

# Contribution SG17-C223

## Considerations for the future of SG17

### ***CAUTION! PREPUBLISHED CONTRIBUTION***

This prepublication is an unedited version of a recently approved Contribution. It will be replaced by the published version after editing. Therefore, there will be differences between this prepublication and the published version.



## Contribution

### Considerations for the future of SG17

**INTERNATIONAL  
TELECOMMUNICATION UNION**

**TELECOMMUNICATION  
STANDARDIZATION BUREAU  
OF ITU**

**STUDY PERIOD 2022–2024**

**SG17-C223**

**STUDY GROUP 17**

**Original: English**

**Question(s):** All/17

Geneva, 21 Feb 2023/03 Mar 2023

#### **CONTRIBUTION**

**Source:** Broadcom

**Title:** Considerations for the future of SG17  
Arnaud Taddei

**Contact:** Broadcom  
United States

Tel. +41 79 506 1129

E-mail [Arnaud.Taddei@broadcom.com](mailto:Arnaud.Taddei@broadcom.com)

**Contact:**

Tel.

E-mail

**Abstract:** This contribution explores considerations for the future of SG17

## FOREWORD

The International Telecommunication Union (ITU) is the United Nations specialized agency in the field of telecommunications, information and communication technologies (ICTs). The ITU Telecommunication Standardization Sector (ITU-T) is a permanent organ of ITU. ITU-T is responsible for studying technical, operating and tariff questions and issuing Recommendations on them with a view to standardizing telecommunications on a worldwide basis.

The World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly (WTSA), which meets every four years, establishes the topics for study by the ITU T study groups which, in turn, produce Recommendations on these topics.

The approval of ITU-T Recommendations is covered by the procedure laid down in WTSA Resolution 1.

In some areas of information technology which fall within ITU-T's purview, the necessary standards are prepared on a collaborative basis with ISO and IEC.

## CAUTION! PREPUBLISHED CONTRIBUTION

This prepublication is an unedited version of a recently approved Contribution. It will be replaced by the published version after editing. Therefore, there will be differences between this prepublication and the published version.

© ITU 2024

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, by any means whatsoever, without the prior written permission of ITU.

## 1. Context

In the past few years, Broadcom's journey in standardization was not linear and it recognized an increasing gap between the real dynamics of the market vs the standardisation dynamics.

Broadcom involved itself on the topic of the Industry Engagement<sup>1</sup> and worked to raise awareness on the problem at the ITU (WTSA20, at PP22 and at TSAG), at IETF, with specific administrations and with its own customers and business partners as well as made concrete proposals (proposed new resolution, proposed action plan, etc.) to address this issue.

## 2. Potential considerations for the future of SG17

Broadcom identified a number of potential reasons for why this situation developed. Yet these are assumptions and need a process for validation which is the object of a draft action plan evolving under the cadence of TSAG.

As SG17 is developing its WTSA24 preparation, and because timelines are very long,<sup>2</sup> Broadcom proposes here that SG17 considers proactively a number of potential issues to perhaps guide its transformation. The intention is to 'fail fast' on those suggestions to rapidly identify what could help SG17 in time!

The following table summarises these suggestions for consideration:

**Table 1**

<b>Problem Statement</b>	Is running a Study Group meeting for 2 weeks the right length?
<b>Theme</b>	Increase Participation
<b>Background</b>	For the industry to detach some of its experts for 2 weeks is too long, this is not just a financial burden on expenses (air flights, hotels, per diem, etc.), but more importantly it blocks a resource for 2 weeks. Other SDOs seems to have moved or moving to a one-week model (e.g. 3GPP, ETSI, etc-) or one week including week-end (e.g. IETF, etc.)
<b>For consideration</b>	Would optimizing a function that minimizes costs but delivers on time help SG17?  Should SG17 consider compressing its meeting length gradually from 9 days to 7 days and ideally to 5 days?

**Table 2**

<b>Problem Statement</b>	Would a less siloed structure be more attractive to the industry? The industry is moving to vertically integrated security platforms with public and private cloud deployment. This requires more common logical bricks to be defined for reuse or repurpose in heavily API driven new environments.
<b>Theme</b>	Culture Change
<b>Background</b>	The current Questions structure and the parallelisation of Questions work in meetings has the advantage of focusing the work but is SG17 not missing an opportunity to have a cross cutting structure for some of its work on common work items?

---

<sup>1</sup> or, in clear text, "the lack of Industry Engagement" in certain areas of developed and developing countries

<sup>2</sup> eventhough the study period is very short, actually adding pressure

**For consideration**

Review if there is room for a question with common ground for all the other questions (let's call it Question 0 for the moment)?

Is there a need for an incremental change of culture in SG17 with a better fit for the industry and probably a better satisfaction of our SG17 members, probably generating interesting new areas?

**Table 3****Problem Statement****Theme****Background****For consideration**

How can we improve the intensity of Questions meetings?

Efficiency

Perhaps COVID didn't help but it is perceived that the intensity of the work in Questions meetings recently could be increased.

This is a non-trivial issue to address (the below list is non exhaustive and here just to start a discussion and part or all or combinations of the below can be considered):

- Would decreasing the questions time slots per week help? Other options?
- Would regrouping some questions help?
- Perhaps exploring running one part of the questions one week and another part the other week? Or on less days?

The workload on Rapporteurs should be taken in considerations on what is achievable.

**Table 4****Problem Statement****Theme****Background****For consideration**

Do we need to continue merging some Questions?

Granularity

Assuming new Questions may come from other Study Groups, how should we manage the expansion of SG17 work?

Should we merge more questions following our logic from CG-XSS in the last study period considering the possibility for a common bricks question (Question 0?) as above?

How would we handle all of the issues it could raise, e.g. Rapporteurship necessary 'compression' and all the political issues of representativity?

**3. Proposal**

Urgent attention is required to resolve these issues along the lines of WTS24 preparation.

Broadcom proposes to create a standalone exercise for further discussion.

Broadcom may as well consider generalising some of its points as a contribution to the TSAG RG-WM for action and RG-IEM for information