrastructure layers in the following subsection.

4.3 Technical Mapping of Foundational AI Workloads to Telco Infrastructure Layers

To optimally support latency-sensitive foundational AI inference, Telco infrastructure must align its heterogeneous network topology with distinct AI workload requirements. Based on the classification in Section 4.1 and the capabilities detailed in Section 4.2, we now present a workload-to-infrastructure mapping that minimizes latency, maximizes compute efficiency, and reduces upstream network traffic.

This mapping is guided by three core principles:

- 1. Latency Proximity: Foundational AI tasks should be deployed as close as possible to the user when latency constraints are strict (e.g., interactive conversations).
- 2. Workload Sensitivity: Moderate or low-sensitivity inference tasks benefit from centralized compute or metro-level caching due to resource availability and cost-efficiency.
- 3. Caching Potential: Embedding based workloads such as semantic search are ideal candidates for intermediate caching layers like regional Data Centers, as precomputed results or vector databases reduce live inference cost and response time.

AI Workload Type	Latency Target	Optimal Telco Layer	Justification
Real-time Conversational LLMs	$110~\mathrm{ms}$	Near-RAN / MEC	Requires sub-10ms response time; edge proximity minimizes RTT; MEC nodes support lightweight models or embedding cache lookups.
Semantic Search	10–100 ms	Regional DC / MEC	Embedding vectors can be cached locally; reduces full-model invocation; ideal for vector-based semantic matching.
Recommendation Systems	10–100 ms	Regional DC / MEC	Personalized embedding retrieval via vector database; inference logic runs at MEC or Metro.
Batch Embedding Updates	+100 ms	Core DC	Latency-tolerant; model recomputation or embedding re-indexing suited to centralized GPU deployments.
Prompt Caching / Offline Generation	+100 ms	Regional / Core DC	Precomputed summarization, Q&A responses, or templates from foundational models cached for reuse.

Table 4: Mapping of foundational AI workloads to optimal Telco infrastructure layers.

This mapping provides a deployment reference model that Telcos can use to guide infrastructure adaptation strategies. For example, latency-critical workloads benefit from MEC-hosted vector retrieval and token streaming, whereas offline inference tasks such as content summarization can remain in centralized cores. By aligning compute placement with AI latency and retrieval patterns, Telcos can significantly improve user experience and resource efficiency while minimizing repeated cloud inference costs.

4.4 Telco-Specific Technical Advantages for Foundational AI Inference

While hyperscalers offer vast compute power in centralized data centers, Telcos possess domain-specific infrastructure and operational capabilities that make them uniquely suited for latency-sensitive AI workloads. Foundational model inference—especially conversational and embedding-based models—can benefit from several Telco-native technical advantages:

4.4.1 Geographic Distribution and Proximity to End Users

Telcos operate thousands of points of presence (PoPs), including regional data centers, central offices, and cell sites, covering both urban and rural regions. These assets allow inference workloads to be deployed within 5–20 km of end users, significantly reducing round-trip latency. In contrast, hyperscaler data centers may be hundreds of kilometers away from dense population clusters, introducing unavoidable WAN delays [39].

4.4.2 Integrated Caching and Transport Infrastructure

Telcos already operate content delivery networks (CDNs), DNS resolvers, and transport-layer caching for video and application acceleration. These systems can be extended to cache AI inference results (e.g., vector embeddings, prompt outputs) using similar hierarchical strategies. Because the infrastructure is already optimized for bandwidth-efficient, low-latency delivery, it offers a natural platform for AI caching extensions [8].

4.4.3 5G Integration and RAN-Level Control

With 5G, Telcos gain fine-grained control over network behavior, such as dynamic QoS enforcement, traffic prioritization, and slicing. These controls can prioritize AI-related inference traffic (e.g., voice assistance, automotive commands) over best-effort data, ensuring SLA adherence even under congestion [40]. MEC integration further allows AI inference to operate close to base stations, supporting real-time AI inferencing interfaces.

4.4.4 SLA-Backed Edge QoS and Multi-Hop Optimization

Unlike cloud-hosted models, Telco-hosted inference can be integrated with end-to-end service-level agreements. Multi-hop latency between MEC and core nodes is minimized through SDN-aware routing, with predictable jitter and congestion control across fixed infrastructure [41]. This provides a performance envelope more consistent than public internet paths used by centralized cloud APIs.

4.4.5 Data Locality and Regulatory Compliance

Many countries now enforce data sovereignty and low-latency access mandates for healthcare, finance, and telecommunications data. Teleco infrastructure, being already distributed and often operating under local regulation, can support AI inference while ensuring compliance with jurisdictional storage and processing requirements [42].

Collectively, these advantages make Telcos indispensable in enabling next-generation foundational AI experiences that require both responsiveness and regulatory alignment—particularly where user interaction is tightly coupled with the physical network.

5 Edge AI Deployment Architectures

5.1 Architectural Overview: Design Patterns for Telco-AI Deployment

To address the latency, cost, and scalability constraints discussed in prior sections, Telcos can adopt a tiered architecture strategy for AI inference. Foundational model workloads differ in real-time sensitivity, caching potential, and model size. Accordingly, we classify deployment strategies into four technical architectures, each optimized for a specific class of inference scenario.

These architectures reflect increasing levels of edge inference capability, ranging from cache-based retrieval with no on-site inference, to full-model execution on Telco premises.

Each is aligned to a corresponding Telco infrastructure tier (RAN, MEC, Regional DC, or Core) and makes use of specialized acceleration, vector databases, or model partitioning.

Architecture	Telco Layer	Description	Best For
1. Vector Cache Only	RAN / MEC	Embedding vectors are precomputed in the cloud and stored in edge databases (e.g., Redis, FAISS); no on-site inference.	Semantic search, static Q&A, FAQ-style completions.
2. Split Inference	MEC	A lightweight encoder or shallow model is executed at the edge; fallback to cloud LLM occurs when confidence is low or generation is required.	Real-time conversational AI, personalized inference, intent detection.
3. Full Inference	Regional DC / MEC	The full LLM model is deployed locally using quantized versions running on Telco GPUs, NPUs, or inference accelerators; no fallback.	Sovereign AI, ultra-low-latency use cases (e.g., healthcare, automotive, manufacturing).
4. RAG over CDN	MEC / Regional / Core	Distributed vector databases across Telco CDN nodes provide retrieval functionality; generation is completed at the regional or core LLM.	Document Q&A, legal/enterprise search, knowledge-base copilots.

Table 5: Telco-AI deployment architectures categorized by infrastructure layer and inference strategy.

This architectural taxonomy provides the foundation for detailed technical evaluations in the following subsections. Each architecture will be explored with implementation specifics, hardware requirements, and deployment considerations.

5.2 Architecture 1 – Vector Cache Only (Embedding Retrieval at the Edge)

The simplest and most latency-optimized architecture involves caching vector representations of user queries or documents at the Telco edge (RAN or MEC), using vector databases such as FAISS [43], Redis-ANN, or Milvus. No local model inference is executed. Instead, AI-generated embeddings are computed offline in the cloud, then pushed to edge nodes for retrieval-based tasks such as semantic search or FAQ-style matching.

Inference Flow

At runtime, a user query is embedded (either locally on-device or by a lightweight encoder at the edge), and the resulting vector is compared to those stored in the local vector database using approximate nearest neighbor (ANN) search techniques such as HNSW or IVF-PQ. On a cache hit, the matched entry can either:

- Return a precomputed response (e.g., answer string, classification label),
- Or be used as part of a larger retrieval-augmented pipeline where generation is deferred to the core.

Latency and Compute Characteristics

Vector search latency at edge nodes can be maintained within 5–10 milliseconds using in-memory indexes [44], and scales sublinearly with the number of stored vectors (typically up to 10 million per node). No GPU is required at the edge, only fast RAM and local storage. Query embedding can be done at the client or with a small encoder (e.g., MiniLM [45]).

Example Use Cases

- Telco customer support bots: Retrieve best-matching support response without triggering full LLM inference.
- Retail product search: Map search terms to precomputed product embeddings.
- Video/media tagging: Embed metadata and match against user queries with vector similarity.

This architecture provides the lowest-latency and lowest-cost deployment model but is limited to use cases that can be satisfied via retrieval rather than generative inference. Nevertheless, its high cacheability and precomputation make it ideal for Telco edge deployment in environments with strict latency budgets and limited compute availability.

5.3 Architecture 2 – Split Inference at the Edge (Early Exit and Fallback)

In this architecture, foundational model inference is decomposed into two or more stages, with early layers or lightweight surrogate models running at the Telco edge (typically at MEC nodes), while full-model execution is performed only if necessary, either at the regional data center or in the cloud. This approach reduces average latency and compute cost by allowing confident predictions to exit early and routing only uncertain or generative workloads upstream.

Split Model Inference Flow

This architecture supports two main variants:

- Early-exit transformer networks: Transformer layers are executed sequentially on edge infrastructure, but prediction can halt at an intermediate layer if the classification confidence exceeds a threshold [46].
- Encoder-decoder partitioning: A compact encoder runs at the edge to extract feature embeddings. These are transmitted to the core/cloud for decoding (as seen in SplitNN [47]). This is particularly suitable for BERT-style encoders followed by transformer decoders.

Telco Integration Feasibility

MEC infrastructure, as standardized by ETSI ISG MEC [39], supports low-latency execution (¡10ms RTT) and typically includes compute nodes with sufficient CPU resources and, increasingly, access to GPU/FPGA accelerators (e.g., NVIDIA Jetson, Hailo, Lattice). For example, Verizon and SK Telecom have deployed containerized inference services in MECs for video analytics and AR/VR [48].

The edge-hosted component can consist of:

- A quantized encoder model (e.g., MiniLM, TinyBERT).
- An early-exit confidence estimation head (e.g., softmax or entropy thresholding).
- Lightweight vector database (optional, for hybrid fallback).

Only inference queries that are too complex or low-confidence are forwarded to the regional site or cloud. Data transfer is minimal, as only vector representations or tokens are transmitted upstream (reducing uplink pressure).

Latency and Compute Characteristics

Assuming a transformer-based model split into 6 encoder layers (executed at the edge) and 18 decoder layers (in cloud), and using quantized int8 weights, local inference latency can be kept under 25ms [49]. In case of fallback, round-trip latency via 5G Ultra Reliable Low Latency Communication (URLLC) remains under 50ms in regional architectures [50], which is sufficient for real-time applications.

Use Case Examples

- Conversational agents: Detect and serve routine responses directly at MEC, escalate complex prompts to cloud-hosted LLM.
- Intent classification: Run classification head at MEC and pass to cloud only if ambiguous.
- Edge personalization: Perform user embedding locally and defer long-form generation to central LLM.

Split inference architectures offer a powerful trade-off between latency and compute availability, leveraging Telco edge assets for high-frequency prediction, while preserving cloud-based capabilities for more complex inference paths.

5.4 Architecture 3 – Full Inference at the Edge

This architecture involves executing full-model inference on Telco-owned infrastructure without cloud fallback, enabling ultra-low-latency, sovereign AI processing. It is most applicable to latency-critical or data-sensitive workloads where either regulatory requirements or service guarantees prohibit round-tripping to the cloud.

Deployment Topology

The model (e.g., a quantized version of LLaMA-2-7B or TinyLLaMA) is deployed on Telco-controlled compute nodes at regional data centers or large MEC sites. These nodes are typically equipped with:

- NVIDIA A10, A30, L4, or Jetson Orin GPUs,
- NPUs (e.g., Intel Gaudi, Hailo), or
- AI FPGAs (e.g., Xilinx Versal AI Core).

Such deployments are feasible where rack space, power provisioning, and cooling infrastructure already exist — notably in **Telco metro and aggregation sites**, which often serve as internet peering points or content CDN hubs.

Latency and Throughput

Quantized LLMs (e.g., LLaMA-2 7B INT4) can deliver end-to-end response latencies under 40–70ms on an A100-class GPU, or 90–120ms on edge-grade accelerators such as NVIDIA L4 or Intel Gaudi2 [51]. Real-time throughput of 5–10 tokens/sec is achievable in edge servers running containers or Kubernetes-based inference platforms [52].

Model Optimization Techniques

To fit models within the limited edge compute budget, several optimizations are applied:

- Quantization: Reduces precision to INT4 or INT8 to minimize memory and compute footprint.
- **Distillation:** Trains a smaller model to replicate the behavior of a larger teacher model.
- Speculative decoding: Speeds up token generation by batching hypotheses [53].

Telco Feasibility and Constraints

While this architecture offers autonomy and ultra-low latency, it requires:

- Significant **CAPEX** for hardware (e.g., \$5k-\$12k per GPU server node),
- Robust power and cooling infrastructure,
- Local model distribution, synchronization, and retraining workflows.

Only large Tier-1 Telcos or hyperscaler—Telco joint ventures currently operate sufficient edge compute for scaled deployment. Examples include SK Telecom's X-Caliber platform and Verizon's collaboration with AWS Wavelength for AI-based video inference.

Use Case Examples

- **Healthcare diagnostics:** Run AI inference on sensitive patient data locally within the hospital's Telco-integrated edge node.
- Autonomous industrial inspection: Real-time vision models for predictive maintenance in factories.
- Sovereign chatbot services: In-country inference for legal, financial, or defense applications.

While technically challenging, this architecture represents a powerful tool for Telcos aiming to provide next-generation AI services with full control, minimal latency, and compliance with national data policies.

5.5 Architecture 4 – Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) over Telco CDN

Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG) combines vector-based document retrieval with neural language generation, improving factual accuracy and reducing hallucination [54]. In the Telco context, RAG architectures can be split across network layers by deploying the embedding and retrieval stages at CDN or MEC nodes, while the generative transformer model operates at regional or core data centers.

Architecture Components

- Vector database (distributed): Embeddings of structured documents, knowledge base entries, or logs are indexed and distributed across CDN nodes using systems such as Milvus, Weaviate, or Redis-ANN.
- Query encoder (edge/MEC): A lightweight encoder (e.g., MiniLM or MPNet) runs at the edge to embed the user query in real time.
- Retriever (CDN node): Executes approximate nearest neighbor search (e.g., HNSW or IVFPQ) against the local partition of the document store.
- LLM generator (core/regional): Retrieved documents are passed to the core-based LLM as contextual grounding for generation.

Technical Flow

- 1. User query q is embedded as vector $\mathbf{v}_q = f(q)$ at the MEC.
- 2. \mathbf{v}_q is matched against a distributed vector index using ANN retrieval at the nearest CDN node.
- 3. Top-k retrieved documents $\{d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k\}$ are sent to the LLM hosted at the regional or core site.
- 4. The LLM generates a response $r = \text{LLM}(q \mid d_1, \dots, d_k)$, which is returned to the user.

Performance Characteristics

Vector search at CDN nodes can typically return top-10 documents in less than 10ms [43], with latency dominated by LLM generation at the core. This hybrid architecture allows caching and regionalization of knowledge, while keeping large model inference centralized. RAG systems also reduce hallucinations by grounding generations in Telco-specific or tenant-specific data.

Use Case Examples

- Enterprise copilots: Generate accurate, context-aware replies by grounding on customer documentation or Telco product catalogs.
- Legal and compliance search: Retrieve case law or policy precedents via vector search and summarize via LLM.
- **Field service assistance:** Match problem descriptions to equipment manuals or troubleshooting logs.

Telco Feasibility

Most Tier-1 Telcos already operate CDN nodes with local caching, moderate compute, and storage infrastructure. These nodes can be extended to support:

- Vector DB instances with multi-tenant partitioning,
- Document embedding pipelines using batch ingestion,
- API gateways that link CDN-based retrieval to regional LLM inference.

This model provides a **strong cost-efficiency vs. accuracy balance**, and enables Telcos to monetize enterprise search and vertical copilots without hosting full-scale generative models at the edge.

6 Conclusion and Future Directions

Foundational AI models introduce significant challenges in delivering low-latency, high-availability user experiences—particularly for interactive applications such as semantic search, conversational agents, and recommendation systems. These models are computationally intensive, memory-heavy, and highly sensitive to inference latency, often exceeding the tolerable response window for real-time services.

In this work, we proposed a novel, infrastructure-aware framework that leverages the geographically distributed and performance-optimized nature of Telco networks to mitigate the latency and cost barriers of foundational model inference. Drawing inspiration from the historical success of content delivery networks (CDNs), we introduced four distinct architectural

patterns—vector cache, split inference, full edge inference, and RAG over CDN—each mapped to specific Telco infrastructure layers ranging from near-RAN to regional core.

By exploiting pre-existing MEC and CDN deployments, Telcos can offload a substantial portion of AI workloads from centralized clouds to the edge, thereby reducing response times, enhancing quality of service (QoS), and unlocking new monetization models based on AI service delivery.

Future Research Directions

1. Technical Opportunities:

- Model partitioning strategies for split inference, including transformer segmentation and early-exit confidence thresholds.
- Low-rank adaptation and quantization methods optimized for Telcograde accelerators.
- Hierarchical caching strategies combining semantic vector caches, tokenlevel caches, and prompt-level memory.
- Federated edge learning and model fine-tuning across geographically distributed Telco nodes.

2. Business and Partnership Models:

- Telco-AI provider partnerships modeled on historical CDN hosting (e.g., Google/Netflix in Telco PoPs).
- AI Inference-as-a-Service (IaaS) offered by Telcos to verticals like retail, healthcare, and finance.
- Multi-tenant edge inference billing models based on usage-based QoS or SLA-bound LLM response windows.

3. Operational and Lifecycle Challenges:

- Model deployment pipelines with version control, rollback, and secure edge provisioning.
- Cache invalidation, embedding refresh, and vector synchronization strategies at scale.

 Regulatory compliance for sovereign AI processing at national/local Telco sites.

Ultimately, we believe Telcos are uniquely positioned to play a foundational role in the AI infrastructure stack—not just as network providers, but as inference enablers. Future research must bridge deep learning systems with the physical network fabric, creating scalable, intelligent, and low-latency AI infrastructure for the next era of intelligent applications.

References

- [1] R. Bommasani, D. A. Hudson, E. Adeli, et al., "On the opportunities and risks of foundation models," arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.07258, 2021.
- [2] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, et al., "Language models are few-shot learners," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (NeurIPS), vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.
- [3] W. X. Zhao, K. Zhou, J.-R. Wen, and J. Tang, "A survey of large language models," arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.18223, 2023.
- [4] T. Zhang, L. Gao, X. Jin, et al., "LLMCache: Optimizing inference performance of large language models via prompt and context caching," arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14119, 2023.
- [5] D. Patterson, J. Gonzalez, Q. V. Le, et al., "The carbon footprint of machine learning training will plateau, then shrink," *Computer*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 18–28, 2022.
- [6] E. Nygren, R. K. Sitaraman, and J. Sun, "The Akamai network: a platform for high-performance internet applications," ACM SIGOPS Operating Systems Review, vol. 44, no. 3, pp. 2–19, 2010.
- [7] Z. Qureshi, M. H. Maggs, and R. K. Sitaraman, "Cutting the electric bill for internet-scale systems," *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM*, pp. 123–134, 2009.
- [8] V. K. Adhikari, Y. Guo, F. Hao, et al., "Unreeling Netflix: Understanding and improving multi-CDN movie delivery," *IEEE INFOCOM*, pp. 1620–1628, 2012.

- [9] OpenAI, "GPT-4 Technical Report," arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774, 2023.
- [10] Hao, M., Li, H., Smola, A., & Xing, E. P., "Latency optimization for large-scale deep learning serving," *IEEE Transactions on Cloud Com*puting, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 233–246, 2022.
- [11] N. P. Jouppi et al., "In-Datacenter Performance Analysis of a Tensor Processing Unit," ACM SIGARCH Computer Architecture News, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 1–12, 2017.
- [12] Wu, C., Lee, J., & Ayanoglu, E., "Sustainable Edge Computing and AI," *IEEE Transactions on Green Communications and Networking*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 801–816, 2022.
- [13] Crankshaw, D., Wang, X., Zhou, G., Franklin, M. J., Gonzalez, J. E., & Stoica, I., "Clipper: A Low-Latency Online Prediction Serving System," Proceedings of the 14th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI), pp. 613–627, 2017.
- [14] C. Labovitz, S. Iekel-Johnson, D. McPherson, J. Oberheide, and F. Jahanian, "Internet inter-domain traffic," Proceedings of the ACM SIG-COMM, vol. 40, no. 4, pp. 75–86, 2010.
- [15] B. Frank, I. Poese, Y. Lin, et al., "Pushing CDN-ISP collaboration to the limit," *ACM SIGCOMM Computer Communication Review*, vol. 43, no. 3, pp. 34–44, 2013.
- [16] R. K. Sitaraman, M. Kasbekar, W. Lichtenstein, and M. Jain, "Overlay networks: An Akamai perspective," Advanced Content Delivery, Streaming, and Cloud Services, pp. 305–328, Wiley, 2014.
- [17] J. Devlin, M.-W. Chang, K. Lee, and K. Toutanova, "BERT: Pretraining of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding," *Proceedings of NAACL-HLT*, pp. 4171–4186, 2019.
- [18] A. Vaswani, N. Shazeer, N. Parmar, J. Uszkoreit, L. Jones, A. N. Gomez, L. Kaiser, and I. Polosukhin, "Attention Is All You Need," Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), vol. 30, pp. 5998– 6008, 2017.

- [19] D. Narayanan, M. Shoeybi, J. Casper, et al., "Efficient Large-Scale Language Model Training on GPU Clusters," Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis (SC21), pp. 1–15, 2021.
- [20] Y. Lee, H. Park, and N. Kim, "A survey on inference acceleration techniques for transformer-based language models," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 55505–55521, 2022.
- [21] B. Shneiderman, C. Plaisant, M. Cohen, and S. Jacobs, *Designing the User Interface: Strategies for Effective Human-Computer Interaction*, 7th ed., Pearson, 2022.
- [22] J. Yoo, S. Lee, and B. Moon, "Semantic Cache: Efficient Semantic Similarity Search for Neural Embeddings," *Proceedings of the ACM SIG-MOD International Conference on Management of Data*, pp. 343–357, 2022.
- [23] J. Johnson, M. Douze, and H. Jégou, "Billion-scale similarity search with GPUs," *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 535–547, 2021.
- [24] ETSI, "Multi-Access Edge Computing (MEC): Framework and Reference Architecture," ETSI GS MEC 003 v3.1.1, 2022.
- [25] Qualcomm Technologies, "5G and Edge Computing: Enabling Ultra-Low Latency Applications," White Paper, 2023.
- [26] Ericsson, "Edge Computing and 5G Networks: Use Cases and Deployment Insights," *Ericsson Technology Review*, 2023.
- [27] Verizon and Ericsson, "Leveraging MEC to Enable Low-Latency AI Applications over 5G," *Verizon White Paper*, 2023.
- [28] Intel Corporation, "AI Inference at the Network Edge: Technologies, Architectures, and Deployment Models," *Intel Technology Brief*, 2023.
- [29] T. Dettmers et al., "LLM.int8(): 8-bit Matrix Multiplication for Transformers at Scale," arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.07339, 2022.

- [30] Z. Yao et al., "Quantization Techniques for Transformer-Based Models: A Review," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023.
- [31] E. Frantar et al., "GPTQ: Accurate Post-Training Quantization for Generative Pre-trained Transformers," *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2023.
- [32] E. Kurtic and D. Campos, "Optimal Structured Pruning of Transformers," *EMNLP*, 2022.
- [33] V. Sanh et al., "DistilBERT: A Distilled Version of BERT," arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.01108, 2020.
- [34] NVIDIA Corporation, "NVIDIA H100 Tensor Core GPU: Architecture and Performance," *Technical Whitepaper*, 2023.
- [35] Google Research, "TPU v4: An Accelerator for Deep Neural Networks," Technical Report, 2022.
- [36] Cerebras Systems, "Accelerating Transformers with Cerebras CS-2," Technical Whitepaper, 2022.
- [37] T. Zhang, L. Gao, X. Jin, et al., "LLMCache: Optimizing inference performance of large language models via prompt and context caching," arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.14119, 2023.
- [38] Ericsson Mobility Report, "Edge Computing and 5G: Technical Opportunities and Industry Applications," *Ericsson Technical Whitepaper*, 2022.
- [39] ETSI, "Multi-access Edge Computing (MEC); Framework and Reference Architecture," ETSI GS MEC 003, V3.1.1, 2023.
- [40] 3GPP, "System Architecture for the 5G System (Release 17)," TS 23.501, v17.9.0, 2022.
- [41] Cisco Systems, "Assured Applications Experience in 5G and Edge Networks," Cisco Technical Whitepaper, 2022.
- [42] European Union, "EU Artificial Intelligence Act (Draft Final)," Council of the EU, COM(2021) 206 final, 2023.

- [43] Jeff Johnson, Matthijs Douze, and Hervé Jégou, "Billion-scale similarity search with GPUs," *IEEE Transactions on Big Data*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 535–547, 2021.
- [44] Jiyoon Yoo, Sanghyun Lee, and Bongki Moon, "Semantic Cache: Efficient Semantic Similarity Search for Neural Embeddings," in *Proceedings* of the 2022 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, pp. 343–357, 2022.
- [45] Wenhui Wang, Furu Wei, Li Dong, Hangbo Bao, Nan Yang, and Ming Zhou, "MiniLM: Deep Self-Attention Distillation for Task-Agnostic Compression of Pre-Trained Transformers," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, vol. 33, pp. 5776–5788, 2020.
- [46] Zhou, Hao, and Kazuya Kawakami. "BERT with history answer embedding for conversational question answering." arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.06286, 2020.
- [47] Vepakomma, Praneeth, et al. "Split learning for health: Distributed deep learning without sharing raw patient data." arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.00564, 2018.
- [48] Verizon, "Verizon 5G Edge: Bringing the power of the cloud closer to the user," Verizon Edge Computing Whitepaper, 2023.
- [49] Zhang, Yuwei, et al. "Accelerating Deep Learning Inference with Quantization on Edge Devices," *IEEE Design Test*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 43–52, 2021.
- [50] 3GPP TR 23.932 V16.0.0, "Study on enhancing support of Edge Computing in 5G Core network," 3rd Generation Partnership Project (3GPP), 2021.
- [51] Tim Dettmers, Artidoro Pagnoni, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Mike Lewis, "QLoRA: Efficient Finetuning of Quantized LLMs," arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.14314, 2023.
- [52] Zihao Xu, Danyang Zhuo, Zhenyuan Ruan, et al., "vLLM: Easy, Fast, and Cheap LLM Serving with Open-Source Infrastructure," arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.06180, 2023.

- [53] Tianyu Chen, Yuxian Meng, Xiaoxi Mao, et al., "SpecInfer: Accelerating Large Language Model Inference via Speculative Decoding and Token Grouping," arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.09380, 2023.
- [54] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, et al., "Retrieval-Augmented Generation for Knowledge-Intensive NLP," Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS), vol. 33, pp. 9459–9474, 2020.