3GPP/PCG#13 Meeting
Seoul, Korea
6 October 2004

3GPP/PCG#13(04)15
28 September 2004
page 1 of 3

Source: **TSG Leaders**

Title: **TSG Reorganization Proposal**

Agenda item: 5

Document for:

Decision	X
Discussion	
Information	

1. Introduction

At PCG#11, the TSG leaders were given the ongoing task of reviewing the 3GPP organization and recommending changes to save money and to improve efficiencies. The TSG leaders have discussed a set of potential changes to the current TSG organization with this, and the following additional points in mind:

- The need for related work to be together in a single TSG where practical.

- The need to avoid lengthy rediscussion of work in one TSG by another.

- The need for the eventual organization to be balanced (TSGs with roughly equal workloads).

These proposals are to a large extent independent and are thus posed to the PCG as a set of decision points. In some cases the TSG leaders were able to make definite recommendations. In other cases, the TSG leaders were not able to reach consensus.

2. Decision Points for TSG Reorganization

2.1. Q1: Should TSG-CN and TSG-T be merged to form TSG-CT

TSG-CN and TSG-T would form the new TSG-CT. This merger has several advantages. TSG-CN and TSG-T are the two smallest TSGs. Merging the groups produces economies of scale with respect to group size. There are considerable synergies in the work also. Functions found in the terminal typically interact with the network. In most cases, the terminal and CN represent the two ends of a common protocol. This merger would save MCC resources and hosting costs. In many cases member companies can often save resources by having a single delegate to TSG-CT delegate instead of both TSG-CN and TSG-T delegates. This merger should be viewed as the combination of two TSGs and not as the dissolution of TSG-T since it retains a home of any future terminal specific work.

TSG Leaders Recommendation: *Yes*

2.2. Q2: Should T1 be moved to TSG-RAN

T1 deals with UMTS testing. Since much of the testing work is dependent on details of the radio access, there are synergies with addressing this within RAN instead of in isolation. This is how testing work is handled in GERAN and this approach seems to work quite well.

TSG Leaders Recommendation: *Yes*

2.3. Q3: Should T3 be moved to TSG-SA

T3 deals with smart cards. Issues of security (tied to the SIM/USIM/ISIM) or when to force migration from SIM->USIM->ISIM for different features is frequently a controversial topic in TSG-SA. For this reason, many of the TSG leaders favour moving T3 into SA.   One disadvantage of this move is that it increases the load on TSG-SA. Many leaders feel that we should be trying to reduce the load on TSG-SA so it can concentrate on issues of principle and coordination. In addition, some leaders believe there is value in maintaining T2 and T3 under the same TSG.

TSG Leaders Recommendation: *No consensus*

2.4. Q4: Should SA5 be moved to CT

SA5 deals with O&M. This proposal is again tied with the desire to decrease the load on TSG-SA. The SA5 CRs are frequently quite detailed and spark little controversy in TSG-SA. Some leaders feel that TSG-CT would be a better place to address O&M. Ties to CT WGs have been noted particularly in the case of charging. The counter argument is that O&M is a system aspect and seems to be working quite well where it is. SA5 is structured into SWGs and some of the SWGs have greater ties to RAN than to CT.

TSG Leaders Recommendation: *No consensus*

2.5. Q5: Should the number of TSG vice-chairs be increased to 3

If the answer to Q1 is yes, then there will be a net reduction of 3 TSG elected officers. This would lead to fewer ex-officio positions in PCG and could make regional balance more difficult. The counter argument is that the current setup with 3 officers per TSG seems a good fit for balance between 3 regions. In any case, the number of vice-chairs should not affect costs or the efficiency of the TSGs.

TSG Leaders Recommendation: *No opinion*

3. Longer Term Evolution of 3GPP

The proposed changes do not include the merging of RAN and GERAN groups. While a restructuring of the radio access work is still a goal, it is not yet a viable option.   Currently, a merger would increase costs rather than reducing them.

This reorganization does not preclude other restructuring (such as the creation of new TSGs or merging /splitting of WGs) to be effected in the future as the need arises.

4. Implementation Details

4.1. Timescale

It is recommended that this change takes effect after the March 2005 TSG plenaries. Specifically, TSG#27 shall be conducted under the existing structure. Elections will be held at TSG#27 for TSG chairs and vice-chairs according to the new structure. The new structure takes affect immediately following TSG#27.

4.2. TSG-CT Election Procedures

Formally, TSG-CT is a new TSG and should thus (according to the 3GPP working procedures) have a convenor appointed for the first two meetings. However, considering that CT is the merger of CN and T it is recommended that it should instead have formal elections in March using the combined (union of) voting lists of CN and T as a basis.

4.3. Working Group Naming

This document refers to groups using their existing abbreviated names. It is expected that the moved groups will be renamed based upon their parent TSG, as is the case now. Migrated WGs can choose to include their old designations in reports, liaisons, etc (e.g., formally known as T1) for as long as they feel necessary to allow continuity and ease the transition.

4.4. TSG Meeting Durations

It may however be desirable to slightly increase the meeting times for June 2005. There may be initial confusion due to the merger and new leadership will likely be in place. Although the workload of the TSGs may be changed due to the restructuring, it is recommended that the target meeting duration for CT be 3 days. CN and T have been finishing early and it should be possible to accommodate the new workload with 3 days. This is the ultimate goal and the first two meetings may require 3.5 days.