
IEEE P802.15
Wireless Personal Area Networks

Project	IEEE P802.15 Working Group for Wireless Personal Area Networks (WPANs)		
Title	Memo of Tele-Conference Call for TG3c, 2008 Feb 20		
Date Submitted	[3 March, 2008]		
Source	[Chin-Sean Sum] [NICT] [Yokosuka,Japan]	Voice: [] Fax: [] E-mail: sum@nict.go.jp	
Re:			
Abstract	Minutes of the Feb 20 th teleconference		
Purpose	Minutes of the Feb 20 th teleconference		
Notice	This document has been prepared to assist the IEEE P802.15. It is offered as a basis for discussion and is not binding on the contributing individual(s) or organization(s). The material in this document is subject to change in form and content after further study. The contributor(s) reserve(s) the right to add, amend or withdraw material contained herein.		
Release	The contributor acknowledges and accepts that this contribution becomes the property of IEEE and may be made publicly available by P802.15.		

Memo of Tele-Conference Call for TG3c, 2008 Feb 20

Date: Feb 20th, 2008, 9.00am in JST

Attendees:

Edwin Kwon, Jisung Oh, Su-Khiong Yong (Samsung), Michael Sim, Raymond Yu Zhan (Panasonic), Makoto Noda, Hiroyuki Yamagishi (Sony), James Gilb (Sibeam), Abby Mathew (NewLANs), Bruce Bosco (Motorola), Ismail Lakkis (Tensorcom), Jason Trachewsky (Broadcom), Mark Grodzinsky (Wilocity), Yongsun Kim (ETRI), Yasunamo Katayama (IBM), Rick Roberts (Intel), Shuzo Kato, Hiroshi Harada, Akio Iso, Fumihide Kojima, Ryuhei Funada, Ryota Kimura, Zhou Lan, Chang-woo Pyo, Junyi Wang, Chin-Sean Sum (NICT)

Action Item:

1. James Gilb will complete and upload the baseline document DF1 in a few days.
2. James Gilb will prepare a discussion list for March 4 teleconference.
3. The assignees will provide the materials for discussions on the assigned tasks in doc. 08/0020r3 in the March 4 Teleconference, 24 hours in advance.

Next Meeting:

March 4, 2008, 6.00am in PST, 11.00pm in JST.

1.5 hours duration

What discussed:

- 1 Updates on the progress of baseline document DF1.
 - 1.1 James Gilb requires several more days to complete and upload the baseline document DF1.
- 2 Discussions on the assigned tasks for the comments listed in doc. 08/0020r3.
 - 2.1 The time plan for each task (40 tasks in total) was discussed one by one.
 - 2.2 Discussions will be carried out for the tasks in the March 4 teleconference. James Gilb will prepare the discussion list.
 - 2.3 Most tasks will be addressed on March 4, others will be addressed in the Orlando meeting.
- 3 The update of each task is given as below. For the complete table, kindly refer to doc. 08/0020r3.

No.	Task	Updates
1	The equation for the FFT period in the OFDM PHY is wrong for LRP and HRP modes	Completed by James Gilb
2	Do we need a capability bit that indicates a DEV is MMC PNC capable?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Materials uploaded before March 4 - Discussion in March 4 teleconference - Try to close in Orlando Meeting
3	Need to describe when the LRP is used.	As above
4	Keep references to 2.4 GHz, add reference to mmWave PHY.	As above
5	Do we need reserved stream indices for beamforming and channel probing.	As above
6	Does the resolution of the superframe timing need to be less than 1 us?	As above
7	Will Dly-ACK do what is necessary for Blk-ACK or are there unique things that Blk-ACK needs to do. Also, can this concept be extended to include the AV PHY directional ACK.	As above
8	Do we add SIFS and MIFS capabilities here or in another information element.	As above
9	How do we encode all of the supported data rates.	As above
10	We need to define the preferred fragment size mapping for each of the PHY modes or possibly one for all PHY modes.	As above
11	How do DEVs know when the superframe starts and when the last beacon ends if they receive one beacon in the middle of a set of beacons.	As above
12	How does a DEV know when the first symbol of the beacon is sent when there is repetition coding.	As above
13	Is this IE needed in light of the contributions on beamforming. If so, does it have the correct information.	As above
14	Can we update this IE to include all of the information useful for beam formed as well as sectorized antennas? What additional information is required?	As above
15	Are these the right set of commands?	As above

16	What is the definition of the value of the Channel Status Information field?	As above
17	Can this be done with an information element? Also, there are some updates to the frame format that need to be reviewed.	As above
18	Why is handover optional? Should it be restricted to certain cases.	As above
19	Need rules to describe that the beacon PHY mode shall not change while in operation. Also, that on handover, the new PNC uses the same PHY mode for the beacon as the old PNC. If so, we may be able to leave PNC Des-Mode as the top criteria for handover.	As above
20	Add requirement that MMC PNCs implement the common mode.	As above
21	What PHY mode is used in the CAP	As above
22	Add a description of the MMC PNC to Clause 5 in relation to the beaconing and the CAP.	James Gilb and sub-editors will work on it
23	Each PHY needs to explicitly define the base rate that will be used	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Materials uploaded before March 4 - Discussion in March 4 teleconference - Try to close in Orlando Meeting
24	The PHY mode names will be SC (single carrier), HSI (high speed interface), AV (audio/video), alternative: SC, MC1, MC2	James Gilb will work on it
25	Move the new text in this subclause to the informative annex.	James Gilb and sub-editors will work on it
26	Can all three PHY modes use the same SIFS and list this in the capabilities field to be used in an CTA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Materials uploaded before March 4 - Discussion in March 4 teleconference - Try to close in Orlando Meeting
27	Do we allow multiple beacons? If so, are they restricted to one PHY mode? Do we allow multiple beacons for sector antenna applications.	As above
28	Can we unify the use of FCS's and types of FCS?	As above
29	Can we unify the aggregation?	As above
30	Do we use one or two HCS for the headers, including the extended MAC header.	As above

31	The rules for Blk-ACK need to be filled out.	As above
32	Table 58a does not need any changes.	As above
33	Work on a unified beamforming submission.	As above
34	Can the SC and HSI PHY use a single preamble format?	As above
35	There needs to be a way for the upper layer that is the source of data to say if the use of UEP is allowed for the data stream.	As above
36	Rather than using commands, if the UEP capabilities are exchanged as part of the normal capabilities exchange, then the commands are not needed.	As above
37	The section repeats information from the channel time request for command.	As above
38	Can we use the existing facilities in 802.15.3b to accomplish this in a manner that improves the performance.	As above
39	This is probably very efficient when both sides are sectorized. However, when one side is not, regular beamforming would need to be used. Keep this section in mind when reviewing beamforming.	As above
40	It is better to use two different HCS for combined PHY and MAC header and MAC subheader	As above