

**Draft Contribution to ITU-R WP 5D**

Received: XX XXX 2007

**TECHNOLOGY**Subject: [Question ITU-R 229-1/8](#)**Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE)****REVISION OF M.1457 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES****1 Source information**

This contribution was developed by IEEE Project 802, the Local and Metropolitan Area Network Standards Committee (“IEEE 802”), an international standards development committee organized under the IEEE and the IEEE Standards Association (“IEEE-SA”).

The content herein was prepared by a group of technical experts in IEEE 802 and industry and was approved for submission by the IEEE 802.16 Working Group on Wireless Metropolitan Area Networks, the IEEE 802.18 Radio Regulatory Technical Advisory Group, and the IEEE 802 Executive Committee, in accordance with the IEEE 802 policies and procedures, and represents the view of IEEE 802.

**2 Summary**

This contribution proposes revisions to the administrative aspects of the historical IMT-2000 update process in order to allow ready cooperation with a wider variety external organizations than anticipated a decade ago.

**3 CL95**

The IMT-2000 update process is governed by Circular Letter 8/LCCE/95 (“Update procedure for revisions of Recommendation ITU-R M.1457”), which we abbreviate here as CL95.

**4 Global Core Specifications (GCS)**

CL95 makes use of the concept of the global core specifications (GCS), defining them as “the specifications provided to ITU by the External Organizations (EOs), upon which the SDOs standards are based.”

**5 Transposition**

CL95 refers to the concept of “transposition.” It reads:

*“Section 5.x.2 also contains hyperlinks to the SDO standards corresponding to a given GCS. The SDOs regularly transpose the jointly agreed specifications into published standards. The SDOs should formally certify to the ITU that their standards incorporated by reference into the revised and published Recommendation ITU-R M.1457 correspond to the set of specifications agreed by the SDOs to be transposed into standards. The SDOs should also certify that their standards are consistent with the relevant Section 5.x.1 of Recommendation ITU-R M.1457 as presented by WP 8F to SG 8. The process of transposition of those jointly agreed specifications into the SDOs standards, should maintain close consistency with the jointly agreed specifications.”*

## 6 The annual revision

Historically, M.1457 has been revised approximately annually. The revision process, which generally invites updates to the terrestrial radio interfaces, has historically been announced by a liaison statement, issued approximately annually, announcing the intent to develop an update on a specific schedule. The annual liaison statement is in some ways contradictory to the update process as defined by CL95. (For example, even the concept of an annual update is foreign to CL95, which reads about update proposals that “The cycle applies independently for each proposal received.”)

The annual liaison statements have historically indicated that the update process is governed not by CL95 but instead by three documents: CL95, IMT/1, and IMT/2. However, these documents are not mentioned in the CL95 update process. The status of IMT/1 and IMT/2 is not clear. They exist on an ITU web site but have no clear approval or review status.

The annual liaison statements have historically also provided many additional detailed process requirements specified in CL95, IMT/1, or IMT/2. Therefore, these liaison statements have, in effect, been taken as the fourth governing document in the update process.

## 7 IMT/1

IMT/1(Rev.2) <<http://www.itu.int/osg/imt-project/docs/001r2.pdf>> is entitled “Update procedure for revisions of Recommendation ITU-R M.1457.”

The titles of CL95 and IMT/1 are identical. Both purport to be the “Update procedure for revisions of Recommendation ITU-R M.1457.” CL95 was issued by the BR Director. IMT/1 was issued by “Project Manager, IMT-2000.” However, IMT/1 references CL95. Both documents carry the same date - 28 March 2001.

The essence of IMT/1 is a description of the relationship between ITU and a specific set of organizations that develop standards and specifications. It clearly appears to be the result of negotiations with those organizations. Key points are addressed in this paragraph:

*“The agreement between the ITU and the SDOs in the development of RSPC represents a groundbreaking relationship and way forward in the rapid development of radio interface standards. This process has been running for approximately a year and WP 8F has requested the secretariat to undertake a quality review of these arrangements. Preliminary discussions on the RSPC updating process were carried out at a meeting held between ITU representatives and the Partnership Project SDO’s in San Francisco, California on 13 November 2000.”*

## 8 IMT/2 and Letter of Conveyance

IMT/2(Rev.1) <<http://www.itu.int/osg/imt-project/docs/002r1.pdf>> is entitled “Requirement to provide assurance for the global core specification as relates to recommendation ITU-R M.1457.” It was issued on 27 February 2001 by “Project Manager, IMT-2000.”

IMT/2 describes the concepts of the GCS and transposition. It reads:

*“This GCS is the nucleus of Recommendation ITU-R M.1457, with each defined element of the specification being transposed into references to one or more individual standards development organization (SDO) standards. These SDO transposed standards reflect the essence of the GCS while allowing a limited amount of flexibility to accommodate minimal regional differences.”*

IMT/2 introduces the concept of a “Letter of Conveyance” by which the SDOs can notify ITU of their endorsement of a GCS document.

IMT/2 also includes a “proposed procedure” for preparation and submission of a “Letter of Conveyance”. The “proposed procedure” introduces a number of “requirements.”

## 9 Presumptions of process

The administrative aspects of the historical M.1457 update process are founded on the key principles of the GCS, the External Organizations, transposition, and regional SDOs. The idea, in brief, is that:

- M.1457 includes the repository of Global Core Specifications
- the Global Core Specifications result from External Organizations
- the External Organizations are partnerships of regional SDOs
- the regional SDOs regularly “transpose” the GCS, making them into regional standards.

## 10 Failure of presumptions

The CL95 process should not and does not assume or require any particular model for External Organizations that support the radio interfaces of IMT-2000. There are no requirements that an external organization be a partnership of regional SDOs.

For example, in some cases, a single “external organization” may be involved in a radio interface. That organization may be, for example, a global SDO. In other cases, several independent external organizations may each support a radio interface or aspects of a radio interface.

## 11 Problem

CL95, which is the “Update procedure for revisions of Recommendation ITU-R M.1457”, does not enforce requirements that demand a specific form of external organization support the radio interfaces. However, the other documents that have historically become part of the process (IMT/1, IMT/2, and the annual liaison statement) do make such presumptions. These other documents, when enforced, serve to create a barrier restricting the participation of a variety of outside organizations that do not conform to the model of those with which procedural agreements were apparently negotiated long ago.

## 12 Proposal

We propose that the “Liaison statement to external organizations on the schedule for updating Recommendation ITU-R M.1457 to Revision 9,” of 1 February 2008, be revised as follows and the proposed revisions be adopted for future such liaison statements.

Specifically, we propose that a clarifying sentence be added to NOTE 3 of Table 1 and a new NOTE 8 be added against the term “stakeholder SDO” in the first column of the table to clarify the concept when a GCS document is the product of a single SDO, as follows:

NOTE 3 – As per Document IMT/1(Rev.2) (<http://www.itu.int/osg/imt-project/docs/001r2.pdf>).  
When a GCS document is the product of a single SDO, the transposition and certification for that document is the responsibility of that SDO.

NOTE 8 – When a GCS document is the product of a single SDO, the stakeholder SDO is that SDO.