

# Radiocommunication Study Groups



Received: 1 April 2008

**Document 5D/109-E**

Subject: Question ITU-R 229-1/8

**2 April 2008**

**English only**

**CIRCULAR LETTER**

**Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)**

## REQUEST FOR CLARIFICATION ON STEPS 2 AND 3 OF THE SUBMISSION AND EVALUATION PROCESS FOR IMT-ADVANCED

### 1 Source information

This contribution was developed by IEEE Project 802, the Local and Metropolitan Area Network Standards Committee ("IEEE 802"), an international standards development committee organized under the IEEE and the IEEE Standards Association ("IEEE-SA").

The content herein was prepared by a group of technical experts in IEEE 802 and industry and was approved for submission by the IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Wireless Metropolitan Area Networks, the IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group, and the IEEE 802 Executive Committee, in accordance with the IEEE 802 policies and procedures, and represents the view of IEEE 802.

### 2 Discussion

The "Submission and evaluation process" in Document IMT-ADV/2 (located at the web page referenced in Circular Letter 5/LCCE/2) needs to be more precise for external organizations, including both proponents and evaluators. In particular:

- **Step 2** ("Development of candidate RITs or SRITs") indicates that "candidate terrestrial component RITs or SRITs are developed to satisfy a version of the minimum technical requirements and evaluation criteria of IMT-Advanced." We understand from 8/LCCE/2 that the term "RIT" stands for "radio interface technology", but the term is not defined. Organizations will not submit a "technology" to ITU; they will submit documentation. The nature of the documentation is not specified. For instance, is an entire interoperable specification required?
- **Step 3** ("Reception of the RIT and SRIT submissions and acknowledgement of receipt") includes the additional information that an RIT includes:
  - completed templates (not yet available)
  - any additional inputs which the proponent may consider relevant to the evaluation
  - the version of the minimum technical requirements and evaluation criteria

- an initial self-evaluation or the proponents' endorsement of an initial evaluation.

This still fails to specify the content of the "radio interface technology."

Without detailed specifications, on what basis can the evaluation groups conduct their evaluation in Step 4?

- The timeline for Step 3 is ambiguous, showing that candidate RITs are expected over three meetings. Submitting organizations would find it convenient to understand the expectations for the first two of these meetings.

### **3 Proposal**

IEEE proposes that clarification of these issues be included during the completion of the Circular Letter at the second meeting of WP 5D.

---