

On CR handling for RRM specification quality improvement

Huawei, HiSilicon

Background

- RAN4#110-bis approved an WF (RP-240782) for RAN4 spec quality improvement
- Following are agreed related to CR handling

Agreement:

- Further discuss on how to improve the process for CR review and approval in RAN4#111.
- Based on the discussion in RAN4#110bis, the following candidates of potential improvements can be further discussed
 - Approve CRs only when proper use of formulas is adopted, e.g. with no FFS
 - Adopt running CR approach as in other WG
 - Appoint big CR/section/WI editor
 - Improve coordination of maintenance CRs for on-going WIs to avoid overlap between CRs submitted by multiple companies

- In this paper, we provide our views on improvement of the process for CR review and approval.

Analysis of different candidate options

- Approve CRs only when proper use of formulas is adopted, e.g. with no FFS
 - > Difficult to set generic criteria, delegates working on the WI are in better position to decide if a specific CR can be approved or not.
 - > Not much help to spec quality improvement as the spec will anyway stabilize e.g. with FFS resolved, and draftCR approach can be used to avoid instable CRs to be implemented in spec.
- Adopt running CR approach as in other WG
 - > Work load can be huge for the running CR editor when the spec impact of a WI is large.
 - > Lack of contributions for the TPs may cause the spec quality to get even worse. During review companies may care about their concerned points rather than the requirements for whole WI.
 - > Converting technical agreements to requirements in specs is non-trivial work, discussion during the meeting with delegates sitting together is the most efficient way.
- Appoint big CR/section/WI editor
 - > Current adopted approach with work split and draftCR endorsement process, no major issue identified so far
 - > Endorsing multiple draftCRs from different companies at same time may lead to misalignment in some case, possible improvements can be considered, e.g. earlier start on CR discussion rather than the last 2 meetings, or endorse a REFERENCE CR when needed, e.g. for similar requirements or test cases

Suggestions

- Keep using the current big CR approach, including work split and draftCR endorsement process before formal CR agreement, and consider the following improvement
 - > earlier start on CR discussion rather than the last 2 meetings
 - > endorse a REFERENCE CR when needed

Thank you.

Bring digital to every person, home and organization for a fully connected, intelligent world.

**Copyright©2018 Huawei Technologies Co., Ltd.
All Rights Reserved.**

The information in this document may contain predictive statements including, without limitation, statements regarding the future financial and operating results, future product portfolio, new technology, etc. There are a number of factors that could cause actual results and developments to differ materially from those expressed or implied in the predictive statements. Therefore, such information is provided for reference purpose only and constitutes neither an offer nor an acceptance. Huawei may change the information at any time without notice.

