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Abstract

This document contains the minutes of the 2017-01-18 Wednesday PM1 meeting of the IEEE 802.11 PDED ad hoc group.

At 2016-01-18T13:34-05:00 the Chairman calls the meeting of the PDED ad hoc group to order. Andrew Myles acts as Chairman of the group. Guido R. Hiertz volunteers to act as secretary. The Chairman presents document 11-16/1602r2. The Chairman continues presenting his slides from page 46.

The Chairman proposes to 1) think continue discussion the ED threshold 2) to brainstorm about a liaison response letter to 3GPP, and 3) to debate any comments to the submission XXX presented yesterday. At 2016-01-18T13:38-05:00 the group agrees to follow the proposed agenda.

At 2016-01-18T13:40-05:00 discussion regarding slide 47:

* Question: Why do you say on this slide things “are likely?”
* Response: I will explain on later slides

At 2016-01-18T13:42-05:00 discussion about slide 48:

* Comment: The goal was not to avoid a risk but to allow for a transitioning period.
* Response: Agreed.

At 2016-01-18T13:50-05:00 discussion about slide 51:

* Comment: Too extreme statements because 802.11ax brings OFDMA like LAA and MuLTEfire
* Response: Agreed, the statements are exaggerating.
* Comment: The exceptions for Wi-Fi are fair. We should go back to ETSI to have an exception for 802.11ax. I know this is technology specific but we should do this.
* Response: Yes, we should call for this exception.
* Comment: I think about exceptions for all 802.11 standards.
* Comment: Spatial reuse has been identified as important topic in 802.11ax.
* Comment: This doesn’t have to do with any value it is allow about fair sharing.
* Comment: The 802.11a PD and ED values have been arbitrarily selected in the 1990s. There were simulation results and ED was never called ED but remedy for missed preambles. We should not over interpret the meaning.
* Comment: There is chances in allowing more flexibility, we need to move ahead as 802.11ax shows.
* Comment: External regulations should not stipulate changes. If something is better the market itself will switch to the new solution.
* Comment: FCC told us that industry needs to resolve this otherwise regulators make decisions.
* Comment: The PD and ED thresholds are just one pair that we never changed. We don’t know if they are good. They are just the status quo.
* Comment: -72 dBm and two other aspects are part of a package bringing compromise in EN 301 893.

At 2016-01-18T14:20-05:00 discussion about slide 52:

* Comment: My employer does not have any interest in one technology having lower performance than the other.

At 2016-01-18T14:24-05:00 discussion about slide 54:

* Question: What is the definition of technology neutrality.
* Response: I will explain on the next slide.

At 2016-01-18T14:28-05:00 discussion about slide 58:

* Comment: This is about placing products on the market. Making them available. It’s not about describing rules for technologies.

At 2016-01-18T14:38-05:00 discussion about slide 60:

* Question: What are the regulatory principles? E.g., the principle of fair access needs to apply regardless of technology.
* Comment: I agree with the conclusion on page 60.
* Comment: I believe PD is a technological silo. And it’s piling up more and more overhead.

At 2016-01-18T14:30-05:00 discussion about slide 62

* Comments: Your slides are suggesting negatives. Don’t do this, don’t do that.
* Question: What should they do then?
* Comment: We don’t need to adopt these definitions.
* Comment: We have some interest in these definitions.
* Comment: I appreciate listing these definitions.
* Comment: I would encourage everyone to research himself. There are many interpretations of the meaning of technological neutrality.
* Comment: I tried to look at our situation at the context of all three definitions.
* Comment: Each definition encouraged me to have the exception in.

No conclusion at this time.

At 2016-01-18T14:47-05:00 the Chairman transitions to slide 31 in his presentation. Continuing the discussion of how to respond to 3GPP.

At 2016-01-18T14:50-05:00 discussion:

* Comment: We should stop this. We should focus on improving our technology. We are wasting time for things that we could spend improving 802.11.
* Comment: I agree with not responding and closing the discussion.
* Question: Is it impolite if we do not respond?
* Comment: I would like that the discussion is documented and archived.
* Straw poll: Which option on slide 30 do you prefer?
	+ Nobody wants to continue disagreeing.
	+ Ignore (don’t send anything): 6
	+ Agree to disagree (send a final thank you): 7

Chairman proposes to review the minutes of the discussion and will draft a short liaison response

At 2016-01-18T14:58-05:00 continued discussion of 11-17/62.

* Comment: As outcome of the discussion there are things to look at how we can improve our standard.
* Comment: We would like to have a chance to continue simulating.
* Comment: We have an interest in improving the 802.11 standard, to improve.
* Comment: We want to show what really happens if LAA LTE comes along.
* Comment: We could make the adjustments proposed earlier.

The Chairman will ask the 802.11 WG Chairman for an extension of the PDED ad hoc group until the March meeting of 802.11.

Nikola Serafimovski volunteers to present the Chairman’s report at the closing plenary of the 802.11 WG.

At 2016-01-18T15:06-05:00 the Chairman adjourns the meeting of the PDED ad hoc group.