3GPP TSG SA#96
Budapest, HU, June 7th-10th 2022

SP-220648
Agenda Item 7.5

Considerations on future release planning

MediaTek Inc.

Introduction

- S2-220633 (SA Chair) provides good and accurate observations on Rel-18 situation and invites for open discussion on the matter to guarantee a smooth process – **MediaTek Inc. fully supports this**
- It is important that a process be agreed early on so all companies have a clear understanding of how the Release planning will play out, esp. the prioritization process.

- The present contribution provides
  - complementary observations to the above; and
  - two proposals *for consideration* during the discussion
- It does not provide a view on the Rel-19 timeline
  - this is however an important variable in the equation (e.g. wrt TU budget)

Background
Rel-18

- Rel-18 prioritization of SA2 work led to a very high workload for SA2 and is a “timebomb” for CT groups
  - ~Unmanageable by e-meeting; Impossible for f2f set-up
  - TUs fill-up as the one decision criteria does not work
  - **Proposal 1:** Strict upstream limitation of the #SIDs/WIDs is necessary in addition to meeting the TU budget
  - Side note: a strict prioritization process for SA2 TEI18 is required
- "Rapporteur" KPI is a significant disruptor to the discussions
  - **Proposal 2:** Rapporteur decisions should be done last so the focus can be on technical considerations
- Bottom-up planning demands considerable SA2 resources concurrent to ongoing Release effort
  - SA2 spends a lot of meeting time discussing, defining SID/WIDs, objectives and work tasks thereof, and approving those bearing in mind a lot of this work will be nulled by plenary
  - Work volume limit (i.e. TU limit) per SI/WI is necessary to constrain each item (i.e. SI/WI "size”) but does not help much on the above
  - **Proposal 3:** SA2 needs to spend resources on limited #directions that are set top-down (i.e. at SA plenary) – See Proposal 3bis (next slide)

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, <u>*off* the meeting week</u>
  • 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

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

Thank You!