3GPP TSG SA #66
December 2014, Hawaii, USA

SP-140768

Proposal for SA2 time planning

QUALCOMM®

Problem Statement

- In the last few releases SA2 consistently approved more WIDs/SIDs that it could handle

- This situation was usually addressed via one or more “prioritisation sessions” in SA plenary where certain WIDs/SIDs were stopped and others were scoped down
- An alternative proposal (SP-140416 /SP-140667) was submitted from SA2 chairman which aims to create a “ranking order” of all the approved WIDs/SIDs of SA2 and time to be distributed based on the ranking order

- Both these approaches present the significant disadvantage that several WIDs/SIDs started and then were eventually deprioritised, thus consuming valuable meeting time and company resources without delivering any feature.
- We believe a different approach should be taken where more “filtering at the source” is applied. This is the same approach that is currently adopted in TSG RAN. We describe this approach in the following slides

Proposal

- Empower SA plenary to perform a “TSG RAN style” admission control at source

- This could work as follows:
  1. SA2 discusses and agrees all WIDs/SIDs based on the “technical merit”
  2. SA2 does not start work on a particular WID/SID until it gets approved by SA
  3. Each WID/SID when submitted to SA for approval is associated with a proposed time budget
  4. The SA2 chairman reports to SA the available time for the different streams of SA2 for the next cycle
  5. SA approves only as many WIDs/SIDs can fit the available time
     - SA chairman can use the usual consensus building tools the working rules provide e.g. offline discussion, show of hands, voting etc.
  6. SA can scope down a particular WID/SID “on the spot” in order to fit in the available time units

Steps 1,3,4 are no different from existing working methods

Steps 2,5,6 present a change in culture

Proposal – cont.

- **Advantages of the proposal compared to the status quo**
  - No time wasted
  - Forces companies to define “relative priorities” for the 3GPP work
  - Transparent release content to other groups
  - No changes in the working procedures of SA2 or SA are required
  - Deterministic outcome based on companies “relative priorities”

- **Disadvantages**
  - More work in SA plenary
    - This can be compensated with measures to “pre-approve” non-controversial CRs, more offline discussions etc.

FAQ

What about other SA working groups?

- SA2 is consistently in overload for the last few releases and its role is central in the stability of the system and as such affects a variety of other WGs. It is therefore important to optimise the time management in order to maximise the 3GPP deliverables. It is FFS if this approach can provide benefits also to other WGs

Hang on! Isn't there some wastage due to SA1 providing more than it can be eventually completed?

- Yes, even though it will be very tough to employ similar measures for SA1 WID/SID approval given it is mostly unknown at the beginning what will be the eventual system impacts from SA1 WIDs/SIDs

Do I need to send my SA2 delegates to SA?

- The new procedure is fundamentally not different to what an SA delegate is expected to do: i.e. to be able to discuss priorities of the SA2 work. It is only that with this proposal he can be expected to do that more often

Can a WID/SID still be stopped or scoped down if it is proven that it needs significantly more time, than what it was budgeted?

- Yes this is all possible. WIDs/SIDs expected to exceed the time budget can be flagged by the SA2 chairman and ask SA to take actions (prior to overload occurring)

Thank you

Follow us on:

For more information on Qualcomm, visit us at:
www.qualcomm.com & www.qualcomm.com/blog

Qualcomm is a trademark of Qualcomm Incorporated, registered in the United States and other countries.
Other products and brand names may be trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective owners