

Source: TSG T WG2 Chairman

Title: 3GPP Reorganization

Agenda item: 5

Document for:

Decision	X
Discussion	
Information	

I have noted the content of the document PCG13_15 for the PCG#13 meeting in Seoul in October.

At the T2 meeting in Montreal T2#26 23rd – 27th August, I briefed T2 delegates on an overview of specific items contained in the TSG leaders re-org proposal V6 that would have a direct effect on T2.

I did not present the V6 document itself as I felt that this would be inappropriate but I was anxious to solicit feedback on 2 issues

1. Should T2 and T3 report to the same TSG?
2. Did T2 feel that CN was an appropriate place for T2 to merge with (TSG-CT proposal)?

The outcome was as follows:-

There is a growing preference among T2 delegates for T2 and T3 to report to a common TSG.

There was no strong view concerning TSG-CT although a number of delegates thought that T2 had more in common with the SA groups.

I note that in the V6 proposal there is a comment that the work of T has a synergy with the work of CN. Given that this statement also encompasses T2 then I felt compelled to examine this assumption further. I and a number of other T2 delegates have difficulty in understanding the rationale for such a statement.

Whilst T2 does deal with protocol matters they are of a much higher layer than those normally dealt with in CN. T2 is concerned with high profile services such as MMS and SMS to which subscribers are exposed. Both MMS and SMS stage 2 specifications for which T2 is responsible have a high architectural, overall service and platform definition content.

This differs somewhat to the scope of CNs work and is much more in line with the work of SA.

I have examined the LSs that T2 has sent out over the past 5 meetings and the detail of that analysis is shown below. It will be seen that T2 communicates with SA groups for actions on a much more regular basis than CN. Indeed the only communications with CN have been concerned with the transfer of GUP work out of T2 which is now complete. Given past records it is unlikely that T2 will need to communicate with CN any more than it has done in the past and so there is little benefit seen in T2 meeting at a common venue with CN with regard to work synergies.

It will also be seen that T2 communicates frequently with T3.

Additionally, T2 and T3 have had numerous joint meetings compared to none with CN groups except for CN4 which was to specifically discuss GUP transfer.

If therefore the objectives of reducing travel costs, providing more effective and efficient meetings etc. then it would seem that as regards to T2 then T2 and T3 should be under a common TSG and that T2 and T3's work should be moved to the SA groups area – maybe by forming TSG-ST rather than TSG-CT.

It is of course common knowledge that SA is overloaded and that CN is less loaded and it would seem that a significant factor the creation of TSG-CT is to balance the work load. I feel that there is a risk that the creation of TSG-CT may be being made for the wrong reasons. i.e firstly one should find the most appropriate place for work emplacement based on where the real synergies and expertise lies and if that results in further loading for SA then that problem should be addressed to examine the most appropriate place for other TSGs within SA.

The current V6 proposal seems to focus heavily on T. I would like to suggest that a more top down approach is taken where ALL main TSG's review the bodies under them and question whether they are in the most appropriate place; whether they can be combined or even disbanded so that we take the opportunity for a more general overhaul of a structure that has remained largely unchanged since 1999.

I would like the views expressed in this document to be considered in further debates on this matter.

Please note that the comments above relate to the **work** of T2 rather than any assumption that T2 continues to exist as an entity. Hence, even if the work load of T2 reduces to a level where the existence of T2 as an entity cannot be justified then it is important that the work of T2 (which could eventually be primarily a maintenance task for SMS,CBS,MMS and AT commands) is carried out in the most appropriate place. The most appropriate place is alongside T3 and in the SA arena.

List of **TO** and **CC** addressees for LS's sent from T2 (T#21 to T#25 inclusive)

- All **TO** addressees were **action** related and include Reply LS's.
- All **CC** addressees were for information only
- No entry in the table signifies a value zero

Group	TO	CC
SA	1	1
SA1	5	5
SA2	11	3
SA3	4	
SA4	2	1
SA5	4	1
CN		
CN1		
CN2		
CN3		
CN4	4 (GUP work transfer)	2
CN5		
RAN		
RAN1		
RAN2		
RAN3	1	
T1		
T3	8	3
GERAN 2		1