3GPP/PCG#6 Meeting
Sophia Antipolis,
10 April 2001

3GPP/PCG#6(01)15
30 March 2001
page 1 of 6

Source: Dr. Bailey

Title: **Proposed Recommendations from the Ad Hoc Group**

Agenda item: 7

Document for:

Decision	
Discussion	
Information	**X**

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.

To this end, the 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.

Also, the IP based Multimedia Services Framework Specification, which SA has agreed to develop, should be a valuable component of the deliverable.

At this time it is not clear that there is any need for SA to create a separate working group to deal with planning of future releases. However, the PCG and SA should remain alert to the best ways (both organizationally and procedural) to efficiently plan for future releases.

2. Weak relations with IETF

- Contribution 113 to the March SA meeting contains several suggestions concerning effective relations between IETF and 3GPP. The PCG should recommend that all 3GPP groups that need to communicate with IETF give consideration to these suggestions.

- It was suggested 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 should recommend 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 rappeteur to IETF.

3. Coordinated Requirements Capture

- The PCG should adopt a formal policy statement stating it supports that the requirements or service concept development can be done within 3GPP, when a reasonable number of members wish to engage in it.

- It was suggested that input from MRPs would be important on this issue. Therefore it is recommended that PCG send a statement to MRPs asking them if they have requirements work or technical work that could be done in 3GPP if procedural or organizational improvements were made. It should also ask if there are ways that 3GPP could improve the process by which SA1 can communicate with these groups and receive input.

- The suggestion that SA1 starts to invite co-operation with other groups on requirements is endorsed and it is recommended that the PCG agrees to add a list of additional liaison partners for this purpose, starting with PAMF, WMF (if not approved as an MRP) and LIF. MRPs should input directly into SA1, and use the SA1 chairman as a first point of contact.

4. Merging the activities on Mobile Terminal Conformance test specifications

Although there was agreement that some work in TSG-RAN WG4 and TSG-T WG1 shares common technological approaches, there was apparently no consensus that there was enough commonality to merge the groups at this time. Some expressed similar views regarding TSG-GERAN WG4.

The PCG should encourage 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 should encourage TSG-GERAN and TSG-RAN to monitor their activities, looking for similar opportunities between their work programs.

The PCG should encourage the eventual combination of all terminal working groups, in order to further harmonisation and remove duplication of effort.

5. Restructuring GERAN meetings

There seemed to be some recognition that the past situation in GERAN needed improvement. There was also recognition that there has been much improvement as GERAN has been assimilated into 3GPP.

The PCG should commend TSG GERAN for:

- Moving toward a 5-day submission requirement for input documents

- Establishing an "emergency break" mechanism by which appeals to GERAN agreement can be brought

And the PCG should encourage TSG-GERAN to continue development of these procedures. The PCG should also encourage TSG-GERAN to consider a long-term evolution towards procedures that align with those of the other TSGs, including meeting concurrently with other TSG's as recommended in the working procedures of 3GPP.

6. Strengthen the role of SA

The PCG should formally adopt the position 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 WIs;

- proactive tracking, 'chasing' and if necessary prioritisation of Feature WIs 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 should note that the current SA plenary meeting agendas seem to have evolved to a point where significant co-ordination activity is being accomplished. It should be encouraged to continue this evolution.

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

There seemed to be no clear consensus on this issue. However, the thought was 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.

Therefor, the PCG should encourage both TSG to be watchful for opportunities to co-ordinate, share, or merge their work, as appropriate.

8. "there is no practical need to further emphasize regional balance in the working procedures for working groups"

There was no consensus on any action to be taken on this issue. There did seem to be consensus that Article 22 of the Procedures lacked clarity in some areas. Similarly there was significant feeling that the practices that should be in place to support Article 22 need to be more carefully defined. It was agreed that specific proposals to resolve these situations should be brought to the 3GPP leadership by individual members or OPs.

C. C. Bailey, Marc Grant, Steve Mecrow, and Kevin Holley

Annex - Palm Springs Meeting Attendance List

Name	Organisation
N. Andersen	Motorola A/S
G. Babut	Rogers' Wireless
C. Bailey	SBC
G. Bratt	Ericsson L.M
Q. Cassen	Conexant (T1)
F. Courau	Alcatel
K. Didascalou	Siemens AG
I. Doig	Motorola S.A
U. Dropmann	Siemens
J. Ellsberger	Ericsson (ETSI)
D. Fauconnier	Nortel Networks
M. Grant	Cingular Wireless
H. Hauser	T-Mobil
S. Hayes	Ericsson (T1)
K. Holley	BT
G. Jones	Voicestream
S. Mecrow	BT
J. Meredith	MCC
S. Merkel	Alcatel
P. Musgrove	AT&T Wireless
A. Napolitano	Blu S.p.a
P. Neumann	Siemens AG
B. Nielsen	Qualcom
I. Park	Vodafone (ETSI)
S.K. Park	Samsung (TTA)
M. Qvarnstrom	Swisscom Mobile
K.H. Rosenbrock	ETSI
N. Sampson	Orange
A. Sasaki	ARIB
G. Schlanger	AT&T Wireless
A. Scrase	MCC
I. Sharp	Nortel Networks
P. Simmons	Nortel Networks
J. Sundborg	Ericsson (ETSI)
A. Toepfer	Mannesmann Mobilfunk
P. Tonelli	Vodafone
F. Trosby	Telenor
Y. Yoshimura	ARIB
K. Yoshino	TTC
T. Varvela	Nokia
H. van der Veen	MCC
K. Taya	NEC

| Don Zelmer | Cingular Wireless |