IEEE P802.21.1 Media Independent Services and Use Cases

Meeting Minutes of the IEEE P802.21.1 Task Group

Chair: Subir Das
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## Monday, PM1 Meeting, November, 03, 2014 (1:00-3:00 PM)

## Meeting called to order by Chair at 1:35PM

Jin Seek Choi presented DCN: 21-14-0157-00-SAUC

Title:Use cases of MIS framework to cooperate with SDN wireless access networks

Q: Slide #8: Co-location does not impact the Standard. It is an implementation issue? Is it correct?

A: MIS does not allow the resource allocation. So this is needed. However, it is true that there is no need to standard amendment.

Q: Slide #10: It is shown there is signaling between MIS PoS and SDN controller. Let’s say, we do not have MISF. In SDN, there will be a way to configure the SDN Controller. Are you suggesting that MISF replaces the SDN controller configuration function?

A: SDN does not provide the mobility or handover.

Q: But you are not providing mobility or handover here?

There were discussions for understanding the relevance of the MISF here. What are the functionalities that are needed from MISF? What are the controller functions that are added to SDN controller?

A: The proposed approach is to show how MISF can work with SDN

Q: Why can’t 802.21 be implemented independently within an SDN framework? Why the separation is needed? What is the problem?

A: Proposal is that if SDN adopts MISF, several options are available to them.

Q: Is there any Standardization issue for option #1?

A: No, and no changes to 802.21.

Q: Is there any Standardization issue for option #2?

A: There may be but not obvious.

Comment: It is not clear that there is no changes are required for option #2.

Q: Is there any Standardization issue for option #3?

A: Yes, this is an integrated scenario.

Comment: Option #3 is a big task. Option #1 can work as it is and it is an implementation issue.

Comment: TG wants to see more call flows for Option #2.

Comment: TG supports having a use case of SDN

Authors will present more call flows for Option #2.

Hyeong Ho Lee presented 21-14-0158-00

Title: Proposed Text of “Radio Resource Management Service” Section for IEEE 802.21.1 Draft Standard

Q: Is there any MAC changes required to enable this scenario?

A: Most likely not. Only mapping is required.

Q: Is MISF residing in Access Controller?

A: Yes

Authors were requested to outline the dependencies, if there is any, with lower layers.

It was mentioned that only mappings are required.

TG thinks that this may be another use case but it is little bit in a slippery slope. Without knowing how the individual radios do their power management and dependencies with the lower layers, it is hard to finalize the decision. The danger is if we suggest something that will neither be achievable nor the way each lower layer does, the document may not be approved during ballot. Authors were encouraged to elaborate these details and present in future meetings.

## Tuesday, PM1 Meeting, November, 04, 2014 (1:30-3:00 pm)

## Meeting called to order by Chair at PM

Hyeong Ho Lee presented 21-14-0159-00

Title: Proposed Text of “D2D Communications Service” Section for IEEE 802.21.1 Draft Standard

Q: Why Query\_D2D-Tech\_List is required during discovery?

A: MN wants to know the peer’s tech list.

Q: Do we need the tech list during registration? How is the above primitive being used during discovery?

A: It seems duplicated. Discovery may be required for special case.

Q: Why can’t we do this during discovery? Why do we need two times?

A: Yes, it could be done at the discovery time.

Q: It should be either one. Not required during initial time and discovery?

A: It seems that we do not need. This will be updated.

Q: In the case of Off-network, do we still need three-stages; discovery, setup and connection?

A: No registration, just setup and connection.

Q: But there has to be a discovery.

A: Yes.

Q: Off-network, the clarification is required.

A: It will be done

Q: What is MIS\_D2D\_Connection request?

A: This is a request to change the connection

Q: How does Mobile Node know the D2D\_PeerID?

A: It assumes that MIS knows this info

Authors will revise the documents and present it in next meeting. It was suggested to clarify things and present it again. TG has consensus to adopt this use case.

Jin seek Choi presented an updated version of DCN: 21-14-0157-01-SAUC

There were many discussions on the new call flows.

Comment: This does not require any changes to Standards. However, it was decided to capture the use cases. Option #1 and #2 should be included as an appendix but Option #3 should be included since it requires integration with SDN group. Authors will update the document and bring to the next meeting.

## Thursday, AM1 Meeting, November 05, 2014 (10:30-12:30 pm)

## Meeting called to order by Chair at 10:32PM

Hyunho Park presented DCN: 21-14-0163-01-SAUC

Title: Media Independent Service Use Case for Open Screen Service Platform

Q: What is Open Screen Service?

A: This is a project under which the IOT services are investigated.

Comment: The service definition and some detailed description would be helpful?

Q: What can’t this be done by applications?

A: Author thinks that this may be done better using media independent services.

Comment: It was recommended to present this kind of use cases in 802.24 IoT service subgroup once it is created. It will be a stretch to add all these uses cases in 802.21.1. Authors were encouraged to present their research results in future meetings.

Hyunho Park presented DCN: 21-14-0164-01-SAUC

Title: Proposed Text of “D2D Communications Service” Section for IEEE 802.21.1 Draft Standard

Q: In Figure 2, why do we need step 2? It should be under discovery step.

A: PoS needs to initiate this.

Comment: Normally this is done at discovery stage. So this step should be merged within discovery.

Author has agreed to do this next time after discussing with other D2D presentation.
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