

Project	<b>IEEE 802.20 Working Group on Mobile Broadband Wireless Access</b> < <a href="http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/20/">http://grouper.ieee.org/groups/802/20/</a> >	
Title	<b>Comments on 802.20 Technology Selection Process Document (PD-010)</b>	
Date Submitted	<b>2006-11-16</b>	
Source(s)	Jim Ragsdale Ericsson Inc 8001 Development Drive Research Triangle Park, NC 27709	Voice: +1 919 472 7548 Email: <a href="mailto:Ragsdale@rtp.ericsson.se">Ragsdale@rtp.ericsson.se</a> or <a href="mailto:jim.ragsdale@ericsson.com">jim.ragsdale@ericsson.com</a>
Re:	Technology Selection Process	
Abstract	Contains comments on the Technology Selection Process Document	
Purpose	To further discussion within the 802.20 WG concerning Permanent documents	
Notice	This document has been prepared to assist the IEEE 802.20 Working Group. 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 grants a free, irrevocable license to the IEEE to incorporate material contained in this contribution, and any modifications thereof, in the creation of an IEEE Standards publication; to copyright in the IEEE's name any IEEE Standards publication even though it may include portions of this contribution; and at the IEEE's sole discretion to permit others to reproduce in whole or in part the resulting IEEE Standards publication. The contributor also acknowledges and accepts that this contribution may be made public by IEEE 802.20.	
Patent Policy	The contributor is familiar with IEEE patent policy, as outlined in <a href="http://standards.ieee.org/guides/opman/sect6.html#6.3">Section 6.3 of the IEEE-SA Standards Board Operations Manual</a> < <a href="http://standards.ieee.org/guides/opman/sect6.html#6.3">http://standards.ieee.org/guides/opman/sect6.html#6.3</a> > and in <i>Understanding Patent Issues During IEEE Standards Development</i> < <a href="http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/guide.html">http://standards.ieee.org/board/pat/guide.html</a> >.	

Here are my comments on the Technology Selection Process document (PD-10):

Page 2, Lines 27-35: The previous revisions of the TSP document (2005-046R1) contained a section for the Technology Description Template. I was tasked to submit the material for the Template. That was done in document 2005-035 and subsequently revised as 2005-035R1. In the September 2005 meeting this contribution was not incorporated into the document. This should be remedied by requiring the Technology Description Template according to 2005-035R1..

Page 3, Lines 14-16: The PD-10 document contains text that says that non-compliance will be determined by a 75% WG vote. I believe that compliance should be a straightforward technical exercise, therefore the text should be changed from "the working group by a 75% vote shall decide if the proposal is not compliant." to the working group by a 75% vote shall decide if the proposal is compliant."

Page 3, Line change "consistent with" to "according to"

Page 3, Line 25 says that Evaluation report 2 is required for the submission, however, Page 4, Line 2-3 says that that Report 2 may be submitted. The text should be changed to "The Evaluation Report 2 specified in the Evaluation Criteria Document shall be available at the beginning of the session at which it is be presented or at a later session."

Page 4, Lines 8-11 states that partial proposals Must merge with other proposals to form a complete proposal to be further considered. I believe that this should not be a procedure since it precludes the benefit that component proposals bring to the table.

Page 4, Lines 32-34 states that if revised proposals result in technical changes, then new simulations are required. Lines 36-37 states "Revised proposals shall be submitted to the working group and posted on the 802.20 website at least 7 days before the session they would be presented in". This clearly indicates a subsequent meeting since simulations are required. Therefore the operating timeline in the call for proposals and the defacto project plan are in opposition to this text.

Page 5, Line 26 states that all proposals that do not achieve at least 35% shall be eliminated. This is too high and should be changed to 25%.

Page 5, Lines 27-29 states "Additional elimination votes may be taken in the same session or in subsequent sessions until one technology remains for consideration." This clearly states that selection could take place over multiple meetings therefore the defacto project plan is in opposition to this text.

Page 6, Lines 3-5 indicates that after any voting that proposals may undergo technical changes without having to merge with other proposals. This clearly indicates that additional sessions are envisioned since technical changes require simulations and posting at least 7 days ahead of the meeting.

Page 7, Lines 4-5 states that "Having attained 75% support, the prevailing proposal will be adopted as the initial technical specification of IEEE 802.20 without further vote". This should be changed to "Having attained 75% support, the prevailing proposal shall proceed to a validation step."

Page 7, Lines 6-7 states that "The IEEE 802.20 Editor shall prepare Draft 1.0 from this technical specification. The Draft 1.0 shall be forwarded to the working

group for letter ballot." This should be changed to "After the validation step is completed, upon vote of the WG, the IEEE 802.20 Editor shall prepare Draft 1.0 of the technical specification. The WG shall then conduct a validation examination of the draft and approve the draft by 75% vote to proceed to WG letter ballot."

The adopted project plan shows multiple meetings between the call for proposals and the evaluation and selection. Therefore the defacto project plan and the call for proposals were in conflict with the PD-07R1 document.

Regards,

Jim

**Jim Ragsdale**