

Project	<b>IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group</b> < <a href="http://ieee802.org/16">http://ieee802.org/16</a> >	
Title	<b>Other MAC/PHY adhoc – Minutes of the second conference call</b>	
Date Submitted	<b>2007-04-26</b>	
Source(s)	Peiyong Zhu Chair, Other MAC/PHY Nortel 3500 Carling Avenue Ottawa, On K2H 8E9 Canada	Voice: +1 613 765 8089  <a href="mailto:pyzhu@nortel.com">pyzhu@nortel.com</a>
Re:		
Abstract	Minutes of the second conference call of the Relay TG's Other MAC/PHY ad hoc, held on 19 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 < <a href="http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/policy.html">http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/policy.html</a> >, 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 < <a href="mailto:chair@wirelessman.org">mailto:chair@wirelessman.org</a> > 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 < <a href="http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/notices">http://ieee802.org/16/ipr/patents/notices</a> >.	

## Other MAC/PHY Ad-hoc: Minutes of the second conference call

Peiying Zhu

Date and Time: Thursday 19 April 2007, 13:00 GMT

Attendance:

Chair: Peiying Zhu

Vice-chair: Mike Hart

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

Minutes:

The meeting started at 9:00am EST on 19 April 2007 with Peiying Zhu as chair and Mike Hart as vice-chair. The agenda emailed on 17 April 2007, updated on 19 April was followed.

**Roll Call**

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

**Discuss if we should accept the new contribution (7286)**

The author of 7286 believed that is this contribution is related to the contributions 7251 and 7258. Mike mentioned that 7286 is not related to 7251 since 7286 deals with the high order MIMO support, while 7251 deals with AAS support. Mike also mentioned that 7286 is loosely related to 7258, however the two contributions addressed separate issues, 7258 deals with cooperative relay, while 7286 deals with high order MIMO support.

Due to the absence of the authors of 7258, no decision was made whether to include this contribution in the ad-hoc discussion.

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

**Discuss deferred contributions (7206r1, 7207r2, 7258)**

=====  
**7206r1:** Hongyun Qu presented the contribution 7206r1. Yufeng raised the following issues :

1. The proposed solution increases overhead
2. The proposal used the absolute number instead of relative number, which may be conflict with the case where the frame number of MR-BS and all RSs are not synchronized (see contribution 240r1).
3. Do not see the need send NACK
4. MAC sub header is encrypted; there might be a security issue.

Derek Yu raised the following concern:

1. The proposal appears to introduce some timing flexibility, which may impact the performance of MBS.

Mike raised the following question:

1. What are the scenarios where the scheme defined in the baseline will fail?

Mary provided answers to some of the issues. And some of these issues were discussed via Emails before. The Chair feels that more discussions are needed.

**Actions:**

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. Peiyong: 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?

=====  
**7207r2:** Hongyun Qu presented the contribution 7207r2.

Yufeng commented that this contribution is related to 7148, which was deferred pending on the resolution of the security. WenPeng raised the following issues:

1. It is not clear what kind of situations the proposed sub header will be used.
2. Concern on the penalty of sub header
3. The proposed reporting metrics (number of discard MAC PDUs) are not enough for the scheduler.

Actions:

1. WenPeng: Send questions via Email
2. Hongyun: Review contribution 148 and Email the review results
3. Hongyun: Respond to the above issues.

=====  
**7258:** The authors are absent. Comment from Mike:

1. The proposed IM-MIMO mode is incomplete, for example, how the interleaving is done?

Chair made a comment that the authors of this contribution were absent in both meetings. If they do not respond to this Email, Chair will recommend to reject the contribution. There is no objection to the above recommendation.

Action: Peiyong: send Email to the authors on the about decision.

#### Review status of other contributions

=====  
**251r1:** There were actions from the last meeting to update the contribution. No action was taken by the authors, who were also absent.

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

=====  
**7052r3:** The author requested to consider r3 instead of r6. Comment from Mike:

1. The proposal modified the coding/modulation tables, which will confuse legacy MSs.
2. Do not see the benefit of adding new coding rate.

Action: Mike: Send questions via Email. Su Chang: Respond via Email

=====  
**7242r2:**

1. Mike request more time to review the contribution since he mistakenly reviewed r1.
2. Peiyong raised issue on how the resource allocation is done for cooperative relay mode
3. Mike commented if the modification is aligned with the Cor2

Actions:

1. Mike sends Email on the review outcome

2. Peiying sends Email on the questions

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

=====

**7172r2:** I-Kang is absent.

Mike and Peiying raised the same issue: The first paragraph of the proposed text is implementation dependent, no need to add that. The rest of modification is fine.

**Recommendation:** Accept\_modified.

**Action:** I-Kang to review the recommendation, if ok, modify the contribution.

=====

**7194r2:** Ranga made modification based on the last CC's recommendation. No one object the contribution. Mike request to follow the editorial style.

**Action:** Ranga to update the contribution based on the recommendation convention in the baseline. Upload the contribution 7194r3.

**Recommendation:** Accept 7194r3, assuming the change in 7194r3 is only editorial style change.

=====

**7026r2:** Mike commented that he is updating the contribution to address the comment received in the last CC, i.e., is it necessary to send the IE on frame base?

**Action:** Mike: Update the document before the next CC.

=====

**7227r2:** Ismail updated the contribution based on the comment received from Hang in the last CC, Hang is satisfied with the modification. Yufeng raise the question:

1. How to make sure that the proposed proposal can guarantee the time synchronization for MBS?

**Actions:**

1. Yufeng: Email the question.

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

=====

**796r4:** Hang updated the contribution based on the comment from Mary in the last CC. Haihong from Nokia suggested the following modifications to the RS type table:

- 1. Comment related MS-CPS lite
- 2. Reference to QoS header, which is still under discussion
- 3. Type 4 is related to security model

Mike commented that he has some editorial comment on MAC protocol, also asked if it is ok to remove the RS type from the proposed text for now. Hang think it should be ok.

**Actions:**

1. Haihong: Email Hang the suggested changes

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

3. Mike: Email hang comments on protocol

=====  
**7250r5:** Sunggun updated the contribution based on the comments from the last CC. Derek and Mike raise the following issues:

1. Why do we need another intermediate ARQ considering we have H-ARQ and ARQ? What is the real benefit? Is there simulation results to show the benefit?

Action: Sunggeun: Provide the answers to the above questions via Email

## Discuss new contribution based on the outcome of the item 2. (7286)

Since we have not reached the conclusion that this contribution should be addressed in the ad-hoc. No further discussion on this contribution. Mike raise a technical question:

1. Is there a real benefit to have higher order MIMO on UL?

Chair encouraged the attendees to review the contributions and send comments via Email disregard the decision whether this contribution will be handled in this ad-hoc since the contribution will be handled in May meeting anyway.

## Actions and plan for moving forward

There will be another CC to discuss the contributions, hopefully to make recommendations. Chair requested that all actions are to be taken before the next CC. The revision of a contribution should be uploaded at least one day ahead of the CC.

### Actions:

1. Peiyong to schedule the CC, tentatively, next Thursday morning 9:00 EST.
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 this updated Email list

The meeting was adjourned at 11:16am EST