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# Agenda

The following tdocs are checked in breakout session:

|  |
| --- |
| 6.19.4 Study on closed control loop management |
| **Editorial and Concept**  |
| S5-242333 | Rel-19 pCR TR28.867 CCL MnS.doc (Nokia) (Stephen Mwanje)ZTE: editorial comments (details offline), the need for changes is unclearH: disagree to revise CCL concepts (happy with existing content)S: no need to list all required capabilities in this clause… suggests to not put supported capabilities in this clause…MCC: please, do not include ".doc" in the contribution nameRevised to 3119Breakout session with d1:H: Still have concerns with the diagram. We can reuse the existing diagram and enhance it.Z: Want to change “governed” to “managed”.N: Ok.Conclusion: Produce d2 with the above changes. | pCRr, TS/TR 28.867 v0.1.0, Rel-19, Cat.  |
| **WT-3** |
| S5-242335 | Rel-19 pCR TR28.867 CCL Conflicts mamagement.docx (Nokia) (Stephen Mwanje)E: (Jan) has offline comments…ZTE: many offline comments (duplicate requirements is one example)H: suggestion to merge two "conflicts" into one "conflict"MCC: please, do not include ".doc" in the contribution nameRevised to 3120Breakout session with d1:N: All comments from E, H, Z are addressedH: Maybe you can align the text to use “3GPP mgmt system”.N: In some cases it’s not so clear if we should use MnS producer or not.H: I prefer to use CCL MnS producer.S. We’d also like to always use CCL MnS producer.N: OK, let’s change to “CCL MnS producer” globally.Z: With “candidate conflict”, do you mean one conflict?N: Yes, one of those conflicts. I can change to potential conflicts.E: In the Note of req.-1, change “CCL” to “CCL MnS producer”N: Ok.Z: In the table first row, can you make it consistent re: “Goal Conflict”.S: Please don’t mix it with intent. We can use “target conflict”.N and Z: Ok.Produce d2 with above changes. | pCRr, TS/TR 28.867 v0.1.0, Rel-19, Cat.  |
| S5-242334 | Rel-19 pCR TR28.867 CCL Conflicts.docx (Nokia) (Stephen Mwanje)E: (Jan) many offline comments. "already discussed in ZSM" we don't need to re-do in SA5 - requests clarification what is and what is not relevant to SA5.S: conflict scenario - anything more than what we saw in previous contribution? If so, then the content goes to clause 4 (or not - needs discussion, as part of the UC). UCs need to be discussed before solutions.H: similar comments as S (also applicable to the previous contribution.ZTE: similar comments as S. The content is not concepts and background (belongs to UCs). The processes of … are out of scope of the WT-3. Additional clarity of CCL goal is needed. Additional comments will be provided offline.DTAG: req should be clearer (current text is not requirement style, more of a description).MCC: please, do not include ".doc" in the contribution nameRevised to 3121Breakout session with d1:S: 4.X.3 needs to go away, it is getting into solutions. 5.A is enough for the req.N: This is just a starting point.E: I also want to remove it…N: Ok.Z: Is this consistent in the description, to align the description of different types of conflict.H: Make the “**Figure 4.X.2-1**” an example. Affects the text before the diag. and the caption etc.E: Still some questions/concerns on the “types of conflicts” in 4.X.1 first bullet, regarding the timeline.N: I can remove the “timeline” everywhere.Produce d2 based on the above. | pCRr, TS/TR 28.867 v0.1.0, Rel-19, Cat.  |
| **WT-4** |
| S5-242338 | Rel-19 pCR TR28.867 CCL scope management.docx (Nokia) (Stephen Mwanje)MCC: please, do not include ".doc" in the contribution nameH: why differentiate the two scopes (management and control)? prefers to merge them. Offline comments.S: as per last meeting agreement, CCL can be created for various purposes… suggests to add a row in the scope about the purpose of CCL. The requirement wording needs improvement.ZTE: CCL scope management is out of scope of WT-4.S: to ZTE your comment relates to S proposal (same/similar concern)E: (Jan) general concept of managing scope needs clarification. More comments offline.DTAG: req 1 needs to be re-wordedCU: suggested improvements Revised to 3139Breakout session with d1S: I have suggested a row to be added at the end of the table, with one more scope.N. Ok.E: We are ok with this table. But it is not complete, so maybe we should have a note that it can be improved/extended.E: On the different types of scope across different contributions, should be aligned.N: We only have measurement/control/impact scope.DT: We have to improve the potential req. …N: OkZ: Still have a comment related to the scope of WT4.N: Ok I can try to clarify it more.Produce d2 based on the above disc. | pCRr, TS/TR 28.867 v0.1.0, Rel-19, Cat.  |
| **WT-7** |
| S5-242946 | Rel-19 pCR 28.867 Feedback Management (Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd) (Deepanshu Gautam)CMCC: What is the algorithm and parameters of CCL? It should be left to the consumer… but it may be very difficult for the consumer to choose…S: the requirements do not touch alg and parameters… just description used for justificsation… requirements focus on actions… will continue offlineZTE: on entity E1 - need clarification… does not see sufficient justification in the descriptionS: E1 - just abstract name… justification for 3rd will be improvedH: 3rd requirement need to be changed into action to align with 2nd requirementDTAG: 1st req should be clarified… related to "execution feedback"N: current model has goals… there are attributes related to how well the goal is met… if the goal is 10 and producer has 5 - what else producer can offer?S: in this revision the focus of feedback is on actions… (south-bound actions). Offline discussion may be needed between S (Deepanshu) and N (Olaf).E: (Jan) - in CCL solution if we separate the concerns of producer and consumer, then how the actions come into picture?S: implicit requirements (actions)… Consumer should be able to tell that certain actions are not preferred… allowing producer to alter the flow…E: (Jan) the need for control loop is unclear in such scenario (provided as explanation above) - offline discussionDTAG: req 3 - which information will be sent to the consumer is unclearS: it's part of the solution (more details offline - such as "which DN", "what has been modified", etc…)Revised to 3142Breakout session with d2:E: What is updated in d2?S: I have focused on the UC and reqs.E: What other types of feedback is expected here, except by reconfiguring the CCL?S: The feedback is not on the goal fulfillment but on the actions to fulfill the goal.E: There should be a constraint on how far back the consumer can request a rollback for actions.H: Suggest to remove the example in req. 3. You can add a note.Z: Have some concerns regarding the procedure…H: Maybe we can add a note to mention “which action can be provided by the producer to the consumer should be decided by the producer”…Z: E1 should be updated.Produce d3 based on the above. | pCRr, TS/TR 28.867 v0.2.0, Rel-19, Cat.  |
| **WT-1** |
| S5-242949 | Rel-19 pCR 28.867 solution for triggered CCL (Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd) (Deepanshu Gautam)N: multiple comments / suggestions for improvements to be provided offlineZTE: overlaps with Nokia's (2336) and is too complicated… (offline discussion needed)N: how to express the conditions - prefers to re-use existing methods (not new trigger IOC, but e.g. "condition monitor"… also use JEX).S: will discuss with N offlineH: suggest to consider inheritance…N: prefers to re-use JEXDTAG: do we have definition of "complex type"? (otherwise suggests to remove this term and use just "type")E: (Jan) the solution is too complex (more comments offline)Revised to 3144Breakout session with d1:Z: You still use ACCL…S: OK, I will update.E: We need more clarification on how this could work.S: There is a full description of that in 5.2.3.2.N: I propose to rename IOC to “information object”.S and E: Ok. | pCRr, TS/TR 28.867 v0.2.0, Rel-19, Cat.  |