**Title:** RAN4 Workload Management

**Document for:** Discussion

# 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** |
| MTK | In principle, we agree to have some downscoping on the issues to be discussed in order to allow RAN4 to focus on the essential issues. But reducing the agenda item may not work because companies will try to bring one long TDoc with dozens of issues (already the case in RAN1). The more efficient way is still to rely on rapporteur and moderator to downselect the key topics. E.g., some topics may even not be discussed during the meeting. To achieve this, a workplan for multiple meetings could help. On top of an agreed workplan, we should still allow companies to bring new issues that were not discussed in previous meeting but are critical to the completion of the WI. Whether the issue is critical can be decided by session chair/rapporteur/moderator. |
| Apple | Since different companies have different prioritization orders, it is difficult to rely on voluntary based downscoping in working group level. We think the best way is to officially reduce the scope in RAN plenary. Unfortunately, there is only one email thread limited to RRM and CSI-RS WI downscoping discussion. We think all RAN4 remaining work in the exceptional sheet should be visited in the plenary.  |

## 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** |
| MTK | Regarding the 2nd bullet, we prefer to let session chair to decide which Agenda to be treated first because the urgency of different topics could be different. Taking a round-robin approach may not good in some cases. A time cap of a single item is OK to us< 30min extension is Ok, although the preference is no extention.  |
| Apple | 1. We should make sure GTW session within 5:30am-12:30am anywhere on earth.
2. It is a bit hard to agree on the principle of order/agenda in GTW since situations vary. Based on moderators’ inputs, topics should be fairly treated. We agree the importance to follow the pre-defined agenda and time allocation. Meanwhile, chairmen should be left with enough flexibility to handle the discussion as what we have done in f2f meeting.
 |

## 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** |
| MTK | Agree |
|  |  |

## 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** |
| MTK | Agree.  |
| Apple | 1. Agree to enforce the deadline. It is suggested Chairman sends an email to the reflector to mark the starting point of slient period. We should discourage any email after that.
2. Agree to give sufficient time for companies to review and comment. The exact schedule can be defined by RAN4 leadership.
3. Enough preparation time should be allowed for the WF preparation in the 2nd round. Otherwise, it is hard to reflect the second round discussion in the WF. For example, if the second round of discussion is planned to last for 72 hours. WF is expected to be provided 48 hours after the 2nd round kick-off. This will also leave enough time for review and further comments.
 |

## 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** |
| MTK | Regarding item 3, since Moderators are from different time zone, we should allow moderator to set a deadline for comments in the 2nd round in order to provide the moderator/volunteer companies sufficient time to prepare the WF.Regarding item 4, from our experience, sub-threads for individual CR/LS/WF can help moderator easily track whether there is a new comment/response to that specific CR/LS/WF. Of couse, all sub-thread should still share the same common part in the email subject, e.g., * Email thread xxx – CR yyy,
* Email thread xxx – CR zzz
 |

## 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** |
| MTK | 1st preference: Option 22nd preference: Option 3Option 1 is the least preferred option which may end up with delay all WIs forever. Actually allowing some uncertainty to be later decided in Sepr is not good for RAN4 to progress in Aug. If companies have different view on whether a certain WI will be further extended or not, it is very difficult to make progress.  |
| Apple | We prefer not to further extending R16 core part beyond Q3 plenary. However, we should not automatically move all remaining works to R17. It is desirable to have some downscope discussion in this meeting.  |

## 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** |
| MTK | Fine with the proposals. But a more general concern is that we have some WIs with long exception sheet, which is obviously not possible to be concluded in Aug meeting. We need to have some downscoping discussion in this plenary meeting. |
| Apple | Many exceptional sheet simply includes all remaining issues. It is suggest to revisit all open issues for downscope. Impact on other WG may unnecessarily mean the related RAN4 work is important or should be prioritized. Prioritization discussion should be done in plenary. It is hard to do so in WG level since different companies have different views and priorities. Also, we don’t have time in WG meeting to discuss the prioritiy.  |