3GPP TSG-CN ***Tdoc NP-040282***
3GPP TSG-RAN ***Tdoc RP-040242***
3GPP TSG-T ***Tdoc TP-040129***
3GPP TSG-SA ***Tdoc SP-040361***
Meeting #24, Seoul (Korea), June 2004

Source: **MCC**
mailto:john.meredith@etsi.org

Title: **New Work Item Description (WID) form**

Document for: **TSG SA: approval**
other TSGs: discussion

Following the discussions at the previous rounds of TSGs and subsequently on the plenary TSG e-mail exploders, the new WID form was revised and is now again brought for approval at SA#24.

The following lists the comments made by e-mail since SA#23 and my responses to them. These might be useful to aid delegates to remember the somewhat protracted discussions.

TSG SA is asked to approve this new form, after which any new work items should use it. (There is no need to recast existing WIs to the new format.)

-oOo-

1 Assorted pelling mistakes and typos
JMM: All fixed (I hope)

2 In the introduction you mention the term work item is interchangeable with the term study item. The title at 6.1 may need to be changed e.g: 'The work item(or study item) is a feature' or even remove the bracketed text?
JMM: I have removed the brackets. (The clause is now §6.2.)

3 Supporting Individual Members -> Supporting individual members
JMM: Rejected: the capitalization indicates that the words have a particular - rather than a general - significance in the context of 3GPP.

4 Is there a revision marked version available and also could you identify which comments you have taken into account and those that you have rejected or not been able to implement?
JMM: No, the revision marks would make it too messy. If you really want to see the changes, do a document compare exercise in Word. All comments made at SA#23 were taken into account in version 1.5.0.

5 Have you taken into account any of the release planning discussion issues e.g identifying if a WI has the possibility of "early implementation"?
JMM: No, I have not considered this issue. Since we were (and maybe still are) far from an agreement on this topic, I did not consider appropriate to cater for any potential change of policy at this stage. But I acknowledge that a further change to the form may become necessary as a result of any agreement on Early Implementation work items.

6 In the old form, there is a section for "Linked Work Items". Why has it been removed?
JMM: There is a slot in clause 2 for this - see the Guidance text. If a correct hierarchical structure of Features / BBs / WTs is followed, there will be little reason to cite other work items here.

7 The table "Nature of the Work Item" is place inmediately below the "Expected output and time scales" section header. It looks rather misplaced to me, the header has nothing to do with the contents...

JMM: It is in clause 6 because it directs the writer to one or other of the following subclauses, depending on the nature of the WI. I have added an extra subclause 6.1 (and have renumbered the other subclauses accordingly). I hope this makes the logic of its position a little clearer.

8 (a) Does your email imply (as I see a WID history) that we will have now regular updates of WIDs in RAN?
(b) I think we need to clarify how we track dates and status. Is it in the WIDs or in the work plan? Section 10 says in the work plan, but there is a lot of date information in the WID. It will be confusing if the two things aren't kept in step.

JMM: It has always been the intention that WIDs be kept up to date, otherwise they become misleading. For example, when the official number of a new spec is allocated, the WID should be updated to reflect it; if the identity of the rapporteur or of the supporting organizations changes, the WID should be updated to reflect it. The only possible point of discussion is whether the target dates for the various milestones are maintained in the WID or only in the Gantt chart. Ideally, I think the WID should be maintained in this respect too, but that is less important, since it is certain that correct (or at least, less incorrect) information will appear in the Gantt chart.

8bis I think there is a good case for updating the WIDs once work it complete to reflect the real final status: which specs were impacted, which nodes were impacted etc. Have you given any thought to this point?

JMM: This is not really a comment about the form but about the procedures associated with managing the work plan. My response to comment 8 may be sufficient.

9 I remain unconvinced by the necessity for the logo. It increases the size of the file. Additionally it raises the question of whether the logos should follow the rules for the technical report and technical specification cover sheets, and therefore have the GSM logo for those WIDs that also affect GSM.

JMM: Logos gone.

10 Impacts. If we are going to have separate "CN" and "IMS" boxes, then the current instructions would imply that whenever the IMS box is ticked, then the CN box will also need to be ticked, as the IMS is a complete subset of the CN.

JMM: I understand the logic, but this is something which needs to be discussed by CN and SA. So far, nobody has responded to this comment.

11 Which box gets ticked with someone wants to change the UICC specification itself, rather than the applications residing on it?

JMM: UICC spec is not the responsibility of 3GPP but of ETSI SCP. The _interface_ between the UICC and the terminal is however within the scope of 3GPP; changes in this area should tick the ME box. So no change to form required.

12 The work item is a Building Block or a Work Task. The table apparently does not cater for new technical reports that are not feasibility studies.

JMM: Playing Devil's advocate: why else should we produce TRs? But pre-empting the debate, I have loosened the guidance text to allow the table to be modified to fit the circumstances. Nevertheless, I still recommend that TRs are used very sparingly, and that the usual document type should be a TS.

13 The work item is a Building Block or a Work Task. I note the instruction: "In the table below, complete only one row. Each stage needs a separate work item, and there may be several Stages 3. Do not enter expected start dates for stages which are dependent on the previous stage; the Work Plan will automatically provide a start date for these." While this may make some sense between stage 2 and stage 3, I see no reason why multiple stage 3 documents should not be listed. Otherwise we have encouragement that a relative small work that does affect multiple specifications will not result in a WID, because people will regard it as too much work, and it is those very items that do need WIDs rather than being dealt with under TEI.

JMM: Not so much a comment, more a thesis. Again, I have modified the guidance text to remove the interdiction on using a single WID to cover more than one stage. Also, it was always the intention to allow multiple stages 3 in a single WID, which is why the guidance text said - and says - "there may be several Stages 3". Hopefully, the changes in the guidance text described against comment 12 make it clear that the stage 3 table row may be repeated ad lib.

14 Secondary responsibility. The meaning of "secondary responsibility" needs to be made clear. For specifications, it currently means that all CRs have to be approved by both primary and secondary responsible groups. Is something similar intended here for the work item, or does it just provide a place to list all the WG that may provide a bit of the work.

JMM: The interpretation of "secondary responsibility" which the author of this comment provides is his own: there is no official interpretation of the term. I think the intended sense is "it just provides a place to list all the WGs that may provide a bit of the work".

15 Section 6. I guess we need to define what a "study item" is. Is it the same as a "feasibility study"?

JMM: Do we? If we do, the WID form is not the place to do it: much better to include text in 21.900.

16 Section 6.1 / 6.2 - These tables confuse me, particularly the relative dates. In the big table it is not clear what any of the dates that say "to TSG for info in....months" are meant to be relative to.

JMM: The target for "to TSG for info" is [obviously!] relative to the start date for that document. Remember that the table can be modified to fit the circumstances of a particular WI.

17 Section 9. It might be worth keeping text to say "the following organisations support and commit to actively progress this work" in the form once it is completed.

JMM: Good idea, form changed accordingly.

end of comments and responses as at 09:31 2004-05-17

Work Item Description

Throughout this form, guidance notes are given in blue. These should be deleted when submitting the completed form for approval of the work item.

This form is intended also to be used for Study Items. The term "work item" as used in this form is intended to apply equally to "study item", and should be changed accordingly in the stock text.

3rd Generation Partnership Project work item:

Title: concise, no abbreviations unless very well-known ones:

<Title>

(date: yyyy-mm-dd)

1 Identifiers

Values furnished by MCC; for revisions, include the allocated values.

Code		Note:	The code is in the form aaaaaaa-bbbbbbb-ccccccc where aaaaaaa = feature code bbbbbbb = building block code within this feature ccccccc = work task code within this building block The code is allocated by the WG Secretary.
UID		Note:	The unique identifier (UID) is an integer number which this work item retains throughout its life, and is allocated by the Work Programme Manager.

2 Justification

*Why is the work item (or study item) needed?. For top level work items (Features), justification should be in **commercial** rather than **technical** terms. See guidance in 3GPP TR 21.900.*

Mention any related work items (other than hierarchical parents, siblings or offspring within the same Feature).

3 Objective

What is the work item intended to achieve? Mention any service aspects, MMI aspects, charging aspects, security aspects, … as appropriate.

4 Impacts

Put an X in the appropriate boxes. One X per column, leave no column blank!

Affects:	UICC apps	ME	UTRAN	GERAN	CN	IMS	Other
Yes							
No							
Don't know							

5 External dependencies

Mention any work carried on in bodies other than 3GPP upon which the current work item depends. Be as specific as necessary, and mention planned time scales for availability of external documents.

6 Expected output and time scales

6.1 Nature of work item

Select ONE option only! Work Item may be a

- *Feature orStudy Item; or*
- *Building Block; or*
- *Work Task.*

It cannot be more than one!

Nature of work item	(select by checking ONE box)	Now go to …
Study Item		§6.2
Feature		
Building block		§6.3
Work Task		

6.2 The work item is a Feature or a Study Item

The output of the Feature is the sum of the outputs of its component building blocks.

*Complete the table below **only if the work item is a Feature**.*

Enter the target date by which this Feature should be frozen.

This is a target only. The actual date will be governed by the building blocks which comprise this Feature. A Feature can be frozen only when:

- *any feasibility study is complete; and*
- *the stage 1 specification is under change control and is frozen (that is, no more CRs which add or materially enhance functionality are envisaged); and*
- *the stage 2 specification is under change control and is frozen or is envisaged to be frozen in the near future (that is no more, or very few, CRs are envisaged, other than essential corrections); and*
- *the stage 3 specifications are under change control and are either frozen or are envisaged to be frozen within six months.*

See guidance in 3GPP TR 21.900 for explanation of the term "frozen".

Freeze target	yyyy-mm	This date will appear as a milestone on the Work Plan. As work progresses, it may be modifed: for the latest target date, see the 3GPP Work Plan.

Now go to clause 6.4.

6.3 The work item is a Building Block or a Work Task

*Complete the table below **only if the work item is a Building Block or a Work Task.***

For Building Blocks, enter the UID of the parent Feature if known, otherwise the Code, otherwise the latest Tdoc containing the WID, otherwise the Name:

For Work Tasks, enter the UID of the parent Building Block if known, otherwise the Code, otherwise the latest Tdoc containing the WID, otherwise the Name:

Parent Feature / Building Block	
UID	
Code	
Tdoc	
Name	

Now go to clause 6.4.

6.4 TSs and TRs to result

The table below is for guidance, and may be adapted to fit the circumstances of the work item / study item in question. In particular, there may be several Stages 3. Do not enter expected start dates for stages which are dependent on the previous stage; the Work Plan will automatically provide a start date for these. The development of test specs often depends on the availability of funded resources, but a test spec is not expected to start until the corresponding stage 3 specification is frozen.

In the case of a work item which is decomposed into subordinate Building Blocks / Work Tasks for which individual work item descriptions will be provided, leave the table below blank. That is, define the TSs and TRs to be produced at the lowest level of work item.

			Expected start date	**Expected duration (months)** As work progresses, these values may be modifed: for the latest target date, see the 3GPP Work Plan.	**Resulting TR(s) / TS(s)** *Give number(s) if output is CRs to existing document, else indicate "new".*	**WG respons-ible for new TR or TS** *Leave blank for existing TRs/TSs, since respons-ibility is already known*
What stage is the work under this Building Block?	**Feasibility study** *Feasibility studies may also be used prior to stages other than 1.*		yyyy-mm	To TSG for info in: .....months To TSG for approval: .....months later Frozen: .....months later	New TR CRs to xx.xxx	WG xx
	Stage 1		*Should not start until feasibility study (if any) is under change control.*	To TSG for info in: .....months To TSG for approval: .....months later Frozen: .....months later	New TS CRs to xx.xxx	WG xx
	Stage 2		*Should not start until stage 1 is under change control.*	To TSG for info in: .....months To TSG for approval: .....months later Frozen: .....months later	New TS CRs to xx.xxx	WG xx
	Stage 3		*Should not start until stage 2 is under change control.*	To TSG for info in: .....months To TSG for approval: .....months later Frozen: .....months later	New TS CRs to xx.xxx	WG xx
	Test spec		yyyy-mm	To TSG for info in: .....months To TSG for approval: .....months later Frozen: .....months later	New TS CRs to xx.xxx	WG xx

7 Rapporteur

Name and organization. The named indivudual should check his coordinates held in the Support Team's database at http://webapp.etsi.org/teldir/PersonalInfo.asp . The person must represent a 3GPP Individual Member; check these at http://webapp.etsi.org/3gppmembership/Queryform.asp.

8 Responsible TSG / WG

8.1 Primary responsibility

TSG/WG primarily responsible for progress. Mention exactly one TSG or WG

8.2 Secondary responsibility

May also mention TSGs/WGs with secondary responsibility.

9 Supporting Individual Members

*Each work item must be supported by **at least** four organizations which are Individual Members of 3GPP. "Support" means that the organization is willing to participate **actively** in the technical work.*

The following 3GPP Individual Member organizations agree to actively participate in the technical work:

1. org 1
2. org 2
3. org 3
4. org 4

10 Work item description change history

It is not necessary to update the Work Item Description form to show changes in progress or time scales. These are reflected in the current Work Programme The WID should be updated if there is a substantive change in the nature of the work or in the case where members withdraw their support. Update the history table whenever a revised version is brought to the responsible TSG for approval.

Date (yyyy-mm-dd)	TSG Tdoc number	Description of change

form change history
v1.6.0: includes comments made during review period prior to TSGs#24
v1.5.0: includes comments made at TSGs#23 (Phoenix)
v1.4.0: offered to SA#23 for approval
v1.3.0: offered to CN#23, RAN#23 and T#23 for comments
DRAFT4 v1.3.0: 2004-03-09: Incorporation of comments from Leaders list
DRAFT3 v1.3.0: 2004-02-19: Incorporation of comments from MCC members
DRAFT2 v1.3.0: 2004-01-29: Complete redraft:
v1.2.0: 2002-07-04: "USIM" box changed to "UICC apps"