### OFDM based 802.16.3 PHY Proposal

### IEEE 802.16 Presentation Submission Template (Rev. 8)

Document Number: IEEE 802.16.3p-00/41

Date Submitted: 2000-11-08

#### Source:

Nico van Waes	Voice:	+1(650)625 2201
Nokia	Fax:	+1(650)6252058
313 Fairchild Dr.	E-mail:	ofdmforum_chair_fwa@wi-lan.com
Mountain View, CA		

#### Venue:

802.16. Session # 10Tampa,FL Nov. 2000

#### Base Document:

### <a href="http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/16/tg3/contrib/802163c-00\_41r1.pdf">http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/16/tg3/contrib/802163c-00\_41r1.pdf</a>

Purpose:

802.16.3 PHY proposal for presentation, discussion and decision

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 text 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.

#### IEEE 802.16 Patent Policy:

The contributor is familiar with the IEEE 802.16 Patent Policy and Procedures (Version 1.0) <<u>http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/policy.html</u>>, including the statement "IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, if there is technical justification in the opinion of the standards-developing committee and provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder that it will license applicants under reasonable terms and conditions for the purpose of implementing 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 <<u>mailto:r.b.marks@ieee.org</u>> as early as possible, in written or electronic form, of any patents (granted or under application) that may cover technology that is under consideration by or has been approved by IEEE 802.16. The Chair will disclose this notification via the IEEE 802.16 web site <<u>http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/notices</u>>.

## Deployment issues

### Low installation cost and good coverage required

• Aiming on BS much more difficult than aiming on satellite

- Residential installations require unobtrusive antennas
  - No large masts possible to gain LOS
- Short ranges (due to propagation and capacity limitations) limit choice of BS sites

• Huge BS structures won't be tolerated

=> Standard should not aim at high directivity antennas

## => Multipath unavoidably severe from deployment constraints

- Robust in adverse channel conditions.
- Allows NLOS operation while maintaining a high level of spectral efficiency.
- It effectively mitigates performance degradations due to multipath and is capable of combating deep fades in part of the spectrum.
- Waveform can be easily modified to adjust to the delay spread of the channel.
- OFDM allows efficient operation in both FDD and TDD mode
  - Only short pre-ambles needed.
  - No need to load channel coefficients for equalizer => No transmitter knowledge required by polling or scheduling
  - => MAC flexibility
- More but independent taps in equalizer (one per carrier) => significant simplified equalizer

- Frequency offset estimation in OFDM and baud timing accuracy in single carrier approaches are equally difficult.
- Relatively large Peak-to-average Power Ratio (~ 10 dB) is a drawback
  - Various methods are available to reduce this ratio.

## • DFT size

- Powers of 4 preferred due to Radix–4 algorithm efficiency
- 64 DFT
  - Legacy technology => Provides fast market entry
  - Comparatively high overhead due to delay spread driven guard intervals

• 256

- Higher phase noise requirements
- Lower overhead due to guard interval
- Longer training required (frequency offset estimation etc..)

# 1024 and higher

- High phase noise requirements (oscillators may get expensive)
- Low overhead due to guard interval
- Long training required
- Traffic burst granularity becomes a big issue
- => Flexibility needed. Also advantageous for longterm relevance of PHY.
  - Scheme as in Breezecom presentation considered.

- Guard interval size
  - Large variation in cell-sizes creates large range in delay spread numbers
  - Selecting guard-interval to fit worst-case scenario causes severe throughput penalty, hence make no sense.
  - => Flexibility needed.
  - Granularity of 1 or 2  $\mu$ s, might make sense.
- Windowing (Roll-off factor or band-pass filtering)
  - Needs to be carefully designed to allow usage of adjacent channels on closely spaced sector– antennas
    - Causes slight reduction in effective guard time.

## Adaptive per-CPE modulation and Power Control required

Necessary to optimize capacity

- FEC
  - Convolutional codes and block turbo codes both make sense.
    - For large DFT sizes, turbo codes might be more efficient, for small DFT sizes, convolutional codes might be more practical.
    - Various coding rates needed to facilitate trade-off between throughput and robustness.

## • ARQ will be mandated to achieve reliability.

## • Modulation:

 up:BPSK to 16 QAM / down: BPSK to 64 QAM, 64 up and 256 optional

# Antenna diversity support (MIMO, Vector etc..)

- Should be included as optional.
  - Boosts system performance.
  - Leads to more expensive equipment.