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# Background

In response to the requirement and the use case in <https://www.3gpp.org/ftp/Email_Discussions/SA/requirements_verticals_v2020-02-08.ppt>, solution proposals were made by Qualcomm and Vivo (see <https://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?A2=3GPP_TSG_SA;acca85c6.2102D> and <https://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?A2=3GPP_TSG_SA;f7d248bb.2102D>). This contribution assesses these proposals from the vantage point of the aforementioned requirement.

# Recap of the requirement

* “Requirement: Provide feature(s) that allow delegates to identify what vertical requirements are addressed by a SI/WI.
	+ The related effort shall be significantly lower than what would be needed at present.
	+ This information shall be available during the entire lifecycle of a SI/WI (SA approval of SID/WID 🡪 SA approval of related TR/TS)
* Note: an initial solution for SIs only would be acceptable.”

Comment: This requirement has the structure

* <statement 1>
	+ <statement 2>
	+ <statement 3>

Note that fulfilling statement 1[[1]](#footnote-1) is necessary but not sufficient. Fulfilling this requirement is contingent on satisfactorily addressing all three statements.

# Assessment[[2]](#footnote-2)

## Qualcomm proposal

| **Sought** | **Provided** |
| --- | --- |
| Provide feature(s) that allow delegates to identify what vertical requirements are addressed by a SI/WI. | Addresses this need, albeit in a very indirect way (if a Stage-1 requirement is addressed in Stage-2, there is no documentation of what Stage-2 TS addresses this Stage-1 requirement). |
| The related effort shall be significantly lower than what would be needed at present.[[3]](#footnote-3) | Fulfilled. |
| This information shall be available during the entire lifecycle of a SI/WI (SA approval of SID/WID 🡪 SA approval of related TR/TS) | Not fulfilled, as the information sought is provided much later, namely after the completion of Stage-2 |

*Verdict:* This proposal does not fulfil the requirement.

## Vivo proposal

| **Sought** | **Provided** |
| --- | --- |
| Provide feature(s) that allow delegates to identify what vertical requirements are addressed by a SI/WI. | Fulfilled for studies; only fulfilled for one-step work items. |
| The related effort shall be significantly lower than what would be needed at present.[[4]](#footnote-4) | Fulfilled. |
| This information shall be available during the entire lifecycle of a SI/WI (SA approval of SID/WID 🡪 SA approval of related TR/TS) | Partially fulfilled (information not available before the first key issues are formulated; it can take several workgroup meetings, before the list of key issues is complete). |

*Verdict:* This proposal only partially fulfils the requirement (see row three). Nonetheless, it is definitely interesting, as it only puts a light burden on the Stage-2 contributors/rapporteur.

### Proposed enhancements

This proposal could be made more valuable by adding the following steps.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Amendment #** | **Proposed amendment** | **Entailed work burden** | **Comment** |
| 1 | Extent this procedure to CRs that modify key issues in the TR. | Small | -- |
| 2 | Extend this solution to normal work items (not just one-step). | Depends on the details of this extension. | This step could be added after a successful and satisfactory test run of this procedure on Stage-2 studies. |

# Annexe: lifecycle view of both proposals

*Assumptions:*

* Start in Release 18
* Stage-2 study starts before pertinent Stage-1 TS is approved
	+ Note: Not a necessary condition; chosen because it is more complicated than when the Stage-2 study starts after pertinent Stage-1 TS is approved.

*Documents mentioned in the table below:*

* SA1: TS *n*
* SA>1: TR *s*, TS *u*

| **SA1-related activities** | **Pertinent activities in and related to SA>1, e.g. SA6** | **Qualcomm proposal** | **Vivo proposal[[5]](#footnote-5)** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Work item *m*: drafting of TS *n* | -- | -- | Enumerate requirements in TS *n*  |
| -- | SID *r* for s Stage-2 study approved at SA plenary; will produce TR *s* | Section 2.2. in SID links to TS *n*\*  | Refer to WID *m* and TS *n* in SID |
|  | TR *s* drafting | -- | *TR s* contributions that introduce a KI addressing a TS *n* requirement refer to the unique number of said requirement; collect enumerated requirements in back of TR *s* |
| TS *n* approved at SA plenary | -- | -- | -- |
|  | TR *s* drafting | -- | *TR s* contributions that introduce a KI addressing a TS *n* requirement refer to the unique number of said requirement; collect enumerated requirements in back of TR *s* |
|  | TR *s* approved at plenary | -- | -- |
|  | WID *t* for a Stage-2 work item, which will address potential requirements in TR *s*, is approved at SA plenary; this work item will produce TS *u* | Section 2.2. in WID links to TS *n*\* | -- |
|  | TS *u* drafting | -- | -- |
|  | TS *u* approved at plenary | -- | -- |
|  | End of Stage-2/3 normative work | SA1 identifies which TS *n* requirements were implemented in Stage-2/3; requirements not implemented should be removed from TS *n* in this Release, but they are kept in the TS *n* of the next Release.Additionally, MCC may help keeping track of TS *n* requirements that were not addressed at Stage 2/3, for instance by listing reference to TS *n* “alignment/clean-up” CRs per feature in the summary of this Release, namely TR21.91*w* | -- |
| --: proposal mute on this step\*: existing SA procedure |

1. Statement 1 applies to Stage-2 studies and work items. This will be clarified in a forthcoming version of the requirement slide stack. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Auxiliary information is provided in the annexe on page 3. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. At present, realistically, one vertical delegate has to be assigned to SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, and SA6, respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. At present, realistically, one vertical delegate has to be assigned to SA2, SA3, SA4, SA5, and SA6, respectively. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. The Vivo proposal also provides a solution for one-step work items. For more details see <https://list.etsi.org/scripts/wa.exe?A2=3GPP_TSG_SA;f7d248bb.2102D>. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)