

Discussion on proposal selection procedure

Document Number:

IEEE C802.16j-06/013

Date Submitted:

2006-05-01

Source:

Peiyong Zhu, Wen Tong, Hang Zhang
Gamini Senarnath,, David Steer, Derek Yu, Wang G-Q
Nortel, 3500 Carling Avenue
Ottawa, On K2H 8E9 Canada

Voice: 613 7658089

Email: pyzhu@nortel.com

613 7631315

wentong@nortel.com

Dean Kitchener, Mark Naden
Nortel
London Road
Harlow, Essex, CM17 9NA

Voice: +44 1279 403118

Fax: +44 1279 402100

E-mail: deank@nortel.com

Venue:

IEEE 802.16 Session #43, TelAviv, Israel

Base Document:

None

Purpose:

To discuss technical proposal selection procedure

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.

IEEE 802.16 Patent Policy:

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>>.

Introduction

- This contribution is provided to promote the discussion on technical contributions/proposal handling and TG schedule.
- Several previous contributions addressed this topic in study group, in this contribution, we provided some further comments and proposed our preferred approach.

Proposal selection options - 1

- Options 1 – complete proposal only
 - Accept complete end-to-end solution proposal only
 - Proponents with partial solution shall merge the proposal with other complete proposal before submitting to the task group
 - TG meeting performs proposal down selection based on pre-defined down selection procedure
- Pro:
 - Likely lead to a more consistent and cohesive solution
 - Better structure
- Con:
 - Probably length process, potentially dead lock
 - Few companies with larger resource pool dominate

Proposal selection options - 2

- Options 2 – Brainstorming and down selection*
 - Agree on list of topics at the beginning
 - Discuss contributions on the topics for two or three following meetings
 - Down selection on each topic in one or two meetings based on pre-defined procedure
- Pro:
 - Promote discussion and harmonization
- Con:
 - Less control over the contributions topics may leave many holes when down selection starts

* See C80216mmr-06_001.pdf

Proposal selection options - 3

- Options 3 – phased approach*
 - Divide the process of submitting / selecting contributions into phases
 - Structure phases so that more fundamental aspects of the air interface are addressed earlier
 - Contributions in subsequent phases can be based on work / decisions made in earlier phases
 - Adapt the process as we go
 - Each meeting concludes with presentation & selection of discussion topics for next meeting
- Pro:
 - Focused efforts and limited scope for each meeting
 - Structure progress
- Con:
 - Topics are inter-related, selection on each topic may not be possible without consideration of other topics
 - Topic isolation may lead to several round of iteration
 - Each member may have different expertise and focus, some may be only interested to the later phase topic, Late feedback from other members on those topics may delay the whole process

* See C80216mmr-06_018

Proposal selection options - 4

- Options 4 – standard drafting centered approach
 - Agree on the structure (table of contents) of draft standard (amendment) at the beginning based on .16e standard meeting
 - Call for contributions to fill in text or comments on the adopted text
 - When too many contributions are submitted for the same topic, form an ad-hoc to recommend a harmonized joint contribution, which could be done between the meetings
 - Go to ballot when the draft is close to finish
- Pro:
 - Focus on the final goal of generating the draft
 - Promote cross topic discussion
 - Reuse the same procedure for .16, no need to reinvent the wheel
 - Selection as we progress
- Con:
 - Topic could be fragmented

Recommendation

- Based on previous discussion
- Our recommendation is
 - Option 4: standard drafting centered approach