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Abstract.

* The Agenda for the January Interim meeting was discussed. (Document IEEE802.19-09-100).
* The conference call scheduled for 13/01/10 was cancelled.

**Notice:** This document has been prepared to assist IEEE 802.19. 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.

**ATTENDANCE**

|  |
| --- |
| **Attendees** |
| **Name** | **Affiliation** |
| Steve Shellhammer (Chairman) | Qualcomm |
| Mark Austin | Ofcom |
| Tuncer Baykas  | NICT |
| Stanislav Filin | NICT |
| Mark Cummings  | SWIM |
| Chen Sun  | NICT |
| Zhou Lan  | NICT |
| Hiroshi Harada | NICT |
| Hyunduk Kang  | ETRI |
| Hou-Shin Chen | Thomson |
| Päivi Ruuska  | Nokia |
| Victor Hou | Broadcom Corporation |
| Rich Kennedy | RIM |
| Ha Nguyen Tran | NICT |
| Joe Kwak | InterDigital Communications  |
| Ivan Reede  | AmeriSys |
| Gerard Chouinard | CRC |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1.00** |  | **Meeting called to order** | **Chair** | **0**  | **10.04**  |

The meeting was called to order by the 802.19 study group on TV White Space Coexistence Chair.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2.00** |  | **Attendance** | **Chair** | **6**  | **10.04**  |

The chair required the attendees to send their name and organisation to the Secretary.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **3.00** |  | **REVIEW IEEE PATENT POLICY** | **Chair** | **2**  | **10.05**  |

A link to the patent policy slides was sent with the agenda, delegates were asked to read this and if they have any questions to send them to PATCOM

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4.00 |  | **Approval of meeting minutes** | **Chair** |  | **10:06**  |

N/A

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 4.00 |  | **Approval of agenda** | **Chair** |  | **10:06**  |

* Attendance (Mark Austin)
* The IEEE patent policy is available at the following location
	+ <http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/pat-slideset.pdf>
* Discuss Agenda for January Session (doc 09/100r0)
* Decide if we need to hold next week’s conference call
* New Business

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **4.00** |  | **Discussions**  |  |  | **10:09**  |

Note: The following minutes are a guide to the discussion that was held not all comments have been captured and some of the following comments have been summarised.

**Document IEEE802.19-09-100 January 2010 Agenda**

Chairman: The primary purpose of this teleconference is to discuss the Agenda for the January interim.



The Chairman presented the graphic and noted the mid week WG session may not be needed and could be changed to a TG instead. Also the Chairman had received a request to hold the WG closing plenary on the Thursday night rather then Friday morning; an alternative could be to hold the closing plenary on PM2.

Currently there is only TVWS activities planned for this week; there has been no request to look at any other coexistence work.

The timing of the closing WG session will be decided during the interim meeting.

IEEE802.19-09-100 Tab 2 WG Agenda

The WG session is where all the administrative activates is carried out with all the technical work being carried out in the TG sessions.

The Chairman made a request for a sectary as Mark Austin does not attend interim sessions.

Wednesday Mid week WG session:

* The nominations for the WG and TG chairs and vice-chairs and sectaries will be opened during the January meeting and will be closed at the beginning of the March Plenary.
* It was decided to keep this session and if the WG work is finished early then this session would revert to a TG session.

IEEE802.19-09-100 Tab 3 TG agenda

Though there will be no votes until the March Plenary a number of areas that could be progressed during the January meeting are:

* The process we are going to use:
	+ Are we going to develop a requirements document:
		- Are we going to start to develop the requirements document at the January meeting?
		- Are we going to have a draft completed during the meeting?
	+ The Chairman feels that a lot of the time of the meeting will be discussing and agreeing the process.
	+ This discussion will be presentations on proposals for the process and an open discussion during the meeting
* Are we going to send out a call for submissions
	+ What do we want the submissions to look like?
	+ There are two general approaches to receive submissions that other groups have used:
		- A submission on the total scope of what the standard would be:
			* Ours is not going to be a MAC/PHY standard so what you will have for the total scope will be different.
		- To agree on a general architecture and then break the standard up into component pieces, then take contributions on the general architecture and then vote on these component pieces. Then receive submissions on the component pieces.

Mark C: During our work on the PAR and the 5C we talked about focusing on the following areas:

1. Discovery
2. Connection
3. Information exchange
4. Algorithms

Not sure if these 4 areas would be a architecture but would be a way of organising the work and when contributions are received for them to show how they met them.

Chairman: Should we take this as a starting point and then in the January meeting build up more build up a more complete architecture. And by then the end of the week we could have draft architecture, if not then have presentations in the March meeting on the areas discussed?

The architecture would be stage 1, we would receive contributions and then vote on architecture, stage 2 would be for people to do contributions on the different parts of the architecture.

Mark C: Agrees that this would be the most productive.

????????

Joe: We should start discussing the architecture early and Marks proposal to discuss functions is a necessary part of early discussions. Reluctant to make any discussion at this meeting due to the lateness of the press release and that this is our first meeting.

Chairman: We are not proposing to make discussion in the January meeting, proposing that we have good hearty discussions and presentations, also have straw polls of the people in the room to get feedback; the decisions will be made in March. We could prepare and send out a call for submissions on the architecture in January and decide when we have the submissions and vote on them.

Joe: The group will need to decide what scope the group needs to attack. This involves a discussion on the layer model and where we want to scope the limits of the standard. If we do attempt to do a complete solution we may be attempting to draft a standard all the way to the application layer. And there may be divergent views on this, so the earlier we start the discussion the better. He does not believe that the PAR limits us, but to proceed we need an agreement.

Chairman: A discussion on the layer model would be good; one possibility is we may even be inventing a new layer model.

Mark C: The model we discussed early Discovery, Connection, Information exchange

Algorithms/negotiation, could represent a new layer model rather then an architecture. We are at the early stages and the way forward will be an iterative process and we should not look at freezing things like architecture until later in the process. Later we will vote to adopt and freeze them when it is appropriate.

Chairman: This will be part of the process document will be to explain this iterative process. We need to allow enough time to have a good discussion but not allow so much time that we don’t get the work done.

Chairman: Another document that we will need to consider is one defining the terminology that we are using.

Chairman: We will need to think what our first call will be and that this should be carry out for contributions for the March meeting.

Joe: It will depend on how we want to organise the process, first we need to decide on the scope and then on the architecture, complete or part contributions. There is a whole series of steps we need to consider and it will depend if we want to consider these in parallel or in series. There may not be any hard template that will suit this project at the 802 level.

Mark C: A call for contributions is a good idea, but we need to calls:

1. To internal 802 groups
2. External groups

Chairman: Would these be separate documents.

Mark C: these will probably be separate, though it may turn out to be the same documents. We want to ask the other 802 groups form the perspective of your standard what would you like us to be aware of. To the outside world living them a layered model and then asking them to talk about the different layers in their contribution. In the early stages we should be flexible in the form of the contributions take.

Chairman: So in January meeting another question to discuss is to whom we would want to send this and what would we send.

Chairman: There is a press release that has been drafted and is under a EC email ballot that closes on Friday. This will hopefully go out sometime next week and may get new people interested in this project.

Joe: The meeting schedule should be added to the press release.

Chairman: The fourth tab on document IEEE802.19-09-100 is the joint 802.11/802.19 and 802.22 meeting scheduled for the January meeting. This meeting is still to be confirmed by 802.11.

Chairman: The agenda has not been set yet; the plan is to hold at least one joint session at each meeting.

Chairman: Are there any thoughts what we would like to discuss at this meeting.

?: how will liaisons be chosen for the different groups?

Chairman: I have sent out an email to the 802.11 and 802.22 chairmen suggesting that 802.19 would grant for example a 802.11 member voting rights in 802.19 and they would a liaison between the groups and that the reverse happens that 802.11 grants a 802.19 member voting rights. These liaisons would then report back to their respective groups the active of the other group. The approval of that is normally taken be the WG chairs but this could be discussed at the joint meeting.

Mark C: Would be good to encourage the participants from the other 802 groups and give them a chance to discuss what they think is important, so they feel that they have been heard. Rather then us talking to them and telling them details it is for them to talk to us to express their views.

Gerard: Concern about the meetings happening in parallel and delegates not being able to attend.

Chairman: The joint meeting would be set so it was not in conflict with any other meeting of the groups. Additional meeting could be set up as a 802.19 to discuss topics that another group would be interested. Meeting schedules could be discussed at the first joint meeting.

Chairman: Gerard are there any topics from a 802.22 perspective that should be on the agenda?

Gerard: you are looking at a general framework, 802.22 already has some specific ways of dealing with it that would need to be harmonised. But looking at it in a broader perspective is a good way for 802.19 to start. 802.2 could get more involved once the call for proposals has been made. The first meeting will be more organisational in nature.

Chairman: We could discuss with 802.11 and 802.22 what are goals and process are for the week and that end of the week we are planning to do a call for contributions, but as the joint meeting is on the Monday night we will not have all the details. The chair will also contact the 802.11 and 802.22 chairman for their items for the agenda.

Chairman: will send out a email to the 802.19 group setting out what we will be discussing in the January meeting, process and architecture, and that we will not be making major decisions in January on the architecture. Also that we will be putting a draft process document together ready to be voted on in March.

Chairman: Discussed the voting procedure that will take place in March and noted that he will be acting as the TG chairman at the January meeting.

Mark C: asked that if people want to present contributions in the January meeting that they could let the group know.

Mark C: Thanked all the people involved in the development of the PAR and 5C.

The conference call for Wednesday 13th January 2010 was cancelled.

The meeting was closed: 11:04