Project	**IEEE 802.16 Broadband Wireless Access Working Group**
Title	**System Requirements Minutes from Session #3 (Draft)**
Date Submitted	**1999-11-04**
Source	George Fishel Communications Consulting Services 10 Bretz Circle Shermans Dale, PA 170990 Voice: +1-717-582-2507 Fax: +1-717-582-3637 E-mail: grfishel@pa.net
Re:	
Abstract	System Requirements Minutes from Session #3 (Draft)
Purpose	
Notice	This document has been prepared to assist the IEEE 802.16. 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 may be made public by 802.16.
IEEE Patent Policy	The contributor is familiar with the IEEE Patent Policy, which is set forth in the IEEE-SA Standards Board Bylaws <http://standards.ieee.org/guides/bylaws> and includes the statement: "IEEE standards may include the known use of patent(s), including patent applications, if there is technical justification in the opinion of the standards-developing committee and provided the IEEE receives assurance from the patent holder that it will license applicants under reasonable terms and conditions for the purpose of implementing the standard."

System Requirements Minutes from Session #3

Author: Jim Mollenauer
Edited by George Fishel

Friday morning, September 17

System Requirements Task Group

George Fishel opened the meeting at about 8:00 AM and pointed out that the minutes of the Denver Session #2 had been on the flash card as document 32. These minutes will not be voted on until November since people have not had time to review them.

Jim Mollenauer presented the work of the QoS ad-hoc committee. The first item, the Bearer Services table, was accepted as presented with the addition of a row for MPEG video with a bit error rate of 10^{-11}. Some doubt was expressed about the possibility of attaining this low an error rate over a radio link, but discussion concluded on the note that additional FEC bits could be appended to the MPEG frame (i.e. the normal 16-byte MPEG FEC field) in the MPEG convergence sublayer. A motion to accept the table as part of the SR document, with a note relating to encryption, passed with 18 yes, 1 no, and 1 abstaining.

The next item was to review the SR comments that had been referred to the QoS committee. The following items were accepted without opposition:

Item Numbers 72, 47, 27, 39, 40, 107, 41, 49.

Item 55 was rejected without opposition, following the recommendation of the ad-hoc committee, since it referenced G.821, which is intended for low-rate connections. Also, it was considered redundant given that item 47 (on definition of an out-of-service connection) was accepted.

It was proposed by Ray Sanders that the paragraph containing items 34-36 be deleted completely. This was approved 16-1-2.

Item 47, to include in the SR document two sections from document 99-28 relating to QoS, was tabled by a vote of 18-3-2. The ad-hoc committee had favored including this item as an informative annex, but the document itself was not immediately available to committee members since it had not been on the flash card. Hence final decision was tabled until November 8 Hawaii meeting.

Next, Jose Costa presented the results to date of the vocabulary ad-hoc committee. There will be an item added for dynamically variable bandwidth, per discussions this morning. Work done to date by the committee was accepted. Further work will be done, though Costa will not be at the November meeting due to a conflict with an ITU meeting.

Fishel will put together a table of all the requirements that appear in the SR document, i.e., all the shoulds, shalls, and musts.

Remaining comments on the System Requirements will be handled in Hawaii. After approval in the meeting, Fishel proposed sending it out for letter ballot. Roger Marks felt that a letter ballot would have more moral authority. Jim Mollenauer felt that if the letter ballot fails to receive 75% affirmative, resolution of letter ballot comments would take a long time. It would interfere with the preparation and evaluation of proposals, which are scheduled to take place at the same time.

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday, November 8 1999 at the Hawaii meeting.

The meeting concluded at about 10:15 AM.