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Abstract

This document contains the Task Group on Light Communications (TGbb) meeting minutes from the IEEE 802.11 San Diego meeting, July 2017.

**IEEE 802.11 Task Group TGbb**

**Monday, July 9, 2018, AM1 Session**

Attendance: around 25 people

1. The IEEE 802.11 TGbb meeting was called to order at by the Chair, Nikola Serafimovski (pureLiFi).

He explained this is similar to an ad-hoc, i.e. no motions can be made. Since officers were neither approved nor selected, the officers from the study group will run this meeting, i.e. John Li Quiang (Huawei) acted as Vice Chair.

1. The Chair Nikola Serafimovski (pureLiFi) reviewed the IEEE-SA patent policy, logistics, and reminders, including meeting guidelines and attendance recording procedures.
	* It is reminded all to record their attendance.
2. The Chair Nikola Serafimovski (pureLiFi) introduced the schedule for the meeting
	* Discuss the suitability of TG/SG results
		+ Usage model document doc. 11-18-1109/r0
		+ Specification Framework document doc. 11-18-1110/r0
		+ Reference channel modelling document for indoor environments doc. 11-18-1236/r0
3. Oliver Luo (Huawei) presented doc. 18/1109/r0 on the Usage Models for LC.
	* Industrial wireless
		+ Robustness to interferences is important
	* Wireless access in medical environments
		+ Use case has been revised
	* Enterprise network
		+ High-speed
	* Secure home network
		+ RF can be hacked, LC is good for users which have concerns of security
	* Backhaul network
		+ Light should be infrared
	* Q: Backaul should be included?
	* A: Yes.
	* C: Let us look again to the table on slide 9.
	* Q: Mobility aspects should be included in the KPI list.
	* A: Chair agrees that handover needs to be discussed. Rapid mobility is included in the industrial use case. What additional KPI should be added?
	* C: Key metrics have been derived from usage models. If the group requires more should be added.
	* Q: Mobility is a requirement, handover is a solution. Channel is highly dynamic due to the channel. Handover is to mitigate the latency and loss of packets. The parameters like latency will possibly not be met if high mobility is required.
	* A: How should the table be changed? Someone should come with a technical proposal.
	* Q: Range could be added and speed.
	* A: 5 use cases only involve very low-speed and low mobility so far.
	* Q: What about the missing lux number for IR used in the backhaul.
	* C: Lux may not be the appropriate measure in general. In the IR it may be counts per seconds.
	* A: Signal strength should be measured in Watts/sr or Candela which is more appropriate than lux.
	* C: Parameters in the list should be high-level and must not contain everything that can be contained in the rest of the document.
4. Oliver Luo (Huawei) presented doc. 11-18/1110/r0 on the Functional Requirements for LC.
	* Mainly compiled from PAR and CSD
	* System requirements
		+ Throughput 10 Mb/s to 5 Gb/s on a single link
		+ Security maintained through movement between lights, as well as the security implications for fast session transfers
		+ Optical safety should be given
		+ Supporting wavelength bands 380 nm to 5.000 nm
		+ Coexistence with other systems operating in the same wavelength bands including 802.15.13
		+ Interoperability between Solid State Light Sources with different modulation bandwidth
	* C: Security should cover the use of different PHYs. 11bb should cover similar security mechanisms as between the existing 802.11 PHYs.
	* C: Besides optical safety there should be health safety
	* A: If made available it will be included here.
	* Q: Where the coexistence with 802.15.13 comes from.
	* C: Could be replaced by “other light communication systems”
	* C: change wording from “support mechanisms for coexistence” to ”show that coexistence is possible”
	* Q: Where the 10 MB/s lower bound comes from.
	* A: Comes from the PAR and cannot be changed at this point in time.
	* C: Was chosen so that the scope of the project remains limited and the project can be completed in a reasonable timeframe. E.g., 10 Mbit/s excludes optical camera communications (OCC).
	* Q: Does it include ultraviolet?
	* A: Regulators stopped this to the lower end, the higher limit is the end of the visible range.
	* Q: Coexistence and Interoperability with other systems like RF.
	* A: Coexistence with RF is not problematic. Coexistence is usually a PHY issue. Interoperability includes systems in the same frequency range.
	* A: Everything which is out of scope of the PAR should not be included in the work of TGbb as it is not authorized.
	* C: One should also look up doc. 0948/r0 which was presented during the last meeting.

Oliver will upload revised versions of both documents including the changes made during the session.

1. Tuncer Baykas (Istanbul Medipol University) presented doc. 11-18/1236/r0 on the Reference Channel Models for Indoor Environments.
	* Empty room, office, home, manufacturing cell
	* Methodology is based on raytracing using Zemax
	* Delivers the Channel Impulse Responses (CIRs)
	* Similar approach was followed already in IEEE 802.15.7r1, references are in the slides
	* Performance evaluation in 802.15.13 is based on the same approach
	* New is including the LED response
	* Two LED models can be changed according to the needs of the group
	* Literature cut-off frequencies are below 20 MHz
	* Empty room is described, regular grid of LED lights 🡪 rather homogeneous illumination
	* Test points of receivers in 100 cells of 60x60 cm²
	* Seven possible locations were selected
	* One channel has only NLOS response, has 20 dB less power but considerable multi-path due to specular and diffuse reflections
	* Sample channel impulse responses will be made available for performance evaluation
	* Some channels show very frequency-selective characteristics is available for all locations
	* Cumulative distribution for path loss ranges from 49-56 dB
	* Same for open office, four columns of light, test points at the ear with a mobile device and on the desktop
	* Channel responses are flat in many cases
	* Include the effects of the LED as well, rms DS of several 10 ns
	* Office with secondary light acting as a relay
	* Channel characteristics are almost flat mainly determined by the LED
	* Home scenario
	* Channel impulse responses also determined by the LED and otherwise flat.
	* Manufacturing scenario, 6 Tx looking at all directions, 8 Rx at the walls
	* Optical channel responses for all LEDs driven together or driven individually
	* Q: Which model to use for which usage model?
	* A: Industrial wireless: manufacturing cell
	* A: Wireless access in medical environments: could be replaced by one indoor model for now
	* A: Enterprise network: indoor model
	* A: Secure home network: indoor model
	* A: Backhaul network: Still open
	* Q: Indoor scenarios will be using phosphor LEDs?
	* A: Yes.
	* Q: CIRs should be made available from individual light points to individual receivers
	* A: Yes this is possible upon request.
	* Q: What will be made available.
	* A: Group may want to select a few scenarios according to the usage models.
	* Q: CIRs are often very flat. Effective CIRs are not that flat due to the LED.
	* Q: Separate optical channel impulse response and impact of the LED.
	* A: This is easily possible.
	* Q: Have one scenario with wide beams overlapping more and another scenario using narrower beams with less overlap.
	* A: The group can decide on specific scenarios and the channels can be modelled accordingly.
	* C: Four different requirements for different usage models.
	* C: Effort should be limited to match the true needs of TGbb for performance evaluation.
	* C: Agree on the principle methodology and select the models needed.

Ad-hoc meeting was adjourned until PM2 on Tuesday July 10.