Comments by T2 Chair on the original document TP-040066 are in Red

Agenda item: 5.2.5
Title: Closure of TSG T WG2 (The issue is NOT about closure – it is about how best to handle T2's work in the future after REL 6. Closure may be a consequence but it seems like closure is the prime objective and as a secondary consideration how to handle the problems ensuing from that decision. i.e Putting the cart before the horse)

Option 3 may well eventually lead to the closure of T2 but at present to close T2 sems somewhat premature. We have already heard fronm one of the supporting companies of this original document that it might prove necessary to re instate T2 sometime after it is dissolved

Source: **Ericsson, Motorola, Nokia, Qualcomm, T-Mobile (why are these companies taking a different view to their delegates who agreed in T2 to the preferred T2 proposal to keep T2 as a virtual independent group ?).**

Background

TSG T has for several meetings addressed the future of TSG T WG2 when Release 6 is completed. It is important to now come to a conclusion of this discussion, and agree on the way forward.

The LS from TSG T WG2 in TP-040013 indicate ?????(this is the interpretation of the proponents of this paper – it is not what is said in the T2 proposal) that the remaining work of WG2 when Release 6 is finalized is not sufficient to justify a separate WG **meeting on a regular basis**. To secure a relevant handling of the maintenance of the specifications currently under the responsibility of WG2, it is proposed to close WG2 and move the responsibility of the maintenance work to TSG T. (What about ongoing work – e.g bearer specific MMS work arising from OMA or even 3GPP). Option 3 makes provision for this

Proposal
It is proposed to close TSG T WG2 at TSG T #26 (December 2004). The responsibility for the specifications in bold listed in TP-040013 are transferred to TSG T. To secure adequate handling of potential CRs on those specifications, the following procedure is proposed: What about those specifications not in BOLD. ? Option 3 keeps all current T2 specifications under T2

- Company contributions toward the affected specifications shall be distributed on the TSG T e-mail reflector no later than 2 weeks before the start of TSG-T. Such contributions shall be clearly indicated in the subject field of the e-mail by "[*spec. nr.*] *Description of contribution*", e.g. "[23.040] Proposed CR on section E.14".

- Technical discussions on the TSG T e-mail reflector should be allowed with the objective to provide comments and agree on the proposed contributions. This e-

mail discussion shall be closed and revised CRs shall be available no later than one week before the start of the TSG-T. If unresolved issues experts must come to T. but T may not be a convenient or economical place to meet. E.G Why meet in T Beijing when experts in contention on a particular matter are European based. Option 3 makes provision to meet in the most appropriate place for cost saving purposes

- The first day(s) of the TSG-T plenary is reserved for technical discussions and approval of contributions toward those specifications.

The proposed procedure will allow sufficient time for member companies to review and comment on the contributions, **and secure relevant participation in TSG T**. Does this mean experts now attend T as opposed to T2 – if so then savings benefits to companies are not so great as T2 option 3

Who is going to co-ordinate T2 activities – T will have to do this and so somebody in T will need to be a virtual chair for T2 work . Option 3 maintains the structure and leadership expertise of T2

Bottom line is that the T2 proposal is the best optimisation for saving travel costs and management of the future work of T2 whilst keeping the experts together in one group