IEEE 802.20 Meeting Notes
Interim Session,
Sept. 8-12, 2008,
Big Island, HI, USA

Chair: Mark Klerer
Vice-chair: Radhakrishna Canchi
Recording Sec.: Chirag Patel

Day 1 – PM session:

Meeting begins: 1:40pm

- Opening remarks by the chair.
    - o The Chair presents agenda for the week.
    - o Suggestion by J. Ragsdale and J. Upton to recess on Tuesday afternoon to attend .18 meeting.
    - o Approval of the agenda:
        - ▪ No objections. Agenda approved.

- Introduction by the attendees

- The Chair presents the IEEE Patents policy

    - o No questions/comments from the audience.

- *Approval of July meeting minutes*:
    - o J. Upton – Attendance is missing from the meetings. The Chair will add that.
    - o Fix typo on Jim Upton name to read Jerry Upton (or J. Upton).
    - o Motion to approve the July meeting minutes (IEEE 802.20/08-13).
        - ▪ J. Upton moves the motion.
        - ▪ R. Canchi seconds it.
        - ▪ No objections raised. A revised version 13r1 will be uploaded after including the attendance sheet and other corrections.

- Presentation on a draft enhanced MIB chapter for IEEE 802.20 wideband mode. (C802.20-08-14) by J. Tomcik
    - o Question by J. Upton: Is the naming convention 'dot20' right?
    - o Answer: The convention is correct. The Chair shows how it originated.
    - o Question by the chair: Can RFC use keywords like "must", "Must not" ,etc. AIS never uses "shall", it always uses "should". Chair suggests examining whether there is a need to change "should" to "shall" at certain places.
    - o Need to ascertain what's the distinction between the two definitions
        - ▪ Have a definition consistent across the standard vs. Make it such that people implementing MIB understand it.

- Comment by J. Ragsdale – The definitions in the AIS are quite clear. MIB text should match the text extracted from the AIS.
- Comments by the Chair: Wherever "should" is used, possible alternative and its implications must be captured in the text. (action items for J. Tomcik and R. Canchi). Also check for references.
- Action item for J. Tomcik – For half-duplex terminal : dot20AnHalfDuplexModeSupported – Need to clarify why "should" is used here, while an earlier version of the MIB had "shall".
- Comment by R.Canchi – 802.11 MIB has both "should" and "shall".

- Coffee break: 3.15 pm
- Session re-convenes - 3.45 pm

- Presentation on IEEE 802.20 PICS Proforma Support – Wideband mode (C802.20-08/16) by J. Tomcik
  - Comment by J. Ragsdale: Items like "FFT size" not covered. Should we go one level deeper and specify this and other items?
    - Action item for J. Tomcik – Add table to outline sizes for FFT & editorial change A5.3.3.3 options in physical layer to precoding layer.
  - Question by J. Tomcik – What should be done with rotational OFDM? It is more of a modulation scheme.
    - Comment by J. Ragsdale & R. Canchi – One good way to address this is to put them under the heading of "transmission features"
  - Action item for R. Gowaikar – Make corrections to the doc. to get a rev.1
    - Changes related to FFT size, half-duplex mode description
  - Question by the Chair – Are we allowed to do a FDD system that allows only half-duplex operation mode? Ans. There do not appear to be any restrictions on this.
  - Question by J. Ragsdale – Are the half-duplex requirements symmetric for both AN and AT? Answer. Not clear.

- End of day one – 4.45 pm. Re-convene tomorrow at 8.30 am.

Day 2 – AM session:

- Session begins 9.00am

- Presentation on "MBWA MPS" (C802.20-8/15) by J. Tomcik

  - AT MPS tests are provided now (AN MPS tests were presented the last time).
  - J. Tomcik describes different AT Tx and Rx tests.
  - Question by J. Upton: How closer are we to getting the building blocks done?

- ▪ Answer by J. Tomcik: We are making progress, there's a contribution on wideband mode as well as 625k mode. We need an outline to coherently put together these contributions and get a complete document.
    - o Question by the Chair: In section 2.1.3, ACS test: Does Table 33 assume 5MHz channel bandwidth?
        - ▪ Answer: Transmission configurations provided in Table 28.
    - o Comment by R. Canchi – Definition of ACS test says interfering MBWA signal should have 5MHz BW.
        - ▪ Not clear if the interfering signal is of 5MHz BW?
        - ▪ The Note 3 in Table 33 is also not clear.
    - o Question by R. Canchi – Are country specific MPS described identically in both AN and AT documents?
    - o Question by R. Canchi - For Figures related to AN MPS, Figure 6/7, do we need HRPD Signal Generator? Also the naming convention Ior, Ioc does not seem to be correct.
        - ▪ Action item: Need to fix these figures and conventions. Also there is some text in red color.

- Presentation on "Receiver Sensitivity and Adjacent Channel Selectivity MPS for BS Receiver" (C802.20-08/17) by R. Canchi
    - o Input for MPS for 625k mode
    - o Question/comment by the Chair: Why do we have backward references to ATIS doc? E.g. Section 3.1, Receiver sensitivity test refers to ATIS doc. 12.9.1.2. It is better to just point to the relevant clause here where the reference is taken care off.
    - o This is AN side MPS. We need AT side MPS.
    - o

- Coffee break: 10am
- Session re-convenes 10.30am

- Discussion on 625k MPS presented by R. Canchi

    - o Suggestion by J. Upton – Is it possible to add the ATIS text into the MPS document rather than referring to it?
        - ▪ Answer by R. Canchi – Need to make some changes in ATIS text to make it coherent with rest of the MPS test
        - ▪ Suggestion by J. Ragsdale – It would be good to have the test procedure included in the MPS text.
        - ▪ Action item for R. Canchi – Cover tests similar to the ones in the wideband mode.
        - ▪ Chair's comment: We have not covered co-existence with IEEE technologies. Need to discuss and decide if co-existence section needs to be there in MPS because it's not there in other IEEE technologies.

- Comment by J. Ragsdale- Is there a agreement to follow the parameters as provided in contribution #15? Yes.

- Question by J. Ragsdale – Is there a plan to discuss IMT-Advanced work?
  - The Chair has not received any input so far from the members on this topic.
  - The Chair will work with J. Ragsdale and R. Canchi on drafting an email for discussing how IEEE 802.20 stakes up with IMT-Advanced requirements?

- For Nov. meeting, the Chair requests all contributions to be available by the Wed. a week before the meeting. This will help in planning the agenda for Nov. meeting.

  - Question by J. Ragsdale – Are we planning to go to WG ballot in Nov.?
    - Ans: Depends on when we are ready with wideband and 625k MPS

- Presentation on "IEEE 802.20 PICS Proforma Support – Wideband Mode", revised version (C802.20-08/16r1) by J. Tomcik
  - J. Tomcik has incorporated changes discussed earlier during this meeting.
  - Question by the Chair: Section A.5.2 – Why is duplexing mode there?
    - Answer by J. Ragsdale: Follows sections in the AIS.
  - FFT sizes now included
  - Members discuss how to proceed further with this doc.
    - Combine this with 625k mode PICS once that is available.

- The Chair modifies the meeting agenda presented on day one. WG will meet today after IMT advanced meeting.

- Lunch break 12.05pm. Re-convene at 4.00 pm.

- PM session reconvened at 3.55pm

- The Chair discusses slide set on "ITU-R Regulatory process" (IEEE 802.18-08-0056-00-0000) and requests members to send comments/suggestions prior to Thursday when this contribution will be discussed.

- K. Ishida shares with members latest developments of ARIB work related to 802.20

  - We should have final approval from ARIB by the end of the month.

- The Chair summarizes the work till now on the two new PARs and outstanding items
  - Haven't received anything yet on bridging PAR
  - MIB PAR was approved
  - Need changes to the wideband MPS mode that were discussed earlier
  - Need 625k mode AT MPS doc.

- R. Canchi goes over the revised version of the AN MPS for 625k mode document ([C802.20-08/17r1](#))
  - o Removed ATIS referencing. Provided referencing to clauses in 802.20 instead.
  - o Question by J. Ragsdale – Aren't there more parameters that need to be captured for MPS?
    - Ans: Yes, later versions of the doc. will have additional parameters.

- Motion to adjourn the meeting:
  - o J. Tomcik moves the motion. J. Ragsdale seconds it.
  - o No objections raised. Motion approved.

- Sept.'08 meeting adjourned (4.45pm).

Attendees– September 2008				
Last Name	**First Name**	**Affiliation**	**Member Status**	**Attendance Credit**
Canchi	Radhakrishna	Kyocera	M	Y
Gowaikar	Radhika	Qualcomm, Inc.	M	Y
Ishida	Kazuhito	Qualcomm, Inc.	M	N
Klerer	Mark	Qualcomm, Inc.	M	Y
Morris	Roy	Wavelink	O	N
Patel	Chirag	Qualcomm, Inc.	M	Y
Ragsdale	James	Telefon AB LM Ericsson	M	Y
Tomcik	James	Qualcomm, Inc.	M	Y
Upton	Jerry	Qualcomm, Inc.	M	Y