

Minutes of the IEEE 802.20 editorial team conference call

[These notes are a best effort recollection of what has been actually said during the conference call and also include text that was provided by participants, after the meeting, descriptive of what they think that they said or heard]

- Time: April 25, 2007; 2:00-3:30 pm US EDT
- Attendees: Arnie Greenspan (AROSCO), Mark Klerer (Qualcomm), Jim Tomcik (Qualcomm), Val Opreescu (Motorola), Canchi (Kyocera), Young Yoon (LGE), Anna Tee (Samsung)
- Agenda: 1) Determine what the appropriate format and content for the draft should be; and 2) Determine how the editorial team should move forward
- Anna Tee volunteered to take the meeting minutes and the meeting participants agreed for minutes to be recorded by Anna Tee and be made available to 802.20 WG
- Val Opreescu expressed the opinion that Jim Tomcik was not officially part of the editing group (as his name is not explicitly mentioned in the meeting notes from the March meeting posted on the 802.20 website) and if he were part of the editing team, Qualcomm may end up having 2 participants (Jim Tomcik and Mark Klerer) with the ability to vote in the editorial group
- Mark Klerer expressed a different opinion and noted that Jim's name may not have been recorded in the March meeting minutes; however, he was identified as representing the Qualcomm proposal, whereas Mark is the editor and as such was to be the chair of the group. He also indicated that he would be requesting that the minutes be amended to explicitly mention Jim Tomcik's name. Mark also pointed out that Anna had raised the issue of Tomcik and Klerer both being Qualcomm with him in March and he gave her the answer that he was there as editor and chair and Tomcik as Qualcomm rep.
- Opreescu: Tracking of the changes in the current standard draft D0.1m should indicate clearly portions of the text that have been taken from 3GPP2; text in which the editor has concerns should be reflected in the document; changes in the text for TDD mode should be highlighted; text changes from the original standard draft D2.1 should be traceable
- Mark said that the minutes clearly indicated that the task was such that production of redline text would be very challenging and would not be done. He also pointed out that what was being requested went even beyond just a redline but asked for identification of all text sources. Mark went on to note that the current draft D0.1m has been created by taking the 3GPP2 text for UMB as the base and aligning with 802.20 text – and it is possible that as a result there may have been an inadvertent drop one or two sections of the original 802.20 text.

- Opreescu: The problem is that there was no meeting for the editorial team before the current draft was created to discuss how to create the new draft and show any traceability.
- Opreescu: There was an agreement by the WG on adopting UMB from 3GPP2
- Klerer: The agreement was to merge the UMBFDD proposal into the draft there was no decision that the 3GPP2 text was to be used as base.
- Opreescu: The process of creating a new draft 802.20 draft D0.1m with no back traceability is unheard of in all my years of working in standards. All other standards bodies back e.g., 3GPP, 3GPP2, ITU, etc. show revision marks. Due to the history and problems in 802.20, I believe it is in our best interest to generate a draft that everyone can understand how it was created and aligns with the decisions in March to avoid controversy
- Klerer: Again the working group, as reflected in the minutes agreed to the absence of redlining and the text would have to be reviewed as a whole.
- Arnie asked if there was an agreement that the new baseline consisted of the original proposal Motorola, LGE etc.
- Arnie suggested that some clarification text be included to the standard text to indicate the source of the latter
- Opreescu: More confusion can be created in the suggested approach
- Opreescu: There should be two basis to the draft: 1) UMB; 2) 802.20 standard draft D2.1; clearly marked
- Tee: The editorial team was created under Arnie's direction in March meeting, to share the work load of creating a new standard draft, so as to meet the tight work schedule. Although she had suggested, in private conversation, to the editor to host a conference call in an early stage to discuss the editorial work, the editor had decided to take on the task all by himself, leaving the other team members to review the draft that he had created, and provide comment within about a week's time. As there have been significant changes made to the previous standard draft D2.1 without tracking clearly, it is difficult to ensure that the current draft D0.1m has captured all the decisions from the WG adequately. The TDD text has been changed significantly, including the removal of one of the partitions (2:1). The hard work performed by the editor is appreciable, but the resulting draft has its problems. She has also requested that there should be a mark-up with respect to the previous 802.20 draft D2.1 as she is familiar with the 802.20 text but not the 3GPP2 text.

- Klerer: The schedule, process and milestones were clearly discussed during the meetings and the process was known. The fact that the TDD text was a “harmonized” creation was noted during the March meeting and it was agreed that such text could be created. It was acknowledged that this would be new technical content for review. The status of the text is the same regardless of how many members of the editorial group think it is good or bad; it is subject to review and approval by the whole working group. Also the TDD text is clearly identified and isolated in separate subsections of the text.
- Arnie: The draft is a large and complex document. With Mark’s hard work, we are lucky to have a document to work with. At this point, let’s figure out what can be done between now and the Montreal meeting.
- Arnie: Indication can be added to show where the current text came from; highlight where changes were made
- Oprescu: The draft text for balloting needs to be unimpeachable
- Arnie: suggested the team members to spend a week’s time to look at the posted document to see how to mark it up, by identifying the source of the document
- Oprescu: WG members would find the whole balloting document changed by the beginning of the Montreal meeting
- Klerer: We are talking about indicating the changes not about revising the draft – so the new document would be identical to the ballot text but have diffmark information in it, e.g. the color code suggested by Val. In response to the high standard being imposed by Motorola, he noted that some typos and other errors are present in the version of 3GPP2 UMB text as referenced by the proposal package that was submitted to the March meeting; Mark wondered why the proposal contributions from Motorola had not included an erratum.
- Arnie stated that it was his understanding that a few team members would like to have a method that shows where the text came from, as it is hard to review the current text;
- Oprescu: base text for UMB should be unchanged. All changes should be revisionmarked.
- Arnie: each team member to go back, review the draft, identify and mark the text that reflect their proposals
- Tee: current draft has been put together by the editor, taking the previous 802.20 draft D2.1, together with some UMB text from 3GPP2; it would be more logical and appropriate for the editor to indicate the changes that he had made in creating the

merged document, rather than to have other team members to go through the text and try to guess what the editor had done

- Arnie: before proceeding with this suggestion, let's check if this approach could satisfy Oprescu
- Oprescu: No, a new draft should be created by putting all the documents on the table.
- Canchi expressed his views that the WG had agreed on the baseline draft (D2.1) and updating this baseline by taking the necessary UMB proposal elements and other proposal elements based on the accepted March proposals to generate a harmonized draft that takes the input from UMB-FDD and other accepted proposals. WG has not agreed to take UMB-FDD proposal as the baseline draft and make changes to UMB FDD.
- Oprescu: TDD text should be based on UMB. Clearly marked changes should be made to the UMB text to accommodate TDD or when the 802.20 PAR was different from the equivalent 3GPP2 document. Note that the previous draft D2.1 had not been formally approved by the WG.
- Klerer noted that the agreement to incorporate UMBFDD was reached by the same membership that also agreed to D2.1. Same group of people had voted for both documents – to amend the baseline document. We do not get to pick which of their votes counts and which does not.
- Canchi: UMB is for FDD only
- Oprescu: take some chapters from UMB, some from 802.20, balloting can be much smoother and faster if the process is followed, and the draft is a solid one; our current discussion has no impact on the 625K MC mode
- Oprescu: 1) rescind the practice ballot, 2) create a solid draft in time for Montreal meeting 3) discuss the document at the Montreal meeting and approve it as base for a Practice ballot to start immediately after the meeting.
- Klerer: The suggestion of developing a brand new text for Montreal that has never been seen by anyone for discussion in Montreal is inconsistent with any acceptable process.
- Arnie: we need a solution as some members are not happy with the baseline draft; cannot rescind the practice ballot
- Arnie: cannot change the plan for Montreal meeting
- Oprescu: can change the version and create a new draft

- Tee: current draft is incomplete and premature for balloting, e.g., the text for TDD was not ready
- Klerer: TDD status has already been discussed
- Oprescu: cannot change the past, but need to move forward with a solid footing
- Arnie: what can you do to help the group move forward with a solid footing?
- Oprescu: cancel the practice ballot on the current draft; let's create a solid, back traceable draft and discuss it in Montreal.
- Arnie: what can be done prior to Montreal? Not to cancel the practice ballot; continue the discussion in the next meeting
- Oprescu: agree on a format for traceability; willing to work on the editorial draft to include proper traceability on condition that the chair rescind the practice ballot;
- Val offered to generate a document with revision marks (either by himself or in cooperation) prior to the Montreal meeting to replace the current uploaded draft, and to form the basis of a Practice Letter Ballot to start at the end of the Montreal meeting.
- When Arnie asked if Val was willing to work on producing a marked-up document that would be used as a companion document of the current draft for Practice Letter Ballot, Val declined.
- Klerer volunteered to prepare a document with traceability while keeping the ballot going
- Oprescu: WG members will be spending time preparing comments for a draft that could be very different, without them knowing how different is.
- Klerer: Again the draft will not be different but this will be a companion showing the differences.
- Tee: Besides the issue of traceability, the text for TDD was incomplete
- Arnie: so you should take up the task for fixing this issue.
- Tee: would try my best to take a look at it
- Arnie: Need to stick to the WG decision; make sure that the document is consistent
- Oprescu: Take a poll for individual opinions of the editorial group: 'Is the document that is currently posted ready and appropriate for a practice ballot?'

- Klerer: Requested that the minutes note that, at the agreed decision time the consensus was to go ahead and that a revote after the deadline is inappropriate.
- Opreescu: not complete and not ready for ballot
- Tee: not ready for ballot; text for TDD not included properly
- Tomcik expressed his opinion that the draft was ready for practice ballot. Also asked for clarification that the currently posted document would not “go away” (i.e., be replaced with something else), as he was preparing comments based on that version.
- Klerer: at the time of close of comments from the editorial team, the majority of those responded was in agreement
- Canchi: draft is good for practice ballot
- Yoon: abstain
- Opreescu: with 2-2-1 vote, no consensus was achieved
- Tee: with the adoption of UMB proposal, the proposed draft in the air interface specifications should have been incorporated in the current draft; in the past practice of the 802.20 WG, the air interface specifications for MBFDD/MBTDD were used for the standard draft directly
- Klerer said that the analogy by Anna was faulty, the previous MBFDD/MB/TDD text was created to fit together, in the case of the UMBFDD proposal the documents were created as separate documents with front end introductions, references, definitions and other material that needed to be edited and it also needed to fit with other IEEE content.
- Tee: what was Mark Klerer’s vote?
- Klerer: draft was ready to go to Practice Letter Ballot ;
- Opreescu: Qualcomm has already voted once, what is this extra vote?
- Klerer: I am voting as chair not as Qualcomm, the Chair gets to vote in case of a tie.
- Arnie: That is correct according to Robert’s rules.
- Opreescu: It is irrelevant if the vote is 2-2-1 or 3-2-1. Consensus requires a clear supermajority and this group does not have it.
- Arnie: We will meet again next week.