

Project	IEEE 802.20 Working Group on Mobile Broadband Wireless Access < http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/20/ >	
Title	Meeting Minutes, 802.20 Session #7, Orlando, Florida, March 15-19, 2004	
Date Submitted	2004-3-28	
Source(s)	Rao Yallapragada QUALCOMM, Incorporated 5775 Morehouse Drive San Diego, CA, 92121	Voice: +1 858 658 4540 Fax: +1 858 651 2880 Email: rao@qualcomm.com
Re:	802.20 Session#7	
Abstract	Draft of the Minutes of the Session #7;	
Purpose	Minutes of the Session.	
Notice	This document has been prepared to assist the IEEE 802.20 Working Group. 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 802.20.	
Patent Policy	The contributor is familiar with IEEE patent policy, as outlined in Section 6.3 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual < http://standards.ieee.org/guides/opman/sect6.html#6.3 > and in <i>Understanding Patent Issues During IEEE Standards Development</i> < http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/guide.html >.	

Draft - Meeting Minutes of the 802.20 Session #7

March 15-19, 2004
Orlando, Florida

Rao Yallapragada
Secretary

The seventh session of 802.20 was held at the March 2004 Plenary meeting of IEEE 802 in Orlando, Florida.

The 802.20 WG had a joint opening interim session with 802.11, 802.15, 802.16, 802.18, 802.19 from 2:00 AM to 4:00 PM on Monday, March 15, 2004.

Contributions and WG documents referenced in these minutes may be found at the 802.20 website, <http://www.ieee802.org/20/>

See Appendix A for the attendance list.

Minutes of 802.20 Monday March 15, 2004

Meeting started at 4:00 pm.

The Chair opened the meeting and made the opening remarks. The chair presented the key goals for the current session. The chair went through the logistics for the current session and explained the attendance rule for full membership. Chair announced that the Officer Elections for 802.20 for Y2004-Y2006 term will be held at 7:00 pm in room Salon V. Chair requested the Vice-Chairs and Secretary to issue voting tokens to 802.20 members

The voting tokens were then handed over to the members after ensuring they have valid membership and confirming their affiliation.

Time: 4:40 pm

Chair asked to let him know if there are any new Candidates for Chair, Procedural Chair and Liaison Vice-Chair officer positions

The chair gave an outline of the Election Procedure

Then Chair presented the detailed agenda for the current session (Appendix B)

Bob Love requested to present an alternative proposal –
Chair allowed Bob Love to discuss the differences he has with the proposed agenda

Then chair proposed changes to the agenda. After a brief discussion and feedback from the working group, the agenda was modified.

Time: 5:10 pm

Motion #1

Motion to approve the meeting minutes for 802.20 Sessions 5 and 6 (C802.20-03/22r3, C802.20-04/02)

Mover: Bob Love

Second: Joanne Wilson

Results: Motion passed by acclamation

Time: 5:15 pm

Presentation by Jennifer Longman on “IEEE Standards Editorial Process” (C802.20-04/xx)

The presentation provided an overview of the editorial process and outlined the roles of program manager, project editor, working group technical editor. It also outlined the importance of editorial coordination and listed the available resources that can be utilized for the process.

Chair Presented the Modified Agenda for the current session#7 (Appendix C)

Time: 5:48 pm

Motion #2

Motion to approve the modified agenda (Appendix C)

Mover: Bob Love

Second: Jim Mollenauer

Results: Motion to approve the agenda passed by unanimous consent

Modified Agenda (Appendix B) Approved

Time: 5:52 pm

The chair requested the members to be assemble back for elections at 7:00 pm

Meeting recessed at 5:55pm

Meeting resumed at 7:00 pm

ELECTIONS

The chair explained the procedures to be followed for the elections of the new Chair, Procedural Vice-Chair and Liaison Vice-Chair for the following 2-year term (Y2004-Y2006)

The chair asked the members to pick up voting tokens one last time.

The chair asked for final nominations of all the officer positions.

The chair turned the chairing of the group to Procedural Vice-Chair Gang Wu to conduct the process of electing the chair.

Three candidates expressed their intent for chair: Robert Love, Mark Klerer and Jerry Upton

Gang Wu requested each of the candidates to make a 3-min statement.

Gang Wu then requested the candidates to leave the room.

Gang Wu requested the members in the floor to make any comments giving each member a time limit of 5 minutes.

After the phase, Gang Wu requested the candidates to enter the room

Voting Ballots were then handed over to the members who have valid voting tokens.

Chair Election Results

Total Ballots Given: 134

Total Ballots Polled: 134

Mark Klerer : 27

Robert Love: 28

Jerry Upton: 72

Abstentions: 6

Discarded (write-in): 1

Time: 20:13

Jerry Upton is elected as Chair of the 802.20 WG for the term Y2004-Y2006

Procedural Vice Chair Gang Wu then turned the chairing back to Jerry Upton

Procedural Chair Election Results:

There was only one candidate for this office. However , a re-affirmation vote was taken.

Total Ballots Given: 98

Total Ballots Polled: 97

Gang Wu: 93

Abstain: 3

Rejected (Write-in): 1

Gang Wu elected as Procedural Vice-Chair of the 802.20 WG for the term Y2004-Y2006

Time: 20:45 pm

Election of Liaison Vice-Chair

There were two candidates for this office: Eshwar Pittampalli and Joanne Wilson.

The Chair requested each of the candidates to make a 3-min statement.

The Chair then requested the candidates to leave the room.

The Chair requested the members in the floor to make any comments giving each member a time limit of 5 mins.

After the phase, Chair requested the candidates to enter the room

Voting Ballots were then handed over to the members who have valid voting tokens.

Total Ballots Given: 111

Total Ballots Polled: 111

Eshwar Pittampalli: 78

Joanne Wilson: 30

Abstain: 3

Rejected: None

Time: 9:25 pm

Eshwar Pittampalli elected as Liaison Vice-Chair of the 802.20 WG for the term Y2004-Y2006

Time: 9:30 pm

Meeting recessed

Tuesday, March 16, 2004

Meeting started at 8:05 am

Chair started the meeting reviewing the working agenda for the day (Appendix C)

Presentation by John Humbert on “System Requirements Update” (C802.20-04/42)

Presented an update on the status of the System Requirements document

John Humbert expressed concerns that CG is not being able to come to consensus on several issues and is not making progress

John Humbert proposed a new system requirements document review process

Discussion followed

Friendly amendment by Joanne Wilson to the proposed text on System Requirements Review Process

Remove “Call for additional contributions” to “Consider additional contributions”
Second: Steve Crowley

Friendly amendment accepted

Discussion followed

Time: 8:50 am

Motion #3

Motion to adopt the SRD Procedure Motion presented in document (C802.20-04/42)

Mover: John Humbert

Second: Eshwar Pittampalli

Results:

All in favor: 54

Opposed: 12

Abstentions: 1

Time: 8:57 am

Motion passes

Chair announced that members who made new contributions on the topic of System Requirements for the current session could present a 5-minute summary of their contributions if they are interested to present their case before the beginning of the review of the System Requirements document.

There are four new contributions made to the System Requirements for the current session.

Vincent Park presented a 5-min summary of his contribution to the system requirements document(C802.20-04/31r1)

Vincent Park - some aspects of the requirements document are contradictory
Sometimes the requirements are potentially counter productive

Way forward – keep it simple

Guidance on scope of problem to be solved without mandating specific solutions

Include requirements when there is a clear consensus

When specific requirements are difficult or impossible to define provide rough guidance

Move on if consensus is not likely to be achieved

Final thought: do the right thing – if we don't know what the right thing is we should at least not do the wrong thing

Joseph Cleveland presented a 5-min summary of his contribution to the system requirements document(C802.20-04/29)

Improvement Factors

- have specific requirements with specific numbers
- Cost improvement: Goal of 10X
- Achieve Shannon's limit on capacity
- Free space – 13.7 bps/hz
- Lognormal – 2 to 3 bps/hz
- Latency constraints: Round trip delay 10 ms is an objective 50 ms is way too high

Chair called for any other 5-min summary presentations on their contributions to system requirements document

Time: 9:15 am

John Humbert began the review of the SRD document beginning with Section 4.1.2

There are currently 2 options listed for consideration.

Discussion and review followed on both the options.

Four options emerged for consideration from the discussion.

Michael Youssefmir presented a 5-min summary of his contribution to the system requirements document (C802.20-04/33r1)

Presented comments on the current options

Time: 9:40 am

Motion #4

Motion to adopt Option 1 of section 4.1.2

Mover: John Humbert

Second: Michael Youssefmir

#1 Friendly Amendment
Proposed by Nagi Mansour

Friendly Amendment rejected

Proposed amendments to the section :

Moved by Nagi Mansour

Second: Joanne Wilson

- 1. Spectral efficiency should be specified as a target value**
- 2. Delete the phase 2 values from table**

a. Friendly amendment to the amendment:
Jim Ragsdale proposed
Nagi Mansour accepted

b. Friendly amendment on the amendment
Proposed by Hank Henry Eilts

Option 1: Last sentence: The system spectral efficiency of the 802.20 air interface shall [should] be greater than

Rejected by Nagi Mansour

Friendly amendment by Nagi Mansour
Joanne Wilson accepts the change

- Change: delete first requirement
- Delete the phase 2 values from table.

Time: 10:10 am

Motion#5

Motion to adopt the amendment

Mover: Nagi Mansour

Second: Joanne Wilson

In favor: 36

Opposed: 47

Results: Motion to adopt amendment fails

Break: 10: 15 am between 10: 30 am

#2 Friendly amendment to change text
Proposed by Marianna Goldhammer

Change: It shall consider among other factors a minimum/maximum expected data rate/user and/or other fairness criteria, and percentage of throughput due to duplicated information flow.

Friendly amendment #2 rejected
Time: 10:40 am

Motion#6

Motion to adopt an amendment to Option 1
Mover: Marianna GoldHammer
Second: None
Result: No Motion

Time: 10: 43 am

#3 Friendly Amendment to Option 1
Proposed by Mark Klerer

Change:
Phase 1 -> Requirement
Phase 2 -> Target [stretch objective]

Friendly amendment #3 rejected

Time: 10:50 am

Motion#7

Motion to adopt the above amendment
Mover: Mark Klerer
Second: Jim Ragsdale

Call into question by Joanne Wilson
No objections
Results:

In favor: 20
Opposed: 38
Amendment fails

#4 Friendly Amendment
Proposed by Joanne Wilson:

Change: Remove Bandwidth on the table because same numbers for 1.25 MHz and 5 MHz

Friendly amendment #4 rejected

Time: 11:05 am

Motion#8

Motion to adopt above amendment (i.e., remove reference to channel BW from table and collapse table)

Mover: Joanne Wilson

Second: Michael Youssefmir

Call into question by Joanne Wilson

No objection

Results:

In favor: 23

Opposed: 34

Motion #8 fails

Discussion followed and main motion #4 called for vote.

Motion#4 on the floor to adopt Option 1 with Phase 1 and Phase 2 as is with no definitions:

Results:

In favor: 3

Opposed 56

Motion #4 fails

Time: 11:20 am

Motion #9

Motion to adopt Option 2 as baseline text for section 4.1.2 for systems requirement document

Mover: John Humbert

Second: Nagi Mansour

#5 Friendly Amendment by Mike Youssefmir to change xx to 1.5 bps/Hz/sector
Friendly amendment #5 Accepted

Chair asked if there any objections to call into question

No objections were raised

Results:

In favor: 23

Opposed: 46
Motion #9 fails

Time: 11:30 am
Motion #10

Motion to adopt Option 3 as baseline text for section 4.1.2 for systems requirement document

Mover: John Humbert
Second: Jim Tomcik

Chair asked if there any objections to call into question
No objections were raised

Results:
In favor: 49
Opposed: 21
Motion #10 Fails, as a < 75% vote was required for passage

Time: 11:35am
Motion #11

Motion to adopt Option 4 as baseline text for section 4.1.2 for systems requirement document

Mover: John Humbert
Second: Mark Klerer

Chair asked if there any objections to call into question
Objection raised by Jim Ragsdale

Discussion followed

Friendly amendment# 6
Proposed by Nagi Mansour
Change: change spectral efficiency from 1 b/s/Hz/sector to 1.2
Friendly amendment #6 rejected (by mover)

Time: 11:45 am
Motion#12

Motion to adopt above amendment (i.e., to change the spectral efficiency 1 to 1.2)

Mover: Mike Youssefmir
Second: Joanne Wilson

Results:
In favor: 19

Opposed: 39
Motion #12 fails

Chair asked if there any objections to call into question
No objections were raised
Main Motion #11 on the floor

Results:
In favor: 16
Opposed: 45
Motion #11 Fails
Time: 11:55 am

Lunch Break: 11:56 am - 1:05 pm

Chair reviewed the agenda for the afternoon

Presentation by Joanne Wilson on material concerning a Motion requesting a name change for 802.11p PAR.

Time: 1:15 pm
Motion #13

Motion: That 802.20 request 802.11 to change the title of their PAR (provisionally 802.11p) from “Wireless Access for the Vehicular Environment” to “Wireless Access for Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Applications: to avoid the appearance of overlap with the work of 802.20

Move: Joanne Wilson
Second: David James

Friendly Amendment #7
Proposed by Mark Klerer

Change: Motion: That 802.20 request 802.11 to change the title of their PAR (provisionally 802.11p) from “Wireless Access for the Vehicular Environment” to e.g. “Wireless Access for Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Applications: to avoid the appearance of overlap with the work of 802.20.

Friendly Amendment #7 Accepted

Chair asked if there any objections to call into question
No objections were raised
Main Motion #13 on the floor

Results:
In favor: 32

Opposed: 32
Chair to abstain
Motion undecided

Chair calls for Recount/Revote on the motion

Results:
In favor: 35
Opposed: 35
Chair to abstain
Motion undecided

Mark Klerer requests a Roll Call Vote which was granted by the Chair

Results of the Roll Call Vote (see Appendix E1 for Roll Call by voter):
In favor: 40
Opposed: 40
Abstentions: 5
There is a tie in the vote again

Chair Votes in favor of the motion
Motion #13 passes

Time: 2:00 pm

Motion # 14:

802.16 is requested to share with 802.20 and with the 802 SEC, all liaison information regarding ITU. In particular, it is requested that 802.16 share the report received from ITU-T Study Group 9 this year (2004) as a result of the liaison during the January (Honolulu) ITU meeting.

Mover: Tom Kolze
Second Eswhar Pittampalli

Discussion followed

Chair requested the Liaison Vice-Chair to request the 802.16 chair to share the report received from ITU-T study group 9 this year (2004). In the event if the report is not received, the chair suggested that then we revisit this issue on Thursday afternoon.

Motion #14 postponed to the afternoon of Thursday, March 18 2004

Time: 2:15 pm

Motion #15

The 802.16 PAR for REVD allows only changes for “errors” and inconsistencies”. It is possible that during the editing process for REVD that one or more technical changes may have been introduced. 802.20 requests the SEC to ask for inputs from all 802 members within a certain time window, for potential examples of exceeding this PAR, and to then ask for a full explanation of these cases from 802.16

Mover: Thomas Kolze
Second: Robert Ward Jr.

Discussion followed

PAR has been reviewed.

On the input and feedback provided from the WG members, Thomas Kolze withdrew the Motion#15 and agreed to study the 802.16d revised PAR

The group then moved back to the Requirements section of the agenda.

Joanne Wilson requested consideration of alternate text in SRD review Process

Mover: Joanne Wilson
Second: Mark Klerer

Discussion followed

Mike Youssefmir moves to table the motion until the work on spectral efficiency section (Section 4.1.2) is completed

Mover and the Second accepts the motion

Time: 2:30 pm

John Humbert resumes the review of Section 4.1.2

Chair remarked that Option 2 that received a 30% favorable vote and Option 3 that received a 70% favorable vote are the top choices for considerations to be adopted as baseline text for Section 4.1.2

Time: 2:40 pm

Motion #16

Motion to adopt Option 2 as the baseline text for Section 4.1.2

Mover: John Humbert
Second: Joanne Wilson

Discussion followed

Joanne Wilson raised the issue that the motion that was adopted earlier in the day contains a significant violation of Robert Rules of order because it includes voting on same motions that previously failed at the same meeting. The Chair stated the Process and Procedures adopted by the Group allows for a re-vote.

Chair asked if there were any objections to call into question

No objections were raised

Main Motion #16 on the floor

Results:

In favor: 17

Opposed: 49

Motion #15 Fails

Time: 3:05 pm

Motion #17

Motion to adopt Option 3 as the baseline text for Section 4.1.2

Mover: John Humbert

Second: Dan Gal

Chair asked if there any objections to call into question

No objections were raised

Main Motion #15 on the floor

Results:

In favor: 54

Opposed: 19

Motion #16: Fails due to < 75% vote

Time: 3:10 pm

Motion #18

Motion to remand the section 4.1.2 on spectral efficiency to an ad-hoc to develop a consensus proposal

Mover: Joanne Wilson

Second: Larry Alder

Results:

In favor: 63

Opposed: 0

Motion #17 passes

Time: 3:15 pm

Break: 3:20 pm – 4:00 pm

The attendance server is down. The chair requested members to record their attendance in a piece of paper and give it to the Liaison Vice-Chair before leaving the session.

Chair reaffirmed that he will get through Vancouver motions before the end of the day.

Time: 4:05pm

Motion #19

Motion to bring the SRD review process off the table and modify the review process

Mover: Joanne Wilson

Second: David James

Discussion followed.

Results

In favor: 18

Opposed: 15

Motion #19 passes

Time: 4:25 pm

Motion #20

Motion to modify SRD Procedure Motion (pg 1 of 4)

Current Text of SRD review Procedure

Whereas it is the desire of the working group to complete the system requirements document...

1. Review the section as presented in latest version of the SRD
2. Consider additional contributions for that particular section
 - Consider motions brought forward to create a consensus proposal for the section under consideration

Proposed new text:

Whereas it is the desire of the working group to complete the system requirements document...

1. Review the section as presented in latest version of the SRD
2. Consider additional contributions for that particular section
 - Consider motions brought forward to create a consensus proposal for the section under consideration or remand to an ad-hoc group.

Moved by Joanne Wilson

Second: David James

Discussion followed

Time: 4:35pm

Motion #21

Motion to Postpone the Motion #20 to amend the previously adopted SRD process until 8:15am (nominal 8:00) on the 17th March 2004 and to establish an ad-hoc group to refine the process for processing SRD comments

Moved by: Mark Klerer

Second: Joanne Wilson

Results:

In favor: 69

Opposed: 2

Motion #21 passes

Time: 4:40 pm

Resumption of review on the SRD by John Humbert

Section 4.1.1.1

Text of the current SRD 11r1 version is brought up for review. This text seemed to differ slightly with the text approved in Motion 6 in Vancouver.

Chair proposed that current text of section 4.1.1.1 of SRD document should reflect the text approved in Motion 6 of the Vancouver Meeting

No objections were raised

There are two options of text for consideration for Section 4.1.1.1 of SRD document:

Option 1 and Option 2.

Discussion followed Option 1 and Option 2

Break: 5:15 pm to 5:30 pm

Time: 5:35 pm

Motion #22

Motion to adopt Option 1 as a baseline text for section 4.1.1.1 of Systems requirement document

Mover: John Humbert

Second: Michael Youssefmir

In favor: 23

Opposed: 2

Motion #22 passes with > 75% favorable vote

Friendly amendment #9

Proposed by Dan Gal

To add the following sentence (at the end) to the definition on Block Assignment.
“A block assignment is typically divided into one or more channels.

Second: Mark Klerer

Friendly amendment #10

Proposed by Mark Klerer

To modify the above sentence in the amendment (#9) as follows:

‘A block is typically occupied by one or more channels’

Rejected by Dan Gal

Time: 6:15 pm

Motion #23

Motion to amend the definition of Block Assignment in Option 1 by adding the following sentence to the definition of Block Assignment

“A block is typically by one or more channels”

Mover: Joanne Wilson

Second: Eshwar Pittampalli

Discussion followed

Chair asked if there are any objections to call into question

No objections raised

Results:

In favor: 23

Opposed: 0

Motion #23 passes

Adoption of Vancouver Session Motion #6

Time: 6:35 pm

Motion #24

Motion to incorporate the modified text approved Motion #23 to Motion #6 in Vancouver session without quorum for section 4.1.1.1

Mover: John Humbert

Second: Michael Youssefmir

Results

In favor: 47

Opposed: 0

Motion #24 passes

Final text of section 4.1.1.1 is as follows:

A block assignment, which may consist of paired or unpaired spectrum, is the block of *licensed spectrum* assigned to an individual operator. It is assumed here that the spectrum adjacent to the block assignment is assigned to a different network operator. At the edges of the block assignment the applicable out of band emission limits shall apply (for example, the limits defined in 47 CFR 24.238 for PCS). A block is typically occupied by one or more channels.

(the above goes into the definitions section)

The AI shall support deployment in at least one of the following block assignment sizes.

FDD Assignments	2 x 1.25 MHz 2 x 5 MHz 2 x 10 MHz 2x15 MHz 2 x 20 MHz
TDD Assignments	2.5 MHz 5 MHz 10 MHz 20 MHz 30 MHz 40 MHz

The individual 802.20 technology proposals may optimize their MAC and PHY designs for specific bandwidth and Duplexing schemes.

This section is not intended to specify a particular channel bandwidth. Proposals do not need to fit into all block assignments.

Time 6:40 pm

Adoption of Vancouver Session Motion #5

The text in the current SRD document version 11r is altered to reflect the text that was approved by Motion #5 from Session 6 (Vancouver, Jan 2004).

Motion#25

Motion to approve the text approved in Motion #5 in Vancouver session (#6) without quorum

Mover: Joanne Wilson

Second: Eshwar Pittampalli

Results:

In favor: 24

Opposed: 0

Motion Passes

Time: 6:55 pm

Two ad- hoc groups were formed:

Ad-hoc group #1 to resolve the “SRD review Procedure”. John Humbert agreed to lead this group.

Ad-hoc group #2 to resolve the issue on “Spectral Efficiency Issue Section 4.1.2 of current SRD Document (11r)” – Mark Klerer volunteer to lead this group

Adhoc group #1 decided to convene at 7:10 pm 3/16 to work and Ad-hoc group #2 decided to convene at 7:00 am on 3/17 to work on their respective work items.

Meeting recessed at 7:00 pm

Wednesday, March 17, 2004 Meeting

Time started 8:15am

Chair opened the day highlighting the need to make progress on the requirements document. He proposed the group to review the agenda and look into ways to free significant time for further Requirements work after a motion which is due at the beginning of the day.

Discussion on motion on SRD Procedure Motion (this was remanded by motion moved by Joanne Wilson on Tuesday)

The ad-hoc group worked on amendments to the SRD Procedure Motion
John Humbert presented the changed (amended text) text.

Friendly amendment to the SRD procedure by John Humbert
Joanne Wilson accepted

Time: 8:30 am

Motion #26

Motion to approve the new text on the revised review process

In favor: 66

Opposed: 0

Motion #26 passes

Time: 8:35

Chair reviewed the agenda and examined ways to cut time on some of the agenda items in favor of moving the work on SRD.

Chair consulted with the contributors to alter the durations of their presentations or possibly withdrawing for this session in favor of moving the work on SRD.

Chair took further inputs from the the group.

Chair asked if there are any objections to follow on with working on the SRD and that Chair and Vice Chair would present a proposed revised agenda after the Morning break.

No objections were raised

John Humbert resumes discussion on SRD

Time: 9:00 pm

Opened Section 1.1

1.1 Scope – 2 options

Discussion on both options

Straw Poll

Option 1 Section 1.1

In favor: 18

Opposed: 2

Option 2 Section 1.1

In favor: 4

Opposed: 8

Time: 9:20 am

Motion #27

Motion to adopt Option 1 as baseline text for Section 1.1 of SRD

Moved by Joanne Wilson

Second: Todd Chauvin

Friendly Amendment: Jim Ragsdale

Joanne Wilson accepts the friendly amendment

Todd Chauvin accepts the friendly amendment

Jim Tomcik makes a friendly amendment (requirement -> requirements)

Accepted

Dan Gal makes a friendly amendment

Delete “in which at least one Mobile station communicates with Base Station.....)”))

Joanne Wilson rejects the friendly amendment

Motion #27 on the floor

Results:

In favor: 61

Opposed: 0

Motion #27 passes

Final text of Option 1, Section 1.1

“This document defines system requirements for the IEEE 802.20 standard development project. These requirements are consistent with the PAR (IEEE SA Project Authorization Request) document (see section 1.3 below) and shall constitute the top-level specification for the 802.20 standard the scope of which is limited to layer-1 and layer-2 specifications. For the purpose of this document, an “802.20 system” constitutes an 802.20 MAC and PHY implementation in which at least one Mobile station communicates with a base station via a radio air interface, and the interfaces to external networks, for the purpose of transporting IP packets through the MAC and PHY protocol layers.”

Discussion on Options for (Purpose) Section 1.2

Straw Poll

Option 1

In favor: 7

Opposed: 6

Option 2

In favor: 4

Opposed: 8

Option 3

In favor: 13

Opposed: 0

Option 4

In favor: 47

Opposed: 0

Motion #28

Motion to adopt Option 4 as the baseline text

Mover: Joanne Wilson

Second: Eshwar Pittampalli

In favor: 59

Opposed: 0

Motion #28 passes

Time: 10:20 am

Approved Text of Section 1.2

“This document establishes the detailed requirements for the Mobile Broadband Wireless Access (MBWA) systems. How the system works is left to the forthcoming 802.20 standard, which will describe in detail the interfaces and procedures of the MAC and PHY protocols in layer 1 and 2 with support for higher protocol layers as well as management functionality.”

Break at 10:26

Resume: 10:56

Chair presented the modified working agenda for Thursday, March 18, 2004 (Appendix D)

Revised Agenda adopted without objection.

John Humbert resumes discussion on SRD.

Opens Section 1.3 for discussion and presents two options

Straw Poll

Option 1

In favor: 6

Opposed: 10

Option 2

In favor: 1

Opposed: 9

Option 3

In favor: 18

Opposed: 4

Option 4

In favor: 15

Opposed: 1

Motion #29

Move to adopt Option 3

Mover: Jim Ragsdale

Second: Eshwar Pittampalli

In favor: 48

Opposed: 7

Motion #29 Passes

Motion # 30

Move to adopt Option 4

Mover: Joanne Wilson

Second: Mark Klerer

In favor: 10

Opposed: 27

Motion #30 fails

Option 3 adopted as final text for Section 1.3

Final Text on Section 1.3:

“(Replaces introductory phrase in of the current text for section 1.3)

The following text, included in the approved IEEE 802.20 PAR, describes the scope and main technical characteristics of 802.20- based MBWA systems. The reader should note that the following table is presented here as the basis for 802.20's work and some requirements have been refined or enhanced within this document. In the case of differences between this table and requirements text in the remainder of this document, the requirements text shall take precedence”

Discussion on Section 2

Straw Poll

Option 1- version 11r/paragraph 1

In favor: 11

Opposed: 14

Option 2

In favor: 30

Opposed: 4

Option 3

In favor: 24
Opposed: 8

Motion #31

Move to adopt Option 2
Mover: Eshwar Pittampalli
Second: Gang Wu
Time: 12:09 pm

Friendly Amendment by Jim Ragsdale
Shall -> may (on last line)
Mover and Second accepts

Friendly Amendment by Joanne Wilson
Domain -> Scenario
Second Rejected
Friendly amendment by Joanne Wilson to alter the text
Three user domains: Work, Home and Mobile and various scenarios
Rejected by Mover

Eshwar Pittampalli calls the question
Joanne Wilson objections

Motion #32

Motion to call the question
In favor:11
Opposed: 6
Time: 12:17 pm

Motion #32 passes

Motion #31 on the floor
Results:
In favor: 7
Opposed: 3
Time: 12:20 pm
Motion#31 fails

Motion #33

Motion to adopt Option 3
Mover: Jim Ragsdale
Second: Gang Wu

Friendly amendment by mover:

Second accepts

In favor: 58

Opposed: 0

Time: 12:25 pm

Motion #33 Passes

Option 3 is adopted for Section 2 as a replacement for paragraph 1 in the current document

Text for Option 3 is as follows:

Figure 2-1 illustrates the vision of a seamless integration of the three user domains - Work, Home, Mobile domains and various scenarios. The IEEE 802.20 standard should form the basis for systems that support this vision.

The 802.20-based air-interface (AI) shall be optimized for high-speed IP-based wireless data services. The 802.20 based AI shall support compliant Mobile Terminal (MT) devices for mobile users, and shall enable improved performance relative to other systems targeted for wide-area mobile operation. The AI shall be designed to provide best-in-class performance attributes such as peak and sustained data rates and corresponding spectral efficiencies, capacity, latency, overall network complexity and quality-of-service management. Applications that require the user device to assume the role of a server, in a server-client model, shall be supported as well

Break: 12:30 pm

Resume: 1:30 pm

Presentation by T. Charles Clancy, William Arbaugh and Paul Nguyen on “IEEE 802.20 MBWA Mobile Broadband Wireless Access Security Architecture” (C802.20-04/41)

Presented a straw man security architecture for 802.20. The design goals of the proposed architecture are stated to intend to meet the 802.20 security and mobility requirements, U.S. DOD requirements for the protection of sensitive but UNCLASSIFIED information, and be free of intellectual property claims.

Time: 2:05 pm

Resumption of Review of the SRD Document by John Humbert

John Humbert presented the second paragraph of Section 2 of the current SRD (11r1). There are two options being considered

Option 1 – original text in the current document

Option 2 – Joint contribution

Straw Poll

Option 4

In favor: 16
Opposed: 31

Option 3

In favor: 39
Opposed: 16

Option 2:

In favor: 42
Opposed: 13
(76% approved)

Option 1

In favor: 16
Opposed: 32

Motion #34

Motion to adopt Option 2 for the second paragraph of Section 2 of the current SRD (11r1)

Mover: Jim Tomcik

Second: Jim Ragsdale

Discussion followed

Friendly amendment

Proposed by Mark Klerer to remove the first sentence of the text in Option 2

Jim Tomcik and Jim Ragsdale accepted

Friendly amendment by Vincent Park – to add the sentence at the front: “The AI shall support applications that conform to open communication standards and protocols”

Jim Tomcik and Jim Ragsdale accepted

Friendly amendment by Joanne Wilson – to remove the word communication

Jim Tomcik and Jim Ragsdale accepted

Motion called
No Objections
Results:
In favor: 57
Oppose 0

Motion #34 Passes

New Text of the second paragraph of Section 2

“Applications: The AI shall support all applications that conform to open standards and protocols. This allows applications including, but not limited to, full screen video, full graphic web browsing, e-mail, file upload and download without size limitations (e.g., FTP), streaming video and streaming audio, IP Multicast, Telematics, Location based services, VPN connections, VoIP, instant messaging and on- line multiplayer gaming. “

Break: 3:15 pm
Resume: 3:30 pm

John Humbert resumed on paragraph 3 of the current SRD 11r text

Option 1 – the original text of paragraph 3
To begin with, there are two options for consideration
Option 3 – Joint contribution from document 802.20-04/44

After discussion, a total of 5 options emerged for consideration as baseline text for the text in paragraph 3 of Section 3 of the current SRD 11r text.

Straw Poll

Option 1

In favor: 12
Opposed: 38

Option 2

In favor: 38
Opposed: 18

Option 3

In favor: 26
Opposed: 16

Option 4

In favor: 4
Opposed: 15

Option 5

In favor: 21
Opposed: 7

Motion #35

Motion to adopt Option 5 as baseline text for the text in paragraph 3 of Section 3 of the current SRD 11r text

Moved by Joanne Wilson

Second: David James

In favor: 59
Opposed: 0

Motion passes

Time: 4:48 pm

Text for Paragraph 3 appears

Always on: The AI shall provide the mobile user with an "always-on" experience similar to that available in wireline access systems such as Cable and DSL while also taking into account and providing features needed to preserve battery life. The connectivity from the wireless MT device to the Base Station (BS) shall be automatic and transparent to the user.

It was decided in the agenda to have an ad-hoc meeting at 5:00 pm for the Presentation on Link Budget by Farooq Khan

The ad-hoc group on the ‘Spectral Efficiency’ issue decided to meet at 7:00 am on Thursday

Meeting recessed at 4:50 pm.

Thursday, March 18, 2004

Meeting started at 8:08 am

Chair began the day by reviewing the previously revised agenda (Appendix D) for the day.

Presentation by Farooq Khan on “802.20 Evaluation Criteria and Traffic Models Update” (C802.20 -04/38)

Presented the status on the Evaluation Criteria Document

Ad-hoc meeting at 12:00 pm to discuss Evaluation Criteria was announced.

Time: 8:57 am

Presentation by David Huo on “Guidelines for Link-System Interface” (C802.20-04/39)

Presented principles and criteria that needs to be considered for a link-system interface in the simulations for evaluating MBWA technology proposals.

Presentation by Qiang Guo on “Status of 802.20 Channel Models” (C802.20-04/30)

Presented the status of the “Channel Models for 802.20 MBWA System Simulations” document

Break: 9:50 am

Resume: 10:30 am

Readout of Ad-hoc group report on Spectral Efficiency by Mark Klerer titled “Spectral Efficiency Ad-hoc” (C802.20-04/45)

For the requirements on system spectral efficiency of the 802.20 standard, the Ad-hoc group brought out four options for consideration.

Straw Poll

Option 1b

In favor: 18

Opposed: 55

Vote: 24.65%

Option 3

In favor: 61

Opposed: 13

Vote: 82.43 %

Option 4

In favor: 15
Opposed: 47
Vote: 24.19%

Motion #36

Move to adopt Option 3 as baseline text for Section 4.1.2 of the systems requirements document

Mover: Eshwar Pittampalli
Second: Dan Gal

Friendly amendment by Mark Klerer
Eshwar Pittampalli – rejected

Motion #37

Motion to amend the text by replacing the words “taking out” with “including”

Mover: Mark Klerer
Second: Joanne Wilson

Results:

In favor: 15
Opposed: 51
Motion #37 Fails
Time: 11:25 pm

Friendly amendment by Jim Ragsdale to remove MAC overhead
Rejected

Motion #38

Motion to adopt the above amendment

Mover: Jim Ragsdale
Second: Mark Klerer

Results:

In favor: 18
Opposed: 50
Motion #38 Fails
Time: 11:35 pm

Friendly amendment by Larry Elder
Rejected

Motion #39

Motion to adopt the amendment

Mover: Larry Elder
Second: David James
Text: replace from ‘shall’ to ‘should’

In favor: 16
 Opposed: 59
 Motion Fails
 Time: 11:42 pm

Friendly amendment by Joanne Wilson
 Not accepted

Motion #40

Motion to alter the text of Option 3

Mover: Joanne Wilson

Second: Vincent Park

Text: Replace “agreed upon block assignment size” to “a specified channel bandwidth”

Results:

In favor: 11

Opposed: 50

Motion #40 fails

Time: 11:49 am

Friendly amendment by Vincent Park

Add the following text as replacement to the introduction of Option 3:

“The system spectral efficiency of the 802.20 air interface shall be greater than 1.5 times the values of commercially deployed systems, when measured by the same methodology. The spectral efficiency at higher speeds than those shown should degrade gracefully”.

Not accepted

Motion #41

Motion to alter the text of Option 3

Mover: Vincent Park

Second: Michael Youssefmir

Text: Replace “agreed upon block assignment size” to “a specified channel bandwidth”

Friendly amendment by Joanne Wilson to replace “1.5 times” to “2 times”

Accepted

Motion #41 on the floor

Results:

In favor: 15

Opposed: 56

Motion #41 fails

Time: 11:55 am

John Humbert called the question
Objection by Joanne Wilson

Motion #42

Motion to Call the Question

In favor: 60
Opposed: 10
Motion #42 passes

Joanne Wilson requests a Roll Call Vote which the Chair accepts.

Motion # 36 on the floor

Results:

In favor: 65

Opposed: 16

Abstain: 8

Roll Call results by voter in Appendix E2

Motion #36 to adopt Option 3 as baseline text for Section 4.1.2 of the SRD Document
Passes with 80%

Final approved text (Option 3) as baseline text for Spectral efficiency for Section 4.1.2 is as follows:

“In this document, the term “System Spectral Efficiency” is defined in the context of a full block assignment deployment and is, thus, calculated as the average aggregate throughput per sector (bps/sector), divided by the spectrum block assignment size (Hz) (taking out all PHY/MAC overhead).

For proposal evaluation purposes, the System Spectral Efficiency of the 802.20 air interface shall be quoted for the case of a three sector baseline configuration and an agreed-upon block assignment size. It shall be computed in a loaded multi-cellular network setting, which shall be simulated based on the methodology established by the 802.20 evaluation criteria group. It shall consider, among other factors, a minimum expected data rate/user and/or other fairness criteria, QoS and percentage of throughput due to duplicated information flow.

Since the base configuration is only required for the purpose of comparing system spectral efficiency, proposals may submit deployment models over and beyond the base configuration”.

“The system spectral efficiency of the 802.20 air interface shall be greater than the values indicated in table 4-1. The spectral efficiency at higher speeds than those shown should degrade gracefully.”

Parameter	Spectral Efficiency Requirements			
	Downlink		Uplink	
	3 km/hr	120 km/hr	3 km/hr	120 km/hr
Spectral Efficiency (b/s/Hz/sector)	2.0	1.5	1.0	0.75

Lunch Break: 12:25 pm

Resume: 1:45 pm

Chair reviewed the remainder of the working agenda (Appendix D)

Time: 1:51 pm

Presentation by Mark Klerer on “Proposed Work Plan and Project Schedule” (C802.20-04/40r1)

Presentation by Gang Wu on “Proposed Work Plan and Project Schedule” (C802.20-04/36)

Discussion followed.

Both the presenters of the different proposed work plans and project schedule agree to work on a common nomenclature and a consensus work plan and present it to the group in the May session.

Break Time: 2:55 pm

Resume: 3:30 pm

Chair Presented Next Meeting Planning Meeting (C802.20 -04/xx)

Chair took inputs to draft the agenda for the Next meeting

Chair collected items for New Business

Motion #43

Motion to adopt SRD resolution process used in March Plenary for the Evaluation Criteria, Traffic Model and Channel Model documents

Mover: Eshwar Pittampalli

Second: Dan Gal

Discussion

Friendly amendment by John Humbert to allow a discussion and a motion by John Humbert before this motion
Accepted

Motion #43 Postponed
Time 4:11 pm

Presentation by John Humbert on “Document Review process between interim and plenary meetings” (C802.20-04/48)

Discussion followed

Motion #44

Motion to adopt the above Document Review process between interim and plenary meetings (C802.20-04/48)

Mover: John Humbert
Second: Michael Youssefmir
Time: 4:40 pm

Jim Ragsdale called the question
No objections

In favor: 17
Opposed: 13
Time: 4:45 pm

Motion #44 Passes

Presentation by Carl R. Stevenson on “802.18 Motion

Motion #45

Motion to approve document 18-04-0011-00-0000_interference-temp-cmts.doc authorizing the chair of 802.18 to do necessary editorial and formatting changes, seek EC approval as an 802 document, and file the document in a timely fashion with the FCC

Informative: This document was approved unanimously by 802.18.
Mover: Carl R. Stevenson
Second: Marianna Goldhammer

Friendly Amendment by David Shively
Accepted by Mover and Second

Question called
No objections

In favor: 47
Opposed: 0
Abstain: 0
Time: 5:12 pm

Motion #45 Passes

Motion #46

Motion to approve document 18-04-0012-00-0000_cognitive-radio-cmts.doc authorizing the Chair of 802.18 to do necessary editorial and formatting changes, seek EC approval an 802 document, and file the document in a timely fashion with the FCC.

Mover: Carl R. Stevenson
Second: Mark Klerer

Discussion followed

In favor: 6
Opposed: 2
Abstain: 1

Time: 5:25 pm
Motion #46 Passes

Discussion on Motion #14 (“802.16 is requested to share with 802.20 members and with 802 SEC members in a timely manner, all liaison information regarding ITU. In particular that 802.16 share the report received from ITU-T Study Group 9 this year (2004) as a result of the liaison during the January (Honolulu) ITU meeting.”)

Motion #14 on the floor
Mover: Tom Kolze
Second: Eshwar Pittampalli

Friendly amendment to change 802 SEC to 802 SEC members
Proposed by Dan Gal
Accepted by Tom Kolze

Friendly amendment
Proposed by Mark Klerer
Not accepted

Question called – No objections

In favor: 48
Opposed: 0

Abstain: 0
Time:5:40

Motion #14 Passes

Resumption of discussion to adopt SRD resolution process used in March Plenary for the Evaluation Criteria, Traffic Model and Channel Model document. Eshwar Pittampalli proposed deferring any further discussion until the May session. The group agreed with no objections.

Discussion regarding Company email tags was lead by Jim Ragsdale

It was pointed out that company policies in some instances do not allow to be sent without the tags. This results in violation of IEEE mail reflector policy.

The Chair pointed out the group does not have a way to address the issue on its own. Though previous attempts to modify the policy or address the issue have not been successful, the issue will be brought to attention of the SEC members again.

Motion # 47

Motion to adjourn the session
Move: Eshwar Pittampalli
Second: Michael Youssefmir

Motion passes by acclamation

Time: 5:50 pm

Appendix A

Attendance List of Session #7

Last Name	First Name	Middle Initial	Affiliation	Gain
Adachi	Tomoko		Toshiba	N
Ahn	Jae-Young	null	ETRI	Y
Bachmann	Heinz	G	CustomRF	N
Bajaj	Rashmi		France Telecom R&D	Y
Ballentine	Paul	H	Motorola	Y
Baum	Kevin		Motorola	Y
Bernstein	Jeffrey	null	TMG	Y
Bischinger	Kurt		T-Mobile	Y
Bumsted	Jamie		Independent	Y
Bussey	Chris	J	Bussey Consulting	Y
Carneiro	Edson	O	Edmais Computer Service	Y
Carson	Peter	A.	Qualcomm	N
Chapman	James	R	TTPcom	N
Charron	Wendy		LCC	N
Chauvin	Todd	H	Arraycomm	Y
Chen	John		Arraycomm	Y
Chen	Nongji		Mitsubishi	Y
Chickneas	Jim		Lucent	Y
Cho	Juphil		ETRI	Y
Choi	Hyoung-Jin		TTA	Y
Choo Eng	Yap		Panasonic Sigapore	Y
Cleveland	Joseph	R	Samsung	Y
Coleman	Neal		Cisco	Y
Crowley	Steven		DoCoMo USA Labs	N
Das	Arnab		Flarion	N
Davis	Chantal		Industry Canada	Y
Dennett	Steve		Nextel	Y
Dorward	Lynne	A	Ladcomm	Y
Entzminger	Lindell		Lucent	Y
Epstein	Mark		Qualcomm	Y
Fong	Mo-Han		Nortel Networks	N
Froelich	Stu	null	Nextnet Wireless	Y
Gal	Dan		Lucent	Y
Ganti	Hari	V	Flarion	Y
Goldburg	Marc		Arraycomm	N
Goldhammer	Marianna	O	Alvarion	Y
Gomes	Eladio	R	Double E Enterprises	Y
Gorodetsky	Svetlana		Gorodetsky Consulting	Y
Guo	Qiang		Motorola	Y
Hafid	Abdel		Telcordia	Y
Hou	Victor		Broadcom	Y
Hubbard	Tina	M	Sprint	Y
Humbert	John		Sprint	Y
Huo	David	D	Lucent	Y

Ibbetson	Luke		Vodafone	Y
Iritz	George		Northrop Grumman	N
James	David	S	Oak-global	Y
Jeon	Ho-In	J	Kyung-Won University	Y
Jeong	Moo Ryong		DoCoMo USA Labs	Y
Jones	Dennis	R.	Taliesen Consulting	Y
Kakura	Yoshikazu		NEC	Y
Kasey	Allen	D.	Ultimia Wireless	Y
Kelly	Ivy	Y	Sprint	N
Khademi	Majid		Khademi Consulting	Y
Khan	Farooq	null	Lucent	Y
Khatibi	Farrokh		Qualcomm	N
Kim	Jeonghwi		KT	Y
Kim	JaeHeung		ETRI	Y
Kim	Yongbum		KT	Y
Kimura	Shigeru		Kyocera	Y
Kitamura	Takuya		Fujitsu	N
Klerer	Mark		Flarion	Y
Knisely	Douglas	N	Lucent	N
Knowles	Skip		Bussey Consulting	Y
Kolze	Thomas		Broadcom	Y
Kotecha	Lalit	R	CoWave	Y
Kuroda	Masahiro		CRL	N
Kwon	Jae Kyun		ETRI	Y
Laihonen	Kari	A	Teliasonera	Y
Lalaguna	Pablo		MedStar	Y
Landon	James		Sprint	Y
Alder	Larry		Arraycomm	Y
Lawrence	Lisa	B	CTCI Group	Y
Lee	Seong-Choon		KT	Y
Lee	Kyoung Seok		ETRI	Y
Lee	Heesoo		ETRI	Y
Liva	Valentino		EuramNet	N
Love	Newton		Alion Science & Technology	Y
Love	Robert	D	LAN Connect Consulting	N
Maez	Dave		Navini	N
Malik	Rahul		Panasonic Sigapore	N
Mansour	Nagi	A.	Nextel	Y
Martynov	Irina		Belgud International	Y
Martynov	Michael		Belgud International	Y
McGinniss	David	S	Sprint	Y
McMillan	Donald	C	Advanced Network Technical Solutions	Y
Migaldi	Scott	F	Motorola	N
Mills	Steve	M.	HP	Y
Miyazono	Max		Qualcomm	N
Mo	Shaomin	S	Panasonic	Y

Mollenauer	James	F.	Technical Strategy	Y
Mukai	Manabu		Toshiba	N
Murakami	Kazuhiro		Kyocera	Y
Naguib	Ayman	F	Qualcomm	Y
Naidu	Mullaguru	S	Qualcomm	N
Nakamura	Kenichi		Fujitsu	Y
Neubacher	Andreas		T-mobile	Y
Ngo	Chiu		Samsung	Y
Nguyen	Tuan	P	DISA	N
Nishio	Akihiko		Panasonic	Y
Obara	Kei		CRL	N
O'Brien	Francis	E	Lucent	Y
Odlyzko	Paul		Motorola	Y
Okubo	Akira		Mitsubishi	N
Park	Vincent	D.	Flarion	Y
PARK	SOON-JOON		LG	Y
Park	Kwanwoo		LG	Y
Park	PS		Hanaro	Y
Peng	Xiaoming		IIR	Y
Pico	Luis	E	UAS	Y
Pirhonen	Riku		Nokia	Y
Pittampalli	Eshwar		Lucent	Y
Poisson	Sebastien		Oasis Wireless	Y
Poula	Milan		T-Mobile	Y
Pulcini	Greg		Bussey Consulting	Y
Ragsdale	James	H	Ericsson	Y
Rajkumar	Ajay		Lucent	N
Rausch	Walter	F	Sprint	Y
Rommer	Stefan		Ericsson	Y
Rudolf	Marian	X	Interdigital	Y
Rylance	Michael	A	Nextnet Wireless	Y
Sakakura	Takashi		Mitsubishi	N
Sanchez	Maria		BT	Y
Seagren	Chris		Sprint	N
Shaver	Donald	P	TI	Y
Sheikh	Khurram		Sprint	Y
Shields	Judith	C	Ladcomm	Y
Shively	David		Cingular	Y
SooHong	Park		Samsung	N
Springer	Warren	J	Springer Associates	Y
Staver	Doug	p	DTScom	Y
Stone	Mike		Consultant	Y
Strand	Warren	E	Credence Systems	Y
Sutivong	Arak		Qualcomm	Y
Taylor	Leslie		Leslie Taylor Associates	Y
Tee	Lai-King Anna		Samsung	Y

Tomcik	James	D.	Qualcomm	Y
Trerotola	Ron		TechnoCom	N
Trick	John	A	Bussey Consulting	Y
Upton	Jerry		J. Upton Consult., mVerify, Qualcomm	Y
Valls	Juan Carlos		TMG	Y
Vatin-Perignon	Serge		Individual	Y
Vivanco	Silvia	C	TMG	Y
Vook	Frederick	W.	Motorola	N
Ward	Robert		SciCom	Y
Wasilewski	Tom	V	Qualcomm	Y
Watanabe	Osamu		Toshiba	N
Watanabe	Fujio		DoCoMo USA Labs	Y
Wieczorek	Alfred		Motorola	N
Wilson	Joanne	C	Arraycomm	Y
Wong	Jin Kue		Nortel Networks	N
Wu	Geng		Nortel Networks	Y
Wu	Gang		DoCoMo USA Labs	Y
Yallapragada	Rao	V	Qualcomm	Y
Yano	Takashi		Hitachi	Y
Youssefmir	Mike		Arraycomm	Y
Yuza	Masaaki		NEC	Y
Zhu	Peiying		Nortel Networks	N

Appendix B: Proposed Detail Agenda

802.20 Session #7

Jerry Upton- Chair

jerry.upton@ieee.org

Gang Wu – Procedural Vice Chair

Eshwar Pittampalli – Liaison Vice Chair

March 15, 2004

Chair, IEEE 802.20

Proposed Detail Agenda

Monday, March 15, 2004 4:00PM - 5:30 PM

- Opening Session of 802.20		
Opening Remarks		4:00pm - 4:30pm
Distribute Voting Tokens		
Approve previous session minutes (November and January)		4:40pm - 4:45pm
Approve agenda for the week		4:45pm - 4:55pm
Logistics and other items		4:55pm - 5:00pm
SA Staff Tutorial on Editorial Process		5:00pm - 5:30pm

Monday, March 15, 2004 7:00PM - 9:30 PM

- Officer Election (Voters List)		
----------------------------------------------------	--	--

March 15, 2004

Chair, IEEE 802.20

Proposed Detail Agenda

Tuesday, March 16, 2004 8:00AM - 12:00 PM (Break 10:00 – 10:30AM)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Voting on motions approved at January meeting (Rao Yallapragada) - Status SRD Document and Process Proposal to Complete (J Humbert) - Expectation on Spectral Efficiency, Throughput, others - Comments on 802.20 requirements - Comments on Alternatives in SRD - OA&M Requirements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8:00am – 8:20am 8:20am – 9:20am 9:20am – 10:00am 10:30am – 10:45am 10:45am – 11:30am 11:30am – 12:00pm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C802.20-04/29 C802.20-04/31 C802.20-04/33 C802.20-04/34
Tuesday, March 16, 2004 1:00PM - 6:00PM (Break 3:00 – 3:30PM)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewing SRD text sections and voting Reviewing SRD text sections and voting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1:00pm – 3:00pm 3:30pm – 5:30pm 	
Tuesday, March 16, 2004 7:00PM - 9:30PM (Attendance Participation Credit) (Break scheduled every 30 minutes for 5 minutes)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue the Process of Reviewing SRD section and Voting Ad-Hoc topics will be assigned based upon voting 		

March 15, 2004

Chair, IEEE 802.20

Proposed Detail Agenda

Wednesday, March 17, 2004 8:00AM - 12:00PM (Break 10:00 – 10:30AM)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation Criteria & Traffic Model Status Link-System Interface Some Remarks on Link Budget Template Evaluation Methodology: Further Notes on Phased Approach 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8:00am – 10:00am 10:30am – 11:00am 11:00am – 11:30am 11:30am – 12:00pm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C802.20-04/38 C802.20-04/39 C802.20-04/28 C802.20-04/32
Wednesday, March 17, 2004 1:00PM - 5:00PM (Break 3:00 – 3:30PM)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voice of IP Modeling Straw man Security Architecture (Paul Ngygen & Bill A) Status Report on Channel Modeling Status Report on Channel Modeling - continued Possible Submission to 802.19-Coexistence (Reza Arefi Request) Potential Ad-Hocs for Evaluation Criteria and Models-Discussion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1:00pm – 1:30pm 1:30pm – 2:00pm 2:00pm – 3:00pm 3:30pm – 4:30pm 4:30pm – 5:30pm 5:30pm – 6:00pm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> C802.20-4/37 C802.20-04/41 C802.20-04/30
Wednesday, March 17, 2004 6:30PM - 9:00 PM		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 802 Social Reception 		

March 15, 2004

Chair, IEEE 802.20

Proposed Detail Agenda

Thursday, March 18, 2004 8:00AM - 12:00PM (Break 10:00 – 10:30AM)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Status of Ad-Hocs Systems Requirements Document and Voting- Liaison Relationship with External Organization follow up- PARs and other WG Activities Requiring Discussion	8:00am – 10:00am 10:30am – 11:00am 11:00am– 11:30am	C802.20-04/25
Thursday, March 18, 2004 1:00PM - 6:00PM (Break 3:00 – 3:30PM)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Proposed Amendments for WG Policies and Procedures- Proposed Work Plan and Project Schedule (Draft)- Discussion on WG P&P- Next Meeting Planning- New Business- Adjourn	1:00pm – 2:15pm 2:15pm – 3:00pm 3:30pm – 3:45pm 3:45pm – 4:15pm 4:15pm – 6:00pm 6:00pm	C802.20-04/40r1 C802.20-04/36 C802.20-04/06

March 15, 2004

Chair, IEEE 802.20

Appendix C: Approved Working Agenda, March 15 2004

Session #7

Jerry Upton- Chair

jerry.upton@ieee.org

Gang Wu – Procedural Vice Chair

Eshwar Pittampalli – Liaison Vice Chair

March 15, 2004

Chair, IEEE 802.20

Proposed Detail Agenda

Monday, March 15, 2004 4:00PM - 5:30 PM

- Opening Session of 802.20		
Opening Remarks	4:00pm - 4:30pm	
Distribute Voting Tokens		
Approve previous session minutes (November and January)	4:40pm - 4:45pm	
Approve agenda for the week	4:45pm - 4:55pm	
Logistics and other items	4:55pm - 5:00pm	
SA Staff Tutorial on Editorial Process	5:00pm - 5:30pm	

Monday, March 15, 2004 7:00PM - 9:30 PM

- Officer Election (Voters List)		
----------------------------------------------------	--	--

March 15, 2004

Chair, IEEE 802.20

Proposed Detail Agenda

Tuesday, March 16, 2004 8:00AM - 12:00 PM		
-Voting on motions approved at January meeting (Rao Yallapragada) (vote the motion by section of SRD and Evaluation Criteria)	8:00am – 8:20am	C802.20-04/29
-- Status SRD Document and Process Proposal to Complete (J Humbert) (Cover these contribution as SRD section are reviewed Plus 5min. Summary)	8:20am – 9:20am	C802.20-04/31
-(Break 10:00 – 10:30AM)	9:20am – 10:00am	
-- Expectation on Spectral Efficiency, Throughput, others	10:30am – 10:45am	C802.20-04/33
- Comments on 802.20 requirements	10:45am – 11:30am	C802.20-04/34
- Comments on Alternatives in SRD	11:30am – 12:00pm	
Tuesday, March 16, 2004 1:00PM - 6:00PM (Break 3:00 – 3:30PM)		
- PARs and other WG Activities Requiring Discussion	1:00pm – 1:30pm	
Reviewing SRD text sections and voting	1:30pm – 3:00pm	
Reviewing SRD text sections and voting	3:30pm – 7:00pm	
Tuesday, March 16, 2004 8:00PM - 9:30PM (optional Attendance)		
Ad-Hoc topics will be assigned based upon voting		

March 15, 2004

Chair, IEEE 802.20

Proposed Detail Agenda

Wednesday, March 17, 2004 8:00AM - 12:00PM (Break 10:00 – 10:30AM)		
Evaluation Criteria & Traffic Model Status	8:00am – 10:00am	C802.20-04/38
Link-System Interface	10:30am – 11:00am	C802.20-04/39
Some Remarks on Link Budget Template	11:00am – 11:30am	C802.20-04/28
Evaluation Methodology: Further Notes on Phased Approach	11:30am – 12:00pm	C802.20-04/32
Wednesday, March 17, 2004 1:00PM - 5:00PM (Break 3:00 – 3:30PM)		
Voice of IP Modeling	1:00pm – 1:30pm	C802.20-4/37
Straw man Security Architecture (Paul Ngygen & Bill A)	1:30pm – 2:00pm	C802.20-04/41
Status Report on Channel Modeling	2:00pm – 3:00pm	C802.20-04/30
Status Report on Channel Modeling - continued	3:30pm – 4:30pm	
- Liaison Relationship with External Organization follow up	4:30pm- 5:00pm	C802.20-04/25
Possible Submission to 802.19-Coexistence (Reza Arefi Request)	5:00pm – 5:30pm	
Potential Ad-Hocs for Evaluation Criteria and Models-Discussion	5:30pm – 6:00pm	
Wednesday, March 17, 2004 6:30PM - 9:00 PM		
- 802 Social Reception		

March 15, 2004

Chair, IEEE 802.20

Proposed Detail Agenda

Thursday, March 18, 2004 8:00AM - 12:00PM (Break 10:00 – 10:30AM)		
- Status of Ad-Hocs Systems Requirements Document and Voting	8:00am – 12:00pm	
Thursday, March 18, 2004 1:00PM - 6:00PM (Break 3:00 – 3:30PM)		
- Proposed Amendments for WG Policies and Procedures - Proposed Work Plan and Project Schedule (Draft) - Discussion on WG P&P - Next Meeting Planning - New Business - Adjourn	1:00pm – 2:15pm 2:15pm – 3:00pm 3:30pm – 3:45pm 3:45pm – 4:15pm 4:15pm – 6:00pm 6:00pm	C802.20-04/40r1 C802.20-04/36 C802.20-04/06

March 15, 2004

Chair, IEEE 802.20

Appendix D: 802.20 Revised Agenda, Approved March 17, 2004

Thursday, March 18, 2004 8:00AM - 12:00PM (Break 10:00 – 10:30AM)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Evaluation Criteria & Traffic Model Status - Link-System Interface - Status Report on Channel Modeling - Reviewing SRD Text Sections and Voting 	<p>8:00am – 9:00am</p> <p>9:00am – 9:30am</p> <p>9:30am – 10:00am</p> <p>10:30am – 12:00pm</p>	<p>C802.20-04/38</p> <p>C802.20-04/39</p> <p>C802.20-04/30</p>
Thursday, March 18, 2004 1:00PM - 6:00PM (Break 3:00 – 3:30PM)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reviewing SRD Text Sections and Voting/Concluding Actions - Proposed Work Plan and Project Schedule - Proposed Work Plan and Project Schedule (Draft) - Next Meeting Planning - New Business - Adjourn 	<p>1:00pm – 2:00pm</p> <p>2:00pm – 3:00pm</p> <p>3:30pm – 4:30pm</p> <p>4:30pm – 5:00pm</p> <p>5:00pm – 6:00pm</p> <p>6:00pm</p>	<p>C802.20-04/40r1</p> <p>C802.20-04/36</p>

	A	B	E	F	G
1	<u>Appendix E1: Roll Call Vote on Motion #13</u>				
2	<p>Motion #13: That 802.20 request 802.11 to change the title of their PAR (provisionally 802.11p) from “Wireless Access for the Vehicular Environment” to “Wireless Access for Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Applications: to avoid the appearance of overlap with the work of 802.20</p>				
3					
4					
5	Last Name	First Name	Yes	No	Abstain
6	Ahn	Jae Young	x		
7	Alder	Larry	x		
8	Bajaj	Rashmi	x		
9	Baum	Kevin	x		
10	Bernstein	Jeffrey		x	
11	Bussey	Chris		x	
12	Carneiro	Edson		x	
13	Carson	Peter		x	
14	Chauvin	Todd	x		
15	Chen	Joseph	x		
16	Chickneas	Jim		x	
17	Cleveland	Joseph	x		
18	Coleman	Neal			x
19	Das	Arnab	x		
20	Dorward	Lynne		x	
21	Eilts	Henry	x		
22	Entzminger	Lindell			x
23	Froelich	Stuart	x		
24	Gal	Dan		x	
25	Ganti	Hari	x		
26	Goldhammer	Marianna	x		
27	Gomes	Eladio		x	
28	Gorodetsky	Svetlana		x	
29	Hafid	Abdel	x		
30	Humbert	John	x		
31	Ibbetson	Luke	x		
32	James	David S.	x		
33	Jones	Dennis		x	
34	Kakura	Yoshikazu	x		
35	Khademi	Majid		x	
36	Khan	Farooq		x	
37	Khatibi	Farrokh		x	
38	Kim	Jeong-Hwi	x		
39	Kimura	Shigeru	x		
40	Klerer	Mark	x		
41	Knowles	Skip		x	
42	Kolze	Thomas	x		
43	Laihonen	Kari	x		
44	Lalaguna	Pablo		x	
45	Landon	James	x		
46	Lawrence	Lisa		x	
47	Lee	Heesoo	x		
48	Lee	Kyoung Seok	x		

	A	B	E	F	G
49	Mansour	Nagi			x
50	Martynov	Irina		x	
51	Martynov	Michael		x	
52	McGinnis	David	x		
53	McMillan	Donald		x	
54	Miyazono	Max		x	
55	Murakami	Kazuhiro	x		
56	Murias	Ron		x	
57	Naguib	Ayman		x	
58	Nishio	Akihiko	x		
59	O'Brien	Francis		x	
60	Park	Vincent	x		
61	Pico	Enrique		x	
62	Pirhonen	Riku			x
63	Pittampalli	Eshwar	x		
64	Poisson	Sebastien		x	
65	Pulcini	Gregory		x	
66	Ragsdale	James		x	
67	Rausch	Walter	x		
68	Stefan	Rommer		x	
69	Sheikh	Khurram	x		
70	Shields	Judy		x	
71	Shively	David		x	
72	Springer	Warren		x	
73	Staver	Doug		x	
74	Stone	Mike		x	
75	Sutivong	Arak		x	
76	Tee	Lai-King Anna	x		
77	Tomcik	James			x
78	Trick	John		x	
79	Valls	Juan Carlos		x	
80	Vatin-Perignon	Serge		x	
81	Vivanco	Silvia		x	
82	Ward Jr	Robert	x		
83	Wasilewski	Thomas		x	
84	Wieczorek	Alfred	x		
85	Wilson	Joanne	x		
86	Wu	Gang	x		
87	Wu	Geng	x		
88	Yallapragada	Rao		x	
89	Youssefmir	Michael	x		
90	Yuza	Masaaki	x		
91					
92	Total Votes: 85				
93		Total Yes	40		
94		Total No		40	
95		Total Abstain			5

	A	B	E	F	G
1	<u>Appendix E2:Roll Call Vote on Motion #36</u>				
2	<u>Motion #36:</u> To adopt Option 3 as baseline text for Section 4.1.2 of the systems requirements document				
3					
4					
5	Last Name	First Name	Yes	No	Abstain
6	Ahn	Jae Young			x
7	Alder	Larry		x	
8	Bajaj	Rashmi	x		
9	Baum	Kevin	x		
10	Bernstein	Jeffrey	x		
11	Bussey	Chris	x		
12	Carneiro	Edson	x		
13	Chauvin	Todd		x	
14	Chayat	Naftali		x	
15	Chen	Joseph		x	
16	Chickneas	Jim	x		
17	Cudak	Mark	x		
18	Dennett	Steven			x
19	Entzminger	Lindell	x		
20	Epstein	Mark	x		
21	Froelich	Stuart		x	
22	Gal	Dan	x		
23	Goldhammer	Marianna	x		
24	Gomes	Eladio	x		
25	Gorodetsky	Svetlana	x		
26	Guo	Qiang	x		
27	Hadad	Zion	x		
28	Hafid	Abdel		x	
29	Humbert	John	x		
30	Ibbetson	Luke		x	
31	James	David S.		x	
32	Jones	Dennis	x		
33	Kakura	Yoshikazu			x
34	Khademi	Majid	x		
35	Khan	Farooq	x		
36	Khatibi	Farrokh	x		
37	Kim	JaeHeung			x
38	Kimura	Shigeru		x	
39	Kitamura	Takuya			x
40	Klerer	Mark		x	
41	Knowles	Skip	x		
42	Kolze	Thomas	x		
43	Koo	Changhoi		x	
44	Laihonen	Kari	x		
45	Lalaguna	Pablo	x		
46	Landon	James	x		
47	Lawrence	Lisa	x		
48	Lee	Heesoo			x
49	Lee	Kyoung Seok	x		
50	Martynov	Irina	x		
51	Martynov	Michael	x		

	A	B	E	F	G
52	McGinnis	David	x		
53	McMillan	Donald	x		
54	Migaldi	Scott	x		
55	Miyazono	Max	x		
56	Mollenauer	James	x		
57	Murakami	Kazuhiro		x	
58	Naguib	Ayman	x		
59	Naidu	Mullaguru	x		
60	Nishio	Akihiko	x		
61	O'Brien	Francis	x		
62	Odlyzko	Paul	x		
63	Park	Vincent		x	
64	Pico	Enrique	x		
65	Pirhonen	Riku			x
66	Pittampalli	Eshwar	x		
67	Poisson	Sebastien	x		
68	Pulcini	Gregory	x		
69	Ragsdale	James	x		
70	Rausch	Walter	x		
71	Rudolf	Marian	x		
72	Seagren	Chris	x		
73	Shields	Judy	x		
74	Shively	David	x		
75	Springer	Warren	x		
76	Staver	Doug	x		
77	Stone	Mike	x		
78	Sutivong	Arak	x		
79	Taylor	Leslie	x		
80	Tee	Lai-King Anna	x		
81	Tomcik	James	x		
82	Trick	John	x		
83	Valls	Juan Carlos	x		
84	Vatin-Perignon	Serge	x		
85	Vivanco	Silvia	x		
86	Vook	Frederick	x		
87	Ward Jr	Robert	x		
88	Wasilewski	Thomas	x		
89	Wieczorek	Alfred	x		
90	Wilson	Joanne		x	
91	Wu	Gang			x
92	Yallapragada	Rao	x		
93	Youssefmir	Michael		x	
94	Yuza	Masaaki		x	
95					
96	Total Votes: 89				
97		Total Yes	65		
98		Total No		16	
99		Total Abstain			8