IEEE 802.23   18 January 2011   Los Angeles

The meeting was called to order at 9:10 AM by:
  – Geoff Thompson (Chair) (affiliated with InterDigital)
Also attending were:
  – Farrokh Khatibi/QualComm
  – George Bumiller/Research In Motion
  – Karen Randall/RSA

An attendance sheet was passed and the chair asked the attendees to register their attendance and to also sign in on the attendance server.

The Chair presented the agenda.
  – Opening boilerplate items
  – SUPL Presetation/Khatibi/QualComm
  – Review and comment on FCC NoI on NG911
  – Meet with 802.18 on Wednesday PM to present NoI comments for submission to FCC.
  – Thompson et al presentation
The proposed agenda was approved without objection

On Wednesday, the chair has a RevCom conference call early in the morning. It shouldn't cause a problem but there is the possibility of a late start.

The chair asked if all present were familiar with the IEEE patent policy, and did the required call for patents.
All responded that they were familiar with the policy.
There were no responses to the Call For Patents.

The standards process slides, and the Route to a standard were shown
We're defining the detail ..
This week's schedule is 9 -12 and 1:30 – 5:00 Tuesday/Wednesday/Thursday
The group will have a Wed PM meeting with 802.18 to consolidate FCC views. The formal 802.18 rules allow the Chair and one other person, but we expect to be able to have all members there.

Our next meeting will be during the March Plenary which will be held at the Marina Bay Sands in Singapore the week of March 13. 802.23 will meet Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday of that week. There will be an executive review of the viability of the 802.23 project and its participation at the March meeting.

There are several choices for a venue for the May interim. The leading contenders are Lake Louise co-located with 802.16 the week of May 16 or Palm Springs co-located with 802.11/15 during the week of May 8.

****

Presentation of FCC NoI (10-100) on NG911.

    Background on 911

    [CMRS – commercial mobile radio service] – without regard to implementation technology.

    It doesn't specifically include VoIP

    2005 – rules re interconnected VoIP service providers...

        Reached out to VoIP services provided through non-traditional (soft phones)

        Farrokh – Verizon deploys service, using VoIP. They must provide E911

            Other services (not Verizon) provide VoIP over LTE.

        Geoff – But most providing service via LTE are already regulated as "Wireless Service".

        Geoff – If you buy I'net service from 'Comcast', a triple-play vendor.

            Implementation of phone service is VoIP

            They present themselves as a vertically integrated company

            Geoff believes they have the E911 obligation

            Therefore, if one uses their I'net service, Geoff believes that they are obligated to provide 911 service where a "pure" internet access provider would not face the same obligation.

        IETF takes position that if you know the location of the routers, the problem is solved.

        Router is Layer 3. Many APs include a router.

        The dumb AP smart switch was one approach in vogue for a while.

        Now, with router only at the edge, the Layer 1/Layer 2 network can be very large,

        Therefore, we need to provide location from the Layer 2 to the end user terminal.

        Farrokh – Access provides the connection, service provides the content.

        For example: Yahoo on Verizon cellular; Verizon doesn't provide location info to Yahoo

        Geoff – The solution we propose is, when a call is placed, the info between the access and service portions must be available on a standardized basis.

        If they are a connected service provider, they shall use a standardized interface.

      [mid-morning break]

        Continue reviewing the FCC NoI (in item 6, p 4)

            "…requiring interconnected VoIP service providers…"

            Footnote 15 on the same page mentions

            Section 16 is key…it doesn't take into account the mobility of VoIP devices

Farrokh – implementation should be able to be done at a reasonable cost.

Geoff – IETF and IEEE are the two appropriate SDOs

NoI asks whether this is a solution or whether something else is needed.

[lunch break]

At this point we lost our note taker.
The remainder of Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning was taken up with review and comment of the remainder of the FCC NoI.
802.23 recessed at noon Wednesday until 8:30 AM Thursday.
Our comments were uploaded to the document server as an annotated copy of the FCC NoI itself.
Annotation was done with both highlighting and comment flags. Annotation covered both comments to be fed back to the FCC and items within the NoI that should be specially noted by 802.23

On Wednesday afternoon our comments on the NoI were presented in 802.18 for them to consider and merge with any comments of their or comments from other groups.
That work was not competed in the time allocated on Wednesday afternoon. The remaining work was carried over until Thursday at 1:30 PM when it continued. The document was finalized for submission for review by the SEC and submission to the FCC in a followup conference call by 802.18 (Feb 3)
The final version can be found in the 802.18 area of the document server as:
https://mentor.ieee.org/802.18/
dcn/11/18-11-0016-04-0000-comments-to-fcc-10-200-ng911-framework.doc
The minutes of that meeting are also available on: https://mentor.ieee.org/802.18/

802.23 recovened briefly on Thursday morning for general discussion. The major topic was whether to plan for a May interim meeting and what venue would be preferred. The two candidate venues were:
co-located with 802.11/15/etc in Palm Springs, CA during the week of May 9-13 or
co-located with 802.16/21 in Lake Louise, Alberta CANADA May 16-19.
It was agreed that Lake Louise was a more pleasant venue but Palm Springs might produce greater attendance. The final decision was left until the March Plenary session of 802.23. The meeting was adjourned at 11:10 AM Thursday.

Geoffrey O. Thompson, WG Chair.

(Thanks to George Bumiller for his assistance in note taking)