Some Thoughts for RAN1 Management

Wanshi Chen

September 2017

Some thoughts for online discussion

- Contribution/summary/WF presentation
  - Please keep it **concise and clear**
  - If there is a **time limit** imposed for the presentation, please respect the time limit
- Contribution/summary/WF discussion
  - As a reminder and a common practice so far, please **raise your hands** before asking any questions/make any comments
    - Please start talking after permission. When you're talking, please make your point loud and clear
  - Please **respect online discussion** and keep any side-discussion voice volume low
  - Please **minimize repeating the same arguments**
    - However, you're welcome to provide additional "angles" (like incremental redundancy)
  - Please make sure the arguments are **purely technical**
    - "I just don't like it" is not a technical argument
  - If you have **co-signed**, any **negative** comments/objections are **NOT welcome**
  - **Conflicting comments** from two or more individuals affiliated with the **same company**/university/organization are **NOT welcome**

Some thoughts on contribution writing

- A contribution with **good clarity and solid quality analysis** (complexity & performance analysis for different options) is more likely to be treated online
- Make sure proposals in the contribution **clear and self-complete** → ideally can be directly proposed for possible agreements with zero or minimal editing
  - A bad example: "Proposal xxx: for yyy channel, we recommend adopt option 2 as listed in Section zzz in this contribution"
  - Another bad example: "Proposal: Dynamic triggering of A-CSI with a 2-bit in DCI *may* be adopted"
- **Re-submission and Revision:**
  - If it's a re-submission, please add in the introduction section one sentence "This is a re-submission of R1-xxxxxxx"
  - If it's a revised submission, please add in the introduction one sentence "This contribution is revised from R1-xxxxxxx"
  - In both cases, please also indicate it when requesting Tdoc number
    - in 3GU there is a field for "it's a revision of". Please mark it to facilitate tracking of revised contributions

Some thoughts on offline discussion/summary

- For each topic, important to keep progress consistent with work plan
- Often, someone will be assigned to lead offline discussion/summary (**feature lead**)
  - Please follow his/her leadership and trust his/her technical integrity and honesty
  - Chair/Vice Chairs will respect the opinion of the feature lead(s)
    - Especially regarding what needs to be discussed or not to be discussed online at that moment
- Each feature lead:
  - Please respect opinions from all parties
  - Please provide solid summary and proposals, such that
    - It can be easily understood by those who didn't participate in the offline discussion
    - It can facilitate discussion online and be readily to be managed by Chair/Vice Chairs leading to possible agreements
    - It can be conveniently used as a reference in the future

Some thoughts on WFs

- A WF should ideally be a proposal which has a good chance of getting consensus in the meeting, typically a **new and reasonable compromise** between the different original proposals
  - Simply taking the proposals from an individual company's contribution is NOT a WF!
    - Please refrain from doing this as much as possible!
  - Necessary to have ***in-person* discussion** from two or more sides with different opinions
- A WF should be **self-complete**. Besides the actual proposal:
  - It should contain **sufficient background**
    - E.g., previous agreements, new issues, different options/alternatives whenever applicable
      - Simply listing your favored option/alternative without others is NOT recommended
  - It can be easily understood by those who didn't participate in the offline discussion
  - It can be conveniently used as a future reference
- Unless the issues and technical tradeoffs are clearly discussed earlier online, please explain the proposals in the WF
  - So that everyone participating online discussion can understand the technical aspects clearly
- **Contributions with `WF' in the title do not have an automatic right to be presented. In particular, WFs not meeting the above criterion are unlikely to be treated。**

Some thoughts on using “Draft” folder

- “Draft” folder has been proven to be a useful tool widely used during RAN1 meeting management
- However, sometimes it’s very difficult to locate a particular document due to a large number of files
- In the future, the “Draft” folder will have at least two levels of **subfolders**
  - For files of agenda items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7,…, no subfolders are necessary
  - For files of agenda items such as 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, please use subfolders 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3, respectively
  - For files of agenda items such as 6.1.1, 6.1.2, 6.1.3, please use subfolders 6.1/6.1.1., 6.1/6.1.2, 6.1/6.1.3 respectively
  - For files of agenda items such as 6.1.1.1., 6.1.1.2, 6.1.1.3, please use subfolders 6.1/6.1.1
  - Subfolder granularity can be further improved if deemed necessary during the meeting (e.g., 6.1/6.1.1/6.1.1.1)
- Please upload the file to the corresponding subfolder in the “Draft” folder

Some thoughts on using RAN1 email reflector

- Due to the size of the group, the use and responsiveness of email reflector(s) can be very challenging… it may become a real issue when collocated with other WGs
- Whenever possible, please use the **"draft" folder for sharing contribution/ summary/WF**
  - Discussions via the email reflector can be achieved with a link to the relevant "draft" folder
- However, if attachment is needed and help the discussion, please only attach **zipped files**
- As far as possible, avoid attachment's **size** over 1M in your emails