

Editorial Task Group – 2007/06/04 Conference Call – Minutes

Time:

The call was scheduled for 3:00-5:00PM EDT

Call Recording Secretary: Mark Klerer

Agenda:

The following agenda was followed

1. Review and discussion of comments (some of these comments had been pre-submitted via e-mail)
2. Discussion of inclusion of additional PLB1 comments in the PLB2 Attachment.

Summary of Discussions:

A question was raised as to whether the definitions in the 802.20 draft came from the UMB text, as in the opinion of the commenter it “seems that some improvements may be possible” in the text of the definitions. It was noted that the text of most of the technical definitions came from UMB, however, if there were concerns comments can be made towards the next draft.

With respect to specific comments on the Editorial Draft the following items were discussed:

1. Section 1.1 line 12, replace "older access terminals." with "older access terminals or user terminals." AGREED
2. Section 1.2: remove text "Time Division Duplex(TDD)" from line 14 altogether, and on line 17 replace TDD with "Time Division Duplex(TDD)" AGREED
3. Section 1.3, lines 29-30 to be moved to a more appropriate location. AGREED Text to be moved to section 1.4
4. For the definitions of the FL and RL in section 1.4 use the terms AN and AT rather than BS and MS. AGREED
5. Add specific text to Wideband Mode and 625k-MC overview sections dealing with sequencing of process steps. AGREED.
 - a. The following text is to be added at the bottom of section 1.4.1: "In procedural descriptions throughout the text describing operations in Wideband mode (see 1.2), the Access Terminal (AT) and Access Network (AN) shall perform the indicated steps in the sequence given, unless otherwise stated."
 - b. The following is to be added in section 1.5.4: "In procedural descriptions throughout the text describing operations in 625k-MC mode (see 1.2), the User Terminal (UT) and Base Station(BS) shall perform the indicated steps in the sequence given, unless otherwise stated."
6. In references section fixed the name of the document listed as reference [25] AGREED, reference corrected by adding “Radio Interface Standard” to end of document title.
7. Page 60 (of Preview Draft), line 5 correct LayerSublayer text to read “Sublayer”. AGREED.
8. On page 65 (of Preview Draft) delete the last sentence of the definition of Sector (for consistency with the change done in the wideband section).AGREED.

9. In section 1.5.4 fixed typo “mSB” should be “MSB” Clean up Figure 6 to delete reference to 3GPP2 draft. AGREED.
10. With respect to PLB1 comment 156 clean up the references to PHY and MAC Specifications by deleting the word “Specification” [Preview Draft page 180 lines 4, 7 and 28 and prior footnote]. AGREED.
11. It was noted that in some sections the page numbers had vanished. Add page numbers to all sections of the document. AGREED.
12. With respect to PLB1 comment 169 – add “Not Applicable” to empty cell in table.
13. It was noted that there is a remaining xxx in section 5.2.1.2.1 it was agreed to resolve that as a TBD in accordance with the text in UMB v1.
14. Fix erroneous reference to table 138 in 625k-MC text. AGREED
15. The editor noted that he also had to fix the table formats and the parameter names for TDD PHY frames. AGREED. TDD the $N_{\text{FLPHYframes}}$ and $NR_{\text{FLPHYframes}}$ will be used only for FDD and for TDD an additional subscript will be added to read $N_{\text{TDD,FLPHYframes}}$ and $NR_{\text{TDD,FLPHYframes}}$, respectively.
16. Additionally there was discussion that PLB1 comment 221 was not executed correctly. It was noted that the comment proposed alignment with UMB v1 but contained detailed instructions that were not aligned with that comment. The editor's draft executed the change to align with UMB v1.

Finally, there was discussion on what comments were to be included in the attachment to PLB2. The editor noted that the attachment was created on the basis of including only those comments that were specifically identified in the LB1 Ballot resolution as being attached. One member of the EG felt that other “open” comments should also be included in the attachment, such that they could be distinguished from those that had been rejected. After lengthy discussion and a poll of the editing group it was agreed to also include comments 227 and 378 (that had the disposition “No action at this time” in the PLB1 spreadsheet) in the attachment.

A new draft including the above updates was planned for posting by Wednesday evening for further review by the ETG members, before sending out for PLB2 on June 8.