[95e-22-WID-Guidelines] - Version 0.0.4
RAN

3GPP TSG RAN #95e RP-220882 Electronic Meeting, 17 - 23 March 2022

Agenda Item:6.2

Source: Moderator (NEC)

Title: Moderator's summary for discussion [95e-22-WID-Guidelines]

1 Introduction

In [1], the 3GPP Work Plan Coordinator proposes a number of guidelines on the names of WIDs and acronyms. [2] comments on some of those proposals.

According to [1]:

These guidelines are intended to help choosing names and acronyms for new WIDs - both for Studies and for Normative work.

The aims are to:

- *simplify*
- *ensure consistency across the different Features*
- *ensure consistency across the different Releases (enhancements)*

The intention is NOT to change the past items but to provide clear references for future items

2 Initial round

2.1 Discussion

2.1.1 Simplicity

[1] states:

Generic words should be avoided, such as "System enhancements to support xxx" or "Support for additional capability for xxx", "Added Service for xxx", "Solution to support xxx", etc.

Feedback Form 1: Do you have any comments on avoiding generic wording?

1 – Deutsche Telekom AG

Perfect proposal ...

What do we do with ”evolved ABC”, ”further evolved ABC”, ”even further evolved ABC”, ”finally even further evolved ABC”, ... ?

2 – MediaTek Inc.

So long as the Title is meaningful enough, we do not see the problem with using generic wording. We do not think we should impose or restrict the use of a particular vocabulary - but we should probably have a generic recommendation to make sure the title is explicit enough.

3 – VODAFONE Group Plc

Seems useful.

4 – TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.

same view as DT and Vodafone. But also the contents of Work Items should be meaningful. And avoid further further ... further enhancements of features never implemented in products

5 – Classon Consulting

(for FUTUREWEI) Does not seem like we can have meaningful guidance here... Simple but not generic... Meaningful but not too detailed. It may be best just to rely on peer feedback when the Title is proposed.

6 – vivo Communication Technology

Agree with FUTUREWEI above, it seems hard to have meaningful guidance for the WID title, it can be discussed case by case. The wording of the WID contents, i.e. objectives are more important and should be accurate, avoid generic texts.

7 – LG Electronics Inc.

Maybe useful, but we don’t see the need to have strict rule.

8 – Ericsson LM

No strong view but from a general perspective the titles should be crisp, using whatever words are needed.

9 – DENSO CORPORATION

As long as the title is meningful, it is O.K to be simplified. On the other hand, strict discipline may not be needed and some flexibility should also be allowed.

10 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Generally some of these proposals seem to be 20+ years late, really the cat is out of the proverbial bag. This said we support succinct and clear titles, but this rule itself is not needed and good feedback during WI creation with adoption of other guidelines below may be sufficient

11 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd

The proposal seems reasonable.

12 – ZTE Corporation

Some examples of generic words are listed here but it is unclear what other words should be avoided. Not sure how useful this specific guideline is. If a guideline is needed, perhaps we can simply say WID titles should be concise.

2.1.2 Generation

[1] states:

For items which are independent of the radio technology (e.g. ”5G” or ”LTE“), the radio technology should be avoided in the Name and in the Acronym.

- *This is at the best useless and, at the worst, it limits the Feature to work on future generations (see ”MCPTT on LTE ”: it had to be later renamed as to remove “on LTE” when 5G was introduced).*

Several exceptions here, e.g. the early studies on 6G can include “6G”.

[2] commented on this:

We find it useful to refer to a radio technology in the title of RAN Work Items as is the usual convention in RAN, because the work (and thus the agenda) in RAN is structured by radio technology. If the intention of the proposal in [1] is strictly to avoid naming a radio technology for generic Work Items in e.g. CT and SA, that would be fine though.

Feedback Form 2: What is your view on using the radio technology(-ies) in the name and acronym of a Work Item, in particular in RAN?

1 – NEC Europe Ltd

We like to keep the RAN convention to refer to radio technologies in the title of Work Items, because this is very relevant to the structuring of the work in RAN

2 – CATT

We share the same view as NEC. Sometimes, one feature may be discussed and supported in one radio technology system first, and it would be introduced in another radio technology system much later. So it is reasonable to refer to radio technologies in the title of the WI.

3 – Deutsche Telekom AG

We also prefer to keep the Radio Technology in the title, but as ”E-UTRA” / ”NR”, not ”4G”, ”5G”, (”6G”) ... these terms shall be avoided as much as possible (again) in the future (I remember that RAN plenary

discussion we cam up with ”NR”)

4 – MediaTek Inc.

Keeping the radio technology convention is useful in RAN.

Similarly having an ”_EPS”, ”_5GS” convention would also be useful when restrictions do apply.

5 – VODAFONE Group Plc

It is useful to have the RAT and/or core network in the title for RAN work.

6 – Classon Consulting

(for FUTUREWEI) Keep RAT

7 – vivo Communication Technology

Agree to keep RAT visable in the name and acronym of a Work Item, our understanding is such principle has been already followed in recent approved WID, e.g. Rel-18 package

8 – LG Electronics Inc.

One feature can be applied to different RATs, so we think it is useful to keep the RAT in the title.

9 – Ericsson LM

For pure RAT independent work it should be generally fine to not include the the RAT in the title. That said within RAN in almost all cases the work is not RAT independent and hence this is not so applicable to RAN WIs/SIs. Hence we foresee that we will have the Radio Technology in most titles due to that.

10 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

[Huawei, HiSilicon] we are aligned with NEC (and others)

11 – DENSO CORPORATION

Agree to keep RAT in the title, if needed.

12 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

yes we support the view that in RAN we continue to use these RAT references when and where appropriate.

13 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd

As the proposal says ”For items which are independent of the radio technology…” our understanding is that it will have little or no impact on RAN as all of our work is dependent on the radio technology. We understand that within RAN we will be free to use radio technology labels in the title. Consequently, this proposal could be left for SA/CT to discuss further.

Agree with DT comment that within RAN we should use the name of the radio technology (i.e, NR, LTE/E-UTRA) and not use ’4G’ or ’5G’. It would also be appropriate for RAN to use MR-DC in a WI title in case the covers both LTE/NR.

Also a more detail wording comment. In the phrase ”…radio technology (e.g. ”5G” or ”LTE“)…”, ”5G” should be replaced by ”NR” as this is the name of the radio technology.

14 – ZTE Corporation

RAT should be kept for RAN items whenever it is applicable. However, we may not need to mandate this for all RAN items since some items like Channel Modeling may be only relevant to frequency ranges e.g. ”Study on channel model for frequencies from 0.5 to 100 GHz”.

2.1.3 Enhancements

[1] states:

For enhancements of a Feature from a previous Release:

- *The Name shall be the one of the original Feature (the one being enhanced) followed by “Phase n” (avoid using “Enhancement/Improvement”; “Further enhancements”, then “Even further enhancements”, etc.)*
- *The Acronym shall be the one of the original Feature followed by “_Phn” (avoid using “e”; then “e2”, etc.)*
- *E.g. the first series of enhancements of NPN should be named “Non-Public Networks Phase 2”, Acronym: “NPN_Ph2”.*

[2] commented on this:

While we agree that calling Work Items ”Enhancements”, ”Further Enhancements”, ”Even Further Enhancements” etc. is not a particularly good convention, the ”Phase n” naming also does not seem to be that useful. It seems confusing that one could have a ”Phase 2” of Work Item X and a ”Phase 3” of Work Item Y in the same release...

Instead we propose to refer to the release. For example, we could talk about ”Non-Public Networks Rel-18”.

Feedback Form 3: To avoid ’enhancement’, ’further enhancement’ etc., how should 3GPP refer to such enhancements in next releases? By ”phase n”, by mentioning the release or do you have another proposal?

1 – NEC Europe Ltd

Instead of ”Phase n” naming, which may lead to having e.g. ”Phase 2” of Work Item X and ”Phase 3” of Work Item Y confusingly in the same release, we prefer to find another solution. For example, explicitly refer to the (targeted) release of a Work Item in its title.

2 – CATT

It is ok for us to add the release number. It is clearer than phase n.

3 – Deutsche Telekom AG

(see DT reply in 2.1.1) ...

We see the itention and agree with it, but ”Phase” might not be the right wording. Maybe Release number provides a better alterantive ...

4 – MediaTek Inc.

We would advise **against** adding the **Release#** to the title:

- Work items can slip out of a release
- an item may not necessarily be entirely specified within a given release e.g. RAN1/2/3 support in Rel-x, RAN4 support in Rel-x+1
- some items can be release independent
- etc.

Using Phase number is a better approach without the unfortunate consequences a Release# could have. That different items may be at different phases in the same release is just a natural consequence of these items not having originated from the same release. We don’t see that being particularly confusing.

5 – VODAFONE Group Plc

Support having the phase and not the release in the title. The phases (even for sidelink) will be at least 10 steps behind the release number (so no confusion) and they will give us an important reminder of how long we have been working on that topic and hence whether we should bother enhancing that thing again !

6 – TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.

Both phase and Rel number do not seem to be a good solution. It seems to me we are simply using different wording but not adding any clarity. It would be better to indicate key objectives (if possible) rather than enhancements, phase, Rel...

7 – Classon Consulting

(for FUTUREWEI) first release you may not know that there will be later phases. Agree with MTK that releases can skip

8 – LG Electronics Inc.

We agree that “enhancement”, “further enhancement”… this kind of naming should be avoided. However, we think both “phase n”, and “release n” may have problem, in that “phase n” is generally used within a WI (i.e. WI phase2, WI phase3), and “release n” may not be appropriate if a certain WI spans over different releases in different WGs. Maybe other candidates need to be considered, e.g. “version n”, “mark n”, “edition n”, etc.

9 – Ericsson LM

We think that the word Phase or similar words is a good proposal.

We would not like to see release being included in the title of SI or WI. That is due to if the topic is extended to the next release, the naming is no longer correct. Hence, we do not want to build it into the name directly when a specific topic finalizes.

10 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

[Huawei, HiSilicon] If we use "Release", in case a feature will "skip" (or "slip") a release , people will wonder if there is a problem in the workplan and go mad to try to find the missing item…which is in reality not missing.

We do not have problem with the phase naming.

11 – DENSO CORPORATION

Prefer to use phase or similar wording. Use of "Release" is not desirable as commented by MediaTek.

12 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

We are not supportive for using release in the title. Also the continued use and confusion around *"Enhancements", "Further Enhancements", "Even Further Enhancements" etc.* could do with some consistency but we are not too sure about how and when a terminology similar to "phase n" can be used. In basic sense it may be okay when enhancements in one release for one RAT follow on directly in another but if in subsequent releases if the scope and/or the RAT change then the title will generally change so confusion regarding the use and applicability of the "phase n" reference will occur.

This does not appear to be a straight forward choice as presented, and more consideration on this proposal should be taken.

13 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd

This needs some careful consideration. We can see potential benefits with the use of 'phase n' and also with the alternative suggestion to use 'Release n' in the title. For example, phase has the benefit to indicate the iteration of the evolution of some feature (e.g. is this the WI that introduces a feature, or is this the nth release of enhancements to it), whereas 'Release n' has the benefit to clearly indicate across multiple different WIs that the work was carried out at the same time. The comments from other companies also show that both approaches have pros and cons.

14 – ZTE Corporation

Agree that using "release" may create some confusion. "Phase n" seems to be a better wording.

2.1.4 Acronyms: General Guidance

[1] states:

Prefer an "easy to pronounce" acronym and, if possible, meaningful. It can be based on keyword(s) or part of them.

- *E.g.: for "Network Sharing", "NetShare" should be preferred to "NS";*

– *Acronyms such as "PPEPO" or "MCGWUE" should be avoided.*

The length of the acronym should be limited to 8 useful characters per level. Only letters (case insensitive), numbers and underline symbol ("_") are allowed. Hyphen "-" is not allowed, since this is a level separator.

Note: the rules on consistency and enhancements take precedence over this one, e.g. keep using the same acronym for an already existing Feature, even if "difficult to pronounce" and/or meaningless

Feedback Form 4: Do you have any comments on the guideline that acronyms should be pronouncable and meaningful?

1 – MediaTek Inc.

An acronym should be, by definition, pronounceable as a word. Having said that, there are important abbreviations that may not be pronounceable as a word but that should be usable in a 3GPP "acronym" e.g. IoT. So while unpronounceable abbreviations should be avoided, we don't think we should impose strict rules - other than avoiding using brands, trademarks etc.

2 – TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.

please avoid meaningless acronyms!!!

what the heck is *MCGWUE???*

SA has this bad habit to use incomprehensible acronyms. We should use meaningful terms which allow people to grasp what is done, without having to open the WID or the workplan...

3 – Classon Consulting

(for FUTUREWEI) don't care about pronounceable. NB-IoT is just fine.

4 – LG Electronics Inc.

Maybe useful, but we don't see the need to have strict rule.

5 – Ericsson LM

Of course, abbreviations should be pronounceable and meaningful. In addition, aspects related to inclusive/offensive language shall be considered.

6 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

[Huawei, HiSilicon] we are not against the guideline but we should accept exceptions where it is difficult to follow the guideline.

7 – DENSO CORPORATION

Incline to the view that abbreviations should be pronouceable and meaningful.

8 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software meaningful and useable in spoken forms is good practice. Not too sure how we ”police” what is pronounceable though as expressed above some initially perceived unpronounceable acronyms have been adopted into everyday parlance over time.
9 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd The proposal seems reasonable.
10 – ZTE Corporation Don’t think it has to be pronouncable.

2.1.5 Acronyms: Consistency

[1] states:

A group of letters commonly known for a topic shall not be used for a different meaning.

- *E.g. “LCS” shall not be used be for “Local Communication Service” since it already usually refers to “Location Services”.*

Whenever possible, it is recommended to reuse some same groups of letters for related Features.

- *E.g. MBMS should appear in the acronyms of all Features dealing with MBMS, e.g. “MBMSAPI_MCS” (for “MBMS APIs for MC Services”), but the acronym of “Support of Hybrid DASH/HLS over eMBMS” could have contained “MBMS”.*

This is only a “best effort” advise, not always possible to comply (e.g. because the length of the acronym is limited, or because many Features are inter-related to some degree). But when there is no specific problem, this guidance should be followed.

Feedback Form 5: Do you have any comment on ’consistency’ of acronyms?

1 – MediaTek Inc. Repurposing acronyms to other use is best avoided.
2 – VODAFONE Group Plc Using the same acronym/abbreviation for different things should be avoided.
3 – Classon Consulting (for FUTUREWEI) at least avoid within same WG

4 – LG Electronics Inc. We agree that using same acronym for different features should be avoided.
5 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd. [Huawei, HiSilicon] OK with the proposal
6 – DENSO CORPORATION Agree
7 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software agree same letters for different features should be avoided, at least for same TSG (or possibly wider)
8 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd The proposal seems like a reasonable ambition. However, we must acknowledge that already today in 3GPP we have overloaded acronyms with multiple meanings in common usage, and in most cases the intended meaning is clear from the context. This proposal should not prevent continued use of such acronyms even in WI titles. Given this, our interpretation of the intention behind this proposal would be 'do not invent a new acronym for use in a WI title that collides with an existing commonly used one'.
9 – ZTE Corporation Agree to keep the consistency and avoid duplicated use of the same/similar acroymns at least within RAN.

2.1.6 Study

[1] states:

Reminder: a "study" can results only in TR(s) (or CRs on TR). It cannot create any TS nor CR on TS.

For Studies, the Name shall begin with "Study on " and the Acronym shall begin with "FS_".

Later, when/if some normative work is derived from this study, the same root acronym should be used. E.g. "FS_NPN" should lead to "NPN"

[2] comments:

We agree that the name of SIs should always start with "Study on", and also that the acronym should start with "FS_". However, we think that we should be careful in mandating that the name of follow-up Work Items have to use the same root acronym. The reason is that in our experience, very often the follow-up Work Items only focus on specific aspects of the SI, or it was found during the SI that the original name (and thus the SI's acronym) was not very suitable. As a hypothetical example, one could think of the already mentioned "SAT" vs. "NTN". If the original SI was FS_SAT, and the follow-up WI actually includes HAPS, calling that follow-up WI "SAT" would not be accurate.

Feedback Form 6: Do you have any comments on the guidelines on naming studies? In particular, do you see any issues with mandating the use of the same acronym for Work Items as for the preceding Study Item?

1 – NEC Europe Ltd

We agree that the name of SIs should always start with ”Study on”, and also that the acronym should start with ”FS_”. But we think it is not good to mandate that a follow-up WI shall use the same acronym as the preceding SI, because the follow-up WI may cover only limited parts of the preceding SI and because it may have become clear that the old title and acronym were not really suitable (e.g. ”SAT” would not be suitable for the follow-up WI of ”FS_SAT” if it also covers HAPS). In addition, an SI may lead to several different WIs, which sometimes are very specific and not necessarily closely related to the original study.

2 – Deutsche Telekom AG

We think ”Study on ...” is good

3 – CATT

We also agree to use ”Study on...” for the SI title and ”FS_” for the acronym. For the following WI, the title can be rediscussed and renamed if needed.

4 – MediaTek Inc.

”Study on blah blah blah...” and ”FS_BLAH” are good. Using ”BLAH” for the feature is preferable, but can be discussed later..

5 – Classon Consulting

(for FUTUREWEI) Study on is ok. WI can change if makes sense.

6 – LG Electronics Inc.

We agree to use “Study on” for SIs. But, WI name may be changed from SI name for some reasons, and it is not necessary to mandate the use of same acronym. It should be a best-effort.

7 – Ericsson LM

We note that MCC uses the word should and not shall in their proposal and we take this as a recommendation on what should be used rather than a hard rule. Hence, there is some flexibility built into their proposal. We presume we can apply some common sense when assigning acronyms to follow-up WI based on previously SI. Assuming that is the case we are fine with the proposal in [1].

8 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

[Huawei, HiSilicon] we do not have a problem with the general guideline.

NEC has a point whenever there is a clear change of scope, so this can be discussed case by case if needed. So we agree with Ericsson and similar views.

9 – DENSO CORPORATION

Agree

10 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software Agree that the name of SIs should always start with ”Study on”, and that the acronym should start with ”FS_”. And where appropriate at time of WI naming the consistency should be considered at that time but on a case by case basis, guideline or rules seem unnecessary.
11 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd ”Study on ” and ”FS_” seem reasonable and in most cases I think we already do this today. For the reuse of the SI name/acronym within the follow on WI, I think we need to have some flexibility. The scope of a follow on WI might be different (e.g. narrower) from the scope of the SI. It more important for the WI name/acronym to be appropriate to the scope of the work than for it to follow the SI name/acronym.
12 – ZTE Corporation Most of the cases we should use the same acronym for work items as for the preceding study items but this may not be mandatory. Sometimes it may not be appropriate because work item may cover only subset of the scope of the preceding study item. In this case, change on acronym may be needed.

2.1.7 ”New WID on”

[1] states:

The WID Name shall NOT start by “New WID/SID on” nor “Updated WID/SID on”

Note that this is acceptable in the tdoc title, but not in the WID title

Feedback Form 7: Do you have any comment on the guidance that the title of a Work Item should not contain phrases like ”New WID on” or ”Updated WID on”?

1 – NEC Europe Ltd We agree that the title of a WI should not contain such phrases.
2 – Deutsche Telekom AG DT disagrees ... we should keep the principle currently used.
3 – MediaTek Inc. New WID / Updated WID in TDoc title is ok. Not so in the WID title.
4 – VODAFONE Group Plc Agree with MediaTek and NEC.
5 – LG Electronics Inc. Agree.

6 – Ericsson LM Agree that the WID name should not contain ”New WID on” or ”Updated WID on”, we do see as pointed out in [1] that contribution title containing the WID can contain the word new or updated.
7 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd. [Huawei, HiSilicon] OK with the new guideline. Anyway we should always refer to the latest approved version and after the first update all the following will be updates, so not much meaning in the use of ”New” and even less useful (if not confusing) is the use of ”Updated”.
8 – DENSO CORPORATION Agree with NEC and MediaTek.
9 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd The proposal seems reasonable, and in most cases I think we already do this today.
10 – ZTE Corporation OK with this guideline.

2.1.8 ”Structured Feature”

[1] states:

Differentiating a new Feature from components of an existing Feature

- *A key concept is to clarify whether what is proposed in a new WID is something “brand new” in this Release (a new Feature) - or if it is a specific component of an existing Feature in this Release*

When creating a new Feature:

- *Its name shall be usable by other WGs.*
- *E.g. do not introduce a new Feature called ”Service Requirements for …” or “Architecture for …”*
- *Remember that, if the new Feature is an enhancement of a Feature from a previous Release, the guidance on “Phase” applies*

When contributing to an existing Feature (i.e. creating a component)

- *e.g. “Non-Public Network /NPN was started in SA1, now SA2 presents the WID for the Stage 2 component.*
- *In this case, for the WID of the contributing group:*

- *The Name shall contain the name of the existing Feature, preferably also explaining which specific component is being introduced, e.g. "Stage 2 of Non-Public Network".*
- *The Acronym shall be exactly the one of the existing Feature. In the above example: it shall be "NPN" (and not "NPN_St2", nor "NPN_Arc", etc).*
    - *Indeed, the component is already specified in the name, and can be deducted by the group (SA1=service; SA2=architecture; SA3=security; etc.). Repeating this component yet again in the acronym would uselessly add complexity and waste a limited resource.*
    - *Exception: in RAN, the use of the suffixes "-Core/-Perf/-UEConTest" in the acronyms remain allowed.*
- *This is valid also for cross-TSG features. E.g. RAN should have used "Sat" to define the RAN components of what is called "Sat" in SA/CT - or conversely, SA/CT should have used "NTN" (instead of having two acronyms, "NTN" and "Sat", for what are mostly different components of a same Feature)*

– *Note that when a group introduces a new Feature, it actually means that it is introducing both the Feature and one of its components (e.g. "NPN", if introduced by SA1 , actually means that the "NPN" Feature is created as well as its "Stage 1 of NPN" component). The Work Plan Manager will rectify this by creating 2 lines in the Work Plan (one for the Feature and one for the component).*

[2] commented:

Although we understand that it is just an example, we would like to point out that "NTN" is not equivalent to "satellite"... Sure, non-terrestrial networks include satellite networks, but also e.g. .High Altitude Platform Systems (HAPS) and air-to-ground networks. Therefore, for the example given in [1] it would not have been correct to say that "Solutions for NR for NTN" was equivalent to "NR aspects of SAT".

"Core part" and "Perf. part"

The naming convention "Core part:" and "Perf. part:" was established in RAN a long time ago, and we believe it is good to continue starting the name of a WID with them.

Therefore, still referring to the "SAT" example, we propose to use a formulation like "Core part: NR aspects of SAT" and "Perf. part: NR aspects of SAT", instead of "NR core aspects of SAT" and "NR performance aspects of SAT".

Feedback Form 8: Do you have any comments on the guidelines for a "Structured Feature"?

1 – Classon Consulting (for FUTUREWEI) best effort if it makes sense
2 – Ericsson LM If the intention of the proposal is to align the naming of items across TSGs, we agree. However, we would like to point out that a feature in SA and RAN maybe different in nature but still be connected to each other. Therefore, it may not be possible to put it under the exact same naming umbrella. From our point of view,

we would need to apply common sense when doing this. In practice it may be difficult to achieve as the scope and timing of the items within SA and RAN may differ.

3 – Ericsson LM

Agree that we should keep Core/-Perf/-UEConTest, but we further believe that is the intention of [1]. If not we would like MCC to clarify that.

4 – DENSO CORPORATION

Agree with Ericsson, especially for the case that functionalities may be different between SA and RAN.

5 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

support Ericsson, nice to have but reality may prove difficult especially across TSGs.

6 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd

This seems like a reasonable ambition. However, we think that some flexibility is still be needed. Similar to the comment in 2.1.6, it more important for the SI/WI name/acronym to be appropriate to the scope of the work than for it is to blindly follow some conventions. As an example, within RAN it may be more appropriate to use 'sidelink' in the item naming, rather than refer to system level features such as V2X or ProSe even though there may be a clear relation between the RAN and SA/CT parts of the work.

We support the continued use of core and performance parts.

7 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

[Huawei, HiSilicon] We observed that "*a Feature and all its components shall be within a same Release*" is not always true.

Feedback Form 9: Regarding the RAN convention on core/performance: Do you prefer the current "Core part: NR aspects of..." and "Perf. part: NR aspects of...", or the proposal "NR core aspects of..." and "NR performance aspects of..."?

1 – NEC Europe Ltd

We prefer to keep the current convention in RAN: "Core part:" and "Perf. part:"

2 – MediaTek Inc.

Keep

3 – TELECOM ITALIA S.p.A.

keep

4 – Classon Consulting

(for FUTUREWEI) keep current convention

5 – LG Electronics Inc. We prefer to keep current convention ”Core part: NR aspects of...” and ”Perf. part: NR aspects of...”.
6 – Ericsson LM Agree that we should keep Core/-Perf/-UEConTest, but we further believe that is the intention of [1]. If not we would like MCC to clarify that.
7 – DENSO CORPORATION Agree
8 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software yes, please keep current convention in RAN
9 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd We support the continued use of core and performance parts.
10 – ZTE Corporation Agree to keep the current convention in RAN

2.2 Summary after Initial round

Simplicity

A common point in most responses is that it is important that a title is meaningful and to the point, but that the guidance on ’generic’ wording is not really helpful, and that we should rely instead on review from other companies to improve titles (before approval). Further comments were made that good objectives and content in general are more important than the title.

Conclusion 2.2.1: Instead of a rule on ’generic’ wording, the guidance should be that WI titles should be meaningful and to the point. To ensure sufficient quality, titles should be reviewed as part of the overall WI review process before approval.

Generation

Companies all agree that for RAN WIs it is essential that reference can be made to the RAT (NR, LTE/E-UTRA etc., not ”5G”, ”4G”). Therefore, CT and SA should review if this proposal makes sense in those TSGs.

Conclusion 2.2.2: For RAN work, it is essential to refer to the RAT (NR, LTE/E-UTRA etc., not ”5G”, ”4G”) for most WIs, and RAN will continue to do so. Therefore, CT and SA should review if this proposal makes sense in those TSGs.

Enhancements

Companies agree that it is not good to have ”Enhancements”, ”Further enhancements”, ”Even further enhancements” etc. However, views are split regarding the solution.

- ”Phase n”
    - Advantages: (1) It is clear if the feature is new or an enhancement, and also how many times it has been enhanced; (2) Avoid ”Release” disadvantages.
    - Disadvantages: (1) ”Phase” is currently also used within WIs; (2) For a new feature, it is unknown if there will be a Phase 2; (3) Feature A ”Phase 2” may be in the same release as Feature B ”Phase 3”, causing confusion; (4) When the scope changes in later releases, it is not straightforward to call it ”Phase n” any longer.
- Mentioning the release in the title
    - Advantage: (1) Avoid ”Phase n” disadvantages.
    - Disadvantages: (1) If the next enhancement is not in the next release (e.g. Rel-14, then Rel-16), people may search in vain for Rel-15 enhancements; (2) Features sometimes are moved to the next release.

A majority of companies prefers ”Phase” over mentioning the release, but many companies also expressed reservations/doubts on both solutions and propose (or at least hint) that we should consider this whole issue longer and possibly find a different solution. Also, if ”Phase” is chosen, ”Phase” is currently also used within WIs, and therefore another more neutral term should be considered. Initial proposals include ”version”, ”mark”, ”edition”.

Conclusion 2.2.3: The use of ”Phase” has several disadvantages: (1) ”Phase” is currently also used within WIs; (2) For a new feature, it is unknown if there will be a Phase 2; (3) Feature A ”Phase 2” may be in the same release as Feature B ”Phase 3”, causing confusion; (4) When the scope changes in later releases, it is not straightforward to call it ”Phase n” any longer. In conclusion, RAN requests that 3GPP takes more time to consider different, better solutions.

Acronyms: General Guidance

A majority of companies thinks it is useful if an acronym is pronounceable and meaningful, but that this cannot be a strict rule. Also, some acronyms (e.g. NB-IoT) that originally were considered unpronounceable have become everyday words over time.

Conclusion 2.2.4: It is useful if an acronym is pronounceable and meaningful, but there is no need for a strict rule.

Acronyms: Consistency

Companies agree that (common) acronyms should not be used for different things in future, but there can be exceptions where the meaning is clear from the context.

Conclusion 2.2.5: Acronyms should in principle not be reused with a different meaning, although there may be occasional exceptions where the meaning is clear from the context.

Study

Companies agree to use ”Study on” as title and ”FS_” as acronym for Study Items. However, a majority of companies also thinks that there has to be flexibility in the name and acronym of ’follow-up’ Work Items. Keeping a link with the preceding SI is one consideration, but it is more important that the name and acronym

match the content of the WI. Examples include situations where the scope of the WI differs from the SI (narrower or wider), improved understanding of the topic means that the old name/acronym are not suitable any longer, etc.

Conclusion 2.2.6: Using ”Study on” and ”FS_” for Study Items’ names and acronyms is appropriate. However, the name and acronym of follow-up WIs need to be considered carefully, because the WI scope may differ from the SI, improved understanding of the topic may render the old name/acronym unsuitable, etc.

”New WID on”

Almost all companies agree that we should not use ”New/Updated WID on” in the title of the WI itself, but that it is good practice to use this in Tdoc titles.

Conclusion 2.2.7: We should not use ”New/Updated WID on” in the title of the WI itself, but it is good practice to use this in Tdoc titles.

”Structured Feature”

On the general point of aligning names between TSGs, companies agree to try such alignment, but think that in practice it may be difficult to achieve, due to differing timelines between TSGs and different actual content even within the same general feature. As an example, ”sidelink” is more appropriate to use within RAN than a system level feature such as ”V2X” or ”ProSe”, even though there is a relation. As indicated under conclusion 2.2.1, it is more important to ensure that WI titles are meaningful and to the point.

Conclusion 2.2.8a: It is good to try aligning names between TSGs, but in practice it may be difficult to achieve, due to differing timelines between TSGs and different actual content. It is more important to ensure that WI titles are meaningful and to the point.

On the specific point of naming convention for core/perf. WIs, almost all companies prefer to keep the current convention ”Core part: NR aspects of...” and ”Perf. part: NR aspects of...” instead of the proposed convention ”NR core aspects of...” and ”NR performance aspects of...”

Conclusion 2.2.8b: Companies clearly prefer the current convention ”Core part: NR aspects of...” and ”Perf. part: NR aspects of...” instead of the proposed convention ”NR core aspects of...” and ”NR performance aspects of...” and plan to continue using the current convention.

3 Intermediate round

3.1 Discussion

3.1.1 Simplicity

Conclusion 2.2.1: Instead of a rule on ’generic’ wording, the guidance should be that WI titles should be meaningful and to the point. To ensure sufficient quality, titles should be reviewed as part of the overall WI review process before approval.

Feedback Form 10: Is conclusion 2.2.1 agreeable?

1 – Classon Consulting [for FUTUREWEI] Yes
2 – MediaTek Inc. Yes
3 – Ericsson LM Ok
4 – VODAFONE Group Plc ok
5 – CATT Ok.
6 – Panasonic Corporation Agreed.
7 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Yes
8 – Nokia Corporation This is fine
9 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software yes
10 – ZTE Corporation OK
11 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd. [Huawei, HiSilicon] OK

3.1.2 Generation

Conclusion 2.2.2: For RAN work, it is essential to refer to the RAT (NR, LTE/E-UTRA etc., not "5G", "4G") for most WIs, and RAN will continue to do so. Therefore, CT and SA should review if this proposal makes sense in those TSGs.

Feedback Form 11: Is conclusion 2.2.2 agreeable?

1 – Classon Consulting

[for FUTUREWEI] Yes

2 – MediaTek Inc.

Yes

3 – Ericsson LM

In our understanding the MCC proposal allows what is now proposed. The original proposal just said that for items that are independent of the radio technology... which is then not the case for most WI and SI in RAN. So we are a bit confused about what are aiming for exactly.

Further ZTE brought up one example of a RAT independent item in RAN, i.e. the topic of channel model. We presume that we still do not mandate the use of a RAT in the name of a SI/WI. That said we do understand that this is a rather rare example and in almost all othercases the SI or WI will be RAT dependent. The point being is that there are still cases that are RAT independent within RAN and that should still be possible todo. Hence the text provided by MCC is fine in that sense, i.e. ”For items which are independent of the radio technology (e.g. ”5G” or ”LTE“), the radio technology should be avoided in the Name and in the Acronym.”

4 – VODAFONE Group Plc

Yes (and SA/CT should be similarly clear as to whether their work applies to 5GS, EPS, etc)

5 – ETSI

clarification: RP-220065 is a proposal from the workplan coordinator; we had MCC internal discussions about whether to submit the Tdoc to TSGs because it was written with main focus on CT/SA and it was ignoring some important RAN aspects: e.g. while CT/SA WIs are often RAT agnostic, it is important for RAN to clarify if a WI is RAT specific (of course this does not forbid RAN to consider also any RAT agnostic WI) and MCC RAN support took care in the recent past that the considered RAT is clear from the WID title.

As it includes a number of aspects also applicable to TSG RAN it was submitted to TSG RAN #95e (but yes some danger of causing confusion was expected)

6 – CATT

We agree with ”For items which are **independent of** the radio technology (e.g. ”5G” or ”LTE“), the radio technology should be avoided in the Name and in the Acronym.” And we also agree with current conclusion.

7 – Panasonic Corporation

Agreed.

8 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd

Yes, agree conclusion, and if RAN has occasional RAT agnostic WIs then it will not be necessary to include a RAT in the title of these (the conclusion says ’most’, so this flexibility is provided).

9 – ZTE Corporation

On top of this conclusion, we agree with the comments from Ericsson and CATT that it is better to clarify for items which are independent of the radio technology.

10 – Nokia Corporation

Conclusions are OK, while also agree that if we end up doing some features that would be indepent of the radio technology, then of course we would need to follow this. Still if we have for example 5 objectives which are NR related and then one objective would be valid also for LTE, one could still very well have the ”NR” there as that the main intention.

11 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

We support the conclusion, and on the occasion of RAN RAT independent WI/SIs then we could consider that no RAT be mentioned, (unless this creates more confusion regarding applicability to legacy RAT, but we think this is less likely)

12 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

[Huawei, HiSilicon] Ok

3.1.3 Enhancements

Conclusion 2.2.3: The use of ”Phase” has several disadvantages: (1) ”Phase” is currently also used within WIs; (2) For a new feature, it is unknown if there will be a Phase 2; (3) Feature A ”Phase 2” may be in the same release as Feature B ”Phase 3”, causing confusion; (4) When the scope changes in later releases, it is not straightforward to call it ”Phase n” any longer. In conclusion, RAN requests that 3GPP takes more time to consider different, better solutions.

Feedback Form 12: Is conclusion 2.2.3 agreeable?

1 – Classon Consulting

[for FUTUREWEI] Yes

2 – MediaTek Inc.

OK with more time. However, we would like to note that there were quite many concerns expressed against using ”Release#” and this should be reflected in the conclusion. Similarly, we have seen quite some support for using ”Phase#” (alongside some concerns). Anyway this can be discussed later.

3 – Ericsson LM

We can take some more time, but we also worried that it will be difficult to converge.

That said we have quite strong concern using the word release in the WID/SID titles and hence do not want to see that. We can discuss to use another word than Phase, but which has the same intent so to say.

4 – VODAFONE Group Plc

OK to take more time, but Release is not the correct answer and phase seems OK.

5 – ETSI

clarification: It is forbidden to indicate the REL in WI titles and esp. acronyms because a WI may have to be shifted to the next REL and e.g. a REL-10 WI with REL-9 in the acronym causes more confusion than it helps (exception: where we intentionally add a REL are basket WI because they can never be shifted to the next REL; only elements of the basket can be taken out);

regarding phases: phase x was rather intended as replacement of enh., further enh., even further enh.; for RAN WIs we also nowadays numbered the enh. in the acronym like enh2;

regarding the usage of phases within one WI: yes, this is possible but be careful to not misuse this (e.g. a study phase should rather be a separate SI; and different WI phases are not a means to complete part of the WI via CRs at an early stage because CRs have to be brought to the end of the WI so if separate approvals are needed better create 2 WIs: an early one and a later one but keep in mind that early spec introductions in a REL cause problems)

6 – CATT

Ok to take more time. It seems both phase n and release m are not pretty good for most companies. Perhaps we can consider main code + a specific acronym (which is typical key word for the new function/enhancement/optimization) as the WIC for this WI. And the typical key word(s) is also shown in the title of WI. But I'm not sure if this can be done for all WIs. Perhaps we can check and make the decision case by case.

7 – Panasonic Corporation

OK

8 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd

Yes, conclusion to take more time to consider this is ok.

9 – ZTE Corporation

OK to take more time.

10 – Nokia Corporation

We also see that using Release in the WI/SI title should be avoided, for the reasons given by ETSI. More time thus would be good for this apect

11 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software

Yes support the conclusion. Definitely support not using Release (which is not useable today) but alternative terminology such as "edition", "iteration" or even enh2, enh3 could be possible. We just consider a marker which increments when an existing feature is modified/enhanced.

12 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd.

[Huawei, HiSilicon] OK to take more time to think but as expressed by many companies maybe we can already eliminate the option of "Release", while keeping "Phase" still on the table (as well as new possible options)

3.1.4 Acronyms: General Guidance

Conclusion 2.2.4: It is useful if an acronym is pronounceable and meaningful, but there is no need for a strict rule.

Feedback Form 13: Is conclusion 2.2.4 agreeable?

1 – Classon Consulting [for FUTUREWEI] Yes
2 – MediaTek Inc. Yes
3 – Ericsson LM No strong view, but was then not the original proposal in [1] okay. We presume further that the limitation on length and only letters are due to the database MCC is operating and hence we cannot change that. Correct?
4 – CATT Yes.
5 – Panasonic Corporation Agreed.
6 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Yes
7 – ZTE Corporation We don't think this conclusion is necessary especially for the part "pronounceable". There were many examples in the past which are not "pronounceable" like NB-IoT, eMTC, URLLC, NTN, RRM, MBS, DC which are all fine. It could be misleading if we make this conclusion saying that it is useful to make acronym pronounceable. Although this is not a strict rule, people may tend to follow this guideline and make acronyms "artificially" pronounceable in the future.
8 – Nokia Corporation Conclusions is OK
9 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software yes
10 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd. [Huawei, HiSilicon] generally OK, but it needs to be decided case by case as usual

3.1.5 Acronyms: Consistency

Conclusion 2.2.5: Acronyms should in principle not be reused with a different meaning, although there may be occasional exceptions where the meaning is clear from the context.

Feedback Form 14: Is conclusion 2.2.5 agreeable?

1 – Classon Consulting [for FUTUREWEI] Yes
2 – MediaTek Inc. OK
3 – Ericsson LM Yet again looking at the original proposal in [1], that should be fine given what is proposed here now. As this given more detailed instructions but has the same meaning.
4 – VODAFONE Group Plc yes
5 – CATT Yes.
6 – Panasonic Corporation Yes.
7 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Yes. Just to be clear this discussion is about WI and SI acronyms. The conclusion should not be interpreted to have any broader implications on use of acronyms.
8 – ZTE Corporation OK
9 – Nokia Corporation Yes
10 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software yes
11 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd. [Huawei, HiSilicon] OK

3.1.6 Study

Conclusion 2.2.6: Using ”Study on” and ”FS_” for Study Items’ names and acronyms is appropriate. However, the name and acronym of follow-up WIs need to be considered carefully, because the WI scope may differ from the SI, improved understanding of the topic may render the old name/acronym unsuitable, etc.

Feedback Form 15: Is conclusion 2.2.6 agreeable?

1 – Classon Consulting [for FUTUREWEI] Yes
2 – MediaTek Inc. Yes
3 – Ericsson LM Yet again looking at the original proposal in [1], the original proposal shall be fine given the proposal here as it is allowed from it. Note that in [1] the word should is used and that is a recommendation and nothing that is mandating anything. The original wording in [1] provides more context and explanation and is hence preferred.
4 – VODAFONE Group Plc ok (might be ”study of” rather than always ”study on...”)
5 – ETSI clarification: normally it is better to think about the scope of the work before starting the SI, so that the WI scope has either the same scope or it is a subset; the benefit is that it can be easily identified which SI led to which WI; if you start multiple SIs and then mix topics of multiple SIs in a WI and give them different titles/acronyms it will be almost impossible to document their linking in the workplan; and when we had cases of modified WI scope in RAN in the past, we took care the SI acronym and WI acronym were rather similar to still guess their linking (so common sense was applied)
6 – CATT Yes.
7 – Panasonic Corporation OK
8 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Yes
9 – ZTE Corporation OK

10 – Nokia Corporation OK
11 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software yes
12 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd. [Huawei, HiSilicon] OK

3.1.7 ”New WID on”

Conclusion 2.2.7: We should not use ”New/Updated WID on” in the title of the WI itself, but it is good practice to use this in Tdoc titles.

Feedback Form 16: Is conclusion 2.2.7 agreeable?

1 – Classon Consulting [for FUTUREWEI] Yes
2 – MediaTek Inc. Yes
3 – Ericsson LM Ok
4 – VODAFONE Group Plc yes
5 – CATT Yes.
6 – Panasonic Corporation yes.
7 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Yes
8 – ZTE Corporation OK

9 – Nokia Corporation Yes
10 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software Naturally, yes
11 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd. [Huawei, HiSilicon] OK

3.1.8 ”Structured Feature”

Conclusion 2.2.8a: It is good to try aligning names between TSGs, but in practice it may be difficult to achieve, due to differing timelines between TSGs and different actual content. It is more important to ensure that WI titles are meaningful and to the point.

Feedback Form 17: Is conclusion 2.2.8a agreeable?

1 – Classon Consulting [for FUTUREWEI] Yes
2 – Ericsson LM We agree with the statement as such. However the original proposal in [1] allowed this in our understanding since it uses the word should for aspects across TSGs. Maybe we should use the text from [1] as a starting point and add the text above in some minor edited format to the proposal in [1]. The proposal in [1] uses the word Phase that is most likely then not agreeable given the discussion above. Hence it needs to modified in some way taking that into account.
3 – ETSI clarification: It was clarified to the workplan coordinator in MCC internal discussion that the inroduction of -Core/Perf and -UEConTest had and have important reasons for the TSG RAN work and also the workplan (that’s why an exception statement got added on slide 8): - Core/Perf: before their introduction it was extremely difficult to check at the REL-freeze whether RAN4 work is completed or not; RAN has clear rules on how to handle them and in contrast to CT/SA which have rather WIs per WG, the RAN WIs are a coordinated activity of all involved RAN WGs - UEConTest: with that approach it is guaranteed that we can easily identify from the workplan which Testing WI belongs to which Core part WI (i.e. which feature can be tested); furthermore it allows RAN5 to have a working approach that is independent of the REL-schedule but at the same time to link the results to the REL of the Core part feature Regarding structure of WIs in the inter-TSG case: Whenever a link to an SA/CT umbrella WI was indicated

in a WID, it was taken care that the RAN WI was put under this umbrella (but of course parallel WI approvals in all TSGs like for REL-18 put limits to this approach).
4 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Yes
5 – ZTE Corporation OK
6 – Nokia Corporation Yes
7 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software ok
8 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd. [Huawei, HiSilicon] OK

Conclusion 2.2.8b: Companies clearly prefer the current convention "Core part: NR aspects of..." and "Perf. part: NR aspects of..." instead of the proposed convention "NR core aspects of..." and "NR performance aspects of..." and plan to continue using the current convention.

Feedback Form 18: Is conclusion 2.2.8b agreeable?

1 – Classon Consulting [for FUTUREWEI] Yes
2 – MediaTek Inc. Yes
3 – Ericsson LM That is fine, we think we can use the approach highlighted above slightly just editing the original proposal in [1]
4 – CATT Yes.
5 – Intel Corporation (UK) Ltd Yes

6 – ZTE Corporation OK
7 – Nokia Corporation Yes
8 – Beijing Xiaomi Mobile Software yes
9 – HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES Co. Ltd. [Huawei, HiSilicon]

3.2 Summary after Intermediate round

3.2.1 Summary

Conclusions 2.2.1, 2.2.5, 2.2.6, 2.2.7 and 2.2.8b were supported by all or a very large majority of companies and can be adopted unchanged.

On conclusion 2.2.2, the main feedback was that RAT may also have RAT-agnostic WIs. The conclusion is therefore refined as follows:

For RAN work, it is essential to refer to the RAT (NR, LTE/E-UTRA etc., not "5G", "4G") for most WIs, and RAN will continue to do so, except for RAT-agnostic WIs. Therefore, CT and SA should review if this proposal makes sense in those TSGs.

On conclusion 2.2.3, the moderator's intention was not to mention the release proposal at all, because it was not supported much, and therefore it did not appear in the conclusion, but it seems that many companies did not interpret it that way. It is clear that "release" is not an option, while many companies agree that "Phase" also has issues.

The use of "Phase" has several disadvantages: (1) "Phase" is currently also used and *within WIs; (2) For a new feature, it is unknown if there will be a Phase 2; (3) Feature A "Phase 2" may be in the same release as Feature B "Phase 3", causing confusion; (4) When the scope changes in later releases, it is not straightforward to call it "Phase n" any longer. In conclusion, RAN requests that 3GPP takes more time to consider different, better solutions, while keeping "Phase" on the table. It was already discussed whether referring to the release would be an alternative solution, but a majority of companies felt that this was not a good solution, and is currently also forbidden by the rules.*

On conclusion 2.2.4, most companies are fine, although there is some concern about "pronounceable". Perhaps we can mitigate this by adding the following:

It is useful if an acronym is pronounceable and meaningful, but there is no need for a strict rule. RAN has many examples of successful acronyms that might originally have been considered unpronounceable but are now commonly used.

Finally, on conclusion 2.2.8a, taking MCC's feedback into account, it is important to stress that RAN will continue to use the structuring, not only the names, and for clarity also include the UEConTest part:

RAN will continue to use the -Core/-Perf/-UEConTest building blocks and corresponding WI title naming conventions and acronyms. It is good to try aligning names between TSGs, but in practice it may be difficult to achieve, due to differing timelines between TSGs and different actual content. It is more important to ensure that WI titles are meaningful and to the point.

Responding to Ericsson's points: we learned from the MCC feedback that the target of the MCC document was mostly SA/CT, and that it was submitted to RAN only because 'some' aspects also are relevant to RAN. Therefore it is better to say explicitly how RAN intends to work with the guidelines in RP-220065. The moderator intends to reflect this by starting the conclusion with:

"RAN has reviewed RP-220065, and plans to work with the guidelines taking into account the following considerations.".

Responding to Intel's comment on acronyms: The moderator agrees that this is not about acronyms in general. The scope of this discussion is limited to WI/SI acronyms.

This leads to the following conclusion.

3.2.2 Conclusion

Moderator proposes this conclusion to be given as feedback, either as LS or as part of the RAN Chair report to SA.

RAN has reviewed RP-220065, and plans to work with the guidelines taking into account the following considerations.

Simplicity

Instead of a rule on 'generic' wording, the guidance should be that WI titles should be meaningful and to the point. To ensure sufficient quality, titles should be reviewed as part of the overall WI review process before approval.

Generation

For RAN work, it is essential to refer to the RAT (NR, LTE/E-UTRA etc., not "5G", "4G") for most WIs, and RAN will continue to do so, except for RAT-agnostic WIs. Therefore, CT and SA should review if this proposal makes sense in those TSGs.

Enhancements

The use of "Phase" has several disadvantages: (1) "Phase" is currently also used within WIs; (2) For a new feature, it is unknown if there will be a Phase 2; (3) Feature A "Phase 2" may be in the same release as Feature B "Phase 3", causing confusion; (4) When the scope changes in later releases, it is not straightforward to call it "Phase n" any longer. In conclusion, RAN requests that 3GPP takes more time to consider different, better solutions, while keeping "Phase" on the table. It was already discussed whether referring to the release would be an alternative solution, but a majority of companies felt that this was not a good solution, and is currently also forbidden by the rules.

Acronyms: General Guidance

It is useful if an acronym is pronounceable and meaningful, but there is no need for a strict rule. RAN has many examples of successful acronyms that might originally have been considered unpronounceable but are now commonly used.

Acronyms: Consistency

Acronyms should in principle not be reused with a different meaning, although there may be occasional exceptions where the meaning is clear from the context.

Study

Using ”Study on” and ”FS_” for Study Items’ names and acronyms is appropriate. However, the name and acronym of follow-up WIs need to be considered carefully, because the WI scope may differ from the SI, improved understanding of the topic may render the old name/acronym unsuitable, etc.

”New WID on”

We should not use ”New/Updated WID on” in the title of the WI itself, but it is good practice to use this in Tdoc titles.

”Structured Feature”

RAN will continue to use the -Core/-Perf/-UEConTest building blocks and corresponding WI title naming conventions and acronyms. It is good to try aligning names between TSGs, but in practice it may be difficult to achieve, due to differing timelines between TSGs and different actual content. It is more important to ensure that WI titles are meaningful and to the point.

Companies clearly prefer the current convention ”Core part: NR aspects of...” and ”Perf. part: NR aspects of...” instead of the proposed convention ”NR core aspects of...” and ”NR performance aspects of...” and plan to continue using the current convention.

4 Final round

4.1 Discussion

The moderator believes that the conclusion in 3.2 reflects the outcome of the discussion so far. For the final round, if there any serious problems, they can be brought up with the following feedback form:

Feedback Form 19: Do you see any serious problem with this conclusion? (Please only comment if you cannot live with the conclusion).

4.2 Summary after Final round

All companies could live with the conclusion of the intermediate round, so the overall conclusion is the same as that of the intermediate round.

5 Overall summary/conclusion

Moderator proposes this conclusion to be given as feedback, either as LS or as part of the RAN Chair report to SA.

RAN has reviewed RP-220065, and plans to work with the guidelines taking into account the following considerations.

Simplicity

Instead of a rule on 'generic' wording, the guidance should be that WI titles should be meaningful and to the point. To ensure sufficient quality, titles should be reviewed as part of the overall WI review process before approval.

Generation

For RAN work, it is essential to refer to the RAT (NR, LTE/E-UTRA etc., not "5G", "4G") for most WIs, and RAN will continue to do so, except for RAT-agnostic WIs. Therefore, CT and SA should review if this proposal makes sense in those TSGs.

Enhancements

The use of "Phase" has several disadvantages: (1) "Phase" is currently also used within WIs; (2) For a new feature, it is unknown if there will be a Phase 2; (3) Feature A "Phase 2" may be in the same release as Feature B "Phase 3", causing confusion; (4) When the scope changes in later releases, it is not straightforward to call it "Phase n" any longer. In conclusion, RAN requests that 3GPP takes more time to consider different, better solutions, while keeping "Phase" on the table. It was already discussed whether referring to the release would be an alternative solution, but a majority of companies felt that this was not a good solution, and is currently also forbidden by the rules.

Acronyms: General Guidance

It is useful if an acronym is pronounceable and meaningful, but there is no need for a strict rule. RAN has many examples of successful acronyms that might originally have been considered unpronounceable but are now commonly used.

Acronyms: Consistency

Acronyms should in principle not be reused with a different meaning, although there may be occasional

exceptions where the meaning is clear from the context.

Study

Using ”Study on” and ”FS_” for Study Items’ names and acronyms is appropriate. However, the name and acronym of follow-up WIs need to be considered carefully, because the WI scope may differ from the SI, improved understanding of the topic may render the old name/acronym unsuitable, etc.

”New WID on”

We should not use ”New/Updated WID on” in the title of the WI itself, but it is good practice to use this in Tdoc titles.

”Structured Feature”

RAN will continue to use the -Core/-Perf/-UEConTest building blocks and corresponding WI title naming conventions and acronyms. It is good to try aligning names between TSGs, but in practice it may be difficult to achieve, due to differing timelines between TSGs and different actual content. It is more important to ensure that WI titles are meaningful and to the point.

Companies clearly prefer the current convention ”Core part: NR aspects of...” and ”Perf. part: NR aspects of...” instead of the proposed convention ”NR core aspects of...” and ”NR performance aspects of...” and plan to continue using the current convention.

6 References

[1] RP-220065 Guidelines on WIDs names and acronyms (3GPP Work Plan coordinator)

[2] RP-220441 Comments on Guidelines on WIDs names and acronyms (NEC)

I