

IEEE 802.16 Project Planning Committee Minutes IEEE 802.16 Session #47, London, UK, January 2007. (DRAFT)

H. Ruck, Acting Secretary

The IEEE 802.16 Project Planning Committee met three times during this session. The meetings were chaired by Brian Kiernan with Herbert Ruck as acting secretary. All sessions were held in the Blenheim room of the Hilton London Metropole Hotel.

1) Monday, January 15, 2007, Afternoon.

The meeting started at 15:30 hours local time. The chair explained the IEEE-SA rules for allowing a maximum of three amendments to a standard after which a new document must be created. This new document (a Revision) allows for a rewrite of the previous standard and associated amendments and therefore new material may be entered. It was explained that 16e and 16f are existing amendments to 802.16-2004, and the currently in-process 16j, 16h and 16i Projects are expected to be amendments also. It was also pointed out that the current Corrigendum 2 has 488 pages of “fixes”, a point often mentioned during the discussions.

One purpose of the Revision is the creation of a single, comprehensive document. It was said that a professional editorial merger is hoped to be completed prior to the March 2007 session.

The contributed draft Revision PAR (C802.16m-07/001) was discussed. There were numerous comments and discussions related to the timing of the Revision and Corrigendum 2. John Humbert talked about referring to the WiMAX profile recently published. There was some discussion of possible removal of text that “was not needed” from the standard. The discussion then focused primarily on the explanatory notes in section 7.4. Considerable discussion ensued on the approval level desired for the Corrigendum 2 document (i.e. working group ballot or sponsor ballot?).

The chair stated that the original intent of the revision project is to keep it at an editorial level as much as possible, but the revision process does open the entire document to comment. A Revision can change the old material. People were concerned about that. There was also concern expressed about getting the 802 EC and IEEE SA approval for Corrigendum 2 due to its size. Discussion then ensued of Corrigendum 2 being incorporated into the revision.

To quantify the result of the discussions a straw-poll was held with four questions:

Straw-poll 1) Is there a need to start a Revision project in 2007? The vote was 22-Yes, 0-No, 6 Abstain.

Straw-poll 2) Should the Revision project replace the Corrigendum 2 Project only after Corrigendum 2 completes WG ballot (i.e. no Corrigendum 2 sponsor ballot). The vote was 10-Yes, 14-No, and 6 Abstentions.

Straw-poll 3) To continue any “left-over” Corrigendum 2 work within the Revision Project (which will probably end up in the maintenance group) in order to stabilize/finalize changes after Revision PAR approval (i.e. CRs that may not complete the WG ballot). The vote was Yes-0, No-12, and 6 Abstentions.

Straw-poll 4) To continue the corrigendum 2 Project through sponsor ballot. The vote was 22-Yes, 3-No and 5 Abstentions.

In further discussions Jose Puthenkulam asked to segregate the maintenance process and Corrigendum 2 in the Revision PAR. This was done by rewording the 7.4 explanatory note to eliminate the reference to the specific Cor 2 document and instead reference the 802.16 maintenance Process. It was further agreed to have a joint meeting with Maintenance on Wednesday afternoon. The meeting recessed at 17:42 h local time.

2) Wednesday, January 17, 2007, Morning.

The meeting started at 08:15 hours. The agenda was modified to have an early joint session with the NetMAN TG to resolve a comment submitted in the P802.16g Sponsor Ballot by John Humbert that was intended to request that the Corrigendum 2 text be incorporated into the P802.16g draft. The issue was brought up because it had direct bearing on the Revision discussions. After considering various pro and cons it was decided to return to the question in the afternoon during the joint session with the maintenance Group. The discussion on the P802.16g comment ended at 8:32.

The chair addressed again the Revision PAR and presented some changes to the draft PAR based on the debates on Monday that separated the maintenance process from Corrigendum 2. The group then formulated and approved changes in the draft PAR including the date of completion for the Revision.

There was a break at 9:30 – 9:55 and the chair uploaded the modified draft PAR as C802.16-07/001r1RevisionPAR.pdf. As there was no other business, the meeting was recessed at 10:06 AM until the session with the Maintenance TG after lunch.

3) Wednesday, January 17, 2007, Afternoon.

The session started at 13:00 hours. The chair projected the revised PAR. and DJ Johnson and Phil Barber suggested minor changes. The Chair asked if anyone objected to the proposed changes. There was no response. The Chair indicated that he will take the final version (C802.16-07/001r2) to the Working Group Plenary for approval. Jon Labs presented a short status of Corrigendum 2 in the Maintenance Group. Phil Barber then spoke to the P802.16g ballot issue regarding the possibility of including the text of Corrigendum 2 in the P802.16g amendment. A lively discussion ensued that lead to another two straw-polls.

Straw-poll 5) To try and complete WG ballot of Corrigendum 2 prior to the March 2007 meeting and request EC approval for Corrigendum 2 sponsor ballot at the March 2007 meeting and also request EC approval of the Revision PAR at the March 2007 meeting. Yes 30; No 1; Abstain 3.

Straw-poll 6) To Complete WG ballot of Corrigendum 2 prior to the May 2007 meeting and request conditional EC approval for Corrigendum 2 sponsor ballot at the March 2007 meeting (assuming a clean recirculation) and request EC approval of the Revision PAR at the July 2007 meeting. Yes 7; No 7; Abstain 9

Based on the straw polls, the Project Planning Group Recommended the following action: “To try and complete WG ballot of Corrigendum 2 and initiate Sponsor Ballot of Corrigendum 2 prior to the March 2007 meeting and request EC approval of the Revision PAR at the March 2007 meeting.” This recommendation was addressed to the Maintenance Group to consider during their planning session on Thursday.

The Chair then moved “That the Chair of the Project Planning Committee be authorized to take the modified Revision PAR (C80216-07/001r2) to the Working Group for approval to be forwarded to the EC.” The motion was seconded by Dan Gal and approved with a vote of Yes-25, No-0 and Abstain-0 .

Having no other business, the Project Planning Committee adjourned at 14:46 hours.