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Abstract

This document contains the meeting minutes for the 2018-12-19 TGbb teleconference.

**Chair: Nikola Serafimovski (pureLiFi)**

**Vice-Chair: Tuncer Baykas (IMU)**

**Secretary: Ryan G. Mennecke (JHU-APL)**

Meeting Recording Secretary: Chong Han (pureLiFi)

**Participants**

 Nikola Serafimovski (pureLiFi)

 Chong Han (pureLiFi)

 Jerome Arokkiam (Osram)

 Kai Lennert Bober (HHI)

 Volker Jungnickel (HHI)

 Arturo (GigaLiFi)

 Gerard (GigaLiFi)

 Athanasios Stavridis (Ericsson)

 Gaurav Patwardhan (HPE)

1. Chair called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM EST.
2. Chair went through IEEE patent policy and other guidelines
* Call for potentially essential patents: no response from participants.
1. Approval of Agenda
	* See agenda document https://mentor.ieee.org/802.11/dcn/18/11-18-2122-00-00bb-january-2019-meeting-agenda.ppt
	* The agenda is approved by unanimous consent.
2. Chair: how do we link the frontend model with channel models?
	* Another document such as simulation methodology could be generated or add the link between channel models and frontend models in the frontend model document.
	* Link level is considered instead of system level for PHY for now.
	* Another option is to add the descriptions in the evaluation methodology document.
	* An alternative way is to take the OFE to an independent document to keep the evaluation document clean.
	* This is to be discussed in the next telco.
3. The Chair presented the ‘PHY System Simulation Detailed Description’ in the evaluation methodology document 11-18/1429r1.
	* The users will have determinate locations and movement.
	* For link level simulations we are limited to the channel models due to the limited available models. Link level simulations are limited but good for comparison among proposals; proposers could do further system level simulations introducing more randomness to investigate the performance of the proposals.
	* One more point to make: AWGN and LOS as good scenario; bad scenarios are with multi-paths. Shall we start the simulations with selected channel models and then allow the proposers to expand the simulations with more complicated scenarios?
	* We need to consider the antenna’s impact as well. This could be considered in the PHY.
	* The question was left open for now and to be discussed in Jan. We should revisit the document and fix the text for the PHY system simuation detailed description in the evaluation methodology document.
4. Chair: where should we put the ‘comparison criteria’ in the document 11-18/1429r1?
	* One suggestion is to move the comparison criteria to the PHY area.
	* BER is better for the PHY; PER is most likely userful for system level.
	* Chair will update and upload a r2 to the mentor; everyone to have a look at the 11-18/1429r2.
5. Chair: Jerome is not able to contribute on the traffic models description. What is suggested regarding this task?
	* Suggest to remove irrelevant models.
	* GigaLiFi has few traffic models and may provide the text.
	* There is a list of traffic models given in the document 11-18/1429r1. Additional traffic models shall be provided if proposers want to add them to the TGbb. M2M is the only missing traffic model.
6. Meeting adjourned at 9:30 AM EST.