Project	**IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group <http://ieee802.org/16>**
Title	**Other MAC/PHY adhoc – Minutes of the third conference call**
Date Submitted	2007-05-03
Source(s)	Peiying Zhu Chair, Other MAC/PHY Nortel 3500 Carling Avenue Ottawa, On K2H 8E9 Canada Voice: +1 613 765 8089 pyzhu@nortel.com
Re:	
Abstract	Minutes of the third conference call of the Relay TG's Other MAC/PHY ad hoc, held on 26 April 2007.
Purpose	Information
Notice	This document has been prepared to assist IEEE 802.16. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.
Release	The contributor grants a free, irrevocable license to the IEEE to incorporate material contained in this contribution, and any modifications thereof, in the creation of an IEEE Standards publication; to copyright in the IEEE's name any IEEE Standards publication even though it may include portions of this contribution; and at the IEEE's sole discretion to permit others to reproduce in whole or in part the resulting IEEE Standards publication. The contributor also acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made public by IEEE 802.16.
Patent Policy and Procedures	The contributor is familiar with the IEEE 802.16 Patent Policy and Procedures <http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/policy.html>, including the statement "IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder or applicant with respect to patents essential for compliance with both mandatory and optional portions of the standard." Early disclosure to the Working Group of patent information that might be relevant to the standard is essential to reduce the possibility for delays in the development process and increase the likelihood that the draft publication will be approved for publication. Please notify the Chair <mailto:chair@wirelessman.org> as early as possible, in written or electronic form, if patented technology (or technology under patent application) might be incorporated into a draft standard being developed within the IEEE 802.16 Working Group. The Chair will disclose this notification via the IEEE 802.16 web site <http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/notices>.

Other MAC/PHY Ad-hoc: Minutes of the third conference call
Peiying Zhu

Date and Time:			Thursday 26 April 2007, 13:00 GMT

Attenance:
Chair:		Peiying Zhu
Vice-chair:	Mike Hart
Participants:

Adrian Boariu	yes		Qu Hongyun	yes
Aik Chindapol	yes		Rakesh Taori	no
Bill Shvodian	no		Ranga Reddy	yes
Changhoi Koo	no		Robert Popoli	no
Chia-Chin Chong	no		Roger Peterson	no
Dale Branlund	yes		Sean Cai	no
Daqiang Gu	no		Shashikant Maheshwari	no
Dave Pechner	no		Gamini Senarath	yes
David Chen	no		Shaw Tayler	no
David Steer	no		Shulan Feng	no
Derek Yu	yes		Shyamal Ramachandran	no
Du	no		Suchang Chae	yes
Fujio Watanabe	no		Sunggeun Jin	no
Fang-Ching (Frank) Ren	no		Sungjin Lee	no
Gerrit Hiddink	no		Suga Junichi	no
Gokhan Korkmaz	yes		Ulas Kozat	no
haihong zheng	yes		Wei-Peng Chen	no
Hang Zhang	yes		YoungBin Chang	no
Hua-Chiang Yin	no		Young-il Km	no
I-Kang Fu	yes		Young-Jae Kim	yes
Ismail Guvenc	yes		Youn-Tai Lee	no
Jae Hyung Eom	yes		Yousuf Saifullah	yes
Jerry Chow	no		Yung-Ting Lee	no
Jimin Liu	no		Yufeng Zhou	yes
John Lee	no		Wei Ni	yes
Kanchei (Ken) Loa	no		Geng Shen	yes
Keiichi Nakatsugawa	yes			
Kim Olszewski	no			
Kumar Prachi	no			
Kyu Ha Lee	no			
Li Anxin	yes			
Li Ting	yes			
Mary Choin	yes			
Mike Hart	yes			
Mike Webb	yes			
Mitius Nohara	no			
Mo-han Fong	no			
Moo Ryong Jeong	no			
Norin John	no			
Peiying Zhu	yes			
Peter Wang	no			
Priscillica Santos	no			

Minutes:

The meeting started at 9:00am EST on 26 April 2007 with Peiying Zhu as chair and Mike Hart as vice-chair. The agenda emailed on 23 April 2007 was followed.

Roll Call

The participants listed above identified themselves as participating in the meeting.

Review action items and status of all contributions

7268:

Action from the second CC: Authors of 7258 to review the contribution of 7286 and send Email to indicate if they see the commonality between 7258 and 7286.

Authors of 7258 and 7286 reviewed the contributions and believed that there are certain commonalities between two contributions and agreed to discuss offline to harmonize. Based on this discussion, it was agreed that the contribution 7286 will be addressed in this ad-hoc.

7206r1

Actions from the second CC:

1. Mary and Yufeng: continue the discussion via ad-hoc Email list on item 3.

2. Yufeng: review Mary's answer on item 2, and send Email to indicate if the answer is satisfactory.

3. Mary: send Email to address the concern on item 1

4. Mary: make sure sub header format is consistent with the format agreed in MAC PDU ad-hoc.

5. Peiying: send a note to security ad-hoc group

6. Derek: Send Email to explain the concerns, Hongyue or Mary will answer the question?

7. Hongyue or Mary: List the scenarios where the scheme defined in the baseline will fail?

Actions were taken by Yufeng, Mary and Derek. There were discussions via Email on all the issues raised. However, both Yufeng and Derek felt that their issues were not fully addressed, more detailed discussions are needed. The main issue is that it is not clear on the benefit of the proposal.

New Action: Hongyue agreed to discuss further with YuFeng and Derek.

7207r2

Actions from the second CC:

1. WenPeng: Send questions via Email

2. Hongyun: Review contribution 148 and Email the review results

3. Hongyun: Respond to the above issues.

Actions were taken by Wen Peng and HongYun, based on the discussion on the Email reflector, HongYun felt that the

issues raised by WenPeng can not be easily resolved, therefore, she requested to reject this contribution. The ad-hoc group agrees the proposal. Therefore, the recommendation for this contribution is to reject the proposal, we can use the following reasons:

It is not clear what kind of situations the proposed sub header will be used.

Concern on the penalty of sub header

The proposed reporting metrics (number of discard MAC PDUs) are not enough for the scheduler.

7258

Action from second CC.
Peiying: send Email to the authors on the about decision.

The action was taken; Wei Ni and Shen Geng attended this CC. Wei Ni explained some details on IM-MIMO. And noted that it is an alternative approach, their main focus is on ADSTC. Mike suggested to focus on the main approach. Wei agreed to remove the IM-MIMO part from their proposal. Aik asked to clarify the exact text proposal over the existing baseline.

New Actions:
1. Need to harmonize with the contribution 7286
2. Clarify the actual text proposal based on the existing baseline text.
3. Remove IM-MIMO part

7251r1
Action from the second CC:

Update the contribution before the next CC, otherwise, we will recommend "reject".

The contribution was updated (7251r3) to reflect the comments received from the first CC. Peiying are satisfied with the change on the diagram. New simulation results were added in the contribution. Adrian raised the following issues:
1. Clarify why there are needs to tie together two separate issues in the contribution: Need for narrow band sounding (training), Need to introduce the new codeword (training preamble).
2. Specific question on the code word number in the proposed text, i.e., why 63x64X2
3. Mode detailed explanations needed for the definition in the codeword section on matrix A, H, also toggle matrix
Dale explained the benefit of narrow band sounding based on the simulation in the proposal. Adrian questioned the suitability of the simulation scenario, i.e., large cell radio for RS coverage.
Mike mentioned that he has some editorial comments.

New Actions:
1. Dale sends Mike the word version of the contribution so that Mike can comment directly on the contribution
2. Adrian and Dale discuss further offline

7052r3

Action from the second CC:
Mike: Send questions via Email. Su Chang: Respond via Email

Mike sent question to Su Chang, due to the short time notice, Su Change did not have a chance to respond. Peiying mentioned that she sent a question before, no answer was provided.

New action:
1. Peiying to resend the question
2. Su Chang responds to both Mike and Peiying's questions.

7242r2:

Actions for the second CC:

1. Mike sends Email on the review outcome

2. Peiying sends Email on the questions

3. Mike/Peiying/Authors: Review if the suggested text is aligned with the modification in Cor2.

Mike felt that 7242 and 7258 are proposing conflicting text . Peiying explained that the issue was raised in the first CC, Aik responded that they prefer not to change 242 since it deals with the editorial issue, while 258 is proposing some new scheme, which he has concerns on the benefit. Mike suggested that at least 242 and 258 should generate a contribution to reflect the common part, and then propose separate contributions for the part which they can not agree.

New actions:

1. Wei Ni and Aik to generate a contribution to reflect the common part, and then propose separate contributions for the part which they can not agree.

7172r2

I-Kang agreed to update the contribution to reflect the ad-hoc's suggestion from the last call. He uploaded the new revision 7172r3. No one has objection to the new version.

Recommendation: Accept 7172r3.

7194r2

Ranga made modification based on the last CC's recommendation and uploaded the new revision to the server (7194r3). No one objected the contribution.

Recommendation: Accept 7194r3

7026r2

Action from the second CC:
Mike: Update the document before the next CC.

Mike is considering harmonizing with some frame structure signaling. He will work on the update.

7227r2

Actions from the second CC:

1. Yufeng: Email the question.

2. Ismail:Provide answer to Yufeng's question.

Action was taken. Ismail updated the contribution based on Yufeng's comment. He also sent out a slide to address Yufeng's question. Yufeng is satisfying with the answer. However, Yufeng is not sure why do we need ARQ for MR-BS-RS link since it is usually more reliable considering there is no ARW for RS to MS link? His main concern are:

What is the benefit of the proposed scheme? What is the tradeoff of complexity vs. benefit?

Ismail explained that MB-RS link is more critical than RS-MS link since it affects more users if it fails. Yufeng is not satisfied with the answer and agreed to discuss more offline.

Mary has a question on the time synchronization for MBS. Hongyue has some other concerns.

New Actions:

1. Ismail will respond to Yufeng's question via Email

2. Mary will send question to Ismail

3. Hongyue will send concerns to Ismail

796r4

Actions from the second CC
1. Haihong: Email Hang the suggested changes

2. Peiying: Send a note to security ad-hoc chair

3. Mike: Email hang comments on protocol

Haihong, Hang and Mike had may Email exchanges and offline discussion. Hang made update (796r5) based on their comments. Mike is satisfied with the update other than some editorial comments. Haihong is also satisfied with the updates except:

1. Concern on the need of CPS-lite

2. Some text related to RS type

3. Second diagram is based on certain security assumption.

Hang explained the reason of CPS-lite for access RS. Haihong agreed. They agreed to take the issue offline for intermediate RS. As for the second point related to RS type, Hang agreed to change the text. For the third point, it is agreed to indicate the diagram is for MRS to remove the dependency on security. Once the security ad-hoc reaches some agreement, we may consider to remove this constraint.

New actions:

1. Hang to send word documents to Mike, Mike to add the editorial comments

2. Haihong and Hang to resolve the CPS-lite for intermediate issue

3. Hang to update the contribution

Based on the discussion, the recommendation is to accept the contribution pending on the completion of above actions.

7250r5

Action from the second CC:
Sunggeun: Provide the answers to the above questions via Email

Sunggeun is absent. . Sungeun's colleague thought that Sunggeun provided the answers, however, no one received the answers.
New Action: Sunggeun: Provide the answers to the above questions via Email

2007-05-03   IEEE C802.16j-07/337

7286

Anxin explained the benefit of introducing higher order MIMO in the uplink. However, Mike and Aik believed that the explanations are not convincing. The authors were requested to bring more evidences including simulation results. Peiying raised an issue on whether the channel estimation based on the current pilot design is good enough for 4 stream data transmission, Anxin cited a contribution from LGE on the simulation. Peiying thought that was for 2 STTD transmission case. Anxin agreed to check the details.

New Actions:
1. Explain more on the benefit of higher order MIMO
2. Check the channel estimation issue
3. Harmonize with 258

Discuss recommendations

To accept the following contributions: 7172r3, 7194r3
To reject the contribution: 7207r2

To consider accept the contribution 796r6 pending the completion action items

Actions and plan for moving forward

There will be another CC on April 30 GMT 13:00 to discuss the remaining unresolved contributions, hopefully to make recommendations. Chair requested that all actions are to be taken before the next CC.

Actions:

1. Peiying to schedule the CC

2. All: Review the actions and take the actions if they are assigned to you.

3. All: Review the recommendations. Send comments if you have concerns.

4. All: Review the contributions and Email comments including the recommendations (i.e., if you support a contribution, recommend accept or accept modified, if you do not support, recommend reject)

5. Please use the updated Email list

The meeting was adjourned at 11:15am EST