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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](D:\\Zou Lan\\2024工作\\标准工作\\3GPP\\SA5#155\\Docs\\S5-242333.zip) | Rel-19 pCR TR28.867 CCL MnS.doc (Nokia) (Stephen Mwanje)  ZTE: editorial comments (details offline), the need for changes is unclear  H: 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 name  Revised to 3119  Breakout 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](D:\\Zou Lan\\2024工作\\标准工作\\3GPP\\SA5#155\\Docs\\S5-242335.zip) | 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 name  Revised to 3120  Breakout session with d1:  N: All comments from E, H, Z are addressed  H: 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](D:\\Zou Lan\\2024工作\\标准工作\\3GPP\\SA5#155\\Docs\\S5-242334.zip) | 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 name  Revised to 3121  Breakout 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](D:\\Zou Lan\\2024工作\\标准工作\\3GPP\\SA5#155\\Docs\\S5-242338.zip) | Rel-19 pCR TR28.867 CCL scope management.docx (Nokia) (Stephen Mwanje)  MCC: please, do not include ".doc" in the contribution name  H: 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-worded  CU: suggested improvements  Revised to 3139  Breakout session with d1  S: 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: Ok  Z: 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](D:\\Zou Lan\\2024工作\\标准工作\\3GPP\\SA5#155\\Docs\\S5-242946.zip) | 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 offline  ZTE: on entity E1 - need clarification… does not see sufficient justification in the description  S: E1 - just abstract name… justification for 3rd will be improved  H: 3rd requirement need to be changed into action to align with 2nd requirement  DTAG: 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 discussion  DTAG: req 3 - which information will be sent to the consumer is unclear  S: it's part of the solution (more details offline - such as "which DN", "what has been modified", etc…)  Revised to 3142  Breakout 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](D:\\Zou Lan\\2024工作\\标准工作\\3GPP\\SA5#155\\Docs\\S5-242949.zip) | Rel-19 pCR 28.867 solution for triggered CCL (Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd) (Deepanshu Gautam)  N: multiple comments / suggestions for improvements to be provided offline  ZTE: 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 offline  H: suggest to consider inheritance…  N: prefers to re-use JEX  DTAG: 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 3144  Breakout 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. |