**IEEE P802.24**

**Smart Grid TAG**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project | IEEE P802.24 Smart Grid Technical Advisory Group |
| Title | Licensed Narrowband Amendment CSD Draft from 802.24 teleconference |
| Date Submitted | 2019-10-01 |
| Source | Kathy Nelson (Ondas Networks) |  |
| Re: | 802.24 TAG Teleconference  |
| Abstract | October 1, 2019 Draft CSD Review  |
| Purpose | Document meeting activity and action items. |
| Notice | This document has been prepared to assist the IEEE P802.24. 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 P802.24. |

2019-10-01

Proposed IEEE 802 Criteria for Standards Development (CSD):

P802.16t Amendment for Fixed and Mobile Wireless Access in Channel Bandwidth up to 100 kHz

**1.1 Project process requirements**

**1.1.1 Managed objects**

Describe the plan for developing a definition of managed objects. The plan shall specify one of the following:

1. The definitions will be part of this project.

Yes

b) The definitions will be part of a different project and provide the plan for that project or

anticipated future project.

c) The definitions will not be developed and explain why such definitions are not needed.

No new definitions are anticipated, although existing ones may require amendment.

**1.1.2 Coexistence**

A WG proposing a wireless project shall demonstrate coexistence through the preparation of a

Coexistence Assurance (CA) document unless it is not applicable.

a) Will the WG create a CA document as part of the WG balloting process as described in

Clause 13? (yes/no)

No

b) If not, explain why the CA document is not applicable.

The scope is to exclusively support operation in licensed spectrum.

**1.2 5C requirements**

**1.2.1 Broad Market Potential**

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall have broad market potential. At a minimum,

address the following areas:

a) Broad sets of applicability.

This proposal addresses the multi-industry, multi-billion dollar worldwide market for

private mission-critical data networks to support the Mission Critical Internet of Things (MC-IoT). This includes private licensed wireless networks for electric, gas, and water utilities; oil and gas companies; commercial and public rail systems; military; and federal, state and local agencies. According to Cisco IBSG, a leading information technology research and advisory company, the installed base of active wireless connected devices will grow from approximately 23 billion units today to 50 billion by 2020. The industrial vertical market, which includes utilities, manufacturing, and government, is forecasted to represent 12% of

the devices or approximately 6 billion devices by 2020.

b) Multiple vendors and numerous users.

There is identified interest and support for the outcome of this project from individuals

affiliated with the following: 1) leading industry support and research groups including the

Utilities Telecom Council (UTC), ENTELEC, Association of American Railroads (AAR), Enterprise Wireless Alliance (EWA), the WiMAX Forum, and the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), 2) system integrators, 3) chip suppliers, 4) equipment manufacturers, 5) licensed spectrum holders, 6) electric utilities, 7) oil & gas companies, 8) rail companies.

**1.2.2 Compatibility**

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard should be in conformance with IEEE Std 802, IEEE

802.1AC, and IEEE 802.1Q. If any variances in conformance emerge, they shall be thoroughly

disclosed and reviewed with IEEE 802.1 WG prior to submitting a PAR to the Sponsor.

a) Will the proposed standard comply with IEEE Std 802, IEEE Std 802.1AC and IEEE Std

802.1Q?

Yes.

b) If the answer to a) is no, supply the response from the IEEE 802.1 WG.

The review and response is not required if the proposed standard is an amendment or revision to an existing standard for which it has been previously determined that compliance with the above IEEE 802 standards is not possible. In this case, the CSD statement shall state that this is the case.

**1.2.3 Distinct Identity**

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence of a distinct identity. Identify

standards and standards projects with similar scopes and for each one describe why the proposed

project is substantially different.

Existing IEEE 802.16 profiles address channels of 100 kHz-20 MHz. This new project provides

support for licensed spectrum with channel bandwidth less than the existing minimum

channel bandwidth of 100 kHz and non-adjacent spectrum aggregation. Other standards and projects, including LTE NB IoT and IEEE 802.20, exhibit surface similarities to this focused amendment project, but are technically quite different.

**1.2.4 Technical Feasibility**

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence that the project is technically

feasible within the time frame of the project. At a minimum, address the following items to

demonstrate technical feasibility:

a) Demonstrated system feasibility.

Several utilities, oil & gas companies, and rail companies have deployed and/or are piloting versions of IEEE 802.16 – 2017 using small channel sizes (between 100 kHz and 1.25 MHz) and some of these have are piloting a proprietary version using channel sizes less than 100 kHz and piloting spectrum aggregation.

b) Proven similar technology via testing, modeling, simulation, etc.

Several utilities, oil & gas companies, and rail companies have deployed and/or are piloting versions of IEEE 802.16 – 2017 using small channel sizes (between 100 kHz and 1.25 MHz) and some of these have are piloting a proprietary version using channel sizes less than 100 kHz and piloting spectrum aggregation.

**1.2.5 Economic Feasibility**

Each proposed IEEE 802 LMSC standard shall provide evidence of economic feasibility.

Demonstrate, as far as can reasonably be estimated, the economic feasibility of the proposed project for its intended applications. Among the areas that may be addressed in the cost for performance analysis are the following:

a) Balanced costs (infrastructure versus attached stations).

The proposed modifications, which include licensed frequencies in narrower channels than currently specified in IEEE 802.16, allow many end users to leverage their existing Land Mobile Radio (LMR) infrastructure. This minimizes the investment in incremental tower and backhaul infrastructure for private wide areas networks. The type of applications that this amendment is intended to support have relatively low bandwidth requirements, and the networks are normally range-limited, not capacity-limited. The reduction in capacity resulting from the narrower channel bandwidth does not require a higher density of base stations to compensate. The cost balance between the Base Station and the Subscriber Station is therefore unaffected by the changes in this amendment for this application set.

b) Known cost factors.

Costs include licensed spectrum, base stations and remote stations and their associated

antenna systems, and network management systems. Licensed channels

narrower than 1.25 MHz are readily available in the secondary markets at a lower cost

than commercial wideband channels. Many of these mission critical entities already own narrow channel spectrum (e.g. 12.5 kHz, 25 kHz) that are unutilized or underutilized for land mobile radio that could be used with this technology.

c) Consideration of installation costs.

Many mission critical entities already have existing LMR and backhaul infrastructure. Remote radios are typically co-located with existing assets (e.g. substations, oil fields, track crossings, customer premises equipment). Licensed VHF/UHF frequencies enable non-line-of-sight installations below the clutter. As these users consider the installation of networks to support multiple applications, the cost factors for IEEE 802.16 are superior to other alternatives. For example, deploying an LTE based infrastructure requires an Evolved Packet Core functionality, which is not necessary for IEEE 802.16.

d) Consideration of operational costs (e.g., energy consumption).

Most mission critical entities already have infrastructure assets for both base stations and

remotes and have support staff to operate these networks.

e) Other areas, as appropriate.