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# Introduction

In this document, the comments on the RAN4 workload management WF are gathered. These will be further input to the WF in RP-101258

# Topics for discussions

## Agenda and time allocations

* Agenda/topics should be reduced to focus the discussion and make it easier to reach agreements
  + Rapporteurs/moderators could be tasked to identify key topics for each meeting and the focus of the meeting should be on those
  + A work plan for multiple meetings with topics to be discussed in each meeting could be followed
* RAN4 discussions should be strictly technical and should be escalated to the Plenary when they are not:
  + Technical issues should be brought to the plenary only as a last resort

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Futurewei | 1. Regarding reducing agenda/topics, it is better to distinguish handling of Rel-16 completion and Rel-17 items. For several of WI/SI, Rel-16 is completed or nearing completion – scope reduction may not be possible. However, for Rel-17 this reducing scope per meeting or rotating the agenda could work well.   In all cases, meeting agenda is set several weeks in advance. The Chairman and rapporteurs can provide a draft agenda and companies have time to comment on the agenda - this is business as usual. A question we have is, what if topics are not concluded in this multiple meetings plan?   1. Regarding who should be tasked: we do not think moderators to be given the ultimate task of scoping the meeting/agenda. Moderator’s task is to facilitate the discussion and to drive the discussion to a conclusion.   **Work Plan:** Having a well thought out work plan that is developed by rapporteur but discussed and agreed at WG-level can work well. Such a work plan can be used by the moderators to drive the discussion.   1. Regarding what topic to be brought to Plenary: In general we are fine 2nd bullet “RAN4 discussions should be strictly technical and should be escalated to the Plenary”. However, it is impractical to provide a guidance on what a company brings to Plenary. We would not have any control what topic – technical or otherwise - a company would bring to Plenary. This is business as usual.   **In summary, (1) Guidance on reducing agenda should distinguish if it is for Rel-16 or Rel-17. (2) Moderators are facilitators and as such moderators should not be given the task of reducing the scope. (3). Work Plan that is developed by rapporteur, agreed by WG, could work well. Such a plan could work well if there is sufficient meeting cycles left- for e.g. from Rel-17 WI/SI.** |

## GTW Sesssions

* GTW sessions were useful in reaching more agreements
* Agenda for online sessions should be rotating so that we do not end up always discussing only the first topic on the agenda. Also, there should be rotation of topics for GTW avoiding always treating the same items.
  + If there are more than one topics to be discussed in GTW in particular day, time allocation shall be provided for each topic and shall be strictly followed
  + Handling of FR1/FR2 topics order could be rotated
  + No single item should take more than ~90 minutes
  + Session chair should make sure that this is implemented
* Online sessions should adhere to the scheduled slot
  + ~30minutes extension could be acceptable but not more

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Futurewei | Agree that GTW sessions were useful in reaching more agreements. The guidance can be to organize GTW more efficiently. Only the critical /controversial issues [identified by moderators, selected by session Chairman] are set for GTW. It is expected that the agenda for GTW sessions are made available in advance, so companies are given ample opportunity to comment on the GTW agenda. Itt is not required to set a guidance to session Chairman on the order of topics or how to handle a session.  The guidance could be that a wide range of topics identified by moderators /Chairman could be handled in GTW. However, fixating on specific examples, such as “FR1/FR2” is not necessary on a guidance document. Start and end time can be clearly specified with setting a maximum time for single topic could bet set.  Further suggestions such as having a clearly drafted WF for GTW could facilitate discussion.  **In summary, (1) structured GTW agenda with critical /controversial issues [identified by moderators, selected by session Chairman]. (2) Start and end time for each topics in GTW. (3) Clearly drafted WF document for GTW** |

## Moderators and allocations of WFs

* Rapporteurs should be consulted on moderator selection
* Moderators should be given more authority to drive the discussions
  + Comments going against prior documented agreements should be discarded (moderator should ignore them), if the prior agreement is still contested by someone, chairman should intervene
    - Moderator (preferably) or even other delegates should notify the chairmen, it cannot be expected that session chairmen monitor all threads
    - As usual, newly identified errors in previous agreements can be addressed in Tdocs together with technical justification
* Feedback for moderators is more than welcome
  + Moderators with negative feedback should be swapped out
  + Good feedback should also be given – moderators doing a good job should be recognized

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Futurewei | We disagree on the some of the WF suggestions here. Moderator selection is a prerogative of the Chairman/leadership. Moderators are experts in the selected topic and they are tasked by the Chairman/leadership to facilitate/drive the discussion.  Guidance can be given such that Moderators communicate regularly with Chairman (not necessarily at the end of the week) regarding progress and if any comments against prior agreements, etc.  Feedback on moderators (both positive and negative) are welcome to be shared privately to Chairman. |

## Enforcements of deadlines

* Deadlines should be clearly enforced, comments received after the comment deadline should be discarded
* Deadlines for the moderator summaries should be at least 16 hours (preferably 24 or more) after the deadline for comments
* Deadline for final approval should be at least another 16 hours (preferably 24 hours) after all the documents are available
* Any deadline extension should be for at least 16 hours to give people enough time to comment
  + Should be announced also on the dedicated thread as well as on the organizational thread
  + Preference is not to have any deadline extension at all

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Futurewei | We agree that deadlines should be enforced. Delegates are adviced to follow deadlines strictly.  With different timezones, companies are getting used to eMeeting arrangements – it is fair to say RAN4#95e (May) saw companies adhering to deadlines well. **The guidance can be provided such that the moderator and/or session chairman can clearly mark the time of delivery of the summary and the commenting window period.**  However, it should be recognized that objections introduced nearer to the deadline impair progress. |

## Tdoc Allocations

* New tdocs to be allocated only after the 1st round based on moderator recommendations
  + Tdocs should not be allocated to anyone else, if some tdoc is needed then companies can comment on the moderator summary
* No new tdocs allocated during the 2nd round of discussions (after the 2nd round is opened until it is finalized)
  + New tdocs are very difficult to track and review if not in the moderator summary after 1st round
  + New tdocs can be allocated during GTW, should be formally announced on the “e-meeting management thread”(see last bullet on slide)
* New WFs that are created during the 2nd round should be circulated at least before the second half of the commenting period (separate deadline can be created)
  + Delegates use moderator summary document to provide comments, which can be used for formulating the contents of WFs.
  + Discussion should be based on the WF and enough review time should be given after the final version is uploaded
* Avoid sub-threads under the same thread as it becomes difficult for delegates to keep track of all discussion:
  + All documents are treated under the main thread (i.e. with same email subject) e.g. WFs, TP/CRs are treated under the main thread.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Futurewei | In this section, “Tdoc” is a used generically. Guidance such as “Tdocs should not be allocated to anyone” cannot be enforced – 3GPP is a contribution driven organization and as such it can be forbidden to request a tdoc or to contribute.  Perhaps, this WF guidance can be rephrased to mean a summary or WF.  There should exceptions: Delegates do make mistakes in their summary or WF documents and they do request another tdoc to amend/update the document. So, tdoc request cannot be avoid.  **Generally, guidance for this section is about the clarity of the WF document number and clarity on the timing [availability and commenting window period]. So, any new tdoc requested should be clearly marked that it is the revision and then should be given ample commenting window period.** |

## Rel.16 Prioritization/Downscoping

* Allow extension of Wis beyond September
  + Option 1: Yes, continue Rel.16 discussion until Q4 2020
  + Option 2: No, what is not finalized should be moved to Rel.17
  + Option 3: Yes only for parts of Wis that are essential for the completion of that WI(features is broken without this part). Handling of parts that can be downscoped(move to Rel.17 or drop altogether) to be discussed in September plenary
  + Option 4: Come back to this discussion in September plenary and discuss based on progress in Q3

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Futurewei | Option 3 or 4 seems reasonable. |

## Priorities for RAN4#96-e meeting in August 2020

* Prioritize the Rel-16 items with the approved exception sheet in the RAN4#96-e meeting including GTW sessions and email discussions
  + Especially prioritize topics impacting other working groups like topics requiring RAN2 signaling support in the first GTW session to allow early feedback/information sharing to other WGs like RAN2
  + Ensure that Rel-16 items (with approved exception sheet), which have gotten less GTW time in the previous RAN4 e-meetings, get sufficient GTW time allocation in RAN4#96-e
* Only critical Rel-15 CRs to be discussed in the GTW sessions and e-mail discussions

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Company** | **Views** |
| Futurewei | Rel-16 completion should be given priority. However, details of WG-level GTW session organization or email discussion need not be mentioned in exception sheet. |