

3GPP

Organizational Review Ad Hoc

Report to the
Project Coordination Group

C. C. Bailey

April 10, 2001

Report to the PCG - 4/10/01

- Outline -

1. Terms of Reference
2. Background
3. Recommendations
4. Next Steps

3GPP Ad Hoc Group on Organizational Structure and Operation

- Terms of Reference -

- Review the current organizational structure of the 3GPP technical groups working on GSM, GERAN and related technologies.
- Examine whether the current organization of work in 3GPP is most effective, or if it needs re-alignment.
- Examine whether any needed work is not being accomplished, and whether 3GPP TSG's should be requested to take on such work items.

“an undertaking to review the structure and operation of 3GPP after six months to verify that the project was being run in an optimal way”

Background

Excerpt from "Report to the 3GPP Organizational Partners Regarding Movement of GSM Radio Activities into 3GPP"

7. Implementation Plan and Conclusions

It is recommended that, following agreement by the Organizational Partners (OPs), all transfers should take place no later than the July meeting of the OPs. In accordance with the 3GPP Working Procedures, all new groups will be convened for 2 meetings by their existing chairs (acting as convenors) and new elections for chairs will take place at their second meeting. *There will be a mandatory review period of 6 months to evaluate these specific decisions at the end of Year2000 (December TSGs) and to facilitate further changes or optimization.* (Emphasis added)

Note: No comments were received regarding the organization of GERAN as a separate with coordination via SA. No PCG action needed.

Background

Excerpts from "Report to the 3GPP Organizational Partners Regarding Movement of GSM Radio Activities into 3GPP"

“Given all of the above, the way forward is to initially place all the GERAN terminal testing specification development work in a separate TSG GERAN.”

“an undertaking to review the structure and operation of 3GPP after six months to verify that the project was being run in an optimal way”

Recommendations

1. Long Term Vision

- There is little scope within the present structure to develop ideas beyond the present release, in terms of service, technology or architecture perspectives. Not only is it important for 3GPP to have such a vision/plan, but other organizations (most recently the ITU) have expressed interest in receiving one.
- The PCG should go on record that it has the primary responsibility for planning the scope and timing of future 3GPP specification releases. For practical reasons this responsibility has been devolved to the SA TSG (to work in cooperation with the other TSGs, and subject to final review by the PCG). In order to progress this the PCG should request TSG SA to establish a new Work Item that will result in a formal deliverable to the PCG (e.g. Technical Report) outlining the Long Term Vision and plans (scope and timing) for future releases.

Recommendations

1. Long Term Vision - Proposal to the PCG

- PCG commends SA's plan for a workshop that will progress work on the subject to be held later this year. The PCG recommends that this workshop be widely publicized, with opportunity for all input on this subject to be given thorough discussion. The results of the workshop should form the initial deliverable of the new Work Item and be available for presentation to the PCG meeting 4Q/2001.
- The IP based Multimedia Services Framework Specification, which SA has agreed to develop, should be a valuable component of the deliverable.
- No recommendation is being made to SA regarding creation of a separate working group to deal with planning of future releases. However, the PCG and SA should remain alert to the best ways (both organizational and procedural) to efficiently plan for future releases.

Recommendations

2. Weak Relations With IETF

- 📌 Contribution 113 to the March SA meeting [TSGS#11(01)0113] contains several suggestions concerning effective relations between IETF and 3GPP. The PCG recommends that all 3GPP groups that need to communicate with IETF give consideration to these suggestions (particularly Section 4).
- 📌 The PCG notes that a key aspect of good liaison with IETF is to appoint highly competent individuals to specific technical liaison positions, which focus in specific technical areas. Therefore the PCG recommends that special liaisons be appointed for specific technical areas as appropriate. As this is done, TSG SA should be watchful for the need to assure proper coordination between the individual liaisons. These specialized liaison personnel should work under the coordination of the overall 3GPP rapporteur to IETF.

Recommendations

3. Coordinated Requirements Capture

- The PCG adopts the position that it the development of requirements or service concepts can be done within 3GPP, when a reasonable number of members wish to engage in it.
- The PCG notes that input from MRPs will be important on this issue. Therefore the PCG requests that MRPs determine if they have requirements work or technical work that could be done in 3GPP if procedural or organizational improvements were made. The PCG also requests the MRPs to consider if there are ways that 3GPP could improve the process by which SA1 can communicate with these groups and receive input.
- The PCG also endorses the suggestion that SA1 starts to invite co-operation with other groups on requirements. The PCG will create and maintain a list of additional liaison partners for this purpose.
- The PCG recommends that for requirements input, MRPs should input directly into SA1, and use the SA1 chairman as a first point of contact.

Recommendations

4. Merging the activities on Mobile Terminal Conformance test specifications

- The PCG encourages TSG-RAN and TSG-T to be monitor the situation between their two WGs, being watchful for opportunities to co-ordinate, share, or merge activities.
- The PCG encourages TSG-GERAN and TSG-RAN to monitor their activities, looking for similar opportunities between their work programs.
- The PCG encourages the eventual combination of all terminal working groups, in order to further harmonisation and remove duplication of effort.

Recommendations

5. Restructuring GERAN Meetings

- The PCG commends TSG GERAN for:
 - 🏠 Moving toward a 5-day submission requirement for input documents
 - 🏠 Establishing an "emergency brake" mechanism by which appeals to GERAN agreement can be brought
- The PCG should encourage TSG-GERAN to continue development of these procedures.
- The PCG also encourages TSG-GERAN to consider a long-term evolution towards procedures that align with those of the other TSGs, including meeting concurrently with other TSGs as recommended in the working procedures of 3GPP.

Recommendations

6. Strengthen the Role of SA

- The PCG notes that the co-ordination role is of great importance. The co-ordination role of TSG SA should encompass:
 - Responsibility for management and co-ordination of work items, including:
 - ◆ approval of Feature Work Items;
 - ◆ proactive tracking, 'chasing' and if necessary prioritisation of Feature Work Items and the corresponding Building Blocks and Work Tasks against the parent Feature(s);
 - Responsibility for ensuring that the requirements are followed through the specification development process;
 - Responsibility for ratification of specifications and CRs to ensure consistency and completeness.
 - The PCG notes that the current SA plenary meeting agendas have evolved to a point where significant co-ordination activity is being accomplished. It is encouraged to continue this evolution.

Recommendations

7. Maximise RAN3, GERAN WG2 synergy on AN-CN interface

- (There is no clear consensus on this issue. However, the thought has been expressed that over time, the work of RAN and GERAN will continually come closer together, with the possibility that they might merge at some point in the distant future.)
- The PCG encourages RAN and GERAN to be watchful for opportunities to co-ordinate, share, or merge their work, as appropriate.

New Issue

8. “no practical need to further emphasize regional balance in the working procedures for working groups”

- No consensus on any action to be taken on this issue.
- There is apparent consensus that Article 22 of the Procedures lacks clarity in some areas.
- There is significant feeling that the practices that should be in place to support Article 22 need to be more carefully defined.
- Specific proposals to resolve these situations should be brought to the 3GPP leadership by individual members or OPs.

Next Steps

- PCG adopts and disseminates recommendations to the TSGs and MRPs
- Re-create similar ad hoc group in 1 year?