IEEE P802.19

Wireless Coexistence Working Group

Project	IEEE 802.19 Wireless Coexistence Working Group (WG)		
Title	Minutes of Teleconference Call, 2010 Feb 23		
Date Submitted	[Feb 2010]		
Source	[Tuncer Baykas] [NICT] [Yokosuka,Japan]	Voice: Fax: E-mail:	[] [] tbaykas@ieee.org
Re:			
Abstract	Minutes of Feb 23rd teleconference		
Purpose	Minutes of Feb 23rd teleconference		
Notice	This document has been prepared to assist the IEEE P802.19. 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 P802.19.		

Memo of Teleconference Call of TG1 System Requirements , Feb 23, 2010 Date: Feb 23rd, 2010, 6:00am in EST

Attendees:

Ivan Reede (Amerisys), Alex Reznik, Joe Kwak (InterDigital), Gabriel Villardi, Tuncer Baykas, Chen Sun, Yohannes Alemseged, Ha Nguyen Tran, Stanislav Filin, Chunyi Song, (NICT), Päivi Ruuska (Nokia), Reinhard Gloger (Nokia Siemens Networks)

Discussed Documents:

19-10-0035-00-0001- P802.19.1 System Requirements,

Action Items:

- 1. Group will use (19-10-0035\r0) as baseline document for requirements document and try to convert it to recommendation of the ad hog group to TG.
- 2. Alex Reznik will send his suggestion related security requirements.

What discussed:

- 1 Minutes of Teleconference Call of TG1 System Requirements, Feb 16, 2010 is approved
- 2 Ivan Reede reminded Patent policy of IEEE.
- 3 Ivan Reede reminded everyone to send their attendance.
- 4 Discussion on P802.19.1 System Requirements (19-10-0035) presented by G. Villardi.
 - 4.1 Comment from Alex Reznik: Thanked for the worked done. The description of the system is unclear. Is the system the collection of the devices of networks? How do we define 802.19.1 compliant
 - 4.2 Stanislav Filin: By system we mean collection 802.19.1 entities and corresponding interfaces. We believe it is early at SDD stage to define what is 802.19 compliant or not? Some parts of the requirement could be optional to implement.
 - 4.3 Alex Reznik requested to add slide 4 to add clarifying comments.

- 4.4 Alex Reznik requested I agree what we are defining in requirement could be optional to implement.
- 4.5 Alex Reznik would like to improve Security requirement, capability to provide policy enforcement, security of geolocation information etc. Do we want to capture these requirements as well?
- 4.6 Paivi Ruuska: I think it would be helpful to include those requirements as well.
- 4.7 Alex Reznik: I volunteer to provide some clarification.
- 4.8 Ivan Reede: Do we want to add authentication, authorization, access as elements of security?
- 4.9 Alex Reznik: It should be on the list. Are authors ok for me to provide clarifications?
- 4.10 Paivi Ruuska: We are fine.
- 4.11 Alex Reznik will provide it before the end of the week.
- 4.12 Ivan Reede asked for the clarification of the system.
- 4.13 Stanislav Filin: System is collection of 802.19.1 entities and corresponding interfaces.
- 4.14 Ivan Reede would like go to the Task Group with a motion with requirements.
- 4.15 Stanislav Filin: We can distinguish system and device?
- 4.16 Paivi Ruuska: Can we have a picture?
- 4.17 Stanislay: Words could be enough.
- 4.18 Paivi Ruuska: It is acceptable:
- 4.19 Reinhard: Picture is a good idea.
- 4.20 Yohanees: Picture would resemble as architecture and I don't want to spend time on that.
- 4.21 Paivi Ruuska: I agree .
- 4.22 Alex Reznik: I agree with Stanislav just to have a good definition of system.
- 4.23 Ivan Reede: Any further discussion on slide 4. No response.
- 4.24 It looks like we are creating a common understanding.
- 4.25 Ivan Reede: Any further discussion on slide 5. No response.
- 4.26 Ivan Reede: Any further discussion on slide 6. No response.
- 4.27 Joe Kwak: Comment on slide 6. This seems to be a requirement to an external system. It is overlapping with assumptions.
- 4.28 Ivan Reede: I am reading in the requirement that the whole system should be able obtain information but not a particular device.

- 4.29 Alex Reznik ask if system is like a nebula of devices and this system somehow access information.
- 4.30 Ivan Reede: We need to define how information is accessed. It doesn't mean that all devices should access information.
- 4.31 Alex Reznik I agree.
- 4.32 Joe Kwak: Suggestion to add "to have external interfaces" to the requirement. Because FCC may block information access to its database.
- 4.33 Paivi Ruuska: I don't see much difference between current systems and your suggestion. However FCC database is just an example, we are defining a general requirement here.
- 4.34 Ivan Reede: I am looking for whole system and if it can not obtain information than it cannot provide coexistence. FCC database is just an example, I like the way it is written.
- 4.35 Stanislav, we agree with Ivan Reede and this was our intention. FCC database is not a good example but it is an example only.
- 4.36 Paivi Ruuska: I agree with Stanislav, it could beinformation from other systems.
- 4.37 Ivan Reede No other comments on slide 6.
- 4.38 Ivan Reede: Any comments on slide 7. No Comments.
- 4.39 Ivan Reede: Any comments on slide 8.
- 4.40 Joe Kwak: I think this requirement is in implementation level. This is not a system requirement.
- 4.41 Alex Reznik: This requirement is not compliance requirements. These are requirements we would like to provide to systems to utilize.
- 4.42 Ivan Reede: As chair, since there were no voting possible in the last meeting. We can provide anything we want.
- 4.43 Joe Kwak: We may elobarate what is goal or requirement in face to face meeting.
- 4.44 Stanislav Filin: Discussion is go far. The problem is the definition of .19.1 system is. As we talked here it is collection of entities and interfaces. Not network or device. What req. 4 saying is that system shall be able to provide reconfiguration commands to networks or devices.
- 4.45 Ivan Reede: Can we change command to decision? Because it looks like inside entities in a .19.1 system and there won't be any outside interface.
- 4.46 Stanislav: We were thinking that commands goes to outside to the devoces or networks.
- 4.47 Ivan Reede: We will check Slide 8 again in the discussion.
- 4.48 Ivan Reede: Any comments to slide 9. No comments

- 4.49 Ivan Reede: Any comments to slide 10.
- 4.50 Alex Reznik: As a reminder I volunteered to expand this requirement.
- 4.51 Any comments to slide 10.
- 4.52 Joe Kwak: I agree with the requirement. But this wording is not a requirement.
- 4.53 Alex Reznik: Would it be goal?
- 4.54 Ivan Reede: It is possible.
- 4.55 Stanislav: We had "shall" "may" and "should" requirements in other standards.
- 4.56 Ivan Reede: You mean that it is desirable but in some situations it is not possible to analyze the information and therefor "should" is kept.
- 4.57 Joe Kwak: I agree with the current wording but optional requirement is an oxymoron.
- 4.58 Ivan Reede This is an desirable attribute. We may work on this requirement.
- 4.59 Ivan Reede: I suggest people to work on it.
- 4.60 Ivan Reede Slide 12 any comments. No comments.
- 4.61 Ivan Reede Slide 13 any comments.
- 4.62 Ivan Reede: I agree with the explanatory note, but the requirement requires all implenetation
- 4.63 Stanislav: What we mean is standard should include all necessary interfaces for all options. That's why we put shall, since we shall define all interfaces.
- 4.64 Ivan Reede No more comments for slide 13
- 4.65 Ivan Reede Any comments for slide 14?
- 4.66 Joe Kwak: This is a desirable goal not a requirement especially for TDMA solutions.
- 4.67 Paivi Ruuska. I agree this is more of a goal requirement.
- 4.68 Ivan Reede thank you all and don't forget to send your attendance.
- 5 Ivan Reede: I propose this week to take this document and converting to recommendation of ad hoc group to TG.
- 6 Group recessed.