this is my response to the resolution of my comment 80 of IEEE 80216-03_03r2
I believe that avoiding to define trigger values to mesh-to-PMP scenarios, makes the document incomplete and reduces its value. I also think that according to the simulations presented, 25km can be set as such a value (see my comment 80 of IEEE 80216-03_03r2)
However, if, according to the Ballot resolution committee there is not enough evidence for that, then the worst case of 80km should be stated for that case, and the fact that 6km refers only to mesh-to-mesh should be emphasized

Suggested Remedy
Change "Mesh Systems" to "mesh-to-mesh interference"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified Recommendation by PW

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified

On page 81, starting at line 56, delete the first sentence and replace with the following:

"No coordination between PMP systems is needed in a given direction if a transmitter is at a distance of greater than 80 km from either the service area boundary or the neighbor's boundary (if known) in that direction. No coordination between Mesh systems is needed in a given direction if a transmitter is at a distance of greater than 6 km from either the service area boundary or the neighbor's boundary (if known) in that direction. No coordination between a PMP system and a mesh system is needed in a given direction if a transmitter is at a distance of greater than 50 km from either the service area boundary or the neighbor's boundary (if known) in that direction."

Add new reference [ next number xx ] after the last sentence, to refer to new contribution IEEE C802.16.2a-03/02 and include in bibliography. This document provides an analysis of the mesh to PMP co-ordination distance and concludes that a 50 km value is satisfactory.
This is my response to the resolution of my technically binding comments 95 and 97 of IEEE 802.16-03_03r2. 99.9% service availability can be achieved by 97% link availability (if at least 2 links can be made to a subscriber). Changing the target link availability to 97% will reconcile the contradiction of the target and the mesh simulation results.

Suggested Remedy
Change "99%" to "97%"

Proposed Resolution Recommendation: Accepted-Modified Recommendation by PW

Reason for Recommendation

Resolution of Group Decision of Group: Accepted-Modified
In table 12, page 85, starting line 20, replace text in second column of "availability" with "97% link availability, approximately equal to 99.9% system availability (for 90% cell area coverage)"
Add reference to a new note, immediately following the above text.
Add new note below table 28 with the following text "System availability is greater than link availability, based on the assumption of at least two link paths between mesh nodes."

Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution

Group's Notes
Group's Action Items

Editor's Notes Editor's Actions

Editor's Questions and Concerns

Editor's Action Items
dBW/MHz. I know that "dBW/MHz" is well entrenched in the jargon, but that does not make it correct. If it were correct mathematical notation, then we would have

\[-138 \text{ dBW/MHz} = -276 \text{ dBW}/(2 \text{ MHz})\]

How about using phrases like, "The receiver thermal noise is –138 dBW in 1 MHz"?

**Equation 2.** Italic $I$.

**Table 12.** In right column, "Up to 5 per square kilometer"

Bruce B. Barrow
Chair, SCC14
b.barrow@ieee.org

**Suggested Remedy**

**Proposed Resolution**

**Recommendation: Accepted**

**Recommendation by PW**

**Reason for Recommendation**

**Resolution of Group**

**Decision of Group: Accepted**

Make global change: change occurrences of "dBW/ MHz" to "dBW in 1 MHz"

Make other changes as proposed

**Reason for Group's Decision/Resolution**

**Group's Notes**

**Group's Action Items**