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## Abstract:

Minutes of the IEEE 802 5G SC conference call on July 20th, 2016

# Conference call on Wednesday, July 20th, 2016 10:00-11:00AM ET

Chair: Glenn Parsons

Recording secretary: Max Riegel

## Call to order

* Chair called meeting to order at 10:02 AM ET
* Guiding slides with agenda proposal by EC doc#61r12
* <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0061-12-5GSG-5g-sc-conference-call-agenda.pdf>
* IEEE SC Guidelines
* Chair showed mandatory slide for IEEE standing committee meetings and explained duties of participants

## Participants

| **Name** | **Affiliation** | **Name** | **Affiliation** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Glenn Parsons | Ericsson | George Calcev | Huawei |
| Max Riegel | Nokia | Paul Nikolich | self |
| Edward Au | Huawei | Roger Marks | EthAirNet Assoc. |
| Fujio Watababe | DOCOMO | Yonggang Fang | ZTE TX |
| Jim Lansford | Qualcomm | Sam Sambasivan | AT&T |
| Joseph Levy | InterDigital | Timothy Jeffries | Huawei |

## Agenda

* Chair brought up agenda proposal contained in guiding slides
* Future meeting schedule
* Plan for face-to-face meeting
* Progress report
* <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0094-05-5GSG-proposed-draft-report-ieee-802-ec-5g-imt-2020-sc.pptx>
* No further requests were made and group agreed on agenda.

## Future meeting schedule

* July plenary plans
* Sessions on 730-930PM on both Monday and Tuesday
* Topics on Monday:
* Present report as available
* Introduce editorial comments as brought up during the session
* Strive for consensus on conclusions of report or capture preferences by a number of straw polls
* On Tuesday
* Discuss disposition of SC
* Either modify scope of SC to focus on conclusion
* Or declare success and disband the SC
  + ..and defer follow-on activities into WGs
* Joe wondered whether decision about conclusion or extension of 5G SC would be fully up to EC
* Glenn responded that indeed the final decision is up to EC but the study group should state its preferences towards EC to provide input for discussion.
* No further comments/questions were raised on future meetings.

## Progress report

* Roger showed the latest draft of the report as created based on the input after the last conference call.
* <https://mentor.ieee.org/802-ec/dcn/16/ec-16-0094-05-5GSG-proposed-draft-report-ieee-802-ec-5g-imt-2020-sc.pptx>
* When Glenn asked for showing the changes to the slides since the last call Roger explained that the slides would not contain revision marks but he would point to the modifications when going through the slides. A short revision history is captured on the first slide.
* On slide 11 Joe asked about the functions behind the green cloud.
* Max explained that the green cloud represents the upcoming 5G core network, which is not defined yet. The IEEE 802 access network would directly connect into it.
* George wondered about the meaning of the dots labeled R2, R3, R4, and R9.
* Max explained that the dots represent interfaces from an IEEE 802 perspective to make the IEEE 802 radio access technologies working. The dotted lines represent control interfaces, and the solid line represents an Ethernet port carrying the user data. How these interfaces finally connect into the 5G core is up to adaptation functions in the green cloud. Whether adaptation is needed depends on the design of the 5G core.
* Roger added that the figure does not represent only the 3GPP case. It is generic and would apply also for connections into other service core networks.
* Glenn asked for providing a reference for the figure
* Max confirmed that the figure was taken from an OmniRAN presentation to 5G SC at the Budapest meeting.
* On slide 13 Glenn informed that IEEE 1904.3 has meanwhile been moved to IEEE 1914.3
* Roger explained that IEEE 1904 was mentioned due to its work related to PON access networks, not due to the fronthaul related project now moved over to P1914.3. Anyhow he would prefer to list a couple of more IEEE projects related with access network.
* Roger pointed to the additions on slide 14 and the editorial amendment on slide 15, which were accepted without further comments.
* Roger explained that slide 18 and slide 19 were contributed by Stephen.
* Glenn wondered about the source of the figures and asked for a reference to be added.
* Joe brought up that the 3 views do not have found yet agreement in 3GPP
* Glenn mentioned that the figures potentially reflect Stephen’s view.
* George explained that likely the confusion is coming from labeling it ‘3GPP….’
* Glenn offered to title the slide ‘Potential architecture of 802.11 in 3GPP-networks’
* Joe concluded that his concerns would be addressed if just ‘Potential’ would be added in front of the title.
* When Roger explained that on both slide 20 and slide 21 an additional threat was added in row 3 stating that RIT simulations may fail to produce convincing results, Paul asked about the process that ITU-R would conclude that results are not convincing.
* Roger explained that there is no defined process in ITU-R on how to establish convincing simulation results. Likely WP5D would evaluate the results, or even create own results based on input about the candidate technologies. How WP5D would allow for enhancing simulation results to fit the expectations is not defined.
* Roger explained that slide 23 is an entirely new slide from Stephen, and he would see need for some edits to make it better fitting to the overall flow.
* When wondering about the meaning of ‘independents’ in the last line of slide 23 Glenn proposed to rename it as ‘other operators’.
* Roger explained that on slide 24 ‘actions towards A’ were added. Previously only ‘actions towards B3’ were present.
* Roger moved on to slide 25 with the conclusions contributed by Glenn.
* Paul wondered that conclusions seem to be prefer B3 with secondary desire to process Action A. He would like to see that more clearly expressed
* Glenn proposed to simply convert the sentence into a bullet list.
* Joe expressed and Roger seconded that such modification would not enhance clarity.
* Paul brought up that a conclusion is not a summary, but the essence of going forward, and he proposed to insert a summary slide before the conclusion
* Glenn agreed to insert a summary slide with the first sentence of his conclusion slide.
* George wondered about the further steps to bring the slides forward to the EC
* Glenn explained that slides are input for the 5G SC meetings on Monday and Tuesday, which will create the final slides for the EC.
* Glenn asked for a further revision before next Monday with the amendments discussed in the conference call and a clean-up of the ‘x’ bullet points on the Appendix 1 slide.
* Glenn concluded the discussion on the draft report that he will circulate the link to the latest draft well before the 5G SC meeting on next Monday asking for submitting further comments to the Monday 5G SC meeting.

## AOB

* No other topics were raised.

## Adjourn

* The meeting was adjourned by the chair at 11:04AM ET