3GPP TSG SA#97e
Electronic, 13-19 September 2022
Agenda Item 3.7

SP-220898
Revision of SP-220648

Considerations on future release planning

Initial version submitted at SA#96 in SP-220648
This present document is in the same format as submitted for the email discussion, with additional clarifications resulting from this discussion.

MediaTek Inc.

Introduction

- Rel-19 Planning discussion kicked-off at SA#96
  - MediaTek submission to SA#96: SP-220648 (complementary to SA Chairman's input: S2-220633)
  - Discussion to continue by email until SA#97: email discussion process: link
  - Set of issues endorsed on June 28th: SP-220709_rev8

- The present contribution
  - does not repeat the observations made in SP-220648
  - maps SP-220648 proposals to the Set of issues
  - Provides additional proposals to identified Set of issues

- MediaTek solution SP-220648 at SA#96 proposed:
  - **Proposal 1:** Strict upstream limitation of the #SIDs/WIDs is necessary in addition to meeting the TU budget
  - **Proposal 2:** Rapporteur decisions should be done last so the focus can be on technical considerations
  - **Proposal 3:** SA2 needs to spend resources on limited #directions that are set top-down (i.e. at SA plenary) – See **Proposal 3bis**
  - **Proposal 3bis:** see appendix (= slide 5 in SP-220648)
  - **Proposal 4:** SA2 work capacity in a Release shall continue to be defined assuming the constraints of SA2's normal f2f set-up only
    - Single-week f2f meetings
    - Max 6 f2f meetings per year
    - Max 3 parallel sessions per f2f meeting
    - Plenary sessions per f2f meeting
    - *Regardless whether a meeting takes place f2f or electronically*
    - Upper TU limit per SI/WI shall be kept

Solutions to set of issues
1. Scope

Issues (see Set of Issues)	**MTK Proposals**	**Comments**
1a – Lack of coherent SA view	Proposals 3 + 3bis	
1b – SI/WI all treated equally	Solution to 1a will address 1b	• Top-down set of directions as proposed in Proposals 3+3bis will implicitly define the Release priorities. No additional action needed
1c – WG time spent, nulled at plenary	Proposal 3 + 3bis	
1d – SA Release plan oblivious of St.3 considerations	Solution to 2a will address 1d	• Solutions to 2a aim to improve SA/RAN/CT coordination – we think SA/RAN coordination works rather well, but not SA/CT at planning phase
1e – Items spanning x releases (large scope / leftovers)	Leftovers shall not be treated with higher priority	• Evolution for the sake of evolution is not always required and need very careful consideration: e.g. 4 releases of network slicing when deployments still focus on the initial release of network slicing

1f – Incoherence St.1<>St.2<>St.3 (no checkpoints)	• Reduce Stage 1 effective work volume
	  • SA1:
	  • Reduce #meetings: strict max 4/year, no AH
	  • Reduce effective #quarters on a given Release
	  • Cap #SI/WI
	  • Introduce Rel-N buffer (see item 2c next slide)
	• Ensure strict Stage X freeze
		• 1f is a by-product of the workload being naturally much higher to define Stage X than it is Stage X-1 as shown below
		`[-Stage 1-]`
		`[-----Stage 2-----]`
		`[----------Stage 3----------]`
		i.e. Stage X may simply not have time to implement all Stage X-1 req
		• Min 80% completion of Stage 1 @start of Stage 2 has ~helped

Solutions to set of issues
2. Timeline / timing

Issues (see Set of Issues)	**MTK Proposals**	**Comments**
2a – Cross-TSG coord. Issues i. RAN dependencies <> SA2	• Solution to 3 will address this issue	• We think SA/RAN coordination does work at Release package planning • We think the issues between RAN2/SA2 are a by-product of SA2 overload • A better management of SA2 workload will inevitably improve the situation
ii. Stage 2 <*insufficient time*> Stage 3 completion	• Solution to 3 will address this issue	• A better management of SA2 workload will inevitably improve the situation

iii. SA <> CT disconnect	• Terminate CT:
	  • Integrate CT WGs into SA
	  • Terminate CT6: integrate into CT1
	
	• At minimum: CT plenary shifted to mid week
	Day1 Day2 Day3 Day4 Day5
	RP RP RP RP
	~~CP~~ ~~CP~~ > **CP** **CP**
	SP SP SP SP
		• No specific need identified to keep CT plenary
		  • We think the work of CT plenary can be fully handled at and by SA plenary
		  • Integrating CT into SA will inevitably yield a better planning, mindful of CT Stage 3
		• Today's CT plenary closes too early in the week (typ. before SA starts), thus preventing any proper coordination between SA and CT (primarily), unlike what is possible between SA and RAN. With CT responsible for much of Stage 3 work pertaining to SA, this needs to be addressed.
		• Shifting CT plenary to mid-week will at least enable better SA/CT/RAN coord.

2b – SAx <*insufficient time*> SAy coordination		• We acknowledge the issues reported and would welcome a better planning and visibility for SA3/4/6 at SA plenary
2c – Rel-*n-1* vs. Rel-*n* overlap	• Formalize Rel-N buffer before start of Rel-N+1	See MTK Proposal at RAN#93e and SA#93e plenaries: RP-212510, SP-210899 (this proposal was implemented at transition from Rel-17 to Rel-18) It allows Stabilizing Rel-N before starting *any* work on Rel-N+1

Solutions to set of issues
3. WG Capacity

Issues (see Set of Issues)	**MTK Proposals**	**Comments**
3a – Large #SI/WI	Proposal 1 Proposals 3 + 3bis	
3b – TU budget constraints	Proposal 4	
3c – #TEI items	Cap #TEI items Enforce strict single quarter work per TEI item	

Solutions to set of issues
4. Other aspects

Issues (see Set of Issues)	**MTK Proposals**	**Comments**
4a – F2F vs. e-meetings	Proposal 4	
4b – Rapporteurships	Proposal 2	
4c – WGs overload	Workload issues to be reported to SA plenary for action Pruning of SID/WID mid-release must be considered	• E.g. SA2 is clearly already working way beyond its capacity, resulting from SA#94e Rel-18 outcome

Appendix

Proposal 3bis
Top-Down process relying on SA2 expertise

This proposal is inspired by RAN top-down process, but relies on SA2 expertise to refine the objectives of the work, unlike RAN process where all SI/WI are drafted at the plenary.

TSG_{N-2}: Rel-X+1 Workshop *adjacent to the plenary meeting*	**TSG_{N-1}: Rel-X+1 Key Directions** *in-plenary*	**TSG_N: Rel-X+1 Package Approval** *in-plenary*
Inputs • Companies' proposals invited for discussion	**Inputs** • Moderators' summaries i.e. Directions with moderated contents	**Inputs** • SA2-agreed SI/WI without Rapporteur Information
Outputs • **Initial Set** *{Initial Directions {Potential Content}}* • **Other Set** *{Other Directions {Potential Content}}* • Each *Initial Direction* assigned to an (SA2) Moderator • *Other Directions* assigned to one/more (SA2) Moderator(s) • No Rapporteur information	**Outputs** • **Key Directions Set** *{Key Directions {Initial Content}}* • No Rapporteur information • Each *Key Direction* assigned to an (SA2) Moderator	**Outputs** • Approved Rel-X+1 Package incl. Rapporteurs

Actions to SA2
• Moderated (NWM/email) discussion
  • 1-week, *off* the meeting week
  • Each moderator responsible to set-up their own email discussion, moderate it and summarize it
	Actions to SA2
	• Define SI/WI based on Key Directions Set (incl. Objectives, All TU-checked, No Rapporteur Information)
	  • Each Moderator responsible to submit draft SI/WI to following SA2 meeting, corresponding to *Key Direction*	

NOTE: Key Directions Set = Subset of Initial Set U Other Set

See next slide for clarifications

Initial Set vs. Other Set

- **Intention:** to *start* distinguishing between directions that could have a higher likelihood of reaching consensus vs. those that may be more challenging
- **Initial Set** would be a list of clear directions with reasonably wide support thus indicative of good likelihood of consensus on the indicated directions
- **Other Set** would be the remainder of directions with fairly isolated support thus potentially indicative of a more difficult consensus building on these directions

- NOTE: this is NOT a WI/SI dimension

Thank You!